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THE "BLOODY BRIDEGROOM"
IN EXODUS 4:24-26*
Ronald B. Allen

EXODUS 4:24-26 comprises possibly the most perplexing passage in all the Torah, surpassed perhaps only by the puzzle many feel concerning "the sons of God" and "the daughters of men" in Genesis 6:1-4.

The Book of Exodus begins in chapter 1 with a brief recital of the plight of Israel in their long period of servitude in Egypt. Then in chapter 2 the story records the birth of Moses, whose protection in his infancy was a most remarkable instance of divine providence, including humor. The balance of chapter 2 through nearly all of chapter 4 focuses on Moses' early life, as Yahweh prepared him for his lifework of being the human agent for God's deliverance of His people from Egypt. Along the way God revealed Himself to Moses in terms of His divine name Yahweh (2:22-3:15), and then He told Moses of His choice of him to be His agent. Moses was reluctant at first, but finally was convinced that his purpose in life was this grand task. So at last in Exodus 4:18 Moses prepared to leave Midian, where he had lived for forty years, to return to Egypt to obey God's command.

As Moses was on his way to Egypt, the Lord came to kill him. Surely these three verses (Exod. 4:24-26) are among biblical

Ronald B. Allen is Professor of Bible Exposition, Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas.

* This is article three in a four-part series, "On Paths Less Traveled: Discovering the Savior in Unexpected Places in the Old Testament," delivered by the author as the W. H. Griffith Thomas Lectures at Dallas Theological Seminary, February 7-10, 1995.

1 It is interesting to note the comic justice of Pharaoh's daughter hiring Moses' mother to nurse her own baby (Exod. 2:7-10).
paths less traveled. Childs wrote, "Few texts contain more problems for the interpreter than these few verses which have continued to baffle throughout the centuries." In the New King James Version, Exodus 4:24-26 reads as follows: "And it came to pass on the way, at the encampment, that the LORD met him and sought to kill him. Then Zipporah took a sharp stone and cut off the foreskin of her son and cast it at Moses' feet, and said, 'Surely you are a husband of blood to me!' So He let him go. Then she said, 'You are a husband of blood'--because of the circumcision."

**PRELIMINARY ISSUES**

Several questions come to mind when one reads these verses.

1. This passage seems to be an intrusion into the flow of the chapter. It is abrupt as well as cryptic and difficult. Though these verses form a unit, the question remains, What is the purpose of this pericope?

2. The passage is marked by a lack of clear antecedents for some of its pronouns or named objects for some of its verbs. Further, many translations have inserted the name "Moses" in verse 25 where the Hebrew has only "his." Who did what to whom?

3. More significantly, the passage prompts the question, Why? What possibly could have prompted the rage of Yahweh that would have caused Him to want to kill Moses? This seems particularly inappropriate, since the initial "misunderstanding" between God and Moses had been settled (Exod. 4:1-17).

4. Why does the passage center on what for modern readers are the distasteful and embarrassing subjects of circumcision, blood, and foreskins?

5. What was behind Zipporah's action? How did she know what to do? Why did Moses not act? After she cut off the foreskin of her son, whom did she touch with it, what did she touch with it, and why did she need to touch anything with it?

---


4 The footnote in the New King James Version correctly notes that the Hebrew is literally "his."

5 Certainly this passage must be studied on the basis of the Hebrew text rather than in a translation. At times the priority of the Scriptures in the original languages needs to be reasserted over that of any translation. All translations of Scripture are adequate for the purposes intended; no translation of Scripture is able to reveal the subtle nuances that are a part of the original locution.
6. What is the meaning of Zipporah's words, "You are a husband of blood to me," and to whom are they addressed?
7. What is the point of this passage?6

SUGGESTED INTERPRETATIONS
Not surprisingly, this puzzling passage has been a mine for critical scholars to explore, allowing them to look for exotic ores and bizarre treasures.7 Alas, they seem to have found mostly fool's gold. On the other hand three contemporary scholars have attempted to deal with the passage constructively.

BREVARD CHILDS'S VIEW
Childs notes many difficulties, including those of connection, the rash action of the Lord, the lack of stated reason, the lack of an explanation of the action of Zipporah, the lack of antecedents, and the irrational, almost demonic, atmosphere with its focus on blood.8 Then he says that it is not clear whose feet were touched. "In my opinion the redactor of the present narrative seemed to have understood the child as the recipient of the action. The smearing of the blood serves as a visible demonstration that circumcision had indeed been performed."9

To this the question may be asked, Would not the boy's wail be sufficient evidence that he was the one on whom the procedure had been accomplished? Why also put blood on the child's feet?

To whom were the words addressed? On the surface they seem to apply neither to the child nor to Moses, and assuredly not to Yahweh. The frequent suggestion of translating the phrase on the basis of Arabic to mean "the blood-circumcised one" escapes some of the difficulties but cannot be sustained philologically.10

Childs concludes that the story "serves to dramatize the tremendous importance of circumcision. . . . the implication is certainly that Moses was held culpable for its omission. Indeed so serious was the offense as to have nearly cost him his life. When Zipporah righted the omission, he was released."11

6 To put it another way, How does this text aid in one's spiritual development, and how may this text be used in preaching God's Word to hurting people? How is this a part of Scripture that has its role in making the believer complete in the Lord (2 Tim. 3:16-17)?
7 For a survey of theories, see Durham, Exodus, 57.
8 Childs, Exodus, 95.
9 Ibid., 103.
10 Ibid.
11 Ibid., 104.
Thus Childs suggests these points: (1) The child was circumcised by his mother because Moses did not do so. (2) The bloody foreskin was touched to the feet of the child to demonstrate that the circumcision was accomplished. (3) Questions about Zipporah's enigmatic words are unanswered. (4) The meaning of the passage is to be found in the tremendous importance attached to circumcision (and its role in the covenant of God and man).

WALTER C. KAISER JR.'S VIEW

With the two textual clues, the rite of circumcision as the explanation of the whole episode and "my firstborn son" as the connection between the sections, the rest of the passage yields this explanation. The Lord had attacked Moses as he was enroute to accomplish the mission of God in Egypt. The nature of this nearly fatal experience is not known to us; therefore, it does not figure in the interpretation. That Moses was the object of the divine action is clear from the fact that the otherwise unspecified son in v. 25 would need to be identified as belonging to someone other than Moses. The sudden introduction of Zipporah's action leads us to believe that she instinctively connected her husband's peril (a malady so great that it left only her hands free to act, for presumably his were not able to help) with their failure to circumcise their son. This she immediately proceeded to do. But her words of reproach--"Surely you are a bridegroom of blood to me"--indicate that the root of the problem was in her revulsion and disgust with this rite of circumcision.

Kaiser then gives this conclusion:

Thus for one small neglect, apparently out of deference for his wife's wishes, or perhaps to keep peace ill the home, Moses almost forfeited his opportunity to serve God and wasted eighty years of preparation and training! To further underscore this connection between Moses' grave condition and the circumcision of his son, Zipporah took the excised prepuce and touched Moses' feet (this need not be as many commentators argue a euphemism for his genitals, for this is not a puberty rite here). The Lord let Moses go, and the grip of death was lited.

These are the salient elements in Kaiser's presentation: (1) Moses was the one under God's action, suffering from an (unnamed) illness that incapacitated him. (2) The child (presum-

\[12\] Kaiser is referring here to the words, "my firstborn son," in verse 22.
\[14\] Ibid., 333.
\[15\] This is also the view of U. Cassuto: "that the Lord met him, that means, that he contracted a severe illness (on the Hebrew usage that attributes every event to the direct action of God)" (A Commentary on the Book of Exodus, trans. Israel Abrahams [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967], 60).
ably Gershom) had not been circumcised, possibly the result of a family dispute. (3) Zipporah showed revulsion to the act of circumcision of her son, as seen in her words to Moses; nevertheless she acted to save Moses' life. (4) One senses the homiletical point in Kaiser's last paragraph: What sadness if one were to lose a ministry for God just to keep peace in the home.

JOHN I. DURHAM'S VIEW

Durham insists that the study should be "of the passage as it stands in Exodus, and, just as important, where it stands in Exodus. These are his interpretive points. (1) The main point is clearly circumcision, and at that, a specific circumcision. The etiological view (as Childs argues) is not in view here, nor (in the present text) is there any ground for a demonic interpretation. (2) Moses was the object of Yahweh's encountering action. (3) The reason for the attack is "that Moses had not previously been circumcised." (4) Zipporah circumcised her son, because if she had circumcised Moses, he would have been incapacitated for his journey. On the child, the effects would be less problematic; in any event, the child did not make the journey. (5) To transfer the effects of the rite to Moses, she touched the severed foreskin of her son to Moses' genitals. (6) The phrase "a bridegroom of blood" was an ancient formula recalling circumcision as a premarital rite. (7) Thus Zipporah's action "is a vicarious circumcision of Moses to prevent his being painfully crippled at the beginning of the most important undertaking of his life."

There are some strengths to Durham's position, but his view is marred by a critical error. "Vicarious circumcision" is as unlikely a category as "vicarious baptism." This is a theological oxymoron. If Yahweh were about to kill Moses because he was not circumcised, the blood of his son's foreskin on his still uncircumcised organ would not likely assuage the wrath of God. Further, Durham says that the words of Zipporah form "the ritual statement which accompanied the premarital circumcision as a declaration to a young man's in-laws that he was of an appropriate for marriage." Of what application would this be for Moses, who had long before married her and fathered two sons by

16 Durham, Exodus, 57.
17 Or if he had been circumcised, it was in the "partial manner" of the Egyptians. This is farfetched, for was it not Hebrew circumcision that led Pharaoh's daughter to recognize Moses as a Hebrew baby (Exod. 2:6)?
18 These points are summarized from Durham, Exodus, 57-59.
19 Ibid., 59.
her? If circumcision were a necessity for marriage in her culture, and if Moses had not been circumcised as a baby in Egypt, surely Moses would have been circumcised by Jethro, her father, in the time-honored tradition of the Arabian (and other) peoples of this period. The weaknesses of this view outweigh the strengths.

A PROPOSED INTERPRETATION

VERSE 24
"Now it happened on the way at an inn, that Yahweh encountered him and sought to kill him" (author's translation). The "him" (twice) in verse 24 undoubtedly refers to Moses. Is it possible that the delicate nature of the text led Moses (or another) to refer to him obliquely? Moses was on his way to Egypt, as commissioned by Yahweh (4:21-23). The strained interplay Moses had had with the Lord (4:1-17) was behind him.

Yahweh is clearly the subject of the verbs "met" (יָדַעְתָּ, "to encounter") and "sought to kill" (though the Septuagint substituted the word "angel" for Yahweh). Moses had recently learned the meaning of the name of God, Yahweh (Exod. 3:13-15); now God who was for him had become his enemy.

The verb "encounter" is minimized by many commentators. Cole says Moses "was struck down by some dangerous sickness or other blow as the sign of God's displeasure." However, Hebrew has a clear way of speaking of physical illness or injury (e.g., 1 Kings 17:17; 2 Kings 1:2), and such phrases are not in this passage. The verb "encounter" is as significant in this passage as is the word "son." Kaiser rightly sees "son" (v. 25) as the connecting link of this pericope with the preceding one (v. 23), but he

---

20 This is particularly the case since the Hebrew for "his father-in-law" (יָדַעְתָּ) used of Jethro is derived from an Arabic word that means "his circumciser."

21 Because there is no clear antecedent for the pronoun "him" in this verse, it is remotely possible that the one whom the Lord was about to kill was not Moses but his son (either Gershom or Eliezer) who was not circumcised. The uncircumcised one was to be cut off from Israel (Gen. 17). In this case one may picture the Lord holding the boy, even as his mother circumcised him. Then the Lord would have released the boy. This option is likely without precedent among interpreters (but see comments below on v. 26). Perhaps the strongest objection to this view is the observation that one would have expected Moses to have acted on behalf of his son in this Hebrew custom rather than his mother (who was a Midianite). Yet her mother's love may have urged her to act quickly, as Phinehas acted with zeal in Numbers 25.

22 R. Alan Cole, Exodus (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1973), 79. Similarly, John J. Davis suggests Moses "was punished by God and was apparently desperately sick" (Moses and the Gods of Egypt: Studies in the Book of Exodus [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971], 71).
strangely dismisses the link of "encounter" with the next pericope beginning in verse 27.23

Yahweh encountered Moses to kill him; in the next unit Aaron encountered Moses to embrace him. Both statements use שֶׁפֶּה, a relatively rare verb that connotes a significant personal encounter.24 This verb suggests a dramatic (hostile) encounter of Yahweh with Moses in what may be a hitherto-unacknowledged theophany. Those approaches that say Moses was ill because of a visitation by the Lord overlook the serious nature of this term. This theophany was an appearance of the living, preincarnate Christ, the One who reveals the Father and is the living Word (John 1:14-18).

Yahweh's encounter with Moses was similar to the wrestling match of the Angel of Yahweh (the preincarnate Christ) with Jacob (Gen. 32). Both theophanic appearances were sudden, personal, direct revelations of the divine presence in a hostile, wrestler's hold. Moses was held by the Lord, not beset by a mysterious disease. And then he was released by Yahweh when His demands had been met (Exod. 4:26); it was not simply that he "got better." Just as he was later held by Aaron (v. 27) in a warm embrace, so now he was held by the Lord (v. 24) in a hostile hold—a death grip.

Why does verse 24 state that "Yahweh...sought to kill him"? If He truly wished to kill Moses, could He not have done so in a moment? Actually the very opposite was God's intention. He held Moses in a death grip, but He did not want to kill him. The verb שֹׁפֶה, "to seek," means not a frenetic activity on God's part, but a sudden struggle, a divine grip, and divine patience before the final blow. Indeed, He was giving Moses one last chance to stay alive. Strangely, but surely, this is another instance of God's grace. Moses had committed a serious offense against the Lord that made him unfit to be God's agent of deliverance or to live in God's presence.

VERSE 25

"Then Zipporah took a flint and she cut off the foreskin of her son, and she held it out to touch his feet, and she said, "Surely you are a bloody bride-father25 [םָּזְמֵר תַּנָּן] to me!" (author's transla-
tion). Crucial to the interpretation of this verse is the Lord's instruction regarding circumcision based on Genesis 17. Clearly that passage says that each male child is to be circumcised on the eighth day of his life. Should that fail to be done, that one was to be cut off from Israel; he had broken covenant with Yahweh (Gen. 17:3-14).

Moses was guilty of not carrying out circumcision in his own family, yet he was the one who was to lead the circumcised nation of Israel from Egypt to the Promised Land. The situation was simply intolerable. "But if Moses was to carry out the divine commission with success, he must first of all prove himself to be a faithful servant of Jehovah in his own house." Though a sentence of death was pronounced on any neglect of circumcision as being a breach of the covenant (Gen. 17:14), "Moses had probably omitted circumcision [of his child] simply from regard to his Midianitish wife, who... disliked this operation; he had been guilty of a capital crime, which God could not pass over in the case of one whom He had chosen to be His messenger, to establish His covenant with Israel."27

There may be a grisly pun in the words "cut off" in Genesis 17:14. If the foreskin were not removed, then the person was to be removed. Did the punishment fall on the child who was uncircumcised, or on the parent who refused to have this done? The answer may be "On both." That is, the child seems to be in view in Genesis 17:14, but the command is for the father (or his agent) to do the task. Another issue concerns which son is in view in Exo-

The verb יָחַס, "to circumcise" is related to an Arabic verb, Ḥata-na, "to circumcise." The Hebrew יָחַס, "father-in-law," is related to the Arabic Ḥata-n, "a circumciser," hence to a father-in-law with reference to circumcision performed on young men just before marriage (cf. the Arabic Ḥata-n, a relative on the wife's side). The Hebrew יָחַס is used of Jethro, Moses' "wife's father" (Exod. 3:1; 4:18; 18:1-2, 5-8, 12, 14, 17, 24, 27; Num. 10:29; Judg. 1:16; 4:11). The same word in the feminine is used of the wife's mother (Deut. 27:23).

In Ugaritic the related verb Ḥta-n means "to marry," and the related noun Ḥta-n means "son-in-law" (Cyrus H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook [Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965], 405).

These Hebrew, Arabic, and Ugaritic terms also have cognate nouns in Aramaic, Syriac, and Old South Arabic, with the same general meaning (cf. the Akkadian Ḥat(a)nu). See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 1:364-65.


27 Ibid.
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dus 4:25. Since only one son is said to be circumcised, one may assume that the other son had already been circumcised. 28

The words "her son" do not exclude Moses as father, of course, (nor is it likely that this was a child of hers from another marriage). But they may suggest something of the animosity she may have had against circumcision. 29

VERSE 26

"Then He released him. (Now she had said 'bloody bride-father' with reference to the circumcision)" (author's translation).

The verb "to release" (ḥpArנ, "to sink," "to relax," "to withdraw") fits with the idea of the release of the wrestler's grip of death, described above. Zipporah repeated the scurrilous phrase "bloody bride-father" to the living God because she was so angry at the act she was forced to perform on her child.

A PROPOSED SCENARIO

When Gershom was born, Moses would have circumcised him on his eighth day as a matter of course, following the clear teaching of Genesis 17:9-14. While circumcision was also practiced by the Midianites, it would have been a kind of puberty "rite of passage" for them (and other Semitic peoples as well). 30 Thus to

28 Some might suggest the second son was an infant, not yet eight days old, but this seems unlikely. The birth of the second son that near the time of travel would have been an extraordinary hardship. Only Gershom's birth has been mentioned to this point (Exod. 2:22). But Moses took with him his "sons" and his wife (4:20); the name of the second, Eliezer, was not given until 18:3-4.

29 Some suggest the son in view here is Gershom, Moses' firstborn. The tie that may link this pericope with the preceding may be the words "firstborn son" (v. 23). Also, as Kaiser suggests, the firstborn of Moses and Zipporah may be linked with the firstborn of Pharaoh. However, even Kaiser is uncertain on this point. Actually the relationship is tenuous. In the case of Pharaoh, it was his son who was at risk, but in the case of Moses, it was Moses himself, not his son, who was at risk. Yet the problem concerned his son. "He who is on his way to liberate the people of the circumcision, has in Midian even neglected to circumcise his second son Eliezer" (John Peter Lange, Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical [1876; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, n.d., 2:13]).

30 The rite of circumcision was not an exclusive practice of the ancient Hebrews. Actually circumcision was practiced in prehistoric times, as attested by some cave paintings. It was practiced among many people groups in the ancient world, in Asia, among South Sea Islanders, in many tribal groups in Africa, and among some of the native peoples of the Americas. However, in most of these cultures, circumcision was a rite of passage performed on a boy at puberty rather than shortly after birth. Among the ancient Semitic peoples, circumcision was practiced among many of Israel's neighbors, but not among the Canaanites or among the Semites of Mesopotamia. Circumcision was practiced in Egypt, but exclusively among priests. The Philistines (who were Indo-European peoples) did not practice circumcision.
the child's mother the practice of circumcising babies would have been unexpected at best and abhorrent at worst. When the second child was born, Zipporah (perhaps in association with her father\footnote{When Moses arrived in Midian he was a fugitive, a person without land, family, wealth, or standing (Exod. 2:15). Besides marrying Zipporah (2:21) he likely became the adoptive son of Jethro. He had become like Jacob in relation to Laban. This is likely the point of Exodus 2:21: "Then Moses was content to live with the man, and he gave Zipporah his daughter to Moses." The verb translated "was content" (Hiphil of לָשֵׁע, probably means here, "he came to terms with," or "he acquiesced with." When Moses wanted to leave, he was not free to do so. He needed to seek permission from Jethro, as he had become Jethro's dependent (4:18). Thus Jethro would have had considerable influence over the treatment of his grandson.} may have strongly resisted, saying, "You have done this with the first boy, but not again. Not with my son." If only one son had not been circumcised, it would seem more likely to be the younger rather than the older.

So now at the critical moment she did what she had objected to before. Moses, her husband, was in the death grip of his God. She rushed forth, did the deed, but was surely repulsed by the practice. In her anger "she reached out with the foreskin to touch his feet." At whom was she angry? Certainly not at her son, for she had sought to protect him from an "early" circumcision. Nor would her anger have been directed principally against her husband. For she sought to save him by her impetuous action. Instead, she was angry at Moses' God. Who demanded the circumcision of babies, against the traditions of all peoples in the region? Who had brought about her husband's action in circumcising their older boy shortly after his birth? And who now demanded that her younger boy be circumcised or her husband would be killed? Her husband's God!

So to the Lord she reached out with the bloody prepuce, touching His feet.\footnote{Critical scholars assert that "feet" is a euphemism for the male genitalia. The unnamed translator of Martin Noth's commentary wrote, ""Feet," is of course here a euphemistic expression, as elsewhere in the Old Testament" (Noth, Exodus, 50, note).} And to Him she called out harshly, "You are a bloody bride-father to me." She would have addressed these words to Yahweh for three reasons. (1) God was the One who had demanded that this action be done on her son. (2) She reasoned that since God "liked" the bloody prepuce so well, He might as well have it. (3) God had become to her like the circumcisers of her culture, demanding the circumcision just before marriage. This
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is the meaning of her ambiguous words in which she called God her "blood relative" by means of the enforced circumcision of her son.

This view helps explain the use of הָאֵם (hem) in verse 26. This word sometimes serves as a stylistic device to introduce a phrase that is to be stressed. She said what she did to the Lord, "because [חָלָה] of the circumcision." This passage does not explain circumcision; circumcision explains the passage.

Also this point of view helps explain something the text does not mention until later. Even though Moses had asked for permission from Jethro to return to Egypt (presumably with his family, 4:18-20), he must have sent his family back to Jethro following this encounter at the inn (18:1-5). They are not mentioned at all in the story of Moses' dealings with Pharaoh in Egypt. Given the attitude of Zipporah, she may well have separated from her husband. She saved his life when he was under threat by God, but she was not present when he by the mercy of God saved the nation.

This view may also explain why Moses married again (Num. 12). Many commentators have assumed that Zipporah died before he married a second time. But it may be that she remained with her father Jethro even after the events in Exodus 18. Although Zipporah came with Jethro to Moses, nothing is said about their reunion. Was it perhaps out of respect for his wife that Moses did not detail the nature of their estrangement? And was it out of personal shame that he did not make this passage clearer?

Moses' sin of not having circumcised his second son calls to mind the concept of a "sin to death" in the New Testament (1 Cor. 11:27-30; 1 John 5:16). Exodus 4:24-26 becomes an example of this in the Hebrew Scriptures. If the proposed view is correct that Zipporah touched the feet of the preincarnate Christ with the bloody foreskin, whose thoughts are not thereby driven to the cross on which His feet would one day bleed?

The rite of circumcision was the foremost symbol of Israel's relationship to God (Gen. 17:9-14). Involving the shedding of blood, it ultimately pointed to the shedding of the blood of the most innocent Son. But He did not merely bleed a few drops; His very life was bled away. And His death is memorialized in the Lord's Supper by the cup, a symbol of blood.

VOWING AWAY THE FIFTH

COMMANDMENT:

MATTHEW 15:3-6//MARK 7:9-13

JON NELSON BAILEY

Dallas, TX

I. Introduction

Religious vows are prominent in ancient Judaism. This study examines the evidence that in the first-century CE a son could make a vow that would keep him from honoring his parents as commanded in the fifth of the Ten Commandments (Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16). This practice, mentioned in Matt 15:3-6//Mark 7:9-13, had the effect of vowing away the fifth commandment. The practice may have been rare and controversial, but it was a phenomenon that could occur in ancient Judaism.

Since God required that vows be kept, problems arose when a vow was made that violated the Torah. In this study, I trace the development of such vows within Judaism and show that the NT bears witness to the practice by which a person could make a vow that superseded requirements of the fifth commandment. I also show that such vows encountered opposition by the rabbis and eventually became unthinkable for pious Jews by the time of the Babylonian Talmud.

II. Significant Terms

A vow is a promise made in a religious context, usually to God. Vows tend to be promises to perform, or to abstain from, specific actions. In biblical and rabbinic Hebrew, the most common terms for "vow" are the verb רָדַן and the noun רַדָּן. The corresponding Aramaic terms are the verb רָדַנֶה and the noun רַדָּנֶה. The most common Greek terms for "vow" are the verb εὐχομαί and the noun εὐχα.

A vow is a solemn promise or assertion directed toward God. Vows in ancient Judaism can be divided into two basic types. The positive vow promises to perform an act or to offer a gift or sacrifice as a votive offering. The negative vow promises to abstain from something, imposing a prohibition on the one who made the vow or others.\(^3\)

Vows in ancient Judaism were closely related to oaths, and sometimes the terms were used interchangeably. The common Hebrew terms are נִרְרָבֵשׁ "oath," and יָרָשׁ "swear, take an oath."\(^4\) The Greek terms are ὁρκός, "oath," and ὁμνύω, "swear, take an oath."\(^5\) An oath is a solemn, formal calling upon God as witness to the truth of words directed toward other human beings.\(^6\)

Another important term is the Hebrew noun נִרְרָבִים. In rabbinic Hebrew this noun introduces a vow to abstain from something by declaring an object to have the status of a consecrated offering as far as the one prohibited by the vow is concerned. This usage is a development from biblical Hebrew in which the term occurs frequently but simply to denote a literal "gift, offering, or sacrifice."\(^7\) In

---


\(^6\) E. Klinger, "Vows and Oaths," *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (ed. Mircea Eliade; 15 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1987) 15:301. In this study it will be evident that the Jews often blurred the distinction between oaths and vows, especially in regard to vows that negatively affected others.

\(^7\) BDB, *Lexicon*, 898; Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1411; J. Kuhlwein, *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (ed. E. Jenni and C. Westerman; trans. M. Biddle; 3 vols. (Peabody: Hendrikson, 1997) 3:1164-69; R. Averbeck, *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (ed. W. VanGemeren; 5 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997) 3:979-82. The noun occurs 80 times in the Hebrew Bible, with 40 of those occurrences in Leviticus. Both the noun and cognate verb are associated with the Israelite concept of drawing near to God in worship by presenting a consecrated gift as a sacrificial offering. While the law specified many gifts such as burnt offerings, grain offerings, and peace offerings, it also was possible to vow voluntarily to God other gifts from one's property. After the loss of the Temple, even the study of the Torah concerning
rabbinic literature it is used both as a designation for actual sacrificial offerings and as a technical term that introduces a vow of abstinence from some object consecrated to God. In rabbinic texts, to avoid use of the actual word for sacrificial offering, the term commonly is replaced by the euphemism מַעְרָשׁ.8

III. The Hebrew Bible

The Hebrew Bible indicates that vows were important in Israelite religion from an early period.9 With a vow a person was placed under solemn obligation to God to do something or to refrain from doing something. Vows were voluntary. Yet, once taken, they were to be fulfilled. The motive for vows was often a desire to obtain divine favor. They regularly have the form "If God does something for me, then I will do something for God." Except for the Nazirite vow, negative vows or vows of abstinence are rare in the Hebrew Bible. Vows intended to affect others negatively are even less common.

A few examples will demonstrate the importance of positive vows in the Hebrew Bible.10 Jacob vowed that if God would keep him safe, fed, and clothed until he returned, he would make the pillar at Bethel into a sanctuary and pay tithes (Gen 28:20-22; 31:13). The people of Israel vowed that if God would give them the land of Canaan, they would destroy its cities (Num 21:2). Jephthah vowed that if God would bring him home victorious, he would offer as a sacrifice whatever first came out of his house when he returned (Judg 11:30-40). Hannah vowed that if God would give her a son, she would dedicate him to God (1 Sam 1: 11). In addition, the Psalms include many texts associated with making and fulfilling vows (Pss 22:22-31; 50:14-15; 56:12-13; 61:8; 65:1; 66:13-20; 116:12-14).

Much of the information concerning vows is in the Pentateuch. Everything offered in fulfillment of a vow was to be of the highest quality (Lev 22:17-25). The vow of valuation allowed one person to vow another person, an animal, a building, or a portion of land, but then redeem what had been vowed by paying sacrifice was considered an offering to God.

8 Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1335.
what it was worth to the priests (Lev 27:1-33). Whether made by a man or a
woman, vows were absolutely binding (Num 30:1-2). However, a vow made by
an unmarried woman could be annulled the same day by her father, and a vow
made by a married woman could be annulled the same day by her husband (Num
30:3-16). Vows were to be fulfilled at the place God chose: the temple in
Jerusalem (Deut 12:6-18). Payment of a vow was not to be made with money
obtained by immoral means (Deut 23:18); and even though vows were voluntary,
they were most serious:

If you make a vow to the LORD your God, do not postpone fulfilling it; for
the LORD your God will surely require it of you, and you would incur
guilt. But if you refrain from vowing, you will not incur guilt. Whatever
your lips utter you must diligently perform, just as you have freely vowed
to the LORD your God with your own mouth (Deut 23:21-23).

The most notable vow of abstinence is the Nazirite vow. It required a person
to abstain from grape products, from cutting the hair, and from contact with the
dead (Num 6:1-21; Judg 13:4-5; 1 Sam 1:11; Amos 2:11-12). Another negative
vow is the vow made by David that he would not enter his house, go to bed, or
sleep until he had found a place for God's house (Ps 132:1-5). Also worth
considering is an oath imposed by Saul upon Israel (1 Sam 14:24-45), when Saul
laid an oath on the people, saying, "Cursed be anyone who eats food before it is
evening" (1 Sam 14:24).

