

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

THE DRAMATIZATION OF SALVIFIC HISTORY IN THE DEUTERONOMIC SCHOOLS

by
J. N. M. WIJNGAARDS

Oudtestamentische Studiën, Vol XVI



LEIDEN, E.J. BRILL 1969

Scanned into Word format for the Wijngaards Institute by Gill Haydon

CONTENTS

Foreword

I THE PROCESSION FROM SUCCOTH TO SHECHEM .

- 1.0. Introduction.
- 1.1. Jos 3: 14-17; 4: 9
- 1.2. Hos 6: 7-10
- 1.3. Gen 33: 17-20
- 1.4. Ex 13: 18-20.
- 1.5. Ps 60 8 -10 (108: 8 -10)
- 1.6. Ps 68
- 1.7. Dtn 5: 1-28: 69
- 1.8. Reconstructing the solemnities of the procession

II. DRAMATIZATIONS OF THE EXODUS .

- 2.0. Introduction
- 2.1. The disparity of Exodus and Landgiving
- 2.2. "You have seen with your own eyes..."
- 2.3. The cultic drama in the book of Exodus
- 2.4. The deuteronomic historians and celebrations at Gilgal
- 2.5. Reconstructing the dramatizations of the Exodus

III. THE CULTIC OCCUPATION OF THE LAND

- 3.0. Introduction
- 3.1. The Land-giving and the "fathers"
- 3.2. The oath and the gift of the land
- 3.3. The inheritance.
- 3.4. Taking possession of the land
- 3.5. Crossing the Jordan
- 3.6. The boundaries of the Promised Land
- 3.7. Reconstructing the Land-giving rituals

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

- 4.0. Introduction.
- 4.1. The pre-conquest dramatization of the Exodus
- 4.2. The Shechemite land ritual (1250-1050 BC)
- 4.3. Covenantal celebrations in the Northern Kingdom (929-722 BC).
- 4.4. The deuteronomic school at Gilgal (850-587 BC) ..
- 4.5. The transition from "cultic drama" to "sacred narrative"

Index of the Principal Texts Discussed

Index of Hebrew Terms

List of Modern Authors

FOREWORD

This study began as philological research on characteristic deuteronomic terms. Incentive and starting-point were the surveys undertaken by S. R. Driver¹⁾ and C. Steuernagel.²⁾ The study did, in fact, widen the scope of research realized in some earlier publications. In the course of time new findings emerged which went far beyond mere philological interest. It seemed to me that these findings have bearing on some of the more exciting questions of present-day Old Testament studies: Israelite worship, the development of the history of salvation and the mutual relationship of the deuteronomic schools.

In this book I would like to report on these findings. The book has retained its character of being a "report." I have tried to keep separate lines of research in separate sections and paragraphs. The conclusions arrived at are proposed as working hypotheses which will need further confirmation. I have attempted to relate my own study to publications that were relevant to each question. But I am fully aware of the limitations the work may have incurred. As a matter of fact, the complexity of the problems involved would seem to exceed the competence of any single person. Only cooperation and "team work" will produce lasting results. It is to make such team work possible that I decided to publish this report - imperfect though it may be, remembering the old adage: "Emendatio pars studiorum longe utilissima."³⁾

1) *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, Edinburgh 1895, pp. LXXVII-XCV.

2) *Das Deuleronomium*, Gottingen 1923, pp. 41-89.

3) QUINTILIANUS, *Insiitutio Oratorio*, 10.4.1.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROCESSION FROM SUCCOTH TO SHECHEM

1.0. Introduction

1.0.a. The crossing of the Jordan, narrated in Jos. 3-4, reflects an ancient cultic practice. H. J. Kraus has proved this with convincing arguments. The linking of the crossing to the sacred "today" (Dtn 9:1; Jos 3:7; 4:14), the formula "you have seen with your own eyes" (Dtn 4:34, 11 :77 29:1; cf. Jos 3:10), the function of the ark and the priests (Jos 3 : 6ff), the liturgical instructions and addresses (Jos 3 : 3ff. ; 3:9ff.; 4:21ff.); these all point to but one conclusion: Jos 3-4 is the cult legend of a liturgical procession at the Jordan. This crossing must have had the significance attributed to it by the account itself: "For Jahweh your God dried up the waters of the Jordan for you until you passed over, as Jahweh your God did to the Sea of Reeds, which He dried up for us until we passed over." (Jos 4:23). The crossing was the cultic re-enactment of the miraculous escape at the Sea of Reeds.¹⁾

1.0.b. Repeated mention is made of Shittim as the point of departure for the procession (Jos 3:1 ; Mi 6:5; Num 25:1; 33:49) and of Gilgal as its terminal (Jos 4-5; Mi 6 : 5). H. J. Kraus concluded from this that the procession crossed the Jordan "on the east of Jericho" (Jos 4:19). It did not escape his attention that frequent reference is made to Shechem also (Dtn 11:29; 27:4, 12ff.) and that cultic representations of the Sinai event were connected to that sanctuary (Jos 24; Dtn 6:21ff.; 26:5ff). Because of these facts he considered the possibility of some cultic transfer of ceremonies (such as the curse and the blessing) from Shechem to Gilgal when Shechem had ceased to be the central sanctuary. Apart from this he judged the traditions of the Ark crossing the Jordan firmly rooted in the sanctuary of Gilgal.²⁾ H. Wildberger is even more outspoken in affirming the original connection between this procession through the Jordan and Gilgal.³⁾

1.0.c. These studies, which have - no doubt inadequately - been outlined so far, did not fail to throw a great deal of light on the cult at the Jordan. Yet, many questions remained unanswered. Why this pernacious reference to Shechem as the terminal of the entrance into the land (Dtn 11 :29; 27 :4, 12ff.), if the crossing had always taken place at Gilgal ?⁴⁾ If the renewal of the covenant had its place on the feast of Tabernacles (presumably at Shechem; Dtn 26:lff.; 31 :10), how then could the indubitably covenantal drama of the Exodus and Landgiving⁵⁾ be linked to the Passover celebration at Gilgal (Jos 5: 11)? Does the covenantal structure of the deuteronomic law itself⁶⁾ not point to Shechem as the most likely cultic setting,⁷⁾ even though the present introduction places it apparently in a more southernly region (Dtn 4: 44-46; 28: 69)? Is Joshua, the cultic hero of the procession, not more related to Shechem than to Gilgal ?⁸⁾ All these questions crystalize round one central problem: what part did Shechem play in the cultic celebration of crossing the Jordan?

1.0.d. I submit that a different reconstruction of the processional cult at the Jordan is called for. And, in the light of material that has not so far been made to bear on the question, I put forward the following hypothesis :

1. The procession across the Jordan was originally (i.e. 1250-1050 BC) conducted, not from Shittim to Gilgal, but from Succoth to Shechem.

2. The deuteronomistic law (Dtn 5 :1-28: 68) found its setting in the covenantal instruction at Succoth which was to prepare for the solemn reaffirmation of the Land-giving at Shechem.

1.0.e. In this chapter we will discuss the reasons that justify the acceptance of this hypothesis. We will consider especially the following texts: Jos 3:14-17; Hos 6:7-10; Gen 33:17-20 (E); Ex 13:18-20 (E); Ps 60:8-10 (108:8-10); Ps 68 and Dtn 5:1-28:69. After a scrutiny of each passage on its own merit we will attempt to analyse the information contained in them in relationship to the whole cultic tradition.

1.1. Jos 3:14-17; 4:9

1.1.a. There is almost universal agreement on the fact that Jos 3-4 was originally not one literary unit.⁹⁾ I agree with K. Mohlenbrink that it is practically impossible to disentangle the passage with a purely literary analysis. Most light will be derived from a recognition and disentangling of various living cultic traditions presupposed in the text.¹⁰⁾ But I also agree with M. Noth's rejection of two parallel accounts having been welded together in the passage. His hypothesis of one primitive account which subsequently underwent additions and redactions seems more acceptable, especially in the light of the obvious redactional involvement of the deuteronomistic historian.¹¹⁾ Applying these principles I believe that we can distinguish *a primitive account* reflecting a northern tradition from *the deuteronomistic redaction* which reflects traditions rooted at Gilgal.

1.1.b. The nucleus of the original account is contained in these verses:

"This is what happened:

The people set out from their tents to cross the Jordan, and the carriers¹²⁾ of the ark¹³⁾ went before them. As soon as the carriers of the ark had reached the Jordan and their feet had touched the side of the water-and (remember) the Jordan overflows all its banks throughout the harvest season-the water of the Jordan stopped flowing. The water that came from upstream rose up as one wall, stretching far, near Adam, the city which is beside Zarethan.¹⁴⁾ And the water which flows down towards the Sea of the Arabah, the Salt Sea, was totally cut off...

And the carriers of the ark of Jahweh's covenant remained standing on dry ground right in the middle of the Jordan and all Israel passed over dry ground ...

And Joshua erected twelve stones in the middle of the Jordan on the spot where the feet of the carriers of the ark had stood. And they are there till this day."

Jos 3:14-19^a; 4:9²)

1.1.c. The first characteristic of the primitive tradition concerns the topography. From Jos 3 :16 emerges that the liturgical crossing of the Jordan took place *in the fords near Adam*. It should be noted that the indication of place, "near Adam, the city that

is beside Zarethan", is linked with the very crossing itself. The waters are "cut off" (3 :16) by the touch of the ark bearers' feet.

The ark-bearers stand in the middle of the river as it were to uphold the "dam of water" that heaps up on the one side (3 :16, 17), just as Moses' commanding gesture had raised and dispersed the walls of water at the Sea of Reeds (Ex 14:21-28). The very kernel of the miracle presupposes an intimate and direct connection between the presence of the ark and the wall of water. The original tradition implies, therefore, a crossing at Adam.¹⁵⁾ Through this characteristic, the tradition can clearly be separated from the deuteronomic redaction.

1.1.d. A similar observation can be made regarding the function of the ark. No doubt, the ark plays a central role in the liturgy:¹⁶⁾ it goes before the people (3 :14) and it initiates the crossing (3 :15). According to the Northern tradition the *ark remains in the middle of the Jordan* until all have crossed (3 :17). The deuteronomic historian, however, follows a tradition according to which the ark crosses right over the Jordan ahead of the people (Jos 3 : 6; 4: 11). The people are consequently told to follow from afar (Jos 3: 4).

1.1.e. This difference in the liturgy of the primitive northern account and the practice known to the deuteronomic historian manifests itself also in the monument connected with the ceremonies. The primitive northern account mentions *a monument of stones in the middle of the Jordan*. The location of the monument is explicitly identified with the characteristic place occupied by the ark bearers during the procession (Jos 4: 9).¹⁷⁾ It can easily be distinguished from the monument erected at Gilgal (Jos 4:20) which was built up from stones carried out of the Jordan bed (Jos 4:4-5, 5, 8). The monument presupposed in the northern tradition may, perhaps, be identified with the memorial erected by the Rubenites and Gadites "*on the Jordan*," "*on the heaps of the Jordan*," "*at the crossing towards Israel*" (Jos 22:10-11). The name has been lost from the text (Jos 22: 34), but the play on the word **עֵד** witness, suggests **גִּלְעָד** (Jos 22:27,35). A Jahwistic tradition attaches to this **גִּלְעָד** the meaning of witnessing to a treaty between Laban and Jacob (Gen 31 :44, 46-48, 51-53a).¹⁸⁾ In Hosea's prophecies this same **גִּלְעָד** recurs as the scene of an idolatrous shrine (Hos 6: 8; 12 :12),¹⁹⁾ perhaps in reference to the same altar as mentioned in Jos. 22: 27ff.

1.1.f. Considering that the relationship of Joshua to the Gilgal traditions seems to be of later date, whereas his position in the "house of Joseph" is incontestible,²⁰⁾ I venture to suggest that also the *person of Joshua* belonged to the original northern tradition. His personality seems firmly rooted in the cultic ceremonies of the crossing: the liturgical addresses (Jos 3: 3-13; etc.) and the erection of the stones (Jos 4:2-8, 20; 4:9) are attributed to him. Moreover, Joshua finds his place in the traditions of Ephraim (Jos 19:49; 24:30) for whom the fords at Adam functioned as the normal crossing place to and from Transjordan (cf. Jdc 12:1-6). Joshua emerges also as the great cultic mediator at Shechem (Jos 24: 1-28), the place to which - as we will see later - the procession moved on. It is quite acceptable, therefore, to assume that Joshua played a part in the cultic traditions of the crossing at Adam.

1.1.g. Another observation can be made. It is likely that the crossing of the Jordan near Adam took place *on the feast of Tabernacles*. Since it is the feast that closes the harvest season (Dtn 16: 13-15; Lev 23: 39), the reference to the harvest in Jos 3 :14 receives a very plausible explanation: the narrator remarks that the water of the Jordan overflows on *all* the days of the harvest, i.e. also at its close.²¹⁾ Then, we should note that the text says: "the people set out *from their tents*" (Jos 3:14). The parallelism with the remark about the ark preceding the people in the same verse suggests that both expressions be taken as reflecting liturgical practice. At the feast of Tabernacles the community lived in tents (cf. Hos 12: 9-10) and the rite of leaving these temporary habitations, symbols of nomad life, in order to take up more permanent dwellings in the promised land may well have had great significance. Was God not going to give them "cities which they did not build" and "houses full of all good things which they did not fill" (Dtn 6:10-11; Jos 24:13)?

1.1.h. Summarizing we may say that Jos 3-4 presupposes an earlier tradition according to which the liturgy of crossing the Jordan was celebrated in the fords near Adam. During the crossing the ark-bearers remained in the middle of the Jordan near a monument of twelve stones which may have been known as גלעד. There are reasons to assume that Joshua was the cultic hero of this tradition and that the liturgical celebration took place on the feast of Tabernacles.

1.2. Hos 6:7-10

1.2.a. H. J. Kraus has pointed out that some passages in Hosea imply the existence of an ancient "tent festival" in Israel.²²⁾ In Hos 12:10 we read: "I am Jahweh your God from the land of Egypt. *I will again make you dwell in tents* as in the days of the assembly." Explicit mention is made of a solemn assembly of all Israel, a מועד, in a tentfestival.²³⁾ The most obvious interpretation of the text is to see in it a direct reference to the assembly, מועד, *at the feast of Tabernacles* (Dtn 31 :10). For the feast of Tabernacles is the only feast of which we know that dwelling in tents was prescribed.²⁴⁾

1.2.b. This at first sight somewhat daring identification of the feast finds strong confirmation in the circumstance that Hosea's prophecies have to be seen in the context of *instruction on the Covenant*.²⁵⁾ This is exactly the setting visualized in Dtn 31 :10, when it prescribes that the law should be expounded to all Israel "at the end of every seven years, at the assembly of the year of release, at the feast of booths".

1.2.c. Analysing Hosea's prophecies further, one is struck by the fact that the present instructions are subordinated to a *future renewal of the Covenant*. I think it is of the greatest importance to observe this subtle contrast in the time element. Hosea is not actually renewing the Covenant, but he is preparing for it. He is teaching the people so that they may worthily participate in a future cultic celebration. That will be the day when Israel shall again say: "You are my God! (Hos 2:25; cf. Dtn 26:17); it will be the day when Israel will "return to Jahweh" (Hos 6:1; 14:1-2)²⁶⁾; it will be the day when Jahweh will love them again (Hos 3:1; 11:1; 14:5)²⁷⁾; it will be the day when He will revive them (Hos 6:2; 13:14).²⁸⁾ All these expressions bear on the future cultic renewal

of the covenant. If we may take the indication of time provided by Hos 6: 2 as somewhat precise: "after two days, on the third day", we might postulate between the covenantal instruction and the cultic renewal a period of three days.²⁹⁾

1.2.d. What is more, the instruction and the cultic renewal of the covenant seem also to be separated in place. Hosea clearly implies that his instruction is given "in the desert" (Hos 2: 16-17; 9: 10; 13: 4-5). This desert is thought to be outside the promised land, since he speaks of "luring Israel away" (Hos 2:16). It would consequently be quite natural to put this place of instruction on the other side of the Jordan. But then, what about the site of the covenantal renewal? It should be noted that the "return" to Jahweh, even if taken in the sense of "conversion," does not exclude, but rather presupposes, a physical "going back to Jahweh's sanctuary." W. L. Holladay has made the observation that in later usage there was a close association between שׁוּב as physical return from exile and as a return to Jahweh's covenant.³⁰⁾ The Hebrew phrase לָכוּ וְשׁוּבוּ, literally: "walk that we may return" (Hos 6:1) certainly implies the act of walking to Jahweh's sanctuary. Presupposing that the setting of the instruction is in the desert on the other side of the Jordan, one would naturally think of a penitential procession from there to an established sanctuary.

1.2.e. I believe that Hos 6: 7-10 refers to this penitential procession :³¹⁾

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| המה כאדם עברו ברית | As soon as they cross <i>at Adam</i> they transgress (cross) the covenant! ³²⁾ |
| שם בגדו בי | (Already) there they betray Me! |
| גלעד קרית פעלי און | <i>Galed</i> is a city of evildoers ; ³³⁾ |
| עקבתם דם | their footprints spell blood. ³⁴⁾ |
| וכחכי איש גדודים | As troops of robbers await a man ³⁵⁾ |
| חבר כהנים דרך | priests plot together on the road! ³⁶⁾ |
| ירצחו שכמה | They murder all the way to <i>Shechem</i> ! |
| כי זמה עשו בבית ישראל | For they commit an abomination (even) in <i>Israel's House</i> ! |
| ראיתי שעריריה שם | I have seen a horrible thing there: |
| זנות לאפרים | An adulterous stain on Ephraim, |
| נטמה ישראל | a defilement of Israel! |

1.2.f.

It is not difficult to understand what Hosea means with these lines. More than once he has accused the priests of extorting money from the people by encouraging idolatrous practices (Hos 4: 8: "they feed on the sin of My people"). Now he accuses the priests of committing this idolatry right on the route of the sacred procession! I don't suppose that he is speaking of actual bloodshed, since in so many words he makes a comparison: "As troops of robbers await a man" (vs. 9). Rather he seems to imply that all along the sacred route of the procession priests are selling idolatrous articles or performing idolatrous rites: at Adam,³⁷⁾ at Galed and all the way to Shechem. Doing so they murder the people by taking away their fidelity to the covenant.³⁸⁾ Yes, even in the principal shrine, which -after its founder - may have been called Jacob's House,³⁹⁾ they had erected a statue of an idol! Hosea laments at the fact that on this very route to the place of covenantal renewal such idolatrous practices are maintained. ⁴⁰⁾

1.2.g. I believe that Hos 6: 7-10, seen in the light of Hosea's other prophecies, justifies the assumption that we are dealing here with cultic celebrations surrounding the covenant. We might, perhaps, reconstruct these celebrations as follows: In the desert, on the other side of the Jordan, the people gathered in the solemn assembly of the year of release at the feast of Tabernacles.

Covenantal instruction was imparted there. From there the people moved via Adam and Galed to Shechem where the Covenant was solemnly renewed. This covenantal renewal seems to have taken place three days after the instruction on the other side of the Jordan. Hosea's stress on the thematology of the land (Hos 2:5-16; 8:7; 14:6-7; etc.) would suggest that this Covenantal renewal had implications for the ownership of the land. From the stress on renouncing idolatry (Hos 2: 5-16; 4: 13-19; 8: 4-5; etc.) one can infer that the covenantal renewal included the denunciation of such worship.

1.3. Gen 33:17-20

1.3.a.

"Jacob journeyed to Succoth and built himself a house and made booths for his flock;⁴¹⁾ therefore the name of the place is called Succoth ("booths"). And Jacob came safely⁴²⁾ to the town of Shechem ...

And he bought for a hundred pieces of money from the sons of Hamor, Shechem's father, the piece of land on which he had pitched his tent.

And he erected an altar and called it "God, the God of Israel"."

1.3.b. It has now long been recognized that the patriarchs are often represented as acting in conformity with later cultic practices. In many instances they were thought to be the cultic founders of shrines and their local festivities. And these founders were represented as inaugurating the cult in the form in which it was to last.⁴³⁾

1.3.c. In the extract cited we may first of all note the *cultic objects* referred to: the altar to 'God, the God of Israel',⁴⁴⁾ was the center of the amphictyonic workshop at Shechem.⁴⁵⁾ The 'plot of land' which Jacob bought corresponded undoubtedly to a well-defined sacred precinct. The 'house of Jacob' at Succoth was in all likelihood a well-known shrine.⁴⁶⁾

1.3.d. Jacob performs a series of *sacred actions*: he builds booths at Succoth (see 1.3.e), he travels to Shechem, he calls on Jahweh as the 'God of Israel' and sacrifices to Him there, and finally he solemnly renounces idolatry with a ritual proper to Shechem (Gen 35: 2-4, which in the Elohist narration followed immediately on Gen 33: 20). This journey with its actions would seem to set a rather precise pattern for a pilgrimage known in ancient Israel.⁴⁷⁾

1.3.e. What about Jacob's building of booths for his flock? At first sight it may seem strange that these booths are said to have been intended for the flock. Given this to be a reference to a cultic practice in Israel one would rather have expected Jacob himself or his household to have dwelt in the booths.⁴⁸⁾ But the comparison of the hut-dwellers to a flock itself has a cultic background. The Israelites call themselves Jahweh's flock: 'the sheep of His pasture' (Ps 74:1; 79 :13; 100: 3). And the term seems to apply especially to the cultic situation here envisaged, the stay of the Hebrews in the desert and their passage through the Sea of Reeds:

"When the waters saw Thee, o God,

when the waters saw Thee, they were afraid,
yea, the deep trembled ...
Thy way was through the sea,
Thy path through the great waters;
Yet Thy footprints were not seen.⁴⁹⁾
Thou didst lead Thy people like a flock,
by the hand of Moses and Aaron."

Ps 17:17, 20, 21

Again in Psalm 80, which contains allusions to the Exodus and Land-giving in verses 9-12, we find the same imagery:

"Give ear, o Shepherd of Israel,
Thou who leadest Joseph like a flock!"

Ps 80:2

Psalm 95 warns the Israelites not to harden their hearts as at Meribah if they wish to enter into God's land (vs. 8-11). Like Hosea it urges Israel to convert in the desert. Then there is the cultic invitation:

"O come, let us worship and bow down,
let us kneel before Jahweh, our Maker.
For He is our God,
and we are the people of His pasture
and the sheep of His hand."

Ps 95:7

In Psalm 78 we read the following cultic description:

"Then He led forth His people like sheep
and guided them in the wilderness like a flock.
He led them in safety⁵⁰⁾ so that they were not afraid;
but the sea overwhelmed their enemies.
And He brought them to His holy land,
to the mountain which His right hand had won."

Ps 78:52-54

In cultic language Israel, journeying through the wilderness and crossing the Jordan, is compared to a flock shepherded by Jahweh.⁵¹⁾ The living in 'booths' during the feast of Tabernacles in preparation for the liturgical crossing of the Jordan may have had the cultic significance of symbolizing the people's status as Jahweh's flock. The aetiology of Gen 33 :17 would seem to derive from this conception. As the people were to do in their sacred pilgrimage, Jacob builds booths in Succoth, then moves on to Shechem where he worships Jahweh, the 'God of Israel', and where he renounces idolatrous practices.⁵²⁾

1.4.a. Granted a solemn liturgy of crossing the Jordan in commemoration of the miracle at the Sea of Reeds, little doubt can remain as to the influence this celebration must have had on the Pentateuchal traditions concerning the crossing of the Sea of Reeds. As a matter of fact, many details of the description fit well into the solemnities which can be reconstructed from Jos 3-4. Moses gives instructions and exhortations just before the crossing (Ex 14:13-18: note the sacred 'today' in vs. 13). On the morning after this instruction (Ex 14:20; cf. Jos 3: 1) the Jordan (or, *in casu*, its prototype the Sea of Reeds) is crossed (Ex 14:21-31: note the stress on Israel's witnessing, 'seeing', the miracle in vs. 30f.). A song is recorded (Ex 15 :1-18) and a dance of the women (Ex 15: 20-21) which surely derive from cultic usage. After the crossing the Covenant is concluded. The famous cracle of Ex 19: 3b-6 would fit admirably well after the ceremonies of the crossing.⁵³⁾ In brief, the account seems modelled on a liturgical pattern and this pattern corresponds to the one met in Jos 3-4. We may, therefore, infer that also these traditions could throw light on the cultic crossing of the Jordan.

1-4.b. Does the text give any information on the exact location of the rites? The mention of the chiefs of Edom, Moab, Philistia and U2.an (Ex 15:14-15) might point to northern surroundings (cf. Ps 60:8ff). The reference to God's own mountain (Ex 15:17) to which He is leading His people could, perhaps, be applied to the Ebal where the procession seems to terminate (cf. Dtn 27:4). The stress on the fact that God has power over all the land might also favour Shechem as the setting.⁵⁴⁾ But such indications do not provide us with the concluding evidence we would need.

1.4.c. To my opinion it is again in an Elohist tradition that we find unmistakable traces of the crossing between Succoth and Shechem:

"God led the people round about, by the way of the wilderness towards the Sea of Reeds ...

And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him; for Joseph had solemnly adjured the people of Israel with these words:

'God will visit you; then you must carry my bones with you from here!'

And they moved on from Succoth, and encamped at Etham on the edge of the wilderness."

Ex 13:18-20

1.4.d. We should keep in mind that we are dealing here with a cult legend, not with a historical report. Apart from the improbability of Israel having remembered such unimportant chronistic details as the exact names of the halting places before the crossing of the Sea of Reeds, we would do injustice to the cultic nature of the passage if we were to search it for geographical information on Egyptian sites. *Succoth* is not mentioned by the Elohist as an interesting geographical detail ⁵⁵⁾ Succoth must have had cultic significance as the last-but-one halting place before the Jordan crossing. The Succoth in Egypt is mentioned only because it is the prototype of the well-known sanctuary, founded by Jacob (Gen 33 :17) from where Israel used to proceed on its way to the renewal of the Covenant. Or rather, as in so many other instances, the Elohist projects back into the past what was known to be a liturgical practice of his own day: the Succoth in Egypt is a cultic description (See 4.1.d; 4.1.g). This also throws new light on the enigmatic *Etham*.⁵⁶⁾ In the cultic setting it corresponds precisely to Adam near Succoth: like Adam, Etham lies on the edge of the wilderness; like Adam, it is the scene of the last liturgical addresses; like Adam, it is the starting point of the

miraculous crossing. Could we, perhaps, suspect Etham to be a dialectic form of Adam? Moreover, the passage also seems to indicate the terminal of the procession. For Joseph's bones (see also Gen 50:25f.) were ultimately to be deposited *at Shechem* where, as everyone in Israel knew, Joseph's grave had a prominent place (Jos 24:32).⁵⁷) The fact that Joseph's bones are said to have been carried from Egypt, suggests that in the cultic re-enactment they may also have played a part in the procession. It is not excluded that Joseph's bones were symbolically carried all the way from Succoth and deposited at Shechem as part of the covenantal solemnities.

1.4.e. The accounts of the crossing of the Sea of Reeds confirm, the cultic practices at the Jordan which we found in Jos 3-4, Hos 6:7-10 and Gen 33:17-20. Moreover, the Elohist tradition of Ex 13:18-20 presupposes a procession which begins at Succoth and terminates at Shechem.

1.5. Ps 60:8-10 (108:8-10)

1.5.a. An ancient oracle has been preserved in two psalms :

"God has spoken in His sanctuary:
'I will exult !
I will divide, o Shechem !
I will portion cut, o Vale of Succoth !
Mine is Gilead, Mine is Manasseh.
Ephraim the helmet on My head, Judah My sceptre.
Moab is the basin in which I wash.
Upon Edom I cast My sandal.
I shout victory against Philistia !"

Ps 60:8-10; 108:8-10

1.5.b. The subsequent verses, identical in both psalms, put the oracle in the context of a war against Edom: 'Who will lead me to Edom?' (Ps 60 :11; 108 :11). Gilead, Manasseh, Ephraim and Judah are declared to be already Jahweh's property. The oracle apparently promises the acquisition of new land in Moab, Edom and Philistia.⁵⁸) The division spoken off in the first lines, consequently, does not have Shechem or the Vale of Succoth as its object.⁵⁹) Shechem and Succoth are rather the scenes of the division. They are addressed as the sanctuaries where the sharing of the land will take place!

1.5.c. There is reason to assume that at Shechem the land was periodically either redivided or juridically reassigned to the tribes.⁶⁰) The mention of Shechem as the scene of land-division need therefore hardly cause surprise. But the parallelism with the 'vale of Succoth' is somewhat unusual. It would seem to imply that the division of land takes place in a ceremony that links both sanctuaries.

Considering that the oracle is obviously referring to a victorious expedition of God's ark, we might infer that the expedition will be closed by a triumphal procession which in turn will end with a new division of land. And what would be more natural than to assume that the procession will proceed from Succoth to Shechem along the route hallowed in covenantal traditions?

1.6. Psalm 68

1.6.a. It is generally admitted that the psalm belongs to a celebration in which the ark was solemnly brought into the sanctuary with a festive procession. A brief description of the pageant has been retained in verses 25-28. The opening verses 'let God arise! ... and the phrase 'Jahweh came into His sanctuary' (vs. 18) correspond to the formulas with which the ark was taken up and with which it was put down again in the processional rites (cf. Num 10: 33-36). Expressions such as 'riding on the clouds' (vs. 5), 'marching before His people' (vs. 8) and 'ascending the mountain' (vs. 19) are equally to be understood as allusions to the movement of the ark. Little doubt can remain that the psalm presupposes and describes *a festive procession of the ark*.

1.6.b. Although the psalm undoubtedly belonged to the repertory of songs in use at Jerusalem (see vs. 30), it is not difficult to see that an ancient version of it must derive from older practice.⁶¹⁾ Where was the procession presupposed in the psalm held before it was adapted to the liturgical situation in Jerusalem? I believe that the psalm itself contains valuable clues to the original setting of the procession.

1.6.c. Let us first note that after the introductory verses the beginning of the procession reads as follows:

'O God, when You went forth before Your people,
when You marched *through the wilderness*,
the earth quaked, the heavens poured down rain.'

vs. 8f

It would seem, therefore, that the procession begins in the wilderness.

1.6.d. Another reference to place is: *Bashan*. An oracle says:

'I will bring them back *from Bashan*,
I will bring them back from the depths of the sea.'

vs. 23

And the psalmist exclaims:

'O mighty mountain, mountain of Bashan,
O many-peaked mountain,⁶²⁾ mountain of Bashan;
Why do you look with envy, o many-peaked mountain,
at the mount which God desired for His abode,
yes, where Jahweh will dwell for ever?'

vs. 16f

Attempts have been made to explain the name Bashan as a general cultic denominator,⁶³⁾ but this does not seem to be necessary. Since we know from the other texts we analysed that a procession with the ark began from Succoth and moved to Shechem, this text would find a very natural explanation. The mountains of Bashan⁶⁴⁾ overlook the valley of Succoth and can be seen all the way towards Shechem. Small wonder that the psalmist imagines the mountain to witness the procession in envy. Small wonder that the oracle speaks of a return from Bashan accompanied by a return from the depths of the sea: the retreat from Bashan implied the crossing of the liturgical Sea of Reeds, the Jordan.

1.6.e. The expressions of Jahweh's conflict with and defeat of 'the kings of the armies' (vs. 12-15), 'the rebellious' (vs. 19) and 'the enemy' (vs. 24) would harmonize well with the victorious entry into the promised land; we find it described as such in other ancient accounts of the history of salvation (cf. Jos 24: 8-12; Ex 15 :14-16). Interesting is the mention of *Mount Zalmon* (vs. 15). From Jdc 9:48 we know that this mountain lay quite near to Shechem.⁶⁵⁾ The victorious entry into the promised land seems to follow the route to Shechem ! What is more: Jahweh's arrival into the sanctuary is phrased in a wording very similar to that found in the ancient text Dtn 33: 2-5. This text records the founding of the amphictyony and would therefore seem to have its roots in the Shechemite traditions.⁶⁶⁾

1.6.f. In conclusion we may say, therefore, that Psalm 68 could well have belonged originally to the ancient procession from Succoth to Shechem, such as we have discovered from other passages. It is my conviction that more psalms may have belonged to this cultic ceremony⁶⁷⁾

1.7. Dtn 5:1-28:69

1.7.a. Since M. Noth's basic study on the deuteronomic work of history,⁶⁸⁾ there is almost universal agreement on the assumption that the deuteronomic redactor of the history work inserted the block of law (Dtn 5 :1-28: 69) as a pre-existing unit into his historical account. The question which remains to be answered is where and when this original code of law was formulated. It is impossible in a few pages even to sketch the manifold attempts made in the past to answer this question.⁶⁹⁾ But, making use of the positive elements of previous research, I intend to limit myself to the indications that favour the law's relationship to the processional ceremony outlined on the foregoing pages.

1.7.b. It will be readily admitted that the code of law (Dtn 5-28) originated in the context of *covenantal instruction*. This does not only emerge from covenantal themes such as 'God's people',⁷⁰⁾ 'love',⁷¹⁾ 'the witness of heaven and earth',⁷²⁾ 'blessing and curse',⁷³⁾ and 'jealousy',⁷⁴⁾ but also from its literary form which corresponds in pattern and thought structure to that of the ancient vassality treaties.⁷⁵⁾

1.7.c. It can also safely be assumed that the deuteronomic code of law was related to the sanctuary of *Shechem*. In favour of this assumption militate the intrinsic relationship of the code to levitic circles in northern Israel,⁷⁶⁾ its affinity to the thematology of the northern prophets⁷⁷⁾ and above all the references to the Shechemitic cult (Dtn 11: 27).⁷⁸⁾

1.7.d. Neither does it seem possible any longer to deny a *definite cultic setting* to the code of law. The very formulation of the law requires a cultic setting in which they were promulgated. This is especially the case for the apodictic laws.⁷⁹⁾ The peculiar deuteronomic discourses which surround and introduce the laws can also be shown to derive from a living practice.⁸⁰⁾ Moreover, cultic formulas, such as the sacral 'today' (e.g. Dtn 26:16-19)⁸¹⁾, 'all of us here' and similar expressions (Dtn 5:3f.; 9:1; 11 :2; etc.),⁸²⁾ leave no doubt as to the law's place in a liturgical situation.

1.7.e. We may also note that recent studies tend to put the origin of the deuteronomic code *a good deal earlier* than was formerly admitted. It has been pointed out that many laws contained in the code bear the characteristics of ancient legislation.⁸³⁾ Literary and form historical comparisons illustrate that the deuteronomic legislation at Shechem precedes the Jahwistic-Elohistic 'book of the

covenant' (Ex 20:20- 23: 33).⁸⁴) And in particular the employment of the ancient treaty formulary has rightly been adduced in support of an early dating of the law.⁸⁵)

1.7.f. Presupposing these latest data of research on Deuteronomy, we may now turn our full attention to the crossing of the Jordan spoken of in the code of law. This crossing of the Jordan is constantly referred to (Dtn 9:1,3; 11:31; 12:10; 27:2,3,4,12). The crossing is directly connected to the sacral *today*: 'Hear Israel, *today* you will cross the Jordan ... !' (Dtn 9 :1). There is a clear mention of *the ark's place* in the procession, when it is stated that Jahweh will cross the Jordan 'before you' (Dtn 9: 3; cf. 30: 3; 31: 3a; Jos 3: 6ff.; 4:11).⁸⁶) It is obvious that these expressions are not merely Mosaic phraseology artificially maintained. They presuppose the crossing of the Jordan as a liturgical event.

1.7.g. The covenantal instruction and the promulgation took place before the liturgical crossing of the Jordan. This is very much stressed in the legislation itself. The lawgiver and the people are outside the promised land. The laws will apply "when Jahweh will have brought you into the land" (Dtn 6:10; 7: 1;8: 7;9: 4; 9: 28; 11:29), or "when you will have come into the land" (Dtn 17:14; 18:9; 26: 1). The promised land is referred to as 'the land which Jahweh your God will give to you' (Dtn 5:16, 31; 8:10; 9:23; 11:17, 31; 12:1; 15:4; 16:20; 17:14; 18:9; 19:1, 3, 14; 21:23; 25:15, 19; 26:1, 2, 15; 27:2, 3; 28: 8), 'the land about which He swore to your fathers that He would give it you' (Dtn 6:3, 10; 7:13; 10:11; 11: 9, 21; 19: 8; 26: 3; 28: 11), 'the land which you are going to take into possession' (Dtn 7: 1; 9: 5; 11:10, 29; 12:29; 23:21; 28:21, 63) and 'the land to which you are crossing over' (Dtn 6:1; 11:8, 11). The references are so multiple and insistent that they must rest on the cultic situation itself: Israel is standing east of the Jordan and is preparing itself for a reenacted taking possession of the promised land!

1.7.h. Where did this covenantal instruction east of the Jordan take place? Where was the Jordan crossed in procession? The law itself indicates the terminal of the procession: "And when Jahweh your God brings you into the land which you are entering to take possession of you shall set the blessing on mount Gerizim and the curse on mount Ebal" (Dtn 11 :29). "You will set up these stones on mount Ebal" ⁸⁷) (Dtn 27: 4). "When you shall have passed over the Jordan, these shall stand on mount Gerizim ... these on mount Ebal .. " (Dtn 27 :12-13). *The sanctuary at Shechem* is, consequently, indicated as the terminal of the cultic crossing of the Jordan. In the light of our earlier discussions regarding the ceremonies conducted between Succoth and Shechem, we may safely presume that *Succoth and Adam* were the corresponding sanctuaries on the east of the Jordan where the deuteronomic code of law was promulgated and inculcated, and from where the procession to Shechem began.

1.7.i. What about the repeated insistence on the centralization of the cult in Dtn 12 :1-28; 14: 22-27; 15 :19-23; 16 :1-17; 17: 8-13; 18: 6-8 and 26 :1-11? That it refers to Jerusalem is excluded.⁸⁸) First of all, ancient traditions show that the centralization of cult at Jerusalem was neither practised nor prescribed until possibly at a very late date (compare Elijah's sacrifice on Mount Carmel, 1 Kgs. 18).⁸⁹) Secondly, even in Josiah's reform it is not the centralization of the cult so much as the abolition of idolatry that is enforced.⁹⁰) In the third place, the prescribed centralization, such as the injunction that all men should appear before Jahweh's face at the three feasts, could not possibly be realized in such a large realm as the one of which Jerusalem was the centre.⁹¹)

1.7.j. To what central sanctuary then did the deuteronomic code of law refer? It would seem to me that the code *implies the possibility of various sanctuaries serving in turn as amphictyonic centre.*⁹²⁾ There are many indications that support this assumption. The formula itself, 'the place which Jahweh your God will choose out of all your tribes, etc.' (Dtn 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; 14:23, 24, 25; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 15, 16; 26:2), implies a sacred act of choosing on the part of God, or, *in casu*, on the part of God's ark. We know that this choice could vary: God chose Bethshemesh and Kiriathjearim (1 Sam 6:1-7:2); God did not choose Shiloh, but chose Sion instead (Ps 78: 67-68). So we may reasonably assume that the formula implies the possibility of God's choice falling on a different sanctuary from time to time.⁹³⁾ In fact, we find the ark stationed at Mizpah (Jdc 20:1, 5, 8), Bethel (Jdc 20:18, 26ff.), probably at Mount Thabor (Jdc 4: 6ff.)⁹⁴⁾ and certainly at Shiloh (1 Sam 1-3) and Gilgal (Jos 5:10-12). The formula should, therefore, be translated as '*that* sanctuary which Jahweh your God will choose ... '⁹⁵⁾ The very employment of the formula and the frequent stress on central worship situate the code of law in the early years of the Israelite amphictyony- perhaps during the formative years when the tribes of Lea began to league together.⁹⁶⁾

1.7.k. This leads us on to another observation. Dtn 16:1-17, which deals with the centralized feasts, does not link any of the three to the renewal of the covenant. According to the interpretation of the centralization formula given above, this would mean that the yearly cycle of feasts had to be observed in the amphictyonic centre then in vogue. This would clearly indicate the distinction between these regular annual celebrations (which were celebrated in the amphictyonic centre of that year) and the reaffirmation of the covenant which was firmly rooted in the ceremonies beginning at Succoth and finishing at Shechem (see above). The reason for the difference is obviously the importance attributed to the route of the procession. The Pascha, Pentecost and the feast of Tabernacles could be kept wherever the ark happened to be. But the reaffirmation of the Covenant was connected with the sacred procession which followed the hallowed route from Succoth to Shechem.

1. 7l. This reaffirmation of the Covenant has, therefore, to be linked with an occasion that fell outside the normal yearly cycle. Such an occasion was the Year of Release, spoken of in Dtn 15:1-16. It is expressly at that occasion that instruction in the Covenant was prescribed according to the deuteronomic tradition preserved in Dtn 31 :10. We have seen before that Hosea seems to refer to a similar 'assembly' as the one mentioned in this text (cf. Hos 12:10; 9:5). The Year of Release was held every seven years to renew and revitalize the whole land through a sacred fallow. In Israel this fallow may have been accompanied by the fresh allocation by lot of plots of land (cf. Num 26:55; 35:54; 34:13; 36:2; Jos 24:28; Jos 16-20). The deuteronomic code of law presupposes the same kind of setting since it formulates the laws in reference to the 'land which Jahweh is going to give' (see 1.7.g).

1.7.m. We may, therefore, conclude that the code of law in Dtn 5-28 confirms what we found elsewhere regarding the procession from Succoth to Shechem. The law itself and its paranetic framework seem to be at home in the solemn gathering at Succoth at the feast of Tabernacles during the year of Release. By its very nature it consists of covenantal instruction given with a view to the reaffirmation of the Covenant. In the earliest Shechemitic traditions the Covenant itself still took place near Succoth (cf. the 'today' in Dtn 26: 16-19), but some rituals had already been transferred to

Shechem (Dtn 11 ; 27). It paved the way for the transfer of the covenantal ceremony itself to Shechem in later days (Jos 24).

1.8. *Reconstructing the Solemnities of the Procession*

1.8.a. Our analysis of these independent passages justifies a tentative reconstruction of the sacred rite that must have been conducted between the two sanctuaries of Succoth and Shechem.

1.8.b. The ceremony seems to have taken place *on the feast of Tabernacles*.⁹⁷ This seems presupposed in the ancient tradition of crossing the Jordan (1.1.g). It is alluded to by Hosea (1.2.a). It may be the reason for the aetiological explanation attached to Succoth by the Elohist (1.3.e). The feast was connected with the close of the agricultural year. The ritual of living in tents or booths had no doubt agricultural implications, but it was at the same time the liturgical re-enactment of how the forefathers of Israel had lived in the desert when they were approaching the promised land (Lev 23:40-43).⁹⁸ The deuteronomic preacher stresses Israel's dependence on rain which will be given by Jahweh in return for covenantal loyalty (Dtn 11:8-17). This may well reflect one of the purposes of the feast which was to obtain rain and fertility for the coming year.

1.8.c. We probably have to identify the occasion even more specifically with the special feast of Tabernacles that was celebrated every seventh year, the Year of Release. That was the time for the periodic *covenantal instruction* (Dtn 31 :10; Neh 8:14-18). Such instruction seems implied in the addresses of Moses (Ex 14) and Joshua (Jos 3) before the crossing. The prophecies of Hosea also testify to such an instruction 'in the desert' in preparation for the renewal of the covenant (1.2.c; 1.2.d). The deuteronomic sermons on the covenant (Dtn 6-11) too presuppose a setting east of the Jordan. There the people prepared for a worthy response to Jahweh's covenant after their entry into the 'land which Jahweh their God was going to give to them' (1.7.g). Such a setting harmonizes equally well with the undeniable stress on the desert theme in the psalms of covenantal instruction (Ps 78; 81 ; 95). From all these indications we may infer that the people gathered 'in the desert region' on the other side of the Jordan in the valley of Succoth. There it was that they lived in tents or huts while priests or prophets gave instructions on the Law.

1.8.d. The Jordan was crossed in procession *between Succoth and Sbechem*. This can be inferred from the linking of these two sanctuaries by the Elohist (1.3.d; 1.4.d) and by an ancient oracle (1.5.c). It is also confirmed by the fact that the deuteronomic code of law indicates Shechem (the Ebal and Gerazim) as the terminal of the procession (1.7.h). It can, moreover, be deduced from the other stations of the route which can be traced⁹⁹: Adam (two miles from the Jordan: 1.1.c; 1.2.c; cf. 1.4.d reg. Ex 13:20), Galed (on the fords of the Jordan: 1.2.e; perhaps implied in Jos 4:9, cf. 1.1.e), Zarethan (see 1.1.b, page 4, note 14) and the Zalmon (1.6.e).¹⁰⁰

1.8.e. *As far as the relation of the procession to the Covenant* is concerned, there would seem to be a notable difference between the liturgical practices discovered in the older and those of the later traditions. It would seem that we have to distinguish the ceremonies of the procession presupposed in Dtn 5-28, Ps 60:8-10 and Ps 68 from the practices found with Hosea, the Elohist, Jos 24 and the pre-deuteronomic tradition in Jos 3-4.¹⁰¹

1.8.f. Dtn 5-28 presupposes that the real covenantal celebrations have already been performed in Succoth on the eastern bank of the Jordan (1.7.m). The crossing of the Jordan constantly referred to (1.7.f) terminates in Shechem (1.7.h), but one has the impression that the march to Shechem has the almost exclusive purpose of reenacting the occupation of the land (1.7.g). The ceremonies foreseen at Shechem certainly belong to the Covenant, since they concern the erection of the sacrificial altar, the inscription of the law and the ceremony of blessing and curse (Dtn 11 ; 27).¹⁰²⁾ But these ceremonies would seem to be considered an extension of the Covenant celebrated in Succoth to the newly acquired land (Dtn 11 :29; 27 :2). We might characterize this conception as *the early Shechemitic tradition*. It finds confirmation in the oracle of Ps 60: 8-10 in which Shechem and Succoth are only hailed as the sites of land-division (1.5.a-1.5.c) and in Ps 68 which describes Jahweh's glorious march to Shechem without any hint regarding a covenantal celebration as the end and outcome of the journey.

1.8.g. The same procession from Succoth to Shechem seems to have undergone significant changes in a later stage of development. For in *Jos 24* we read that the Covenant itself is concluded in Shechem. Hosea also presupposes in his sermons that the covenantal renewal will take place at Shechem (1.2.c; 1.2.d). Another change seems to concern the interpretation of the crossing of the Jordan. The deuteronomic preachers do not equate the crossing with the miracle at the Sea of Reeds, but with occupying the land (1.7.g). *Jos 24* still separates the events at the Sea of Reeds (vs. 6-7) from the crossing of the Jordan (vs. 11). But the old tradition underlying *Jos 3-4* (1.0.1a; 1.1.c; etc.) and the Elohist (1.4.c; 1.4.d) manifestly equate the procession near Adam with the crossing of the Sea of Reeds. We may thus conclude that in the course of time the covenantal renewal itself was relayed to Shechem (*Jos 24*) and that the crossing of the Jordan became a re-enactment of the miracle at the Sea of Reeds. There are other aspects of the processional ceremonies that would seem to belong to this later stage of development. One aspect might be the various 'holy places' that grew up along the route: Adam (1.2.e; 1.2.c, note 37; 1.4.d, note 56), Galed (1.1.e; 1.2.e, note 33), Jacob's Houses in Succoth (1.3.c, note 47) and Shechern (1.2.f, note 39), and, perhaps, the footprints of the ark bearers' (1.1.e; 1.2.e, note 34; 1.3.e, note 49). This last detail might indicate that in that period the ark was no longer carried in the procession: 'relics' of this type flourish best once the sacred object or person itself has vanished. The carrying of Joseph's bones (1.4.d, note 57) would also seem to fit into this context, perhaps as a substitute for carrying the ark. The time element by which it is stated that the Covenant will be renewed 'after three days' (Hos 6:2: 1.2.c; cf. *Jos 3:3*; *Ex 19:11*) could also be a trace of the liturgy in this period. The same would seem to be the case concerning the abjuration of idolatry. The deuteronomic code prescribes the destruction of pagan shrines (Dtn 12: 2-4) and warns against idolatry (Dtn 7: 3-5; 13: 1-18), but there is no direct reference to a ritual of renouncing former idolatrous practices. But such a ritual existed in later days as we know from the covenantal text of *Jos 24* (compare vs. 14-15), from Hosea (Hos 2: 2-17; etc. cf. 1.2.c; 1.2.e) and from the Elohist (*Gen 35:2-4*: cf. 1.3.d).

1.8.h. Would it be possible for us to determine *the period during which the Shechemitic procession* originated? It is clear that both in the practices of the early Shechemites (1.8.f) and in the later full covenantal rites of Shechem (1.8.g) the land-giving played a major role. As G. von Rad has rightly remarked,¹⁰³⁾ such celebrations

which try to solemnize the occupation of the land must have originated at a time when that occupation was both factual and problematic. It must have been factual, in as far as the land had to have been either conquered or claimed; problematic, in as far as the land-giving would still seem to need official legitimization in the cult. The rite cannot have arisen before the conquest; nor can it have come into being long after the conquest when the possession of the land had been a *'fait accompli'* for a considerable period. The origin of the land-giving rites must, therefore, be sought in the period of the invasion itself. This puts our *terminus a quo* at roughly 1250 BC. There is no evidence of the ark moving outside Jerusalem—certainly not as a regular event—after David had brought it into the Holy City. On the other hand, when the ark was stationed at Shiloh it was still carried from place to place, even towards the end of that period (1 Sam 4:4). This would put the *terminus ad quem* for the processional rites, which included the ark, at the destruction of Shiloh around the year 1050 BC. Thus the procession from Succoth to Shechem must have been celebrated as an amphictyonic rite *during the time of the Judges*, i.e. from 1250-1050 BC. This dating is confirmed by the antiquity which has recently been claimed for the deuteronomic code of law (see 1.7.e) and by its connection to such an ancient institution as the Year of Release. But the sacred route from Succoth to Shechem remained in vogue as a pilgrimage in preparation for the feast of Tabernacles and the Covenantal rites at Shechem even after the departure of the ark. To this witness the later texts that belong to the processional tradition (1.8.g).

1.8.i. It still remains for us to evaluate *the liturgical meaning of the procession* which we have discovered. The first implication of the procession seems to have been *the going up to the sanctuary in preparation for partaking in the cult*. It is noteworthy that processions often have this purpose of providing an opportunity for a gradual preparation by means of the journey to the central sanctuary.¹⁰⁴ The procession has an educative value as a prolonged religious expression of one's search for God.¹⁰⁵ This is undoubtedly the force of the exclamation: 'Walk that we may return' (Hos 6:1). The covenantal instruction, given on the other side of the Jordan, sought to put the people in the frame of mind in which they would benefit most from the procession.¹⁰⁶

1.8.j. Another aspect inherent in the procession is closely bound up with the fact that Jahweh, or rather His cultic symbol the ark, was going in front to lead the people. The preacher would inculcate time and again: "Know therefore this day that He who goes over before you as a devouring fire is Jahweh your God!" (Dtn 9: 3). That is how Jahweh went before the people when they left Egypt (Ex 13:21f.). The procession was, consequently, for the people *an act of following Jahweh*, of 'walking after Him' (Jos 3: 3; Jer 2:2). Such a sacral journey in the train of the Godhead was the expression and symbol of commitment to that Godhead. 'Walking after Jahweh' soon became identical to 'being faithful to Jahweh' (Dtn 1:36; 13 : 4; 1 Kgs 14: 8; 2 Kgs 23: 3; 2 Chr 34:31). Apostasy on the other hand was characterized as "walking after strange gods" (Jdc 2:12; Dtn 4:3; 6:14; 1 Kgs 21:26; Jer 11:10; etc.), an expression which may have taken its origin 'from the procession of devotees of pagan cults behind the preceding images of the gods'.¹⁰⁷ The imitation of a god was originally not a purely spiritual matter, but a real following, a cultic walking behind the god, quite often even 'throwing in one's lot with the god'.¹⁰⁸ It is in this full sense of 'following Jahweh' that we have to understand the divine complaint:

"I remember the devotion of your youth,
your love as a bride,
how you followed me in the wilderness ... "

Jer 2:2

1.8.k. But the procession from Succoth to Shechem had yet another function. It is well known how ancient rites purposed to bring about a liturgical renewal of an original divine deed:

'The religious feast makes present an ancient event, a "sacred history" in which gods and half-gods are the agents. This "sacred history" is recounted in the myths. Those who partake in the feast become therefore contemporaries of the gods and half-gods. They also live in that beginning of time which was hallowed by the presence and the intervention of the gods .. .'¹⁰⁹⁾

In the case of Israel the cycle of the myth was broken through by the belief in a personal God, who acts in the profane, historical time of past, present and future.¹¹⁰⁾ Yet, we may say that also in Israel the historical events of the past, *the Exodus and the Land-giving, were in some way 'renewed', 'actualised', 'rendered present'* through the procession which reenacted them. That is why in all descriptions (Jos 3-4; Ex 14; Dtn 5-11) the matter is narrated as if the participants are witnessing the original events when Moses or Joshua were mediating. The visible action may be symbolic, but the mystery transcends the sphere of 'play': it becomes reality.¹¹¹⁾ 'Through the dramatic, symbolic presentation, realization and reanimation of the particular event this event is actually and really repeated'.¹¹²⁾

1) H. J. KRAUS, "Gilgal-ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels", VT1 (1951) pp. 181ff. ; Worship in Israel, Oxford 1966, pp. 152-165. See also H. WILDBERGER, Jahwes Eigentumsvolk, Zürich 1960, pp. 55ff.

2) H. J. KRAUS, 1.c., esp. "Gilgal", pp. 193ff, Worship pp. 163-165.

3) H. WILDBERGER, 1.c. pp. 59ff.

4) A. ALT, "Josua," BZAW 66 (1936) p. 29; *Kleine Studien*, I, München 1959, p. 192: "Das Heiligtum bei Sichem scheint seine Rolle vor dem von Silo und erst recht vor dem von Gilgal gespielt zu haben und damit am Anfang der ganzen Reihe zu stehen."

5) The covenantal function of the 'historical creed' can no longer be seriously denied. Cf. W. L. MORAN, review of K. BALTZER's, "Das Bundesformular," *Bibl.* 43 (1962) pp. 100-106, esp. p. 104; W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen*, Tübingen 1961, pp. 190f.; C. BREKELMANS, "Het 'historische Credo' van Israel," *Tjids. Theol.* 3 (1963) pp. 1-11; J. WIJNGAARDS, *The Formulas of the deuteronomic Creed*, Tilburg 1963, esp. pp. 57f.; H. B. HUFFMON, "The exodus, Sinai and the Credo," *CBQ* 27 (1965) pp. 101-113.

6) K. BALTZER, *Das Bundesformular*, Neukirchen 1960, pp. 42ff.; D. J. MCCARTHY, *Treaty and Covenant*, Rome 1963, pp. 109-140.

7) See J. L'HOURE, "L'Alliance de Sichem," *RB* 69 (1962) esp. pp. 26ff.

8) A. ALT, "Josua," 1.c., M. NOTH, *Geschichte Israels*, Göttingen 1963⁵, pp. 90ff.

9) Some attempts have been made to defend the literary unity of the passage, but they fail to convince. cf. P. P. SAYDON, "The Crossing of the Jordan," *CBQ* 12 (1950) 194-207 (who yet admits different traditions underlying the account, cf. p. 2071) ; B. ALFRINK, "De litteraire compositie van Jos. 3 en 4," *Studia Catholica* 18 (1942) 185-202.

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

- 10) K. MOHLENBRINK, "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua," ZAW 56 (1938) 238-268, esp. p. 241.
- 11) 211. NOTH, "Das Buch Josua," HAT Tubingen 1938, p. 11ff.
- 12) The original formulation seems to have been 'carriers of the ark' cf. 3 :15. That 'priests' were carrying the ark could be a later redaction by the deuteronomic historian (cf. Jos 3 :13, 14, 15, 17; 4: 9, 10, 18; 6: 6a; see also Jos 6: 4, 6b, 8, 9, 12, :3, 16; 1 Kgs 8:3-4) M. NOTH, *Ueberlieferungs-geschichtliche Studien I*, Halle 1943; ·Jos:::2,, I.e.
- 13) 'Of the covenant' could also be a redactional enlargement (Jos 3:17; 4:7, 9, 18; compare Dtn 10: 8; 31: 9; Jos 6 :6; Jdc 20:27; 1 Kgs 6:19; 8 :1ff.), as it certainly is in Jos 3:14 ("the ark" with article instead of the construct case). On the other hand, it might be that the tables of the covenant were written on in Succoth and then taken to Shechem in the ark (cf. Dtn 27: 2-4, 8?; 31 : 24-25). The 'ark of the covenant' may then have been a very ancient one.
- 14) W. F. ALBRIGHT renders 'as far from Adamah as beside Zarethan', cf. "The Administrative Divisions of Israel and Judah," JPOS 5 (1925) p. 33, note 37; N. GLUECK renders, reading מַצֵּד in stead of מִצֵּד: 'as far from Adamah as the fortress Zarethan', cf. "Three Israelite Towns in the Jordan Valley: Zarethan, Succoth, Zaphon," BASOR 90 (1943) p. 6. These translations presuppose that Zarethan was situated on the same east bank of the Jordan, twelve miles north of Adamah (tell es-Sa' idiyeh). If this interpretation of the text is correct, it adds to the probability of the crossing having taken place near Adam. For 'the Israelites setting out from just below Adamah' could then see the whole stretch of water that was dammed up-stream 'as far as Zarethan' (cf. N. GLUECK, *Explorations in Eastern Palestine*, vol. IV, part 1, text, New Haven 1951, p. 340).
- 14) Many authors have judged these verses to belong together. W. RUDOLPH ascribes them to J, cf. "Der 'Elohist' von Exodus bis Josua," Berlin 1938, BZAW 68). M. NOTH ("Das Buch Josua," I.c.) makes it a part of the primitive account. K. MOHLENBRINK ("Die Landnahmesagen," I.c.) assigns them to the northern Jordan tradition.
- 15) E. SELLIN already acknowledged this, cf. "Gilgal," 1917, p. 31ff. but he drew from it the inadmissible conclusion of two Gilgals, one near Jericho and one near Shechem (cf. also Dtn 11:30).
- 16) H. J. KRAUS considers the possibility that two originally separate traditions have been joined together: one of crossing the Jordan (the Sinai tradition) and another of the ark (the land-giving tradition). However, he notes that the cultic act of taking the ark through the Jordan did already belong to the pre-redactional nucleus (*Worship in Israel*, I.e., pp. 155-157).
- 17) Note the characteristic formula of an aetiology: 'until this day'; MOHLEN=BRINK I.c. p. 239.
- 18) For the critical analysis see B. FINKELSCHERER, "Der Gilead-Vertrag," MGWJ _(Montschr f. d. Gesch. u. Wiss. des Judentums) 82 (1938) 22-46. The crossing mentioned in Gen 31: 52 would make it likely that in the Jahwistic tradition the treaty was supposed to have been concluded at the Jordan. The monument designated the Jordan as the frontier which the partners of the pact were not supposed to cross.
- 19) With a different vocalization, For a discussion of the text, see below 1.2.e,
- 20) See above, 1.0.c, note 8.
- 21) The note on the overflowing of the Jordan has the literary function of bringing out the greatness of the miracle (cf. M. NOTH, "Der Jordan in der Geschichte Palastinas," ZDPV 72 (1956) p. 145), but it must also have had relevance in the season during which the liturgy was celebrated. The feast of Tabernacles closed the harvest season and came at the end of dry and hot weather. All brooks and wadis in Palestine have dried out by that time. But the Jordan is an exception. Since it is fed by the melting snow of the Hermon, it continues to overflow its banks even then (cf. D. BALY, *The Geography of the Bible*, New York 1956: pp. 100ff., 200).
- 22) H. J. KRAUS, *Worship in Israel*, I.c. pp. 131ff.
- 23) P. VOLZ observed correctly that the feast of Tabernacles must originally have been held in tents made of cloth (*Das Neujahrsfest Jahwes*, Tubingen 1912: p. 20). The transition to booths made of branches may have been occasioned by Canaanite harvest customs or by the lack of cloth in later times. That 'tents' and 'booths' are identical from a theological point of view is illustrated in the Holiness Code which presupposes a tent camp (Lev 17: 4ff; 19: 21; 24: 3) but which at the same time states that Israel lived in booths when leaving Egypt (Lev 23: 43). If we may call this an anachronism at all (cf. A. ALT, *Zelte und Hiitten*, Festschrift Fr. Notscher, Bonn 1950, pp. 24f, *Kl. Sehr.* III, pp. 241f.), it is a deliberate one to equate the 'booths' of the feast of Tabernacles with the 'tents' of the early Hebrews.

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

24) The אהל מועד, the 'tent of the assembly', has been illustrated to have been the cultic center of an ancient camp festival, cf. H.J. KRAUS, *Worship in Israel*, I.c. pp. 132ff. It fascinates me that the setting of this festival is undoubtedly the desert; in fact, it could well be the region east of the Jordan (Num 25:6). I believe that the Priestly Code has here retained some valuable traditions that derive from the same extraordinary assembly of all Israel in the Transjordan in preparation of the covenantal renewal at Shechem.

25) H. W. WOLFF, "Wissen um Gott" bei Hosea als Urform von Theologie: *Ev Th* 12 (1952/53) pp. 533-554. Hosea makes explicit mention of the covenant in two passages: Hos 6: 7; 8 :1; cf. R. E. CLEMENTS, *Prophecy and Covenant*, London 1954, p. 54. His oracles abound with allusions to treaty-curses: Hos 2:20; 4:10; 5:6, 12, 14; 8:7; 9:12, 16; 13:7-8; cf. D.R. HILLERS, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*, Rome 1964, pp. 54ff.; 28ff.

26) W. L. HOLLADAY has proved the covenantal implications of this 'return'; cf. *The root subh in the Old Testament, with particular reference to its usages in covenantal contexts*, Leiden 1958, p. 116.

27) This 'love of Jahweh' characterizes His covenantal relationship; cf. W. MORAN, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 25 (1963) pp. 77-88; N. LOHFINK, "Hate and Love in Osee 9: 15". *CBQ* 25 (1963) p. 417.

28) I have recently attempted to show that this revival has to be understood as a renewal of the covenant; cf. "Death and Resurrection in Covenantal Context," *VT* 17 (1967) pp. 226-239.

29) Compare W. BRUEGGEMANN, "Amos IV 4-13 and Israel's Covenant Worship," *VT* 15 (1965) pp. 6ff.

30) W. L. HOLLADAY, *The Root subh*, 1.c.. p. 146.

31) E. SELLIN voiced the suggestion that the oracle reflects cultic practices ("Gilgal," 1917, pp. 12f., 103ff.). A. ALT on the other hand sees in it the route followed by a political revolution: "es schildert in echt hoseanischer Art den Verlauf einer von Gilead ausgehenden, über den Jordan (Adam) bis nach Sichem herübergreifenden Revolution, etwa der Sallums und Menahems"; cf. "Hosea 5, 8-6, 6, Ein Krieg and seine Folgen in prophetischer Beleuchtung," *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 30 (1919) p. 567f.; *Kl. Sehr.* II, p. 186. I believe that this interpretation fails to do justice to the cultic references in the passage, such as: the priests, transgression of the covenant, defilement in the sanctuaries, etc. Besides, the text seems to speak of things that normally happen, not of one historical event in the past.

32) A play on the word עבר : the crossing at Adam and the transgression of the Covenant coincide; cf. also M. NOTH, *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch*, Halle 1940, p. 52; *Gesammelte Studien*, Munchen 1957, p. 85.

33) TORCZYNER, "Gilead, a city of them that work iniquity," (hebr.) *BJPES* 11 (1944) pp. 9-16, is not available to me. Since גלעד is called a city it cannot be easily vocalized as Gilead which normally denotes whole region. The evidence of a shrine in the fords near Adam which probably bore the name גלעד (see above 11c) justifies us to vocalise גלעד here in the same way.

34) עקבה מדם vocalised as עִקְבֵיהֶם דָּם . Could it be that the shrine of Galed contained some 'footprints' of the ark bearers who are mentioned in the cult legend? This would throw some light on the stress given to their feet (Jos 3:15) and the place where they stood (Jos 4: 9). 'Footprints' of famous people are frequently venerated in popular shrines; cf. the impression of Jesus' foot on Mount Olives, the footprints of St. Thomas in Maliattur (India), the knee impressions at Rankweil (Austria), etc.

35) כחכו vocalised as כְּחָכּוּ .

36) חבר vocalised as חִבְרִי .

37) Can it be that in Mi 6: 8 we have a reference to this same city? Instead of addressing 'man' the prophet could speak to this city, as is stated in Mi 6: 9: 'The voice of Jahweh cries to the city .. .' The 'assembly of the city' (in the same verse) might then indicate the gathering of Israel which came together at Adam in preparation for the renewal of the covenant. The allusions to the Exodus in that chapter would favour that we assume this setting; cf. H. LUBSCZYK, *Der Auszug Israels aus Agypten*, Leipzig 1963, pp. 56ff.

38) This murder could be related to the 'killing', i.e. deposing of partners in a treaty, which results in a covenantal 'death' (cf. Hos 2:3; 9:15; 13:1; 13:14). See the author's *Death and Resurrection in Covenantal Context*, I.c. pp. 230ff.

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

39) The expression (Jos 6: 9f) could mean 'a crime against the whole of Israel' (cf. Jdc 20: 6). But the parallelism with 'there' in the next line requires that 'House of Israel' be taken as a place, i.e. as a well-known shrine.

40) Hos 11 :1-2 may imply the same accusation. As long as the people remains in the desert, it is loved by Jahweh. There it is still נָעַר , i.e. innocent as a person to be initiated into the covenant (cf. Ex 24:5; W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinai-traditionen*, l.c. p. 47.). But as soon as they have been invited to participate in the Covenant (i.e. as they move in procession towards Shechem), they run to the Baals (i.e. they practice idolatry).

41) The Jahwist uses מִקְנֵה both for cattle and sheep (Gen 26:14; 46:32; Ex :2: 38, etc.). The Priestly Code distinguishes מִקְנֵה , flock of sheep, etc., from בַּהֲמָה , cattle (Gen 36:5; Num 31:9, etc.). It is difficult to establish the precise connotations of the term מִקְנֵה with the Elohist, but considering that in his narration Jacob's possession is portrayed to have been composed mainly of sheep (Gen 31: 4-18), we prefer the translation 'flock' to 'cattle'.

42) The translation is somewhat uncertain. If taken as בְּשִׁלּוֹם it might refer to the 'safe'-conduct granted by Jahweh to the pilgrim (see Ps 78:53 below). The Sept. and Vulgate see in it a locality (Samlin, 7 km East of Nablus?) via which Jacob journeyed to Shechem.

43) R. de VAUX, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice*, Oxford 1962, p. 67 .

44) Are we to see in this title the name of a local deity worshipped at Shechem?

(So R. SMEND, *Die Bundesformel*, Zurich 1963, pp. 14ff; see also W. EICHRODT, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Göttingen 1959⁶, p. 114). I would be more inclined to consider it an Elohist correction of the ordinary title: 'Jahweh, God of Israel'.

45) C. STEUERNAGEL, "Jahweh der Gott Israels," *Wellhausenfestschrift, BZAW 27* (1939) pp. 329ff.

46) Compare above our note to Hos 6 :10 (1.2.e, note 39). As far as I can judge in all the other passages where 'House of Jacob' (21 times) or 'House of Israel' (146 times) occurs, the term refers to the nation, not to a locality or shrine. But it is interesting to note that Jacob always seems to dwell or to pitch his tent in sacred places: Galed (Gen 31 :25, 49), Bethel (Gen 28:22; 35:1, 6, 14-15), Succoth (Gen 33:17), Shechem (Gen 33:19-20), near the tower of Eder (Gen 35:21) and at Hebron (Gen 35:27). And in Psalm 87:2 the "dwelling places of Jacob" are certainly understood as sanctuaries, as is clear from the parallelism to Sion.

47) I am not convinced by A. ALT's arguments in favour of a pilgrimage that would have taken place from Shechem to Bethel (see A. ALT, *Die Wahlfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel*, *Gedenkschrift A. von Bulmerincq*, Riga 1938, VI, no 3 (1938) pp. 218-230; *Kl. Sehr.* I, pp. 79-88). In the first place, Bethel and Shechem cannot be demonstrated to have been thus connected in any other passage than Gen 35: 1-4. Secondly, the renunciation of idolatry finds its complete explanation in the Shechemite covenantal rites without reference to Bethel (see Jos 24). Then, the Elohist centers all Jacob's movements round Bethel (Gen 28 :10-12, 17-18, 20-22). Not only at Shechem, but also in Paddan Aram he is told to go to Bethel (Gen 31 :3, 13). Fourthly, the Elohist is obviously opposed to the cult of the calves at Bethel (cf. Ex 32:1-16, 19-24) and he probably wishes to stress that Jacob cleansed himself from such idolatry before going to Bethel. This purification he puts at Shechem, the traditional sanctuary for such rites.

48) According to Rabbinic commentators, however, Jacob himself also lived in the booths during the summer; cf. S. FISCH, *Deuteronomy*, London 1966⁶, p. 203.

49) Could this be a reaction against the 'footprints' venerated at Galed? See 1.2.e, note 34.

50) This might be parallel to Jacob's arriving 'in safety' (Gen 33:19; see 1.3.a, note 42).

51) The psalms seem to use consistently the term זֵאֵן , sheep (cf. 77:21; 80:2; 95: 7; 78: 52). The Elohist has מִקְנֵה in Gen 33 :17. This discrepancy weakens somewhat our equating the theological themes in both traditions (see 1.3.a, note 41).

52) K. GALLING has pointed out that Abraham's complaint in Gen 15 :1 should be understood as having been spoken when the patriarch was still in Transjordan (*Die Erwiiblungstraditionen Israels*, 1928, p. 45f). This would make the whole chapter a perfect parallel to the processional rites we are considering. Abraham was first instructed in the Transjordan (Gen 15:1-6: stress on his faith). Then God concludes a covenant in Palestine (cf. Gen 15: 7) by which the land is assigned to Abraham (Gen 15:7-21).

53) H. WILDBERGER, *Jabwes Eigentumsvolk*, Zurich 1960, p. 61ff.

54) H. WILDBERGER (ib. p. 62) adduces the title 'Lord of all the earth' (Jos 3:11, 13) in favour of the oracle Ex 19: 3b-6 deriving from Gilgal. But the statement 'all the land is Mine' obviously implies the promise of land-giving. And such land giving can be illustrated to have been celebrated and renewed at Shechem, not at Gilgal (see below on Ps 60: 8).

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

55) This Succoth is sometimes said to be a hebraicised form of the Egyptian *tkw*, a city which is identified with the present Tell el-Maschuta (cf. M. NOTH, *Geschichte Israels*, ib., p. 107). Others point to the fact that Semitic names do occur in Egypt, such as Baalzephon, Migdol and Goshen (W. F. ALBRIGHT, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, Baltimore 1946², p. 242). But if such a Succoth did exist in Egypt and it was known to our narrator, his interest in linking it to the Exodus tradition would all the same seem to derive from the cultic significance of the Succoth in Transjordan.

56) The name Etham is at times explained with reference to the Egyptian *htm*, 'fortress' (H. CAZELLES, "Les localizations de l'exode et la critique littéraire," *RB* 62 (1955) p. 358). According to this interpretation the place would have to be identified with Sile, which seems to have been called "the *htm*" par excellence. Again I believe that if the narrator is thinking of an actual Egyptian place at all, he only does so with the cultic Adam in mind.

57) Tombs played a definite role in the cult of local sanctuaries. cf. R. DE VAUX, *Les Institutions de l' Ancien Testament*, vol. II, Paris 1960, p. 112.

58) This is certainly the meaning of 'casting a sandal on Edom'; cf. R. DE VAUX, *Institutions*, ib., vol. I, p. 258.

59) Contrary to most standard translations: *RSV*, *JB*, Powis Smith, Canisius, etc.

60) Cf. A. ALT, "Die Ursprünge des Israelitischen Rechts", *BVSAW* 86, 1 (1934) pp. 64ff.; *Kl. Scbr.*, vol. I, pp. 327ff.

61) S. MOWINCKEL, *Der achtundsechzigste Psalm*, Oslo 1953, pp. 68ff.; H. J. KRAUS, "Psalmen," *Bibi. Komm.* 15 (1960) pp. 464ff; H. J. KRAUS, *Worship in Israel*, 1.c., pp. 167ff. One of the reasons for accepting a pre-Davidic origin is the prominence given to Benjamin in vs. 27.

62) Another possible translation: 'o mountain peak'.

63) S. MOWINCKEL and H. J. KRAUS (1.c.) connect this psalm with the battle against Sisera (vs. 11 ff.). They surmise that the 'mountain of God' (vs. 17) meant in the psalm has to be identified with the Thabor (cf. *Jdc* 4:14ff.). H. J. KRAUS translates verses 16f. in this way:

'A mountain of God is the mountain of Bashan; a high mountain is the mountain of Bashan.

Why look ye askance, ye high mountains, at the mountain which God hath desired for his abode?'

He then explains 'Bashan' in these words: 'it has probably nothing to do with the district of Bashan, but was probably a traditional name for the 'mountain of gods', mount Olympus. Taken in this sense, the term Bashan would correspond to the ancient Syrian name 'Zaphon' used to describe the mountain of the gods' (*Worship in Israel*, ib. p. 168; cf. also "Die Kulttraditionen des Berges Thabor," *BASILEIA--Festschrift W. Freytag*, 1959, pp. 177ff., which, however, was not available to me).

64) D. BALY argues that most probably the Jebel Druze is meant, a mountain which can be seen from afar and which has many peaks (*The Geography of the Bible*, New York 1957, pp. 194, 222).

65) The waving with the branches which Abimelech and his soldiers cut from the Zalmon may have been a parody on an existing religious custom. cf. T. MAERTENS, *A Feast in Honor of Yahweh*, Notre Dame 1965, pp. 65, 78f.

66) Compare M. NOTH, *Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels*, Stuttgart 1930, pp. 66ff., 87ff.

67) Especially the following psalms would need to be examined from this angle: Ps 15, 81, 100 and 114.

68) *Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, vol. I, Halle 1943.

69) See the outlines in H. J. KRAUS, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, Neukirchen 1956; S. LOERSCH, *Das Deuteronomium und seine Deutungen*, Freiburg 1967.

70) G. VON RAD, *Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium*, Stuttgart 1929; W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen*, ib. pp. 79ff.; 111ff.

71) See 1.2.c, note 27.

72) K. BALTZER, *Das Bundesformular*, Neukirchen 1960, pp. 24, 33f.

73) D.R. HILLERS, *Treaty-curses and the Old Testament Prophets*, Rome 1964, esp. pp. 30ff.

74) K. BALTZER, *Das Bundesformular*, ib., pp. 35, 42; B. RENAUD, *Je suis un Dieu Jaloux*, Paris 1963.

75) G. VON RAD, *Das Formgesch. Problem*, ib. pp. 23-30; *G.S.*, pp. 33-41; K. BALTZER, *Das Bundesformular*, ib. pp. 43-48; D. J. MCCARTHY, *Treaty and Covenant*, Rome 1963, pp. 109-140; M. G. KLINES, *Treaty of the Great King. The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy: Studies and Commentary*, Grand Rapids 1963.

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

- 76) A. BENTZEN, *Die josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen*, Kopenhagen 1926; G. VON RAD, *Deuteronomiumstudien*, Göttingen 1948², pp. 170f.; cf. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, I, München 1961, pp. 218ff.
- 77) H. CAZELLES, "Pentateuque," *Supp. Dict. Bibl.* vol. 38/39, Paris 1963/64, esp. col. 813ff.
- 78) A. ALT, "Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts," *ib.* pp. 61ff.; *Kl. Schr.* vol. II, pp. 324ff.; G. VON RAD, "Das formg. Problem," *ib.* pp. 3ff., 32ff.; *G.S.*, pp. 12ff., 48ff.; J. L'HOUE, "L'Alliance de Sichem," *RB* 69 (1962) esp. pp. 26, 365ff.
- 79) A. ALT, "Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts," *ib.*, esp. pp. 44ff.; *Kl. Schr.*, vol. I, esp. pp. 311ff.
- 80) A. KLOSTERMANN, *Der Pentateuch. Beiträge zu seinem Verstandnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte*, Leipzig 1907, Neuer Folge, pp. 313ff.; H. BREIT, *Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten*, München 1933; H. LOHFINK, *Das Hauptgebot, Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11*, Rome 1953, esp. 113-120.
- 81) H. J. KRAUS, *Worship in Israel*, pp. 141ff.
- 82) H. WILDBERGER, *Jahves Eigentumsvolk*, *ib.* pp. 57f.
- 83) A. ALT already remarked that—except for the possible addition Dtn 17 :14-20—the pattern of government presupposed in the deuteronomic law seems to date from a period prior to kingship (cf. "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums", *Kl. St.*, vol. II, pp. 250-275, esp. 263f.). Recently G. T. MANLEY has defended a very ancient date for the laws. The author goes somewhat to an extreme by claiming that many laws were written by Moses himself; cf. *The Book of the Law. Studies in the Date of Deuteronomy*, London 1957, esp. pp. 177ff.
- 84) J. L'HOUE, "L' Alliance de Sichem," *RB* 69 (1964) esp. pp. 359f.
- 85) M. G. KLINE (*Treaty of the Great King*, *ib.* esp. p. 42) pleads for a genuine Mosaic origin.
- 86) G. VON RAD has also made the observation that the ark is closely connected with the concept of Jahweh as the national military protector. And it is the deuteronomic law alone which has corresponding legislation with its laws on war, camp arrangements, sieges and the sacred ban (cf. "ZELT und LADE," *NKZ* 42 (1931), pp. 476-498, here pp. 128f).
- 87) According to J. HEMPEL (*Die .Altbebraische Literatur*, Potsdam 1930, p. 90) a later ironical tradition has put the building of the altar on the Ebal, mountain of curse (Dtn 27: 4), rather than on the Gerizim, mountain of blessing (Dtn 11: 29; 27 :12).
- 88) It is sometimes argued that the deuteronomic historian understood the phrase as referring to Jerusalem. This conclusion is drawn from the fact that the code states that worship may only be brought in the place which Jahweh chose "to make His name dwell there" (Dtn 12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2) and that the historical redactor attributes the same purpose to the Temple at Jerusalem (1 Kgs 9:3; 11:36; 14:21; 5:17, 19; 8:20, 44, 48; etc.); cf. K. BUDDE, "Das Deuteronomium und die Reform König Josias," *ZAW* 44 (1926) pp. 177ff. But it should be noted that the original formulation in the code of Law (Dtn. 12 etc.) always speaks of 'the place which Jahweh will choose,' a turn of phrase never used by the deuteronomic historian. The original formulation is, therefore, older than the historian's one and his interpretation need not have followed the original meaning.
- 89) Cf. A. WELCH, "When was the Worship of Israel centralized at the Temple?" *ZAW* 43 (1925) pp. 250-255.
- 90) The first one to underline this was M. KEGEL, *Die Kultus-Reform des Josia*, Leipzig 1919.
- 91) G. HOELSCHER rightly observed this fact, but his conclusion as to the postexilic date or the utopian character of the law cannot be maintained; (cf. "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," *ZAW* 40 (1922) pp. 185ff.
- 92) Recently this interpretation has been defended by G. T. MANLEY, *The Book of the Law*, 1.c., pp. 131ff.; M. G. KLINE, *Treaty of the Great King*, 1.c., pp. 81ff.
- 93) cf. J. Dus, "Der Brauch der Ladewanderung im alten Israel," *ThZ* Basel 17 (1961) pp. 1ff.
- 94) H. J. KRAUS, *Worship in Israel*, 1.c., pp. 165ff.
- 95) TH. OESTREICHER defended a distributive sense of the formula, adducing Dtn 23 :17 ('a fugitive slave can choose any place') in support of his view. The formula were then to mean: "In every place which Jahweh your God will choose in any of your tribes." The formula would, therefore, envisage the possibility of more sanctuaries having been chosen at a given time. This does not seem to do justice to the Hebrew which points to one definite sanctuary (cf. H. GRESSMANN, "Stimmen Ex 20, 40 und Dt 12, 13f. zusammen?", *ZAW* 42 (1924) pp. 337-346). The distribution is rather that one sanctuary could be chosen as central after another one.
- 96) cf. M. NOTH, *Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels*, 1.e. pp. 87-98.