Later passages suggest that vows created practical difficulties and conflicts
with the Law. Vows resulted in promises people failed to fulfill (Mal 1:14). The
author of Ecclesiastes advises: "When you make a vow to God, do not delay
fulfilling it; for he has no pleasure in fools. Fulfill what you vow. It is better that
you should not vow than that you should vow and not fulfill it" (Eccl 5:4-5).
Similarly, the book of Sirach teaches: "Let nothing hinder you from paying a
vow promptly, and do not wait until death to be released from it. Before making
a vow, prepare yourself; do not be like one who puts the Lord to the test" (Sir
18:22-23).

IV. Qumran

The most relevant source from Qumran is the Damascus Document (CD). 11
Two incomplete medieval copies of this document were discovered in an old
Cairo synagogue in 1896. Extensive fragments of the document were later found

11 The text used for this study is The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek
English quotations are from The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English (ed. G. Vermes;
in Caves 4, 5, and 6 at Qumran. The oldest fragments date from the early first century BCE. The most important text for this study begins at CD 16:6 and continues to CD 9:1.\textsuperscript{12}

And concerning the saying, "You shall keep your vow by fulfilling it (Deut 23:24)," let no man, even at the price of death, annul any binding oath by which he has sworn to keep a commandment of the Law. But even at the price of death, a man shall fulfill no vow by which he has sworn to depart from the Law. Inasmuch as He said, "It is for her husband to cancel her oath (Num 30:9)," no husband shall cancel an oath without knowing whether it should be kept or not. Should it be such as to lead to transgression of the Covenant, he shall cancel it and shall not let it be kept. The rule for her father is likewise. No man shall vow to the altar anything unlawfully acquired. Also, no Priest shall take from Israel anything unlawfully acquired. And no man shall consecrate the food of his house to God, for it is as he said, "Each hunts his brother with a net (Mic 7:2)." Let no man consecrate... And if he has consecrated to God some of his own field... he who has made the vow shall be punished.... Every vow by which a man vows another to destruction by the laws of the Gentiles shall himself be put to death.

This passage emphasizes the solemn nature of oaths and vows. It allows for annulment of vows of women that violate the law. It prohibits vows that dedicate wrongfully acquired property. It forbids vowing or consecrating personal property to affect others negatively. And it condemns the practice of vowing another person to destruction. The entire passage is based on Deut 23:21-23 (Matt 23:22-24) and Num 30:2-15 (Matt 30:3-16). However, the texts from the Hebrew Bible have been paraphrased, and the terms for oath and vow are used interchangeably. In addition, CD 16:6-18 uses הָאָרֶץ ("something consecrated, dedicated, removed from profane use, vow"), הָאָלֶם ("freewill-offering, donation"), אָרֶם ("sanctify, consecrate, dedicate"), לֹאָרֶם ("swear, vow"), מִבּוֹרֶם ("oath"), and מִבּוֹרֶם ("swear, take an oath").\textsuperscript{13}

The text upholds the inviolability of the Law, requiring individuals to pay the price of death rather than transgress a commandment. The text does address the annulment of oaths and vows made by women, but any such annulment is limited only to oaths or vows that violate the community's covenant. Significant for this study are the admonitions concerning unacceptable vows, particularly the ruling "No man shall consecrate the food of his house to God, for it is as he said,


‘Each hunts his brother with a net’ (Mic 7:2).” The prohibition is supported by a quotation from Mic 7:2: מְשַׁלֵּךְ יַעֲרֹא שָׁר הָאָרֶץ. In CD 16:15, the noun מְשַׁלֵּךְ should be understood as "something consecrated, dedicated; vow;" rather than the homonym meaning "trap, net, snare." According to Fitzmyer, the text forbids "the dedication of any food to God so that it might not be used to help one's neighbor."

V. Philo

Philo of Alexandria, who lived from about 20 BCE to 50 CE, provides still another link in the tradition concerning vows.15 He regularly uses εὐχή and εὐχομαι for "vow."16 His most extensive treatment of vows occurs in On the Special Laws. In 1.247-54 he discusses the ‘great vow’ of the Nazirite. In 2.1-38 he discusses rash oaths and vows, oaths and vows of women, and vows of valuation, all under the category εὐορκία, "fidelity to one's oath, the duty of keeping oaths." In 2.16 he comments on people who make oaths that negatively affect others. Here Philo uses ὀρκος, "oath," rather than εὐχή, "vow." But he often uses the terms interchangeably, and his statements in this text show how negative oaths or vows affecting others could be made by Jews in his time contrary to the law or good moral judgment:

But there are some who, either because through excessive moroseness their nature has lost the sense of compassion and fellow-feeling or because they are constrained by anger which rules them like a stern mistress, confirm the savagery of their temper with an oath. They declare that they will not admit such and such a person to their board or under their roof, or again, that they will not render assistance to so and so or accept anything from him till his life's end. Sometimes they carry on their vindictiveness after that end has come and leave directions in their wills against even granting the customary rites to the corpse.

Although the practice was not considered acceptable by Philo, this example provides evidence that oaths, and probably also vows, were used by Jews in his


16 Philo, Allegorical Interpretation 1.17; 2.63; On the Unchangeableness of God 87; On Husbandry 175; On Drunkenness 2; On Mating with the Preliminary Studies 99; On Flight and Finding 115; Life of Moses 1.252; On the Decalogue 126; et al. See also Eusebius, Preparation for the Gospel 8.7.

17 LSJM, Lexicon, 725.
day to prohibit individuals from receiving any assistance from the one who made the oath or vow.

VI. Archaeological Evidence

Two archaeological discoveries provide valuable information regarding the Jewish practice of making vows during the Second Temple period. In each case the term נַרְכַּה was used to deny others the use of something by declaring an object to have the status of a consecrated offering.

The first discovery is a fragment of a stone vessel recovered from an excavation of a first-century-BCE Herodian street near the Temple in Jerusalem. The vessel, found among coins and other vessels, bears the inscription נַרְכַּה, most likely representing the Hebrew noun נַרְכָּה. Along with this inscription is a carved depiction of two birdlike figures, suggesting some connection with the offering of two doves or pigeons (Lev 12:8). The vessel's inscription and its discovery along with coins indicate that its use was similar to the practice debated in the following passage from the Mishnah:

Any coins that are found are deemed unconsecrated, even if it was a golden denar found with silver coins. If a potsherd was found with them and on it was written 'Tithe,' they must be deemed (Second) Tithe (redemption money). If a man found a vessel and on it was written "Korban," R. Judah says: If it was of earthenware the vessel is to be deemed unconsecrated but its contents Korban; and if it was of metal it is to be deemed Korban but its contents unconsecrated. They said to him: It is not the way of men to put what is unconsecrated into what is Korban (m. Ma'aser Sheni 4:9-10).19

The second discovery is an ossuary found southeast of Jerusalem. On the ossuary lid, written in a Herodian script from the end of the first century BCE, is the Aramaic inscription: כל דר את מחתה חלמה דברי מזדבון אלוהים ("Everything that a man will find to his profit in this ossuary (is) an offering to God from the one within it)." According to Milik, נַרְכַּה is used as a male-diction or imprecation toward others." Fitzmyer claims the term still means "offering," but is used here as "a warning that whatever of value is in the ossuary

22 Milik, "Trois tombeaux juifs," 235, 238, 239.
has been dedicated to God and is not intended for any profane use."23 Significantly, the term נבר, did not transfer the ossuary or its contents to the temple. Rather, this vow formula was used simply to declare something to be sacred and thus prohibit others from using it or obtaining benefit from it in any way.

VII. The New Testament

The practice of vowing is not common in the NT.24 The verb εὐχωμαί is not used meaning "vow," but only "pray" or "wish" (Acts 26:29; 27:29; Rom 9:3; 2 Cor 13:7, 9; Jas 5:16; 3 John 2). The noun εὐχή is used once meaning "prayer" (Jas 5:15) and twice meaning "vow" (Acts 18:18; 21:23).25 References to oaths are more common. The noun ὁρκος, "oath," occurs ten times, and the verb ὀμνυς, "swear, take an oath," occurs twenty-six times.26 Most significantly, with the exception of oaths made by God or an angel, swearing of oaths is always portrayed in the NT as an undesirable act. Other significant terms include ἀνάθεμα ("anything dedicated, a curse") and ἀναθεματίζω ("curse, bind with an oath").27

The one clear NT example of a negative vow forbidding the use of something by others is in Matt 15:3-6 and Mark 7:9-13. Here Jesus speaks to some Pharisees about a conflict between their oral tradition and the Scriptures. The key sentence occurs in Matt 15:5 and Mark 7:11-12. It describes a practice by which a son could make a vow prohibiting his parents from receiving any benefit from him, thus exempting him from honoring them with material support. This violated not only the commandment to honor one's parents (Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16) but also the commandment not to speak evil of one's parents (Exod 21:17; Lev 20:9). According to both Matthew and Mark, Jesus accused the Pharisees of upholding the validity of such a vow that would prevent a person from doing anything for his parents.

25 BAGD, Lexicon, 329.
26 BAGD, Lexicon, 565, 566, 581. See also: ἐνορκίζω, "cause someone to swear"; ἔξορκίζω "charge under oath"; and ὀρκίζω, "cause someone to swear"; ὀρκῳσία, "oath, taking an oath."
Matt 15:3-6
3) He answered them, "And why do you break the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition?
4) For God said, ‘Honor your father and your mother,’ and ‘Whoever speaks evil of father or mother must surely die.’
5) But you say that whoever tells father or mother, ‘Whatever support you might have had from me is given to God,’ then that person need not honor the father.
6) So, for the sake of your tradition, you make void the word of God."

Mark 7:9-13
9) Then he said to them, "You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God in order to keep your tradition!
10) For Moses said, ‘Honor your father and your mother,’ and ‘Whoever speaks evil of father or mother must surely die.’
11) But you say that if anyone tells father or mother, ‘Whatever support you might have had from me is Corban’ (that is, an offering to God)--
12) then you no longer permit doing anything for a father or mother,
13) thus making void the word of God through your tradition that you have handed on. And you do many things like this."

According to Mark 7:11, the vow was introduced by the formula "Whatever support you might have had from me is Corban." The term κορβαν is simply a transliteration of the Hebrew קָרַבָּן or the Aramaic קָרַבָּן. Mark explains this term with the clause ὁ ἐστὶν δωρόν, "that is, an offering to God." Matthew simply has the translation δωρόν. Thus קָרַבָּן or קָרַבָּן was understood in the first century CE to mean "gift, offering" while also functioning as a technical term in a vow formula that prohibited others from deriving benefit from that which was dedicated.

Scholars are divided over whether a vow formula like the one preserved in Mark 7:11 actually dedicated the designated object to the temple or simply declared the object to have the status of consecrated property as far as certain individuals were concerned. Derrett has argued that the person who made the vow could not continue to use the property, but was required to give the property

28 BAGD, Lexicon, 210-11.
or its value to the Temple. However, Derrett's argument is based entirely on later rabbinic rulings concerning vows of valuation and does not consider earlier evidence.

In an age when the Temple still stood, the formula may well have been used to dedicate property that would subsequently be given as an offering to God. Yet the previous evidence examined in this study suggests that the formula was also used to prohibit others from using something by declaring it consecrated as far as they were concerned. The person who made the vow could retain possession of the property as before, and only those toward whom the vow had been directed could have no further use of it. Still, the effectiveness of this vow was based on the belief that such a declaration gave objects consecrated status, even if only with limited application.

However, would the Pharisees actually have upheld a vow that violated the Law of Moses? For scholars such as E. P. Sanders, this would not have been possible. At least not as it is portrayed in the Gospels. According to Sanders, even if some odd Pharisee may have done this at some time, the Pharisees as a whole were not guilty of teaching people to act in this way. Instead, according to Sanders, most Pharisees would have condemned the practice just as Jesus did. Thus the story preserved by Matthew and Mark must be considered part of the anti-Jewish or anti-Pharisaical polemic of the early church and not dependable evidence for an accepted practice within the tradition of the Pharisees in the first-century CE.

In response to Sanders, it must be pointed out that his claim is based on the presupposition that the teaching of the Pharisees is preserved in later rabbinic texts. However, the tradition passed on by the Pharisees was not identical with that of the later rabbis, but underwent considerable development. One area in which such development occurred was the tradition concerning vows. As Saul Lieberman has shown, the practice of making all kinds of oaths and vows

---

presented a constant challenge to rabbis in the formative period of Judaism. Albert Baumgarten has argued very convincingly that the Pharisees of the first-century CE probably taught that only a limited number of vows could be released and that they probably would have required a son to fulfill a vow even like the one recorded in the Gospels."

The vow described by Jesus may have been due to anger, selfishness, or even misguided religious zeal. However, to uphold the sacredness of vows, the Pharisees were apparently bound by oral tradition to enforce and not annul such a vow.

VIII. Josephus

The writings of the Jewish author Josephus contain two passages that include κορβαν, a transliteration of either the Hebrew noun נברן or the Aramaic noun נברון similar to Mark 7:11.36 In Antiquities 4.73, Josephus says that the term κορβαν was used as a vow by those who declared themselves a "gift," δώρον, for God, apparently referring to the vow of valuation (Lev 27:1-33). In Against Apion 1.167, he reports that according to Theophrastus the use of κορβαν as an "oath" (ὄρκος) was forbidden by the people of Tyre. Josephus then comments: "Now this oath will be found in no other nation except the Jews, and, translated from the Hebrew, one may interpret it as meaning 'God's gift.'" Josephus's translation "God's gift," δώρον θεοῦ, confirms that the idea of an offering or consecration of something to God was still behind the formulaic use of the term in the first century CE.

IX. The Mishnah

The Mishnah treats oaths and vows at length.37 Although primarily informative regarding the time of its completion around 200 CE, the Mishnah also provides some insight into earlier development of Jewish law. The rulings on vows before 70 CE dealt with the invalid nature of vows made in error or under constraint. From 70-140 CE, general principles for abrogating vows were

---

36 The Greek text and English translation used for this study are from Josephus (Thackeray, LCL).
worked out. After 140 CE, the language of vows was subjected to greater clarification. The general trend was to restrict frivolous vows and to annul unacceptable ones.38

The main treatment of oaths is found in tractate Sebu‘oth ("Oaths").39 The most extensive treatment of vows is found in tractates Nazir ("Nazirite Vow"), ‘Arakin ("Vows of Valuation"), and especially Nedarim ("Vows").40 According to Neusner, the predominate concern of the tractate Nedarim is "the power of a person to affect his or her concrete and material relationships with other people through invoking the name of heaven."41 In this tractate, the rabbis attempt to regulate the practice of vowing, to prevent improper vows, and to provide for release from harmful or unjust vows because "vows will be taken primarily under emotional duress and express impatience and frustration. They are not predictable and never follow upon a period of sober reflection."42

The passages in the Mishnah of primary interest for this study are those that deal with negative vows, or vows of abstinence or prohibition. Many of these passages use תָּלְשׁ.43 Even more frequent is the euphemism בֶּן נֶדֶר.44 The following passages from the Mishnah are significant because they include the use of these terms in negative vows, or vows of abstinence intended to prohibit the use of something by someone other than the person who made the vow:

(If a man said to his fellow,) "May I be to thee as a thing that is banned!" he against whom the vow is made is forbidden (to have any benefit from him); (if he said,) "Be thou to me as a thing that is banned!" he that makes the vow is forbidden (to have any benefit from the other); (if he said,) "May I be to thee and thou to me (as a thing  that is banned)," then each is forbidden (to have any benefit from the other). (m. Nedarim 5:4)

39 See also m. Seqal 2:1; m. Ketub. 8:5; 9:2; 10:5; 13:1-4; m. Ned. 1:1, 2; 2:1, 2, 3; 3:4; m. Git. 4:3; 5:3, 4; m. Kidd. 1:5; m. B. Qam. 9:5; 10:3; m. Baba Mezi‘a 1:1, 2; 3:1, 2; 4:7; 6:8; 7:8; 8:2; 9:12; m. Sanh. 3:2.
40 See also m. Sebu. 9:7; m. Ter. 1:3; m. Hal. 1:2; m. Sabb. 24:5; m. ‘Erub. 3:1; m. Meg. 1:6,7; m. Wed Qat. 3:1, 2; m. Hag. 1:8; m. Yebam. 2:10; 13:13; m. Ketub. 7:6; m. Git. 4.-3; m. Qidd. 2:5; m. Sanh. 3:2; 7:6; m. Menah. 12:2; m. Hul. 8:1; m. ‘Arak. 5:1; m. Nid. 5:6.
42 Neusner, Nedarim, Nazir, 5.
43 m. Nedarim 1:2-4; 2:2; 5; 9:7; 11:5; m. Nazir 2:1-3; m. Ma‘aser Sheni 4:10.
44 m. Nedarim 1:2, 4; 2:1-2; 5; 3:1-4; 11; 4:6; 5:3; 6:1-4; 7, 10; 7:3; 6-8; 9:2-3, 7-10; 11:1-4, 6, 11; m. Gittin 4:7; m. Baba Kamma 9:10; m. Sebu‘oth 3:4.
If a man was forbidden by vow to have any benefit from his fellow, and he had naught to eat, his fellow may give (the food) to another as a gift, and the first is permitted to use it. It once happened that a man at Beth Horon, whose father was forbidden by vow to have any benefit from him, was giving his son in marriage, and he said to his fellow, "The courtyard and the banquet are given to thee as a gift, but they are thine only that my father may come and eat with us at the banquet." His fellow said, "If they are mine, they are dedicated to Heaven." The other answered, "I did not give thee what is mine that thou shouldst dedicate it to Heaven." His fellow said, "Thou didst give me what is thine only that thou and thy father might eat and drink and be reconciled one with the other, and that the sin should rest on his head!" (*m. Nedarim* 5:6)

So, too, if a man said to his fellow, "Konam be the benefit thou hast from me if thou come not and give my son a kor of wheat and two jars of wine!" R. Meir says: The vow is binding until he gives (him them). But the Sages say: He, too, may break his vow without recourse to a Sage, and he can say to his fellow, "Lo, it is as though I had already received them." (*m. Nedarim* 8:7)

R. Ehezer says: They may open for men the way (to repentance) by reason of the honour due to father and mother. But the Sages forbid it. R. Zadok said: Rather than open the way for a man by reason of the honour due to father and mother, they should open the way for him by reason of the honour due to God; but if so, there could be no vows. But the Sages agree with R. Eliezer that in a matter between a man and his father and mother, the way may be opened to him by reason of the honour due to his father and mother. (*m. Nedarim* 9:1)

If a man said to his son, "Konam be any benefit thou hast of mine!" and he died, the son may inherit from him; (but if moreover he said) "both during my life and at my death!" when he dies the son may not inherit from him and he must restore (what he had received from his father at any time) to the father's sons or brothers; and if he has naught (wherewith to repay) he must borrow, and the creditors come and exact payment (*m. Baba Kamma* 9:10)

The preceding passages demonstrate that at the time of the Mishnah negative vows could affect other people, even spouses, parents, or children. Some vows were declared with the intent of denying benefit to others. The most significant texts are *m. Ned.* 9:1 and *m. B. Qamma.* 9:10. In *m. Ned.* 9:1, in spite of debate, the Sages agreed "in a matter between one and his father and his mother," a son could be released from a vow "by reason of the honor due to his father and his mother." A vow such as that described in Mark 7:11 was a vow that could be annulled. This is a change from the situation in Mark 7:12, where Jewish teachers would not permit one who made such a vow to do anything for his parents. And in *m. Baba Kamma* 9:10, it is the father who declares קור any benefit that his son might have from him. It was possible for a son to vow away obligations toward his parents, but the rabbis of the Mishnah would declare such a vow voidable. As Z. W. Falk observed, "had the son approached them, they
would have taught him to annul his vow and abide by the rules of filial duty.\footnote{Falk, "On Talmudic Vows," 311.}

Still, the Mishnah considers rules of release from vows to "hover in the air and have naught to support them" (\textit{m. Hagigah} 1:8).\footnote{Origen was a contemporary of the Mishnah's redactors and appears to have had firsthand knowledge about Jewish teaching of the time. For information on Origen and his knowledge of Judaism, see J. Danidiou, \textit{Origen} (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955); C. Kannengiesser and W. L. Petersen, eds., \textit{Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy} (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1988); H. Crouzet, \textit{Origen} (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989. Origen preserves the following explanation of \textit{korban}, which he learned from a Jew. The translation is from A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, \textit{The Ante-Nicene Fathers} (rev. A. C. Coxe, 10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980-1983).}

Sometimes, he says, when money-lenders fell in with stubborn debtors who were able but not willing to pay their debts, they consecrated what was due to the account of the poor, for whom money was cast into the treasury by each of those who wished to give a portion of their goods to the poor according to their ability. They, therefore, said sometimes to their debtors in their own tongue, "That which you owe to me is Corban," that is, a gift, "for I have consecrated it to the poor, to the account of piety towards God."

Then the debtor, as no longer in debt to men but to God and to piety towards God, was shut up, as it were, even though unwilling, to payment of the debt, no longer to the money-lender, but now to God for the account of the poor, in the name of the money-lender. (\textit{Commentary on Matthew 11.9})

\textbf{X. The Yerushalmi}

The Yerushalmi, also known as the Palestinian Talmud or Talmud of the Land of Israel, is the next significant source for this study.\footnote{The Hebrew/Aramaic text of the Yerushalmi used for this study is from \textit{Talmud Yerushalmi}, (7 vols.; New York: M. P., 1976). English quotations are taken from J. Neusner, ed., \textit{The Talmud of the Land of Israel} (35 vols.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982-1986). There were other compilations of Jewish law produced between the Mishnah and Yerushalmi. The work \textit{m. Aboth}, compiled around 250 CE, contains only two brief references to vows (3:14; 4:18), neither of which concerns negative vows. The Tosefta, compiled around 300 CE, omits much of the Mishnah's discussion of negative vows, especially expletive vows. Of the Mishnaic texts discussed previously, the Tosefta does not include \textit{m. Nedarim} 5:6 and 9:1 and includes only a small portion of \textit{m. Nedarim} 8:7.}

and vows interchangeably (y. Ned. 1:1 VI; 5:4 IV; 9:1 V). Other passages distinguish oaths from vows by claiming that only vows were capable of being absolved by the rabbis (y. Ned. 11: I II). According to Jacob Neusner, what is important is that "in its account of the public conduct of the rabbis, the Talmud provides ample evidence that rabbis found grounds for absolution of vows and told people about them."49

The Yerushalmi discusses m. Ned. 5:4; 5:6; and 8:7, but it provides no additional information. It treats m. Ned. 9:1 more thoroughly, including some material found only here in rabbinic literature. In particular, y. Ned. 9:1 I-IV contains various rulings on the proper grounds for release from vows. Immediately afterward y. Ned. 9:1 V attempts to explain what the rabbis of the Mishnah must have meant in m. Ned. 9:1 in the matter between a son and his parents:

How shall we interpret the matter? If he says, "Benefit deriving from me is forbidden to father," then we must invoke that which was said by R. Jacob bar Aha, R. Samuel bar Nahman in the name of R. Jonathan: "They force the son to provide maintenance for the father." But thus we must interpret the matter: It is a case in which he has said, "Benefit deriving from father is prohibited to me."

The rabbis of the Yerushalmi record an interpretation that the son had made a vow forbidding his father from receiving "benefit" (הנייה), the financial support due to his parents.50 But they conclude this could not be the correct meaning of the Mishnah. The command to "honor" one's parents was sufficient reason to absolve the vow and force the son to provide for his father. Therefore, they explain the text to mean that the son had vowed not to receive any benefit from his father.

XI. The Bavli

The Bavli, also called the Babylonian Talmud, dates from 500-600 CE.51 Like the Yerushalmi, the Bavli provides an exposition of over half the Mishnah. In addition to organizing the work around the structure of the Mishnah, the compilers of the Bavli produced a synthesis of all rabbinic literature, drawing on previous Mishnah exegesis in the Tosefta, the Yerushalmi, and previous Scripture exegesis in the various midrashim. All this material was selectively shaped into the "classical statement" of rabbinic Judaism." As Louis Jacobs has

49 Neusner, Judaism in Society, 169-70.
50 Jastrow, Dictionary, 357-58.
51 The text and translation of the Bavli used for this study is from I. Epstein, ed., Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud (London: Soncino, 1962-).
observed, "the compilers were creative artists, reshaping all the earlier material to produce a literary work."\(^53\)

The Bavli shows significant developments in rabbinic attitudes toward vows. These include emphasis on fulfilling all binding vows, opposition to vow taking in general, and increased efforts to find ways of releasing people from improper vows. In *b. Shabbath* 32b the rabbis say failure to fulfill a vow can result in the death of one's wife and children.\(^54\) In *b. Ta'anith* 4a the rabbis criticize the vow of Jephthah (Judg 11:30-40) and link it with worship of Baal.\(^55\) In dealing with annulling vows, *b. Yebamoth* states: "R. Nathan said, 'If a man makes a vow it is as if he has built a high place and if he fulfills it, it is as if he has offered up a sacrifice upon it."\(^56\) After quoting the biblical injunction on vows in Eccl 5:4, *b. Hullin* 2a says: "And it has been taught: Better than both is he who does not vow at all; this is the opinion of R. Meir. R. Judah says, Better than both is he who vows and pays."\(^57\)

As in the Mishnah and Yerushalmi, the most extensive treatment of vows in the Bavli is *Nedarim* ("Vows"). Here the Bavli intensifies its opposition to vows, offers examples of rabbis granting release from vows, but demands fulfillment of binding vows. Numerous passages repeat that any vow that appears to violate biblical commands must not really violate them or must be annulled (*b. Nedarim* 13b; 14a; 15a; 15b; 16a; 16b; 17a; et al.). The practice of taking vows is discouraged: "Never make a practice of vow ing, for ultimately you will trespass in the matter of oaths" (*b. Nedarim* 20a). Occasionally, rulings attempt to save the practice from condemnation (*b. Nedarim* 21b). However, in general, vowing is seen as undesirable, as the rabbis once told a man who sought release from a vow: "Go and pray for mercy, for you have sinned. For R. Dimi, the brother of R. Safra, learnt: He who vows, even though he fulfills it, is designated a sinner" (*b. Nedirim* 77b).


\(^{54}\) Similar warnings concerning vows are found in *Leviticus Rabbah* 37:1, where a man's unfulfilled vows result in idolatry, fornication, and bloodshed, including the death of his wife and himself. Also *Genesis Rabbah* 81:1 explains that when a man delays to fulfill his vow, God examines his ledger.

\(^{55}\) A similar disapproval occurs in *Genesis Rabbah* 60:3 and *Leviticus Rabbah* 37:4, where it is emphasized that Jephthah should have obtained release from his vow by appealing to Phineas.

\(^{56}\) Opposition to vows was so strong that sayings attributed to the rabbis in *Leviticus Rabbah* 37:2-3 state that whoever takes a vow and whoever annuls a vow deserve to be stabbed with a sword. Still, anyone who makes a vow is urged to go to a rabbi and beg for release. See also *b. Nedarim* 22a.

\(^{57}\) See also *b. Nedarim* 9a; *Leviticus Rabbah* 37:1.
The passages of the Mishnah concerning negative vows of prohibition that affect others are not at all important for the compilers of the Bavli. For example, the Bavli’s treatment of m. Nedarim 9:1 in b. Nedarim 64a-65a lacks the discussion that is found in y. Nedarim 9:1 V A-B. The rabbis of the Yerushalmi concluded that the Mishnah could not have meant that a son could make a vow forbidding him from supporting his parents, but they did record the earlier view that it could happen. The rabbis of the Bavli omit all discussion of this issue. The issue had been settled, and it was no longer even a faint memory that a person seeking to live as a faithful Jew could vow away the fifth commandment.

XII. Conclusion
A major issue in the development of Jewish law concerning vows is the possible conflict between keeping a vow and keeping the commandments of the written Torah. Evidence from the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Philo, and archaeological information indicates that prior to the first century AD negative vows that affected others were already being made. Mark 7:9-13 shows that, in the first century CE, a son could make a vow using the term qorban and prohibit his parents from receiving support from him. Even though such a vow violated the fifth commandment, some Jewish teachers upheld such a vow, perhaps because of the biblical teaching on the inviolability of vows. The NT and Josephus indicate that the use of the term qorban as a vow formula was still associated with the idea of an offering. Later the Mishnah set forth rulings making such a vow clearly voidable because of the honor due to one's parents. For rabbis of the Yerushalmi, the practice was understandable, though rejected. By the time of the Bavli, the rabbis did not contemplate it, for one could no longer vows away the fifth commandment.
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THE OPENNESS OF GOD:
DOES PRAYER CHANGE GOD?

William D. Barrick
Professor of Old Testament

A proper understanding of two OT prayers, one by Hezekiah and one by Moses, helps in determining whether prayer is the means by which God gets His will done on earth or the means by which the believer's will is accomplished in heaven. A chronological arrangement of the three records of Hezekiah's prayer in 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, and Isaiah reveals the arrogance of Hezekiah in his plea for God to heal him. Because Hezekiah missed the opportunity to repent of his self-centered attitude, God revealed that his descendants would become slaves in Babylon, but Hezekiah's arrogance kept him from being concerned about his children and grandchildren. His pride further showed itself in his inability to trust God for defense against the Assyrians. God healed Hezekiah, not so much because of his prayer, but because of the promises that God had made to Hezekiah's ancestors about sustaining the Davidic line of kings. Hezekiah's prayer changed Hezekiah, not God. Moses' prayer in Exodus 32 sought a change from God's expressed intention of putting an end to Israel and starting over again with just Moses. This suggestion was not something that the Lord ever intended to occur; such a course would have voided His expressed purpose for the twelve tribes of Israel (Genesis 49). God did not change His mind regarding His plan for the twelve tribes; He rather altered His timing in order to keep His promises to them. What He did in response to Moses' prayer cannot be taken as normative action. His "change of mind" was a tool to elicit a change of response in Moses. Moses' prayer changed Moses, not God.