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

97) Also in later Judaism there always was a solemn procession on the feast of the Thora, i.e. on the last day of the feast of Tabernacles (I. ELBOGEN, *Der Judische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Hildesheim 1962⁴, pp. 138f, 199ff., 219f.). And it will hardly be mere coincidence that the readings on the feast of Tabernacles have bearing on the same theme: Gen 32-33 (Jacob's procession), Lev 9 (the blessing of the Tent in the desert), Dtn 8 (the journey through the desert to the land), 2 Sam 6 (David conducting the ark into Jerusalem) and 1 Kgs 8 (Solomon bringing the ark into the Temple). cf. A. ARENS, *Die Psalmen im Gottesdienst des alten Bundes*, Trier 1961, p. 32 note 57.

98) H. J. KRAUS, *Worship in Israel*, I.c., pp. 63-65.

99) By car the route from Succoth (Tell DeirAllah?) to Shechem (Tell Balatah) is 76 km; cf. *Guide Bleu*, Moyen Orient, Paris 1956, pp. 546ff. This car route passes Adam (Ed Damiyeh), but after crossing the Jordan it makes some long detours, such as up the Wadi Faria until almost Tell el Farah. Calculating a more direct route, the distance would come to 50 km. M. DU BUIT assures us that a more direct route, perhaps via Beit Dajan, was in use even in Roman times (*Geographic de la Terre Sainte*, Paris 1958, pp. 118f.; maps 5, 6, 8, 13).

100) In Jdc 8 :11 we may have another reference to the route as 'the way of the tentdwellers'.

101) Compare 1.1.b, page 4.

102) Cf. A. ALT, "Die Ursprünge des Israelitischen Rechts," *BVSAW* 86, 1 (1934), pp. 64ff.; *Kl. Scr.*, vol. I, pp. 327ff.

103) G. VON RAD, "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch," *BWANT* 4, 26 (1938) pp. 39; *Gesammelte Studien*, ib. pp. 51.

104) K. GOLDAMMER, *Die Formenwelt des Religiösen*, Stuttgart 1960, p. 199.

105) cf. T. OHM, *Die Gebetsgebarden der Völker und das Christentum*, Leiden 1948, pp. 309ff.

106) Quite often the procession approaching the sanctuary is spoken of as 'climbing up to it'; cf. K. GOLDAMMER, I.c., p. 100; T. OHM, I.c., pp. 309ff. Perhaps this association of ideas may have influenced the formulation by which Israel confessed that Jahweh had 'made them climb up from Egypt' (*העלה*) Jos 24:17; Jdc 6: 8; etc. Forty-one instances of the formula exist). See my analysis of the formula in *VT* 15 (1965) pp. 98-101.

107) G. KITTEL, *ακολουθεω Theol. Diet. of the New Test.*, Vol. I, Grand Rapids 1965², pp. 210ff.; cf. also T. OHM, o.c., p. 307.

108) G. VAN DER LEEUW, *Der Mensch und die Religion*, Basel 1941, p. 149.

109) M. ELIADE, *Das Heilige und Das Profane*, Hamburg 1957, p. 62.

110) M. ELIADE, ib. pp. 65f.

111) I-I. LuBIENSKA DE LENVAL, *Die Liturgie der Gebarde*, Klosterburg 1959, pp. 81ff.

112) S. MowrNCKEL, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, Oxford 1962, vol. I, pp. 15ff.

CHAPTER TWO

DRAMATIZATIONS OF THE EXODUS

2.0. Introduction

2.0.a. In the foregoing chapter we discovered that the history of salvation, including the Exodus and the Land-giving, was cultically represented and reenacted in the procession that went up from Succoth to Shechem. Had this cultic re-enactment always been attached to this holy route? Did it originate in the sanctuary of Shechem itself or do we have to look for liturgical antecedents for it elsewhere?

2.0.b. The question poses itself all the more forcefully since the processional tradition itself points to Sinai as the holy place from where Jahweh moved to

Shechem. Psalm 68, which describes the holy route from Bashan via mount Zalmon to Shechem,¹⁾ records the arrival at the sanctuary with these words:

| | |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| רכב אלהים | God rides ²⁾ into the army |
| רבתיים אלפי שנאן | assembly ³⁾ of the thousands ⁴⁾ of |
| אדני בס סני | Shinan. ⁵⁾ The Master arrives from |
| בקדש | Sinai into the sanctuary. |

Ps 68:18

Dtn 33: 2-5 is an ancient hymn which speaks about Jahweh having become king 'when Jacob's tribes were joined to be one' (vs 5) ⁶⁾. In all likelihood we have in it an ancient record of how the amphictyony was formed, and thus it would also most naturally find its setting at Shechem, the 'birthplace' of that amphictyony.⁷⁾ Also in this song we read about Jahweh's arrival from Sinai:

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| יהוה מסני בא | Jahweh came from Sinai |
| זרח משעיר למו | He rose up to us from Seir. |
| הופיע מהר פארן | He shone forth from mount Paran. |
| ואתה מרבבת קדש | He arrived at the army assembly of the sanctuary. ⁸⁾ |

Dtn 33:2

A similar arrival of Jahweh from Sinai is alluded at in Jdc 5:4-5. In fact, Jahweh is called 'the one of Sinai' (Jdc 5: 5; Ps 68: 9). ⁹⁾ Whether the sanctuary in which Jahweh is said to arrive 'from Sinai' was Shechem from the very beginning, is difficult to assess. However, it would seem that also the arrival at Shechem is stated to be a procession of Jahweh 'from Sinai'. The ceremonies at Shechem seem, therefore, to indicate an antecedent, if not factual at least in the world of cultic conviction at the holy place of Sinai.

2.0.c. Was there a cultic celebration connected with Sinai that preceded the covenantal solemnities at Shechem? W. Beyerlin published a specific study on the Sinaitic traditions in which he arrives at farreaching conclusions regarding early cultic practices in Mosaic times. In his reconstruction of these practices he places the celebrations at Kadesh, "eleven days' journeying" from mount Sinai (Dtn 1: 2). There a covenant was celebrated according to the fundamental pattern of the vassal treaty. The original form of the decalogue was promulgated and through the mediation of Moses a pact was concluded with sacrifices and sacrificial meals. The terms of the covenant were written down and deposited in the ark. Even the periodic reading of the document at the covenantal reaffirmation feasts was already practised at Kadesh.¹⁰⁾ Supposing that this reconstruction is sufficiently accurate to give a general pattern of the solemnities, we could then further ask: What part was given to the history of salvation in the cult? Was it dramatized? Was there a cultic re-enactment of the salvific events? And how did such a cultic re-enactment influence the later processional rites of Shechem?

2.0.d. Reexamining the biblical traditions at our disposal, I believe that the following hypothesis merits consideration:

1. The kingship pact at Kadesh was celebrated with a dramatic liturgical re-enactment of the liberation from Egypt.
2. This original celebration was preserved almost unchanged at the sanctuary of Gilgal, and it greatly influenced the concept of the history of salvation as found with the later deuteronomic historians.

2.0.e. Our approach will be mainly literary. We will subsequently consider peculiarities of certain Exodus formulas, the literary composition of Ex 4-18 and the passages in the deuteronomic work of history dealing ex professo with the history of salvation. From these considerations we will try to reconstruct the oldest cultic dramatization of Jahweh's saving intervention.

2.1. *The disparity of Exodus and Land-giving*

2.1.a. The historical confession of Jahweh's salvific deeds comprises, in its classical formulation, both the liberation from Egypt and the land-giving.

"We were Pharaoh's slaves in Egypt.

EXODUS

And Jahweh brought us out of Egypt with a might hand; and Jahweh showed signs and wonders, great and grievous, against Egypt and against Pharaoh and all his household, before our eyes; and He brought us out from there,

LAND-GIVING

that He might bring us in and give us the land which He swore to give to our fathers."

Dtn 6:21-23

In this classical scheme of the history of salvation we find the Exodus and the Land-giving as the two indispensable kernels round which the other events are grouped.

2.1.b. In a previous publication I have illustrated that this scheme of Exodus and Land-giving (abbrev.: E-L), if we include the eschatological new Exodus and new Land-giving, occurs *in ninety three passages of the Hebrew Bible*.¹¹⁾

The numerical distribution is as follows:

| | | | | | |
|--------|----|-----------------|----|----------|---|
| JE | 14 | Dt-hist | 2 | Chr | 4 |
| Pre-Dt | 5 | Add. to Dr-hist | 2 | Ps | 7 |
| Amos | 2 | Jer | 12 | Dt. Is | 3 |
| Hosea | 3 | Ez | 13 | Trit. Is | 4 |
| Micha | 3 | p | 4 | Seph | 1 |

This wide distribution of the E-L scheme throughout these literary sources certainly justifies our accepting it as the classical pattern of the history of salvation.¹²⁾

2.1.c. In the same publication I attempted to list all the Exodus and Land-giving formulations. I also tried to show their connection with this scheme of the history of salvation. It is impossible and unnecessary for me here to go into all the details that were considered there. For our purpose it will suffice to recall some general conclusions that have bearing on the question at hand. How do the Exodus and Land-giving formulas relate themselves to E-L as a scheme? Do they normally appear in connection with this classical account of the history of salvation, or are they functioning independently? Restricting ourselves to some of the oldest sources we may note the following tendency: ¹³⁾

| | | Exodus Formulas | Land-giving Formulas |
|--------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| JE | total number | 43 | 34 |
| | occurring in E- L | 10 (25%) | 17 (50%) |
| Pre-Dt | total number | 28 | 10 |
| | in E-L | 8 (35%) | 5 (50%) |
| Amos | total number | 3 | 1 |
| | in E-L | 1 (33%) | 1 (100%) |
| Hosea | total number | 3 | 1 |
| | in E-L | - | - |
| Isaiah | total number | 3 | 2 |
| | in E-L | 1 (33%) | - |
| Micha | total number | 6 | 1 |
| | in E-L | 3 | (50%) |
| | TOTALS | 86 | 49 |
| | in E-L | 23 (30%) | 23 (50%) |

The survey reveals one undeniable fact: *the references to the Exodus in standard formulas are about twice as frequent as those to the Land-giving.* Moreover, the references to the Exodus occur far more frequently outside the E-L scheme. Of course, such numerical indications have to be treated with the utmost circumspection, but they suffice to illustrate that the Exodus formulas are not altogether of a homogeneous nature with the Land-giving ones. Moreover, in these early sources there seem to be more occasions to employ the standard Exodus formulations than the corresponding ones concerning the Land-giving. This circumstance itself raises the question whether the Exodus was considered more fundamental than the Landgiving.

2.1.d. The quantitative factor which seemed to require that we attribute a prominent place to the Exodus event, is further confirmed by a qualitative analysis. *The Exodus happening* is now generally admitted to have been considered by Israel as *the oldest*

and all determining event in the history of salvation. K. Galling was one of the first to point it out:

"The faith of the people always refers to the Exodus; it does not base itself on the promises made to the patriarchs ...

The Exodus tradition can be traced from pre-prophetic times to the period of the Maccabean struggle ...

It is the starting point of Israel's faith in its election ('Orientierungspunkt des Erwählungsglauben') ...

The patriarchal tradition, which is characterized by the patriarchal promises ..., is found in the great prose authors and in some late quotations: it is lacking in pre-exilic prophetic writings ...; from this would follow *the independence of the Exodus tradition and also its greater antiquity* ... " ¹⁴⁾

As J. Pedersen put it, it is participation in the Exodus event that decides membership or non-membership in Israel.¹⁵⁾ The decisive and central part played by the Exodus theme and its frequent occurrence in so many diverse contexts prove it to have been 'das Urbekenntnis Israels'.¹⁶⁾ Analysing three ancient accounts of the history of salvation (Ex 19:4; Jos 24:3-13; 1 Sam. 12:6-11) J. Muilenburg concludes:

"The central event in all three is the deliverance from Egypt, as the literary analysis makes indisputably clear, but to the covenantal recital at Shechem *the events of the conquest are added*, as in the covenantal recital at Gilgal too." ¹⁷⁾

It is to be noted that these observations do not rest on the mere absence or presence of either theme, but on the position filled by them. No one would deny that the land-giving is presupposed in the early prophets and in other pre-deuteronomic writings. What is to be remarked is rather that the land-giving theme (connected with that of the patriarchs) shows a gradual increase in importance. From an almost complete absence of its formulas in the early prophets, through a moderate occurrence in pre-deuteronomic texts, it reaches a peak of popularity in the deuteronomic sources. The Exodus theme and its formulas on the other hand have an established position from the earliest prophetic writings. The Exodus is a central and fundamental theme in Israel's faith from the very start (Is 11:6; Hos 2:17; 8:13; 11:1, 5; 12:10; 13:4; Am 3:1; Ps 81:11; etc.). It is 'Orientierungspunkt' and 'Urbekenntnis'. This cannot be said of the Land-giving.

2.1.e. The same discrepancy between Exodus and Land-giving can be illustrated if we approach the two themes from another angle. What is their relationship to factual history? The Exodus, the liberation from Egyptian slavery, is definitely understood as one, unique historical fact. Originally it goes back to a victory fought for Israel by Jahweh at the crossing of the Sea of Reeds.¹⁸⁾ It may later have been embellished by the numerous miracles worked by Jahweh against Egypt, but in essence it always remained for Israel the Holy War by which Jahweh once for all brought Israel into existence. It is the primordial war of salvation which may be compared to the primordial war by which Jahweh achieved creation.¹⁹⁾ It truly is Israel's birthday, and later oracles refer to its date with such implications:

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

"From the day in which I brought you out of Egypt" *nine times*
2 Sam 7:6; 1 Kgs 8:16; Jer 7:22; 11:4, 7; 31:34; 34:13; 1 Chr 17: 5; 2 Chr 6: 5.

In simple historical references the Exodus event serves as a date that cannot be reduced to others:

"At their going out of Egypt" *eleven times*
Ex 16:1; 19:1; Num 1:1; 9:1; 33:1, 28; Dtn 4:45, 46; 1 Kgs 6:1; 8: 9; 2 Chr 5:10.

The Exodus has great importance in determining the liturgical date of the feast of unleavened bread. For it is the Exodus that linked this feast to the month Abib:

"Because in the month Abib you went out of Egypt" *seven times*
JE: Ex 13:3, 4; 23:15; 34:18.
Dt-Law: Dtn 16:1, 3, 6.

The Exodus is consequently considered to be a definite historical fact. So much so that it is referred as to a date the first 'redletter' date in Israel's history.

2.1.f. In the Land-giving theme we do not find anything that approaches this same concept. Even those texts which expressly state the Land-giving (*Pre-Dt:* Jos 24:13; Jdc 2:1; 6:8; *Dtn-Law:* Dtn 6:23; 26:9) would seem to be concerned rather with declaring the present actuality of possessing the land than with recalling one definite, indivisible event of Land-giving. This may have its reasons in the historical developments themselves, since the earliest sources seem to reflect a slow and gradual conquest of Palestine (Jdc 1 :-). But ultimately the reasons should be sought rather in a fundamentally different conception of the Land-giving. The deuteronomistic historian may serve as an example. His interest in the Land-giving theme is indisputable. He is the one who incorporates into his historical work the story of a sweeping conquest of Palestine under Joshua ²⁰) and he deliberately halts to reflect on the actuality of the Land-giving (Jos 21 :43-45; Jos 23). Yet he dates the building of the Temple not from the Land-giving, but from the Exodus (1 Kgs 6 :1) ! As a matter of fact, we never find such a dating, in such phrases as: 'from the day that I gave you the land ... '. The statement of the Land-giving has, usually, more the character of a juridical than of an historical declaration. Its stress seems to fall more on the right of possession accorded to Israel by Jahweh than on the historical event of the conquest. Of course, Israel also confessed the Land-giving as one of the historical intercessions of Jahweh on her behalf. Both Exodus and Land-giving belong to this group. But there is a subtle distinction between them. The Exodus is a unique event, the decisive escape made in the month Abib, the birthday of Israel from which later history is dated. The Land-giving is an actual reality, a right conceded by Jahweh in the past, a right with the stress on the juridical consequences and not on the date, the place or the circumstances of the historical conquest by which the right was granted.

2.1.g. There is still another way in which this disparity of the two themes can be proved. Again we take our starting-point from a question. What function does each theme adopt when it occurs all by itself? What particular meaning does it take on when it does not immediately function in the classical scheme of the history of salvation? The answer is most revealing.

2.1.h. When the Exodus theme occurs all by itself it is usually embedded in liturgical formulations such as the following:

"I am Jahweh, who led you out of Egypt" *eleven times*
 Ex 20:2 (E); Ex 6:7; 29:46; Lev 11 :45 (P).
 Lev 19:36; 22:33; 26:13, 45(HG).
 Dtn 5:6 (Dt-Law); 2 Kgs 17:36 (DH); Ps 81:11.

"Jahweh is the God who led Israel out of Egypt"
 (or equivalents) *sixteen times*
 Ex 32:4; Num 23:22(E); Num 24:8(J); 1 Kgs 12:28(pre-Dt).
 Dt-Law: Dtn 6:12; 8:14; 13:6, 11; 20:1.
 DH: Jdc 2:12; 1 Sam. 12:6; 3 Kgs 9:9; 2 Kgs 17:7; Jer 16:14; 23:7; Chr.: Neh 9:18.

"The people which You have led out of Egypt" *eight times*
 (or equivalents)
 Ex 32:11 (E); Dtn 9:26, 29 (Dt-Law);
 Am 3:1; Dan 9:15;
 3 Kgs 8:51, 53 (DH).

The first of these three formulations is, in fact, nothing else than a complete version of the 'Selbstvorstellungsformel'.²¹⁾ The other two have been derived from it. The Exodus theme, therefore, plays a distinct role in the covenantal liturgy of Israel. *In the theophany of Jahweh* the brief reference to the Exodus suffices to denote Jahweh's true nature. He reveals himself by it as the God who chose to have historical and juridical relations with Israel.²²⁾ It is also the acclamation by which people acknowledge Him as such, as nobody less than the 'God of the Exodus'.²³⁾ The same formulation also functions *in the apodictic proclamation of law*, At times it emerges as an abbreviated historical prologue (cf. Ex 20: 2)²⁴⁾; quite frequently it has the specific purpose of excluding the making of images: for Jahweh had proved to be more than a personification of a force of nature by His dynamic and historical action against Egypt.²⁵⁾ *In oracles and prayers* the reference to Jahweh as the God of the Exodus provides a ground for trust.

2.1.i. Quite another picture is obtained from a scrutiny of the texts in which the Land-giving theme occurs all by itself. In the patriarchal narratives it invariably ranks among the blessings which God promises to bestow on his people in the future(*JE*: Gen 12:7; 13:15, 17; 26:3, 4; 28:13; etc.; *P*: Gen 17:8; 28:4; 35:12; 48:4; etc.). Since there is a close relationship between the theme of the Land-giving and the fathers,²⁶⁾ it is natural to assume that an aspect of 'patriarchal blessing' always remained inherent in the theme of the landgiving. This assumption is further corroborated by the fact that the Land-giving theme frequently appears to be part and parcel of fixed formulations of blessing and curse:

"That you may live long on the land which Jahweh gave to you"
 (or equivalents) *twenty times*
 E: Ex 20:12; Am 9:15;
 Dt-Law: Dtn 5:16; 6:3; 7:13; 11:9, 21; 15:4; 16:20; 25:15; 28:8, 11; 30:20;

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

DH: Dtn 4:1; 2 Kgs 21: 8. *Add*: Dtn 4:40; *Jer* 25:5; 35:15; *Ez* 28: 25; 36:28.

"That you may perish from the land which Jahweh gave to you

(or equivalent(s)

nine times

Dt-Law: Dtn 11 :17;

DH: Jos 23:13, 15; 1 Kgs 9:7; 14:15;

Jer: 15:14; 17:4; 24:10; *Chr.* 2 Chr. 7:20.

The ultimate and deepest meaning of the Land-giving seems to lie in this sphere of blessing and curse. The peaceful possession of the land or its loss are thought to be almost identical with enjoying Jahweh's favour or enduring His anger, to being on good or bad terms with Him. Never does Jahweh introduce Himself as: "I am the God who gave you the land,"²⁷⁾ nor is He addressed as such by the people. The Land-giving theme by itself -- quite contrary to its value when combined with the Exodus -- does not seem capable of motivating and characterizing God's relation to His people. When alone, it seems to belong not so much to the realm of the historical foundation of the covenant as to the blessing and curse attached to that covenant.

2.1.j. In rough outlines we might sketch the disparity of the two themes in this way:

Exodus theme

the oldest and all determining event in the history of salvation;

considered a unique, historical event from which time is dated;

in liturgical formulations it characterizes Jahweh's peculiar relationship with Israel.

Land-giving theme

a tradition which gains importance with the course of time;

the stress falls on its juridical consequences, rather than on the historical circumstances;

its ultimate and deepest meaning lies in the sphere of blessing and curse.

The analysis, furthermore, allows us to draw the important conclusion that the history of salvation seen as comprising Exodus and Land-giving did not constitute the original form of that history of salvation. The analysis justifies us in assuming *an earlier phase in which the history of salvation was based on the Exodus event alone*. The Land-giving theme originally did not belong to the history of salvation but to the realm of promise and blessing. It was added to the history of a salvation only at a later stage.

2.1.k. This, again, involves another consequence. If the Exodus event by itself was considered the one historical intervention by which Jahweh won His rights to Israel's allegiance, the celebration of this relationship must have involved a ritual that preceded the one practiced at Shechem. For, as we have seen in the foregoing section,²⁸⁾ the celebrations at Shechem recalled the Land-giving, ratified it and, perhaps, perpetuated it by a new distribution of property. The pact at Shechem was a land-pact. What then was the celebration in which only the Exodus featured as the salvific event? Have any traces of it been left in the Old Testament? Was there any liturgical re-enactment of the Exodus considered on its own merit?

2.2. "You have seen with your own eyes ... "

2.2.a. In the ancient oracle of Ex 19: 4 the cultic speaker refers to Jahweh's salvific deeds in these words:

"*You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings and brought you to Myself.*"

In the context of the actual Pentateuchal text in which the oracle is found the last phrase: "how I brought you to Myself" must mean "how I brought you to My sanctuary, i.e. at Sinai." For the words are spoken immediately after the escape from Egypt before the people have reached the promised land. Assuming for a moment that this interpretation be also the original meaning of the oracle, one would conclude to the fact that the cultic speaker sums up the history of salvation as one act of liberation with distinct scenes: the miracles in Egypt ("what I did to the Egyptians"); the journey through the desert ("how I bore you on eagles' wings") and the arrival of Sinai ("how I brought you to Myself"). About all these three scenes the cultic speaker affirms that Israel 'has seen it'. Aware of the fact that this oracle is obviously spoken to a liturgical community which is commemorating the liberation from Egypt, we may safely conclude that the mention of 'seeing' finds its explanation in a reference to a cultic dramatization of this liberation.²⁹⁾ In other words: the oracle seems to presuppose that the liberation of Egypt was dramatized. In all probability three scenes were staged: the miracles in Egypt, the journey through the desert and the arrival at Sinai.

2.2.b. The formula 'you have seen' would need, therefore, to be further examined. What is its meaning in the context of this cultic drama? In which literary strata of the Old Testament do we encounter it? Does the employment of the formula throw any light on an early liturgical representation of the Exodus?

2.2.c. It may be useful here to list a complete survey of where the formula occurs. For the sake of accuracy we have to distinguish two of its variations:

"*You have seen ... "*

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

- (i) See above, para 2.2.a. Ex 19:4
- (ii) "I plagued Egypt with what I did in the midst of it;
and afterwards I brought you out.
Then I brought your fathers out of Egypt,
and you came to the Sea;
and the Egyptians pursued your fathers with chariots
and horsemen to the Red Sea.
And when they cried to Jahweh, He put darkness
between you and the Egyptians,
and made the sea come upon them and cover them;
and *your eyes saw what I did to Egypt.*"
Jos 24:5-7
- (iii) "Thus Jahweh saved Israel that day from the hand of the Egyptians.
And Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore.
And Israel *saw the great work which Jahweh did against the Egyptians.*"
Ex 14:30f.
- (iv) "He is your God, who has done for you these great and terrible things *which your eyes have seen.*"
Dtn 10:21.
- (v) "And consider this day, (since I am not speaking to your children who have not known or *seen it*), consider the discipline of Jahweh your God, His greatness, His mighty hand and His outstretched arm, His signs and His deeds which He did in Egypt to Pharaoh the king of Egypt and to all his land;
and what He did to the army of Egypt, to their horses and to their chariots;
how He made the water of the Red Sea overflow them as they pursued after you, and how Jahweh has destroyed them as to this day; and what He did to you in the wilderness, until you came to this place;
and what He did to Dathan and Abiram the son of Eliab, son of Reuben; how the earth opened its mouth and swallowed them up, with their households, their tents and every living thing that followed them, in the midst of all Israel,
for your eyes have seen all the great work of Jahweh which He did."
Dtn 11:2-7.
- (vi) "*You have seen all that Jahweh did before your eyes in the land of Egypt, to Pharaoh and to all his servants and to all his land, the great trials which your eyes saw, the signs and those great wonders.*"
Dtn 29:1-2.
- "*Before your own eyes ...* "
- (vii) "For it is Jahweh, our God, who brought us and our fathers up from the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, and *who did these great signs before our own eyes,*

and preserved us in all the way that we went, and among all the peoples through whom we passed." *Jos 24:17.*

- (viii) "We were Pharaoh's slaves in Egypt; and Jahweh brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand; and Jahweh showed signs and wonders, great and grievous, against Egypt and against Pharaoh and all his household, *before our eyes.*" *Dtn 6:21-22.*
- (ix) "Jahweh your God who goes before you will Himself fight for you, just as He did for you in Egypt before your eyes, and in the wilderness, where you have seen how Jahweh your God bore you, as a man bears his son, in all the way that you went until you came to this place." *Dtn 7:30-37.*
- (x) "Or has any god ever attempted to go and take a nation for himself from the midst of another nation, by trials, by signs, by wonders and by war, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, and by great terrors, *according to all that Jahweh your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes?*" *Dtn 4:34*

2.2.d. From a comparison of the ten passages listed above one may draw the conclusion that the *particular formulation discussed is a very ancient one*. We find it in such ancient texts as Jos 24 (ii, vii), Dtn 6 :21- 23 (viii) and the cradle of Ex 19: 4 (i). It is known to JE (iii), to the deuteronomic lawgiver (iv, v), the deuteronomic historian (ix) and to other deuteronomic preachers (vi, x). As some of these texts may be dated very early: the deuteronomic law,³⁰ Jos 24,³¹ Ex 19:4,³²) the formulation itself must be of an even more ancient origin.

2.2.e. What is more: it is significant that in such ancient accounts of the history of salvation as are found in Jos 24:2-13; Jos 24:16-18 and Dtn 6:21-23, *the formulation of 'seeing' is only attached to Jahweh's action against Egypt*, and not to His military interventions that led up to the Land-giving.³³) The signs and wonders Jahweh did in Egypt can, therefore, be lifted out as an older part -- a part distinct from the Shechemite scheme of the history of salvation which starts from the patriarchs and which ends with the giving of the land.

2.2.f. Examining the object of the 'seeing' even more closely we find *four scenes* recurring time and again: (a) the miracles in Egypt (Ex 19:4; Dtn 6:21-22; 11 :2; 29:1-2; Jos 24:17; see also Dtn 4:34; 10:21); (b) the miraculous crossing of the Sea of Reeds (Ex 14: 30f.; Jos 24: 5-7; Dtn 11 :3-4); (c) the journey through the desert (Ex 19:4; Dtn 1:31; 11: 5-7; see also Dtn 1:19) and, perhaps, (d) the arrival 'in this place' (Ex 19: 4; Dtn 11: 7; 1 : 31). It should be noted that the crossing at the Sea of Reeds may often be included in the general phrase 'what Jahweh did against Egypt', so that scene (b) must probably be understood as the climax of scene (a). Yet in the dramatic representation they may have been somewhat distinct.

2.2.g. *The acting* is seemingly done by three parties. One is constituted by Jahweh, the main actor. In all the texts quoted it is always Jahweh Himself who 'does the signs against Egypt'. Moses and Aaron seem to figure as secondary actors siding with Jahweh in at least one

account (Jos 24:5), but even then it is not they but Jahweh who does the 'bringing out of Egypt' (Jos 24:5-7). Jahweh's protagonist is the Pharaoh (Dtn 11:3; 29:1; 6:21f.), the head of the Egyptian party. At times mention is made of Pharaoh's courtiers (Dtn 29:1; 6:22) or his army (Jos 24: 6; Dtn 11:4); frequently 'Egypt' or 'the Egyptians' are collectively introduced as Jahweh's enemies (Ex 19: 4; Jos 24:6-7; Ex 14:30f.; Dtn 6:22; 1:30; 4:34). The third party is constituted by Israel. They are the ones who benefit from Jahweh's dynamic intervention. Apart from the general denominator 'Israel' (Ex. 14:30f), we find 'your fathers' (Jos 24:6) or a personal pronoun involving the sacred community itself: "you" (Ex 19:4; Jos 24:5; Dtn 10:21; 11:2ff.; 29 :1-2; 1: 30-31; 4: 34) and "we, us" (Jos 24:17; Dtn 6 :21-22).

2.2.h. This last observation puts the cultic community in a twofold role: it is both the audience witnessing the drama and at the same time it is on the stage partaking in it as one of the acting parties. The formula 'you have seen with your own eyes' requires, therefore, some further analysis. It will not do to dismiss it merely as a coined phrase in paranetic preaching.³⁴⁾ No doubt it became such a phrase later on, but its original force must have implied some specific connotation. And since 'seeing' is the characteristic act of a witness, it may well derive its ultimate meaning from the notion of witnessing.

2.2.i. Witnessing had an indispensable function in many public acts. The presence of witnesses could be required *for the validity of the act itself*. This applies to buying and selling (Gen 23:18: Abraham's acquisition of Macpelah; Jer 32:12: Jeremiah's transaction regarding landed property), to the levitate marriage (Dtn 25:9), to the delivery of a public message by the prophet (Jer 19:10; 43:9; cf. 28:1, 5, 11), to the dismissal of a wife (Hos 2:12) or to the presentation of a successor to the throne (1 Chron 28:8ff.) In such public acts the witnesses are necessary for the legal validity.³⁵⁾ The sworn witness will pronounce a conditional curse on himself. ³⁶⁾ This is on account of his further obligation to *testify to the validity of the act* whenever this validity might be challenged. 'Having seen' something is almost synonymous to 'having to give witness' about it:

"If someone has sinned, because after having heard the formula of adjuration he should have brought testimony -- for he had seen it or knew of it --, but did not make a declaration, and so carries the burden of his fault, etc."

Lev 5:1

The man who 'has seen' or 'who knows' but who does not bring testimony when called upon, sins. Witnesses have the strict duty to testify to what they saw, especially if called upon to do so with an adjuration (cf. Jdc 17:2; Prov 29:24). To acquit themselves of guilt in a murder case, the elders of the city near the scene where the body was found, have to declare not only that they did not commit the crime (disavow culpability), but also that 'their eyes did not see it' (to discharge them of the duty which they might have as witnesses: Dtn 21 :7).

2.2.j. H. Reventlow has noted accurately that there is some analogy between this legal witnessing and Israel's witnessing Jahweh's signs. Moses has to strike the rock 'before the elders of Israel' (Ex 17: 6), which is consequently a public, legal act ("eine rechtliche Handlung," cf. also Num 20:12).³⁷⁾ Similarly it is said that Moses did all his signs "before the eyes of all Israel' (Dtn 34:12), just as Joshua's command to the sun was spoken 'before all Israel' (Jos 10:12). In this sense it can be said that *Israel's witnessing of Jahweh's deeds makes them into public, legal acts*, to which He could later appeal saying: 'You have seen .. '. Upon Israel, the witness, devolves the 'juridical' duty to testify to others that Jahweh has really done these acts (cf. Ex 10:2; 12:25f.; 18:8ff.; Dt 6:21ff.).

2.2.k. There is, however, another aspect to Israel's witnessing. Israel does not only see public acts, *it sees 'signs'* (Dtn 4:34; 6:22; 29:2; Jos 24:17). W. Zimmerli has thrown some light on this aspect when exploring the formula: '... so that you may know that I am Jahweh'.³⁸⁾ This formula frequently occurs in the rib between Jahweh and Pharaoh in Egypt (Ex 7:17; 8:6, 18; 9:14, 29; 10:2; 11:7) and in the account of the victory at the Sea of Reeds (Ex 14: 4, 17f.). The author shows that the structural pattern of the formula derives from the function of the sign. A sign is a previously determined event which forces the witness to either a favourable or an unfavourable decision. In this way the miracles and signs in Egypt force the witnessing Israel to the acknowledgement that Jahweh is the Lord.³⁹⁾

2.2.l. Moreover, also in a different respect Israel's witnessing cannot be simply identified with legal testimony. For it is not individuals or even official persons who do the witnessing, but *the cultic community*. The whole people assembled in the public liturgical celebration sees Jahweh acting in rites and cultic re-enactments. The witnessing has at the same time the value of being a liturgical act, a part of reliving the community's fundamental relationship to Jahweh. In this kind of witnessing we have to reckon with the peculiar features of ritual: consecrated priests and mediators, symbolized actions, hallowed formulations. 'Israel seeing Jahweh inflicting plagues on the Egyptians' means in this context: Israel witnessing how a cultic representative of Jahweh annihilates symbolic figures of the Pharaoh and his court with ritually determined actions and formulas.

2.2.m. Summarizing our findings regarding this formula we may say that it seems to presuppose *a cultic re-enactment of Jahweh's liberating acts*. The liberation of Israel from Egypt was the central theme of this drama. It included scenes of the plagues, the miraculous crossing of the sea, the desert journey and the arrival at Sinai. The cultic actors were: Jahweh (with Moses and Aaron), the Pharaoh (with his court) and the cultic community itself. The drama obviously intended to establish Jahweh's rights as Lord over Israel: this follows from Israel's participation as 'witnesses' and from the nature of the 'signs' performed by Jahweh.

2.3. *The Cultic Drama in the Book of Exodus*

2.3.a. J. WELLHAUSEN has been one of the first to draw the attention of scholars to the distinction between the Exodus-Kadesh tradition and the Sinai traditions. He claimed that the "wilderness of Kadesh formed the true scene of the Mosaic history." There it was that the Hebrews settled immediately after the Exodus. There Moses dispensed justice in a way that was later to be followed by the priests and judges after him (cf. Ex 15:25; 18; Num 11). The true and original significance of Sinai, on the other hand, was judged by him to have been quite independent of the legislation. "Sinai was the seat of the Deity, the sacred mountain, doubtless not only for the Israelites, but generally for all the Hebrew and Cainite (Kenite) tribes of the surrounding region." Originally Jahweh was thought to appear to His people 'from Sinai' (cf. Dtn 33: 2). It was only by a later literary process that the journey to Sinai, the solemn inauguration of the covenant there and the proclamation of the law during that covenant became part of the pentateuchal traditions.⁴⁰⁾ H. Gressmann worked out this suggestion to a literary hypothesis: He separated the 'Sinisagenkranz' (Ex 19-24; 32-34) from the 'Kadessagenkranz' (Ex 17-18; Num 10-14). Of these only the latter was thought to have had an original connection with the Exodus.⁴¹⁾ Celebration concerning the escape from Egypt would, consequently, have found their earliest expression in the encampment at Kadesh, and not at the foot of mount Sinai.

2.3.b. This theory of the separation between the Exodus (at home in Kadesh) and Sinai was subsequently strengthened by two independent studies. J. Pedersen contended that Ex 1-15 forms one literary unit which culminates not in the covenant (Sinai), but in the new creation of the people in the paschal celebrations.⁴²⁾ G. von Rad formulated his theory of the distinct 'Exodus-Land-giving tradition' and 'Sinai-or Covenant tradition'.⁴³⁾

2.3.c. It is not difficult to see, however, that the conclusions of these authors are partly based on presumptions and theories which have meanwhile been disproved. Such is the tenet, underlying J. Wellhausen's and H. Gressmann's theories, that the insertion of law into history is to be explained as a gradual process: from Moses' judicial practice in Kadesh to a formation of code and later to its sanction on Sinai.⁴⁴⁾ G. von Rad wrestled with the same problematic when he distinguished as heterogeneous elements the historical accounts of the Creed (Exodus, Land-giving) and the legislative texts of the covenantal traditions.⁴⁵⁾ This presumed heterogeneity of law and history has now been disproved. The abundant evidence of the ancient international vassal treaties has illustrated that historical prologues and binding stipulations function as juridical counterparts. History and Law as a combination find their most natural explanation in the covenant.⁴⁶⁾

2.3.d. J. Pedersen's attempt to penetrate into the original setting and theological implications of Ex 1-15 was certainly very valuable, and I will later have occasion to point out a modified form in which his basic proposition is acceptable to me.⁴⁷⁾ But his reconstruction as it stands cannot be maintained. First of all, his total rejection of literary criticism seriously weakens the strength of his arguments.⁴⁸⁾ Secondly, his reconstruction of the paschal feast does not account for a most telling contradiction: the pascha is a family celebration (p. 165), commemorating the night before the Exodus (p. 170), in which the sacrifice safeguarded the firstborn (pp. 166f.). How can this 'family celebration' be the feast that reenacts the very creation of the whole people as people (cf. pp. 168f.)? How can this same pasch, consumed in Egypt, be identified with the sacrifice for which the people had to leave Egypt (Ex 5 :3; 8 :22-25; etc. "three days far into the desert!") and which they had to bring on mount Horeb (Ex 3 :12)? How could anyone, after an attentive reading of Ex 1-19, identify the paschal sacrifice enjoined in Ex 12 (destined to save Israel's firstborn from Jahweh's striking hand; Ex 12:13f, 26f.) with the sacrifice to be offered far from Egypt (destined to celebrate Jahweh's dominion; Ex 8:21-25; 12:31; etc.)?

But, in the third place, J. Pedersen's gravest failure would seem to be his overlooking the covenantal features that run throughout Ex 1 - 15. He fails to note that Jahweh's programme of Ex 3 - 4 (cf. p. 168) contains -- in the promise of Exodus and Landgiving -- the "royal pledge" of a future pact (Ex 3 :7-9; 3 :16f.).⁴⁹⁾ This promise is made explicit in Ex 6 :3-8 (P) and avowed fulfilled by the hymn of Ex 15 (Exodus: Ex 15:13a, 16, etc.; Land-giving: Ex 15:13, 17). He does not see the covenantal traits of Moses' function as mediator between God and the people (cf. pp. 173f.), of Jahweh's claim on His vassal (called His "firstborn", Ex 4:22; cf. p. 168) and of the technical term עֶבֶד in the often repeated demand 'let My people go that they may *serve* Me' (Ex 7:16; 7:26; 8:16; 9:1; 9:13; 10:3, 7). Moreover, he attributes to the paschal feast the commemoration of Jahweh's creating His people (p. 167), of the people's existence as a people (pp. 168f.) and their coming into their own land (p. 169). Doing so he seems to disregard the undeniable fact that the people are considered to have become Jahweh's

people through the covenant⁵⁰) (Ex 19:3b-8; Jos 24 etc.). In view of these considerations J. Pedersen's analysis of Ex 1-15 has to be rejected as inadequate.

2.3.e. In fact, all along there have been authors who -- in defiance of the common view -- sought to demonstrate the historical and literary connection between Exodus and Sinai. J. Morgenstern admitted a document K which, describing Moses' life, culminated in the covenant on Sinai.⁵¹) Of greater weight was S. Mowinckel's study on the decalogue, in which he amply evinces that Exodus and Sinai cannot be understood adequately if not in their mutual interrelation. The Exodus story is the account of how Jahweh through combat and victory establishes his reign over Israel. The covenant was the consequent enthronement of this New King.⁵²) After the basic studies of M. Buber⁵³) and C. J. Gadd,⁵⁴) special mention should be made of a contribution by H. Wildberger. Against many authors (A. von Gall, O. Eissfeldt, A. Alt, G. von Rad and H. Schmid)⁵⁵) he defended that the concept of Jahweh as 'nomadic king' must be considered part and parcel of genuine Hebrew tradition.⁵⁶) G. Fohrer raised the question whether Jahweh might not have been considered the charismatic leader who was made king of Israel through a royal pact.⁵⁷) In the line of these investigations⁵⁸) we may conceive of the Sinaitic pact as the prequest enthronement of Jahweh as king after His victorious combat to save Israel. In the next pages I take the possibility of such a prequest celebration as the starting point for a further analysis of traditions found in the book of Exodus.