Introduction

Two very different views of prayer pervade the church today. The first view teaches that prayer is one of the means by which God gets His will done on earth: "Effective prayer is, as John said, asking in God's will (John 15:7). Prayer is not a means by which we get our will done in heaven. Rather, it is a means by which
God gets his will done on earth.”¹

The second view proclaims that prayer is one of the instruments by which the believer's will is accomplished in heaven. This view holds that prayer can change God:

Prayer affects God more powerfully than His own purposes. God's will, words and purposes are all subject to review when the mighty potencies of prayer come in. How mighty prayer is with God may be seen as he readily sets aside His own fixed and declared purposes in answer to prayer.²

This view sees prayer as changing God's mind or helping Him decide what to do, since He does not know everything.³ In his book The God Who Risks, John Sanders writes, "Only if God does not yet know the outcome of my journey can a prayer for a safe traveling be coherent within the model of S[imple] F[ore-knowledge]."⁴ In other words, an individual has reason to pray about a journey only if God does not know where that person is going or what will happen to him. If God already knows where someone is going and what is going to happen, open theism believes there is no need for prayer regarding the journey. The prayers of Hezekiah and Moses are among the passages whose interpretation is contested by these two views.

**Hezekiah's Prayer (2 Kgs 20:1-11; Isa 38:1-8; 2 Chr 32:24)**

Open theists present the prayer of Hezekiah as an example of prayer changing God's mind.⁵ Error in open theists' approach to this prayer is partially due to their failure to examine all three records of Hezekiah's prayer (2 Kgs 20:1-11; 2 Chr 32:24; Isa 38:1-8) in their respective contexts.

**Hezekiah's Arrogance**

King Hezekiah repeatedly manifested an arrogant mindset. What was admirable about Hezekiah was that, in spite of that arrogance and egotism, he was

---

³ Gregory A. Boyd, *God of the Possible: A Biblical Introduction to the Open View of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000) 58: "God sometimes expresses uncertainty about it" (the future)—based on passages like Gen 22:12. "... [S]ometimes God tells us that things turn out differently than he expected" (59)—based on passages like Isa 5:2-4. "Scripture teaches us that God literally finds out how people will choose when they choose" (65)—based on passages like I Sam 15:11. "God is also perfectly certain about a good deal of what is actually going to take place in the future" (150). Clark H. Pinnock, *Systematic Theology," in The Openness of God: A Biblical Challenge to the Traditional Understanding of God* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1994) 122: "In saying ‘perhaps,’ God also indicates that he does not possess complete knowledge of the future“—based on passages like Jer 26:3.
yet sensitive to the leading of God through the words of the prophet Isaiah. The king allowed himself to be rebuked, would demonstrate a sincere change of mind, and turn to God in faith. Close scrutiny of the order of events in Hezekiah's fourteenth year reveal the king's arrogance as well as his moments of faithfulness. Old Testament scholars recognize that the biblical records of Hezekiah's reign are not in chronological order. Prior to his illness, Hezekiah had already been on the throne for 14 years of his 29-year reign (2 Kgs 18:2, 13). At the time God granted him healing and an extended life, He also promised to deliver both Hezekiah and Jerusalem from the Assyrians (2 Kgs 20:5-6; Isa 38:6). Clearly, therefore, that deliverance had not occurred prior to Hezekiah's healing. When Merodach-baladan, king of Babylon, sent envoys with a letter and a gift for the restored Hezekiah (Isa 39:1), the proud king showed them his stored treasures (39:2-4). Thus, the stripping of Jerusalem to pay tribute to Sennacherib had to have taken place subsequent to that event. Careful reconstruction of the events of Hezekiah's fourteenth year as king reveals that it was a very busy year:

1. Sennacherib invaded Judah (2 Kgs 18:13; 2 Chr 32:1; Isa 36:1).
2. Hezekiah became mortally ill (2 Kgs 20:1; 2 Chr 32:24; Isa 38:1-3).
3. Hezekiah was healed and granted an additional 15 years of life (2 Kgs 20:5-6; Isa 38:4-22).
4. Merodach-baladan's envoys bring Hezekiah a letter and gift because Babylon had heard of the Judean king's illness (2 Kgs 20:12; Isa 39:1).
6. Isaiah informed the king that one day his own descendants would serve in the palace of Babylon's king (2 Kgs 20:16-19; Isa 39:3-8).
7. Hezekiah constructed the Siloam water tunnel, strengthened the walls of Jerusalem, and prepared weapons to defend the city (2 Chr 32:2-8).
8. Weakening in his faith, Hezekiah stripped both the Temple and his own treasures to pay tribute to Sennacherib at Lachish (2 Kgs 18:14-16). This wealth was what God had given to Hezekiah (cf. 2 Chr 32:27-30).
10. The Assyrian officers left Jerusalem and rejoined Sennacherib at Lachish (2 Kgs 19:8; Isa 37:8).
11. Rumor of the Ethiopian king's intent to attack Sennacherib resulted in renewed pressure upon Hezekiah to surrender (2 Kgs 19:9-13; Isa 37:9-13).
12. In what the writer of 2 Kings and Isaiah both present as a significant act of

---

8 Whether this was just a weakening of his resolve to resist Sennacherib or a ploy to buy time or further strengthening of Jerusalem's fortifications, it is evidence that Hezekiah was depending upon his own actions rather than upon the living God's protection.
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faith, Hezekiah took the letter demanding surrender into the Temple and prayed for deliverance (2 Kgs 19:14-34; 2 Chr 32:20; Isa 37:14-20).


14. Assyrian troops surrounded Jerusalem; 185,000 were slain by divine intervention; and Sennacherib returned to Nineveh (2 Kgs 19:35-36; 2 Chr 32:21-22; Isa 37:36-37).

15. The people bestowed such an abundance of gifts on Hezekiah that even the nations around Israel began to exalt him (2 Chr 32:23).

Why is the order of the record in 2 Kings and Isaiah so confused? It appears that with chapters 36 and 37, Isaiah intended to wrap up the prophecies he had begun in chapter 7 concerning the Assyrian era. Starting at chapter 38 and continuing through at least chapter 48, he is dealing with the Babylonian era. The writer of 2 Kings was probably well aware of Isaiah's order and chose to follow it himself. A summary of each king's life was a characteristic part of the formula employed by the writer of Kings. In 2 Kgs 18:3 the summary declared that Hezekiah "did right in the sight of the LORD, according to all that his father David had done."9 After describing the revival under Hezekiah's rule (v. 4) and his piety (vv. 5-6), his political achievements are listed (vv. 7-8). The most prominent of these was the repelling of the Assyrians. Therefore, the writer proceeds to describe it in detail (vv. 9-37). Then he reveals another side of Hezekiah that God did not choose to hide from His people. Hezekiah was not a perfect saint.

Hezekiah's illness probably was due to divine chastening for his arrogance. Fourteen years prior to becoming mortally ill he had repaired the Temple doors, ordered the cleansing of the Temple, and arranged for its reconsecration (2 Chr 29:3-36). He also had reinstituted the observance of the Passover (30:1-27) and a revival broke out in the nation (31:1). Then he led the people in the provision of tithes and offerings for the Temple service (31:2-7). So much was given that room had to be prepared for storing them in the Temple (31:8-19). The first words of 32:1 sound ominous: "After these acts of faithfulness...."

One indication of the king's arrogance appears in the self-centered character of his plea for God to heal him. A comparison of Isa 38:3 with 37:16-20 reveals that Hezekiah's emphasis in the former was upon his own deeds ("I have walked before Thee in truth and with a whole heart, and have done what is good in Thy sight"). By contrast, the latter prayer focused upon God Himself ("Thou art the God, Thou alone, . . . Thou hast made . . . Incline Thine ear ... open Thine eyes ... that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that Thou alone, LORD, art God").10 Further evidence of the king's arrogance is obvious in that even after his healing, Hezekiah was chastised for arrogance: "But Hezekiah gave no return for the benefit

---

9 Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture references are taken from the New American Standard Bible (1977).

10 Cf. Hobbs, 2 Kings 290.
he received, because his heart was proud; therefore wrath came on him and on Judah and Jerusalem" (2 Chr 32:25).

God gave Hezekiah the opportunity to show that his mortal illness and divine healing had changed his attitude (2 Chr 32:31). Finding no such change, God sent Isaiah to prophesy that Hezekiah's descendants would become slaves in Babylon. But all that the king could think about was that he would be spared such an indignity. He showed no concern for his children or grandchildren (2 Kgs 20:19; Isa 39:8).

Hezekiah was one of the most truly human of the kings, and his portrait here accords with what is recorded elsewhere. He was a man whose heart was genuinely moved towards the Lord but whose will was fickle under the pressures and temptations of life. Like the David who was his ancestor, and unlike the greater David who was his descendant, his first thoughts were for himself. On hearing of his imminent death his only cry amounted to ‘I do not want to die’ (38:2-3), and on hearing of a dark future for his sons his private thought was ‘There will be peace ... in my lifetime’ (39:8).11

Perhaps Hezekiah's first words ("The word of the LORD which you have spoken is good," Isa 39:8a) were merely a public show of yielding to God's will. However, the Lord knew the king's true thoughts in the matter (v. 8b). "The clay feet of Hezekiah are now apparent."12 Assuming that Hezekiah did not hide such feelings from Manasseh, it is no wonder the son turned out to be so antagonistic to spiritual things Hezekiah lacked the capacity to trust God totally for his and the nation's deliverance from the Assyrians. The fact that he sent tribute to Sennacherib seems to indicate as much. Isaiah had exposed Ahaz's dependence upon Syria in the face of the Assyrian threat (Isa 8:6-8). Hezekiah may have followed in his father's footsteps and merited the prophetic accusation that he made plans and alliances apart from the Lord (30:1-5, 15-17; 31:1). There was truth to the accusations made by Rabshakeh that Hezekiah had sought help from Egypt (36:5-9). As Motyer so eloquently stated, "Sennacherib arrived! But the Lord looks on the heart. Sennacherib would not have come had Hezekiah kept himself free from the worldly expedient of arms, alliances and rebellion."13

Therefore, with Whitcomb, the conclusion must be "that if II Kings 20:1 were expanded, it would read: ‘In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death because Jehovah chastened him for the pride that was rising within his heart after so many years of prosperity and blessing.”14 In addition to the prosperity, there was also the matter of Hezekiah trusting more in his own ingenuity at preparing the defenses of

---

12 Hobbs, *2 Kings* 295.
14 Whitcomb, *Solomon to the Exile* 126.
Jerusalem, amassing armaments, and seeking advantageous political alliances.

**Hezekiah's Ancestry**

Why did God heal Hezekiah? One possible reason would be that Manasseh, who began his reign at the age of 12 when his father died (2 Kgs 20:21-21:1), might not have been born yet. However, that has been disputed. The Israelite system of coregencies makes it possible that Manasseh ... was probably a co-regent with his father—perhaps for 10 years—since his 55-year reign is difficult to fit into the history without such a co-regency. Hezekiah appears to have failed to provide Manasseh with sufficient reason to be a godly kin. However, he may have played a part in Manasseh's later repentance (2 Chr 33:12-13).15

Oswalt takes a line in Hezekiah's psalm (Isa 38:19, "It is the living who give thanks to Thee, as I do today; a father tells his sons about Thy faithfulness") as an indication that he was still heirless at the time of his healing. As Young notes, if it is correct that Hezekiah had no heir at this time (see on 38:3), then the opportunity to declare God's faithfulness to his children through the added years of life would have been a special blessing. Given Manasseh's apostasy, one can only wonder whether Hezekiah then missed the opportunity when it was given him.16

Whether or not Manasseh had not yet been born, there was a greater reason why God prolonged Hezekiah's life. Divine action was founded upon the Lord's covenant with David. That motivation is clearly declared in regard to God's promise to rid Jerusalem of Sennacherib ("I will defend this city to save it for My own sake and for My servant David's sake," 2 Kgs 19:34). "It also makes clear that, in spite of his piety and his prayers, Hezekiah played a minor role in the deliverance. Yahweh acted because of his promise to David."17 The Davidic factor is "emphasized by the use of the self-designation of Yahweh as הַלָּוָּא ('lhy dwd

---

15 Ibid., 127.

16 John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 689. Herbert Lockyer concurs: "His prayer was heard and his tears seen. God added fifteen years to Hezekiah's life, during which time a son was born to him, Manasseh, who became an abomination unto the Lord. It might have been better for Hezekiah had he died when the divine announcement reached him. There are occasions when God grants our request, but with it comes leanness of soul" (*All the Prayers of the Bible* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959] 80). Cf., however, "Nor did God punish Hezekiah by giving him the full measure of his 'wrongful prayer' as some have suggested. Indeed selfish, misdirected prayer (James 4:3) and petitions that are contrary to God's will are not granted (cf. Deut 3:23-26; 2 Cor 12:8 with 2 Chr 7:14; John 15:7)" (Richard D. Patterson and Hermann J. Austel, "1, 2 Kings," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. by Frank E. Gaebelein [Grand Rapids: Regency/Zondervan, 1988] 4:274).

17 Hobbs, *2 Kings* 282.
Hobbs proposes that the reference to David as Hezekiah's "father" is followed by the promise to add to Hezekiah's days (2 Kgs 20:6) because the "only commandment with a promise attached grants length of days for honoring parents."19

In other words, the answer to Hezekiah's prayer had more to do with the welfare of the nation and with sustaining the Davidic line than with the prayer of Hezekiah. "It is a sobering thought that when God answers one's prayer, He can also be considering others in the larger picture, not just him."20 Oswalt seconds this concept: "Hezekiah's recovery is not merely because God has changed his mind but because of his willingness to keep faith with those to whom he has committed himself in the past (Deut. 4:37, 38)."21

**Did Hezekiah's Prayer Change God's Mind?**

God did not change His mind because of Hezekiah's prayer. Nowhere in the text of 2 Kings 20, 2 Chronicles 32, or Isaiah 38 is the claim made that God changed His mind. Absence of such a statement in Scripture does not, however, prevent open theists from making that claim. Their claim flies in the face of all that the Scripture has to say regarding God's relationship to the Davidic line.

1 Sam 15:29 affirms that Yahweh's choice of David and his dynasty is irrevocable, unlike his choice of Saul. Nathan's statement to David in 2 Sam 7:15 concurs. 1 Sam 24:21; 2 Sam 3:9-10; 7:12, 16; Pss 89:4-5, 36-37; 132:11 all connect Yahweh's irretractable oath to his promise to David and his descendants. Thus, 1 Sam 15:11, 29, and 35 all come from the same Davidic circle, which advocated that whereas Yahweh repented over his choice of Saul, he would never repent of his choice of David and his dynasty.22

"It seems clear," as Bruce Ware points out, "that the divine repentance, in such cases, functions as part of a tool for eliciting a dynamic relationship with people, a means of drawing our responses which God uses, then, to accomplish his ultimate purposes."23 The change was not in God. The change was in Hezekiah. How can the reader of Scripture ascertain whether the change was first in Hezekiah rather than in God? Within this context the reader is repeatedly reminded that the

---

18 Ibid., 287.
19 Ibid.
20 James E. Ross cup, unpublished manuscript on prayer, 36.
focus is not really Hezekiah. "I will defend this city to save it for My own sake and for My servant David's sake" (Isa 37:35) does not include "for your sake."24

God will never contradict what He has said or promised elsewhere. He knew what He had promised in the Davidic covenant and would not violate it. Divine provision and care for the nation and for the Davidic dynasty superseded any immediate death sentence on Hezekiah, no matter how much it might have been justified. The illness was designed, not to kill Hezekiah, but to humble him. Its purpose was to teach the arrogant king that he was insignificant in God's overall plan. Likewise, there was no change in anything that the Lord had planned with regard to the length of Hezekiah's life (cf. Ps 139:1625). As far as Hezekiah's limited grasp of reality was concerned, God had added the 15 years at the time of his prayer. The Lord spoke of them from Hezekiah's standpoint.26

A reprieve had been granted to Hezekiah. However, that reprieve was primarily for Jerusalem's benefit, not his. As a matter of fact, the reprieve was "only a temporary one. And it is conditional. The life of a man or of a city is solely in the hand of God."27

Interestingly, God's specific declaration that Hezekiah's life would be extended 15 years is, in itself, inconsistent with Open Theism.

God granted to Hezekiah fifteen years of extended life--not two, not twenty, and certainly not "we'll both see how long you live," but fifteen years exactly. Does it not seem a bit odd that this favorite text of open theists, which purportedly demonstrates that God does not know the future and so changes his mind when Hezekiah prays, also shows that God knows precisely and exactly how much longer Hezekiah will live? On openness grounds, how could God know this? Over a fifteen-year time span, the contingencies are staggering!28

Moses' Prayer (Exod 32:1-35)

Exodus 32 is another passage contested by the two views of prayer introduced at the beginning of this essay. Open theists parade it as evidence that prayer changes God's mind.29 The chapter describes the role of Moses' prayer in

24 Isa 38:6's parallel in 2 Kgs 20:6 adds a nearly identical statement: "I will defend this city for My own sake and for My servant David's sake."
25 Boyd tortures the text in order to gain support for his opinion that the length of one's life may be altered (*God of the Possible* 40-42).
26 Rosscup, Manuscript on prayer, 36.
27 Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah* 673. Oswalt introduced this declaration with an astute observation regarding the theme of Isa 38: "the major thrust of the chapter, including the psalm (vv. 9-20), is upon the mortality of the flesh."
28 Ware, *God's Lesser Glory* 95.
God's dealing with Israel's rebellious and idolatrous worship of the golden calf at Sinai.

That idolatry aroused God's anger. As a result, He spoke of putting an end to the nation and starting over again with just Moses (Exod 32:10). Did the Lord make a legitimate offer to Moses? Is it possible that God had only made an announcement, not a decree, therefore He was free to change His mind about its implementation?\(^{30}\) Could the Lord nullify the prophecies concerning the individual tribes of Israel (cf. Genesis 49) or the prior promises to Abraham (Gen 12:1-3) in order to produce a new nation from Moses? Did Moses' prayer permanently remove the sentence of death from the nation?

Unlike the biblical accounts concerning Hezekiah's prayer, Exodus 32 specifies that "the LORD changed His mind" (v. 14). What is involved in God changing His mind or relenting? Is it the retraction of declared punishment in an act of forgiveness? Parunak\(^{31}\) offers parallelism, idiom, and context as indicators for determining the meaning of \(\text{NHM} \) (\(nhm\), "He changed His mind"). Are these sufficient for determining the meaning in this text? Since a postponement of inevitable judgment would allow time for the rise of a new generation of Israelites to replace the one to be destroyed, was the change of mind a matter of expediency?

Who was changed? God or Moses? How does prayer relate to the petitioner's will and God's will? Is prayer a means of training leadership and/or testing leadership? Is prayer the means of human participation in God's program? If so, what kind of participation? Does anthropomorphic interpretation apply well to the concept of God changing His mind or regretting His actions?\(^{32}\) In such matters, is there anything to Graham Cole's comment that "it may not be so much a matter of God being anthropopathic (human like) but of our being theopathic (God like) as bearers of the divine image"?\(^{33}\)

In this examination of Exodus 32 the text itself is enlisted as the primary witness. Therefore, the study will be organized according to the order of the text. Donald Gowan makes the important observation that the Book of Exodus "reaches its theological conclusion with chapters 32-34, for they explain how it can be that

---

\(^{30}\) Robert B. Chisholm, Jr., "Does God 'Change His Mind'?," BSac 152/608 (October 1995):396.


\(^{32}\) "The Scriptures, however, which come to us as a revelation from God, often bear an anthropomorphic character. All our speaking of God must, in fact, be anthropomorphic. We need not, on that account, devaluate Scripture's ascription of longsuffering to God. To do so consistently would be to rob Scripture of much of its own vocabulary" (G. C. Berkouwer, The Providence of God, Studies in Dogmatics [reprint of 1983 ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983] 73-74). Berkouwer is discussing the forbearance of God in the days of Noah when God patiently held back judgment for a time while the call to repentance was given. This same discussion of anthropomorphism could be equally applied to concepts of God "regretting" or "repenting" of his actions.

the covenant relationship continues in spite of perennial sinfulness.\textsuperscript{34} Thus the context itself emphasizes the Lord's faithfulness in spite of Israel's unfaithfulness.

**Israel's Disobedience and Idolatry (32:1-6)**

While Moses was on Mt. Sinai, the Israelites and Aaron made a golden calf idol for themselves and attributed to it their deliverance out of Egypt. The people had deliberately committed the sin of idolatry; therefore they deserved to die (cf. Deut 7:4; 8:19; 29:17-20; 32:15-25). By his later actions, Moses demonstrated that he recognized the justice of the death sentence for his people because of their wickedness (Exod 32:27-29).\textsuperscript{35} When he had seen for himself what the Lord had already seen, Moses' actions mirrored those of God: anger, determination to remove the idolatry, and ordering the execution of the idolaters.

**The Divine Declaration of Judgment (32:7-10)**

"Go down at once, for your people ... have corrupted themselves" (32:7). When the Lord revealed the crisis to Moses, He changed the possessive pronoun to indicate "that he was disowning Israel (contrast 'my people' of 3:10 et al.)."\textsuperscript{36} Then He proceeded to offer Moses the opportunity to start over with a different people who might not be so stubbornly disobedient. Gowan claims that the offer to Moses reveals the "vulnerability" of God.\textsuperscript{37} He quickly adds,

> Having said that, I must immediately emphasize that in this passage God's vulnerability is set alongside strong statements concerning his sovereignty.... Yet this sovereign God, who is fully in charge, . . . is also represented as a God who will change his plans as a result of human intervention, and more than that; he indicates that he has subjected himself to some extent to the will of Moses.\textsuperscript{38}

The implications of "Now then let Me alone" (32:10) have been variously construed by the commentators and theologians. Kaiser viewed it as God's way to test Moses.\textsuperscript{39} Some ignore the divine statement altogether, some make it an example of divine accommodation to human inability to understand the mind of God fully,

\begin{itemize}
  \item Identifying the idol and dealing with questions of polytheism and syncretism will not be handled in this study.
  \item Gowan, \textit{Theology in Exodus} 222.
  \item Ibid.
  \item Kaiser, "Exodus," in \textit{Expositor's Bible Commentary} 2:479.
\end{itemize}
and others claim that "it is actually God's invitation to Moses to intercede." To claim that God is "unwilling to act without Moses' ‘permission’, seems to be making too little of God in the situation. Fretheim argues that

For such a word to make sense, one must assume that, while God has decided to execute wrath (see v. 14), the decision has not reached an irretrievable point; the will of God is not set on the matter. Moses could conceivably contribute something to the divine deliberation that might occasion a future for Israel other than wrath. In fact, God seems to anticipate that Moses would resist what is being said.... God thereby does leave the door of Israel's future open.

Moberly agrees with Fretheim's observation and proceeds to take it one more step by declaring that the "importance of Moses' role in these chapters and elsewhere has frequently been underestimated through a slightly exaggerated emphasis on divine sovereignty." But even Fretheim admits that it is possible "that God was testing Moses in some way, seen not least in God's reference to Moses' future."

That leads to God's offer to produce a new nation from Moses. Was His offer to Moses a sincere offer? Gowan believes that Moses' appeal to God's solemn oath to Abraham (32:13) is, "in a way, ... a very weak argument, for God has offered to start over with Moses, who is a descendant of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and who could keep the line intact." However, the matter is not that simple. Even if God kept the Abrahamic line intact, it would still result in the repudiation of prior divine revelation regarding the twelve tribes of Israel (cf. Genesis 49). Moses was a member of the tribe of Levi. Therefore, if God were to begin again with Moses alone, only the Levites would survive to fulfill the prophecies concerning them (Gen 49:5-7). God's suggestion to Moses could not have been something the Lord ever intended to occur. If He did intend for it to happen, it would indicate either that He forgot what He had previously declared about the tribes, or that His previous prophecies were false and untrustworthy, or that Genesis 49 is an illegitimate

---

40 Gowan, Theology in Exodus 223. Brevard S. Childs, The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary, Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974) 567: "The effect is that God himself leaves the door open for intercession. He allows himself to be persuaded. That is what a mediator is for! As B. Jacob correctly observes, God could have shut the door--indeed slammed it--as he did in Deut. 3.26 when Moses requested permission to enter the promised land. Moreover, the personal promise to Moses to make him into a great nation picked up the identical words of the prior promise to Abraham (Gen. 12.2), giving Moses his strongest argument by which to counter the threat."

41 Ibid.


44 Ibid., 51.

45 Fretheim, Exodus 284.

46 Gowan, Theology in Exodus 224-25.
intrusion in the Scriptures. It is, more logical and consistent to understand the
divine offer as a test intended to prepare Moses for the remaining 39 years of
leading Israel in the wilderness.

The position taken by Robert Chisholm is that God had only made an
announcement, not a decree, therefore He was free to change His mind about its
implementation.\(^{47}\) His position, however, has several problems. First,
grammatically the distinction between decree and announcement is not sufficiently
diverse. Imperative + jussive + cohortative is not exegetically distinct from waw +
imperative + waw + cohortative.\(^{48}\) Second, contextually it does not take into
account the direct ties to the Abrahamic Covenant (Exod 32:10 [cf. Gen 12:2] and
Exod 32:13) and the final declaration of unretracted judgment (32:34, 35). Exodus
32 shares elements in common with Elijah's judgment speech against Ahab in 1
Kings 21:20-24--it would still come to pass because "it was a divine decree that
could not be altered."\(^{49}\)

Third, theologically it does not make sense that Moses could "persuade
Him to change His mind."\(^{50}\) Chisholm's ultimate conclusion is not consistent with
the contents of the passage as a whole: "In every case where such a change is
envisioned or reported, God had not yet decreed a course of action or an outcome.
Instead He chose to wait patiently, hoping His warnings might bring people to
their senses and make judgment unnecessary."\(^{51}\) The Lord had decreed what He
would do in the first half (up to the athnach in the Hebrew) of 32:10. The last half
of the verse is obviously inconsistent with what He had decreed concerning the
twelve tribes of Israel in Genesis 49. Perhaps it would be best to keep in mind
Chisholm's final word (his last sentence): "At the same time such passages should
not be overextended. God can and often does decree a course of action."\(^{52}\)

Was there anything conditional about God's declaration? No new condition
was given, but God had repeatedly declared His principles of justice and compas-
sion (cf. Gen 18:19, 25; Exod 33:19; 34:6-7).

**Moses' Prayer and Its Answer (32:11-14)**

The petition of Moses was heard by God and He "changed His mind"
(32:14). What does that phrase mean? It is the Hebrew verb לִחלָּם (nhm). Unfortu-
nately, the entry on nhm in NIDOTTE\(^{53}\) is woefully inadequate and overly brief in

\(^{47}\) Chisholm, "Does God 'Change His Mind'?," *BSac* 396.
\(^{48}\) Ibid., 390, 396.
\(^{49}\) Ibid., 391.
\(^{50}\) Ibid., 396.
\(^{51}\) Ibid., 399 [emphasis added].
\(^{52}\) Ibid.
\(^{53}\) Mike Butterworth, "לִחלָּם," in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology &
its discussion, offering virtually no help at all for someone struggling with its utilization in passages like Exodus 32:14. The entry in TLOT\textsuperscript{54} is a little more extensive in its discussion and of more help. Note especially Stoebe's observation that nhm in the Niphal "is never sorrowful resignation but always has concrete consequences. Consequently, 'and he regrets the evil' can elaborate 'he is gracious and merciful' (Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; ...)."\textsuperscript{55} Fortunately, the entry in TDOT\textsuperscript{56} is substantial.\textsuperscript{57} Simian-Yofre concludes, "The nhm of Yahweh is thus presented as a response to Moses' appeasement. Yahweh's repentance is a change of purpose incidental to the circumstances, not a modification of the circumstances."\textsuperscript{58} Although he did not directly apply it to Exodus 32, one of Simian-Yofre's observations is pertinent to our current discussion: "The only element common to all meanings of nhm appears to be the attempt to influence a situation: by changing the course of events, rejecting an obligation, or refraining from an action, when the focus is on the present."\textsuperscript{59} In Exodus 32 God is obviously refraining from an action--indeed, He is temporarily postponing the inevitable judgment. That postponement is not a change in His purpose it was a planned postponement in order to allow time for the rise of a new generation of Israelites to replace the generation He will destroy in the wilderness. God's action was a temporary delay of punishment in order to allow for a replacement generation to arise.

The reprieve is only temporary, because the people are still in open rebellion and obviously Yahweh will not tolerate apostasy and idolatry.... Unless there is a radical change on the part of the people, the grace period will elapse and the judgment will be reinstituted.... Intercession can only produce a temporary reversal; the basic situation must be rectified.\textsuperscript{60}

If Manasseh had not yet been born when Hezekiah was ill, the same observation would apply. God postponed Hezekiah's death until the next Davidite was ready to take the throne.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 2:738.
\item \textsuperscript{57} However, the contribution to the study of Exodus 32 is marred by Simian-Yofre's adherence to the documentarian views of Martin Noth: "Ex. 32:9-14 is an addition in Deuteronomistic style that inappropriately anticipates the question of Israel's punishment" (ibid., 9:345 [emphasis added]).
\item \textsuperscript{58} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 9:342.
\end{itemize}
Furthermore, God did not change His mind regarding His plan for the twelve tribes of Israel. He merely altered His timing in order to keep His promises to the tribes in Genesis 49 as well as His promise of judgment on the entire nation. In the light of this conclusion, it is significant that six of the thirty times the Old Testament speaks of God repenting or changing His mind emphasize that He does not repent or change His mind (Num 23:19; 1 Sam 15:29; Jer 4:28; 20:16; Ezek 24:14; Zech 8:14). God will never do that which would contradict His previously revealed declarations.