2.3.f. Assuming for a moment that the Sinaitic pact was celebrated in a drama such as our analysis of the formula 'you have seen .. .' would seem to require⁵⁹) we may legitimately ask the question whether the book of Exodus might not contain remnants of such a celebration. And, in fact, this seems to be the case. For the Jahwistic-Elohistic traditions seem to include brief descriptions of *a drama of Jahweh's enthronement* in the following passages⁶⁰):

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Ex 3:11-14, 18-20 | Moses sent from Sinai. |
| 5:1-23 | First encounter with Pharaoh. |
| 7 :14-18, 23-24 | The Nile turned into blood. |
| 7:25-29; 8:4-10 | The frogs. |
| 8:16-20, 21-28 | The hornets. |
| 9:1-7 | The plague on the cattle. |
| 9:13-35 | The hailstones. |
| 10:1-20 | The locusts. |
| 10:21-29 | The darkness. |
| 11 :4-8; 12:29-32 | The firstborn. |
| 14: 5-7, 13-14, 19-20, 21b, 24- 25, 27b, 30-31 | The crossing of the Sea of Reeds. |
| 19:3b-8 | The covenantal invitation |
| 24:3-8 | The conclusion of the covenant |

These passages originally belonged to one complete literary unit, which was taken over by the Jahwistic-Elohistic narrators. Analysing some of its themes we may illustrate both the intrinsic unity of these passages and their original independence from the Jahwistic-Elohistic sources.

2.3.g. We may start with noticing a negative characteristic of this drama of Jahweh's struggle with Pharaoh. The Jahwistic-Elohistic account is totally constructed on the thematic of the so-

called deuteronomic creed (Dtn 5:21-23; 26:5b-9), which in its complete form embraces the following successive stages in the history of salvation:

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----|
| the patriarchs | (a) |
| the descent to Egypt | (b) |
| the growing to be a numerous people | (c) |
| the oppression by the Egyptians | (d) |
| Jahweh's seeing the oppression | (e) |
| the Exodus | (f) |
| the journey through the desert | (g) |
| the disinheritance of the inhabitants of Canaan | (h) |
| the giving of the land to Israel | (i) |

The J-E story itself, of course, moves through these themes. But also in the course of its narrative full references are made to these elements of the history of salvation. One may compare the following texts: Gen 15:12-16 (a,b,d,e,f,h,i), Gen 46:3-4 (a,b,c,f,i), Ex 3:7-8, 16-17 (a,d,e,f,h,i), Num 20:14-21 (b,d,e,f) and Gen 50:24; Ex 13:3-5; Ex 15; 32:11-14; Ex 33:1-3a; Num 24:1-9. The important inference to be made from this is that both the theme of the Patriarchs and of the Land-giving are fundamental to the structure of the Jahwistic - Elohist history of salvation.⁶¹⁾ But *in the Exodus Drama references to either the Patriarchs or to the Land-giving are totally lacking*. This is a first conclusive argument for its independent origin. The problematic that animates the whole story centers round Jahweh's claim on service from Israel. In no way does it regard the need of Israel to have land. Neither does it recall earlier connections between Jahweh and the patriarchs.

2.3.h. Jahweh's imperative demand: '*Let My people go that they may serve Me*', dominates the whole drama. The demand is phrased in juridical terminology. It could freely be translated to mean: "Give up your claim on this slave so that he may be in my service!"⁶²⁾ It is truly the leitmotif of the story: it marks the beginning of many a new episode (Ex 7:16; 7:26; 8:16; 9:1; 9:13; 10:3); it becomes increasingly exacting in the course of the dispute; it is brought to a dramatic and triumphant conclusion in Israel's passage through the Sea of Reeds and the Covenant on Sinai.

In the beginning Jahweh seems to require no more than that the Hebrews be allowed to celebrate a feast in His honour on the open plains of the desert (Ex 4:1-3). After the plague of the hornets Pharaoh's concession, permitting the sacrifice 'in this land' or 'not far from Egypt', is not accepted (Ex 9:21ff.). Later Moses insists that not only the men, but sons and daughters, sheep and cattle have to go (Ex 10: 8-11), yes that 'no hoof will remain behind' (Ex 10: 24-26). Struck by the death of the firstborn the Pharaoh finally allows the whole people with all their possessions to go (Ex 12: 31-32). Completely liberated from their former masters at the sea of Reeds (Ex 14:27- 28), the Israelites submit themselves to serve Jahweh in the Covenant He holds out to them (Ex 19: 8), sealing the agreement with the 'sacrifice' that had been their pretext for leaving Egypt from the very start (Ex 24:3-8). Jahweh's demand that initiated and prompted this turn in Israel's history reached its accomplishment at Sinai.

2.3.i. Characteristic of the drama are also *the signs which Jahweh works*. These miraculous signs, which force Egypt to surrender, follow one another in a true crescendo of gravity and effectiveness. The signs mark the stages of development in the contest. They are the

progressive 'mile-stones', the kernel events round which the rest of the narrative is grouped. Usually we find this sequence of episodes:

Jahweh's word to Moses
Moses' demand in Pharaoh's court with the threat of a sign
Pharaoh's refusal
Moses' calling down the sign
Description of the sign
Pharaoh's request to have the sign removed
Moses' prayer effecting its removal
Pharaoh's hardening his heart.

It should be noted that this very pattern, repeated as it is over and over again, illustrates the dramatic origin of the passage. Liturgical plays of this type require a simple structure of action, which is repeated over and over again. The main actors: Jahweh, Moses, Pharaoh, maintain the same characteristic attitudes, make the same symbolic gestures and repeat their stock-phrases. Tension is maintained by introducing slight variations, intensifying the conflict of demand and refusal and by introducing different and increasingly severe 'signs'. These signs were carefully arranged so as to symbolize a gradual climax of devastating punishments. The poisoned Nile, the frogs and the hornets are no more than a trifling nuisance compared to the destructive cattle diseases, the hailstones and the locusts that follow. Most severe, however, are the last three inflictions that affect every Egyptian in person: the terrifying darkness, the death of the firstborn and the utter defeat of the army in the Sea of Reeds. It is this that the cultic speaker refers to when he says: 'You have seen all I did to Egypt' (Ex 19:4).⁶³)

2.3.j. For the signs are worked by Jahweh for a specific purpose. Time and again Jahweh declares that He is showing His power '*that you may acknowledge that I am Jahweh!*' (strict formulation: Ex 7:17; 8:18; 10:2; wider formulation: Ex 8:6; 9:29; 11 :7; 9:14). In fact, this is the only reason why Jahweh allows the Pharaoh to harden his heart: "in order that I might be able to work My signs among them, so that you could tell your sons and grandsons what I did to the Egyptians and which signs I wrought among them; that you might acknowledge that I am Jahweh!" (Ex 10:1-2). Skilfully the dramatic opposition of Pharaoh is exploited to the full. At times the Pharaoh seems to be on the point of yielding (Ex 8:4; 8:21; 9:27; 10:7-10; cf. 10:24-26; 12:31-32), but each time he hardens his heart again as soon as the oppressive sign has been removed (Ex 8:28; 9:7; 9:34; 10:20; 10:27-29; 14:5-8). This provides the cultic actors with the opportunity to elaborate on the all-important theme of acknowledging Jahweh. The Pharaoh becomes a test-case of unbelief, the protagonist of the sceptics and religious rebels. But Jahweh will crush him with signs:

that the Pharaoh may acknowledge Him as Jahweh (Ex 7 :17);

that he may realize there is none like Jahweh (Ex 8:6);

that he may know that Jahweh is in the middle of Egypt (Ex 8:18);

that he may see Jahweh's power and that His Name be mentioned in the whole world (Ex 9:16);

that he may understand that Jahweh discriminates between Egypt and Israel (Ex 11: 7).

This acknowledgement is finally extorted from the Egyptians when they seek to fly from the Sea of Reeds crying: 'Jahweh fights for Israel against Egypt!' (Ex 14:25). And also Israel acknowledges Jahweh's supremacy 'when they saw the great work that Jahweh had done against Egypt' (Ex 14:31).

2.3.k. If Jahweh may be called the leading actor and Pharaoh His antagonist, with the Hebrew people as the contested property, a definite role is also given to Moses. Jahweh's pleas for and claims on the Hebrews are always voiced through Moses. Through Moses every sign is previously announced. It is through his lifted hand that they are brought about and it is again on Moses' intercession that they cease. Pharaoh's rejection is certain at the moment when he refuses to receive Moses again (Ex 10:28f.). Pharaoh's ultimate defeat results in Israel's confidence in Jahweh "and in Moses, His servant" (Ex 14:31). Yes, the lasting importance of Moses' *mediating function* gradually unfolds itself. For Moses is not only Jahweh's plenipotentiary in the war with Egypt, but to Moses is confided the office of proposing the pact (Ex 19:3b-8) and mediating the sacrificial ratification (Ex 24:3-8).

2.3.1. What is the position of the Hebrews throughout the Drama? Little action is recorded on their part. Jahweh is acting on their behalf. His signs are specially arranged so as to illustrate Jahweh's discrimination in their favour: when only the region inhabited by the Hebrews remains exempt from the hornets (Ex 8:18f.), from the plague among the cattle (Ex 9:4, 6f.), from the hail storm (Ex 9:26), from the darkness (Ex 10: 23b) and from the slaying of the firstborn (Ex 11:7). And the Hebrews cross the Sea of Reeds by a miraculous path, while the Egyptians are mercilessly drowned without a chance to escape (Ex 14:21b, 24-25, 27b). This discrimination itself helps the elected people to understand the meaning of the signs (Ex 11:7). For *the part played by the elected people is to be witnesses*, not only for the present generation but also for the future ones (Ex 10:1-2). At the beginning they are frankly distrustful and antithetic (Ex 5:21). After the miracle at the Sea of Reeds there is total conversion and faith in Jahweh (Ex 14:30-31). At Sinai this faith (Ex 19:4) finds concrete expression in the acceptance of the covenant (Ex 19: 8; 24: 7). It is by "seeing all that Jahweh does against Egypt" that Israel became the believing witness it is (Ex 3:20; 10:2; 14:31; 19:4).

2.3.m. This internal analysis of the passages selected by us from the book of Exodus abundantly proves their coherence and common origin. It is also clear that these passages belonged to a literary unit that existed independently before it was taken up into the Jahwistic-Elohistic accounts. It has the obvious traits of liturgical drama: well-defined actors (Jahweh, Moses, the Pharaoh, the Egyptians, the Hebrews), scenes that evolve on a common pattern, formularized conversations, a gradual increase in the conflict until it is resolved in Jahweh's victory at the Sea of Reeds and in the Covenant on Sinai. It is also interesting to note how naturally the formula 'you have seen all I did for you against Egypt' ⁶³) fits in its dramatic context, and it can hardly be chance that our independent analysis of this formula provided a reconstruction of the liturgical drama that is curiously parallel to the one arrived at by analysing the passages in the book of Exodus. In fact, it seems that both these passages and the formula presuppose the existence of such a drama.

2.3.n. Since neither Patriarchs nor the Land-giving play any major part in this drama, its origin must be pre-conquest. Sinai (Horeb) seems to belong intrinsically to it as the place where Moses received his mission (Ex 3:14) and where he mediates the covenant (Ex 19:3). This is confirmed by references to the place of sacrifice as a definite location "three days'

journey into the wilderness" (Ex 5:3; 8:27). The occasion is also a well defined one. The Hebrews have to celebrate a feast to Jahweh (Ex 5:1; 10:9). As its purpose the feast has to profess their 'service' to Him (Ex 7:16; 9:1; 9:13; 10:3). Holocausts and other sacrifices are an essential part of this feast (Ex 3:18; 5:3, 8, 17; 8:4; 8:21; 10:25-26; 24:5). All the people are to be present (Ex 10:9; cf. 24:5). By the feast Jahweh's possible curse will be averted (Ex 5:3). In brief, the whole drama presupposes a genuine covenantal celebration (Ex 19:3b-8; 24:3-8) and it visualizes the feast to be celebrated at the foot of mount Sinai.

2.4. *The Deuteronomic historian and celebrations at Gilgal*

2.4.a. It has not remained unnoticed that the deuteronomic historian conceives of the history of salvation as a series of liberations worked by Jahweh. Contrary to the classical scheme which ended with the Land-giving as crowning benefit (cf. Jos 24:3-13; Dtn 6:21-23; 26: 5-9), the pattern followed by the deuteronomic historian does not include the Land-giving, but lists a series of liberations.⁶⁴⁾ This can be illustrated from summaries of the history of salvation which derive from the historian's hand:

"Did I not deliver you from the Egyptians and from the Amorites, from the Ammonites and from the Philistines? The Sidonians also, and the Amalekites, and the Moabites, oppressed you; and you cried to Me, and I delivered you out of their hand."

Jdc 10 :11-12

"I brought up Israel from the land of Egypt, and I delivered you from the hand of the Egyptians and from the hand of all the Kingdoms that were oppressing you."

1 Sam 10:18

In the book of Judges we find that the historian consciously arranged the course of history on the pattern of: Israel's lapse -- oppression by an enemy --conversion -- liberation. The historian himself introduces it as a general scheme (Jdc 2:10-19) and then he follows it in the description of the liberations from Edom (Jdc 3:7-11), Moab (Jdc 3:12-30), Hazor (Jdc 4:1-5:31), Midian (Jdc 6:1-9:29) and Ammon (Jdc 10:6-11 :6.⁶⁵⁾ When he makes Samuel recount Jahweh's salvific acts, it is again in a series of such successive liberations (1 Sam 12:7-11). The landgiving does not feature in this history of salvation as an irrevocable gift from Jahweh. On the contrary, at the very juncture of time when the great conquest has been completed, he makes Joshua utter a warning regarding the land: its possession depends on fidelity to the covenant; Jos 23 :12-16; cf. also 1 Kgs 9: 6-9).

2.4.b. Is the deuteronomic historian's conception of the history of salvation as a series of liberations a mere literary composition? Or was there in Israel a line of tradition -- distinct from the one leading through Shechem -- in which the history of salvation was considered to be a series of victories won by Jahweh on behalf of Israel? As I have pointed out elsewhere, such a conception of the history of salvation could well have grown out of the Exodus seen as the exemplary deliverance, of which each later deliverance from enemies was considered an extension. ⁶⁶⁾ What, then, could have been the sources from which the deuteronomic historian drew his peculiar conception of the history of salvation?

2.4.c. Let us begin by noting that the deuteronomic historian is rather negative regarding Shechem. In fact, consciously or unconsciously, he belittles Shechem's historical position. Shechem appears in his history as little more than a place of misfortune. In his narrative of

the conquest (Jos 1-12) Shechem finds no mention at all.⁶⁷) When the story of Abimelech forces him to refer to Shechem, he hastens to tell us that it is at Shechem that Israel lapsed from Jahweh to serve Baal-Berith (Jdc 8:33). The destruction of the city is seen by him as God's just punishment for the crimes committed in it (Jdc 9: 57). The lamentable split between the north and the south is narrated to take place at Shechem (1 Kgs 12:1-20). The arch-sinner Jeroboam (1 Kgs 15:3; 15:30; 16:19; 2 Kgs 3:3; 10:31; 13:6; 17:21) made Shechem his first residence (1 Kgs 12: 25). Perhaps we have to imagine that it is at Shechem that Jeroboam conceived his evil scheme of introducing the cult of the golden calves (cf. 1 Kgs 12:25-28). The sad story of how the mixed cult of the Samaritans arose (2 Kgs 17:24-34) contains the last indirect reference to the hapless Shechem. In all his long narration we find no trace of how Jahweh's covenant was reaffirmed in periodic celebrations at Shechem, no trace of the role Shechem played in the division of the land. Obviously Shechem was in the bad books of this historian.

2.4.d. The opposite is true of Gilgal. There it is that the people is supposed to have camped immediately after crossing the Jordan (Jos 4:20). There was the monument commemorating this event (Jos 4: 20). There Israel was circumcised (Jos 5: 9) and there it celebrated its first Passover in the promised land (Jos 5 :10). It is in Gilgal that Joshua is supposed to have had his military headquarters. He receives the Gibeonites at Gilgal (Jos 9: 6), he begins his expeditions from Gilgal (Jos 10:6f.), he takes decisions at Gilgal regarding the division of the land (Jos 14: 6) and it is probably in Gilgal that the deuteronomistic historian visualises Joshua's farewell speech to Israel (Jos 23: 1-2).

Gilgal functions as one of the centres of Samuel's apostolate (1 Sam 7:16; 10:8; 11 :14, 15; 13:8; 15:12, 33). Again it is at Gilgal that the historian stages Samuel's last address (1 Sam 12:1ff.; cf. 11:14, 15). At Gilgal we find the residence of the prophetic schools founded by Elijah and Elisha (2 Kgs 2:1; 4:38). Considering the importance attributed to Joshua, Samuel, Elijah and Elisha in the deuteronomistic work of history, its redactor must have considered Gilgal as the outstanding sanctuary in ancient Israel.

The deuteronomistic historian seems, consequently, to attribute to Gilgal a central importance in the worship of Israel. It becomes likely then that he depends on it for many of his traditions and conceptions. Could it be that also his 'pattern' of the history of salvation originated from this sanctuary? I believe that there are indications that justify such a hypothesis.

2.4.e. When analysing the crossing of the Jordan as described in Jos 3-4 ⁶⁸) we pointed out that in that passage two different traditions have been connected. Not only at Shechem there was a ceremony of crossing the Jordan, but also at Gilgal. *The characteristic features of this Gilgal tradition were:* Shittim as point of departure (Jos 2:1; 3:1); the ark crossing the Jordan ahead of the people (Jos 3:6; 4:11); the taking of stones from the river bed to build a monument on the western shore (Jos 4: 4-5, 8, 20; the connection of the crossing with the Passover (Jos 5:10). The historical factuality of this ceremony near Gilgal is, moreover, attested to by other scriptural texts. Also the priestly code places the point of departure for the crossing of the Jordan at Shittim (Num 25:1; 33:49); and in the plains of Moab (Num 22:1; 26:3, 63; 31:12; 33:48, 49, 50; 35 :1; 36:13; cf. Dtn 1:5; 34:6; Jos 13:32). Micha mentions both Shittim and Gilgal (Mich 6:5). Gilgal's standing as a sanctuary is amply attested by Hosea's prophecies (Hos 4:15; 9:15; 12:12). There can be no doubt about the existence at Gilgal of the ceremony of crossing the Jordan.

2.4.f. Further light is thrown on Gilgal by the legends woven round Elijah and Elisha. The sanctuary seems to have experienced an extraordinary revitalization under these prophets,

and the legends manifestly had their origin in the new religious spirit that radiated from them. Keeping this in mind, it is highly significant that Elijah is purposely presented as a new Moses. Like Moses on the Horeb, so Elijah on the Carmel mediates a covenant between Jahweh and the people (1 Kgs 18). As Moses destroyed his adversaries with a curse, so Elijah destroys the king's soldiers by calling down fire on them (2 Kgs 1). Like Moses Elijah receives the privilege of seeing God pass on the Horeb (1 Kgs 19). As Moses handed over his task to Joshua, so Elijah anoints Elisha to be prophet in his place (1 Kgs 19:16-21; 2 Kgs 2:1-15). As Moses was taken up by God in the Transjordan and his body was not found, so Elijah is taken up and his body is not found (2 Kgs 2:11, 16-18). It would seem them that *in the legends Elijah and Elisha are taking the places of Moses and Joshua*. In this light it is especially interesting to note that the legends also narrate a miraculous crossing of the Jordan. In the region of Gilgal (2 Kgs 2: 1) Elijah first divides the water with his mantle (2 Kgs 2:8) and afterwards Elisha performs the same miracle with the mantle Elijah left behind (2 Kgs 2:14). And just as Israel had come to acknowledge that God was with Joshua as he had been with Moses precisely on account of the miraculous crossing (Jos 3:7; 4:14), so the disciples at Gilgal recognized that 'the spirit of Elijah rests on Elisha' through the latter's miraculous crossing (2 Kgs 2: 1,5). Are these mere legends? Should we not rather see in them traces of a revival of ancient rites under the leadership of Elijah and Elisha? ⁶⁹)

2.4.g. I submit that all these indications make it likely that the ancient enthronement and covenant celebration of Sinai with its stress on the liberation from Egypt, was retained at the sanctuary in Gilgal. This would explain the ceremonies of crossing the Jordan connected with it. It would fit in very well with the preoccupations manifested in the legends of Elijah and Elisha. And it would provide the pattern of the history of salvation presupposed by the deuteronomic historian. For unlike the pattern at Shechem, at Gilgal Jahweh's salvific deeds were not seen as culminating in the giving of the land. There, it would seem, the original liturgical drama of Jahweh's victorious interventions on behalf of Israel was extended in another way: not by adding the Land-giving, but by stressing other victories Jahweh had gained for Israel.

2.4.h. It would seem that the celebrations at Shechem did, however, have some influence on Gilgal also. This can be inferred first of all from the attempt to integrate the Shechem traditions with those of Gilgal in the account of Jos 3-4. Moreover, the deuteronomic historian begins his whole work of history with an extensive recalling of the Shechemite Code of Law (Dtn 5-28), and obviously he intends his readers to judge the course of Israel's history by it.

In the third place, he explicitly acknowledges Shechem's original primacy when he relays some of its local ceremonies to Gilgal. For in the Deuteronomic Code there was the old law:

"When Jahweh your God will have brought you into the land of which you are entering into possession, you shall set the blessing on Mount Gerizim and the curse on Mount Ebal."

Dtn 11 :29

Instead of deleting this reference to Shechem -- a thing he may have done at other occasions -- he makes the following annotation:

"Are they not beyond the Jordan, on the side of the road which comes from the west, in the domain of the Canaanites who live in the Jordan valley, bordering on Gilgal, next to the oaks of Moreh?"

The verse as it stands is obviously an addition. In the original code of law the explanation as to where the Gerizim and the Ebal are to be found were completely superfluous (see also Dtn 27:4, 12-13). The question-form too jars with the assertive tone so far adopted by the preacher. The addition was, consequently, an attempt to link the Gerizim and the Ebal to the shrine of Gilgal.⁷⁰) This is not very surprising in the light of the historian's attachment to Gilgal. But it is obvious that the linking of the ceremony of blessing and cursing with Gilgal (and hence with the Gerizim and the Ebal) cannot have been merely due to the literary imagination of the deuteronomic historian. The author seems to know the definite places near Gilgal which had been designated as Gerizim and Ebal. In fact, when narrating afterwards how Joshua put the blessing and cursing ceremony into execution (Jos 8: 30-35), he apparently implies that the Gerizim and Ebal in question are at Gilgal (see Jos 6:24ff.; 9:6; Joshua remains all the time at Gilgal)! It all testifies to the fact that the ancient ceremonies of the sanctuary at Shechem had been transferred to Gilgal at some later period.⁷¹) Could Elijah's flight from the Kingdom of Israel (1 Kgs 19:1-3) have been the occasion when a definite break was made with the North and when established Covenantal traditions were transferred to the South?

2.4.i. Whatever may have been the influence of Shechemite traditions on Gilgal, it does not seem to have altered the view of the history of salvation which seems to have been at home there. For the deuteronomic historian accepts that view of the history of salvation and not the one contained in the Shechemitic texts. We will have to reconsider this fact at a later stage.

2.5. *Reconstructing the Dramatization of the Exodus*

2.5.a. We may conclude with a great amount of certainty to the fact that the Exodus Event was *dramatized* in Israelite liturgy. This follows from the terminology of 'seeing' and 'witnessing' persistently and purposely employed by liturgical speakers (2.2.a; 2.2.e; 2.2.1; 2.2.j; 2.3.1). It is also clear from many dramatic properties that are discernible in the traditions: the distinction of scenes (2.2.f) and sub-scenes (2.3.i; 2.3.f); the well-defined cast of actors (2.2.g; 2.3.k; 2.4.f); formularized conversations; and the gradual build-up to the climax that needs to be resolved(2.3.m). Only an existing practice of dramatizing the Exodus Event can adequately explain the formula 'You have seen with your own eyes' (2.2.m) and the story of Israel's liberation from Egypt as recorded in the Book of Exodus (2.3.m).

2.5.b. It should also be noted that this drama belongs to *Israel's liturgy*. It possesses a sacred and not a profane character. The very context of all the passages in which this Exodus Event is recalled as a drama is religious preaching (2.2.c; 2.2.d). Jahweh Himself is considered the main actor, with religious mediators as His immediate allies(2.2.g; 2.3.k; 2.4.f).The liberation is connected with a 'feast for Jahweh' (2.3.n) and it is thought linked to His holy place (2.2.f; 2.3.n). Whatever political and social implications the liberation from Egypt may have had, the drama in question bore a specifically liturgical character.

2.5.c. The whole dramatization leads up to *the acclamation of Jahweh as king of Israel*. The attention of the audience is not focussed so much on the bare historical facts themselves, but on the need of 'acknowledging Jahweh's Supremacy' (2.3.j). The liturgical community itself partakes in the drama as actors (2.2.h), as the beneficiaries of Jahweh's redeeming power (2.3.l), and as 'witnesses' to what He has done (2.2.i; 2.2.j; 2.3.l). For, Jahweh's actions are 'signs' which demand recognition (2.2.k; 2.3.i). Jahweh performs these 'signs' to bring it about that Israel will 'serve' Him (2.3.h) and worship Him as their God (2.3.n). In fact, the whole

drama requires by its very internal structure a culmination in a covenantal celebration by which Jahweh is acknowledged as king of Israel (2.3.d; 2.3.n).

2.5.d. There can be no doubt as to the antiquity of the drama. *Its origin is certainly pre-conquest.* A first unmistakable pointer to this fact is the singular and independent role played by the Exodus formula in Israelite tradition (summary: 2.1.j).

The dramatic formula 'you have seen with your own eyes' is not applied to the Land-giving (2.2.e). The liberation drama as recorded in the book of Exodus has no reference to either the territorial ambitions of the patriarchs or to the conquest of the land (2.3.g). This absence of problematics concerning the land postulates an origin before the conquest (2.3.n). As place of origin nothing remains than the twin sanctuaries at Kadesh and Sinai (2.0.a; 2.0.b; 2.0.c; 2.3.n).

2.5.e. There are indications that would suggest that the pre-conquest dramatization of the Exodus with the resulting Jahwestic kingship celebrations were transferred from Kadesh to Gilgal after the conquest. The deuteronomic historians, who undoubtedly hailed from a Gilgalite tradition (2.4.c; 2.4.d), belong to a tradition in which the history of salvation is considered as a series of liberations, not unlike the Exodus drama (2.4.a; 2.4.b). The sanctuary at Gilgal seemed to link its cultic mediators (such as Elijah and Elisha) directly to Moses (2.4.f). The ancient 'crossing of the Jordan' at Gilgal may have been an adaptation of a scene that belonged to the ancient Exodus drama (2.4.e). It would seem, then, that the Exodus Drama, adapted and extended, lived on in the sanctuary of Gilgal and because of it in the school of the deuteronomic historians (2.4.g).

2.5.f. The Exodus Drama is equally presupposed by the Shechemite Deuteronomists (Dt 10: 21; 11: 2-7; 6: 21-22; 2.2.c) These preachers refer to the Exodus Drama as to something that happened in the past: 'You *have* seen ... ! On the other hand, we know that these sermons were preached before the liturgical crossing of the Jordan was going to take place (1.7.g).

The Exodus Drama was, consequently, re-enacted *near Succoth on the eastern Banks of the Jordan*. The 'crossing of the Jordan' itself must, at least originally, have been considered more part of the conquest than a re-enactment of crossing the Sea of Reeds. Further analysis of the deuteronomic land terminology will confirm this conclusion (3.5.b, 3.5.c, 3.5.d, 3.5.e).

2.5.g. Evaluating the Exodus Drama, such as was analysed in the foregoing sections, we must first of all appreciate *its literary value*. Drama is essentially different from literature in that it presents living characters who express themselves in what they do and say and in that it moves the story through conflict and crisis to a resolution.⁷²⁾ The conflict, which rises in a series of climaxes and anti-climaxes, is considered *the* essential element in drama.⁷³⁾ The resolution of the conflict "should be the inevitable outcome of the expectations created up to this point."⁷⁴⁾ Judged by this standard the Exodus Drama certainly excels. The conflict between the Pharaoh and Jahweh moves with all the force of real life: through desire and disappointment, through clashes of will and confrontation of the opponents, through suspense and excitement, through a gradual increase of all conflicting factors to the almost unbearable tension of the Jewish plight before the Sea of Reeds. This may truly be called the climax of the drama. Its resolution in Israel's total liberation and Jahweh's kingship flows inevitably from the expectations created throughout the foregoing actions. Its dramatic value cannot be over-estimated. I believe that experienced stage-directors might be able to reconstruct the Exodus Drama from some of its technical aspects: the representation of the 'miraculous' signs; the participation of 'crowds' and 'choruses'; the arrangement of the various 'dialogues' (including the ones with the invisible Jahweh); the use of the 'stage' or 'arena'; other dramatic devices that may have been employed.

2.5.h. Drama also has *sociological dimensions*. This is true in as far as each form of literature is influenced by and in its turn influences the society in which it is produced.⁷⁵⁾ Drama is also one of the forms in which man expresses his need of breaking through everyday life in a 'playful' release of his tensions. Also this aspect of the 'play' in drama affects society as a whole.⁷⁶⁾ But apart from such more fundamental relationships between society and drama, there are certain 'social dramas' which have a direct bearing on the constitution of society as such. Initiation dramas have played a great role in various stages of a people's development from neolithic village life to a highly organized urban society.⁷⁷⁾ Such a function was also present in the Exodus Drama. It undoubtedly exercised a profound influence on Hebrew society. In his analysis of Ex 1-15 J. Pedersen has rightly stressed that the Drama affected the whole people as such: it described how Israel as nation came into being and it explained the structural foundations on which the nation actually rested.⁷⁸⁾ It is not at all excluded that the Drama in question and the feast at which it was performed had immediate connections with the initiation of new members into Hebrew Society. This would explain the instruction of children referred to (Ex 10:2) and the service of the 'young men' during the covenantal sacrifice (Ex 24: 5).⁷⁹⁾

2.5.i. Specific sociological dramas which express the very constitution of a nation can often be identified with *cult dramas*. Social anthropology has rightly stressed the significance of such dramas for the religious formation of primitive peoples. Cult dramas represent the mythical events of the pre-historical, time-less world of origins. They express in dramatic form the profound laws of existence: creation, fertility and death, the relationship of the gods to mankind, the basis of human kingship and of priestly rites.⁸⁰⁾ Such cult dramas belong to the category of *collective rituals* which have been defined as fixed rituals which move in the sacral sphere and which express the norms, values, aims and expectations of the group according to accepted, traditional forms.⁸¹⁾ The individual benefits much from his participation in these rituals: he is better integrated into the community; his emotions are directed towards the objects of the cult and his intellectual conceptions are clarified.⁸²⁾ Moreover, through the cult drama the individual takes part in the divine realities which are brought about by it.⁸³⁾ All these social, psychological, educational and religious values are also present in the Exodus Drama. Jahweh's liberating acts in Egypt were soon considered deeds of time-less importance which through the cult drama were realised anew for His chosen people. Through the collective ritual the individual Israelite would re-live emotionally the meaning of slavery in Egypt and freedom with Jahweh; he would feel strongly united to his fellow Israelites; he would understand better the nature of his relationship to Jahweh and the people; he would, finally, reaffirm his own freedom and Jahweh's kingship which he knew reactualized in the drama. Such must have been the effects of participating in the drama.

1) See the analysis in 1.6.a-1.6.f.

2) Vocalized רִבְבוּ.

3) The term רִבְבוּ, רִבּוֹ 'ten thousand' seems usually to be employed in two contexts: first, as a sacred measurement in the Temple service (cf. Esd 2: 64, 69; 1 Chron 29: 7; Mic 6- 7; Ugaritic: 51 :l :29, 31, 44); then as a military term for an army division (Dan 11:12; Dtn 33:17, 30; Lev 26:8; Ps 3:7; 1 Sam 18:7, 8; 21 :12; 29: 5). I guess that in this last usage it is related to רִבְבוּ which seems to mean 'assembling an army around oneself' (Jdc 9: 29). In the sacred usage of the formula in Ps 68 :18; Num 10 :36 and Dtn 33: 2 it is always made parallel to a

place, the sanctuary. I deduce, therefore, that it is understood as referring to the 'army assembly', evoking a vision of a huge camp (cf. Jdc 6:5; Num 23:9-10; 24:5-6).

4) Vocalized מִבְּתֵּי, in which the mem is an enclitic mem such as can occur even after a noun in the construct case (cf. C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Grammar*, Rome 1965, No 11.8).

5) No satisfactory translation has so far been offered. The parallelism with Num 10:36, where we find 'Israel' in the same position, suggests that it designates the nation.

6) S. TALMON (*VT* 3 (1953) pp. 133-140) takes מִבְּתֵּי as a noun: 'the constitutional body formed by the elders'; cf. also R. MARCUS, *JEL* 71 (1952) pp. 207ff.

7) M. NOTH, *Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels*, Stuttgart 1930, pp. 66ff; 87ff.

8) Parallelism with Ps 68:18 and Num 10:36 ("Return, o Jahweh, to the army assembly of the thousands of Israel") seems to rule out a reference to Maribat Kadesh. The text would rather seem to speak again of the arrival of the ark into the army assembly of the sanctuary. This makes me see in the mem after אֶתֶּה an enclitical mem such as was used after verbs; cf. C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Grammar*, ib. 13.100; 13.102.

9) That מִבְּתֵּי should be translated thus is illustrated by the Ugaritic epithet of 'El: "ze-p'id," "the one of mercy," and by the Mari Names: Zuhatni (m), Zuhadim, Zuseumim and Zusaabi; cf. W. L. MORAN, "The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background," from *The Bible and the Near East: Essays in honor of W. F. Albright*, ed. G. E. WRIGHT, New York 1961, pp. 54-72; here p. 62.

10) W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft and Geschichte der ältesten Sinaïtraditionen*, Tübingen 1961, pp. 165-171.

11) *The Formulas of the Deuteronomic Creed*, Tilburg 1963; (available with Brill, Leiden), pp. 34ff.

12) Twenty-two passages were classified by me as containing what seems to have been the most 'authentic' expression (judged from the point of view of the stylized formulations): *JE*: Gen 50:24; Ex 3:8, 17; 19:4; 33:1-3; Num 16:12ff; 20: 3-5; *Pre-Dt*: Jos 24: 3-13; Jdc 2:1; 6: 8; *Dt-Creed*: Dtn 6 :21-23; 26-5-9; *Add*: Dtn 4:37; *Jer* 2:6-7; 32:20-23; *P*: Ex 6:6-8; *HG*: Lev. 25:38; *Chr*: Neh 9:10-25; Ps 78 :12-55; 105: 5-44; 135 :4-12; 136 :4-25. Cf. *The Formulas* etc., ib. pp. 35f.; 40f.

13) *The Formulas* etc., ib. pp. 41f.

14) K. GALLING, "Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels," *BZAW* 48 (1928) pp. 62ff. (the italics are mine).

15) J. PEDERSEN, "Passahfest und Passahlegende," *ZAW* 52 (1939) p. 169.

16) K. GALLING, ib., pp. 5ff.; M. NOTH, *Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, Stuttgart 1948, p. 52; G. VON RAD, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, vol. I, München 1957, pp. 177f.

17) J. MUILENBURG, "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations," *VT* 9 (1959) p. 364 (the italics are mine).

18) G. VON RAD, *Theologie*, vol. I, ib. pp. 178ff.; cf. J. WJNGAARDS, *VT* (1965) p. 94.

19) J. PEDERSEN, *Passahfest und Passahlegende*, ib. p. 169.

20) Compare A. ALT ("Josua," *BZAW* 66 (1935) pp. 13-24; *Kl. Sehr.*, vol. I, pp. 176-192) for the classical exposition of the theory of the gradual conquest by Israel, and the replies given by J. SIMONS ("Landnahme en Landesausbau in de Israëlitische Traditie," *Bijdragen* 4 (1941) pp. 201-223) and G. E. WRIGHT "The Literary and Historical Problem of Joshua 10 and Judges 1," *JNES* 5 (1946) pp. 105-114. M. NOTH ("Das Buch Josua," *HAT* 7, Tübingen 1953²) illustrates how the story of the conquest under Joshua was a literary composition of its own which was later taken up by the deuteronomic historian. For criticism on his analysis, see G.

E. WRIGHT (ib) and J. BRIGHT ("The Book of Joshua," *The Interpreter's Bible*, vol. II, pp. 541ff.).

21) Cf. W. ZIMMERLI, "Ich bin Jahwe," *Alt-Festschrift*, Tübingen 1953, pp. 179-209; *Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel*, Zurich 1954, esp. pp. 58ff.; "Das Wort des göttlichen Selbsterweises, eine prophetische Gattung," *Melanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de Andre Robert*, Paris 1957, pp. 154-164.

22) W. ZIMMERLI, *Erkenntnis Gottes* etc., ib. p. 58.

23) K. GALLING, *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels*, ib. p. 9.

24) K. ELLIGER, ("Das Gesetz Leviticus" 18, *ZAW* 67 (1955) pp. 1-25), distinguishes the "Heiligkeitsformel": 'I am Jahweh' (motivating the law on the ground of Jahweh's holiness) and the "Huldformel": 'I am Jahweh your God' (motivating the law with the historical benefits); cf. esp. pp. 23ff. I think that the latter motivation, immediately derived as it is from the juridical value of the historical prologue, is always at least implicitly contained in the Selbstvorstellungsformel.

25) C. NORTH, "The Essence of Idolatry," *BZAW* 77 (1958) pp. 155f.

26) From the 166 times that the nathan formula occurs in its various forms ('I gave the land', 'the land Jahweh gave; etc.) 71 times 'the fathers' are connected with the landgiving. See below 3.1.a, etc.

27) The Land-giving theme occurs twice in such a construction, but then only *after* the Exodus theme: Gen 24:7 (JE); Lev 25:38 (HG).

28) See especially 1.5.c, 1.7.1.

29) H. WILDBERGER, *Jahwes Eigentumsvolk*, Zurich 1960, pp. 55-62; esp. pp. 61ff.

30) See the arguments enumerated in 1.7.e.

31) The particular traditions found in Jos 24: 3-13; that Balak (vs. 9), the citizens of Jericho (vs. 11) and, perhaps, a confederation of twelve kings (vs. 12) actually fought with Israel, prove its great age. Cf. M. NOTH, "Das Buch Josua," *HAT* 7, Tübingen 1953, ad locum.

32) W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft und Geschichte* usw., ib. pp. 79-89.

33) The deuteronomic historian applied it in a later period to other deeds of Jahweh, such as His exalting Joshua (Jos 4:14), the sun miracle (Jos 10:12), the defeat of the Canaanites (Jos 23:3), the miraculous (1 Sam 12:16) and the miraculous taking fire of Elijah's sacrifice (1 Kgs 18:39).

34) W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft and Geschichte*, ib. p. 82, note 1.

35) H. REVENTLOW, "Die Völker als Jahwes Zeugen bei Ezechiel", *ZAW* 71 (1959) pp. 34-36.

36) Hos 10:4; Ez 16:59; 17:19. Cf. J. SCHARBERT, "Fluchen" und "Segnen" im alten Testament," *Bibl.* 39 (1958) pp. 1-26; esp. pp. 4ff.

37) H. REVENTLOW, "Die Völker als Jahwes Zeugen bei Ezechiel," ib. p. 37.

38) W. ZIMMERLI, *Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel*, Zurich 1954.

39) W. ZIMMERLI, *Erkenntnis Gottes* usw., ib. pp. 53ff.

40) J. WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, New York, 1957, pp. 342ff.

41) H. GRESSMANN, "Mose und seine Zeit. Ein Kommentar zu den MoseSagen," *FRLANT* 18, Göttingen 1913, pp. 123ff.

42) J. PEDERSEN, "Passahfest und Passahlegende," *ZAW* 52 (NF 11) (1934) pp. 161-175.

43) G. VON RAD, "Das formgeschichtliche Proplem des Hexateuch," *BWANT* 4, Heft 26, Stuttgart 1938: *Ges. Studien*, München 1958, esp. pp. 11-20.

44) Compare this quotation from J. WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena*, ib. pp. 343f.: "... in this way the Torah has its place in the historical narrative, not in virtue of its matter as the

contents of a code, but from its constituting the professional activity of Moses ... ;" "It is a further step to make Sinai the scene of the solemn inauguration of the historical relation between Jehovah and Israel ... if this were done, the covenant between Jehovah and Israel must receive a positive (as well as a negative) character, that is to say, Jehovah Himself must announce to the people the basis and the conditions of it. Thus the necessity arose to communicate in this place the contents of the fundamental laws and so the matter of the legislation made its way into the historical narrative."

45) This principle is found throughout his work; see its statement, e.g. in "Das formgeschichtliche Problem." ib. p. 26.

46) Compare the bibliography quoted in 1.0.c, note 5.

47) Of special value are also: the analysis of Ex 12:1-16 (p. 167); the parallel drawn with Jahweh's struggle at creation (p. 169); the natural setting of the feast being at night (p. 170); the elements of 'theatre' in it (pp. 172f.) and some of the criticism against exaggerating literary divisions (pp. 171ff.)

48) Cf. C. R. NORTH, "Pentateuchal Criticism," in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. by H. H. ROWLEY, Oxford 1961, pp. 48-83, esp. pp. 63, 77f.

49) J. WIJNGAARDS, *The Formulas* etc., ib. pp. 52-55; *Vazal van Jahweh*, Baarn 1965, pp. 125-130.

50) Cf. W. EICHRODT, *Theologie des alten Testaments*, vol. I, Stuttgart 1959⁶, esp. pp. 9-18.

51) J. MORGENSTERN, "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch," *HUCA IV* (1927) pp. 1-138.

52) S. MOWINCKEL, *Le Décalogue*, Paris 1927, esp. pp. 120-124.

53) M. BUBER, *Königtum Gottes*, Berlin 1932.

54) C. J. GADD, *Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient Near East*, London 1948.

55) A. VON GALL, "Ueber die Herkunft der Bezeichnung Jahwes als König," *Wellhausenfestschrift* 1914, pp. 145-160. O EISSFELDT, "Jahve als König," *ZAW* 46 (1928) pp. 81-105; A. ALT, "Gedanken über das Königtum Gottes," *Kl. Schriften*, ib. vol. I, pp. 345-357; G. VON RAD, "Melek und Malkoth in alten Testament," *ThWNT*, Bd I, 1933, pp. 563ff.; H. SCHMID, "Jahve und die Kultrationen Jerusalems," *ZAW* 67 (1955) pp. 168-197.

56) H. WILDBERGER, *Jahwes Eigentumsvolk*, Zurich 1960, pp. 24-29, 83-94. He derives his evidence largely from M. NOTH, "Die israelitischen Personennamen in Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung," *BWANT* 46, (1928) pp. 118ff.

57) G. FOHRER, "Der Vertrag zwischen König und Volk in Israel," *ZAW* 71 (1959) pp. 1-22.

58) W. BEYERLIN, illustrates how the Sinaitic pact has been a 'Königsbund' from the earliest date onward; cf. *Herkunft und Geschichte* etc., ib. pp. 84-87.

59) See above 2.2.a-2.2.m.

60) The list is not complete since I did not want to include doubtful passages which may be enlargements of the Jahwist or Elohist (such as, e.g. the extra booty taken out of Egypt: Ex 3:21-22; 12:33-36).

61) G. VON RAD's observation on the 'Vorbau' of creation in the Jahwistic work is confirmed by the fact that creation has not yet been fully integrated: it is never referred to in the general lists of Jahweh's deeds. Cf. "Das formgeschichtliche Problem," ib. *GS.*, pp. 71-75.

62) D. DAUBE, "Rechtsgedanken in den Erzählungen des Pentateuchs," *BZAW* 77 (1958) p. 36.

63) See above 2.2.a-2.2.m.

- 64) J. N. M. WIJNGAARDS, *The Formulas* etc., ib. p. 43, footnote 48.
- 65) J. N. M. WIJNGAARDS, *Vazal van Jahweh*, ib. p. 44, 48f.
- 66) J. N. M. WIJNGAARDS, VT 15 (1965) pp. 96f.
- 67) Also Jos 8:30-35 is to be placed at Gilgal, as I will show further on.
- 68) See above 1.1.a-1.1.h.
- 69) This possibility is apparently ignored by H. H. ROWLEY when he puts his readers before the dilemma of accepting the legends as either facts or fiction. Cf. "Elijah on Mount Carmel," *BJRL* 43 (1960-1) pp. 190-210, in "Men of God," London 1963, pp. 37-63; esp. pp. 59ff.
- 70) S. R. DRIVER, *Deuteronomy*, Edinburgh 1895¹, 1965, pp. 133ff. discusses at length the great difficulty of accepting Gilgal as the landmark defining the position of the Eba! and Gerizim.
- 71) H. J. KRAUS, *Worship in Israel*, ib. p. 165.
- 72) J. GASSNER, *Producing the Play*, London 1953³, pp. 11ff.
- 73) C. CANFIELD, *The Craft of Play Directing*, New York 1963, pp. 57ff.
- 74) J. GASSNER, ib. p. 17.
- 75) R. WELLEK-A. WARREN, *Theory of Literature*, ch. 4, New York 1942; German transl. Frankfurt 1963, pp. 78ff.
- 76) J. HUIZINGA, *Homo Ludens*; German transl. Munchen 1956, p. 22, pp. 133ff.
- 77) J. INGALLS, "Urban History and Urbanity in Literature," in *Indiana University Conference on Oriental-Western Literary Relations*, ed. by H. FRENZ and G. L. ANDERSON, Chapel Hill 1955, pp. 193-203.
- 78) J. PEDERSEN, "Passahfest and Passahlegende," *ZAW* 52 (NF 11) (1934) pp. 167ff.
- 79) W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft: und Geschichte*, usw., ib. p. 47.
- 80) K. DITTMER, *Allgemeine Völkerkunde, Formen und Entwicklung der Kultur*, III ch. 8; Dutch transl. Utrecht 1962, pp. 122f.
- 81) J. A. A. VAN DOORN and C. J. LAMMERS, , Utrecht 1962, pp. 236ff.
- 82) J. A. A. v AN DOORN and C. J. LAMMERS, ib.
- 83) S. MOWINCKEL, *Religion und Kultus*, Gottingen 1953, pp. 13ff., 113.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CULTIC OCCUPATION OF THE LAND

3.0. Introduction

3.0.a. It is obvious from the foregoing chapter that the celebrations concerning the Exodus may well have constituted a liturgical antecedent to the cultic procession from Succoth to Shechem (2.5.e; 2.5.f). But the procession cannot have drawn its significance exhaustively and exclusively from these Exodus celebrations. Did the very entry into the Holy Land not reenact the taking possession of the promised land? And was the Land-giving itself not considered the crowning benefit on Jahweh's part? The question thus arises: from where did the concept of Jahweh's 'giving the land' enter into Shechem's celebrations? Were there cultic antecedents that influenced this development?

3.0.b. The question has all the more validity as it would seem that the Land-giving exercises a different function with the Gilgalite deuteronomists. For them it would not seem to constitute an event in the history of salvation, at least, not directly. The history of Jahweh's deeds seems, on the contrary, to have been experienced by the Gilgalite as a series of liberations in imitation and continuation of the Exodus event (2.4.a, 2.4.b). A further question needs, consequently, to be considered: Why have the Gilgalites a different concept of the Land-giving? How does it differ from the one adhered to in Shechem?

3.0.c. The clue to these questions may, perhaps, be found in an ancient oracle that has -- to my knowledge -- so far escaped the attention of scripture students:

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| כי אהב את אבתיך | He loved your father ¹⁾ and chose |
| ויבחר בזרעו אחריו | his posterity. |
| ויוצאך בפניו | He Himself ²⁾ liberated you with |
| בכחו הגדל ממצרים | His great strength from Egypt. |
| להוריש גוים גדלים | In order to ³⁾ dispossess ⁴⁾ nations |
| ועצמים ממך מפניך | greater and mightier than you are |
| | in favour of you. |
| להביאך לתת לך | To bring you (there) ⁵⁾ to give to |
| את ארצם נחלה | you their lands as property, ⁶⁾ as |
| כיום הזה | it is today. |

Dtn 4:37-38

3.0.d. The first observation that can be made on this oracle is its *ancient formulation*. The use of the plurale majestatis for 'father' is archaic. **בפניו** is a hapax. The lameds, if emphatic, also testify to an early origin. The oracle is written in a rhythmic form (2-3; 2-3; 5; 5). We are thus justified in taking the **'כי'** in the beginning of verse 37 as introducing an ancient and wellknown quotation. ⁷⁾

3.0.e. We may also note that the oracle abounds with themes and turns of phrases that are characteristic of *the Shechemite deuteronomists*. The 'love' and 'election' shown by Jahweh are attested to by parallel formulations in Dtn 10:15 and 7:7-8. Whereas in the other biblical traditions Israel itself is called 'great' (Gen 12:2; 17:10; 18:18; 46:3; Ex 32:10; Num 14:12; 2 Chr 1:10), the Shechemite deuteronomists also call Israel a great nation (Dtn 4:6-8; 26:5), but stress that the former inhabitants were greater (Dtn 9:1-2; 11:23). Again, Israel is called 'mighty' in the biblical traditions (Gen 18:18; Ex 1:9; Num 14:2; 22:6; Mic 4:7; Ps 35:18; Is 60:22); yet it is the Shechemite deuteronomists who apply this quality not only to Israel (Dtn 9:14; 26:5) but also to the former inhabitants of the land (Dtn 9:1-2; 7:1; 11:23).⁸⁾ Equally characteristic of the Shechemite phraseology is the expression **נתן ארצם נחלה**, which occurs nine times in Shechemite writings (Dtn 4:21, 38; 15:4; 19:10; 20:16; 21:23; 24:4; 25:19; 26:1) and only five times elsewhere (Jos 17:14; Ps 2:8; 135:12; 136:21, 22). We may thus rightly conclude that the oracle belongs to the Shechemite tradition.

3.0.f. It cannot be chance, moreover, that we find in many independent traditions the scheme of the '*election of Israel*' because of '*love for their father Jacob*'. Compare the following passages:

כי נער ישראל ואהבהו
וממצרים קראתי לבני

When Israel was a boy⁹⁾ I loved
him. From Egypt I called his
sons to Myself.¹⁰⁾

Hos 11 :1

כי ירחם יהוה את יעקב
ובחר עוד בישראל

Jahweh will have compassion on
Jacob and choose Israel once
more.

Is 14:1

יבחר לנו את נחלתנו
את גאון יעקב אשר אהב

He chose us as His heritage¹¹⁾ as
the glory of Jacob whom He
loves.

Ps 47:5

באבתוך חשק יהוה לאהבה
ויבחר בזרעם אחריהם

Jahweh set His heart in love upon
your father,¹²⁾ and chose his
posterity.

Dtn 10:15

3.0.g. Much has been written on the meaning and setting-in-life of the term **בחר**¹³⁾ What is striking in the passages cited above is the pattern of a fine distinction between 'love' for the patriarch and the 'election' of his children. It will not do to dismiss this distinction with a reference to texts where Jahweh is also said to 'love' Israel or 'choose' the patriarch (Ps 135:4; Dtn 7:7f.; Ez 20:5) or to texts where 'loving' and 'choosing' are obviously used as parallels (Ps 78:69; Ps 132:13; Prov. 1:29; Is 1:29; 58: 5; etc.). The term 'loving' and 'choosing' can, of course, be used as synonyms to some degree, but the distinctive employment here is too pronounced to be accidental.

3.0.h. In fact, the 'loving' of the father and 'choosing' of his children would seem to reflect a common pattern of adoption. Jacob adopts Ephraim and Manasseh as his own sons because of his special love for Joseph: 'Your two sons, who were born to you in the land of Egypt before I came to you in Egypt will be mine' (Gen 48: 5; on Jacob's love for Joseph see Gen 37:3f.). David is grateful to Barzillai and expresses his gratitude by treating Kimham, Barzillai's son, as one of his own children (2 Sam 19:32-39; 1 Kgs 2:7). David concludes a pact of love with Jonathan (1 Sam 20:12-17). Jonathan stipulates explicitly that out of love for him David may not cut off his loyalty from Jonathan's house for ever (1 Sam 20:15-17). For Jonathan's sake then David treats Mephibaal as his own son (2 Sam 9:1-13, esp. 11). In all such cases we see that one relationship, the covenant (?) of love with the father, leads to another relationship, the 'election', 'adoption' of his children. In this way the five texts quoted above seem to accept two similar stages: Jahweh's love for Jacob and His election of Jacob's children.

3.0.i. It is obvious from the context of the passages quoted that the election of Israel spoken of is realized in the contract by which Israel received its land: Dtn 4:38, Ps 47:5 and Is 14:1 explicitly connect the 'election' with the giving of the land. Of all the five texts only Is 14:1 cannot be directly shown to have a relationship to the covenant. We might, therefore, venture to paraphrase the election pattern in this way: Jahweh made a pact of friendship with Jacob; because of his pact He becomes sovereign of Jacob's sons and gives them land. For it is such a contract that is presupposed in the passages under discussion (with the possible exception of Is 14:1 ?). And it should be noted that it was customary in land treaties to consider the claims of vassal because of the special favour enjoyed by his father. When the vassal died, his son will be installed by the sovereign on the strength of a renewed vassality

pact.¹⁴) And how consideration for the father influenced the sovereign's appointment of the son can be read from these lines :

"When your father died, in accordance with your father's word I did not drop you. Since your father had mentioned to me your name (with great praise), *I sought after you*. To be sure, you were sick and ailing, but although you were ailing, I the Sun, put you in the place of your father and took your brothers (and) sisters and the Amurru land in oath for you. When I, the Sun, *sought after you* in accordance with your father's word and put you in your father's place, I took you in oath for the king of the Hatti land, the Hatti land, and for my sons and grandsons. So honour the oath to the King and the king's kin. And I, the king, will be loyal towards you, Duppi-Tessub. When you take a wife, and when you beget an heir, he shall be king in the Amurru land likewise. And just as I shall be loyal towards you, even so shall I be loyal towards your son."¹⁵)

It would not be considered extraordinary, consequently, to find mention of an agreement with ancestors being the ground for the present allocation of land.

3.0.j. Taking this text as a starting point I have attempted to reconstruct the Shechemite and Gilgalite conceptions of the landgiving from an analysis of the formulas employed by them. As a result of this analysis I put forward the following hypothesis:

1. At Shechem existed an old tradition according to which Jahweh had promised to give the land to Jacob and his seed. An amphictyonic league of tribes saw in their covenant with Jahweh and in the occupation of the land the fulfilment of this promise. At the year of release they reaffirmed the occupation of the land and the covenant, which came to be understood on the lines of the current vassality treaties.
2. At Gilgal, on the other hand, the Sinaitic covenant did not undergo such drastic changes. The promise of fertility and land, which undoubtedly belonged to the blessings of the Sinaitic pact, were seen fulfilled in the day-to-day occurrences of life. Jahweh's good pleasure or wrath were measured by the tranquil possession of the land or by its adversity.

3.0.k. The Land-giving theme will be examined regarding the following constituent elements: the fathers, Jahweh's oath, the inheritance, the act of taking possession, the crossing of the Jordan, the boundaries of the promised land and vassality terminology.

3.1. *The landgiving and the fathers*

3.1.a. It may be stated that from the roughly 160 cases in which biblical passages speak of Jahweh's giving the land to Israel, more than half contain references to 'the fathers'. There are, of course, old traditions that speak of the land-giving without any mention of 'the fathers' as the first beneficiaries, such as Am 9:15 and Jos 2:9, 14. But on the whole it would seem that all the generally accepted literary strands: J, E, Shech. Dtn, Gilg. Dtn, Jer, Ez, P, HG and Chr, see a connection between the gift of the land and the fathers.

3.1.b. In our first analysis of the oracle *Dtn* 4:37-38 we have seen that in that passage there was only mention of one 'father', since the word אבֹת had to be translated as a *plurale majestatis* (see 3.0.c, note 1). Moreover, we found that this oracle had close relationship to other traditions, namely, Hos 11:1; Is 14:1 and Ps 47:5, in which there was equally question

of one father only. It would, therefore, seem that the Shechemitic deuteronomists knew only of Jahweh's love and of Jahweh's promise to one patriarch.

3.1.c. This conclusion is also confirmed by a scrutiny of the landgiving promises in which there is mention of the 'fathers'. There are twelve cases in which it is stated that the land or the covenant were promised to the 'fathers' in general (אבות) without a further specification of the names (Dtn 6:23; 7:23; 10:11; 11:9, 21; 4:1; 12:1; 19:8; 26:3, 15; 27:3; 28:11). Only in four cases had this general denominator been amplified by the addition of the formula: 'Abraham, Isaac and Jacob' (Dtn 6:10; 9:5; 29:12; 30:20). Supposing that the preachers did attach some value to the plurality of the patriarchs, it would be most surprising that they never care to speak of any of them in particular but that they always refer to them as one block. It seems therefore far more reasonable to accept that the term אבות designated only one patriarch for the original Shechemitic deuteronomists (cf. Dtn 4:37). Some later redactor understood the word אבות as plural or wanted it to be understood as such. He it was who changed the singular formula of Dtn 4:37 to the plural in Dtn 10:15. He must equally be held responsible for changing all the אבות phrases into the plural and for adding the general denominator 'Abraham, Isaac and Jacob' in some cases.

3.1.d. Another confirmation may be seen in the formula 'the god of your fathers' אלהי אבותיך which is found six times with the Shechemite deuteronomists (Dtn4:1; 12:1; 26:7; 6:3; 27:3; 29:24). It is now commonly accepted that this formula originally occurred as 'the god of my father' (sing.). The plural construction: 'the god of your fathers' on the other hand arose as a later attempt to correlate traditions concerning various ancestors.¹⁶⁾ Also in this formula, the word אבות has to be seen as having had originally a singular meaning.

3.1.e. Has this shift from a singular to a plural understanding of אבות to be explained as a development within the deuteronomistic school itself, or was it a mere literary redaction by the later historians?

It seems difficult to resolve this question. It would hardly seem likely that a change from a singular to a plural understanding could have been effected by such thorough preachers as the deuteronomists without some stress and elaboration. But such emphasis we do not find in the Shechemitic sermons. On the other hand it should be noted that whereas Dtn 26:5 refers to Jacob alone, Jos 24:2-4 begins the history of salvation with a plurality of fathers.¹⁷⁾ Anyhow, even if the change to a plurality of patriarchs came about within Shechemite theology, it can only have entered it at a late stage. The original preachers know only of one patriarch to whom the land was promised.

3.1.f. Who then was this patriarch to whom the Shechemites accredited the first claim on the land? Who was the patriarch so closely related to Jahweh that He could merit the title of being the 'god of that patriarch'? Who was he to be so much loved by Jahweh that the future election of and the covenant with Israel were considered the outcome of that love? The text of Dtn 4:37 is too undetermined to disclose the identity of the patriarch.¹⁸⁾ But there are other indications that strongly suggest that Jacob must have been the one who occupied that position in the tradition of the Shechemites. First of all, in three of the parallel texts that preserve the 'love and election pattern' (see 3.0.f), Jacob is explicitly mentioned as the patriarch loved: Hos 11 :1 (Israel); Is 14:1 (Jacob) and Ps 47:5 (Jacob). Secondly, in Dtn 26:5 Jacob is the one mentioned as the 'father': 'A wandering Aramean was my father; and he went down to Egypt and sojourned there'. The same must be said of Dtn 10:22: "With seventy souls your father (אבות !!) went down to Egypt.¹⁹⁾ Since it is Jacob who brought the Hebrews down to Egypt, He must be the 'father' referred to by the Shechemitic writings. In the third place, the people is constantly referred to as 'Israel' (Dtn 4:1; 5:1; 6:3, 4;

etc. in total twenty-three times) and in the rite of cursing and blessing special importance is given to the twelve tribes (Dtn 27: 9-13). This again presupposes that Jacob be considered the father, since he is the 'father' of the twelve tribes of Israel.

3.1.g. Turning our attention next to the Jahwistic-Elohistic writings it becomes clear at once that a conscious effort has been made in them to attribute the promise of land, of a numerous offspring and of blessing to all three patriarchs. The promise to Abraham is the most elaborate (Gen 12: 7; 13 :15ff; Gen 15 :7, 18; Gen 24: 7), but essentially the same promise is repeated to Isaac (Gen 26: 3ff.) and to Jacob (Gen 28:13). In two instances the promise of land is referred to all three patriarchs together (Ex 32:13; 33:1). Without any doubt Jahweh's promise is understood as one covenant, reaffirmed to all three patriarchs, much in the way it was conceived of in Ps 105:9-10:

"The covenant He made with Abraham,
His sworn promise to Isaac,
which He confirmed to Jacob as a statute ... !"

This attempt at synthesis manifests itself clearly in the over-complete formula of Jahweh's self-revelation in Egypt: 'Say to the people: Jahweh, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you' (Ex 3:15; cf. 3:16; 4:5). It is interesting to note that in the apparition to Jacob God speaks as follows: 'I am God, the God of your father (אֲנִי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיךָ : Gen 46:5)'. It is clear that the phrase 'the God of your father' was added as an explanatory gloss.²⁰⁾ Even more interesting is Ex 3:6 where we find:

"I am the God of your father (אֲנִי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיךָ)
the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob."

It is the clear that the second half with the explicit mention of the three patriarchs was added later on. ²¹⁾ Through some oversight the אב was not changed into אבות as was done in Ex 3 :15, 16.²²⁾ We may surmise that in the original Exodus drama Jahweh appeared to Moses as saying: "I am the god of your father." When the Jahwist incorporated the drama into his historical narrative he added the formula that would include Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. It all goes to show that the explicit reference to the three patriarchs was beyond any doubt one of the theological concerns of the Jahwistic-Elohistic writers. The full development of this tendency is reached in the priestly writings which not only have the three patriarchs in combined formulations (Ex 6:4, 8; Gen 35:12; etc.), but for whom the אבית always designate the patriarchs.²³⁾

3.1.h. The Gilgalite deuteronomic texts do not seem to have one uniform conception of 'the fathers'. In Dtn 1:8 and 34:4 Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are explicitly mentioned. In Dtn 1:35; 31:7; Jos 1:6 and 5:6 it is without any doubt the patriarchs who are 'the fathers', since Moses is addressing the generation of Hebrews who roamed in the desert. But in Jos 21:43 the 'fathers' is put in as a parallelism to 'the house of Israel'. In 1 Sam 12:6-8 it is unequivocally the Exodus generation that is indicated by the name 'your fathers', and the same seems to hold good for 3 Kgs 14:15 and 4 Kgs 21 :8.

Should this difference in usage be attributed to a variety of hands in the compilation of the one big opus? One thing seems certain: the reference to the fathers was with the Gilgalites always a reference to a plurality of persons. And 'the fathers' to whom Jahweh promised the

land by oath could be understood both to be the patriarchs and the Exodus generation: which illustrates the fact that for them the formula had lost very definite implications.

3.1.i. In conclusion we may state, therefore, that the Shechemite deuteronomists can be distinguished from other theological schools by their conception that the promise of land had been made *to one patriarch*. This patriarch has in all likelihood to be identified *as Jacob*. In this conception the Shechemites clearly represent an earlier stage of theological thought than the one found in the Jahwistic and Elohist traditions. Jahweh is for them: 'the God of your father Jacob'.

3.2. The Oath and the gift of Land

3.2.a. One of the most frequent formulations in Shechemite sermons is the turn of phrase: 'the land which Jahweh your God is going to give to you'. This expression occurs twenty-three times (Dtn 5: 16, 31; 8:10; 9:23; 11:17, 31; 12:1; 15:4; 16:20; 17:14; 18:9; 19:1, 3, 14; 21:23; 25:15, 19; 26:1, 2, 15; 27:2, 3; 28:8). In all these cases the verb used is נתן . Only in three instances do we find the direct statement: 'Jahweh will give you the land' (Dtn 9:7; 19:8; 26:9), again employing the verb נתן .

3.2.b. Apart from these uncomplicated formulas the Shechemite sermons also contain phrases which introduce the ground or the reason for the giving of the land. For it is asserted that Jahweh is going to give the land because he swore an oath to the father. In its most complete form we find this affirmed in the formulation: 'the land which Jahweh your God swore to your father to give to you'. We find it ten times (Dtn 6:3 LXX ; 6:10; 7:13; 10:11; 11:9; 11:21; 19: 8; 26:3; 28:11; 30:20). Four times we meet the abbreviated form: 'the land which Jahweh your God promised' (Dtn 6:18, 23; 8:1; 26:15). In all these cases Jahweh's promise or oath is constantly referred to with the term נשבע .

3.2.c. The important question we have to ask ourselves at this stage is: what was that future land-giving which the Deuteronomic preacher refers to? What is that land-giving which will happen in fulfilment of Jahweh's oath to Jacob? Contrary to what one might superficially conclude at first, *this future land-giving* was for the Shechemites not the military action of the conquest, but *the ritual by which the land was to become theirs by right*.

3.2.d. This fact may, first of all, be deduced from the circumstance that not only is the giving of the land the object of promise (see above), but also that the promise equally entails the future covenant (Dtn 7:12; 8:18), or, as it is expressed elsewhere, Jahweh promised to make Jacob's descendants 'His own people' (Dtn 28:9; 29:12). The same formulas of the oath (נשבע) cover both the covenant and the giving of the land. This very parallelism suggests and demands that we understand both objects in relationship to one another. The land-giving the preacher is referring to is first and foremost the covenant. This covenant has been renewed 'today', as the preacher puts it (Dtn 8:18; 29:12; cf 26:16-19), i.e. before the crossing of the Jordan. The landgiving is another ritual, that follows as the logical consequence of the covenant. It will take place after the crossing.

3.2.e. Moreover, there are definite parallels of this terminology in contemporary sources. International documents of the time employ the root נתן as the appropriate word for conveying specific juridical rights to landed property. 'Nadanu' is defined as 'a technical term

for the transfer of fiefland by the king from one vassal to another'. 'Nidnuti sa sarri' are 'royal grants, fieflands' ²⁴) The act of 'giving' land was considered a public deed, which necessarily involved a ceremonial and written accounts. The land was given by 'a written document',²⁵) for the writing of which many court officials attended as witnesses. ²⁶) There was a close connection between the writing of the document and the ratification of the treaty: the writing did not only serve to provide a juridical proof for later verification; it was also the very writing that was considered to bring about the covenantal relationship and the transfer of the land, 'Writing' the treaty and 'concluding' the treaty were synonymous.²⁷) 'Sealing land by tablet' became an idiomatic equivalent of 'giving land by a sealed tablet'.²⁸) The act of giving was thus considered a legal procedure, a ceremonial in the sovereign's court. Giving the land belonged to the realm of the sealed agreement. Conquest, battles, military support on the part of the sovereign could precede such an agreement; they could not be identified with it.

3.2.f. It is of such a legal giving of land that the Shechemites are speaking. This land-giving is not merely a promise. For Jacob, the patriarch, had already received the promise of both covenant and land, but he had not actually obtained these gifts themselves. Jacob received no more than the promise whereas the people of the actual generation experienced God's bounty and so were more privileged than Jacob. They witnessed all the miracles in Egypt and saw Jahweh's saving power (Dtn 4:34; 11:2-4); they made the wonderful journey through the desert eating the manna 'which your father (אבות) did not know' (Dtn 8:3, 16); they took part in the covenant at Horeb (Dtn 4:9-24). The preacher says it emphatically: "Jahweh, our God, made a covenant with us at Horeb. Not with our father (אבות) did Jahweh make this covenant, but with us who are all of us alive this day" (Dtn 5:2-4). In the same way, it is the present generation that is going to receive the actual gift of land, whereas their father (אבי) was no more than a wandering Aramean (Dtn 26: 5).

3.2.g. It should be noticed that, at least in the early Shechemitic tradition, this land-giving ritual was not in itself a treaty. The Covenant had already been concluded in the plains east of the Jordan (Dtn 26:16-19). The ceremonies at Shechem are seen as complementary: such as the erection on Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal of the tables of blessing and curse which had already been prepared (Dtn 11:26-29; 27:11-26) and the stones of the law which had already been promulgated (Dtn 27:4). The sacrifices at Shechem will seal the legal act of crossing the Jordan and taking possession of the land (Dtn 27:5- 7). The complete land treaty celebrations at Shechem, such as we know them from Jos 24, must belong to a later stage of development.

3.2.h. This Shechemite conception of the land-giving contrasts very powerfully with *the military conception of the Gilgalite deuteronomists*. For the latter Jahweh gave the land by helping Israel to conquer it. The gift of the land is, consequently, not first and foremost a legal procedure, but it is a military intervention of Jahweh's part. There are mainly three aspects under which this military conception can be illustrated.

3.2.i. In the deuteronomic history it is the conquest of the land that functions as the spill on which the story turns. The opening lines introduce the reader to Israel at the moment when it is preparing to enter the promised land (Dtn 1:1ff.) and the book closes with the total reversion of the conquest in the exile (4 Kgs 24). The five lengthy addresses that form the framework of the narrative have all been connected to a stage of possessing the land. Moses reaffirms the covenant just before the conquest (Dtn 5:1-30). Joshua delivers his solemn warning after the initial conquests (Jos 23). Samuel reminds Israel of Jahweh's covenant when the rule of the land is handed over to a king (1 Sam 12). Solomon speaks his prayer of dedication (1 Kgs 8) when the land had reached its fullest extension (1 Kgs 4:21; 5:1). The

author inserts a long reflection after the exile of the Northern kingdom (2 Kgs 17). In other words: *the history of Israel is framed according to the stages of possessing the land.*

3.2.j. The giving of the land is for these historians not a part of a covenant that has still to be legally celebrated in the land. The gift of the land proved Jahweh's fidelity to the promise He had made to Israel's fathers. The actual conquest of Palestine occasions a spontaneous acknowledgement of this fidelity:

"Thus Jahweh gave to Israel all the land which He swore to give to their fathers ... And Jahweh gave them rest as He had sworn to give to their fathers ... Not one of all the good promises which Jahweh had made to the house of Israel had failed; all came to pass."

Jos 21:43-45

This acknowledgement is repeated by Joshua in the same formulations (Jos 23:14) and by Solomon (1 Kgs 8:56). It should be noted that the division of land under Joshua concerns the proportionate sharing out of the property, not the granting of the gift itself (Jos 13:7). Jahweh Himself will still drive the unconquered nations out and so make Israel possess their land (Jos 13:6; 23:5). The opposite of 'giving the land' is not the legal rescinding of the treaty, but a 'driving out of the land' (Jos 23-15-16).

3.2.k. This last remark leads us on to another fundamental conception of the Gilgalite historians. Jahweh's giving the land is not an irrevocable deed. It is not a legal transaction which remains valid in conferring right of property no matter what happens to the estate. The gift of the land is rather considered a very fluctuating entity. It can be possessed to a greater or less degree, ranging from a tranquil occupation of it in its fullest extension (1 Kgs 5:1; 8:56) to a total loss in utter destruction and ignominious exile (Jos 23:13, 15; 1 Kgs 9:7; 14:15; 2 Kgs 17; 24). For the historians *the degree of possessing the land expresses the degree of blessing bestowed lry Jahweh* at any given moment of time. Invasions, war, unrest and loss of territory manifest His curse. This is how they see the invasions during the time of the Judges (Jdc 2:10-19). The invasions of the Edomites (Jdc 3:7-11), Moabites (Jdc 3:12-30), Hazorites (Jdc 4:1-5:31), Madianites (Jdc 6:1-9:29), Ammonites (Jdc 10:6-11 :6) and Philisthines (Jdc 13:1; 1 Sam 4:1ff) illustrate the principle. The final disintegration of the promised land is noted in stages: from the loss of the Northern Kingdom (1 Kgs 17) and the loss of Gilead (2 Kgs 10:32; 15:29) to the destruction of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 24-25). In the course of history the gift of the land plays a major role as the measure of benevolence towards His hardnecked people.

3.2.1. The two deuteronomic schools can, therefore, be contrasted regarding their conception of the land-giving. For the Shechemites the land was given through a ritual. As the secular overlords used to hand over ownership of land to vassals by the covenant ceremonial, so did Jahweh confer the right of ownership on Israel by a landgiving ritual. The Gilgalite deuteronomists, on the other hand, identified the gift of the land with its military occupation. Jahweh conquered the land for Israel in harmony with His promise, but His gift functioned as a blessing that could be and was withdrawn as a punishment for covenantal transgression. Of course, the Shechemites also speak of the conquest and the Gilgalites will not deny that the right on the ownership of the land was derived from Jahweh's covenant. Yet, their approach to the land-giving was fundamentally different. The Shechemites identified the gift of the land with the contract; the Gilgalites with the conquest.

3.3. The Inheritance

3.3.a. There can be little doubt as to the fact that נחלה originally signified *the inheritance within a family*. For with this signification it is found in old texts such as Jos 24:28, 30, 32; Jdc 2:6, 9; 21 :24; Prov 17:2; Ruth 4:6; 3 Kgs 21:3, 4; Mich 2:2; Ps 37:18; and Job 42:15. The inheritance spoken of in these texts is the landed property which sons receive from their father. It is the property of a family so that ownership of it will pass within that family. Even P still handles the term in this original sense (Num 27:7; 34:14; 36:2ff.).

3.3.b. That the Shechemite deuteronomists know נחלה in this original meaning cannot be doubted. The following law can have no other reference than to such a 'family inheritance':

"In the inheritance which you will hold in the land Jahweh your God will give you to possess, you shall not remove your neighbour's landmark, which the men of old have set."

Dtn 19:14

When speaking of the Levites, the Shechemites demand special privileges for them since they do not possess such a 'family inheritance' (Dtn 12:12; 14:27,29; 18:1-2). It should be noted that even here there is no mention of the property of a whole tribe. The preacher does not speak of the whole tribe of the Levites as one block, but of 'the Levites living in your town' (Dtn 12:12; 14:27), who do not have any family property among the Israelites with whom they live (Dtn 14:29; 18:1-2).²⁹ We cannot, therefore, but conclude *that for the Shechemites נחלה still refers to 'family inheritance'*.

3.3.c. The value of this observation will be readily appreciated if we consider that the Shechemites affirm that *Jahweh will give the promised land as 'family inheritance' to Israel* (Dtn 4: 21, 38; 12:9; 15:4; 19:10; 20:16; 21:23; 24:4; 25:19; 26:1) Attention has been drawn to the fact that it is the Deuteronomists who are the first to attribute the concept of נחלה to the whole of Israel.³⁰ It is then implied that נחלה hereby acquired a new meaning. This rests on a misunderstanding, as far as I can judge. The word keeps its original meaning as 'family inheritance', but what is new is the use of this metaphor for the landgiving. And its use is highly significant. As we have seen above, Jahweh adopts Israel as His own children, because of His love for Jacob (see 3.0.h). This same adoption is affirmed here. Jahweh is giving the land in the same way as a father transfers his own property to his children. By this, more than anything else, He proves that Israel is really His own family.

3.3.d. Again we find a notable difference in conception when we analyse the meaning of נחלה with the Gilgalites. Also here we find sporadically נחלה employed of 'family inheritance' (Jos 19:49) or of the inheritance of all Israel (Jos 11:23; 13:6; 23:4). But the normal meaning of נחלה for the Gilgalites seems to be the relative portion of land attributed to each tribe. It is in this sense that it occurs in Dtn 3:18; 29:8 and ten times in Jos 13:7-19:51.

3.3.e. The most striking difference, however, lies in the fact that the Gilgalites delegate the distribution of these inheritances to secondary agents. *For the Shechemites it is Jahweh alone* who 'gives the land as an inheritance' (Dtn 4:21; 4:38; 12:9; 15:4; 19:10; 20:16; 21:23; 24:4; 26:1). It is Jahweh who 'bequeathes the land to Israel' (הנחיל ; Dtn 12:10; 19:3). It is, for that matter, Jahweh Himself who 'leads (הביא) Israel into the land' (Dtn 6:10; 7:1; 8:7; 9:4, 28; 11:29; 31:20, 21)³¹ and who 'crosses the Jordan ahead of you' (Dtn 9:3; 30: 9). *But the Gilgalites attribute the same actions to Joshua*. Just as the Transjordan had been given to Ruben, Gad and Manasseh by Moses (Dtn 3:12, 15), so it is Joshua who 'gives Israel its inheritance' (Jos 11:23; 13:6; 23:4). It is Joshua who is appointed to 'provide Israel with its inheritance' הנחיל ; Dtn 1:38; 3:28; 31:7; Jos 1:6). It is Joshua who 'leads Israel into the land' (Dtn 31:7 LXX; 31 :23) and who crosses the Jordan ahead of the people (Dtn 3:28; 31:3).

3.3.f. The reason for this difference should be sought in the conception of the land-giving such as we discussed in the foregoing section (3.2.1). Jahweh's giving of the land is for the Shechemites both the legal deed of a sovereign and the loving gesture of a father. It is, therefore, directly attributed to Jahweh and could never be attributed to anyone else. For the Gilgalites on the other hand the landgiving is brought about by the conquest and the portioning out of the territory. These two actions were delegated by Jahweh to Joshua. Joshua acts both as the commander-in-chief of Jahweh's army and as His supreme executive officer in the division of the land.³¹⁾

3.4. Taking Possession of the Land

3.4.a. The deuteronomists agree in stressing that Jahweh gave Israel a land that had before belonged to other nations. In the transfer of ownership over the land the term **ירש** has acquired a rather dominant positions. As it would appear to occur with more than one connotation, the term has not failed to cause confusion among translators and commentators.

3.4.b. The most original meaning of **ירש** seems to have been 'treading on something'.³²⁾ 'Walking upon land' will naturally convey the idea of 'taking possession' of that land. Such taking possession apparently could be either the acceptance of a legitimate inheritance or a military conquest. These two different aspects have clearly been preserved in the active participle **יורש**, which may mean both 'heir' (2 Sam 14:7; Jer 49:1; Num 36:8) and 'conqueror' (Jer 8:10; Mic 1 :15).

3.4.c. The meaning of **ירש** with the Shechemites may be deduced from its parallelism to the inheritance. Dtn 25 :19 says: 'the land which Jahweh your God *will give you for an inheritance to possess*'. The same formulation recurs in Dtn 15:4 and 26:1. The taking possession of the land is, therefore, manifestly seen as the act of the heir occupying his legitimate possession. It is obvious that this same meaning is implied in the formulation 'the land which Jahweh your God will give you to possess', even if the word 'inheritance' is not explicitly mentioned (Dtn 5:31; 12:1; 25:19).

3.4.d. The Shechemites frequently employ the combination **בוא וירש** 'to go and take possession'. There can hardly be any doubt as to the fact that this combination must have been a technical term. Compare the 'coming' and 'going out' of slaves (Ex 21:2ff.).³³⁾ A new landowner would go to see his newly acquired property as Hiram of Tyre did (1 Kgs 9:12).³⁴⁾ Similarly it is said that Achab rose up to take possession of Naboth's vineyard (1 Kgs 21:15, 16). Yet it is striking that the combination **בוא וירש** is only used in the deuteronomic writings (except for seven other dependent passages: Jer 32: 23; Esd 9:11; Neh 9:15, 23; 2 Chron 20:14 and Dtn 2:9, 12, 19) and that it is only employed in the context of Israel's occupation of the promised land. We cannot but conclude that an ancient term has been preserved through the sacral context in which it was handed on.

3.4.e. The Shechemites handle the term in parallelism to 'crossing the Jordan'. The phrase 'the land which you are entering to take it into possession' (Dtn 4:5; 7:1; 9:5; 11:10, 29; 12:29; 23:21; 28:21, 63) is absolutely equivalent to the phrase: 'the land to which you are crossing over to take it into possession' (Dtn 4:14; 6:1; 11:8, 11). At other occasions the preacher blends the ideas of 'crossing' and 'going' to take into possession: "You are to pass over the Jordan to go to take possession of the land" (Dtn 11:31) or simply: 'You shall cross over and take possession of the land' (Dtn 4:22). From this we may conclude that *the procession across the Jordan was understood to signify the taking possession of the land*.