At no time did Moses attempt to justify the idolatry of the Israelites. "He realizes that they committed a great sin, and that strict justice requires them to be severely punished, but he appeals to the Divine attribute of mercy, and relies on the Lord's paternal love for his people." To explain how Moses' prayer could actually change God's mind, adherents of open theism appeal to "the fellowship model" in which "God is genuinely responsive to us... God changed his mind to accommodate Moses' desires." A milder, but nonetheless equally anthropocentric approach explains that

God is always ready to be entreated. He is unchanging in his intention to bless his creatures and is willing to change his word if people turn to him in intensity of faith (Jon. 4:2). This does not mean that matters will always turn out as we wish. But it does mean that prayer can change the course of events, and that failure to pray is not necessarily a sign of submission to God's intractable will. Rather, it may be a sign of apathy and unwillingness to wrestle with God (note Jacob's refusal to let go of the man with whom he wrestled, Gen. 32:26).

This concept that God is unchanging in His intention to bless is often carried over to His "unwavering intention to save."

Those who would be more theocentric in their interpretation of passages referring to God's change of mind, would propose that "divine repentance, in such cases, functions as part of a tool for eliciting a dynamic relationship with people, a means of drawing our responses which God uses, then, to accomplish his ultimate purposes." Indeed, a more theocentric approach is open to the thought that the Lord considers more than the petitioner when answering prayer. That was also observed in the examination of Hezekiah's prayer. Israel's temporary reprieve from divine judgment was not because God had changed his mind, but because the Lord

---

64 Oswalt, The Book of Isaiah 675.
65 Gowan, Theology in Exodus 226.
66 Ware, God's Lesser Glory 97.
would keep faith with those to whom he had committed himself in the past (cf. Deut 4:37, 38). As John Sailhamer declares, "When the Lord did act mercifully with them as a result of Moses' intercession (v. 14), the basis of his actions was not any merit of Aaron or the people, but rather his own oath sworn to the patriarchs (vv. 12-13)."67

Fretheim's conclusions are a classic example of the explanation offered by open theists:

The God of Israel is revealed as one who is open to change. God will move from decisions made, from courses charted, in view of the ongoing interaction with those affected. God treats the relationship with the people with an integrity that is responsive to what they do and say. Hence human prayer (in this case, intercession) is honored by God as a contribution to a conversation that has the capacity to change future directions for God, people, and world. God may well adjust modes and directions (though not ultimate goals) in view of such human responsiveness. This means that there is genuine openness to the future on God's part, fundamentally in order that God's salvific will for all might be realized as fully as possible. It is this openness to change that reveals what it is about God that is unchangeable: God's steadfastness has to do with God's love; God's faithfulness has to do with God's promises; God's will is for the salvation of all. God will always act, even make changes, in order to be true to these unchangeable ways and to accomplish these unchangeable goals.68

Some commentators have sought to distinguish a divine change of mind from a human change of mind as the explanation. Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman emphasize that God does not change His mind the way human beings change their minds. We often change our minds "frivolously, capriciously, or arbitrarily, whereas Yahweh does so only for cause.... Yahweh's repentance is limited to situations of a certain number and kind and occurs only under certain conditions."69 At the same time, Andersen and Freedman admit that the whole issue involves the employment of a metaphor to seek to represent a difficult concept for humans to understand about God.70

The situation involved a very unusual occurrence that places the event outside that which should ever be considered normative for our practice of prayer. In Scripture, only Moses ever used the imperative of nhm with God (Exod 32:12; Ps 90:13). "To instruct God to repent (using this verb with its connotations and overtones) is a privilege claimed by Moses and restricted to him."71 Parunak's suggestion that nhm should be given the meaning of "forgive"

68 Fretheim, Exodus, 287.
69 Andersen and Freedman, Amos 644.
70 Ibid., 645.
71 Ibid., 649.
Moses' Actions and Their Results (32:15-29)

Although Moses prayed for mercy while he was still on the mountain, when he descended and beheld what had occurred, his actions were swift and bloody (32:27-29). It was as though he changed his mind and began to agree with the Lord's assessment of the seriousness of Israel's sinful rebellion. In a parallel passage (Deut 9:7-21) Moses gave a few additional details about the incident that occurred at Sinai. His reference to the events was to support his sermonic declaration that the Israelites were not chosen by the Lord because of any righteousness they possessed (Deut 9:4-6). He had not only led the slaying of about three thousand (Exod 32:28), he had also spent another forty days and nights in prayer (Deut 9:18).

Moses' Intercession and God's Response (32:30-35)

God revealed that even Moses' prayer could not remove the irrevocable sentence of death that the people had incurred (Exod 32:34-35). Had God really determined to destroy the Israelites? Was His statement to Moses an unalterable decree or a mere threat? It was obviously a decree (cf. Ps 95:8-11). The punishment was inevitable, even if it were temporarily delayed (Exod 32:34-35). It was delayed, not because of Moses' prayer nor because of any righteous action or confession by the Israelites, but because of the sworn promise the Lord had made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Deut 9:5).

Moses' action bought time only, time to remedy the situation, because a holy God cannot dwell in the midst of an idolatrous people, and unless the idolatry and the apostasy are eliminated the great experiment will end at its birth. . . . Moses achieved a more permanent rescission of the judgment. The temporary suspension of judgment was confirmed, and with some reservations Yahweh agreed to keep his people and lead them.

---

73 Cf. Childs, *The Book of Exodus* 568: "The writer brings this scene to a close by an explicit reference to its effect on God. Yahweh changes his mind regarding his intention to destroy Israel. If this sentence is read by itself, it makes the God of Israel as arbitrary as Zeus. If it is read in its full context, it epitomizes the essential paradox of the Hebrew faith: God is ‘merciful and gracious ... but will not clear the guilty’ (34.7)."
to the holy land.\textsuperscript{74}

Punishment for the nation's sin would be postponed to some undefined time in the future. In Num 14:36-38 a similarly undefined future plague was to kill the unbelieving spies. That judgment is referred to in a way that interrupts the narrative in much the same way as Exod 32:35 interrupts its surrounding narrative.\textsuperscript{75}

Verse 35 is the ultimate fulfillment of the initial execution carried out by Moses in verse 20.\textsuperscript{76}

Only in the last verse of the chapter do we see God himself acting in that judgment. The reason for this focus on Moses' role in judgment rather than God's is apparently the writer's desire to stress God's gracious response to Israel's sin. The central theme of the subsequent narrative (Ex 33) is God's great mercy and compassion (33:19). God's dealings with Israel henceforth emphasize his goodness and compassion. What the present narrative shows, however, is that God's gracious dealings with his people are not accomplished in the absence of a clear acknowledgment of his wrath.\textsuperscript{77}

Compassion or deferred execution do not nullify the federal consequences of sin. Nor does the necessity of judgment nullify God's prior promises (cf. Heb 6:18).

**Concluding Thoughts**

Since God was not changed and His plan unaltered, and since Israel did not repent and remained in their sinful and rebellious condition, Moses must have been the only one who was changed by this incident at Sinai. Is it possible that prayer could change him? John Yoder's response is instructive for both Hezekiah and Moses:

Why prayer? Because it lifts man from being an observer in God's arena to being a participant. He does not idly watch God's will being done in history; he earnestly seeks it. He asks for each need and praises for each victory. In prayer we see God near His humblest point: He allows men to do what He could do so easily. In prayer we see men at their highest pinnacle: bringing fire from heaven, raising the dead, feeding the hungry, winning lost souls, and learning to fellowship with their Maker. In God's goal of discipling men, nothing is more effective than prayer.

Our argument for prayer is that prayer changes me. How so? (1). It leads us to earnestly desire what He desires; my will becomes merged with His. (2). We become

\textsuperscript{74} Andersen and Freedman, *Amos* 674.
\textsuperscript{75} Cassuto, *Commentary on the Book of Exodus* 424. Cassuto has an unusual interpretation that adds another divine reservation stating that God would not dwell in the midst of the Israelites in the Tabernacle because of their disobedience in the golden calf incident (425-26).
\textsuperscript{77} Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative* 312.
more grateful for everything He does. (3). Not only is God's will done, but we learn to fellowship with Him. (4). We begin to see that God is behind all events. (5). We become participants in God's program, not spectators.  

Norm Geisler agrees: ‘There was a change in Moses. As leader and mediator for his people, there was a change in Moses' heart, which allowed God's unchanging mercy to flow to Israel through Moses as their mediator.” Indeed, if man is capable of changing the mind of God, then it might be argued that man knows more about governing this world than God. However, God does know what He is doing. The appearance of change is merely the fact that God had already planned to "change" when His people have finally come to behave in the way He had anticipated they would in response to His words and actions.

It is significant that God would utilize this incident to motivate Moses to be the kind of mediator he needed to be. Moses was to be the revelation of God, not on tablets of stone, but on a tablet of a heart and life of flesh (cf. 2 Cor 3:1-3). May these examples of Hezekiah and Moses produce in us a godly humility and commitment to the Word of God that will fit us for service for the Sovereign Lord.

79 Geisler, Creating God in the Image of Man? 86. Charles Swindoll recounts how Donald Barnhouse "came to the pulpit and made a statement that stunned his congregation: ‘Prayer changes nothing!’ You could have heard a pin drop in that packed Sunday worship service in Philadelphia. His comment, of course, was designed to make Christians realize that God is sovereignly in charge of everything. Our times are literally in His hands. No puny human being by uttering a few words in prayer takes charge of events and changes them. God does the shaping, the changing; it is He who is in control. Barnhouse was correct, except in one minor detail. Prayer changes me. When you and I pray, we change, and that is one of the major reasons prayer is such a therapy that counteracts anxiety" (Charles R. Swindoll, The Tale of the Tardy Oxcart And 1,501 Other Stories [Nashville: Word, 1998] 451).
80 Yoder, Your Will Be Done 2:478, 479.
81 Ware, God's Lesser Glory 92-93. Cf. William Lane Craig, Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freedom: The Coherence of Theism: Omniscience, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 19 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991) 12: "God's foreknowledge encompasses the most contingent of events, even the very thoughts that a person will think (Ps. 139.1-6). It is true that there are instances in which God is said to 'repent' of some action He has taken or to relent on something He had said would take place, which would seem to undermine the doctrine of foreknowledge. But a careful study of the relevant texts reveals that God's 'repenting' does not mean His changing His mind, but simply 'to suffer emotional pain', and that His relenting on prophesied judgements is due to a change in human behavior which renders the judgement no longer appropriate. In such a case the prophecy of judgement was not a manifestation of foreknowledge but was rather a forecast or forewarning of what would, ceteris paribus, happen, that is, unless the persons involved repented."
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AN EXEGETICAL AND THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATION
OF THE HARDENING OF PHARAOH'S HEART IN
EXODUS 4-14 AND ROMANS 9

G. K. Beale
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary

1. Introduction

The ninth chapter of Romans has been one of the key texts throughout church history for debates concerning predestination, reprobation and free will. One of the crucial passages in this perplexing chapter has been vv 17-18, where Paul alludes to God's hardening of Pharaoh's heart (Exod 9:16 and chaps 4-14). While this problematic passage was not a primary point of debate in the Augustinian-Pelagian controversy, it did become important beginning with the discussions of the Reformation period. In trying to refute Erasmus' claim that Pharaoh first hardened his heart freely apart from divine influence, Luther attempts to argue that God was the ultimate cause. John Calvin agreed with Luther, but Sebastian Castellio and Jacob Arminius agreed with Erasmus. The debate has continued even into the twentieth century, especially undergoing scrutiny in recently published literature.

It is surprising, however, that apparently no writer in the history of this discussion has ever attempted to exegete all of the hardening predictions as they appear in consecutive order throughout their context in Exod 4-14. Many attempt to solve the issue by focusing on only one hardening statement and determining its implications for the others, often according to their own theological predispositions.


2 In this respect, one of the best studies is that of Martin Luther (Bondage of the Will Tappan: F. H. Revell, 1957) 195-212), although the most complete exegetical and contextual study very recently is that of F. Hesse. Das Verstockungsproblem im Alten Testament (BZAW 74; Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1955). In addition, since the first draft of the present article was completed, John Piper has published a thorough exegetical survey of the hardening statements as they occur consecutively in Exodus 4-14 (The Justification of God 139-54). As will be seen, Piper's work lends impressive support to the argument of this article.

3 This is true of both the Arminian and Calvinistic traditions.
Nevertheless, the historical debate has generated the following questions: (1) Who is the ultimate cause of Pharaoh's hardening? (2) If the hardening is at all associated with God, is it an unconditional or conditional judgment with respect to Pharaoh's sin? (3) When Paul refutes the idea that God is unjust (v 14) in rejecting Esau rather than Jacob before they were born (vv 10-13), does he give an understandable explanation for this refutation (γυναικείον, v 17), or does he merely refute the idea without offering any rationale in defense of God's rejection? (4) Does the hardening involve God's dealing with certain individuals or nations only on the plane of history or does it have reference to a general principle concerning God's eternal rejection of man from salvation? The purpose of this study is to attempt to answer these questions through a contextual exegesis of each hardening passage in Exod 4-14. Perhaps the conclusions may contribute to a better understanding of Paul's allusion to Pharaoh's hardening. Therefore only brief comment will be made about Romans 9 at the conclusion of this discussion, since a thorough exegesis of that chapter is not intended here.

II. The Contextual Idea of Exodus 1-15

In Exodus 1-15 Yahweh is seen as beginning to fulfill the patriarchal promise by means of redeeming Abraham's seed out of Egypt. It is in this "actualization of promise" context that God's revelation of his name as YHWH takes on most significance; this divine name emphasizes God as the one who is to effect his patriarchal promise, since intrinsic to the meaning of the name itself is that of God as a "controlling and effecting reality." In view of this it is understandable that Moshe Greenberg says, "The plague story, then, revolves around the theme: revelation by God of His name--his essence, his power, his authority--to Pharaoh, to the Egyptians, and to all men... [it is a] demonstration of God's essence to the arrogant pagan world and onlooking Israel... [it is] the decision of God to break into history on behalf of Israel."

III. The Terms Used for Hardening

Exodus 4-14 uses three terms for hardening: hazaq ("to be strong"),...
kbed ("to be heavy") and qasa ("to be difficult"). In contrast to qasa, hazaq and kbed are used abundantly throughout the OT and are fluid terms.

In the light of OT usage, the essential idea of hazaq is that of "having power to accomplish a function" or it may secondarily refer to a strong desire which is prerequisite for accomplishing something. It can also mean "to be firm, secure," which usually stresses the strength of something to continue to perform its function. The use of the word with respect to Pharaoh is probably similar to that in Josh 11:20, where Yahweh gives the Canaanites a strong desire to fight and actually to carry out a military campaign against Israel, which resulted in the Canaanites' destruction ("For it was of the Lord to make strong their hearts"). Likewise, Pharaoh exhibited a "strong will" in refusing to let Israel go, and this led to his destruction.

Kabed has the central meaning of "heaviness, weightiness." In its most concrete usage it refers to a quantitative heaviness (of wealth, animals, people, etc.) but it can also indicate a qualitative weightiness, referring to an intensification of the quality of actions or attitudes. From this fluid backdrop, kbed in Exod 4-14 may be seen to be used qualitatively rather than quantitatively, with a stress on Pharaoh's attitudes rather than on actions. Pharaoh's rejection of God's requests becomes so psychologically intensified that it results in an immovably heavy volition which cannot be changed.

The primary use of qasa in the OT revolves around the idea of "being difficult." It is often used qualitatively to refer to such an intense performance of an activity that the activity becomes "cruel, fierce or severe." Men's dealings with others become so intensely wrathful that they are said to be "cruel" (Gen 49:7); a person's speech becomes so emphatically wrathful that it is "fierce, harsh;" a battle can be fought so intensely that it becomes "severe." The word also

---

9 Hazaq in the Piel occurs seven times (4:21; 9:12; 10:20, 27; 11:10; 14:8, 17), and five times in the Qal (7:13, 22; 8:15[19]; 9:35; 14:4); kbed occurs once as an adjective (7:14), four times in the Hiphil (8:11[15]; 28[32]; 9:34; 10:1); qasa occurs twice in the Hiphil (7:3; 13:15). Contemporary OT critics base part of their theory for diverse sources in Exod 4-14 on these different terms used for hardening and the supposed different theology associated with each. The present approach assumes unity of authorship, since this was presumably the way Paul would have viewed Exodus.


12 E.g., when a person continually exhibits a certain quality, it could be said that he is "weighty" in that quality. Sometimes it indicates a stress on the quality of man's or God's activities (cf. Judg 20:34, the intensity of a battle; cf. I Sam 5:6, 11, the intensity of divine judgment). On occasion it may refer to an emphasis on the quality of man's attitude (cf. 2 Chron 25:19, an improperly high attitude, i.e. pride.).


14 Cf.2 Sam 2:17. Cf. also Cant 8:6.
means "difficulty" with reference to an action that cannot easily be performed. When the judges of Israel could not easily perform their role in certain cases, these cases were said to be "difficult" (Exod 18:26; Deut 1:17). A possible transitional link may lie between this root's qualitative and resultative meanings: the intense severity or fierceness of an action may be viewed from the difficult result it produces (2 Sam 2:17). In Exod 7:3 and 13:15 it appears to refer to the severely stubborn nature of Pharaoh's volition which made his decision in favor of Israel's release too difficult ever to be reached.

In conclusion, these three verbs in Exod 4-14 are all related to Pharaoh's refusal to obey Yahweh's command to release Israel. Whether or not the verbs are fundamentally synonymous can only be answered after an exegesis of their contexts.

IV. **Hebrew and Egyptian Views of the Heart**

In the OT leb ("heart") may denote intellectual activity (204 times) emotional activity (166 times), volitional activities (195 times) and personality or character. The heart is also seen to be spiritual in that many of its decisions concern one's religio-ethical relationship with God. Perhaps the heart may be seen as that faculty which combines into a psychical unity the volitional, intellectual, emotional and spiritual aspects of a person. Among these the volitional, decision-making aspects should be viewed as primary but always influenced by the thoughts and emotions, all of which impinge on the spiritual. Consequently, the heart is often viewed as the inner, spiritual center of one's relationship to God.

In Egypt is found the same variation of meaning as in the OT. It

---

15 Whether of giving birth (Gen 35:16), performing labor (Exod 1:14; 6:9; Deut 26:6) or answering a request (2 Kings 2:10). The metaphor of the "stiff neck" in the OT compares Israel's unwillingness to serve and obey "the way" of Torah to cattle who are difficult to steer (cf. Jer 17:23; 19:15 [see Jer 5:5 and Hos 4:16]; Prov 29:1; Neh 9:16, 17, 29; 2 Chron 30:8; 36:13; Exod 32:9; 33:3, 5; 34:9; Deut 9:6,13).


17 Statistics are derived from H. Wheeler Robinson ("Hebrew Psychology," *The People in the Book* [ed. A. S. Peake; Oxford: Clarendon, 1925] 362-3), who also notes that about a third of the 851 uses of leb "denotes the personality as a whole, the inner life, the character" (ibid. 362).


may be that the concepts of the heart ('ib) as an inner spiritual centrum and volitional, decision-maker were emphasized even more by the Egyptians than by the Hebrews.21 Indeed, these aspects became so emphasized that the heart came to be viewed as the "seat of destiny," determining one's life.22 It is probably because of this apparent autonomy of the heart that it came to be seen as a "second being of man, next to and outside of him,"23 and it even came to be said "that 'the heart' of a man [is] his God himself."24 The heart was also seen as a divine instrument through which a god directed a man25 and the organ by which man could receive and comprehend divine commandments.26

The spiritual-intellectual-volitional emphasis is found in the Exodus plague narratives, as will be seen in the exegetical section.

V. An Exegetical Survey of the Hardening Passages

The hardening predictions will be exegited contextually as they appear in consecutive order in each distinct plague narrative scene. Their relationship to one another will be investigated, with special focus upon the subject of the hardening activity and the interrelationship of the hardening expressions. This exegesis is conducted with the aim of answering the four theological questions raised in the introduction.

The pre-plague narratives (3:18-7:5)

The first hint of the hardening is found in Exod 3:18-20, where Yahweh commands Moses to request Israel's release (v 18). Yahweh then says that he "knew" (yada'ti) that Pharaoh would not permit this request. The hint of hardening is found in the prediction of Pharaoh's refusal of Moses' request in v 19. This "hint" becomes an explicit prophetic announcement in 4:21.

Exod 4:21 has been the classicus locus of the hardening debates in Exodus. It will receive special focus here, but it still cannot be understood fully until it is seen in its contextual and theological relationships with the other hardening predictions.

In v 21a Yahweh commands Moses to perform wonders, since he has given Moses the power to do such; however, due to Moses' uncertainty about his whole mission (cf 4:1-17), Yahweh tells Moses

21 Besides 'ib, hati is another characteristic Egyptian word for "heart," which is essentially synonymous with 'ib. So Bonnet, "Herz," 297 who argues against A. Piankoff's attempts to see in hati only reference to the emotions and views 'ib as referring exclusively to the intellect (Le couer dans les textes egyptiens depuis l'Ancien jusqu'a la fin du Novel empire [Paris: no pub. listed, 1930] as cited by Bonnet).
24 Morenz, Egyptian Religion 64; Bonnet, "Hen," Realllexikon 297.
25 Morenz, Egyptian Religion 65.
26 Jacob, Theology 164. n. 1.
that Pharaoh's reaction to the signs will be (4:21c, *welo* 'yesallah *et-ha'am*, "so that he will not send out the people"), so that when this reaction occurs it will not discourage Moses, but he will remember Yahweh's prediction and realize that Yahweh is still in control of the apparent failure. It is evident that v 21b states the definitive cause of 21c, i.e., *wa'ani 'ahazzeq 'et-libbo* ("but I will harden his heart").

The first consideration of the v 21b clause concerns the exact nuance of the Piel stem of *'abazzeq*: the specific sense could be causative, but it is better to see it having an intensive-iterative idea, looking at a "strengthening and repetition"\textsuperscript{27} of the hardening action, with Yahweh as sole subject "busying Himself eagerly"\textsuperscript{28} in the action. The sense is that Yahweh will not only be involved in hardening Pharaoh's heart once, but a repeated number of times,\textsuperscript{29} as the context of the following narratives makes evident. The prefixed conjugational form of the verb does not function as a cohortative, but as a specific future.\textsuperscript{30} The relationship of clause b with clause c is expressed by the purposive *waw*.\textsuperscript{31} The specific lexical idea of the verb is that Yahweh will give Pharaoh the psychological power which would cause the accomplishment of a refusing action. Thus, at least from 4:21 it should be concluded that just as Yahweh gave Moses power to perform a theocratic function (v 21a), so he gave Pharaoh power for the accomplishment of a non-theocratic function,\textsuperscript{32} although both are to be seen as contributing to a Heilsplan goal.

A further observation with respect to the time scope of v 21 may be made, as seen in the verse's relation to vv 22-23: the time period involved in vv 21-23 is inclusive of 5:1-11:10, i.e., apparently from the time that Moses returns to Egypt until he performs the first nine plague signs (ten miracles), it is predicted that Yahweh will harden Pharaoh's heart with a view to Pharaoh's refusal. Therefore, there are two phases of the hardening: (1) that which occurs in 5:1-11:10 before the final plague and (2) that which occurs subsequent to the final plague, resulting in Egyptian disaster at the Red Sea (cf. Exod 14:4, 7, 17). Thus, 4:21 apparently indicates a divine control of Pharaoh's

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid. 141 #52F.
\textsuperscript{29} That the plural aspect of the *Piel* is definitely in mind is clear from clause a, i.e., Moses was to perform a series of wonders (*hammopetim*), each of which was to be received negatively because of the repeated hardening action.
\textsuperscript{30} So W. Richter, *Die sogenannten vorprophetischen Berufungsberichte* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970) 122.
\textsuperscript{31} NASB renders it "so that".
\textsuperscript{32} It is the volition with which *'ahazzeq 'et-libbo* is specifically concerned as 10:27 clarifies (*'aba lesalham*); YHWH was to influence Pharaoh's intellect and emotions that his volition was to decide to choose a "refusing" course of action (v 21b), which he would then perform (v 21c). Most of the instances in the Targum describe the "disposition" or "design of his heart" being hardened. In the light of our discussion of *leb*, Pharaoh's inner spiritual being should also be seen as affected by this course of action.
actions in 5:1-11:10. But further discussion must bear out whether or not this is, indeed, the case.

The next passage deserving comment, even though it does not contain an explicit hardening statement, is Exod 5:2, where Pharaoh is viewed as exercising his first refusal to Moses' first request. This appears to be the first partial fulfillment of Yahweh's hardening prophecy in 4:21. However this could be doubted for two reasons: (1) If the 4:21 hardening relates only to "sign-reaction," then it cannot be applied to 5:2, since no signs are given; that is, if 4:21 refers only to Pharaoh's hardened rejection of miraculous signs which were intended to compel him to release Israel, then 5:2 cannot be a beginning fulfillment since no signs are mentioned toward which he could be hardened. (2) Some would not see Exod 5:2 as the beginning fulfillment of 4:21 since Yahweh is not mentioned there as causing Pharaoh's refusal. Yet the following reasons argue in favor of a connection between 4:21 and 5:2: (1) Although the 4:21 hardening is integrally related to the performance of signs, it is even more related to refusal of Moses' request to release Israel. The hardening of 4:21 is not conditional on the performance of signs. Hence, signs could be absent and hardening present. The argument rests with the one attempting to prove an absolute and strictly necessary relation between hardening and "sign-reaction." (2) Even if the sign theory were valid, it still could not be shown that Moses did not perform a sign similar to the ones he performed for Israel in the immediately preceding verses, since it is a characteristic of the plague narrative to assume certain events, without

---


34 I have never seen this first alternative in print, but it is more viable than the second. If this alternative proves erroneous, the second should also.

35 Regardless of how one views the copulative between 4:21a and 4:21b, a validation of either view should not rest only on an interpretation of such a fluid word as waw. In 4:21 two functions are in view: (1) Moses' sign-performing function would supposedly influence Pharaoh to release Israel; (2) Yahweh's hardening function was to influence Pharaoh negatively toward refusal, thus reversing any positive effect the signs might have had. However, the idea of a request is also assumed in 4:21 (d. its relation to 3:18-20). In 4:21 it would seem that hardening is primarily related to the refusal of request; it is possible to have "request" without "signs" and still have "hardening" towards "refusal." Signs are meaningless without request since they are brought about to convince one who has already refused, but request is not meaningless without signs. Furthermore, hardening refers primarily to influence against request, and only secondarily to signs when they accompany requests, so that there may be the presence of request without signs, but with hardening. (This is not only suggested by the psychology of hardening, but also by Exod 7:2-4; 14:4, 8, 17; Deut 2:30; Josh 11:20.) Furthermore, in the plague narratives Pharaoh's acts of refusal, which are appended with explicit hardening notations, may still be seen as acts resulting from hardening (cf. 10:10-11 with 10:1). See further infra.
stating their occurrence.\textsuperscript{36} (3) the divine omnipotence necessary for a proper effecting of the Heilsgeschichteplan of Exodus is incongruous with a “by chance” refusal of Pharaoh, since this refusal was already an integral part of the plan.\textsuperscript{37} (4) Another argument for God's control of Pharaoh is found in 5:22-23. In 5:22 it is said that Yahweh had brought harm to Israel (hare’ ota’ la’am hazzeh), whereas in v 23 Pharaoh is said to have brought harm (hera’ la’am hazzeh). Verse 22 specifically refers to the previous events where hard bondage was imposed on Israel, which was a direct result of Pharaoh's refusal in 5:2; thus, both bondage and refusal are included in the thought of v 22, so that Yahweh should be seen as the ultimate cause of Pharaoh's refusal in 5:2. After 5:22 views Yahweh as cause of the refusal resulting in harder bondage, v 23 then sees Pharaoh as Yahweh's secondary effecting agent.\textsuperscript{38} (5) The divine commentary on the Pharaohs during the whole course of Egyptian bondage views their harsh actions toward Israel as being directly caused by Yahweh (Ps 105:25): hapak libbam lisno ‘ammo lehitnakkel ba' abadayw (“He turned their heart to hate his people, to deal craftily with his servants”). The Pharaoh's actions of Exod 5 were the zenith of this harsh bondage, so that it would certainly seem to be included in the thought of Ps 105:25. This is especially interesting, since the hardening of Pharaoh's heart in Exod 14:4 is described in 14:5 with wording similar to this Psalm (wayyehopek lebab par'oh wa'abadayw, "the heart of Pharaoh and his servants was turned"). This may be further evidence then that the refusal was a beginning fulfillment of 4:21.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{36} Cf. even 4:21 where the “request” is assumed and not stated; in addition, many of the ten plague narratives make the same omission, with the assumption definitely in mind. In three of the narratives, Moses does not effect the plague as divine intermediary, but God comes to act more directly in effecting the signs himself. If 4:21 were taken to mean that God would never effect a sign unless it were through the instrumentality of Moses, then these three narratives could never have occurred (cf. 8:13-19, 20-28; 9:6-7).