3.4.f. The act of taking over the ownership over the land could only happen at the cost of the former proprietors. That is why the crossing over into Palestine and the crowning land-treaty at Shechem must necessarily entail the disinheritance of the other nations. The preacher leaves no doubt as to this fact: "You are to pass over the Jordan this day to go to take possession of (*בוֹא וִירֶשׁ*) states greater and mightier than yourselves, cities great and fortified upto heaven." (Dtn 9 :1; and similar passages with *יֶרֶשׁ* alone: Dtn 11:23; 12:2, 29; 18:14; 19:1). The object of *יֶרֶשׁ* in these passages is *גוֹיִם* . Rather than translating this word by 'nations', a meaning it undoubtedly also conveys, we prefer to render it as 'states'. Attention has been drawn recently to the circumstance that *גוֹי* is always related to a geographical place and that it occurs as a parallel to *מַמְלָכָה* , 'the territory ruled by a king' (cf. Ez 37:22; Ex 19:6; Mic 4:7).³⁵ Moreover, in the passage quoted above (Dtn 9:1) the parallelism to the cities should be noted.³⁶ Considering the fact that *יֶרֶשׁ* naturally has a land rather than a people as its object, we may infer that the preachers are thinking of taking over the states rather than the nations.

3.4.g. Of course, these states were organised communities. They had their places of worship and practiced their magic rites (Dtn 12:2, 29; 18:14; 19:1). These elements of the foregoing states should not be taken over by Israel. But other aspects of organised society were taken over by Israel. The Shechemite preachers insist on this. The Hebrews took over 'great and goodly cities which you did not build, houses full of all good things which you did not fill, and cisterns hewn out which you did not hew, and vineyards and olive trees which you did not plant' (Dtn 6:10-11; see also 12:29; 19:1; Jos 24:13). In fact, the preacher tells his audience that God decided to be slow in destroying the former inhabitants lest the land become wild and un-inhabitable before its occupation (Dtn 7:20-23). It would seem that that *יֶרֶשׁ הַגּוֹיִם* does not mean so much "to dispossess the nations" as "to occupy their states."

3.4.h. The hiphil form of *יֶרֶשׁ* is also employed by the Shechemites to express the act of dispossessing. It is said that 'Jahweh dispossesses the nations to the benefit of Israel' (Dtn 9:4, 5; 11:23; 18:12) and also that 'Israel dispossesses the nations' (Dtn 7:17; 9:3). The same act of 'dispossessing' may be expressed by *נָשַׁל*. This word refers originally to the 'pulling off' of sandals (Ex 3:5; Jos 5:15). In both these examples Moses and Joshua pull off their sandals to acknowledge that the soil on which they stand belongs to God. When the Edomites recover the definitive ownership over Elath they 'dispossess the men of Judah' (*נָשַׁל* pi'el). In such expressions we may have an implicit reference to ceremonies of transferring land in which the pulling off of the sandals played a part. Parallels are known from the Nuzu tablets and examples can be found in the Bible also (Ruth 4:7-8; Ps 60:10; 108:10; Am 2:6; 8:6; 1 Sam 12:3).³⁷ Rather than thinking of *נָשַׁל* as the physical 'driving out' of the former inhabitants (no such 'driving out' is known from the Bible),³⁸ we should again see in it a term expressing the ritual of dispossessing the nations (Dtn 7:1, 22).

3.4.i. It should not be thought, however, that the Shechemites advocate a tolerant attitude towards the former inhabitants. No, Jahweh will hand these nations over to Israel (Dtn 7:2, 23) and then it is up to Israel to take action: to kill them, to put the ban on them, to make no covenant with them and to spare no one (Dtn 7:2, 24; 20:16-18). Yet it is interesting to note the remark about those who manage to escape this destruction (Dtn 7:20). We cannot fail to notice that the preacher finds it extremely necessary to forbid mixed marriage with the former inhabitants (Dtn 7:4-5) and to inculcate horror for Canaanitic practices: all forms of idolatry (Dtn 4:15-19; 7:5; 12:2-3, 29-31; 13), various kinds of magic (Dtn 18:9-14) and cultic prostitution (Dtn 23:17-18). It is quite clear from these warnings that the Canaanites were still

looming largely on the Palestinian scene during the period of the Shechemitic ceremonies.³⁹) All this in spite of the fact that Jahweh has somehow already given the land to Israel, has granted it as its inheritance, has dispossessed all the former nations. Again this illustrates the fact that for the Shechemites the giving of the land in all its expressions should be seen first and foremost as a legal act. *Through the ceremonies at Shechem Jahweh grants to Israel the legitimate ownership over the land.* Through these same ceremonies the former inhabitants have been dispossessed. It is up to Israel to occupy its legitimate inheritance. The procession across the Jordan will symbolize this deed. Later conquests will have to realize it.

3.4.j. Excepting two chapters in Deuteronomy (Dtn 2;20) we find the Shechemites hardly make any mention of 'military warfare' with the former inhabitants. The stress is rather on the religious combat with Baalism in all its manifestations. The sermons even presuppose a relative political stability, even if some of the land still remains to be conquered. Quite a different approach is found in the Gilgalite writings. We have seen before that they viewed the history of salvation as a series of liberating interventions on the part of Jahweh (2.4.a). Jahweh manifests His power through war and military conflict. The history of Israel is thus seen as one continuous Holy War and, ofcourse, this way of viewing did not fail to influence the conception of how Israel occupied the promised land.⁴⁰)

3.4.k. The Gilgalite historians also employ the term **ירש** in the pa'al and hiphil forms. With them the terms have taken on an entirely military significance. We have seen above that **יורש** also means 'conqueror' in certain contexts (Jer 8:10; Mic 1:15). The Gilgalites leave us in no doubt as to the circumstance that Israel acquired the land as the conquerors. Jahweh's cry 'go in and take possession' is accompanied by the war oracle: 'I have set the land before you; I have given it into your hands!' (Dtn 1:8, 21; 2:24, 31). The same military context is apparent in the other passages where the Gilgalites speak of 'taking possession of the land': the special duty of the Transjordanian tribes (Dtn 3:12, 18, 20; Jos 1:15) and the more general statements (Jos 1:11; 21:43; 23:5; Jdc 2:6).

3.4.1. This characteristic conception of the Gilgalites is even more pronounced in the texts where the hiphil of **ירש** is employed. For the Gilgalites it is only Jahweh who 'dispossesses (**הוריש**) the nations (Jos 3:10; 13:6; 23:5, 9, 13; Jdc 2:21, 23; 1 Kgs 14:24; 21 :26; 2 Kgs 16: 3; 17: 8; 21: 2). We will remember that the Gilgalites attribute to Joshua certain actions which in older traditions are only ascribed to Jahweh Himself: such as giving the land, assigning the inheritance, leading Israel into the land, and crossing the Jordan ahead of the people (see 3.3.e). But it is never said of Joshua or of Israel or of any other personality but Jahweh that they 'dispossessed (**הוריש**) the nations'. Why was this notion exclusively reserved to Jahweh in Gilgalite theology? No doubt, the reason was its direct connection with the concept of the Holy War. For it is a basic axiom with the Gilgalites that 'Jahweh fights for Israel' (Dtn 1:30; 4:34; Jos 7:13; 10:14; 10:42; 23:3, 10; Jdc 2:15). Whenever Israel fights on its own strength it is miserably defeated (Dtn 1:41-46; Jos 7; Jdc 6; 1 Sam 28; etc.). It is Jahweh, not Moses or Joshua, who determines what nation should be left at peace and which should be defeated (Dtn 2:1-3:17; Jos 1:1-11:23; etc.). In the light of these notions we might, perhaps, translate **הוריש** as 'annihilation'. Especially in the early texts there is a close connection with the ban. What Jahweh is claimed to have done to the nations in Jos 3:10; 23:5, 9 (**הוריש**) should obviously be seen fulfilled in the ban of destruction put on Hai (Jos 8:22-29), Makkedah (Jos 10:28), Libnah (Jos 10:30-31), Lachish (Jos 10:32), Eglon (Jos 10:35), Hebron (Jos 10:37), Debir (Jos 10:39-40) and Hazor (Jos 11:10-15). This ban is understood by the Gilgalites as the total innihilation of all the inhabitants. In Jos 13:6 and 23:13 Jahweh is introduced as promising the further 'annihilation' of the remaining inhabitants if Israel remains loyal. But in Jdc 2:21-

23 the authors explain to us Jahweh's decision not to annihilate (הוריש) all the inhabitants in punishment for Israel's transgressions. The remaining pockets of ancient Canaanites are regarded by him as 'a snare and a trap, a scourge on the sides and thorns in the eyes' (Jos 23:13), 'a test for Israel whether they will take care to walk in the way of Jahweh' (Jde 2:22).

3.4.m. The Shechemites view Israel's taking possession of the land as the action of the legitimate heir who rises to lay hands on his inheritance. In a cultic context this act of taking possession was symbolised by the procession towards Shechem. The Shechemite preachers stressed the fact that Jahweh gave Israel a property that had before belonged to others: the property consisted of organized states. Everything in these states could be inherited by Israel except for the religious practices. The former inhabitants had to be dealt with firmly, especially regarding marriage and cult. For the rest the preachers pre-suppose the actual possession of part of the land and they promise the conquest of the rest.

3.4.o. The Gilgalites stress the military side of the occupation. Israel's taking possession of the land can be identified with the conquest. Jahweh Himself fights the war for Israel. He it was who decided the 'annihilation' (הוריש) of the former inhabitants to make room for Israel. That He reverses His decision, leaving some of the former inhabitants alive, is explained as a punishment and as a temptation.

3.5. Crossing the Jordan

3.5.a. The word עבר may have many meanings in Hebrew. When it is employed for the crossing of a river, the word river (נהל) is normally required to complete the expression. So we find it said that people cross *the river* Zered (Dtn 2:13, 14), *the river* Amon (Dtn 2:24), *the river* Besor (1 Sam 30:10), *the river* Kidron (2 Sam 15:23; 1 Kgs 2:37) and the river of Ezekiel's vision (Ez 47:5). On the other hand, when there is question of crossing the Jordan, it is hardly ever felt necessary to mention the fact that the Jordan is a river (2 Sam 2:29; 10:17; 17:16; 21, 22, 24; 19:19, 32, 37, 40; 24:5; etc.). There are even instances where עבר by itself would seem to indicate the crossing of the Jordan, even when the Jordan has not been referred to explicitly in the context (cf. 2 Kgs 8:21; Jer 41:10). These philological facts prove that the Jordan certainly ranked as *the river* 'par excellence' for the Israelites.

3.5.b. We have already had occasion to point out that for the Shechemite deuteronomists *the crossing of the Jordan symbolized the taking possession of the land.*⁴¹ It appeared to be an exact equivalent of the term בוא וירש which involved the deed of occupying one's newly acquired property (3.4.d). A question which needs next to be considered is: did the crossing of the Jordan also symbolize the crossing of the Sea of Reeds?

3.5.c. The arguments seem to demand a negative reply to this question. *The Shechemite preachers do not draw the parallel between the crossing of the Sea of Reeds and the crossing of the Jordan.* A few illustrations will indicate the significance of this omission. First of all, the preachers have numerous references to the Exodus. They profess that Jahweh has liberated Israel from Egypt (הציא : Dtn 5:6, 15; 6:12, 21, 23; 7:8, 19; 8:14; 9:12, 26, 29; 13:6, 11; 16:1; 26:8), that He has redeemed them (פדה : Dtn 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 15:15; 21 :8; 24:18) and that He did many signs and wonders to achieve this (Dtn 6:22; 7:19; 10:21; 11: 3, 7). Yet, in none of these cases do they make the slightest reference to a miraculous 'crossing' of the Sea of Reeds. Even in Dtn 11:4, the only passage that elaborates Jahweh's intervention at the Sea of

Reeds, it is the destruction of the Egyptian army that is stressed without a single word to commemorate Israel's miraculous 'crossing'.

3.5.d. This is all the more significant since the Shechemites do, on the other hand, find frequent occasion to refer to the 'crossing of the Jordan' as something of importance (Dtn 4:21, 22, 26; 9:1 ; 11:31 ; 12:10; 27:2, 4, 12). The fact looms so large in their minds that they can simply speak of 'the land to which you are crossing over' without mentioning the Jordan (Dtn 4:14; 6:1; 11:8, 11). In none of these references to the crossing of the Jordan is any comparison with the crossing of the Sea of Reeds.

3.5.e. A third observation confirms the conclusion that the miracle at the Sea of Reeds was not linked to the crossing of the Jordan by the Shechemites. Whenever the preacher recalls 'the signs Jahweh did against Egypt' (Dtn 6:22; 7:19; 10:21), among which signs the miracle at the Sea of Reeds should also be reckoned (Dtn 11: 3-7), he always points to them as facts that happened in the past. The crossing of the Jordan, however, has still to take place in the future (see esp. Dtn 9:1 and 27:2). It should be noted that in this cultic crossing of the Jordan *the miraculous element of a drying up of the Jordan's waters* constitutes an element that is equally absent from the Shechemitic reflections. Such an element would also seem to be absent in the processional passages of Hos 6:7-10 (1.2.c) and Gen 33:17-20 (1.3.a).

3.5.f. We cannot, therefore, but conclude that the element of 'crossing the Jordan' was not theologically linked to the crossing of the Sea of Reeds. It would rather seem that the Shechemites move in that stream of tradition according to which the miracle at the Sea of Reeds was not conceived of as a crossing. In this line of tradition the miracle has two aspects: Israel goes on dry ground (**יְבֹשָׁה**) through the sea (Ex 14:16, 22, 29; 15:19; Ps 106:9; Jos 2:10; Ps 66:6; cf. Judith 5:13; Wisd 19:7) and the Egyptian army is routed (Ex 14:1-30; Jos 24: 6; Ps 106:10, 11; Dtn 11: 3-4). In this tradition the element of 'crossing' is not stressed. If the crossing of the Jordan was considered to re-enact the miracle of the Sea of Reeds, what would have been more natural than describe the miracle as a 'crossing'?

3.5.g. On the other hand we have firm evidence to prove that at a later date the procession from Succoth to Shechem was understood to re-enact the crossing of the Sea of Reeds by the cultic crossing of the Jordan. The ancient traditions underlying Jos 3-4 (1.0.a; 1.1. b) and Ex 13:18-20 (1.4.d) point to this. To this also witnesses psalm 114 in which the miracles of the Red Sea and of the Jordan are paralleled. We must, therefore, conclude to *two stages in the processional practice at Shechem*.

3.5.h. In the earlier stage Jahweh's saving acts in Egypt were celebrated before the crossing of the Jordan. We may well suppose that the old drama of the Exodus was enacted before the people while they camped at Succoth. The procession from Succoth to Shechem was seen as the cultic occupation of the land which Jahweh was going to give as inheritance during the ceremonies at Shechem. Characteristic of this earlier stage are: the reference to the Exodus as a past event (usually with the formula 'you have seen'); the absence of a miraculous element in the crossing of the Jordan; the stress on the occupation of the land. This earlier stage of the processional practice is not only reflected by the Shechemite deuteronomists, but also in Jos 24:3-13, which mentions the Sea of Reeds (not as a crossing, vs. 6) and the crossing of the Jordan (not as miraculous, vs. 11).

3.5.i. In a later stage the crossing of the Jordan which formed the starting point of the procession, took on the significance of re-enacting the crossing at the Sea of Reeds. This new phase is testified to by the traditions of Jos 3-4, Ex 13:18-20 and Psalm 114. It may also underlie the exclamation in Ps 66:6:

'He turned the sea into dry land;
men crossed the river on foot.'

It corresponds to the leading ideas of the song in Ex 15, which contains not only the traditional description of the Egyptians' defeat (vs 1-12), but also the reflection on the triumphal march to Jahweh's holy mountain (vs. 13-18) and a reference to the 'crossing' (vs. 16).

3.5.j. 'Crossing the Jordan' takes up an important place in the Gilgalite writings too. In the first four chapters of Joshua the theme recurs nineteen times! A close scrutiny of the theme throughout the historical writings shows, however, that the Gilgalite historians mingled various traditional elements with their elaboration of the theme.

3.5.k. First of all there is undoubtedly *the element of reenacting the crossing of the Sea of Reeds*. The whole structure of Jos 3-4 demands a cultic practice to this effect connected to the shrine of Gilgal (see 1.0.a; 2.4.e; 1.1.a; 1.1.g). This practice at Gilgal is, moreover, confirmed by the writings of P and by Mich 6:5, which mention Shittim and Gilgal as the point of departure and terminus of the procession across the Jordan (see 3.0.b). Then there are the pointers in the legends of Elijah and Elisha (see 2.4.f) and the reference to the 'Ebal and Gerizim' near Gilgal (Dtn 11 :30: see 2.4.h). The theological reflection in Jos 4:21-24 explicitates this cultic element.

3.5.l. Secondly, *the crossing of the Jordan initiates the official conquest of the promised land*. We have to say the 'official' conquest, since the Gilgalites introduce a preliminary conquest under Moses which brought the Transjordanian regions under Israel's dominion (Dtn 2:16-3:17). In spite of the importance the Gilgalites attribute to the Transjordanian regions (see below 3.6.j; 3.6.k), they stress that the real conquest only began when Joshua crossed the Jordan. Moses himself was not allowed to cross the Jordan (Dtn 3:23-28; 31:2; 34:4), but after his death it is Joshua who receives the command: 'Arise, cross the Jordan!' (Jos 1:2). With this command the conquest begins.

3.5.m. Then, *'crossing the Jordan' also had military implications*. Israel's history abounds with examples of wars in which the advance of an invading army is characterized by the verb עבר (Jos 6:7; Is 10: 28- 29; Hab 1:11; Ps 48:5; 1 Sam 29:2; 2 Kgs 8:21). Quite often the invasion involves an armed crossing of the Jordan (Jdc 6:33; 12:1 etc.). For the war-minded Gilgalites the crossing of the Jordan could not but symbolize at the same time the irrevocable beginning of Jahweh's Holy War (cf. Jos 1:2-3; 3:10-11; 5:1).

3.5.n. In conclusion we may underline our discovery of two stages of development in the Shechemitic practice of crossing the Jordan. In the older stage the crossing of the Jordan signified the beginning of the symbolic occupation of Israel's inheritance. In a later stage the same crossing was understood as a re-enactment of the crossing at the Sea of Reeds. The Gilgalite historians witness to a similar practice at Gilgal. In spite of their obvious interest in the Transjordanian regions they picture the crossing of the Jordan as the beginning of the conquest and of the Holy War.

3.6. *The boundaries of the promised land*

3.6.a. The Shechemites recall an ancient promise by which Jahweh made this commitment to Israel: "Every place on which the sole of your foot treads (ירך) shall be yours!" (Dtn 11:24). This promise is by itself quite unlimited. It holds expectations for the future; it indicates possible expansion. And again, the formula illustrates the fact that the procession across the Jordan symbolized the occupation of the land (see 3.5.b).

3.6.b. What were the boundaries of the Promised Land? How far could it extend? Let us first recall that for the Shechemites the Jordan itself constitutes the eastern border of the Promised Land. Israel moves out into the desert for its recollection (see 1.8.c). Only on the western side of the Jordan lies the territory which Jahweh is going to give. Only by crossing the Jordan does the ritual occupation of the land begin. *The Shechemites presume, therefore, that the Transjordanian regions are no part of the Promised Land.*

3.6.c. The description of the boundaries in Dtn 11:25 are thereby easy to understand. The Shechemites adhere to an early form of what we might call '*the West-Jordanian Land Scheme*'. It may be useful to tabulate some examples of it.⁴²⁾

| | North | South | East | West |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Dtn 11:24</i> | the river, the river Euphrates | the wilderness | (the Jordan) | the western sea |
| <i>1 Kgs 5:1</i> | the Euphrates | the border of Egypt | | the land of the Philistines |
| <i>2 Kgs 24:7</i> | the river Euphrates | the brook of Egypt | | |
| <i>Gen 15:18</i> | the big river, the river Euphrates | the river of Egypt | | |
| <i>Num 34:3-12</i> | the entrance | the desert of Hamath | the Jordan | the great sea of Sin |
| <i>Num 13:17-29</i> | the entrance of Hamath | the desert of Sin | | |
| <i>Ez 47:13-20</i> | the entrance of Hamath | the waters of Meribah Kadesh | the Jordan | the great sea |

3.6.d. The southern and western boundaries (the desert and the Mediterranean Sea) are fixed data in any conception of the extension of the Promised Land. Variation is only possible in the eastern and northern boundaries. In the '*West-Jordanian Land Scheme*' the eastern border is constituted by the Jordan. Usually this is simply presupposed as something that needs no further comment. The spies of Num 13 journey only through the West-Jordanian regions (see vs 17-29). In Dtn 11:24 it is quite superfluous to mention the eastern border (the

Jordan), since the preachers have already announced that the entry into the Promised Land will be across the Jordan. In Gen 15:18; 1 Kgs 5:1; and 2 Kgs 24:7 only the northern and southern borders are indicated with the obvious implication that the East (the Jordan) and the West (the Sea) cannot be altered in any case. The northern boundary of the West-Jordanian land scheme is indicated with the somewhat vague denominator 'the entrance of Hamath' or 'the Euphrates' ! Probably we have to think of the Northern tributary of the Euphrates near Karkemish (2 Kgs 23:29; Jer 46:2, 6).

3.6.e. The West-Jordanian land scheme may, perhaps, be characterised as uninterested in East and West (which were presumed unchangeable) and exaggerated in North and South (as if the territory ever stretched all the way from Egypt to Karkemish!). A more realistic version of this land scheme is the expression '*from Dan to Beersheba*' (1 Sam 3:20; 2 Sam 3:10; 17:11; 24:2; 1 Kgs 5:5; 1 Chron 21:2; 2 Chron 30:5; cf. Am 8:14). Also in this expression East and West are presupposed as known. It is, therefore, sufficient to indicate the most northern and most southern cities.

3.6.f. Perhaps, in no other aspect of their theology the Gilgalite historians have been so active as in the question of the extension of the Promised Land. In the light of Israel's actual historical development they have consciously attempted to interpret the ancient formulas in a new way.

3.6.g. Also the Gilgalites know Jahweh's promise that He would give each piece of soil on which the Hebrews were going to tread. But they handle this promise with particular care. *In its fullest meaning this promise was only applied to Caleb and Joshua.* As to Caleb we read:

"Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, shall see the land; and to him and to his children I will give the land on which he has trodden (**דָּרַד**), because he has wholly followed Jahweh."

Dtn 1:36

"Caleb said: 'Moses swore on that day saying: Surely the land on which your foot had trodden (**דָּרַד**) shall be an inheritance for you and for your children for ever, because you have wholly followed Jahweh.'"

Jos 14:9

Also Joshua receives this promise:

"Every place that the sole of your feet will tread upon (**דָּרַד**) I have given to you, as I promised to Moses."

Jos 1:3

This last promise which is addressed to Joshua certainly embraces all Israel as the beneficiaries. Yet, the role Joshua will play is most important in the eyes of the historian. It is under Joshua's leadership alone that the land will finally be conquered, and the promise of receiving every place 'trodden upon' is thereby limited. The historians want us to understand this clearly and so they state expressly that Jahweh did not give Moab (Dtn 2:9), Ammon (Dtn 2:19) or Edom (Dtn 2:5) to Israel, even though the Hebrews passed through their territories. The old formula is partly revoked by this categorical correction:

"I will not give you any of their (the Edomites') land, no, not so much as for the sole of the foot to tread on (**דָּרַד**)"

3.6.h. Such an outspoken correction of the old claim can only have been provoked by opposing views. We know that Judah attempted for a long period to keep dominion over Edom (1 Kgs 11:14-22; 2 Kgs 8:20-22; 14:7), but that Edom eventually regained its full independence under Achaz (2 Kgs 16:5). The Gilgalite historians justify this independence by their refusal to extend the ancient promise also to Edom. Similar attempts to explain Edom's independence theologically are also found with the Jahwist (Gen 27:40) and in the old tradition of Jos 24:4. We may surmise that the Gilgalites want to counteract popular belief that Edom should be subject to Judah as 'Israel has trodden on it'. Or it wants to stigmatize the costly wars against Edom as totally inexpedient.

3.6.i. The Gilgalite historians did also not agree with accepting the Jordan as the eastern border of the Promised Land. Of course, they are dealing with an ancient tradition here and they could not altogether avoid attributing importance to the Jordan. Consequently, they kept to the crossing of the Jordan as the real start of the conquest and the Holy War (see 3.5.1, 3.5.m). They also admit that the regions east of the Jordan are not completely equal in standing to the land on the west of it. In the narration we are given the impression that the East-Jordanian regions were only given by Jahweh as an afterthought: the conquest is occasioned by the opposition of Sihon and Og (Dtn 2:26-30; 3:1-2.⁴³) Moses is not allowed to enter the promised land (Dtn 1:37; 3:23-27; 32:48-52; 34:1-6), but no objection is made against his stay in the regions East of the Jordan. On one occasion the historians even record the following invitation to the East-Jordanian tribes: "If your land is unclean, pass over into Jahweh's land where Jahweh's tabernacle stands, and take for yourselves a possession among us." (Jos 22:19). We should not think that the historians themselves want to discredit Transjordan by these words. But the objection they voice illustrates the difference spontaneously felt between the land west and east of the Jordan.

3.6.j. In spite of the old tradition which fixed the eastern border at the Jordan and in spite of the different status thus to be recognized in the West-Jordanian regions, *the Gilgalites take trouble to stress that the East-Jordanian regions also enjoy a place in Jahweh's land*. They narrate how the whole of Gilead with the neighbouring districts was conquered by Moses at Jahweh's command (Dtn 2:24-3:11)⁴⁴ and how this land had been given to *Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh* as their official portion (Dtn 3:12-17). To underline the unity of these Transjordanian tribes with their brothers in Palestine proper, weight is attached to the stipulation that the three tribes have to cross the Jordan with the others to partake in the Holy War. Moses imposes this condition (Dtn 3:18-22); Joshua reminds the three tribes of their duty before the crossing (Jos 1:12-15); the narrator records the fact of the three tribes crossing the Jordan (4:12), gives them a place in the summary of conquests (Jos 12:1-6) and recounts their honourable dismissal at the end of the conquest (Jos 21:43-22:6). In this last passage the historians emphasize once more the religious unity of these tribes with the ones on the West of the Jordan.

3.6.k. The historians do not leave it at that. In their long history of Israel's rise and decline they do not forget to keep their hearers' attention focussed on the East-Jordanian regions, especially *Gilead*. First of all they inserted traditions which particularly concern Gilead, such as the rule of Jair, the Gileadite, (Jdc 10:3-5), the war by which Jephthah liberated Gilead from Ammonite oppression (Jdc 10:6- 11:33); the civil war between Gilead and Ephraim (Jdc 12:1-6); Saul's intervention on behalf of Jabesh Gilead (1 Sam 11:1-11); the Transjordanian provinces under Solomon (1 Kgs 4:13, 19); and the legends of Elijah, 'of Tishbe in Gilead' (1

Kgs 17:1); What is more, the historians treat Gilead as part of the whole of Israel, so that they consider the loss of Gilead as the beginning of the dis-integration and exile. We read of the historians' hand:

"In those days Jahweh began to cut off parts of Israel. Hazael defeated them throughout the territory of Israel: from the Jordan eastward, all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer, which is in the valley of the Arnon, that is, Gilead and Bashan."

2 Kgs 70:32-33

The definitive exile of Gilead is recounted in 2 Kgs 15:29, a prelude to the exile of the Northern Kingdom (2 Kgs 17: 6).

3.6.1. In order to include Gilead and the other East-Jordanian provinces within the boundaries of the Promised Land, the Gilgalite historians seem to have given a new interpretation to the ancient description of the borders. They build on the conception that *the Euphrates should not be considered the northern, but the eastern border of the Promised Land*. Instead, all the land east of the Jordan, with all the desert land up to the Euphrates in a far, easterly direction, becomes part of the Holy Land. Thus the historians could write that David by his war in Transjordan acquired power 'until the river Euphrates' (2 Sam 8:3). Of Solomon it is stated that he 'ruled over the whole region west of the Euphrates from Tiphseh to Gaza, over all the kings west of the Euphrates' (1 Kgs 4:24). The northern boundary is constituted, according to the Gilgalites, by the Lebanon, which probably is taken to designate the area between the Hermon and the entrance of Hamath (cf. Jos 9:1; 11:17; 12:7; 13:5; Jdc 3:3). In this conception the Lebanon itself is supposed to belong to the Promised Land, as its most northern portion (cf Dtn 3:25). The entrance of Hamath cannot have been considered by the Gilgalites to lie much further north than Dan, since they expressly mention Dan as the furthest point in Moses' view of the 'entire' land (Dtn 34:1).

3.6.m. At the hand of the old terminology a new land scheme was thus developed by the Gilgalites. We might style it the '*Broad Land Scheme*'. It is described by the historians in the following passages:

| | North | South | East | West |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Dtn 1:7</i> | (the Lebanon) | (the Arabah) | the great river, the river Euphrates | |
| <i>Jos 1:4</i> | the Lebanon | the wilderness | the great river, the river Euphrates | the great sea in the West |

According to this scheme the Gilgalites also corrected the 'West-Jordanian Scheme' originally found in Dtn 11:24, by adding 'the Lebanon': ⁴⁵⁾

| | North | South | East | West |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Dtn 11:24</i> | the Lebanon | the wilder- ness | the river the river, Euphrates | the western sea |

3.6.n. Furthermore, the Gilgalites are not altogether satisfied with the expression 'from Dan to Beer-shebah' (see above 3.6.e). At times they employ this formula, but make clear from the immediate context that Gilead and all Transjordan should be included (1 Kgs 4:25; 2 Sam 24:5-7). And once the formula is explicitly enlarged: "All the people of Israel, from Dan to Beer-shebah, *including Gilead*, came out .. " (Jdc 20:1).

3.6.o. The Shechemite conception of the extent of the promised land thus differs considerably from the Gilgalite one. The Shechemites adhere to the "West-Jordanian land scheme', making the Jordan itself the eastern border and so excluding the Transjordanian regions from partnership in the Promised Land. For the rest they do not go in much for details. The promise of Jahweh to give every place on which Israel will tread is given an expansive interpretation.

3.6.p. The Gilgalites, on the other hand, take a strongly positive attitude towards the Transjordanian regions. They want to defend their partnership in the Holy Land by elaborating the themes of the conquest of the lands of Sihon and Og, of the part played by Reuben, Gad and Manasseh in the Holy War, of Gilead's place in the history of total Israel. The ancient scheme of boundaries receives a new interpretation by which the Euphrates was made the eastern border instead of the Jordan. The phrase 'from Dan to Beer-shebah' is enlarged to include Gilead. The Gilgalites also declare themselves against the conquest of Edom, which - they consider - was never meant by Jahweh to be part of Israel.

3. 7. *Reconstructing the Land-giving rituals*

3.7.a. It will be obvious from the foregoing sections that there was a marked difference between the conceptions of the Land-giving as they were formed by the Shechemite and Gilgalite Deuteronomists. This difference rests ultimately on a different liturgical practice. I will try now to outline the Land-giving rituals known to both schools, using the data so far collected.

3.7.b. For the Shechemite deuteronomists the Land-giving is to be identified with *a ritual in which Jahweh transfers the legal ownership of the land to Israel*. "Jahweh will give the land," means in the mouth of the preacher at Succoth: "Jahweh will re-affirm your legal right to the land in the ritual to be celebrated at Shechem." This conclusion can be arrived at in a variety of ways. First, there is the negative approach by which we can show that the Shechemites could not understand the Land-giving formula in the sense of outright conquest. For, in spite of the fact that the promise embraces the whole land 'from Egypt to the Lebanon' (3.6.c; 3.6.d), the former inhabitants of the land are still an existing reality (3.4.i) and Israel knows them to be 'greater and mightier' than itself (3.0.e). Surely, Jahweh will 'disinherit' these hostile nations (3.4.h), so that Israel will 'take over their states' (3.4.f; 3.4.g); but this legal fact will only gradually be realized by its execution in the conquest. Secondly, the terminology of the Land-giving used by the Shechernites has legal connotations. Apart from the terms already mentioned regarding the former inhabitants, we should note the juridical and legal value of expressions such as: 'giving the land' (3.2.c; 3.2.d), 'occupying the inheritance' (3.4.c; 3.4.d), 'treading on the soil' (3.6.a) and 'crossing over to take possession' (3.4.e). Thirdly, the transfer of ownership is brought out by the fact that it is Jahweh Himself, and no one else not even His mediator, who 'gives Israel his inheritance', who 'brings him into his land' and who 'crosses over to the land ahead of him' (3.3.e). The crossing of the Jordan is thus understood as symbolizing not the conquest, but the legal occupation of one's property (3.4.e; 3.5.b).

3.7.c. The ritual by which the land is given to Israel is, moreover, *distinct from the Exodus drama*. The drama was certainly known to the Shechemites. The text presupposes it to have been staged near Succoth on the eastern banks of the Jordan (2.5.f). The preachers refer to it as something of the past. The taking possession of the land, however, begins with the crossing of the Jordan, which is still to take place (3.5.e). What is more: the Exodus event is never seen by the Shechemites as a 'crossing' (3.5.c), and they could hardly have omitted characterizing it as such if they had considered the crossing of the Jordan a re-enactment of the Red Sea event. Again, the Land-giving formulas used by the preachers are always phrased in the future (3.2.a). The Shechemites, therefore, distinguish two liturgical rites: the Exodus drama (east of the Jordan) and the Land-giving (west of the Jordan).

3.7.d. The Land-giving ritual found expression in the crossing of the Jordan and the procession towards Shechem (3.4.e; 3.5.b). *But its full ratification must have taken place in the legal ceremonies at Shechem*. The preaching at Succoth was, it will be remembered, covenantal instruction by which the people were prepared for the celebrations at Shechem (1.7.b; 1.7.d; 1.8.c). The procession from Succoth culminated in the covenantal rites so firmly rooted in the sanctuary at Shechem (1.8.e). This would by itself point to the legal 'giving of the land' as a deed confirmed in those covenantal rites. But the Land-giving terminology also justifies the same conclusion. 'Land-giving' and 'Covenant' are connected as a common object of Jahweh's promise (3.2.d). The terms used for expressing the giving of the land possess many characteristics of ancient contractual jargon (3.2.e). The special election of Israel on account of the promise to Jacob harmonizes very well with the conception of a vassal being put on the throne because of the suzerain's friendly relations with his father (3.0.i; cf. also 3.2.f). We may thus safely conclude to the fact that the Land-giving was fully ratified in the celebrations of Shechem.

3.7.e. This covenant of Jahweh with Israel is always presented by the Shechemites as *the adoption of Israel because of Jahweh's love for Jacob*. This is a rather specific concept which corresponds to a well-known pattern of adoption (3.0.h). According to this pattern the children are more privileged than their father. Jacob only received the promise, whereas his

children, Israel, were granted the full benefits of the covenant (3.0.e; 3.2.f). It is in harmony with this concept that the land is called Israel's "family inheritance" (3.3.a; 3.3.b; 3.3.c), that Jahweh is said to 'bequeath' to them this property (3.3.e) and that Israel is believed to 'occupy their inheritance' (3.4.c; 3.4.d) Dtn, 4:37-38 may be an ancient hymn which summarizes the concept rather accurately (3.0.c; ff.).

3.7.f. We find various *stages of theological development in the Shechemite traditions*. The crossing of the Jordan, for instance, was not seen in relation to the Exodus by the preachers of Dtn 5-28 nor by the author of Jos 24 (3.5.c; 3.5.d; 3.5.e; 3.5.h). But the processional traditions of Jos 3-4, Ex 13:18-20 and Ps 114 require that at a later date the crossing between Succoth and Shechem was understood as a re-enactment of the Red Sea miracle (3.5.i). Similarly, in the oldest traditions there was mention of the promise to one father only (3.0.c; 3.0.f; 3.1.b; 3.1.c; 3.1.d). This father was undoubtedly Jacob (3.1.f). In later traditions, such as the Jahwistic and Elohist ones, we find an attempt to extend the ancient promises to a plurality of fathers (3.1.g). A similar shift to a plural understanding of the bearer of the promise occurred within Shechemite circles also (3.1.e). Finally, the early traditions visualize the Covenant itself as concluded east of the Jordan and leave to Shechem no more than complementary rites (3.2.g). At a later stage, however, the covenantal ceremonies themselves were transferred to Shechem (cf. Jos 24). Such developments in the ancient practices are no more than natural processes of a living theology.⁴⁶⁾

3.7.g. The treaty pattern would require that the cultic mediator at Shechem introduced the Covenant with a historical prologue. The best example of such a prologue is, without any doubt, Jos 24:3-14. By the very nature of the liturgical ceremonies that had gone before, this historical, prologue would contain two elements:

- a) a reference to the Exodus drama;
- b) a reference to the occupation of the land, symbolized by the procession from Succoth to Shechem.

This liturgical background for the formulation of the historical prologue explains, consequently, *the classical pattern of the history of salvation on Exodus and Land-giving* (2.1.a; 2.1.b). This scheme could easily be extended backwards by beginning with an earlier part of history, such as the patriarchs (Dtn 26: 5-9; Psalm 105) or creation (Jer 32:17-22; Psalms 135; 136). But it could not be so easily extended forward, i.e. including events that happened after the conquest, since the procession from Succoth to Shechem did not so much recall a past event as express a legal fact. The Exodus and the Land-giving played, consequently, a slightly different role: the Exodus represented the historic fact of liberation, whereas the land-giving expressed more the legal aspect of receiving new property (see also 2.1. j).

3.7.h. For the Gilgalite deuteronomists *the land-giving could be identified with the military occupation of the land*. Numerous considerations confirm this conclusion. First and foremost, all the Landgiving terms employed by the Gilgalites savour of War: **ירש** means 'to conquer' (3.4.k); **הוריש** refers to the extermination of people stricken with the holy ban (3.4.1); and the crossing of the Jordan is an act of military aggression (3.5.l; 3.5.m). Secondly, the extensive work of the Gilgalite historians is entirely dominated by the theme of how the land was gradually conquered and thus 'given to Israel' (3.2.h). The actual possession of the land is seen as a measure of covenantal blessing; the occasional losses reflect covenantal punishments (3.2.k). The Land-giving, understood as the factual ownership of the land, is therefore not a

one-time legal transfer, but a covenantal blessing which Jahweh can maintain or withdraw (2.4.a). Moreover, the territorial extent of Israel is limited by the actual conquests which Jahweh permits. He does not allow Moses to 'tread on' Edom, Moab or Ammon (3.6.g; 3.6.h). But he does 'hand over' the Transjordanian regions so that they become object of the 'Land-giving' (3.6.i; 3.6.j; 3.6.k). In fact, the Gilgalites develop an ingenious 'Broad Land Scheme', which, while employing ancient terminology, also embraces the territories east of the Jordan (3.6.m). All these considerations demonstrate conclusively that the 'Land-giving' and the military conquest of the land are absolute parallels.

3.7.i. It would seem that in the eyes of the Gilgalite theologians the Land-giving belonged essentially to the realm of the covenantal blessings. The first conquest of Palestine was, in fact, the fulfilment of the covenantal blessing attached to the pact of Sinai (3.2.j). The further good or bad fortune in possessing the land manifested the degree of blessing or punishment God meted out to His people at any period of its history (3.2.j). This way of looking on the Land-giving is not restricted to the Gilgalites alone. In its very nature the Landgiving was connected to the patriarchal blessing and to the blessing of a land treaty (2.1.i).

In as far as the Land-giving is accomplished by military interventions on Jahweh's part, *it becomes part of the history of salvation*. But it is not considered a separate favour granted by the suzerain, such as we analysed in the Exodus-Landgiving Scheme (2.1.a; 2.1.b). The various acts of Land-giving are believed to be extensions of the salvific deeds begun at the Exodus. The Gilgalites conceive of the history of salvation as a long series of liberations from enemies, including those liberations which involve the conquest or re-conquest of the land (2.4.a).

3.7.j. The theological conceptions of this particular deuteronomic school were also *nurtured in a specific liturgical practice*. We have demonstrated before that the monumental work of history composed by these theologians indicates Gilgal as the likely religious centre of its traditions (2.4.d). One outstanding characteristic of this liturgical practice was the prominence given to charismatic leaders. The sanctuary of Gilgal was firmly attached to eminent prophetic mediators such as Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Elijah and Elisha (2.4.d; 2.4.f). In the Land-giving itself Joshua is given the role of commander-in-chief of the victorious nation and of supreme distributor of the conquered lands (3.3.e; 3.3.f).