\textsuperscript{37} Cf. Exod 3:18-20 and note the phrase wa' ani yad'ati ki lo'-yitt'in 'etkem melek misrayim lahalok (3:19). Space does not allow for a word study of yada , but most scholars admit the word has a much stronger sense than our Western concept of foreknowledge. It is generally agreed that it revolves around the nuance "to be actively-experimentally involved in a relationship" (cf. the standard Old Testament theologies, e.g., Vriezen, Jacob, Eichrodt, Pedersen, etc.). It is well known that this applies to covenant relations, but it may also refer to non-covenantal, judgmental relations (Jer 16:21; Ezek 25:14; Ps 106:8). When used of Yahweh the emphasis is upon his "knowing" which "establishes the significance of what is known." (R. Bultmann, γινώσκω: The OT Usage [of Yada’],” TDNT.1:698; cf. further Exod 33:12; Gen 18:19; 2 Sam 7:20; Ps 1:6; 144:3; Jer 1:5; Hos 13:5; Amos 3:2). “To know anything is to have power over it” (Jacob, Theology 284). The parallel could be drawn that just as Yahweh used Abraham in his Heilsgeschichteplan to fulfill a purpose (Gen 18:19), so he did with Pharaoh.

\textsuperscript{38} Piper, (Justification of God 142-3) makes the same basic observation, but gives no convincing reason for his assertion that the reference to "evil" is limited only to the physical realm and not to the moral.

\textsuperscript{39} Cf. inter alios Clements (Exodus 34): “[in Exod 5] the divine plan at first appears to be thwarted and the situation temporarily worsens. Yet in reality God is at work in this . . The Lord Himself is hardening Pharaoh's heart. . . .” F. Hesse (Verstockungsproblem 8) sees kabed (“heavy”) in Exod 7:14 as a verbal adjective, which designates a hardened condition of Pharaoh even before the beginning of the chap. 7 plague narrative.
The last pre-plague narrative hardening prediction is 7:3. This is similar to 4:21, but there are some major differences. First, the Hiphil 'aqsheh ("I will make difficult") is used instead of 'ahazzeq in the Piel. Furthermore, the "request" is explicitly stated in 7:2, so that the hardening is especially related to Yahweh influencing the Pharaoh's volition against giving in to the request; 'aqsheh probably has the specific lexical idea of "difficult," i.e., Yahweh's influence upon Pharaoh's mind and volition would be so "intensely severe" that a positive decision to the request would become too "difficult" to make, so that only a refusal could result. Exod 7:4a emphasizes this refusal in terms of Pharaoh "not listening" to Aaron's request. Exod 7:3b most likely expresses the purpose of the hardened refusal: Yahweh hardened Pharaoh's heart so that he could make a pyrotechnic display of his "signs" and "wonders in the land." Thus, the hardening purpose of 7:3 may be contrasted with that of 4:21b-c where it was seen to be that of influencing Pharaoh not to let Israel go upon request. Furthermore, in 4:21 the sign performance was mentioned before the hardening activity, whereas here it is mentioned after.

As 4:21-23 denoted the first phase of Pharaoh's hardening, so also does 7:2-5. The phrase 'et-'otot ay we'et-mopetay be'eres ("signs and wonders in the land") refers to the first ten miracles (nine plagues) which occur in 7:9-11:10 (cf kol-hammopetim, 4:21a) and are the precursors of the climbing death plague of the Egyptian first-born (12:29-31). Exodus 7:5 contains a further clarifying note which 4:22-23 did not clearly specify, viz., Yahweh's "stretching out his hand on Egypt" is probably a figurative description of the death plague already mentioned in Exod 4:21-22 and must also include the Red Sea deliverance, and, thus, the second phase of the hardening in Exod 14.41

A final note is in order with respect to the nuance of the Hiphil 'aqsheh since some have recently questioned the normal causative sense of the Hiphil hardening predications with God as subject in the plague narrative, arguing for a "permissive" or "declarative" nuance and even

40 Most translations render the waw connecting the hardening clause with the following sign clause merely by a simple "and" (so LXX, Vulgate, KJV, Jerusalem Bible, Luther). However, the NASB renders it in a purposive (resultative?) manner ("that"), whereas the NIV and RSV translate it circumstantially (and though). The former views the hardening as the basis for the signs, while the latter views the signs as instigating the hardening response of "not listening." The purposive use is favored by the context of Exod 4-14, since statements are found throughout which have better with it (so Exod 3:18-20; 9:16, 28-30; 10:1-3, 29; cf. Rom 9:17). Furthermore, in many of the plague narratives Pharaoh is not given opportunity to respond to the apparent threat, but the threatened judgment begins immediately to take place, so that the threat "actually puts the forthcoming judgment into motion" (C. Westermann, Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech [Phil: Westminster, 1967] 66; cf. also 217-18). These unconditional Unheilsankündigung narratives appear in Exod 7:14-25, 26(8:1)-8:11(15); 8:16(20)-28(32); 9:1-7, 13-35 and 10:1-20 (note esp. 7:17, 19; 8:1[5], 19[24]; 9:5, 18). This observation fits in better with a pre-sign hardening scheme.

41 The final phrase of 7:4, bispatim gedolim ("by great judgments"), must also refer to the same thing.
viewing it with the sense of "to help." In deciding upon matters of grammar in crucial and debated theological texts of Scripture, any interpreter is faced with a tension between his theological assumptions and the objective facts of grammar. Such is the case here. A canon in grammatical interpretation in such texts where contexts cannot absolutely determine a particular grammatical option is: the exegete should conclude with that option which is most usual elsewhere. In the present case, according to this canon, the basic causative sense of the *Hiphil* stem should be preferred over the declarative. Consequently, 7:3 most likely views Yahweh not as permitting or tolerating Pharaoh's hardening, but as its direct cause. While agreeing with Kautzsch and Cowley's view of *qasa* as having a basic causative-transitive force, their more specific classification of it as denoting "the entering into a certain condition and the being in the same" should be seen as less probable than that normal force of the *Hiphil*, which "expresses action in some particular direction." If so, the 7:3 hardening expression is a second prophecy of the first phase of the hardening, stressing Yahweh as influencing Pharaoh's volition and intellect to act in a refusing direction, in conformity with the lexical force of *qasa* as explained at the beginning of this discussion.

**The beginning of the first phase of the hardening: the introductory miracle narrative (7:8-13)**

In Hebrew style 7:6 is probably a summary statement of all that

---

42 Forster and Marston are the most recent advocates of the possibility of such a view. For example, the *Hiphil* perfect *hikbadti* ("I will make heavy") in 10:1 they say has the possible meaning "that the Lord actively accepted, and would further utilize Pharaoh's 'heavy' heart for his own ends of revealing Himself through increasingly wonderful signs" (*God's Strategy in Human History* 167). They feel that it is impossible in these narratives to distinguish clearly whether or not the *Hiphil* hardening predictions are causative or permissive (tolerative), and because of the apparent ambiguity decide in favor of a permissive nuance.

43 Even though Foster and Marston in mentioning the declarative sense admit, "We would like to be cautious here," they go on to cite an incomplete word study by D. F. Payne (unpublished) that concludes in favor of a permissive sense. Their conclusions are not very persuasive since their grammatical interpretations are somewhat based on an apparent misuse of Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar*: in arguing for the declarative meaning they cite Gesenius in support of the idea that this stem may sometimes be taken this way (*God's Strategy*, 167, 177). However, when one turns to the appropriate sections of Gesenius, one not only finds that the declarative sense is not the most usual, but in addition that two of the verbs in the *Hiphil* which are used for the hardening in Exodus are classified as causative: *kabad* is rendered "to make heavy," while *qasa* is classified under a "causative and transitive" category (Grammar 145, #53c-e). These writers misuse Davidson's *Grammar* in the same way (*God's Strategy*, 167, 177), since Davidson places the *Hiphil* of *kabad* in the same causative category as Gesenius, i.e., "to make heavy" (A. B. Davidson, *Hebrew Grammar* [Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1943] 96).


45 Ibid. 145, #F.

46 As the Piel verbal nuance in 4:21 was seen to have a plurative sense, so here the *Hiphil* lends itself well to a causative-transitive idea denoting "a series of actions" so that the hardening action by Yahweh is not to be a singular occurrence but repeated (Ibid. 145, #53d).
Moses and Aaron did in 7:8-11:10. The first miracle narrative (7:8-13) is introductory to the first plague narrative (7:14-25), and is crucial in its relation to the previous hardening predictions. The first problem of the 7:13 hardening statement concerns the exact function of the Qal wayyehezaq ("Yet Pharaoh's heart was hardened"), which acts as a preterite with waw consecutive.

A close examination of the exact verbal nuance of the perfect here is crucial, since the same verb form is repeated three times in the following narratives (cf. hazaq in 7:22; 8:15[19] and kabed in 9:7). The perfect may be viewed either as denoting aoristic action or perfective action. If the former be preferred, it would specifically refer to definite past action and be rendered in a passive sense, with an unstated subject doing the hardening ("was hardened, strengthened"); if the latter alternative be correct, it would refer to a present perfect action, which, in contrast to the aoristic, would conceive of the subject (Pharaoh's heart) as in a given condition resulting from a preceding action ("was hard," "had become hard"). Although both alternatives are possible, the present perfect is probably preferable for the following reasons: (1) even though a passive sense is possible for a semantically stative perfect Qal verb, a transitive-passive nuance is somewhat unusual, and especially so for the Qal stative of hazaq in the light of its usage elsewhere; (2) the word order in the MT designates the heart as the subject of the verb; (3) when the writer wants to express the heart as the object being acted upon, the Hiphil or Piel stems together with the direct object sign (et) are employed (cf. hazaq 4:21; 9:12; 10:20, 27; 11:10; 14:4, 8, 17). (4) the unique use of a verbal adjective (kobed) for the hardening (7:14) could continue the idea of v 13 and point further to a perfective condition in v 13.

If this preference is accepted, the verb refers to Pharaoh's heart already being in a hardened condition before the signs of this narrative were performed before him. But this still leaves us with the problem of whether Pharaoh or Yahweh previously caused this subsequent condition. The hardened condition of 7:13 should probably be traced back to the first historical instance of Yahweh's hardening of Pharaoh, discussed in chap. 5. This was a condition of his volition characterized by a "refusal power" with respect first to request and then to signs. The

47 This is the most basic and usual idea among the verbs in the perfective action category. For the various options of verbal nuance for the perfect verb, consult P. P. Jouon Grammaire de l'H'ebréen Biblique (Rome: Institute Biblique Pontifical, 1947) 294-300, ##a-m; Kautzsch and Cowley, Grammar 309-313, ##106a-p; B. L. Waltke, "A Revision of Jouon's Grammaire de L'Hébreu Biblique" (Dallas: Dallas Theological Seminary, unpub, 1975) 10-30. Perhaps it might be best to designate the verb in 7:13 as an intransitive, semantically stative perfect.


49 See also 7:3; 8:11[15].28[32].10.1
waw probably functions resultatively—even after the sign Pharaoh "did not listen to them," as a result of his condition. This appended phrase appears five other times directly following a hardening predication, four of which occur with hazaq (cf. 1:22; 8:11[15], 15[19]; 9:12). In sum, it describes Pharaoh's decision of refusal which was motivated by his volition.

The concluding phrase appended to v 13, ka'aser dibber YHWH ("as the Lord had said"), is probably the most significant in the whole plague narrative complex, especially as it pertains to the cause of the hardening. This phrase may also provide confirming evidence for our present perfect preference of hazaq and for linking the hardened condition of 1:13 to Yahweh's ultimate influence. The phrase occurs six times between 1:1 and 10:1 as a concluding formula to six different hardening predictions.50 Because this phrase takes on great importance in the present argument, it must fully be explained within its pentateuchal context.

Of the approximately 200 times the phrase is employed in the Pentateuch, nearly 150 of these denote an exact correspondence between a preceding action and a subsequent action (or word).51 Of these, about 95 refer to acts to be accomplished or having been accomplished in exact correspondence with the way in which Yahweh previously said they would. Two of these denote that the performance of a future act by Yahweh will be effected in exactly the same way as a past act performed by him (Deut 28:63; 31:4). In other passages it is used in the same manner except that the future act is to be performed in exactly the same way it had been previously predicted or commanded by Yahweh (or occasionally Moses), and either Yahweh or man is to be the effecter of the action.52 In many of these verses ka'aser appears in the same concluding formula as in Exod 1:13 (with the exception that siwwa ["to command"] usually replaces Dabar ["to speak"]). Some of these uses are found in a context of promise-fulfillment: the previously spoken word is seen to have been "certainly spoken" so that it had of necessity to occur,53 and consequently may be viewed in the framework of prophetic promise.

50 In addition to 7:13, cf. 7:22; 8:11[15], 15[19]; 9:12, 35. These six formulas not only refer to the hardening phrase proper, which has reference to Pharaoh's will, but also to the immediately following phrase, welo' sama' 'alehem ("and he did not listen to them"), which refers to the action inspired by the volition (cf. 4:21 and 7:3-4).


52 Cf. the predictive sense (often with dabar) in Gen 24:51; Exod 13:11; Deut 1:11; 6:3; 10:9; 11:25; 12:20; 13:17; 18:2; 19:8; 26:15,18-19; 28:9. Cf. the preceptive sense in Genesis (7 times), Exodus (24 times), Leviticus (13 times), Numbers (18 times) and Deuteronomy (12 times).

53 Cf. Gen 21:la, lb; Deut 26:15; 18:2; 10:9: 2:14: See also the same phrase where it refers to a future fulfillment of prophetic promise (Gen 24:51; Deut 1:11; 6:3; 10:9; 11:25; 12:20; 26:19; 31:3). In all of the above verses dabar is used with ka'aser and YHWH in the usual formula of Exod 7:13ff.
It is probably in this precise sense that the *ka'aser dibber YHWH* formulas of Exod 7:13ff should be understood. The reasons for this should already be evident, but are as follows: (1) the majority of the times when the three words YHWH, *dibber* and *ka'aser* occur together in the Pentateuch, they function within either a promise-prophetic framework or a promise-prophetic fulfillment framework; (2) the prophecies of Exod 4:21 and 7:3 are further evidence that 7:13 is a specific fulfillment of them, especially since 7:13 contains the two most essential elements of these prophecies as having been accomplished, i.e., "hardening" and "not listening." However, even if it be somehow concluded that 7:13 is not a prophetic fulfillment formula, the concluding formula must nevertheless be viewed as denoting an accomplished act in which the essential details of the act are performed in exact correspondence with the previously spoken word of Yahweh. When one refers back to this spoken word (4:21; 7:3), he finds three essential details of which the future act was to consist: (a) the heart of Pharaoh was to be hardened; (b) this hardening was to result in Pharaoh "not listening" or "letting Israel go" and (c) the *subject of this hardening act was to be Yahweh himself*. The first two elements are clearly indicated in 7:13, but Yahweh is not directly mentioned. It should be concluded, though, that Yahweh is viewed as the ultimate cause of the hardening in this verse because of the predominant "exact correspondence" character of the *ka'aser* phrase.54 The same conclusion should also be drawn at Exod 7:22; 8:11[15], 15[19]; 9:12 and 9:34.55 Thus the 7:13 hardening is to be seen as either the continuation of Pharaoh's hardened condition in 5:2 or as the resulting condition of a second hardening by Yahweh prior to the serpent miracles.56

*The first plague narrative (7:14-7:25)*

This narrative begins in 7:14 by a declaration of Pharaoh's heart as being in the same condition as described by 7:13: "Pharaoh's heart is heavy (*kabed)*." Apparently the condition of Pharaoh's heart must be

---

54 In this regard it is significant to see the same usage of the *ka'aser* formula in Josh 11:20, where Yahweh hardens the Canaanites.

55 Among the few interpreters attempting serious study of the concluding formulas is Piper, whose discussion confirms the conclusions independently reached here ("Justification of God" 144-145). Hesse's thorough treatment suffers from uncleanness with respect to the implications of the formulas for the ultimate cause of the hardening (*Verstockungsprolem* 47-8). A. B. Ehrlich explains that in 4:21 Yahweh's purpose of telling Moses about the hardening was so that he would not be discouraged when his signs had no effect on Pharaoh. Thus, when Moses recounts the actual hardening occurrences in these narratives he expresses his remembrance of Yahweh's prediction of such in 4:21 by the *ka'aser* phrase (*Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel* I [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs sche, 1908] 275; so also B. Baentsch, *Exodus-Leviticus-Numen in Handkom-

men.tar zum Alten Testament* I, 2 [Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903] 59; R. R. Wilson, "The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," *CBQ* 41 [1979] 32, who views a "P" redactor as adding these concluding phrases in order to show that "Yahweh is in total control of events and causes the hardening" even in chaps. 7-9; see also Luther, *The Bondage of the Will* 211).

56 Hesse prefers the former option (*Verstockungsprolem* 10), which seems best.
traced back to the same divine cause of the v 13 condition. It is significant that here the hardening is mentioned before the performance of any signs. The reason for this may be two-fold: (1) the hardened condition of 7:13-14 warrants the performance of the next miracle, so that the signs are not a willy-nilly concatenation of events, but always a dynamic-historical divine response to the "failure" of the previous miracle; (2) at the same time the writer is likely giving a reason for the forthcoming negative response to the signs. Both motives are probably in view. The specific idea of kabed here probably shows that Pharaoh's volition had been given such intense power for refusal, that it became "too heavy," so that other influences would not be able to move or change its direction-even signs.

Chap. 7:22b states the concluding reaction of Pharaoh to the signs, which is the result of v 14, with the same meaning as 7:13, since the verb again is to be taken with a stative-intransitive force ("and Pharaoh's heart was strong [wayyehezaq], and he did not listen to them, just as Yahweh said"). The verbatim repetition of the 7:13 hardening statement in 7:22, and its subsequent occurrences (cf. 8:15[19]; 9:1), point both to a continuing inner disposition and an external response pattern, the latter of which builds drama into the historical narration and the former imparting further understanding about why each sign itself does not effect the release of Israel. So the continued repetition of the hardening statements and the display of signs have a literary, rhetorical and theological role. Therefore, in the 7:14-25 narrative Yahweh is viewed again as the ultimate cause of the hardening activity which had brought Pharaoh's heart into such a condition, as emphasized by the concluding ka'aser dibber YHWH phrase, which views the hardening as a fulfillment of 4:21 and 7:3. The narrative thus begins and ends with God's hardening of Pharaoh's heart.

57 See likewise Hesse, Verstockungsproblem 8.
58 This would provide further support for the above argument concerning 4:21 and 5:2ff. that hardening is not contingent upon performance of signs, since the conclusion of this narrative (7:22) links the hardening to God's influence in 7:13, where the hardening is viewed as being the primary reason for the signs and not vice-versa. The same relationship between hardening and signs occurs in John 12:37-40 (cf. Isa 6:9-10).
59 For the rationale see above.
60 The signs also have a dynamic redemptive-historical role in intensifying the hardened condition of Pharaoh, as well as increasing the amount of revelation for which he would be held accountable (cf. Matt 11:20-25; 13:10-16). I am grateful to the Rev. Ivan Davis for pointing out the importance in a discussion such as this of highlighting the historical integrity of Pharaoh's actions and of the repeated signs.
61 However, G. Fohrer, after admitting that some of the hardening predictions have a divine cause, says without explanation that 7:13, 22; 8:15[19] and 9:35 do not apparently view YHWH as the cause (Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus [Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1964] 61). On the other hand, K. Berger affirms that wherever the LXX renders hazaq by σκληρύνω in the Exodus narratives (cf. 4:21; 7:22; 8:15[19]; 9:12, 35, 10:20,27; 11:10; 14:4,8,17) that God is always the source of the hardening ("Hartherzigkeit und Gottes Gesetz: Die Vorgeschichte des antijudischen Vorwurfs in Mc 10:5," ZNW 61 [1970] -7).
The second plague narrative (7:26-8:11[15])

With this narrative the performance of signs occurs first (8:2[6]-3[7]), with an apparent positive effect (8:4[8]-7[11]); but with relief from the plague (8:8[12]-10[14]) comes "hardening" (cf. wehakbed ["he (Pharaoh) made heavy his heart"], 8:11a [15a]). It is probably best to view the Hiphil infinitive absolute "as a substitute for the finite verb, ... as the continuation of [the] preceding finite verb" wayyar' ("he saw") in 8:11a 15a]. Because of the concluding ka'aser formula, the conclusions for 7:13, 22 are applicable here.

Interestingly, the fact that Pharaoh is viewed as performing the hardening in 8:11a [15a] is a comment by the writer on the historical integrity of the narration and about the dispositional reality of Pharaoh's genuine choice, i.e., his hardened refusals are not mechanistic mock actions. Nevertheless, in view of the ka'aser formula Pharaoh must be viewed as YHWH's agent, who truly hardens himself—never independently, but only under the ultimate influence of Yahweh.

In short, in this narrative is seen Yahweh's omnipotence over the Pharaoh, as Yahweh positively influences him externally with signs (8:6[10]-8:12), but then negatively influences him internally with a power for refusal.

The third plague narrative (8:12[16]-15[19])

This narrative is similar to the introductory miracle narrative (7:8-13), with Yahweh's command appearing first, followed by sign performance and concluding with the negative hardening reaction in 8:15[19] ("But Pharaoh's heart was strong [wayyehezaq], and he did not listen to them, just as the Lord said."). The conclusions of this narrative are the same as that in 7:8-13. The hardened condition should be seen as a result of the hardening of the preceding narrative (cf. again the stative-intransitive sense of hazaq).

The fourth plague narrative (8:16[20]-28[32])

The order of events here is almost identical to the 7:26[8:1]-8:11[15] narrative: divine command (vv 16[20]-19[23]), sign performance (v 20[24]), positive reaction by Pharaoh (vv 21[25]-25[29]), plague relief (vv 26[30]-27[31]) and a resulting transitive hardening action (v 28[32]), "But Pharaoh made heavy [wayyakbed] his heart this time also, and he did not let the people go." Since this denotes an activity rather than a

---

62 Kautzsch and Cowley, Grammar 345, ##113Y-Z. Hesse views the verbal action in a reflective sense, which is possible (Verstockungsproblem 9).

63 For this particular sense of agency, cf. the significance of 5:22-23 (discussed supra) as well as 3:21-22 and 12:33-36; 12:12-13, 23, 27; 13:15; 33:2; 34:11. This idea of divine actions standing ultimately behind human actions is an apparently common idea in the A.N.E. (for illustrations and discussion cf. B. Albrektson, History and the Gods [Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1967] 18-21, 36-39, 47, 55, 111; Hesse acknowledges the possibility of the same concept for the hardening from the viewpoint of the Elohist [Verstockungsproblem 46]).

64 The Hiphil prefixed conjugation with waw consecutive functions as a perfect definite past and should be taken transitively since it is in the Hiphil (cf. Kautzsch and Cowley, Grammar 145 ##c-e).
condition, it should be seen as a third hardening occurrence since chap.

5. Again, the integrity of history and the dispositional reality of Pharaoh's choice are reflected in an expression of self-hardening. Again, however, "the king's heart is like channels of water in the hand of Yahweh, he turns it wherever he wishes" (Prov 21:1), first influencing it positively, then reversing the positive effect by negatively influencing him toward a refusal: Pharaoh's "yes" (8:24[28]) is reversed to "no" (8:28[32]). The conclusions of this narrative concerning the cause of the hardening are identical to that of 7:26[8:1]-8:11[15]. Not only does the order of events argue for this identity, but so also does the phrase gam bapa'am hazzo't ("this time also") of 8:28[32] which identifies the hardening activity of this narrative as being of the same nature as in the previous narratives: Yahweh is the ultimate cause and Pharaoh's acts are not independent but influenced.65 No doubt this phrase also highlights the rising drama in the narrative.

The fifth plague narrative (9:1-7)

The order of this narrative is almost identical to 7:8-13: divine command (9: 1-5), sign performance (9:6-7) and a concluding hardening ("But the heart of Pharaoh was heavy [wayyikbad], and he did not let the people go."). This is an unusual hardening predication in that the ka'aser formula is not added, nor is any other phrase explicitly relating it back to the hardening action of the previous narratives. However, because of the narrative's identical structure with 7:8-13 and the observation that all the previous hardening expressions are traceable to Yahweh as ultimate cause, it is probable that the present expression should be similarly interpreted. Further, the hardening here can be traced back directly to the hardening action of 8:28[32] via its stative-intransitive verbal nuance, describing a condition which is a result of the previous activity.66

The sixth plague narrative (9:8-12)

The exact sequence of the previous narrative also appears here. The main difference is that for the first time Yahweh is the stated subject of the hardening, so that its cause here clearly lies with him. Since Yahweh is subject, wayhazzeq ("and he [YHWH] made strong") may be seen as a definite past, functioning transitively, with leb par'oh ("the heart of Pharaoh") as object, and should be viewed as the fourth actual hardening occurrence. This first explicit mention of Yahweh as subject

65 While recognizing the ultimate influence of divine hardening upon Pharaoh's decisions, H. Frey nevertheless affirms that Pharaoh had free will in order to maintain an ethical basis for the hardening (Das Buch der Heimsuchung und des Auszugs [Stuttgart: Calver, 1957] 107-108). B. Baentsch views 8:28[32], 9:34 in a similar way (Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri 78). Hesse is confusing at this point, asserting that 8:28[32] and 9:34 stress Pharaoh's "responsibility" (Verstockungsproblem" 45). "Responsibility" should not be used in such discussions since it cannot be determined whether one means "freedom," "Accountability," or both.

66 See the above discussion of 7:13, 22 and 8:15[19].
of the hardening, together with a concluding *ka aser dibber YHWH* clause (v 12), serves to identify Yahweh as the subject of the previous . . . hardening statements also coupled with the *ka aser* formulas, all of which now become more clearly seen as prophetic fulfillments of Exod 4:21 and 7:3-4.⁶⁷

*The seventh plague narrative (9:13-35)*

This narrative, as has been the case previously, follows the same order as the second and fourth plague narratives 7:26[8:1]-8:11[15] and 8:16[20]-28[32]. Again, the *Hiphil wayyakbed* ("he made heavy") is employed with the same sense as in 8:28[32]. The "hardening conclusions" here coincide with the earlier conclusions of the 8:16[20]-28[32] narrative, although this narrative adds the fact that the hardening action which Pharaoh performs under Yahweh's influence is "sin"⁶⁸ (cf. 9:27, 34). The phrase *wayyosep labato'* ("he sinned again"⁶⁹ or "he continued to sin."⁷⁰) in v 34 connects the hardening statements of v 34 with all the previous ones.

It is evident that vv 34-35 do not function separately (cf. the copulative), but as a unity ("he sinned again and made heavy [wayyakbed] his heart [v 34b] . . . and Pharaoh's heart was strong [wayyehezaq] . . . just as Yahweh said [v 35].") Together they again seem to display the familiar transitive-intransitive pattern: v 34 has a transitive hardening expression (the fourth such thus far), and v 35 follows with a semantically stative-intransitive verb, describing the, resulting condition of the hardening activity in the previous verse. In fact, these verses appear to be a summary of the hardening motif throughout chaps. 7-9. In this light, v 34 may also be subsumed under the previous hardening statements which are linked to God's influence in 4:21 and 7:3.

Exod 9:30 carries significance in that it appears to be an interpretation by Moses on the basis of Pharaoh's past reactions. He is affirming both the historical and theological integrity of the hardening narratives ("I know that you do not yet fear the Lord."). Moses seems finally to discern the reality of the hardening decree of Yahweh in 4:21 fill and 7:3, which has now become for him the practical basis of his expectations about Pharaoh's future negative responses, as Yahweh reaffirms to him in 10:1-3. There is a hardening factor in Pharaoh which is quite independent of his relationship to the signs (cf. 10:29).⁷¹

*The eighth plague narrative (10:1-20)*

This is the most complex plague narrative thus far: hardening (v 1), divine command (vv 1-2), positive reaction by Pharaoh (vv 8-9), his

⁶⁷ Cf. Piper (Justification of God 145) whose argument is very similar to my own on this point (see below).
⁶⁸ For the difficult problem of theodicy to which this conclusion drives us see further infra.
⁶⁹ So NASB and BDB 415, *yasap*: *Hiph* #2a.
negative reaction (vv 10-11), sign performance (vv 12-15), Pharaoh's positive reaction, admittance of sin, relief (vv 16-19) and the typical concluding hardening remark (v 20). Since 9:34-35 seem to function as a literary device for summarizing the sequential hardening predications--the hardening motif--of these narratives, the Hiphil hikbadti ("I [Yahweh] have made heavy his heart, 10:1) begins a new section that looks ahead, and functions best as a prophetic perfect rather than a definite past referring to the previous action. The verb here shows Yahweh has determined not only the hardening later in this narrative, but the rest of the events involved (cf. v 1a and 1b). Pharaoh's volition is reversed four different times in this one narrative (vv 8-9, 10-11, 16-17, 20). The reversal in vv 10-11 should be seen as partial fulfillment of the hardening prediction in 10:1, both viewing Yahweh as ultimate cause of the hardening. Verse 20 should be seen in the same way ("But Yahweh made strong [wayhazzeq] Pharaoh's heart, and he did not let the sons of Israel go.")

The ninth plague narrative (10:21-29)

The sequence here is identical to that of 7:26; [8:1-8:11[15]; 8:16[20]-28[32] and 9:13-35, with the hardening predication taken in the same sense as 10:20, with the same theological conclusion. Note the explicit connection in v 27 between "hardening" and Pharaoh's volitional faculty ("But Yahweh made strong [wayhazzeq] Pharaoh's heart, and he was not willing to let them go.").

The introduction to the death plague (11:1-10)

Verse 9 is a prediction that Pharaoh will again be hardened so that Yahweh can bring on the death plague of chap. 12. Verse 10 is the summary of the whole narrative from 7:6-10:29, viewing Yahweh as the ultimate cause of all the hardening occurrences throughout: "And Moses and Aaron performed all these wonders before Pharaoh; yet Yahweh made strong [wayhazzeq] Pharaoh's heart, and he did not let the sons of Israel go out of his land." This is the formal ending of the first phase of the hardening. The concluding hardening remark in 13:15 (hiqsa, "he was stubborn") denotes that the hardening influence was directed toward Pharaoh's intellectual-volitional faculty in such an intensely severe manner that a decision for release was impossibly "difficult" to reach.

71 This again testifies to the thesis that hardening is the inceptive cause for signs and not vice-versa.
72 So Hesse, Verstockungsproblem 10. D. F. Payne argues that the Hiphil in 10:1, even though it denotes that Yahweh is "behind" the hardening and that it was "part of God's plan," still asserts that he "could not however deduce from the statement itself whether Pharaoh had any volition in the matter or not" (Forster and Marston [God's Strategy 168] citing Payne [source unpublished]). But our exegesis has shown that although Pharaoh did have volition, it was always under the influence of Yahweh.
73 Cf. the summary statement at the beginning of the narrative in 7:6.
74 See Piper's explanation from the parallels of 4:21; 7:3-4 and 11:9-10, which gives evidence in favor of my observation here (Justification of God 150-51).
The second phase of the hardening (14:1-31)

In this second phase the hardening is not directly related to the performance of signs. However, its nature continues to exhibit the "reversal" characteristic of the hardening influence. A Prediction of hardening occurs again in 14:4 and is explained in 14:5: the fulfillment fit of the prediction in v 5 describes the hardening influence of v 4 as expressing itself through causing Pharaoh's intellectual-volitional faculty to "reverse" the former decision concerning the release of the Israelites, with the result that Egypt pursues Israel. Verse 8 notes Yahweh's continuing effectuation of his reversing influence begun in v 5, as does v 17.

VI. Conclusion to the Exegesis

Lexical Conclusion

The three hardening terms are synonymous in the sense that they always refer to an intellectual-volitional power of refusal with respect to a decision of Israelite release. This decision also affected the center of Pharaoh's spiritual being, as suggested by leb. Furthermore, it is evident that hazaq and kabed, in particular, refer to this "volitional power of refusal" as a reversal from an opposite volitional decision. The result of this reversed power is almost always mentioned immediately following each hardening predication. On the other hand, there do seem to be possible distinctions in usage among the three words. The term hazaq may specifically stress the volition's strong desire to refuse Israelite release. The idea with kabed may emphasize the qualitative intensity of the volitions's power with respect to refusal, so that such a power of decision is seen to be so psychologically "heavy" that it cannot be changed by anyone except Yahweh. Qasa stresses the result of this intense power as it relates to Pharaoh's reason, i.e., this

35 Here Pharaoh is viewed as the cause; but, in view of the preceding discussion, he is to be seen as an agent under the causative influence of Yahweh. The Targum says that it was "the word of the Lord" that hardened Pharaoh's heart in 13:15 (cf. J. W. Etheridge, The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathon Ben Uziel on the Pentateuch [New York: KTAV, 1968] 483).

36 That this "change of heart" was not a "strengthening of a previously made decision" is evident not only from context, but from the term wayyehapek, which is probably another term for "hardening." Its basic nuance is that of "turn" and often refers to a "turn in the opposite direction." Cf. Exod 10:19 (wind "turned the reverse way"); Esther 9:1 ("to be turned to the contrary"). One of its predominant uses in the Pentateuch is that of a reversal in something's intrinsic nature (cf. Exod 7:15, 17, 20; Lev 13:3, 4, 10, 16, 17, 25, 55; Deut 23:6). Cf. especially Ps 105:25 where hapak is used with reference to YHWH changing the hearts of the Egyptians to hate Israel.

37 This is found usually in the form of wo'sama'alehem or wo'silla et ha'am.

38 Compare the following discussion with our introduction. While we can agree with Piper that the three terms do not have "Fundamentally different meanings (Justification of God 142), he is perhaps too simplistic in not recognizing their secondary semantic distinctions.

39 Contra Piper who sees the idea of strengthening as completely lost (Justification of God 141).
power makes a decision for release too "difficult" ever to be reached.80

**Exegetical Conclusions: Yahweh as the Ultimate Cause of Pharaoh's Hardening**

The exegesis of the plague narrative complex has shown a definite pattern of a hardening motif (1) the introductory miracle narrative (7:8-13) and the first plague narrative (7:14-25) describe a "hardened" condition (7:13, 14,22), which assumes that a previous action has occurred that caused the condition. Our exegesis has argued that this first action occurred in 5:2 (or somewhere soon after) as a beginning fulfillment of 4:21, which views Yahweh as cause of the hardening. (2) A second hardening act (8:11[15]) occurs in the second plague narrative (7:26[8:1]-8:11[15]) with the resulting condition again (8:15[19]) described in the third plague narrative (8:12[16]-15[19]). (3) The same pattern occurs a third time in plague narratives four (8:16[20]-28[32]) and five (9:1-7) respectively; (4) then in the sixth narrative (9:8-12) Yahweh is explicitly identified as the subject of the previous hardening acts, mainly by showing that he is to be identified with all the previous ka'aser prophetic fulfillment clauses. (5) The seventh narrative (9:13-35) summarizes the pattern of the preceding narratives by employing vv 34-35 as a concluding emphasis of the transitive-intransitive ("act-condition") hardening pattern. What further substantiates this pattern is that the transitive hardening predication are always in the Hiphil of hazaq81 and the intransitive hardening statements are in the Qal of kabed.82

The significance of this pattern83 lies in the observation that even when Pharaoh is subject of the hardening, or when the subject is unmen-

---

80 It is sometimes deduced that the hardening predictions are metaphorical pictures of the malfunctioning of the ethico-religious faculty. So K. L. Schmidt ("Die Verstockung des Menschen durch Gott," TZ 1 [1949] 1-2) and Piper (Justification of God 140-42), the latter of whom gives the most cogent explanation of a metaphorical meaning. While the idea of malfunctioning is certainly part of the intended meaning, the metaphor is imprecise, and, in fact, the meaning is probably not even derived from any metaphor because: (1) hazaq and kabed may be too flexible in their verbal nuances to be designated as obvious pictorial terms and then metaphorically applied (cf C. Brook-Rose, A Grammar of Metaphor [London: Seeker and Warburg, 1965] 209); (2) in the phrase "he hardened his heart," heart is probably not even a pictorial reference to the actual organ, whose underlying significance is intellect, volition, spiritual faculty, etc, but is perhaps best understood as a "dead metaphor," like "foot of a mountain" or "leg of a table." Therefore, heart is best taken as a literal reference to the intellectual-volitional faculty of man, which has ethico-religious implications, affecting the spiritual centrum of life (cf. Hesse, Verstockungsproblem 7-8, 22 and supra).

81 Cf 8:11[15], 28[32], 9:34 (note the adjectival exception of kabed in 7:14).

82 Cf. 7:13, 22, 8:15[19]; 9:35 and, uniquely, the Qal intransitive of kabed in 9:7. When Yahweh is subject, the stem is usually Piel, thus denoting his intense involvement in the hardening.

83 The pattern in 7:8-9:35 seems to betray and point to the work of one mind rather than many conflicting sources, which were harmonized by a theologically ingenious final redactor- contra Hesse (Verstockungsproblem 18-19,45ff.), W. Fuss (Die Deuteronomistische Pentateuchredaktion in Exodus 3-17 [Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1972], e.g. 84-263) and R. R. Wilson ("The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," 18-36).
tioned, these statements describe a resulting condition traceable to a previous hardening action caused by God (cf 7:13, 14, 22; 8:15[19]; 9:7, 35). Therefore these statements cannot refer to Pharaoh independently hardening his heart, as many commentators argue. This is not to say that the reality of Pharaoh’s volitional decisions and accountability should be overlooked or ignored; the concern of this study is about the ultimate cause of the hardening.

Beginning with 10:1 the predications are usually in the Piel and have Yahweh as subject, thus denoting his integral involvement (though cf. 13:15). Thus, the exegesis has shown these hardening patterns, together with 4:21, 7:3 and 10:1ff, involved Pharaoh in a hardening nexus from which he could not escape nor exercise any totally independent self-determining actions, since Yahweh was the ultimate cause of the hardening.

Exegetical Conclusions: The Purpose of Pharaoh's Hardening

As the narratives develop there is a thematic progression with respect to the purpose of the hardening: (1) that the uniqueness of Yahweh’s omnipotence would be demonstrated to the Egyptians (7:17; 8:6[10], 18[22]; 9:16; 10:1-2; 14:4, 17-18; (2) that Yahweh’s acts would become a memorial in Israel and its later generations (10:1-2; 13:14-16); (3) then 14:4, 17, 18 summarizes the whole purpose of the Heilsgeschichte program: it is for Yahweh’s glory.

Having said this, the overarching theme of Exod 1-14 may now be stated: Yahweh hardens Pharaoh’s heart primarily to create an Israelite Heilsgeschichte, necessarily involving an Egyptian Unheilsgeschichte—all of which culminates in Yahweh’s glory. Yahweh caused the kabad of Israel’s bondage (Ps 105:25; Exod 5:9) and the kabad of Pharaoh’s heart, both of which culminate in his own "ikkabella (Exod 14:4, 17, 18).

VII. Theological Implications of the Exegetical Conclusions

Do the above exegetical conclusions help us toward answering the four questions raised in our introduction with respect to Rom 9 and, if so, how? With respect to the first two questions concerning the ultimate cause of the hardening and its conditional or unconditional nature, the above conclusions lead to some straightforward yet difficult answers. First, our study has shown that God was the ultimate cause of all of the hardening actions throughout Exod 4-14 so that at no time was Pharaoh’s volition independent of Yahweh’s influence when he hardened his heart. This may be especially significant since the hardening may be viewed as a polemic against the Egyptian idea of Pharaoh’s deity and the belief that Pharaoh’s heart was the all-controlling factor both in history and society.84 Second, it is never

84 Cf. a Memphite mythological text where the gods Re and Horus exercise absolute control over everything by means of their hearts (J. B. Pritchard, “The Theology of Memphis,” Ancient Near Eastern Texts [Princeton: Princeton Univ, 1969] 5-6). Since the Pharaoh was viewed as the divine incarnation of these two gods, Helmer Ringgren rightly concludes that the heart of the living Pharaoh also was seen as possessing the same power (Word and Wisdom [Lund: Haken Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947] 22).
stated in Exod 4-14 that Yahweh hardens Pharaoh in judgment because of any prior reason or condition residing in him.85 Rather, as stated in the exegetical conclusion, the only purpose or reason given for the hardening is that it would glorify Yahweh. Therefore, the divine hardening of Pharaoh was unconditional.86 All that can be said is that Yahweh deemed it necessary to include Pharaoh's disobedient refusal in the historical plan, which was to glorify himself.87

A classic and important objection to this idea is that it associates God too closely with the cause of sin.88 No doubt the theologian must be very careful in discussing God's relation to sin. Nevertheless, the above exegesis shows that Exod 4-14 says that God was the ultimate, unconditional cause of Pharaoh's volition while holding him accountable for his disobedient volitional acts. While many theologians see an antinomy between divine sovereignty and human freedom in Exod 4-1489 and Rom 9, the present evidence places the mystery between divine sovereignty and human accountability.90 Paul's apparent expres-

85 Hesse asserts that the hardening was not based on the ethical behavior of Pharaoh (Verstockungsproblem 54). Many have attempted to deny this by saying that since Yahweh is not mentioned as subject until 9:12, Pharaoh had to be the subject of the previous predications. (M. Erb, seemingly indifferent theologically, affirms the basic argument presented here "Porosis und Ate"; unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Eberhard-Karls-Universitat zu Tubingen, 1964) 308).


81 The systematic theologian may assert that Pharaoh's hardening was contingent upon his fallen position in Adam, but neither Exodus nor Romans even hints that this was a reason for the hardening. In fact, Rom 9:11 seems to indicate that the pre-natal election and rejection of Jacob and Esau was contingent neither on works nor on any condition residing in them. This may be evident further from observing that the "purpose of God" in preferring Jacob for blessing and Esau for cursing is based on his choice (κατ' ἐκλογήν), so that the ultimate cause of the selection and rejection lies within the determining, unconditional being of God himself. Hence, the divine dealings with both Jacob and Esau are not based on or influenced by either their actions or their natures which give rise to such actions. So Calvin (Romans 215) and Piper (Justification of God 155, 160-62).


90 So J. Hempel, Das Ethos des Alten Testaments (Berlin: A. Topelmann, 1964) 46-54, 96; and apparently Hesse, Verstockungsproblem 46-54, 96, who speaks of this sovereignty-accountability distinction as a Spannungsverhaltnis and the ultimate theological Meisterfrage of Exodus 4-14 (cf. ibid. 51, 54 and 96).
sion of this antinomy is found in the hypothetical Jewish objection which he anticipates in his allusion to Pharaoh's hardening, i.e., how can God blame a man for sin, since man cannot resist God's decree (βουλή) which includes sin (cf. Rom 9:19).91

This antinomy leads directly to our third question concerning whether or not Paul gives an understandable explanation in Rom 9:17 supporting his denial that God is unjust (9:14). Neither Moses nor Paul leaves room for the possibility that God was unjust or immoral in his dealings with Pharaoh or Pharaoh had a peccatum alienum. Paul alludes to Exod 9:16 in affirming the justice of God: "For this very purpose I raised you up, to demonstrate my power in you, and that my name might be proclaimed throughout the whole earth." Paul's wording comes closer to the LXX than the MT, since he sees that God's power was demonstrated in Pharaoh and not merely before his eyes. In this regard, Paul's use of ἐξεγείρω could be synonymous with 'amad (MT) or διατηρεῖ (LXX), but its LXX usage elsewhere denotes an "arousing" or inciting," so that here it may well be a reference to God's internal hardening or inciting of Pharaoh's heart.92 Thus, Paul seems to be alluding to Exod 9:16 as a summary of the purpose of the hardening throughout Exod 4-14--that God's name should be proclaimed "in all the world." If God had not repeatedly hardened Pharaoh, there would have been no drawn out series of plagues and there would have been no proclamation of God's omnipotence, Thus, Paul sees hardening as the key to the proclamation of the divine name.93 That Paul understands Exod 9:16 in terms of hardening is clear from his summary of this allusion in Rom 9:18b ("he hardens whom he wills").94

But how does Paul's use of Exod 9:16 argue for God's justice? The phrase "proclaim the name" of Yahweh is also found in Exod 33:19, a

91 This hypothetical objection becomes real in R. Exod xiii 3, which gives the following evaluation of Exod 10:1: "Does this not provide heretics with ground for arguing that he had no means of repenting since it says: For I [Yahweh] have hardened his heart?" The Midrashic writer then explains the hardening in the following way: "God warned Pharaoh five times before chap 10:1, and finally God hardened Pharaoh's heart as a retributive penalty for him hardening it himself previously."

92 ἐξεγείρω may be understood in Rom 9:17 as "to appoint," "to rise up on the scene of history," etc. M. Stuart has shown that throughout the LXX ἐξεγείρω is best viewed under a more subsuming idea of "incite," "stir up," "excite," "arouse," rather than merely through the idea of "historical appointment": e.g., 2 Chron 36:22; Ezra 1:1,5; Pss 7:6; 34[35]:23; 43[44]:23, 56[57]:8; 58[59]:4; 77[78]:65; 79[80]:2; 107[108]:2; Cant 2:7; 3:5; 4:16; 8:4-5; Ecclesiasticus 22:7; Jonah 1:4; Hag 1:14; Zech 2:13; 4:1; 13:7; Isa 38:16; Ezek 2:2; 2 Macc 13:4. Stuart concludes that the LXX usage denotes a "sense of bringing out of a state of rest or inaction or inefficiency into a contrary state, i.e., in the sense of exciting" (Epistle to the Romans [Andover: Flagg and Gould, 1832] 396), so that this meaning may be in Paul's mind with reference to God's inciting Pharaoh's heart to disobey his command to release Israel. Cf. the same kind of meaning for ἐξεγείρω in Isa 45:13 with reference to Cyrus, only three verses after the potter-clay metaphor to which Paul alludes in Rom 9:20 (cf. also Isa 29:16; 64:8). See Piper for a full discussion of ἐξεγείρω; his conclusion is similar to that reached here, but is arrived at by means of different argumentation (Justification of God 146-8, 158-60).

93 So also Hesse, Verstockungsproblem 50.

94 That v 18b is a summary of v 17 is clear from observing that v 18a ("He has mercy on whom he desires obviously is the summary of vv 15-16.

---
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verse to whom Paul alludes in Rom 9:15 to support God's justice in the election of Jacob over Esau. If it can be determined how Exod 33:19 is a rationale for divine justice, perhaps this may be the key to Paul's use of Exod 9:16.95 John Piper has argued that the proclamation of God's name and the demonstration of his glory in the OT are synonymous,96 so that Exod 33:19 "God's glory and his name" refer fundamentally to his "essential nature mainly to dispense mercy... on whomever he pleases apart from any constraint originating outside his own will. This is the essence of what it means to be God. This is his name"97 and it is what brings him glory. This meaning of "proclaiming the name" certainly seems applicable also to the Exod 9:16 phrase98 and generally coincides with our exegetical conclusions, yet specifically in this context it now refers to the unconditional dispensing of judgment rather than mercy.99

Hence, Paul is arguing in Rom 9:17 that God's justice/righteousness (sedeq) is shown and consists in his acting for his name's sake or glory, i.e., acting unconditionally according to his intrinsic nature. Thus, for Paul, God's actions would be unjust if they were responses conditioned by the creature, whether they be actions of judgment or mercy. While Paul's readership may not have been completely satisfied with his explanation of this theodicy, Paul himself is constrained to conclude, "Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and unfathomable his ways!" (Rom 11:33).

In response to the final question posed in the introduction, God's hardening and rejection of Pharaoh (and the Egyptians) does not appear to be limited to divine dealings only on the temporal, historical level, but appears to have a continuity with a rejection from eternal salvation.100 This may be evident from the following considerations in Exodus: (1) hardening of the heart probably has implications in the

95 Although Exod 9 uses στιχαγγέλλω and Exod 33 has καλέω, the two verbs are virtually synonymous in their contexts. It is notable that two of the only other three OT uses of the phrase found in Exod 9:16 show that "proclaiming the name" of Yahweh is to extol his justice and sovereignty (cf. Deut 32:3; Ps 21[22]:23, 32).
97 Ibid. 215. See supra.
98 The Targum of Exod 9:16b reads "that they might acknowledge the might of My name in all the earth." In the OT the sem YHWH most often refers to God's holiness as it is demonstrated by power, so that the phrase "stands for God's essential nature revealed to men as an active force in the lives of the people" (A. P. Ross, "Popular Etymology and Paranomasia in the Old Testament," unpub Ph.D. dissertation [Univ of Cambridge, 1982] 21-2).
99 See Piper (Justification of God 55-68) where he further discusses Exod 33:19 and Rom 9:15 and strikingly applied his conclusions to Rom 9:17-18 in the same way we have (ibid. 160-62). Note that the name of YHWH also expresses his sovereignty in judgment elsewhere (cf. Ezek 6:13-14; 7:27; 11:10, 12:15-16; 12:25).
100 Contra Forster and Marston, God's Strategy in Human History 66-77. However, it is also possible to agree with Piper (Justification of God 46, 156-7, 160), who says that although he cannot determine whether Pharaoh was consigned to eternal punishment, the principle of God's hardening relationship with him is applied by Paul to the sphere of spiritual reprobation.
spiritual realm affecting Pharaoh's eternal destiny, since in the OT leb ("heart") refers very often to the inner, spiritual center of one's relationship with God,\textsuperscript{101} as is also true of "heart" in the Egyptian literature; (2) this is supported by observing that Pharaoh's hardening of his heart is referred to as "sin against the Lord " for which he needs "forgiveness" (10:16-17; cf. 9:34). Therefore the hardening does not merely concern Pharaoh's intellectual-volitional faculty, but also the spiritual center of his being, since he repeatedly disobeyed God's command and deserves judgment. This is significant in the Exodus account, since the Egyptians viewed Pharaoh as divine and sinless while living, and believed at death he was exempt from judgment but became the god (Osiris) presiding over judgment after his death.

In addition to this, other terms in the immediate context of the Rom 9 hardening statement are used there and elsewhere in the pauline corpus with reference to the eternal destinies of people,\textsuperscript{102} so that it would appear likely that Paul has the same concerns in Rom 9:17 and that he likewise understood the Exodus hardening. The context also points to a concern for eternal destinies in Rom 9, since Rom 8:29-39 refers to assurance of eternal salvation and Rom 10-11 focus on the problem of why national Israel is not in such a salvific condition. Could Paul have expressed such grief about his hardened brethren and wished himself "accursed" on their behalf if issues of eternal destinies were not at stake?\textsuperscript{103} Therefore the hardening is not limited to unique historical situations, but is an expression of a gnomic principle of God's eternal dealings. The principle of such dealings is based on God's unconditional nature, as Paul's use of Exod 9:16 has shown. That such a principle is in Paul's mind is apparent from. Rom 9:18, where he generalizes the individual OT examples of the divine dispensing of mercy and hardening,\textsuperscript{104} the former explains God's dealings with the

\textsuperscript{101} Although Hesse acknowledges that "Altes wie Neues Testament schen im Herzen das Zentrum des religiossittlichen Lebens" (Verstockungsproblem 21), he later states that to interpret Pharaoh's hardening in terms of an eternal rejection (ewige Verwerfung), which he sees Paul doing, is to go beyond the meaning in Exodus, since God has only a historical--not a spiritual--relation with Pharaoh (ibid 33-4). For a discussion of those commentators who argue against and those who argue for an idea of eternal reprobation in Rom 9:17 see Piper (Justification of God 156-7), whose own argument lends support to our present explanation (ibid. 157-60). Cf. also O. Schmitz, "Verstockung," RGG 5, 1574, who says hardening in the NT always concerns man's failure to respond to the announcement of salvation and it always relates to divine judgment.

\textsuperscript{102} See discussion of the usage of the following words in Piper, Justification of God: ἀπωλεία (182-184), ἐλέεω (158), τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ (i.e., τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας) and τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός (49-52). Cf. likewise Paul's usage elsewhere of words synonymous with σκληρύνω (ibid. 157-8) and καλέω (Rom 8:30; 9:7, 24-25; 1 Cor 1:9; 7:22, 24; Gal 1:15; 5:8, 13; Eph 4:1, 4; Col 3:15; 1 Thess 2:12; 4:7; 5:24; 2 Thess 2:14; 1 Tim 6:12; 2 Tim 1:9-10; and ὀργής (Rom 1:18; 2:5, 8; 3:5; 4:15; 5:9; Eph 2:3; 5:6; Col 3:6; 1 Thess 1:10; 2:16; 5:9 and elsewhere in the NT.

\textsuperscript{103} See likewise the thorough discussion of Piper, Justification of God 29-30, 40, 46.

\textsuperscript{104} Note the generalized use of the relative pronoun ὁς). My conclusions about Exod 4-14 and Rom 9:17-18 are given extensive support in Piper's work (ibid. 138-62), which also shows how the whole of Rom 9:1-23 provides further confirmation of these conclusions (his discussion covers 300 pages).
Israelite remnant and Gentiles, while the latter explains the present rejection of the majority of the Jewish nation. The results of this study lend support to the idea that there is an equal ultimacy or parallel between election and reprobation in terms of unconditionality.\textsuperscript{105} Rom 9:18 appears to be the clearest textual expression of such a symmetry.

In the light of these results, it is appropriate that Paul concludes 9-11 with, "For from him and through him and to him are all things. To him be the glory, Amen" (Rom 11:36).

\textsuperscript{105} Contra Berkouwer, \textit{Divine Election} 212; J. Daane, "Something Happened to the Canons," \textit{RJ} 21 (Feb, 1971) 21-22; and H. R. Boer, "Reprobation: Does the Bible Teach It?", \textit{RJ} 25 (April, 1975) 7-10; idem, "Reprobation in Modern Theologians," \textit{RJ} 15 (April, 1965) 13-15, who argue that there is no biblical evidence for unconditional reprobation.
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EXODUS 3:14 AND THE DIVINE NAME:  
A CASE OF BIBLICAL PARONOMASIA

BARRY J. BEITZEL  
TRINITY EVANGELICAL DIVINITY SCHOOL

I. The Device of Paronomasia in the Old Testament

In its broadest definition, paronomasia is a comprehensive term first employed by ancient Greek scholastics when referring to rhetorical devices designed to engage and retain the attention of an audience. This extremely persuasive literary embellishment was so-called because one word was "brought alongside" (lit. "to name beside") of another which appeared or sounded similar or identical--thus producing an aura of literary ambiguity--but which was actually quite different in origin and meaning.1

Paronomasia is a common ancient Near Eastern phenomenon, specimens of which are preserved in Mesopotamian,2 Egyptian3 and Arabic4 literatures. It is also attested in the New Testament5 and post-Biblical6 corpora.

1 adnominatio in Latin; tajnis in Arabic.
3 Examples have been collected by L. Peeters, "Pour une interpretation du jeu de mots," Semitics 2 (1971-72) 127-42.
4 Consult the discussions of G. M. Redslob, Die Arabischen Worter mit entgegengesetzten Bedeutungen (Hamburg: Meissner, 1873); W. C. F. Giese, Untersuchungen uber die 'addad auf Grund von Stellen in altarabischen Dichtern (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1894); T. Noldeke, "Worter mit Gegensinn," Neue Beitrage zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft (Strassburg: Trubner, 1910).
5 M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (3d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 160-85; E. Bullinger, Figures of Speech Used in the Bible (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1898 [repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968]). What seems to this writer to be an important New Testament example of paronomasia is not cited by Bullinger. The word Jerusalem translates two Greek words Ierousalem and Hierosoluma. The former is simply a Greek transliteration of the Old Testament Aramaic form, whereas the latter reflects the word hieros, "holy," representing an instance of Hellenistic paronomasia, but having correspondence neither with the Semitic root nor with the city's historical reality.
Though regarded by contemporary Westerners only as an appropriate form of comedy, paronomasia is characteristically utilized in the Old Testament to arouse curiosity or to heighten the effect of a particularly solemn or important pronouncement, in this way permanently and indelibly impressing the proclamation upon the memory of an audience.\(^7\) This essay will consider the two foci of paronomastic types--visual and oral--and advance a paronomastic explanation of Exodus 3:14.

Visual paronomasia, tending to be intellectual, if not esoteric, includes the following varieties: (1) **Gematria**. In Biblical Hebrew, a numerical equivalent existed for each letter of the alphabet (e.g. ' =1, b=2, etc.). Gematria normally defines a cryptograph in the form of a word or cluster of words which, through the calculation of their combined numerical values, discloses an otherwise-concealed meaning. For instance, David, whose gematria is 14, is listed 14th in the genealogy of Jesus (Matthew 1) and the employment of his gematria is reinforced by the prominent role which the number 14 plays later in this chapter (v 17). Gad, with a gematria of 7, is reckoned 7th in the tribal listing of Genesis 46, where 7 sons are ascribed to him. The first collection of Solomonic Proverbs (10:1-22:16) is introduced with the expression *misle selomoh*, the gematrial total of which is 375. Hence, it is not surprising that one discovers precisely the same number of Proverbs comprising this section of the book.\(^8\)

Some writers see in the "318" servants of Abraham (Gen 14:14) a gematria for Eliezer, the servant of Abraham (15:2), and in the "603,550" people delivered from Egypt (Num 1:46) a gematria for *bene yisra'el kol ros*, "the children of..." 


\(^8\) According to the count of codex Vaticanus. For this reference, I am indebted to my colleague, Professor Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.
Israel, every individual."  

(2) **Atbash.** Atbash is an oratorical device according to which letters of one or more words, counted from the beginning of the alphabet, are exchanged for corresponding letters counted from the end of the alphabet (e.g. ' = t, b = s, etc.). Embedded in Jeremiah's grim oracle of doom directed against Babylon and the king of Babylon (chaps. 50-1) is the enigmatic Sheshak (51:41). Enigmatic, that is, until one recognizes that the letters which comprise the word ssk are actually atbash for bbl, "Babylon" (cf. 25:26). In this same chapter (v 1), Jeremiah describes the inhabitants of Babylon by means of the otherwise-mysterious lb qmy which, through atbash, becomes ks'dym, "Chaldeans," known to have been contemporary inhabitants of the great city. It is suggested that the hapax legomenon kbwl of 1 Kings 9:13, traditionally transliterated "Cabul," is to be understood as atbash for lspk, "worthless land."  

(3) **Acrostic.** Biblical literature displays a paronomastic device in which successive or alternating verses, or cluster of verses, begin with the letters of the Hebrew alphabet in sequence. A complete acrostic sequence may be found in Psalms 111, 112, 119, 145; Proverbs 31:10-31 and Lamentations 1, 2, 3, 4.  

(4) **Notrikon.** This term defines the concept in which letters of a word are considered as abbreviations for a series of words. Hence, 'yk, "how" (Jer 3:19) is said to represent a notrikon for '[*amen*] y[hwh] k[i], "Amen, O Yahweh for," and hmh, "this" (Jer 7:4) is a notrikonic representation for h[am] m[aqom] h[azzeh], "this place."  

(5) **Acronymy.** The opposite of notrikon, an acronym is formed when the initial letter of each of the successive words in a series is extracted to form a separate word. Acronymy is beautifully illustrated in Esther 5:4. In context, the heroine has just risked her life to plead the case of her betrayed people. The dramatic suspense reaches a climax when, in response to the king's query, Esther's first sentence of intercession includes the words y[abo] h[ammelek] w[ehaman] h[ayyom], "let the king and Haman come today." Now the writer, realizing full well that the book inevitably would be translated into...  