3.7.k. Crossing the Jordan seems from the beginning to have been understood as *the liturgical re-enactment of the Red Sea miracle* in the Gilgalite ritual (3.5.k). But the ceremony had other implications. The crossing symbolized at the same time the irrevocable divine decision to initiate the conquest of the promised land (3.5.1; 3.5.m). Moreover, the crossing was at the same time a manifestation of the authority granted by God to the religious leader. As Moses had been acknowledged God's pleni-potentiary because of the miraculous crossing which He mediated, so Joshua, Elijah and Elisha win acknowledgement on the same title (2.4.f). All this presupposes that in the Gilgalite drama of the Exodus, such as we outlined elsewhere (2.5.c), a definite place was reserved to the religious leader who acted the part of Moses (2.3.k).

3.7.1. The ceremonies at the Jordan must have led up to a solemn acclamation of Jahweh as king. This is required by the very nature of the solemnities, such as we reconstructed them (2.5.c). But the question remains open as to at what particular occasion during the year this kingship feast was celebrated. There is good reason to believe that *at Gilgal the Exodus celebrations were linked to the Passover*. In fact, three separate testimonies make this connection a very likely one. In the first place, in a later redaction of Ex 1-15 the Exodus drama was purposely linked to the Pascha. I have had occasion to demonstrate against J. Pedersen that this connection could not have been the original one (2.3.d). But it remains a fact that

the drama was linked to the Pascha by later redactors before it was taken up into the Jahwistic account. And considering that the Exodus drama was specifically celebrated at Gilgal (2.5.e), it becomes likely that it was in that sanctuary that the connection with the Pascha was brought about. A second witness is Jos 5:10-21 in which the Gilgalite deuteronomists affirm that the Pascha was celebrated four days after the completion of the liturgical crossing of the Jordan (cf. Jos 4:19), in the encampments at Gilgal. Thirdly, we find that the deuteronomic reform under Josiah entails a renewed celebration of the Pascha, "such as it had not been kept since the days of the judges" (2 Kgs 23:21-23). What may, actually, have happened is that the practices of the deuteronomic colony at Gilgal were now officially extended to the whole kingdom. The Passover offers itself, consequently, as the most likely setting for the Exodus celebrations of the Gilgalites.

1) **אבות** has to be understood as singular, 'father'. M. DAHOOD has recently adduced both biblical and extrabiblical examples of **אבות** being used with a singular meaning (cf. *Karatepe Notes*, Bibi. 44 (1963) p. 70; *Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography*, 1, Bibi. 44 (1963) p. 291). That **אבות** is definitely meant to be singular in this passage can be illustrated from the singular pronoun in **ורצו אחריו** 'his seed after him'.

2) The expression **בפניו** occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible. It obviously means that Jahweh *Himself, in person*, effected the liberation (see 2 Sam 17 :11; Ex 33 :14). There may be a reference in it to a cultic mask which symbolized Jahweh's presence (cf. G. VON RAD, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, vol. I, Munchen 1957, p. 284).

3) It would also be possible to translate 'surely He dispossessed' and 'surely He brought you here,' by considering the lamed an emphatic one. Reasons for this could be: (a) the infinitive construct with *lamed* is normally not continued by another infinitive, but by a finite verb (cf. P. JOUN, *Grammaire de l'Hebreu Biblique*, Rome 1947, par. 124q, p. 364). The three infinitives **להוריש**, **להביא**, and **לתת**, seem to violate this rule. (b) The action of bringing Israel to the land (**הביא**) is normally not considered the purpose of the Exodus, but another separate action (cf. Ex 6: 8; 15 :17; Num 14:12; 16:14; Dtn 26: 8; Jos 24:8; Jdc 2:1; Ps 78:54; Neh 9:23). On the emphatic *lamed* see: F. NÖ TSCHER, *VT* 3 (1953) pp. 372-380; M. DAHOOD, *Gregorianum* 43 (1962) pp. 64f. On the other hand, the construction 'in order to dispossess', 'in order to bring you', may be a deliberate attempt to indicate the relationship between the Exodus (which has already taken place) and the Land-giving (which has still to be cultically re-enacted) (see further 3.5.c; 3.7.c). The parallels in Dtn 6:23 and Num 20:5 must also be considered important.

4) This rendering of **הוריש** will be justified later (3.4.h).

5) **הביא** is at times used without an explicit mention of the place where the object is taken to (cf. Gen 42:34; 1 Sam 16:12; 1 Kgs 2:40; Ex 19:4). In such cases it must be supplied from the context.

6) The precise meaning of **נחלה** for the Shechemite Deuteronomists would seem to be 'family property' (see 3.3.a; 3.3.b; 3.3.c).

7) Parallel examples of **כי** introducing direct speech can be read in Gen 20: 11 ; Ex 3:12; 2 Chron 28:23; of **כי** introducing an ancient saying: Is 2:3; Jer 49:16; 51:53; Ex 17:16; Zach 8:6.

8) In Jos 23: 9 also the Gilgalite historians describe the former inhabitants as great and mighty nations. This isolated example seems to find its explanation in the fact that the

historians modelled Joshua's speech on the pattern of the deuteronomic sermons (esp Dtn 7-8). It is for them not a frequently expressed or reflected theme.

9) נֶעֱרַר might also refer to the state of initiation, to one 'not yet initiated into the covenant'. See W. BEYERLIN's comment on Ex 24:5, *Herkunft und Geschichte* etc., ib. p. 47.

10) Read: לִי בְנוֹי. This is the reading presupposed in the Septuagint: τα τεκνα αυτου. Moreover, this reading agrees better with the plural of the following line.

11) Reconstructed as נַחֲלָתוֹ. Reasons justifying this reconstruction are the Septuagint reading: την κληρομιαν αυτου, and the fact that לָנוּ must be the object of Jahweh's choosing, both for grammatical reasons (cf. 1 Sam 20: 30) and theological ones (cf. Psalm 33 :12; etc.),

12) Also in this passage אֲבוֹת may originally have been understood as singular. The interpretation of such texts as applying to more 'fathers' was the conscious work of later theologians (see 3.1.c; 3.1.d; 3.1.e; 3.1.g). Text reconstructed.

13) A classical exposition of the term can be found with K. KOCH, "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel," *ZAW* 67 (1955) pp. 205-226. Of great interest seems to me the Accadic parallel 'beheru', which apart from the ordinary meaning of 'choosing' may also express the taking of soldiers into one's service (cf. W. VON SODEN, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Wiesbaden 1959, 117f., 122, 125). We know on the other hand that in Mari the allotment of land was accompanied by a census (E. A. SPEISER, "Census and Ritual Expiation in Mari and Israel," *BASOR* 149 (1958) pp. 17-25; cf. esp. p. 20 note 11). In Num 26 we find the same combination of a census of all men 'from twenty years and upwards ... all who are able to go forth to war' (vs. 2) and the allotment of land (vs. 52ff.). Could it be that the original meaning of the 'election' in Israel was the initiation of the young men who had reached a mature age into Jahweh's service, with a corresponding right to landed property?

14) K. BALTZER, *Das Bundesformular*, ib. pp. 87f.

15) From the treaty between Mursilis and Duppi-Tessub of Amurru; transl. by A. GOETZE, in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ed. J. B. PRITCHARD, Princeton 1955, pp. 203f.

16) A. ALT, "Der Gott der Vater," *BWANT* III, 12, Stuttgart 1929; also in *Kleine Schriften*, vol. I, München 1953, pp. 1-78; J. LEWY, "Les Textes PaleoAssyriens et l'Ancient Testament," *Rev. de l'Hist. des Rel.* 110 (1934) esp. pp. 50-64; H. G. MAY, "The God of My Father-A study of Patriarchal Religion," *JBR* 9 (1941) pp. 155-158, 200; C.H. GORDON, "The Patriarchal Age," *JBR* 21 (1953) pp. 238-243; J. P. HYATT, "Jahweh as 'the God of My Father'," *VT* 5 (1955) pp. 130-136; F. M. CROSS, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Th. Rev* 55 (1962) pp. 225-259.

17) It is curious, however, that also in Jos 24:2 אֲבוֹת has obviously to be taken in the singular sense, since it is given as apposition to Terah. Is אֲבוֹת here a special title, reserved to Terah as 'Stammvater'? Abraham receives, after all, only the appellation אָב (Jos 24:3). If this is true, we find also in Jos 24:2 only one אֲבוֹת.

18) Some commentators explain the passage in reference to Abraham, who was especially loved by God (cf. Is 41: 8; 2 Chron 20: 7; Gen 18:17ff.). Cf. C. F. KEIL, Leipzig 1870, p. 437; A. BERTHOLET, Freiburg 1899, p. 19; S. R. DRIVER, Edinburgh 1902, p. 77. Others maintain that Jacob is meant, since by the election of his seed other nations (Ismaelites, etc.) are excluded. Cf. E. KONIG, Leipzig 1917, p. 83; S. Frscrr, Hindhead 1947, p. 1015.

19) For the Shechemite deuteronomists the 'fathers' are never the Exodus generation. The religious community they are addressing are themselves considered the Exodus generation (cf. Dtn 4:10; 5:2; 11:2; see 1.7.g). The religious community itself was fed with the manna which their 'father' had not known (Dtn 8:3, 16).

20) A. ALT, "Der Gott der Vater," *ib.* pp. 19ff.; *Kl. Sehr.* I, pp. 18ff.; J. LEWY, "Les Textes Paleo-Assyriens," etc., *ib.* p. 54.

21) J. LEWY, "Les Textes Paleo-Assyriens," etc., *ib.*; J.P. HYATT, "Jahweh as 'the God of My Father'," *ib.* p. 133.

22) But the Samaritan Pentateuch has אֲבֹתֶיךָ in Ex 3: 6.

23) H. LUBSCZYK, *Der Auszug Israels aus Agypten*, Leipzig 1963, pp. 118, 128, 139.

24) I. MENDELSON, "The Denial of Kingship in Akkadian Documents from Ugarit," *BASOR* 143 (1956) pp. 17-22; here p. 20, note 12.

25) E. F. WEIDNER, "Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien"; *Die Staatsverträge in akkadischer Sprache aus dem Archiv von Boghazköi*, Leipzig 1923, Pact VI, Recto 3-5, 7, 26, 32, pp. 81-85; Pact IX, Recto 6, p. 125.

26) E. F. WEIDNER, "Politische Dokumente," etc., *ib.* Pact VI, Verso 17-22, pp. 87ff.

27) K. BALTZER, *Das Bundesformular*, *ib.* pp. 26f.

28) That is why "ik-nu-uk-su-nu-ti," which E. F. WEIDNER renders by 'mit seinem Siegel siegelte er', could rightly be translated as 'a attribuee par sceau' by J. NOUGAYROL. Cf. E. F. WEIDNER, *Politische Dokumente*, etc. *ib.*, Pact VI, Recto 6, 26, 32, etc., pp. 81f. J.

NOUGAYROL, *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, IV, Paris 1956, text 17.340, Verso 10, pp. 48ff.; text 17.237, Recto 5f., pp. 63f.; texts 17.382 and 17.380, Recto 19, p. 81.

29) I disagree here with G. VON RAD'S position in "Verheissenes Land und Jahwes Land," *ZDPV* (1943) pp. 192/f.; *Gesammelte Studien*, München 1958, pp. 88f. Only one text speaks of the tribe of Levi as one block, viz. Dtn 10: 9, and this text belongs obviously to a later priestly redaction (Dtn 10: 6-9).

30) G. VON RAD, "Verheissenes Land," etc. *ib.* Later texts in which נְחֻלָּה is attributed to the whole of Israel: Num 43:2; Jer 3:18, 19; 12:14, 15; 17:4; Ez 35:15; 36:12; Ps 105:11; 135:12; 136:21, 22; 1 Chron 16:18; 2 Chron 6:27.

31) It would seem that the term הִבִּיא does express more than the mere transfer from one place to another. It may rather have been a technical term for introducing someone formally into a new legal status. In this sense the term בִּוּא is employed for 'entering into slavery with someone' (Ex 21 :3), for 'entering into matrimony' (Dtn 25:5) and 'becoming a legal member of the community' (Dtn 23:5ff.). To 'bring the people in and out' means 'to rule' (Num 27:17; 1 Chron 11: 2). To 'bring a woman into one's house' implies a formal legal acceptance as wife (Dtn 21:12). In the same way הִבִּיא may have been used for 'introducing a vassal to his office, or into his kingdom'. This meaning would seem implied in Dtn 33: 7: "Hear, Jahweh, Judah's plea, and introduce him to the people ... ". Moreover, there is a parallel in the treaty between Mursilis and Niqmepa, where the overlord addresses his vassal in this way: "En ce qui te concerne, Niqmepa, *en ton pays je t'ai ramené* et roi sur le trone de ton père je t'ai fait asseoir. Le pays ou moi (Je t'ai ramené, et toi, Niqmepa) avec ton pays, vous êtes mes serviteurs." cf. J. NOUGAYROL, *Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, *ib.* text 17.338, Recto 2-4, p. 85.

31) N. LOI-IFINK, "Die deuteronomistische Darstellung des Übergangs der Führung Israels von Moses auf Josue," *Scholastik* 37 (1962) pp. 32-44.

32) L. A. SNIJDERS, "Gen 15. The Covenant with Abram," *Oud Test. Stud.* 12 (1958) pp. 261-279, here p. 268.

33) See above footnote 31 (to 3.3.e).

34) D. DAUBE, "Rechtsgedanken in den Erzählungen des Pentateuchs," *Beib. ZAW* 77 (1958) pp. 32-41, here p. 35.

35) L. ROST, *Die Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk im Alten Testament*, Festschrift O. Procksch, Leipzig 1934, pp.125-148; A. CODY, "When is the Chosen People called a Goy?" *VT* 14 (1964) pp. 1-6; R. VAN DE WALLE, "An Administrative Body of Priests and a Consecrated People," *Ind. Journ. Theol.* 14 (1965) pp. 57-72, esp. pp. 68f.

36) The next verse (Dtn 9: 2) with its reference to the Anakim is a later gloss.

37) R. DE VAUX, *Les Institutions de l' Ancien Testament*, vol. I, Paris 1961, pp. 258f.

38) Even the term גרש, pi'el, which does mean 'to drive out' (cf. Jdc 11:7) has also the technical sense of taking a right away from someone (cf. 1 Sam 26:19; 1 Kgs 2:27). This would seem to be the meaning in the few passages where the verb is applied to Jahweh's action regarding the former inhabitants (Ex 23:29ff.; 33:2; Jos 24:12, 18; Jdc 2:3; 6:9; Ps 78:55; 80:9). I have not found any evidence to support the view that the former inhabitants were 'driven away' to another place. There seems to be question either of annihilation or of a legal replacement.

39) A. ALT comes to a similar conclusion in: "Erwägungen über die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palästina," *Palästina Jahrbuch* 35 (1939) pp. 8-63; *Kl. Schr.*, vol. I, pp. 126-175.

40) For an analysis of the terminology of Holy war, see G. VON RAD, *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, Zürich 1951.

41) It may be that the very notion of עבר, 'crossing', by itself implied an encroachment on someone else's property, a claim to its ownership. Thus we find that such a crossing into one another's territory is expressly prohibited in many treaties; cf. the treaty between Hattusilis and Ramses II, J. B. PRITCHARD, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ib. p. 202 (vs. 23f.); the treaty of Suppiluliuma and Mattiwaza, Verso vs. 19ff., E. F. WEIDNER, *Politische Dokumente*, etc., ib. pp. 25ff.; the treaty of Laban with Jacob, Gen 31:52; see also Jdc 11:18-20. It is also quite evident that David's crossing the Jordan after Absalom's defeat symbolizes his new claim on the land (see esp. 2 Sam 19:41-43).

42) In Ex 23: 31 we find the following boundaries: the river (North), the desert (South), the Sea of Reeds (ים סוף, East) and the Sea of the Philistines (West). What is meant with the Sea of Reeds, ים סוף? Some commentators identify it with the Gulf of Akabah, which could be considered the extreme eastern border as it included the settlement at Eilath (J. DE FRAINE, *Exodus*, Roermond 1963, p. 181). Another solution might be that in this programmatic passage the Sea of Reeds is mentioned as the cultic equivalent of the Jordan. If this interpretation is correct, Ex 23: 31 should also be reckoned as in accordance with the West-Jordanian Land Scheme.

43) The conquest of the land of Sihon and Og is completely absent from the early Shechemite traditions. It may have come in at a later stage (cf, Dtn 29:6; Jos 24:12). The Gilgalite writings, on the other hand, abound with references to it (Dtn 1:4; 2:24-3 :13; 31:4; Jos 2 :10; 9:10; 12:4; 13 :12; 3 Kgs 4:19). We may conclude from it that the note in Dtn 4: 44-49 is from Gilgalite hands.

44) It would seem that the Shechemites only know of the 'Amorites' as a people West of the Jordan, as one of the original nations of Canaan (Dtn 7:1; 20:17). This agrees with ancient traditions (Jos 3:10; 9:1; 10:12; 11:3; 24:11, 12, 18; Jdc 1:34, 35; 1 Kgs 9:20). The Gilgalites, however, call 'Amorites' both the inhabitants of Mount Judah (Dtn 1:7, 19, 20, 27, 44; 1 Kgs 21:26; 2 Kgs 21:11; cf. Am. 2:9, 10; 2 Sam 21:2; Ez 16:3, 45) and the nations east of the Jordan (Dtn 1:4; 2:24, 31; 3:2, 8, 9; 4:46, 47; 31:4; Jdc 10:8; 1 Kgs 4:19; Cf. Jdc. 11: 21-23; Jos 24:8). The fact that East-Jordania was conquered from one of the peoples traditionally branded as disinherited by Jahweh may have served as a confirmation to the Gilgalites that also that region belonged to the 'Promised Land'.

45) The awkward position of the word Lebanon in the Hebrew phrase (without a preposition and without a connective *waw* to follow it) proves its later origin as a gloss.

46) In the light of these developments, and specifically of the Jahwistic-Elohistic extension of the promise to all the fathers, it seems to me quite possible that Gen 15:7-21 was originally a tradition that concerned Jacob and that was at home in Shechem. It corresponds exactly to the kind of land promise presupposed in Shechemitic theology. Since Abram was hailed as the founder of the sanctuary at Shechem in the later extended patriarchal traditions (cf. Gen. 12:6-7), the land promise of Gen 15:7-21 might also have been transferred to him.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

4.0. Introduction

4.0.a. The foregoing chapters have dealt with various cultic dramatizations of the history of salvation. They illustrated the existence in Israel of liturgical functions such as the Exodus Drama, the Procession from Succoth to Shechem, the Procession from Shittim to Gilgal and the ritual of Land-giving. In this chapter I will attempt to assemble the information obtained in the various sections in *a historical survey of how cultic drama and the sacred narrative of salvation were related*. This survey will, of course, possess all the qualities of general reconstructions of this kind. It will have the limitations of generalization, of oversimplification and abstraction. It will also be somewhat one-sided because of the limited amount of Old Testament text which I have been able to draw from. But I hope that it will also provide some new insight into fundamental problems that affect the whole of Old Testament studies: the relationship between various traditions and the influence of the cult on the growth of the history of salvation.

4.0.b. The historical survey of this cultic drama will at the same time permit us to outline some *new theories regarding the deuteronomic schools*. I believe that the general line of development which will be sketched on the following pages provides a constructive hypothesis on which the inter-relationship of the various deuteronomic traditions can be further examined. This hypothesis seems, moreover to be quite in harmony with the recent trends of research regarding the deuteronomic question.

4.0.c. The conclusions arrived at in this study find a very frequent contact of agreement and disagreement with other publications of this type. To many of these contacts I have attempted to refer in the foregoing chapters. In this resuming chapter I wish to draw attention to some of them. I necessarily had to be rather selective, limiting the discussion to some questions that seemed to be of particular interest. I hope in this way *to focus further study on these questions* and to stimulate discussion on the solutions offered. For, however assertive I may seem in putting forward certain solutions, I would not like to be misunderstood as to my intention. Let all my criticisms and suggestions be regarded as argued questions.

4.1. The Pre-Conquest Dramatization of the Exodus

4.1.a. There is good evidence to accept that we possess in certain passages of Ex 1-20 traces of a dramatization of the Exodus Event. It is superfluous to repeat all the arguments for this fact which we enumerated elsewhere (2.5.a-2.5.c). Let it suffice to recall that its character seemed to require a feast in which Jahweh was acclaimed king of Israel (2.5.c) and that this would confirm the results arrived at by some outstanding authors (2.3.e). The point we want to make here is that *this Exodus Drama must have originated in pre-conquest times*, even if it has undergone later redactions because of the Shechemite (2.5.f) and Gilgalite (2.5.e) liturgical practices and their literary expressions. This pre-conquest origin can be proved by three independent and major arguments. In the first place, the references to the Exodus have such a prominent and independent role in Old Testament tradition that they postulate a very specific and distinct origin. The disparity of these references with those concerning the Land-giving demonstrate that the Exodus event cannot be put on a par with the giving of the land. The Exodus event is unique and serves by itself as characterizing Jahweh's relationship to Israel (2.1.a-2.1.k). A second argument is based on the traces of the Exodus Drama itself. In this Drama we find a total absence of any problematics regarding the land or regarding the patriarchs. This absence becomes completely unintelligible in the supposition that the Exodus Drama were to have its origin after the conquest (2.3.g; 2.3.n). Thirdly, the formula, 'You have seen' ... is only applied to the Exodus event and never to the Land-giving. This, again, postulates that the Exodus had been dramatized in a different manner than the Land-giving (2.2.e). These three arguments mutually confirm one another so that we can rightly conclude to the existence of a form of the Exodus Drama independent from and earlier than the conquest.

4.1.b. The theological implications of this conclusion are of great importance. It has long been recognized by scholars that the Exodus event enjoyed such a prominent place in Hebrew tradition (2.1.d). But it has not, perhaps, been sufficiently adverted to that this prominent position could be the result of the great antiquity and lasting influence of a kingship drama in which the Exodus was cultically represented (2.5.i). If the Exodus may rightly be called the oldest and all-determining event in the history of salvation, it is good to remember that it received this prominence through the cult. In other words: *the oldest formulations of the history of salvation are expressions of what had been dramatized first in the liturgy*. The expression of the history of salvation has, therefore, a cultic and not a literary origin.

4.1.c. There is another significant conclusion to be drawn. It concerns the nature of the Sinaitic covenant. D. J. McCarthy makes the following statement regarding this covenant at Sinai:

"In its significant omissions the J version of Sinai agrees with that of Ex 19-24. The historical element is lacking. Certainly the text itself is a history of what happened on Sinai, but there is no sign of an historical prologue in the sense of the Hittite treaties. That is to say, there is no recounting of a series of past events as background and foundation for the covenant. The coming of Jahweh with its awe-inspiring accompaniments is described, and it is the mere presence of Jahwe which founds the covenant. This is the antithesis of the historical prologue. It is not what Jahweh *has done* which is the source of the covenant, it is what He *is*. This stands out the more when we glance at Joshua 24. This latter also represents a covenant ceremony but here it is the history of what Jahwe

has done which leads up to His demands and Israel's acceptance. At Sinai Jahwe simply presents Himself: that is enough and more to establish a ground for what follows." ¹⁾

4.1.d. I believe that this characterization of the Sinaitic covenant does not do justice to the facts. For, as we have seen the kingship celebration of Sinai is the climax of the Drama in which precisely Jahweh's historical interventions for His people are recalled and celebrated. Even if the foregoing history is not expressed in the way of the Hittite treaties, it certainly is background and foundation for acclaiming Jahweh as king. The opening lines of the Decalogue should thus not be brushed aside as 'a form of identification of the God who appears' (D. J. McCarthy, *ib.* p. 161), but should be taken as a forerunner of a genuine historical prologue. Even if the Sinaitic covenant lacks other qualities of the Hittite pact, it cannot be said to lack a historical foundation for Jahweh's claims. It seems, therefore, more correct to state with W. Beyerlin that the basic form of the Mosaic Covenant at Sinai already corresponded to the pattern of the vassality treaties.²⁾

4.2. *The Shechemite Land Ritual (1250-1050 BC)*

4.2.a. In our first chapter we outlined the reasons for assuming that between Succoth and Shechem a periodic liturgical procession was conducted (1.8.d). This procession was related to the Covenant (1.8.c) and had, in all likelihood, its festive occurrence on the feast of Tabernacles during the Year of Release (1.8.b). *The origin of this procession could be placed in the period of the judges, i.e. from 1250-1050 BC.* Again we dispose of a number of independent arguments which prove this dating. The procession certainly symbolizes the taking possession of the land (3.4.e). This, together with the other rituals at Shechem that express a cultic justification for the conquest, can only have had its origin in the period of the conquest itself (1.8.h). The presence of the ark in the procession points to a date anterior to the destruction of Shiloh (1050 BC; 1.8.h). The concept of the Jordan being the boundary of the Promised Land, which is solemnly crossed in the procession, agrees with the ancient West-Jordanian Land Scheme (3.6.b; 3.6.c). At the same time it postulates a political situation preceding the conquests of David and Solomon, in which the Transjordanian regions had not yet been incorporated into 'Israel' (cf. 3.6.l). The amphictyonic traditions that are connected to the procession (3.1.f) also point to an early dating, in fact a dating that goes back to the period before the kings. We may thus legitimately conclude that the processional practice, as it is found with the early Shechemites, originated in the centuries immediately following on the conquest (1250-1050 BC).

4.2.b. In this earliest tradition the Covenantal renewal itself was celebrated in Succoth (1.8.f; 3.7.f). The crossing of the Jordan was not yet seen as the re-enactment of the miracle at the Sea of Reeds (3.5.c). *This crossing and the procession that followed on it symbolized the taking possession of the Promised Land* (3.4.e; 3.5.b). We may, perhaps, reconstruct the cultic 'picture' as follows: every seventh year, at the feast of Tabernacles, the people withdrew to the desert to identify themselves once more with to the Exodus generation (1.8.c; 3.2.f). The Exodus Drama was performed and Jahweh re-affirmed as king (2.5.f). The people knew themselves present once more at Horeb (Dtn 5:2) and through the ancient cult drama they were re-integrated into their covenantal relationship to Jahweh (2.5.i). But, and this is what is new in the Shechemite practice, Jahweh has taken His people to a new land. Horeb (*in casu*, Succoth) is only the beginning, but not the end of Jahweh's care for His people. In the cultic procession from Succoth to Shechem they were still to re-enact a two-fold reality: Jahweh's

journey from Sinai to His sanctuary in the Promised Land (2.0.b) and the consequent occupation of the land by His people (3.7.b). The ritual of the procession was distinct from the Exodus celebrations, even though it may have been seen as their logical extension (3.7.c). In fact, the early Shechemites base the occupation of the land not on the Sinaitic Covenant, but on the promise to Jacob. Israel is adopted by Jahweh and is given the land, because of His love for Jacob (3.7.e). It would seem, therefore, that we have here *the coming together of two originally distinct traditions: the Exodus celebrations and the land-promise tradition of Jacob*. The Land-giving tradition may have been connected from the beginning with Shechem. The procession from Succoth to Shechem constituted the liturgical attempt to combine these two traditions into one uniform celebration. This was, moreover, a natural development since Jahweh's journey from Sinai to His sanctuary was an established *datum* in ancient tradition (2.0.b; 1.6.a-1.6.f). H.J. Kraus is right when he states that the Exodus and Land-giving traditions were united in the cult and not by the literary activity of an author such as the Jahwist. But I disagree with his hypothesis that the Exodus tradition was at home in Shechem and the Land-giving tradition at Gilgal, and that the two traditions were united when the amphictyonic centre was moved from Shechem to Gilgal.³⁾ The first link between these two traditions should be sought in the procession from Succoth to Shechem.

4.2.c. It is obvious that our reconstruction of the ancient Shechemitic rites throws a new light on the *deuteronomic code of law*. Many authors admit that this code of law contains ancient Hebrew traditions, but they ascribed its composition to levitic circles in the seventh century BC ⁴⁾ The code is regarded as a somewhat 'utopian' idealization, which remained without any true influence on life until its sanction by Josiah (621 BC: 2 Kgs 22-23). "Its historical activity did not begin until it had been found under Josiah." ⁵⁾ "We can no longer discover with certainty whether it came into being only at that time or five to ten decades earlier. But in any case it first began to have its effects from the year 621." ⁶⁾ I have already had occasion to point out that the code does not fit in the cult at Jerusalem. Not even during Josiah's reform (1.7.i). On the other hand, the newly discovered setting for the law in the covenantal instruction at Succoth would suggest that it was effective during that period (i.e. 1250-1050 BC). The studies of J. L'Hour ⁷⁾ who defends such an early, actual practice of the law, merit a serious hearing (see also 1.7.e).

4.2.d. Another weighty consequence of accepting our re-construction of the early Shechemite practices, such as we outlined above, concerns the place of the patriarchs in covenantal tradition. It would seem that their connection with the official Israelite cult is frequently under-estimated. R. E. Clements makes the following observation:

"It was only during and after the exile that the patriarchs began to feature in Israelite prophecy as the founders of the nation, and as the first to receive the call of Yahweh. Among the pre-exile prophets it is only Hosea who makes any considerable use of traditions about the patriarchs. The patriarchs, therefore, did not figure in the election traditions of Israel until after the exile, when Yahweh's call of Abraham, and the promises to Jacob, were looked upon as the earliest beginning of Yahweh's purpose with Israel. What explanation are we to offer for this? ...

The reason for this must be that the stories of the patriarchs did not originally form a central part of the covenant tradition of Israel. They were at first only indirectly related to it. Whilst some parts of Israel identified the gods of the patriarchs with Yahweh, it is apparent that there were also others who sharply distinguished them from the God of Israel. For a long time no uniformity of attitude existed, but different sanctuaries presented the origins and claims of the Yahwistic religion in their own way." ⁸⁾

4.2.e. It can, of course, not be denied that the patriarchs played a different role in the various leading sanctuaries. But it seems hardly justifiable to deny them an important place in the pre-exilic election traditions of Israel. For the early Shechemites the election of Israel is precisely the consequence of Jahweh's love for Jacob (3.0.c; 3.0.f). Jacob is a central figure in early Shechemite theology: he is the 'father' who brought Israel down to Egypt (Dtn 10:22; 26:5; 3.1.f); to him the promise of land and of the covenant were made (3.2.b; 3.2.c; 3.2.f); Jahweh is really 'Jacob's God' (3.1.i); and the people are identified with 'Israel' and the twelve tribes of Jacob (3.1.f). Such ancient texts as Dtn 4: 37-38 and 16: 5 ascribe even the Exodus to Jahweh's promise to Jacob. In other words: they make the Exodus event a fore-runner and preparation for the Land-giving. As we have seen above, this was the achievement of the Shechemite practice; There, for the first time, a cultic link was forged between those two traditions. What they did by their cult, they also expressed in their theology. Jacob becomes the link between the two traditions. It is because of Jahweh's love for him that his children are 'elected', 'adopted', in the Exodus, the Covenant and the Land-giving. The pattern of 'love for the father' and 'election of the children' corresponds to accepted adoption practices (3.0.g; 3.0.h; 3.0.i). Jacob, had, therefore, a central place in the ancient election tradition of the Shechemites, and Hos 11: 1, Is 14:1 and Ps 47: 5 are precious parallels of the same tradition (3.0.f).

4.2.f. It may also be good to reflect anew on the meaning of the feast of Tabernacles. There are, of course, widely divergent opinions regarding the origin and primary meaning of the feast. R. de Vaux speaks about it in these terms:

"One recent writer has attempted to justify the connection of the feast of Tents with the desert. He does not deny that it was an agricultural feast, or that it was connected with Canaanite customs: he claims, however, that when the Israelites were living as semi-nomads, they still had a feast of Tents: the regulations in Nb 2, about the arrangement of the camp around the Tent of Re-union, refer, he says, to this. Secondly, Dtn 31:9-13 prescribes that the Law be read out at the feast of Tents: therefore the feast must have been a feast for the renewal of the Covenant, celebrated, at first, at Shechem ... This argument is not convincing. The ancient texts (down to, and including Deuteronomy) stress only the agricultural aspects of the feast, and the explanation given in Lv 24:43 is clearly not the primary one. There is no proof whatever that, in Old Testament times, the feast commemorated the Covenant, and Dtn 31:9-13 connects the reading of the Law primarily with the sabbatical year, and only secondarily with the feast of Tents in that year. And when, in later ages, the Covenant was commemorated on a feast, the feast chosen was not the feast of Tents, but the feast of Weeks."⁹⁾

4.2.g. The oldest explicit mention of the Covenant having been celebrated on the feast of Weeks is only found in the Book of Jubilees and with the Essenes of Qumran. Ex 19:1 and 2 Chron 15:10 could possibly be adduced as implicit testimony of a similar practice known to the Priestly tradition.¹⁰⁾ The connection of the Covenant to the feast of Weeks is, therefore, a very late one indeed. The deuteronomic Law, as we have seen, reflects a cultic practice of the period following immediately on the conquest (4.2.a). It presupposes a desert setting for its covenantal instruction (1.7.g) and thus the link with the feast of Tabernacles made in Dtn 31:9-13 becomes a very natural one (1.7.b; 1.7.d; 1.7.l). Hosea's prophecies reflect a similar practice (1.2.c; 1.2.d). Covenantal instruction in the desert fits in with the addresses before the crossing (1.4.a), and there are frequent references to it in the covenantal psalms (1.3.e).

Add to this the explicit testimonies of the priestly traditions as to what the 'living in tents' meant: a re-enactment of the Exodus (Lev 23:43), a preparation for renewing the Covenant (Neh 8:14-18; 9:1-38), a celebration in honour of Jahweh as King (Zach 14:16). It would seem, therefore, that there is good evidence to link the feast of Tabernacles with the Covenant, and this right from the earliest times onwards. I realize that the question would need a far more thorough and detailed discussion than can be given in the context of this book. All I want to say here is that the re-discovery of the processional practice at Succoth and Shechem provides fresh evidence for accepting a historical and ancient connection between the covenantal celebrations and the feast of Tabernacles.

4.3. *Covenantal Celebrations in the Northern Kingdom (929-722 BC)*

4.3.a. There is clear evidence for the fact that the practice of going up in procession from Succoth to Shechem did not stop with the withdrawal of the ark. In fact, as we find references to the practice in both Hosea and the Elohist, we may presume that it was maintained until the destruction of Samaria in 722 BC. But a comparison of the principal sources at our disposal for this period would indicate *certain lines of development* in the processional celebrations.

4.3.b. The most important development concerns the meaning of the Jordan crossing itself. The early Shechemites saw in this crossing nothing more than the beginning of the cultic occupation of the land (1.7.g; 3.5.c; 3.5.d). The Exodus Drama is something that precedes the crossing (2.5.f). The crossing of the Jordan has no miraculous element for them (3.5.e). Even Jos 24: 3-13 still reflects this separation to some extent, since the Exodus Drama (vs. 5-7) and the crossing of the Jordan (vs 11) are not identified. But *the later traditions present the crossing as the re-enactment of the miracle at the Sea of Reeds*. The tradition underlying Jos 3-4 presupposes a miraculous crossing of the Jordan and links this crossing explicitly with the Exodus miracle (1.0.a; 1.1.c; ff.). Also the Elohist identifies the two by narrating the miracle at the Sea of Reeds with terminology that reminds us of the cultic crossing of the Jordan (1.4.c; 1.4.d).

4.3.c. This development cannot be separated from another change that had meanwhile taken place. The early Shechemites still celebrated the Covenantal feast itself at Succoth (1.7.m; 1.8.f.); the Land-giving ritual at Shechem was seen as a complement (3.7.d). At some stage, however, *the covenantal celebrations themselves were shifted to Shechem*. Jos 24 proves this convincingly. So does the preaching of Hosea (1.2.c; 1.2.d) and the patriarchal tradition handed down by the Elohist (1.3.d). Even if the Exodus Drama was still produced on the eastern banks of the Jordan, the re-affirmation of the Covenant - in the full form of a vassality treaty - took place at Shechem.

4.3.d. A significant theological shift came about when *the traditions of Jacob were extended to all three patriarchs*. This is one of the most puzzling developments. In the deuteronomic Law itself we find traces of a deliberate change to a plurality of fathers (3.1.c; 3.1.e). The Elohist retains the tradition that links Jacob to the procession (Gen 33: 17-20; 1.3.a,ff.), but joins in the general effort to unite the three patriarchs (3.1.g). Jos 24 begins salvific history with a plurality of patriarchs (vs. 2-4), but Hosea mentions Jacob alone. One gains the impression that this work of extending the traditions to more fathers is more a literary process than a cultic one (3.1.e; 3.1.g).

4.3.e. Further areas of development can be found in *the liturgical organization*. Jos 3-4, Hosea and the Elohist traditions make us suspect that the processional route could boast of many famous shrines: Jacob's House in Succoth, Adamah, Galed (with the 'miraculous'

footprints?), and the various holy places in Shechem itself. The ritual of renouncing idolatrous practice could also belong to this period. (1.8.g).

4.3.f. Reviewing these aspects of development one cannot escape the conclusion that their roots are very old. Since Shechem was undoubtedly gaining importance in the course of time, the centre of gravity would naturally tend to coincide with it. This tendency to concentrate the main liturgical events at Shechem must have begun from the earliest times. Perhaps, the joining of new tribes to the amphictyony, tribes which had not taken part in the Exodus and the Covenant on Sinai, would make it even more desirable to arrange the covenantal ceremonies themselves at Shechem. Whatever may have been the date of this first transfer from Succoth to Shechem and whatever may have been the causes that led up to it, one thing is certain: *the sanctuary at Shechem became in this way the cultic Sinai of the Covenant*. The ceremonies in Succoth: the Exodus Drama, the various rebellions in the desert, the crossing of the Jordan as a re-enactment of the miracle at the Sea of Reeds and the symbolic, land-conquering march to Shechem, were only preparations that preceded the real Sinaitic Covenant to be concluded on the Ebal. The cultic mediator would, in the style of the current vassality treaties, refer to these foregoing, history re-enacting, ceremonies in the historical prologue of the pact. A clear example of this can be found in Jos 24:2-13. The so-called 'deuteronomic creed' of Dtn 6:21-23 and Dtn 26:5-9 may, perhaps, be adduced as early instances of the same tendency. The oracles in Jdc 2:1-5, Am 2:9-11 and Ex 19:3-6 show a similar prologue, based on the combination of Exodus and Land-giving, to introduce the Covenant. As I have shown elsewhere (2.1.b), this pattern of Exodus and Land-giving became the basis for the 'classical' scheme of the history of salvation. The Jahwistic and Elohist traditions are structured on precisely the same pattern (2.3.g). We may, consequently, surmise that *the Exodus Land-giving pattern of the history of salvation derived from the processional practice at Shechem*. For it was in that practice that the cultic mediator could point back to these two events as the stages of God's plan of salvation.

4.3.g. The implications of the last paragraph will be obvious for anyone who is familiar with Old Testament studies. For many decades scholars have been puzzled at the total absence of the Sinai event in the large majority of passages that contain the history of salvation in outline. G. von Rad was the first to raise the question. He suggested that the Sinai tradition was originally distinct from the Settlement tradition (i.e. the Exodus Land-giving pattern), and that their combination was due to the literary work of the Jahwist.

"Let us cast a brief glance at the various poetical representations of the redemption story (Ps LXXVIII, CV, CXXXV; Exod. XV; 1 Sam XII. 8; Joshua XXIV). All of them follow to a greater or lesser extent the canonical outline of the Settlement tradition and thus overlook simply the Sinai episode. This is the more striking in view of the fact that they are otherwise very ready to recount events the significance of which is in no way comparable with that of the events at Sinai. Only in the exilic Ps. CVI and in the prayer of Neh. IX, does the Sinai episode appear as an event of the redemption story. It can only be that the association of the two traditions was of recent origin, not something which the Yahwist found ready-made, since even at a time later than that of the Yahwist it had not taken root in the traditional account of the history of redemption. It is in fact to the Yahwist himself that we owe the fusion of the Sinai tradition with the Settlement tradition ... " ¹¹⁾

4.3.h. It has already been pointed out by many scholars that the original separation of these two traditions can no longer be maintained (1.0.c, esp., Chapter 1, note 5; 2.3.c). History (the Settlement account) and Covenant (the Sinai event) belong together as two elements of a

basic concept. ¹²⁾ But the question raised regarding the absence of the Sinai event in the historical prologue itself is thereby not altogether solved. H. B. Huffmon certainly contributed to the solution by pointing out that in the vassality treaties the granting of the treaty itself is not one of the favours enumerated in the historical prologue. "This is also why Sinai, which represents lawgiving (or, perhaps, better 'receiving of law') based upon prior gracious acts of the suzerain, is not part of the Credo." ¹³⁾ The difficulty that could be raised against H. B. Huffman's observation is that in those vassality treaties the granting of the treaty would normally follow on the events narrated in the prologue, whereas the Sinai event would seem to come before the Land-giving. It is here that our research may be of a help. Since Shechem had become the 'Cultic Sinai' and since the Exodus and Land-giving were re-enacted together in the procession from Suecoth to Shechem, it becomes quite understandable why the Sinai event is not mentioned in the historical account. The Exodus-Land-giving pattern of the history of salvation reflects the cultic practice. Sinai fits in, not as part of the re-enactment of salvific history but as the concluding covenantal ceremony itself.

4.4. *The Deuteronomistic School at Gilgal (850-587 BC)*

4.4.a. Ever since M. Noth had so convincingly illustrated that the history from Deuteronomy up to the last books of Kings was composed by redactors who adhered to characteristic theological principles ¹⁴⁾, these historians have been the object of study. I believe that my own research has also yielded some new information on their outlook and their background. We will try to highlight some of our main conclusions.

4.4.b. The deuteronomistic historians manifest an explicit disregard for, if not contempt of, Shechem. Not only have important data about Shechem been suppressed but also all through the narrative Shechem is presented as a place of religious misfortune (2.4.c). This agrees, for that matter, with the historians' general dislike for the Northern Kingdom and its dynasties. Ever since the erection of the golden calves (1 Kgs 12) they keep a critical view of the North. Also the kings of Judah are subjected to heavy criticism, but there are at least four of them who merit praise: David, Asa, Hezekiah and Josiah. The historians' problematics regarding Edom (3.6.h; 3.6.g) also demonstrates a more direct involvement in Judah. The theme of the Temple at Jerusalem demands that the historians had access to it. It is, therefore, quite sure that the school of historians had their domicile in the Southern Kingdom, *in Judah*. It is not very likely that they had any influence in Jerusalem before the time of Josiah (2 Kgs 22-23). Judging from their writings it is quite clear that *Gilgal* was considered of special importance to them. They draw many of their traditions from that sanctuary. Their great heroes, Joshua, Samuel, Elijah and Elisha, are connected to it. We may thus safely link this school of historians to the holy place of Gilgal (2.4.d).

4.4.c. The aversion of these Gilgalites from Shechem does not mean that they did not owe anything to the Shechemite traditions. On the contrary. *The Gilgalite deuteronomists depend heavily on early Shechemite tradition*. This dependence can be illustrated in four separate instances. The first one concerns the crossing of the Jordan. The analysis of Jos 3-4 shows that the older tradition, of a crossing near Shechem, was later adapted to a similar practice near Gilgal (1.1.a - 1.1.h). That the Jordan was ceremoniously crossed near Gilgal is also witnessed to by P and by Micha (2.4.e). But Jos 3-4 clearly implied that this practice at Gilgal depended on the earlier practice at Shechem. A second instance of this cultic dependence is provided by the redactional note in Dtn 11:30. For from this note we learn that the sanctuary of Gilgal possessed its own 'Ebal and Gerizim'. But no one will deny that the mountains which originally

carried those names are the ones that flank Shechem. The transfer of cultic practices from Shechem to Gilgal must have involved the transfer of the names too (2.4.h). As a third instance might be taken the fact that the Gilgalite historians adopted the Shechemite law as one block (Dtn 5-28) and that they made it the pre-ample for their whole historical narrative. This surely implies that they possessed this Shechemite law as a traditional document of the greatest value. There is, finally, another clear instance of dependence in the Gilgalite view of the extent of the Holy Land. It was not difficult for us to establish that they deliberately sought for new explanations to fit the accepted formulas: "All the land on which your foot has trodden, I will give to you;" "all the land until the great river;" "from Dan to Beershebah" (3.6.g -3.6.m). In Dtn 11:24 the redactor's change can still be seen in the clumsy arrangement of the text as it stands now (3.6.m). From all these instances one conclusion may be drawn. *The Gilgalites accepted the Shechemite practice (Dtn 5-28) as normative*. Without changing this practice or its formulations, they seek to apply them to their own cultic situation at Gilgal.

4.4.d. What more can we find out about these Gilgalites? One outstanding feature of their writings is *military and political interest*. Many considerations confirm this aspect of Gilgalite ambition. Their long account of Israel's history is, no doubt, a religious work, but it conveys at the same time such an outspoken political ideal that the reader will immediately identify the authors as 'nationalists'. What is more, the whole 'national history' of Israel is seen as an endless succession of wars. The book of Judges, for example, has purposely been composed on the pattern of invasion - defeat - counteroffensive - victory (3.2.h). The terminology of the Gilgalites is heavily coloured with military significance. This applies to terms as **ירוש** (3.4.k), **הוריש** (3.4.1), **הנחיל**, (3.3.e) and even 'giving the land' itself (3.2.j; 3.2.k). 'Crossing the Jordan' implies military aggression for them (3.5.1; 3.5.m). They manifest an obvious pre-occupation with territorial problems, such as the rights to Edom (3.6.h; 3.6.h), the status of Transjordan (3.6.i; 3.6.j; 3.6.k) and the exact boundaries (3.6.m). The great mediators between God and man are portrayed as leaders in the political and military fields as well. One need only think of Moses' conquests in the Transjordan, Joshua's military campaigns, Samuel's involvement in the war against the Philistines and in Israelite politics (1 Sam 7-12) and Elisha's share in the revolt of Jehu (2 Kgs 9:2-10). On the other hand, all through the history there is the theme of the tension between these spiritual mediators and the purely political leaders, the kings. The historians obviously take sides with the mediators, taking a negative attitude to practically all kings about which they have to report. From all this information we may definitely conclude that the Gilgalites belong to *a militant group of religious men*, who want to reform the society in which they live according to certain religious and political ideals.

4.4.e. We have already pointed to the significance of Gilgal for the historians (4.4.b). Would it also be possible to define the period in which they operated? To this question also a rather definite reply can be given. *The tradition of the Gilgalite school was moulded in the century following on Solomon, i.e. from 929-800 BC*. The Gilgalites are later than the Shechemite practice, but they still know and appreciate it as a living law of life (4.4.c). They are positively hostile to Shechem as a Sanctuary (2.4.c; 4.4.b). These two facts combined suggest that their own practices were derived from early Shechemite cult, but that they disagreed with the form it took in later times. They presuppose that Shechemite rituals are still in vogue at that sanctuary as a rival to their own understanding of these rituals. In other words, Gilgalite theology arose in a period when covenantal celebrations were still going on in the sanctuary (i.e. from 929-722 BC; 4.4.b). The Gilgalite conception of the extent of the land also throws light on the period in which it arose. Since the extension of the Kingdom under Solomon is taken as the norm and ideal (3.6.m; 3.6.k; 3.6.n; etc.), the theological conviction arising from

it must have come about after Solomon (929 BC). On the other hand, Israelite claims to Edomite territory seem still to be active (3.6.g; 3.6.h), so that we have to place Gilgalite problematics regarding this point in the period from Edom's war of independence (2 Kgs 8:20-22; 850BC?) and Amaziah's counter-attack (2 Kgs 14:7; 796 BC?) until Edom's final victory (2 Kgs 16:5; 736 BC?). A third factor to help us determine the 'tradition building' period of the Gilgalites is the prominence of Elijah and Elisha (2.4.f). It is clear that these two men have left their mark on the future theological convictions of the historians. We may well suppose that the disciples of Elisha, who were so actively involved in Jehu's revolt (2 Kgs 9-10; 842 BC), were the immediate fore-runners, if not the first generation of the Gilgalite deuteronomists. Summarizing the available evidence we thus put the beginnings of the Gilgalite school in the period from 929-800 AD, allowing, of course, for its further active existence until the time of the Judean exile (587 BC).

4.4.f. The Gilgalite deuteronomists depend on the practice of the early Shechemites (4.4.c). Yet they are opposed to the rituals at Shechem as they were celebrated in later times (4.4.b). This may, perhaps, explain another outstanding characteristic of their theology. The Gilgalites do not adhere to the pattern of the history of salvation which is based on the Exodus and the Land-giving. *For them the history of salvation is one continuous series of liberations* (2.4.a; 2.4.b). The land-giving is not so much a one-time gift as a blessing of the covenant which can be withdrawn or restored according to the people's state of fidelity (3.2.k). The explanation for this development is not so difficult. We have seen that in the practice of the early Shechemites the Covenant was celebrated on the eastern banks of the Jordan with the Exodus Drama. The rites on the western bank were only the complement to them, rituals that concerned mainly the legal taking possession of the land. This same basic pattern remained preserved in Gilgal. The cultic indications of Jos 1-6 allow us to reconstruct Gilgalite practice in this form: (a) the Covenant was celebrated in Transjordan (Dtn 28:69); (b) three days of intense preparation preceded the crossing (Jos 1:11; 3:2); (c) the crossing itself symbolized the miracle at the Sea of Reeds (Jos 3: 23); (d) there was circumcision for those re-converted to Jahwism (Jos 5:2-9); (e) the feast of the Passover followed on the fourth day after the crossing; (f) there were various rites to signify the taking possession of the land: the eating of the first produce (Jos 5:10-12), the symbolic capture of Jericho (Jos 6:1-27) and the ceremony of blessing and curse (Jos 8:30-35). It is clear that early Shechemite practice provided the pattern on which these rites developed. New is the connection with *the Pascha*. No doubt this was a natural development, since the Exodus Drama could easily be linked to it (3.7.1). The circumcision ritual, apparently for adults, would fit in with the general purpose of the Gilgalite theologians to reintegrate the people into Jahwism. An interesting feature is the symbolic capture of Jericho. It shows that the dramatization of salvific history did not stop with the Exodus Drama, but that it included other victories. How much of the Gilgalite 'history of salvation' was re-enacted? We don't know. But it should be noted that the formula 'You have seen ...', which in other traditions is exclusively used when referring to the Exodus Drama (2.2.c), is extended to other miracles by the Gilgalites: the exaltation of Joshua during the crossing of the Jordan (Jos 4:14); the sun miracle (Jos 10:12); the defeat of the Canaanites (Jos 23:3); the miraculous storm (1 Sam 12:16) and the miraculous taking fire of Elijah's sacrifice (1 Kgs 18:39). Was it merely a cultic phrase, put in the mouth of the famous mediators? Or may we suspect that some of these events were dramatized (2.2.e, Chapter 2, note 33)?

4.4.g. When the deuteronomic school (Elijah and his disciples after their flight from the North in 850 BC?; cf. 1 Kgs 19:1-3) settled in Gilgal they must have found certain ancient

traditions that had already been attached to that sanctuary for a long time. H. J. Kraus draws our attention to the presence of the Ark:

"The Ark tradition in the Gilgal narratives deserves special attention in this connection. It is surprising that in Joshua iii-v there is no mention of the 'sacred Tent', which - as we have already seen - elsewhere is part of the camp arrangement. This would suggest that we are really in the sphere of a sacral tradition in Canaan of which we have seen evidence elsewhere in the Old Testament. Joshua iii-v does, in fact, deal with the entrance into the promised land and with a tradition that points to the Gilgal cult. But what part is played by the Ark in this complex of traditions? There are three main aspects which we can pick out: (1) the guiding presence of Yahweh, which is directly connected with the Ark and which precedes the camp after it has broken up (cf. Num x. 35f.); (2) the significance of the shrine in the event of 'holy war' as it is demonstrated in the cult (cf. again Num x. 35f): (3) the character of the sacred Ark as a processional shrine. These three aspects appear time after time with varying emphasis in the Ark tradition." ¹⁵⁾

4.4.h. In the earlier centuries after the conquest of the land the Ark may have been attached to various amphictyonic sanctuaries in turn (1.7.j) It is, therefore, by no means excluded that also Gilgal possessed its own traditions in which the Ark played a role. This is what might have been the case in the legend of the capture of Jericho. But it is not likely that the deuteronomic Gilgalites, in the later monarchic period, could dispose of the Ark for their cultic rites. Jos 3-10 is, as a matter of fact, the only evidence we have for the Ark having been at Gilgal. It is clear from our literary analysis that 'Sammler' who composed these chapters drew heavily on a tradition describing the crossing between Succoth and Shechem (1.1.b.ff.).

4.4.i. I would like, therefore, to suggest another solution for the presence of the Ark in later Gilgalite tradition. That 'Sammler', and thus the deuteronomic Gilgalites, refer to specific cultic practices in which something like the Ark is involved, cannot be doubted. For in the crossing itself the Ark follows different rubrics than the ones adhered to at Shechem (1.1.d). And the specific stress on 'priests' carrying the Ark (1.1.b, note 12) and the detailed rubrics for the seven-fold procession round Jericho (Jos 6) presuppose a living practice. But it seems to me almost certain that *the latter Gilgalites made use of a substitute Ark for their liturgy*. Some arguments confirm this hypothesis. First and foremost, the cultic description in Jos 3-4 implies a distinction between the original sacred act, the crossing near Adam (with the miracle and with Joshua!), and the re-enactment at Gilgal. It is clear that in the liturgical re-enactment the persons, things and events of the original sacral happening were substituted: the miraculous crossing by a symbolic wading through the Jordan, Joshua by the cultic mediator, and so on. In this way the Ark also may have been cultically substituted by a similar object representing it. Secondly, we have evidence that in later Gilgalite practice the miraculous crossing is ascribed to the cultic mediator (Elijah: 2 Kgs 2:8; Elisha 2 Kgs 2:14), in obvious connection to former miraculous crossings (2.4.f). This same tendency of making the cultic mediator take the place of the Ark appears equally in the terminology of the Land-giving. Whereas it is Jahweh Himself, present in the Ark, who 'leads Israel into the Land' and 'crosses the Jordan ahead of the people' in ancient Shechemite tradition, for the Gilgalites it is Joshua who 'leads Israel into the land' and 'crosses the Jordan' before them (3.3.e). But this same tendency is already present in Jos 3-4. For it is not the Ark, or its cultic substitute, which is

'glorified' by the miraculous crossing, but Joshua, the cultic mediator (Jos 3:7; 4:14). This trend of giving more importance to the cultic mediator can only have begun when the actual Ark was no longer there. Thirdly, if the actual Ark were present in the cult of Jos 3-5, there surely should have been mention of the 'Sacred Tent', as H. J. Kraus points out, or at least of the new sanctuary where it is deposited (Num 10:36; cf. 2.0.b). The absence of such a 'shrine' for the Ark makes it likely that a temporary cultic substitute for it was used during the celebrations only.

4.4.j. The prominence of the cultic mediator in Gilgalite tradition (2.4.d; 2.4.f) may also suggest a solution for the oracle in Jdc 2:1-5. It is clear that Ex 23 and Ex 34 contain a code of law related to deuteronomic law. We may, therefore, place them in the line of ancient Shechemite practice.¹⁶) This code promises that 'God's angel' will precede the people into the Promised Land (Ex 23:20, 23; 32:34). In the terms of the ancient Shechemites this certainly refers to Jahweh preceding in the procession to Shechem by His presence in the Ark. But the Gilgalites may have understood this promise in the sense that *the cultic mediator is the 'angel of God' who precedes*. For it is actually Joshua who precedes the people into the Holy Land (3.3.e). And we know that the cultic mediators at Gilgal acted on the instigation of the 'angel of Jahweh' (Elijah: 1 Kgs 19:4-7; 2 Kgs 1:3, 15) so that the oracles they speak are actually the words of the 'angel of Jahweh'. They could say: 'The angel of Jahweh told me' (cf. 1 Kgs 13:18). The 'angel of Jahweh' gives oracles through the cultic mediator, so that Balaam's blessing is really the blessing spoken by the 'angel of Jahweh' (Num 22:35). In this context it becomes understandable how the 'angel of Jahweh' in Jdc 2:1-6 can 'go up from Gilgal to Bochim' (vs. 1), can give an oracle (vs. 1-3) and can address the whole community (vs. 4). It is, in fact, the cultic mediator who - prompted by the 'angel of Jahweh' and acting in his name - does these things. Jdc 2:1-6 belongs therefore unmistakably to Gilgalite tradition, but it does not follow that Ex 23 and Ex 34 would also be at home in Gilgal. The similarities between the code in these chapters in Exodus and Gilgalite tradition can easily be explained by the dependence of Gilgal on early Shechemite practice (4.4.c).¹⁷)

4.5. *The Transition from 'cultic drama' to 'sacred narrative'*

4.5.a. From the matter reviewed so far we may now deduce some general conclusions as to the gradual development of the 'history of salvation.' I believe that we are justified to indicate the following stages:

a) The history of salvation comprising *only the liberation from Egypt* with all the accompanying deeds of Jahweh. This concept is certainly pre-conquest (4.1.a) and was expressed in a sacred drama (4.1.b). Its literary expressions can mainly be traced in the peculiar 'Exodus formulas' (2.1.a - 2.1.k), the cultic phrase 'You have seen what I did to Egypt' (2.2.a - 2.2.m) and in the traces of the Exodus Drama still found in some chapters of Exodus (2.3.a - 2.3.n).

b) The early Shechemites link this liberation from Egypt with *the land-promise made to Jacob*. The Land-giving is seen as the completion of what Jahweh did in the Covenant. Their concept was expressed in a double ritual: the Exodus Drama celebrated at Succoth and the processional entry into the land which terminated at Shechem (4.2.b). Literary expressions of this practice exist mainly in the deuteronomic sermons (1.7.a - 1.7.m) and in Psalm 68 (1.6.a - 1.6.f).

c) As a development of this earlier, double ritual the procession from Succoth to Shechem was later understood as symbolizing both the miracle at the Sea of Reeds and the conquest of the land. Thus arose the concept of the history of salvation which comprises *both Exodus and Land-giving*. This history of salvation functioned as the formal 'historical prologue' to the covenant at Shechem (4.3.f). The literary expression of this conception is found in the numerous passages in which the history of salvation is summarized as 'Exodus and Landgiving' (2.1.a - 2.1.c) and especially in the Pentateuchal narratives which are based on this pattern (2.3.g).

d) In Gilgal the ancient practices of Shechem were taken up and continued (4.4.c) but in a different form. The Land-giving never became a part of the history of salvation as such, In stead, the history of salvation was seen *as a continuous series of liberations from enemies* (4.4.f). No doubt, this was an extension of the liberation from Egypt celebrated in the Exodus Drama. Were the extensions, i.e. the other liberations, also dramatized in the cult? It is difficult to give a conclusive answer to this, but some indications of such cultic rituals are not lacking (Chapter 2, 2.2.e, note 33, 4.4.f). The main literary expression of this conception of the history of salvation is found in the gigantic 'book of history' composed by the Gilgalite historians.

4.5.b. The most interesting conclusion from this survey of the development of the 'history of salvation' is *the influence of the cultic dramatization on it*. It would seem that it is through the cult especially that the history of salvation was moulded in its various forms. The literary expressions seem all to presuppose and describe what was already done in the cult. W. Richter has recently undertaken a minute scrutiny of the various summaries of the history of salvation. I fully agree with his stress on the many shades of difference in traditions containing the history of salvation and with his conclusion that we cannot speak of a cultic 'creed' in the sense of a fixed literary document, such as our 'Confessions of Faith'. But I disagree entirely with his general conclusion that it is "literary works, such as J, E, and various deuteronomic redactions, which stand at decisive moments in the process of the theological systematization." One of these moments at which literary authors are considered the main active agents is the linking of Exodus and Land-giving.¹⁸⁾ I regret that the essay only came to my notice at a late stage of my research and that I will not be able to discuss its many observations in detail. In general I have the impression that the differences and similarities of formulation regarding the history of salvation may often be explained by individualistic expressions of the same cultic dramatizations. This would explain, for instance, why in the same text Jos 24 the cultic dramatization can be expressed in a variety of ways: vs. 2-13 and vs. 17-18.¹⁹⁾

4.5.c. The prominence of cultic dramatization in the formation of the history of salvation may also have methodological consequences. H. J. Kraus has rightly pointed to the methodological problems connected to the analysis of 'cult-legends':

"The 'cultic legend' presents us with special difficulties. Reliable criteria are still lacking in this field-and it is not likely that they will ever emerge. When, for example, it is stated that the Sinai pericope was a 'festival legend', this immediately raises the question what the actual relationship between the epic account and the cultic event was. It is too easy to avoid answering this question by asserting that there was mutual interaction. Where

can one really point to features with a cultic significance in the epic account? Are there any parallels in specifically cultic passages? To what extent and to what degree could traditions which originally had nothing to do with worship be supplied with secondary cultic elements? And on the other hand, what is the part played by the epic tradition, which permeates materials which once belonged to the cult with new aspects? Such are the questions which have to be faced by anyone who attempts an explanation, questions which warn one against the danger of reading too much into passages which reveal some cultic traces." ²⁰⁾

4.5.d. The questions put by the author are certainly of crucial importance. Research, such as the one attempted in this book, will always be open to valid criticism as to the methodological basis for assuming that certain literary expressions reveal cultic traces. In order to stimulate thought on this methodological basis I would like to suggest some norms that might prove helpful. I confess, however, that these norms emerged as a result of my attempts to deal with such presumed cultic passages rather than that I applied them conscientiously as principles throughout the process of research. This is also the reason why I put them at the end and not at the beginning of the book, where methodological principles should normally be announced.

4.5.e. As a first norm, I suggest, that *we distinguish 'cult describing legends' from 'cult reflecting legends'*. In the former category I would reckon such 'cultic legends' as the describe the actual liturgical drama such as it was practiced in the cult. As a practical criterion one might stipulate that the 'dramatis personae' of the cult legend should be identical with those acting in the cult. Only few so-called 'cult legends' conform to this requirement. The Exodus Drama is, however, an outstanding example that does conform to it. The present text can be shown to be the immediate literary expression of actual dramatic and liturgical practice (2.5.a;ff.). The actors of the liturgical drama: Jahweh, the Pharaoh, Moses and the community (2.3.j; 2.3.k; 2.3.l; cf. 2.2.g) can be identified with the persons acting in the sacred narrative. 'Cult reflecting legends', on the other hand, are not so directly related to the cult. In them the agents cannot be identified with the cultic actors. Gen 33:17-30 may serve as an example. Jacob's journey from Succoth to Shechem may surely reflect cultic practice (1.3.b; 1.3.c; 1.3.d), but Jacob cannot have been the cultic actor of the Shechernite celebrations. The account contains, therefore, a double layer: narrative about Jacob which reflects the cultic practice of the community.

4.5.f. It is not easy to establish the difference between these two in many a case. I could well see that *Jos 3-4* could be defended as being either 'cult describing' (if the cultic mediator was hailed a new Joshua; cf. 2.4.f) or 'cult reflecting' (if the cultic mediator was not considered to be a new 'Joshua'). But supposing that we are able to make this distinction with some degree of probability, we could then apply the norm that in *'cult describing legends' all details can be presumed to be cultic, unless the opposite is proved*. In 'cult reflecting legends', on the other hand, all details should be presumed of narrative value only, unless the cultic significance can be illustrated. This would mean that in the Exodus Drama the specification of time and place as "three days' journey into the desert" (Ex 5:3; 8:27) could methodically be presumed to be cultic, unless disproved (cf. 2.3.n). Jacob's building the booths' at Succoth, on the contrary, needs explicit proof from parallel passages before we may accept it as reflecting cultic practice (1.3.e). I believe that these norms, even if they need further elaboration and testing, could be helpful in future research.

- 1) D. J. McCARTHY, *Treaty and Covenant*, Rome 1963, pp. 166f.
- 2) W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen*, Tübingen 1961, pp. 165ff.
- 3) H. J. KRAUS, "Gilgal. Ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels," *VT* 1 (1951) pp. 181-199; esp. pp. 193ff.
- 4) G. VON RAD, *Deuteronomium Studien*, Göttingen 1947, pp. 11ff.
- 5) M. NOTH, *Geschichte Israels*, Göttingen 1950, p. 249. The translation is my own.
- 6) O. EISSFELDT, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Tübingen 1964³, pp. 309ff.; Engl. Transl., Oxford 1965, p. 232.
- 7) J. L' HOUR, "L'Alliance de Sichem," *RB* 69 (1960) pp. 5-36; 161-184; 350- 368.
- 8) R. E. CLEMENTS, *Prophecy and Covenant*, London 1965, pp. 66f.
- 9) R. DE VAUX, *Les Institutions de l'ancien Testament*, vol. II, Paris 1960, pp. 406f.; Engl. Transl., London 1961, p. 502.
- 10) R. DE V Aux, l.c. p. 396; Engl. transl., p. 494.
- 11) G. VON RAD, "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch," *BW ANT* 4, 26, Stuttgart 1938, pp. 48f.; *Gesammelte Studien*, München 1958, pp. 60f.; Engl. Transl., Edinburgh 1965, pp. 53f.
- 12) Also G. VON RAD has recently accepted the analogy of the Hittite vassality treaty for Jos 24; cf. *Theology of the Old Testament*, Engl. Transl., vol. I, New York 1962, p. 132.
- 13) H. B. HUFFMON, "The Exodus, Sinai and the Credo," *CBQ* 27 (1965) pp. 101-113; esp. pp. 107f.
- 14) M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, vol. I, Halle 1943.
- 15) H.J. KRAUS, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, Munich 1962; Engl. Transl., Oxford 1966, p. 164.
- 16) J. L' HOUR has demonstrated the relationship of these traditions to one another and to the cult at Shechem. Cf. *L' Alliance de Sichem*, l.c. (4.2.c, note 7), esp. pp. 359ff.
- 17) I cannot agree, therefore, with the designation of these passages (Jdc 2:1-6; Ex 23; 34) as the 'Gilgalbundestext'. Cf. N. LOHFINK, *Das Hauptgebot*, Rome 1963, pp. 176-180.
- 18) W. RICHTER, "Beobachtungen zur theologischen Systembildung in der alttestamentlichen Literatur anhand des 'Kleinen geschichtlichen Credo'," in *Wahrheit und Verkündigung*, Festschrift für M. Schmaus, ed. by L. Scheffczyk et al., München 1967, pp. 175-212; esp. pp. 210ff.
- 19) W. RICHTER, ib. p. 195.
- 20) H. J. KRAUS, *Worship in Israel*, l.c. (4.4.g, note 15), p. 23.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL TEXTS

A selection was made from some of the main passages discussed.

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| Gen 15:1-21 | 1.3.e, 2.3.g, 3.6.d, 3.7.f | Dtn 33:2-5 Jos 3-4 | 2.0.b 1.0.a |
| Gen 31 :44-53 | 1.1.e | | 1.1.a-1.1.h, 1.4.a, |
| Gen 33 :17-20 | 1.3.a-1.3.e, 4.5.e | | 2.4.e, 3.5.g, 3.5.i, |
| Ex 3-19 | 2.3.a-2.3.n, 4.1.a | | 4.3.b, 4.3.c, 4.3.a, |
| Ex 13:18-20 | 1.4.a-1.4.e, 3.5.i | | 4.4.c, 4.5.f |
| Ex 19:3 ^b -6 | 1.4.a, 2.2.a-2.2.g, 2.3.d, 2.3.i, 2.3.k, 2.3.n, 4.3.f | Jos 8:30-35 Jos 24 | 2.4.h, 4.4.f 1.7.m, 1.8.g, 2.2.c -2.2.g, 3.1.e, 3.5. |
| Ex 20: 20-23: 33 | 1.7.e, 4.4.j | | h, 3.7.g, 4.1.c, |
| Num 10: 33-36 | 1.6.a, 2.0.b | | 4.3.b-4.3.g, 4.5.b |
| Dtn 4:37-38 | 3.0.c-3.0.i 3.1.b, 3.1.f | Jdc 2:1-5 Jdc 10 :11-12 | 4.4.j 2.4.a |
| Dtn 4:44-49 | 3.6.i | 1 Sam 10:18 | 2.4.a |
| Dtn 5-28 | 1.7.a-1.7.m, 1.8.f, passim | Ps 47:5 Ps 60:8-10 | 3.0.f, 3.1.b 1.5.a-1.5.c, 1.8.f |
| Dtn 6:21-23 | 2.1.a, 2.2.c-2.2.g, 2.3.g, 4.3.f | Ps 68 | 1.6.a-1.6.e, 1.8.f, 2.0.b |
| Dtn 11 : 29-30 | 1.7.h, 2.4.h, 4.4.c | Ps 108:8-10 | 1.5.a-1.5.c |
| Dtn 12 | 1.7.i, 1.7.b | Is 14 :1 | 3.0.f, 3.1.b |
| Dtn 26:5b-9 | 2.3.g, 3.1.f, 3.7.g, 4.3.f | Hos 6:7-10 Hos 11 :1-2 | 1.2.a-1.2.g 1.2.f, 3.0.f, 3.1.b |
| Dtn 27 | 1.7.h, 3.1.f, 3.2.g | | |
| Dtn 31 :10-13 | 1.2.a-1.2.b, 4.2.f, 4.2.g | | |

INDEX OF HEBREW TERMS

| | | |
|-----|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | אבות | 2.1.j, 3.0.c, 3.0.d, 3.0.f, 3.1.a-3.1.i, 3.2.f, 4.2.d, 4.2.e, 4.3.d |
| 2. | אדם | 1.1.c, 1.2.c, 1.4.d, 1.8.d |
| 3. | אהב | 1.2.c, 1.7.b, 3.0.e, 3.0.f, 3.0.g, 3.0.h |
| 4. | אהלים | 1.1.g, 1.2.a, 4.2.g |
| 5. | אהל מועד | 1.2.a |
| 6. | אות | 2.2.k, 2.3.i |
| 7. | אל אבי | 3.1.d |
| 8. | אמרי | 3.6.j |
| 9. | אני יהוה | 2.1.i |
| 10. | ארון | 1.1.b, 1.1.d, 1.7.j, 4.4.g-4.4.i |
| 11. | אתם | 1.4.c, 1.4.d |

| | | |
|-----|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12. | בהמה | 1.3.a |
| 13. | בוא | 1.7.g, 3.3.e, 3.4.d, 3.4.e, 3.4.f, 3.5.b |
| 14. | בחר | 3.0.f, 3.0.g |
| 15. | בית יעקב | 1.3.c |
| 16. | בית ישראל | 1.2.e, 1.3.c |
| 17. | בפניו | 3.0.c, 3.0.d |
| 18. | בשן | 1.6.d |
| 19. | גוי | 3.4.f, 3.4.g |
| 20. | גוי גדל ועצום | 3.0.e |
| 21. | גלעד | 1.1.e, 1.2.e |
| 22. | גרש | 3.4.h |
| 23. | דרך | 3.6.a, 3.6.g, 3.6.h |
| 24. | הביא | 1.7.g, 3.0.c, 3.3.e |
| 25. | הוריש | 3.4.h, 3.4.1, 3.4.n, 4.4.d |
| 26. | היום | 1.0.a, 1.4.a, 1.7.d, 1.7.f, 1.7.m, 3.2.d |
| 27. | הלך אחרי | 1.8.j |
| 28. | הלך לפני | 1.6.a, 1.8.j |
| 29. | המית | 1.2.c, 1.2.d |
| 30. | הנחיל | 3.3.e, 4.4.d |
| 31. | (העלה) | 1.8.i |
| 32. | יבשה | 1.1.b, 3.5.f |
| 33. | ידע | 1.2.c, 2.2.k, 2.3.j |
| 34. | יהוה מלך | 2.3.e, 2.5.c, 4.1.d, 4.2.g |
| 35. | ירש | 1.7.g, 3.4.a-3.4.n, 4.4.d |
| 36. | זאן | 1.3.e |
| 37. | כי | 3.0.c, 3.0.d |
| 38. | מדבר | 1.2.d, 1.3.e, 1.6.c, 2.3.n |
| 39. | מועד | 1.2.a, 1.2.b |
| 40. | מלאך יהוה | 4.4.j |
| 41. | מקנה | 1.3.a, 1.3.e |
| 42. | נחלה | 3.0.c, 3.0.e, 3.3.a-3.3.f |
| 43. | נער | 1.2.f, 2.5.h, 3.0.f |
| 44. | נשבע | 1.7.g, 3.2.b, 3.2.d, 3.2.J |
| 45. | נשל | 3.4.h |
| 46. | נתן | 1.7.g, 2.1.j, 3.2.a-3.2.1 |
| 47. | סיחן ועוג | 3.6.i |
| 48. | סכת | 1.1.g, 1.2.a, 1.2.b, 1.3.e, 1.4.c, 1.4.d, 1.5.a-1.5.c, 1.8.b, 1.8.d, 4.2.f, 4.2.g |
| 49. | עבד | 2.3.d, 2.3.h, 2.3.n |
| 50. | עבר | 1.1.e, 1.2.e, 1.7.f, 1.7.g, 3.3.e, 3.3.a- 3.5.n |
| 51. | עד | 1.1.e, 2.2.i |

| | | |
|-----|------|----------------------------------|
| 52. | עקב | 1.2.e |
| 53. | פרת | 2.3.c, 3.6.d, 3.6.m |
| 54. | ראה | 1.0.a, 2.2.a-2.2.m, 2.3.1, 2.3.m |
| 55. | רננה | 2.0.b |
| 56. | שוב | 1.2.c, 1.2.d, 1.8.i |
| 57. | שלח | 2.3.h |
| 58. | שלם | 1.3.a |

LIST OF MODERN AUTHORS

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| W. F. ALBRIGHT 1.1.b, 1.4.d | H. GRESSMANN 1.7.j, 2.3.a, 2.3.e |
| B. ALFRINK 1.1.a | J. HEMPEL 1.7.h |
| A. ALT 1.0.c, 1.2.a, 1.2.e, 1.3.d, 1.5.c, 1.7.c, 1.7.d, 1.7.e, 2.1.e, 2.3.e, 3.1.d, 3.4.h | D. R. HILLERS 1.2.b, 1.7.b |
| A. ARENS 1.8.b | G. HOELSCHER 1.7.i |
| K. BALTZER 1.0.c, 1.7.b, 3.0.i, 3.2.e | W. L. HOLLADAY 1.2.c, 1.2.d |
| D. BALY 1.1.g, 1.6.d | H. B. HUFFMON 1.0.c, 4.3.h |
| A. BENTZEN 1.7.c | J. HUIZINGA 2.5.h |
| A. BERTHOLET 3.1.f | J.P. HYATT 3.1.d, 3.1.g |
| W. BEYERLIN 1.0.c, 1.2.f, 1.7.b, 2.0.c, 2.2.e, 2.2.h, 2.3.e, 2.5.h, 4.1.d | J. INGALLS 2.5.h |
| C. BREKELMANS 1.0.c | P. JOÜON 3.0.c |
| J. BRIGHT 2.1.f | M. KEGEL 1.7.i |
| W. BRUEGGEMANN 1.2.c | C. F. KEIL 3.1.f |
| M. BUBER 2.3.e | G. KITTEL 1.8.j |
| K. BUDDE 1.7.i | M. G. KLINE 1.7.b, 1.7.e, 1.7.j |
| M. DU BUIT 1.8.d | A. KLOSTERMANN 1.7.d |
| C. CANFIELD 2.5.g | K. KOCH 3.0.g |
| H. CAZELLES 1.4.d, 1.7.c | E. KÖNIG 3.1.f |
| R. E. CLEMENTS 1.2.b, 4.2.d | H. J. KRAUS 1.0.a, 1.0.b, 1.2.a, 1.6.b, 1.6.d, 1.7a, 1.7.d, 1.7.j, 2.4.h, 4.2.b, 4.4.g, 4.4.i, 4.5.c |
| A. CODY 3.4.f | C. J. LAMMERS 2.5.i |
| F. M. CROSS 3.1.d | G. VAN DER LEEUW 1.8.j |
| M. DAHOOD 3.0.c | J. L'HOOR 1.0.c, 1.7.c, 1.7.e, 4.2.c, 4.4.j |
| D. DAUBE 2.3.h | S. LOERSCH 1.7.a |
| K. DITTMER 2.5.i | N. LOHFINK 1.2.e, 1.7.d, 3.3.f, |
| J. A. A. VAN DOORN 2.5.l | H. LUBIENSKA DE LENVAL 1.8.j |
| S. R. DRIVER foreword, 2.4.h | H. LUBSCZYK 1.2.e, 3.1.f |
| J. DUS 1.7.j | T. MAERTENS 1.6.e |
| W. EICHRODT 1.3.c, 2.3.d | G. T. MANLEY 1.7.e, 1.7.j |
| O. EISSFELDT 2.3.d, 4.2.c | R. MARCUS 2.0.b |
| I. ELBOGEN 1.8.b | H. G. MAY 3.1.d |
| M. ELIADE 1.8.k | D. J. McCARTHY 1.0.c, 1.7.b, 4.1.c, |

The Dramatization of Salvific History by John Wijngaards

- K. ELLIGER 2.1.i
B. FINKELSCHERER 1.1.e
S. FISCH 1.3.e, 3.1.f
G. FOHRER 2.3.e
J., DE FRAINE 3.6.c
C. J. GADD 2.3.e
A. VON GALL 2.3.e
K. GALLING 1.3.e, 2.1.d, 2.1.i
J. GASSNER 2.5.g
N. GLUECK 1.1.b
A. GOETZE 3.0.i
K. GOLDAMMER 1.8.i
C. H. GORDON 2.0.b, 3.1.d
- J. NOUGAYIWL 3.2.e
T. OESTR.EICHER 1.7.j
T. OHM 1.8.i
J. PEDER.SEN 2.1.d, 2.1.e, 2.3.b,
2.3.d, 2.5.h
J. B. PR.ITCHAR.D 3.0.i, 3.5.b
G. VON RAD 1.7.b, 1.7.c, 1.7.f, 1.8.h
2.1.d, 2.1.e, 2.3.b, 2.3.c, 2.3.e, 2.3.g,
3.0.c, 3.3.b, 3.3.e, 3.4.j, 4.2.c, 4.3.g
B. RENAUD 1.7.b
H. REVENTLOW 2.2.i, 2.2.j
W, RICHTER. 4.5.b
L. ROST 3.4.f
H. H. ROWLEY 2.4.f
W. RUDOLPH 1.1.b
P. P. SAYDON 1.1.a
J. SCHAR.BER.T 2.2.i
H. SCHMID 2.3.e
E. SELLIN 1.2.e
J. SIMONS 2.1.f
R. SMEND 1.3.c
- 4.1.d
I. MENDELSON 3.2.e
K. MÖHLENBRINK 1.1.a, 1.1.b, 1.1.e
W. L. MORAN 1.0.c, 1.2.c, 2.0.b
J. MORGENSTERN 2.3.d
S. MOWINCKEL 1.6.b, 1.6.d, 1.8.k,
2.3.e, 2.5.i
J. MUILENBURG 2.1.d
C. NORTH 2.1.i, 2.3.d
M. NOTH 1.0.c, 1.1.a, 1.1.b, 1.1.g,
1.2.e, 1.4.d, 1.6.e, 1.7.a, 1.7.j, 2.0.b,
2.1.d, 2.1.f, 2.2.d, 2.3.e, 4.2.c, 4.4.a
F. NÖTSCHER 3.0.c
- L.A. SNIJDERS 3.4.b
W. VON SODEN 3.0.g
E. A. SPEISER 3.0.g
C. STEUER.NAGEL foreword, 1.3.e
S. TALMON 2.0.b
R. DE VAUX 1.3.b, 1.4.d, 1.5.b, 3.4.h
4.2.f
P. VOLZ 1.2.a
R. VAN DE WALLE 3.4.f
A. WARREN 2.5.h
E. F. WEIDNER 3.2.e, 3.5.b
A. WELCH 1.7.i
R. WELLEK 2.5.h
J. WELLHAUSEN 2.3.a, 2.3.e
J. WIJNGAARDS 1.0.c, 1.2.c, 1.2.e,
1.8.i, 2.1.b, 2.1.c, 2.1.e, 2.3.d, 2.4.a,
2.4.b
H. WILDBERGER 1.0.a, 1.0.b, 1.4.a,
1.4.b, 1.7.d, 2.2.a, 2.3.e
H. W. WOLFF 1.2.b
G. E. WRIGHT 2.0.b, 2.1.f
W. ZIMMERLI 2.1.i, 2.2.k