---

9 Cf. EncJud 7. § § 369-70. The use of letters to signify numbers was known to other Semitic peoples. An inscription of Sargon II (722-705) states that this king extended the wall of his capital city to 16,283 cubits, which corresponds to Sargon's personal gematria. Rabbinic scholarship also indulged in this oratorical device; based upon a gematrical interpretation of the phrase 'elleh-haddebarim, "these are the words" (Exod 35:1), they argue that there were 39 categories of work forbidden on the sabbath. One recalls that the painstaking statistical work undertaken by Massoretes, including the counting of verses, words and letters for each book of the Old Testament, was recorded in the Massorah finalis, where such detailed data was somewhat unsusceptible to textual corruption, owing to the employment of gematria.  

10 Variations of atbash advanced by others include atbah (i.e. t is substituted for ' , h for b, etc.) and cipher (i.e. reversing the letters of a word and then suggesting that the following letter in the alphabet was actually intended). Using the latter method, some writers suggest that the intended subject of the prophecy of Ezekiel 38-9 is Babylon [bbl], and that Magog [mgg] is to be interpreted in the text only as a cipher for Babylon.  


12 Partial acrostics occur in Psalms 9-10, 25, 34, 37; and Nahum 1.
Persian, and wishing to preserve the divine name from Persianized profanation, wrote the entire book without its inclusion. However, in this critical passage, the Lord is present, if oratorically by way of the acronymic reference yhwh, in a form which cannot possibly be distorted by a Persian writer.13

(6) Anastrophe. In this type of paronomasia, the usual syntactical order is inverted for oratorical effect or emphasis. Though examples of this device abound in the Scriptures, it is poignantly employed in Gen 1:2. Here one observes that, after verse 1, the chapter is decidedly geocentric. And it is the anastrophic function of weha'ares at the beginning of verse 2 which rhetorically signals this orientation for the balance of the chapter. Alternatively, the name of the patriarch Noah is purposely placed at the end of a verbal sentence in order to underscore a relationship with the admired ancestor Enoch. One reads 'et-ha'elohim hithallek-noah, "and Noah walked with God," (Gen 6:9), and observes that the last three radicals, read backwards [hnk], spell the name Enoch, known also for walking with God (Gen 5:22-4).14

(7) Epanastrophe. Here the final syllable of one word is reproduced in the first syllable of the word which immediately follows. For example, takossil 'a1-hasseh / seh tamim, "you should compute for the lamb / (your) lamb should be whole" (Exod 12:4-5); bene-yisra'e1 beyad ramah le 'ene kol-misrayim / umisrayim megabberim 'et . . . kol-bekor, "the children of Israel went out triumphantly before all the Egyptians / while the Egyptians were burying . . all (their) firstborn" (Num 33:3-4); welir 'ot sehem-behemah hemmah lahem, "to show them that they are but beasts" (Eccl 3:18); or the constantly recurring phraseology, paras reset leraglay, "he has spread a net for my feet" (Lam 1:13; Prov 25:13; cf. Ezek 18-20); and finally 'oyaw 'albis boset, "I will clothe his enemies with shame" (Ps 132:18; cf. Job 8:22).15

Oral paronomasia depends upon the similarity of sounds to provide a meaning or to draw an image other than that expected in the context. The terminology is adopted from Gluck.16

(1) Equivocal. This type of paronomasia depends on the literary paradox of homonymy, that is, the similarity of sound between varying words, illustrated in the mene, mene, tegel, parsin passage of Daniel 5. Daniel announces, "mene', God has numbered [menah] . . . your kingdom," "teqel, you have been weighed [tegiltah] . . . and found wanting," "peres, your kingdom is divided" [perisat]. Other eloquent expressions of equivocal paronomasia include yhwh seba'ot . . . wehayah . . . ulsur miksol . . . te'udah, "Yahweh Seba'ot . . . will become a rock offense . . . (therefore) bind up the testimony" (Isa 8:14, 16); wehahemar hayah lahem lahomer, "and they had bitumen for mortar" (Gen 11:3); and beti 'aser-hu' hareb . . . wa'eqra'.

Cf.7:7.


15 It is sometimes suggested that lahem hallbenah le'aben, "they had brick for stone" (Gen 11:4), illustrates the epanastrophic principle.


horeb ‘al-ha’ares, "my house is a desolation... I have called a drought on the earth" (Hag 1:9, 11); and watta ‘as ha’ares beseba’ hassaba’ leqmasim, "during the seven plenteous years the earth brought forth abundantly" (Gen 41:47).

Sometimes homonymy that allows for such punning occurs when consonants which are phonemically disparate in proto-Semitic fall together in Hebrew, e.g. hereb ‘al-kasdim... horeb ‘el-memeha, "a sword (HRB) upon the Chaldeans... a drought (HRB) upon her water" (Jer 50:35, 38); we’anah ‘iyym be’almenotaw... weqarob laba’ ittah, "hyenas will cry (GNH) in its towers... its time (‘NH) is close at hand" (Isa 13:22; cf Jer 51:14, 18; Pss 88:1, 10; 119:153, 172).18

(2) Metaphony. Metaphonic wordplay is facilitated by the occurrence of verbal forms in which a change in stem conjugation does not affect the consonantal root but introduces a vowel mutation which alters, sometimes radically, the nature of the act described. maqqel saqed ‘ani ro’eh... / ki-soqed ‘ani, "I see a rod of almond... / for I am watching" (Jer 1:11, 12); kelub qayis... / ba’ haqqes ‘el-ammi, "a basket of summer fruit... / the end has come upon my people" (Amos 8:1, 2); ‘im lo’ ta’amimu ki lo’ te’amenu, "if you do not believe, then you will no longer be established" (Isa 7:9); wahasimmoti ‘ani ‘et-ha’ares wesamenu ‘aleha ‘oyebekem hayyosebim bah, "I will devastate the land, so that your enemies who settle in it will be astonished at it" (Lev 26:32). A somewhat more sophisticated instance of metaphonic wordplay is to be found in Gen 26:8. Isaac’s name, which in Gen 17:17, 19; 21:6 had been associated with its cognate verb "to laugh" (SHQ), is read here as follows: wehinneh yishaq mesaheq ‘et ribqah ‘isto, "Isaac was fondling Rebekah his wife."

(3) Parasonance. This type of paronomasia involves the use of verbal and nominal roots which differ in one of their three radicals. This device is profusely illustrated in Judg 5:19-21. Here the kings of Canaan fought, heaven fought and the stars fought [nilhamu] (LHM) against Sisera while the torrent Kishon, the mighty onrushing torrent [nahal] (NHL) swept him away. The Lord frequently promises, "I will bring again [sabti] (SWB) the captivity [sebut] (SBY) of my people.19 Parasonancy is artfully employed elsewhere: "Yahweh seba’ot looked for justice [mispat], but there was only bloodshed [mispat],20 for righteousness [sedaqah], but there was only a cry [se’aqah] (Isa 5:7); qamah ‘en-lo semah beli ya ‘aseh-qqemah, "standing grain has no heads, it will yield no meal" (Hos 8:7); haggigal galah yigleh, "Gilgal will surely go into exile" (Amos 5:5); kime noah... me noah, "like the days of Noah... the water of Noah" (Isa 54:9); wesama ‘ta yisra’el wesamarta La’asot, "hear therefore, O Israel, and be careful to do [my commandments]" (Deut 6:3); weteben lo’-yinnaten lakem wetoken rebenim tittenu, "no straw shall be given you, yet you shall deliver the same number of bricks" (Exod

---

19 This formula is recorded some 26 times in Scripture.
20 This word is a hapax legomenon.
But perhaps the most widespread use of parasonance is to be found in word plays upon proper names. Very often, assignment of the names of Biblical characters, tribes, places and episodes is made to suggest a characteristic attributed to them or an important event associated with them.22 Babel (BBL) received its name because it was the place of confusion, [balal] (BLL) (Gen 11:9); the first female was called woman ['issah] (NS) because she was taken from man ['is] (YS) (Gen 2:23);23 Cain [qayin] (QYN) was so named because his mother claimed to have gotten [qaniti] (ONY) a man with the help of the Lord (Gen 4:1).24 At times, double parasonancy is employed with proper names. Gad [gad] was named at birth because of his mother's good fortune [bagad] (Gen 30:11), and later in life he is called a raider [gedud] (Gen 49:19). Because Jacob took hold of Esau's heel [ba 'aqeb] (Gen 25:26) he was named Jacob [ya 'aqob], but later Esau claimed that Jacob had been named aright because he had beguiled [wayya' qebeni] (Gen 27:36) his older brother. Though examples of punning proper names could be multiplied, it should be clear from these cited that one is dealing with words which exhibit a paronomastic relationship, and not an etymological one.

A more complicated form of parasonance is the type in which radicals of one word are found in another word in a differing order: "He delivers (yehalles) the afflicted by their affliction, and opens their ears by adversity (ballahas)" (Job 36:15); "All my enemies shall be ashamed (yebosu) and sorely troubled, they shall turn back (yasubu) and be put to shame (yebosu) in a moment" (Ps 6:10 [H 11]); "Noah (noah) found grace (hen) in the eyes of the Lord" (Gen 6:8). One is tempted to see an example of this type of parasonancy in Genesis 32:24 [H 25]: "And Jacob (ya'aqob) was left alone, and a man wrestled (ye'abeq) with him until daybreak."

(4) Farrago. This form of paronomasia defines somewhat confused and often ungrammatical wording which gains meaning only because of context. A characteristic of farrago is that some of the elements display a tendency to rhyme (e.g. "hodge-podge," "helter-skelter"). Farragonic examples from the Scripture include maher salal has baz, the son of Isaiah (Isa 8:1, 3); tohu wabohu "without form and void" (Gen 1:2); 'et-ha'urim we'et-hattummim, "Urim and Thummim" (Exod 28:30); uben-meseq beti hu' dammeseq 'eli'ezer, "the heir of my house is Eliezer of Damascus" (Gen 15 :2); ben sorer umoreh, "a stubborn and rebellious son" (Deut 21: 18, 20).

(5) Assonance. Words may be strung together primarily for oral effect rather than furthering the meaning of the phraseology. Isaiah seems to have

---

21Parasonance becomes the vehicle to convey the poignant outpouring of Micah's grief (1:10-5).
22J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture* (2 vols.; London: Cumberlege, 1926 [repr. 1954]) 1.245-59. He succinctly states: "To know the name of a man is the same as to know his essence... the name is the soul" (245).
23One observes that "man" and "woman" do not derive from the same root. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the character of the shin in these 2 words is phonemically different in proto-Semitic: in the former case it is a proto-Semitic and * and in the latter case a proto-Semitic *S.
24The *petros/petra* passage in Matthew 16 closely resembles this classification.
been particularly fond of this rhetorical device: wa'omar razz-zi razi-zi 'oy zi bogedim bagedu ubeged bogedim bagedu / pahad wapahat wapah 'aleka yoseb ha'a'ares. "But I say, I pine away, I pine away. Woe is me, for the treacherous deal very treacherously.' / Terror, and the pit, and the snare are upon you, 0 inhabitants of the earth" (Isa 24: 16-7); hakkemakkat makkehu hikkahu 'im-kehereg harugaw horag, "Did he smite him with the same blows as his smitters smote him? Was he slain in the same way as those he had slain?" (Isa 27:7); hitmahmethu utemahu hista 'as 'u waso'u, "Tarry and be astonished, blind yourselves and be blind!" (Isa 29:9). Other instances of assonantic paronomasia include yitten yhwh 'et-metar 'arseka 'abaq we'apar, "Yahweh will make the rain of your land powder and dust" (Deut 28:24); sam sepatam 'aser lo'yisme'u 'is sepat re'ehu, "there [confuse] their language, that they may not understand one another's speech" (Gen 11:7); gad gedud yegudennu wehu/yagud 'aqeb, "raiders shall raid Gad, but he shall raid at their heels" (Gen 49:19).

(6) Onomatopoeia. This term involves the formation and use of words in imitation of natural sounds, beautifully illustrated by the gibberish of foreign tongues in Isaiah 28:10, 13: saw lastaw saw lasaw qaw laqaw qaw laqaw ze'er sam ze'er sam, "precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little, there a little."25 Other examples of onomatopoeia include: 'az halemu 'qqebe-sus middahot daharot 'abbiraw, "then loud beat the horses' hoofs with the galloping, galloping of his steeds" (Judg 5:22); welo' hayah noded kanap uposeh peh umsapsep, "and there was none that moved a wing or opened the mouth or chirped" (Isa 10:14).

(7) Antanclasis. The same word or words, when repeated, sometimes requires different renditions: "I saw the tears of the oppressed, and there was no one to comfort them [we'en lahem menahem], strength was on the side of their oppressors, and there was no one to avenge them [we'en lahem menahem]" (Eccl 4:1); hitrapptta beyom sarah sar kohekah, "If you faint in the day of adversity, your strength is small" (Prov 24:10); 'en qol 'anot geburah we'en qol 'anot halusah qol 'annot 'anoki somea, "it is not the sound of the shout of victory, or the sound of the cry of defeat, but it is the sound of singing that I hear" (Exod 32:18).

The Biblical narratives also benefit from paronomastic displays extending beyond the confines of an immediate context. A few such wordplays, called extended paronomasia, deserve mention here. Launching a propaganda assault calculated to demonstrate the ineptitude of Hezekiah, the emissaries of Sennacherib charge, in effect: Hezekiah had to pay tribute (NS') to us, don't let him deceive (NS') you with words! (2 Kgs 18:14, 29; cf. 19:4, 22). The text of Genesis 3 supplies further expressions of this paronomastic device. A clever ['arum, 1] serpent leads the couple to sin and become naked ['erumim, 7] and to be cursed ['arur, 14]; because the woman had eaten from the tree ['es, 6] she must experience pain ['issabon, 16] in childbirth.

25Casanowicz, 105, incorrectly limits paronomasia to the oral dimension and rules out this passage from consideration.
Cassuto\textsuperscript{26} points out a skillful contrivance of extended paronomasia in the flood narrative, playing on the radicals in the name Noah: "This one shall bring us relief [\textit{yenahamen}, 5:29]; "Yahweh was sorry" [\textit{wayyinna}, 6:6]; "The ark came to rest" [\textit{wattanah}, 8:4]; "A restingplace to set her foot" [\textit{manoah}, 8:9].

This discussion in no way attempts to exhaust the possibilities of Old Testament paronomasia, either in function or in form. The concept was resorted to most frequently by the prophet Isaiah, and it may be found frequently in the books of Proverbs and Job. In the historical books, paronomasia is largely found embedded in poetic passages and in the assigning of proper names.

II. An illustration of Paronomasia in Exodus 3:14

The Exodus discourse between Moses and his God bristles with a number of virtually insoluble philological and theological problems, and one is not surprised at the inability to forge a common scholarly concensus regarding the linguistic and theological meaning of the ineffable tetragrammaton. Though a veritable kaleidoscope of etymological speculation has been set forth,\textsuperscript{27} three prevalent viewpoints will be distinguished in this essay. These outlooks commonly share and express the belief that the relationship between the verb \textit{hayah} and the divine name \textit{yhwh} is one of etymology.

(1) \textit{An Ejaculatory Cry}. Since the writing of G. R. Driver,\textsuperscript{28} a number of scholars have embraced the opinion that the divine name, when first it arose, did not have a readily intelligible form, instead being an emotional cultic outburst, such as dervishes might cry out ecstatically. In the main basing his
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\item \textit{An Ejaculatory Cry}. Since the writing of G. R. Driver,\textsuperscript{28} a number of scholars have embraced the opinion that the divine name, when first it arose, did not have a readily intelligible form, instead being an emotional cultic outburst, such as dervishes might cry out ecstatically. In the main basing his

\begin{enumerate}
\item[27] A Sumerian etymology [ia-u5, "seed of life"] has recently been theorized by J. M. Allegro, \textit{The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross} (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970) 20, 130, 215, n. 1. An Egyptian etymology [Y-h-we3, "moon one"] has been proposed by N. Walker, \textit{The Tetragrammaton} (West Ewell, England: privately published, 1948) [volume unavailable to author] 10-4; "Yahwism and the Divine Name 'Yhwh,'" \textit{ZAW} 70 (1958) 262-65. An Akkadian etymology [ia-u, "noble one"] has been suggested by F. Delitzsch, \textit{Babel and Bibel} (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921) 79-80; E. Littmann, \textit{AfO} 11 [1936] 162 has proposed an Indo-European etymology [*Dyau-s, which became Zeus in Greek, Jupiter in Latin, and Yah in Hebrew]. A Hurrian etymology [ya, "god" (plus a pronominal suffix)] has been offered by J. Lewy, "Influences hurrites sur Israel," \textit{(Revue des Etudes Semitiques}, 1938) 55-61. Finally, it has been suggested by B. Hrozny, ("Inschriften und Kultur der Proto-Inder von Mohenjo-Daro und Harappa," \textit{ArOr} 13 [1942] 52-5) that Yahweh is to be related etymologically to a god Yaue, apparently mentioned in a yet unpublished 3rd millennium inscription found in the Indus valley.
\end{enumerate}
conclusions upon extra-Biblical evidence, Driver affirmed that the antique form of the deity worshipped by some pre-Mosaic Hebrew ancestors was the digrammaton Ya, a form whose origin was a kind of numinal exclamation. Conclusive for Driver was the fact that whereas Hebrew compound proper names were never formed with Yahweh, many were formed with Ya. Now over a period of time, such primitive ecstatic ejaculations tend to become prolonged. Thus, taken together with Driver's belief that the genius of the Exodus event lay in the creation of a new national Hebrew deity, the evolution from Ya to Yahweh was easily effected. At once, this new form was recognized on the basis of popular etymology as closely resembling the verb hayah, therein facilitating its general acceptance and interpretation by the Mosaic community.

Elmslie\(^29\) accepted the reasoning of Driver, but he extended the argument by suggesting, on the analogy of Tunisian cult shouts, that the ejaculation Ya was originally associated with the cult of the moon deity Sin, whom the Hebrew ancestors obviously adored and from one of whose centers the great patriarch emigrated.

In 1961, Mowinckel\(^30\) sought to advance this hypothesis by asserting that the divine name was to be understood as ya-huwa, being composed of the Arabic interjection and the third person independent personal pronoun, and translated "Oh He!" Though such a form was originally a cultic cry of exclamation and invocation, it gradually developed into a symbolic designation ("He whose inmost essence and being we cannot see or understand") and finally came to be understood as a proper name.\(^31\)

As to these suppositions, it must be asserted that it would be unprecedented for a Semitic divine name to originate as a religious exclamation. Driver cited Greek analogies and Mowinckel relied heavily on Norwegian analogues. Furthermore, leaving aside the problem of how Ya developed into Yahweh and not some other form, Semitic proper names normally begin with transparent appellations or sentences and shorten or disintegrate. They do not become prolonged, as supposed by adherents of this view.\(^32\)

(2) \textit{A Triliteral Verbal Form}. By a large margin, the \textit{opinio communis} has been one which treats the tetragrammaton as a triliteral verbal form, deriv\textit{ing from}


\(^{31}\)Psalm 102:27 [H28] \textit{we'attah-hu} was luminous with meaning for Mowinckel

the root HWY.\textsuperscript{33} (a) Causative Participle. J. Obermann\textsuperscript{34} attempted to show that Yahweh need not represent a finite verb. As a finite verb, it would be, of necessity, one of the third person. Yet the solemn formula ‘\textit{ani yahweh}, occurring with high frequency throughout the pages of the Old Testament, would present one with the enigma of a third person imperfect having as its subject or agent a first person pronoun.\textsuperscript{35} For Obermann, such a construction was manifestly impossible unless one assumes either that the meaning of the appellation had been lost by the time this formulation developed, or that the form \textit{yahweh} does not represent a finite verb. On the other hand, arguing on the analogy of the Karatepe inscription of Azittawadd, where numerous expressions of the same type occur, Obermann submitted that \textit{yahweh} represented a peculiar type of causative participial formation with a \textit{y} instead of a \textit{m} preformative. Therefore, as a lexeme, \textit{yahweh} should be translated "Sustainer, Maintainer."

Against Obermann's view it must be argued that demonstrably participial forms with \textit{y} preformatives are non-existent in Semitic. Even in the unlikely event that the Phoenician examples cited by Obermann should eventually prove to be participial in form and function,\textsuperscript{36} their appearance only in relatively late inscriptions cannot be used to support the antiquity of the phenomenon. Moreover, the causative of the root HWY is attested in Semitic.

(b) G stem triliteral verb. Actually, the only common denominator among those who endorse this view is that the tetragrammaton springs from the root HWY. Goitein\textsuperscript{37} argues that the root signifies "the Passionate One," whereas Schorr\textsuperscript{38} and Bowman\textsuperscript{39} aver that the root reflects the meaning "to speak" (cognate to Akkadian \textit{awatu}), hence Yahweh was the "Speaker, Revealer," an epithet particularly eloquent in the Mosaic period. Murtonen,\textsuperscript{40} who accepts this reasoning, regards the divine name as a kind of \textit{nomen agentis} with a \textit{y} prefix, meaning "Commander." Klostermann\textsuperscript{41} recognized in the same root a negative connotation, declaring that Yahweh means "the Faller," in the sense

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{33}C. H. Ratschow, (\textit{Werden una Wirken. Eine Untersuchung des Wortes hajah als Beitrag zur Wirklichkeitserfassung des alten Testaments} [BZAW 70; Berlin: Topelmann, 1941] 81) finds 3 meanings for the verb \textit{hayah}: "to be," "to become" and "to effect."
  \item \textsuperscript{34}J. Obermann, "The Divine Name \textit{YHWH} in the Light of Recent Discoveries," \textit{JBL} 68 (1949) 301-23, esp. 303-09; "Survival of an Old Canaanite Participle and Its Import on Biblical Exegesis," \textit{JBL} 70 (1951) 199-209.
  \item \textsuperscript{35}According to the linguistic model of F. Anderson, (\textit{The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch} [Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1970] 39-42), such a syntactical order would indicate a clause of identification.
  \item \textsuperscript{36}G. R. Driver, ("Reflections on Recent Articles," \textit{JBL} 72 [1954] 125-31) disputes the admissibility of the Karatepe evidence. The forms at Karatepe are generally considered to be infinitives followed by a personal pronoun. An infinitive without such a governing pronoun could never have developed into a divine name in Hebrew.
  \item \textsuperscript{37}S. D. Goitein, "YHWH the Passionate: The Monotheistic Meaning and Origin of the Name YHWH," \textit{JT} 6 (1956) 1-9.
  \item \textsuperscript{38}M. Schorr, Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil- und Prozessrechts (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913 [repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1971]) XXXII-XXXIV.
  \item \textsuperscript{39}R. A. Bowman, "Yahweh the Speaker," \textit{JNES} 3 (1944) 1-8.
  \item \textsuperscript{40}A Murtonen, \textit{Treatise} 90.
  \item \textsuperscript{41}A. Klostermann, \textit{Geschichte des Volkes Israel} (Munchen: Beck, 1896) 70.
\end{itemize}
of one who crashes down or falls from heaven, as a meteor.

But the prominent position has been to associate the tetragrammaton with hayah (necessarily related to a hypothetical antique verb *HWY), and to suggest the meaning "He Who is the Existing One," "the Absolute, Eternally-Existing One, the One Who is with His people." According to this view, Moses poses a question of nomenclature and Yahweh offers an etymological response. In appraising this point of view, this writer would offer three lines of counter-argumentation: lexicographic, phonetic and onomastic. Buber states the following:

If you wish to ask a person's name in Biblical Hebrew, you never say, as is done here, "What (mah) is his name?" or "What is your name?" but "Who (mi) are you?" "Who is he?" "Who is your name?" "Tell me your name." Where the word "what" is associated with the word "name" the question asked is what finds expression in or lies concealed behind that name.

Having inspected the various categories and significant citations of the interrogative particles mah and mi; Motyer concluded that when mah is employed, it consistently and uniformly possesses this qualitative force which Buber had attributed to it. Consequently, mah should be labelled as an impersonal interrogative particle asking the question "What?"

The question . . . mah semo, cannot mean; "by what name is the deity called?", because the answer to such a question should have been: He is called by the name YHWH. The actual answer to the question: "I am that I am" (v 14) does not give the name of the Deity. It gives the significance and the interpretation of the name YHWH, but not the name itself. Therefore the question mah semo can only mean: "What meaneth His name? what is its import and significance?"


46 M. H. Segal, *The Pentateuch: Its Composition and Its Authorship* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967) 5. Furthermore, this assertion is altogether consistent with what is known about the word sem the semantic range of which, according to *BDB* 1027-28, is understood to encompass nomenclature, reputation, character and fame.
Accordingly, it appears that Moses is posing a question of character reference and not one of nomenclature. And in context, such a question would have conveyed profound theological potentialities.41 "What kind of a God are you?" Moses queries, to which the Lord responds in kind, "I will be what I will be." That is to say, God is affirming that in His essential character He will not be the product of human thought or manipulation, unlike the Egyptian deities with which the children of Israel would have been eminently familiar.

Secondly, the contention that the divine name and the verb hayah are related etymologically violates a Hebrew law of phonetics regarding the hollow verb. Here the same phonetic rules govern CwC/CyC verbs in all persons, and one looks in vain to find a verb in this classification exhibiting a middle waw in the 3rd person but a yod in the 1st person. In fact, so uniform is this phonetic axiom that Kautzsch48 declares that secondary formations, found only in the latest Old Testament literature, are owing to Aramaic influence. And to suggest that in Exodus 3:14 there was an intentional alteration specifically to avoid confusion with the tetragrammaton is to introduce into the MT a hypothetical reconstruction for which there is an utter lack of textual support.

Finally, the suggestion that the tetragrammaton and verb hayah are etymologically interwoven leads inescapably to the conclusion that the divine name consists exclusively of a finite verb. Mowinckel observes that "in the ancient Semitic nomenclature a name containing a verbal form, whether impf. or perf., would otherwise always be an abbreviated form of the name concerned; the full form contains also a subject of the verb."49 While the present writer has frequently encountered divine names consisting of augmented one-word nouns (e.g. El), genitive compounds (e.g. Marduk [amar-utu-ak], "son of Utu"), predicate compounds (e.g. Dagan-Neri, "Dagan is light"), noun plus pronoun (e.g. Yaum-An, "An is mine"), and verb plus noun (e.g. Itur'-Mer, "Mer returns"), it would be virtually unparalleled for a bare verbal form to exist as a divine name.50

What is more, it must be pointed out that a root HWY is inextant in all West Semitic languages which antedate the Mosaic era. That is to say, Phoenician contains no root HWY; Ugaritic, despite its attestation of a divine name yw,

48GKC 191. § 12m.
50For a listing of ancient Semitic deities, refer to A. Deimel, ed., Pantheon Babylonicum (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1914); K. L. Tallqvist, Akkadische Gotterepitheta (Helsinki: Societas orientalis fennica, 1938); G. Dossin, "Le Pantheon de Mari," Studia Mariana (Leiden: Brill, 1950) 41-50; S. Moscati, ed., Le Antiche Divinita Semitiche (Studio Semitici 1; Rome: University of Rome, 1958). This writer has been able to find one such divine name: diksudum (CTXXIV.16.21; 28.15 [Deimel #1545]); ARM XIII. 111.6.
bears no witness to this verbal root;\textsuperscript{51} and Amorite Akkadian evidences no root HWY.\textsuperscript{52} The root HWY is attested only in Aramaic, Syriac, Nabataean and Palmyrian.

(c) \textit{H stem triliteral verb}. Many writers advocate that the divine name is to be connected etymologically with the causative stem of the root HWY, again agreeing only in the basic root. Smith\textsuperscript{53} proposes that the word derives from an Arabic cognate meaning "to blow," claiming that Yahweh was originally a storm god. This sentiment is echoed by Wellhausen,\textsuperscript{54} Duhm,\textsuperscript{55} Eisler,\textsuperscript{56} Ward,\textsuperscript{57} Oesterly and Robinson,\textsuperscript{58} and Meek,\textsuperscript{59} some of whom link Yahweh with the ancient southern sanctuaries of the Kenites and/or the Midianites. Citing an alternate Arabic root, Barton\textsuperscript{60} views the name as meaning "He Who causes to love passionately." On the other hand, Holzinger\textsuperscript{61} takes the root to mean "to destroy," and the God of Israel is seen to be "One Who brings about destruction." At the same time, a host of scholars\textsuperscript{62} advance the theory that the tetragrammaton derives from the causative stem of a Hebrew verb \textit{hayah}. In this case, "Yahweh" and the verb "to be" are understood to be fused etymologically, and the divine name is taken to convey the meaning "the One


\textsuperscript{52}Akkadian attests the verb \textit{awu} "to argue in court" "to discuss talk over" "to speak" [CAD A2 86a-96, possibly a denominative verb derived from \textit{awatu}], as well as the verb \textit{ewtl}, "to change, turn into" [CAD E 413b-15b]. The only root meaning "to be" of which there is evidence in Ugaritic 38d Phoenician is KWN; cf. Arabic \textit{kawana}. The normal Akkadian root meaning "to be" is BSY.

\textsuperscript{53}W. R. Smith, \textit{The Old Testament in the Jewish Church} (New York: Appleton, 1881) 423.


\textsuperscript{55}B. Duhm, \textit{Israels Propheten} (Tubingen: Mohr, 1916) 34.

\textsuperscript{56}R. Eisler, "Orientalische Studien," \textit{MVAG} 22 (1917) 36.

\textsuperscript{57}W. H. Ward, "The Origin of the Worship of Yahwe," \textit{AJSL} 25 (1925) 175-87.


\textsuperscript{61}H. Holzinger, \textit{Einleitung in den Hexateuch} (Leipzig: Mohr, 1893) 204.

Who causes to be (what is)," "He Who brings things to pass," or "the Performer of the Promise."

But again, one is left with a divine name composed wholly of a finite verb and, in this case, one of a demonstrably non-existent causative stem.63 Nor can one affirm, with Lagarde,64 that the divine name is itself responsible for this lack of attestation; to do so would be to commit an obvious circularism and to fail to explain such non-attestation in Semitic dialects where the divine name was never sacred.

Further, if, as the result of such an interpretation of the tetragrammaton, one formulates a notion of causality which implies ontological speculation, one proceeds still further from early Hebrew thought and faith. Though causatives of verbs meaning "to be" are predicated of deities in the sense of creating, it would be absolutely without precedent to define in such an abstract and philosophical manner the character, vis-a-vis the actions, of a deity.65 That is to say, it seems to the present writer that the distinction is one of philosophy and not merely of semantics, and early Hebrew thought perceived being phenomenally, not ontologically or metaphysically. The latter impression is received from the reading of the LXX.66 In any case, the causative of this root is unattested in Semitic.

(3) A Genuine tetragrammaton. Arrayed against the inherently improbable conclusions of the first two standpoints, this writer should like to theorize that, with the tetragrammaton, one is most likely dealing with a quadriliteral divine name in which the initial yod is lexically intrinsic.67 In support of this suggestion, one summons the following evidence. As a second millennium extra-Biblical phenomenon, this name is ubiquitous. One is able to locate the name in an onomastically identical or equivalent form in three corpora of second millennium literature. It appears (1) as a Ugaritic divine name [yw],68 (2) as an Egyptian place name [ya-h-wa/yi-ha] (Amenophis III text from

---

64P. de Lagarde, Erklarung hebraischer worter (Gottingen: Koenigliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 1880) 27-30.
66LXX reads 'Ego 'eimi ho on; Aquila and Theodotion 'Esomai hos 'esomai; and the Vulgate reads Ego sum qui sum.
67Occurring in a number of languages, the name is attested some 250 times in extra-Biblical documentation where the linguistic equivalent of the Hebrew yod is always present, even in a language (e.g. Greek) in which the corresponding radical cannot possibly be construed as a preformative element.
Soleb, Ramses II text from 'Amarah, Ramses III text from Medinet Habu, and (3) as a Byblian divine name ['Ieuw]. Moreover, some authorities argue that it may be found as an element in Babylonian proper names from the Cassite period [e.g. Ya-u-ha-z] and as an element in personal names [e.g. Is-ra-il / lu du-bi-zi-pis, Is-ya-ra ya du-bi-zi-pis; dinger Ya-ra-mu] at Ebla.

This list cuts a wide swath linguistically and geographically, and it evidences a great antiquity for the word as a personal name, and as a divine name in particular. Now Semitic philologists are familiar with onomastic proposition which states that geographical names and personal names derive from divine names, but that the converse is not generally true. Further, the complexity of phonetics and orthography between the Akkadian, West Semitic and Egyptian writing systems is profound, but it is a fundamental principle in onomastic studies that "divine names and even other substantives lend themselves to borrowing more easily than do adjectives and that borrowing of verbal forms is highly improbable."

This latter dictum of linguistic borrowing is obviously recognizable in the first millennium extra-Biblical evidence, where Yahweh is found in Aramaic, Greek, Moabite and Canaanite literature. But the antiquity and ubiquity of the second millennium evidence coupled with these two onomastic axioms strongly suggest that the word was already known as a divine name centuries before the Mosaic epoch. Accordingly, it seems preferable to conclude that tetragrammaton is a quadriradical divine name of unknown lexicographic and ethnic origin, and that its relationship with hayah in Exodus 3:14 is one of paronomasia, not etymology.

Since the use of paronomasia promoted a certain excitement and curiosity, some authorities argue that it may be found as an element in Babylonian proper names from the Cassite period [e.g. Ya-u-ha-z] and as an element in personal names [e.g. Is-ra-il / lu du-bi-zi-pis, Is-ya-ra ya du-bi-zi-pis; dinger Ya-ra-mu] at Ebla.

This list cuts a wide swath linguistically and geographically, and it evidences a great antiquity for the word as a personal name, and as a divine name in particular. Now Semitic philologists are familiar with onomastic proposition which states that geographical names and personal names derive from divine names, but that the converse is not generally true. Further, the complexity of phonetics and orthography between the Akkadian, West Semitic and Egyptian writing systems is profound, but it is a fundamental principle in onomastic studies that "divine names and even other substantives lend themselves to borrowing more easily than do adjectives and that borrowing of verbal forms is highly improbable."

This latter dictum of linguistic borrowing is obviously recognizable in the first millennium extra-Biblical evidence, where Yahweh is found in Aramaic, Greek, Moabite and Canaanite literature. But the antiquity and ubiquity of the second millennium evidence coupled with these two onomastic axioms strongly suggest that the word was already known as a divine name centuries before the Mosaic epoch. Accordingly, it seems preferable to conclude that tetragrammaton is a quadriradical divine name of unknown lexicographic and ethnic origin, and that its relationship with hayah in Exodus 3:14 is one of paronomasia, not etymology.

Since the use of paronomasia promoted a certain excitement and curiosity, some authorities argue that it may be found as an element in Babylonian proper names from the Cassite period [e.g. Ya-u-ha-z] and as an element in personal names [e.g. Is-ra-il / lu du-bi-zi-pis, Is-ya-ra ya du-bi-zi-pis; dinger Ya-ra-mu] at Ebla.

This list cuts a wide swath linguistically and geographically, and it evidences a great antiquity for the word as a personal name, and as a divine name in particular. Now Semitic philologists are familiar with onomastic proposition which states that geographical names and personal names derive from divine names, but that the converse is not generally true. Further, the complexity of phonetics and orthography between the Akkadian, West Semitic and Egyptian writing systems is profound, but it is a fundamental principle in onomastic studies that "divine names and even other substantives lend themselves to borrowing more easily than do adjectives and that borrowing of verbal forms is highly improbable."

This latter dictum of linguistic borrowing is obviously recognizable in the first millennium extra-Biblical evidence, where Yahweh is found in Aramaic, Greek, Moabite and Canaanite literature. But the antiquity and ubiquity of the second millennium evidence coupled with these two onomastic axioms strongly suggest that the word was already known as a divine name centuries before the Mosaic epoch. Accordingly, it seems preferable to conclude that tetragrammaton is a quadriradical divine name of unknown lexicographic and ethnic origin, and that its relationship with hayah in Exodus 3:14 is one of paronomasia, not etymology.

Since the use of paronomasia promoted a certain excitement and curiosity, some authorities argue that it may be found as an element in Babylonian proper names from the Cassite period [e.g. Ya-u-ha-z] and as an element in personal names [e.g. Is-ra-il / lu du-bi-zi-pis, Is-ya-ra ya du-bi-zi-pis; dinger Ya-ra-mu] at Ebla.

This list cuts a wide swath linguistically and geographically, and it evidences a great antiquity for the word as a personal name, and as a divine name in particular. Now Semitic philologists are familiar with onomastic proposition which states that geographical names and personal names derive from divine names, but that the converse is not generally true. Further, the complexity of phonetics and orthography between the Akkadian, West Semitic and Egyptian writing systems is profound, but it is a fundamental principle in onomastic studies that "divine names and even other substantives lend themselves to borrowing more easily than do adjectives and that borrowing of verbal forms is highly improbable."

This latter dictum of linguistic borrowing is obviously recognizable in the first millennium extra-Biblical evidence, where Yahweh is found in Aramaic, Greek, Moabite and Canaanite literature. But the antiquity and ubiquity of the second millennium evidence coupled with these two onomastic axioms strongly suggest that the word was already known as a divine name centuries before the Mosaic epoch. Accordingly, it seems preferable to conclude that tetragrammaton is a quadriradical divine name of unknown lexicographic and ethnic origin, and that its relationship with hayah in Exodus 3:14 is one of paronomasia, not etymology.

Since the use of paronomasia promoted a certain excitement and curiosity, some authorities argue that it may be found as an element in Babylonian proper names from the Cassite period [e.g. Ya-u-ha-z] and as an element in personal names [e.g. Is-ra-il / lu du-bi-zi-pis, Is-ya-ra ya du-bi-zi-pis; dinger Ya-ra-mu] at Ebla.
to invite a search for meanings not readily apparent, it is not at all surprising to find that a divine revelation like Exodus 3:14 would be couched in paronomastic forms. Nor is such a view inconsistent with those Johannine passages in which Jesus consciously seeks to identify Himself with the "I am" of Exodus. 76 But neither the gospel nor the proclamation of Exodus is attempting to supply us with the etymology of the tetragrammaton. Exodus 3:14 becomes, therefore, yet another instance of paronomasia in the Bible.
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THE HEBREW PAPYRUS OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

F. C. Burkitt

A HEBREW papyrus is a rarity in any case, but the document that forms the subject of this paper is unique. It is a papyrus containing the Decalogue in Hebrew followed by the *Shema‘*, the text differing in many notable particulars from the Massoretic standard, and agreeing with that which underlies the Septuagint version. When we add that there is every reason to suppose that the Papyrus is at least five or six hundred years older than any piece of Hebrew writing known to scholars, it is evident that the tattered fragments of which a facsimile is here inserted are interesting and important from every point of view.

The recent history of the Papyrus is involved in some obscurity. It came into the possession of Mr. W. L. Nash, the Secretary of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, having been bought in Egypt from a native dealer along with some very early uncial fragments of the Odyssey. Mr. Nash thinks it very probable that the whole "find" comes from somewhere in the Fayyum. These Greek fragments must be as old as the second century A. D., and are probably much earlier: they contain portions of *Odyssey* XII. 279-304, and have been edited by the present writer with a facsimile in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* for November, 1902, p. 290 ff. The Hebrew fragments which form the subject of the present article were entrusted to Mr. Stanley A. Cook, Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, and one of the sub-editors of the new *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. Mr. Cook identified the fragments and published them in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical*
HEBREW PAPYRUS OF THE DECALOGUE
Archaeology for January, 1903, in an admirable paper which contains, in addition to the text and translation, a full discussion of the interesting questions to which this discovery has given rise. The Papyrus itself has been most generously presented by Mr. Nash to the Cambridge University Library.

So much for the way in which the Papyrus has made its reappearance in the world. About one thing there can be no doubt. There can be no doubt that it is a genuine relic of antiquity and not a forgery. The scraps of Greek papyrus with which it was associated are certainly genuine. It may be safely said that no forger of antiquities has the palaeographical knowledge necessary for such work as this; and if he had had the knowledge, he would not have allowed his work to be thrown in, as a thing of no particular value, among a collection of Greek documents. I have thought it worth while to insist upon the genuineness of the Papyrus, because unfortunately it has been found impossible to make a satisfactory photograph of it. What appears here is a photograph of the papyrus, but not of the handwriting. The papyrus is a very dark yellow, and by the time this has made a sufficient impression on the photographic plate, light enough has been reflected from the black surfaces of the letters themselves to affect the plate also: consequently, while every fibre in the material was visible in the photograph, the letters were not visible at all or were exceedingly faint. What is seen in the reproduction is a very careful drawing of the letters upon the photograph, made by myself from the Papyrus. In doing this I was greatly helped by the faint marks on the photograph, which could be identified when compared with the original as the traces of the several letters. Fortunately there is no serious case of doubtful reading. In a slanting light the letters are clear on the Papyrus itself, and there is only one word in the decipherment of which Mr. Cook and I are not completely agreed. Modern fluid ink and modern pens, coupled with the circumstance
that it was almost impossible to erase a badly-formed letter, made the copy somewhat rougher than the original, but I can honestly claim that the facsimile gives a not misleading view of the appearance of the handwriting.

In its present state the Nash Papyrus consists of four fragments, all of which fit together. The largest is nearly two inches across and about four inches long. It appears to have been doubled up into a packet. A portion of the upper margin (not shown in the photograph) is still preserved, and one of the smaller fragments contains a portion of the right-hand margin. The handwriting is arranged in a column with an average of a little over thirty letters in a line. The greater part of twenty-four lines are preserved, and there are traces of a twenty-fifth, but it is of course impossible to say how much further this column extended. The fragment containing a portion of the right-hand margin appears to terminate with the natural edge of the Papyrus, so that what is preserved is the beginning of a document. The smallness of this margin suggests that there was never more than the single column of writing. The material is now very brittle, and it would be hazardous to detach it from the card upon which the fragments have been gummed, but Mr. Cook and I have managed to ascertain that there is no writing on the other side. Before speculating on the nature of the document, it will be convenient to give the actual text, and to examine its relation to other authorities. Then will follow a few words on the date of the Papyrus, and the value of the text.

HEBREW TEXT.

אוכניך יהוה אלהיך אשש [מושא|תיך מארץ מתים] 1

[לא היה לך אלילים אורות [על כל על תשבה [לע מועל] 2

וכל חמה] אוש בשם ממצל אוש בראיר [מחחה] 3

[אוש בשם ממצל להארך לא תשחתר לוח [לוזי] 4

[תבעדה כז] אוכניך יהוה אלהיך אל קונה פָּר [ד צו] 5
HEBREW PAPYRUS OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

1. I am Jahwe thy God that [brought] thee out of the land of E[gypt:]
2. thou shalt not have other gods before me. Thou shalt not make [for thyself an image]
3. [or any form] that is in the heavens above, or that is in the earth [beneath,]
4. [or that is in the waters beneath the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them [nor]
5. [serve them, for] I am Jahwe thy God, a jealous God visiting the iniquity
6. [of fathers upon sons to the third and to the fourth generation unto them that hate me, [and doing]
7 [kindness unto thousands] unto them that love me and keep my commandments. Thou shalt [not]
8 [take up the name of Jahwe] thy God in vain, for Jahwe will not hold guiltless [him that]
9 [taketh up his name in vain. Remember the day of the Sabbath [to hallow it:]
10 [six days thou shalt work and do all thy business, and on the [seventh day,]
11 a Sabbath for Jahwe] thy God, thou shalt not do therein any business, [thou]
12 [and thy son and thy daughter,] thy slave and thy handmaid, thy ox and thy ass and all thy [cattle,]
13 [and thy stranger that is] in thy gates. For six days did Ja[hwe make]
14 [the heaven]s and the earth, the sea and all th[at is therein,]
15 and he rested [on the] seventh day; therefore Jahwe blessed [the]
16 seventh day and hallowed it. Honour thy father and thy mother, that]
17 it may be well with thee and that thy days may be long upon the ground [that]
18 Jahwe thy God giveth thee. Thou shalt not do adultery.
   Thou shalt not do murder. Thou shalt [not]
19 [st]eal. Thou shalt not [bear] against thy neighbour vain witness. Thou shalt not covet [the]
20 [wife of thy neighbour. Thou shalt] not desire the house of thy neighbour, his field, or his slave,]
21 [or his handmaid, or his o]x, or his ass, or anything that is thy neighbour's. [Blank]
22 [(?) And these are the statutes and the judgements that Moses commanded the [sons of]
23 [Israel] in the wilderness, when they went forth from the land of Egypt. Hea[r]
24 [0 Isra]el: Jahwe our God, Jahwe is one; and thou shalt love]
25 [Jahwe thy G]o[d with al]l t[hy heart ... ].
In making the restorations at the beginnings and ends of the lines it must be borne in mind that א, מ, נ, ר, ש, ת (and sometimes כ) are wide letters, and that ד, ה, ג, ד, ר, ל (and sometimes ב and ל) are narrow letters. Lines 15-19 indicate that about seven letters are lost on the right hand of lines 1-14, 20-22; consequently, no more than four letters as a rule are lost on the left-hand side. I think therefore that Mr. Cook has supplied too many letters at the ends of lines 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 11, and too few at the beginnings of the following lines. That the division here adopted is right may also be seen from lines 4 and 5, for to add אלו שבעים at the end of line 4 leaves only יכ to be prefixed to line 5. At the end of line 20 I have added א שבעים, leaving only עבז to be prefixed to עבז at the beginning of line 21. It is more likely that the end of a line should be crowded than the beginning, and in the handwriting of the Papyrus all the letters in עבז are rather narrow.

The only point where there is some doubt as to the actual reading of the Papyrus occurs in line 20, where I read אלה "desire" (as in Deut. v. 18b), but Mr. Cook is still inclined to read ודמא ת "covet" (as in the preceding line and in Ex. xx. 17b). The surface of the Papyrus is here somewhat damaged and the middle letter is defaced-so much so, that it looks more like ר than ש or מ. But the curve at the foot of the left-hand stroke of the second letter is characteristic of ש and not of ר, while it is very difficult to suppose that the last letter can be anything but ש. If אלה be right, the ש exhibits an extreme form of that curious horizontal sweep at the end of the right foot, which is characteristic of the handwriting of this Papyrus, e. g. in the בהו of the Shema’.

The Ten Commandments are familiar to every one, and I do not propose to go through the text line for line. Mr. Cook, in the course of his paper in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, has already done this, and the reader will find there full and clear details about the readings of the Versions and other authorities. I propose here only to touch upon such points as may help us to discover the nature of the document and its date.

The first question which naturally presents itself is the identification of the Biblical passages. Does the Papyrus give us a text of Exodus or of Deuteronomy? In agreement
with Exodus against Deuteronomy it begins the Fourth Commandment with "Remember" instead of "Keep," and does not add "as Jahwe thy God commanded thee" after "to hallow it." It adds at the end of this Commandment the verse "For in six days Jahwe made the heavens and the earth," &c., as in Exod. xx. 11, and does not give the verse Deut. v. 15 or the clause "that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou " in the preceding verse. In the Fifth Commandment it agrees with Exodus in not having the clause "as Jahwe thy God commanded thee." On the other hand, the Papyrus agrees with Deuteronomy against Exodus in the Fourth Commandment by prefixing "thy ox and thy ass" to "thy cattle," in the Fifth Commandment by inserting the clause "that it may be well with thee," in the Ninth Commandment by reading "vain (נשל) witness" and not "false (רמך) witness," and in the Tenth Commandment by putting the wife before the house, and by the insertion of "field " before " slave," and (if my reading be correct) by having "desire" in the second place instead of "covet." To these we must add the appearance of the Shema', which of course belongs to Deuteronomy alone. Most of these agreements with Deuteronomy against Exodus are also found in the Greek text of Exodus, but not all: in fact, we may say with confidence that in the Ninth Commandment the Greek supports רמך both for Exodus and for Deuteronomy. Moreover הדר "his field" in the Tenth Commandment is without the conjunction as in Deuteronomy, while the Greek has οὐτε τὸν ἀγρόν αὐτοῦ.

It is, I venture to think, impossible to resist the impression that the Papyrus gives a text containing elements both from Exodus and from Deuteronomy, just such a text as might be formed in a liturgical work based indeed upon the Pentateuch, yet not a direct transcript either of Exodus or of Deuteronomy. We know from both Talmuds that the daily reading of the Decalogue before the Shema' was once customary, and that the practice was discontinued
because of Christian cavils. It is therefore reasonable to conjecture that this Papyrus contains the daily worship of a pious Egyptian Jew who lived before the custom came to an end.

But further, the Hebrew text upon which the fragment is based was far from being identical with the Massoretic text. Even if we refer each phrase to its origin in Exodus or Deuteronomy, whichever be the most convenient, there still remain several readings which do not agree with the Massoretic text, and do agree with the Septuagint. In the Fourth Commandment we have the insertion of ב before [ד] in 1.10, and the addition of [ב] after ח in the following line. At the end of the same Commandment we find "seventh day" instead of "Sabbath day," again with the Septuagint. In the Fifth Commandment, the reading, "that it may be well with thee, and that thy days may be long on the ground," agrees in order with the Greek. The order, Adultery, Murder, Steal, is that of some texts of the Septuagint (including Philo), and it is found in the New Testament (Mark, Luke, Romans, James, not Matthew). To crown all, we have the preface to the Shema’, which is found in the Septuagint of Deut. vi. 4, but not in the Hebrew; and in the Shema’ itself we find--

שְׁמֵעַ יְهوּדָא יְהוָה אֲלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אָדָם הָאוֹ

the נָ at the end being added in agreement with the Greek, both of the Septuagint and of Mark xii. 29, which has ἀκοῦε, Ἰσραηλ, Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν Κύριος εἰς ἐστιν.

In this Papyrus, therefore, we have a Hebrew document based upon a text which is not the Massorethic text, but has notable points of agreement with that which underlies the Septuagint. It is not a question only of difference from the Massorethic standard; mere differences might have arisen through carelessness. The all-important point is the agreement with the Septuagint. This shows us that

---

1 Talm. J. Berakhoth, i. 8 (4); Talm. B. Berakhoth, 12 a.
the variants have a history behind them, and that they belong to the pre-Massoretic age of the text. We can trace the consonantal text of our printed Hebrew Bibles back to the time of Aquila, to the time of the revolt of Bar-Cochba. From that time onwards there has been but little serious change in the Hebrew text of the Canonical Scriptures as accepted by the Synagogue. From that time onwards the composition of a document such as our Papyrus is inconceivable. In other words, it is a relic of Jewish religious literature earlier than the age of Rabbi ‘Akiba, who died in the year 135 A.D., and who was the founder of the accurate study of the Hebrew text.

It is of course probable that our Papyrus is the copy of an earlier document. The original composition might be older than Rabbi ‘Akiba, but our fragment might be very much later. At the same time there are palaeographical considerations which suggest that the Nash Papyrus is itself of very great antiquity. It is entirely unaffected by the conventional rules that regulated the writing of Scripture in later times; the of in the Shema is not enlarged, there are no "crowns " to the letters, nor is there any division into verses. It is also a mark of very early date that several of the letters are run together by a ligature, e.g. in 1. 15. We have to compare the handwriting not with rolls and codices of the early mediaeval period, or with the other surviving fragments of Hebrew written on papyrus, but with Palmyrene and Nabataean inscriptions. The nearest parallel of all is to be found in a Nabataean inscription of A. D. 55, and I

1 I cannot resist quoting the words of Dr. Landauer about Euting's discovery of a text of the Shema' engraved over the lintel of the ruined Synagogue at Palmyra. Dr. Landauer says: "Variationen im Text eines so uralten Gebets wie das Sch'ma wird kein Verständiger bei einer Überlieferung aus einer Zeit wie die der Mischna etwa erwarten. Die Umschreibung von Jahwe durch uberrascht uns nicht, wohl aber dass dem Künstler ein Lapsus passirt ist, indem er mit mater lectionis schreibt und, wenn ich recht lese, mit " (Sitzungsberichte of the Berlin Academy for 1884, p. 934).
am inclined to assign this Papyrus to about the same
date. Those who place it later will have to account for
the archaic א (X), the large broken-backed medial; the
occasionally open final ב, the ק with a short foot (like
Palmyrene and Syriac), and the looped it. The hand-
writing is cursive, but it is as distinct from the so-called
"Rashi." character as the cursive Greek of pre-Byzantine
times is distinct from the minuscule hands of the Middle
Ages. And I have already drawn attention to the fact
that our Papyrus made its reappearance before the world
in company with Greek fragments of the Odyssey, which
are certainly as old as the second century A . D., and may
be very much earlier.

The five letters ב ב ב ב כ and ק all appear on the Papyrus
in distinct medial and final forms, but the development
of nearly all these forms can be traced almost back to the
Christian era. The distinction of medial and final Kaph,
for instance, is as old as the first beginnings of Syriac
literature. More curious are the considerations derived
from the spelling of the Papyrus. The most characteristic
feature of this spelling is its independence of the Biblical
standard. On the one hand we have the archaic no and
משא for but, and in agreement with the Massoretic
text the vowel o is not written plene in
משה, אלער, אלע הל, or the present participle. The distinction between the
vowels in ו and ו is maintained, just as in the Masso-
retic text of the Commandments. On the other hand we
have ל לא every time for המ and התב (but
also התנ and התנ), and א is written plene. ו agrees with the
present Massoretic spelling.

These spellings cannot be brought forward in favour of
a later date than what I have urged in the preceding
paragraphs. The *scriptio plena* had become general by the
year 66 A. D., for from that time we find בת on Jewish
coins. And I cannot help remarking by the way that
I believe the saying in Matt. v. 18 about the jot and the
tittle (יוטא יוטא א קא) to refer not to the size of certain
letters but to their use as vowels. The word \textit{waw} meant “a hook,” and this I fancy may have been rendered \textit{κεραία}, as a Greek equivalent for the original Semitic term. Thus the fashion of representing the long vowels \textit{i} and \textit{u} by the consonants \textit{v} and \textit{1} was not only in use about the year 30 A. D., but was already beginning to invade the copies of the Law. Our Papyrus represents the every-day usage. The Massoretic text of the Bible, based as we believe it to be upon the spelling of a MS. of about 135 A.D., represents a mixture. It often preserves the archaic spelling of an earlier age, as is natural in a copy of any ancient writing: on the other hand, many spellings represent the usage of the second century A. D.

The differences between our Papyrus and the Massoretic text show that the scrupulous care to preserve the words of the Law accurately, which prevailed among the later Jews, was not universally taken in the first century A.D. and the preceding ages. The agreement between the Papyrus and the Septuagint also proves that some things in the Greek which we may have been inclined to regard as paraphrase or amplification are in fact the faithful reproduction of the Hebrew text that lay before the translator. But there remains a more serious question, the question as to which is really the better text. Does the text approved by Aquila and the Massoretes, or the text of the Nash Papyrus and the Septuagint, more nearly represent the text of Exodus and Deuteronomy as (shall we say) Ezra left it? I am afraid, after all, that in this instance I must vote for the Massoretic text. So far as the Decalogue and the \textit{Shema’ go}, the Massoretic text appears to me the more archaic and therefore the more genuine. In these passages the Massoretic text reads to me like the scholarly reproduction of an old MS. which happens here to contain no serious errors, while the Nash Papyrus is not the scholarly reproduction of a MS., but a monument of popular religion, giving a text of the Commandments with the grammatical difficulties smoothed down.
I trust I may escape being misrepresented as holding a brief for the Massoretic text. On the contrary, I believe that the printed Hebrew Bible contains serious errors, both palaeographical and editorial. Many of these errors can, I am confident, be removed by an intelligent use of the Septuagint, and I greatly rejoice to learn from the Nash Papyrus that the ancient Greek translation was even more faithful to the Hebrew which underlies it than some of us dared hope. But it does not follow that all the labour of the Sopherim was thrown away, or that every early variant is a relic of a purer text. Especially is this the case with the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch became, canonical from very early times, and the consonantal text was practically fixed in the Maccabaean age. And if any part of the text were fixed, surely this would be the Ten Commandments. When therefore we find that the Ten Commandments actually differ in Exodus and in Deuteronomy, we have some ground for supposing that they have escaped intentional harmonization. And if they have escaped intentional harmonization they have escaped the only serious danger to which they would have been exposed, for it is hardly likely that a mere palaeographical error in such a well-known context would have been left uncorrected.

The clearest instance to my mind is in the text of the Fourth Commandment. Here I believe the Massoretic text to be right, and the Nash Papyrus to give an easier, less original, reading: at the same time it is a better commentary on the true text than either the Authorized Version of 1611 or the Revised Version of 1881, both of which actually follow the Samaritan text. The Massoretic text has ששת ימים תשב והшибкаحت יוהו אָלֹהִים לָא תעשה את מלאתך מַעֲשֶׂה יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּעַבְרֶה יְהוָה שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל אָלֹהִים לָא תעשה את מלאתך שֶׁשׁמֶש יִשְׂרָאֵל אָלֹהִים לָא תעשה את מלאתך. i. e. Six days thou shalt work and do all thy business; and the seventh day, Jehovah thy God's Sabbath, thou shalt do no business.

In the first clause "six days" are in what may be called the accusative of duration of time; the symmetry of the sentence shows us that יומֵי השביה is in the same construc-
tion, and "לְּまとַת" is in apposition to it. If we wanted to bring out the exact force of these accusatives, we might translate "During six days thou shalt work... but during the seventh day... thou shalt do no business." But this construction, though perfectly clear, can easily be misunderstood. It is so easy to take לְּまとַת as a separate sentence and say "But the seventh day is the Sabbath," or to regard it as a kind of nominativus pendens without any grammatical construction at all. This leaves לְּまとַת, so to speak, in the air: "thou shalt do no business" by itself is rather too general a commandment, and consequently we find לְּまと (written לְּמטה, as in Jeremiah xvii. 24) added by the Nash Papyrus and by the Samaritan, and implied by the Septuagint and the Vulgate. The Papyrus further prefixes לְּמטה to לְּמטהך, thereby making it quite clear that לְּמטה is in apposition and not a predicate. The English Bible has "but the seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD thy God in it thou shalt not do any work"--a translation that makes havoc of the syntax, and the matter is made worse by the Revised Version, which puts the italic is into ordinary type.

The result of this grammatical excursus can be stated in a sentence. On the assumption that the Massoretic text preserves the true wording of the Fourth Commandment both in Exodus and Deuteronomy, the reading of the Nash Papyrus, of the Samaritan, and the rendering of the Septuagint, can all be easily explained; but on the assumption that either the Nash Papyrus or the Samaritan gives the original, it is very difficult to account for the omissions of the Massoretic text.

At the end of the Fourth Commandment (Exod. xx. 11b) I incline to think that we have another instance of the superiority of the Massoretic text, this time in company with the Samaritan. "Blessed the sabbath day" (MT.) is less obvious than "blessed the seventh day" (Papyrus and LXX), which might easily have come from the context or from Gen. ii. 3. Here again it is interesting to note
that the divergence of the Septuagint from the Massoretic
text was not caused by paraphrastic tendencies on the part
of the translators, but by the faithful following of the
Hebrew text that was used.

It is not necessary here to discuss the longer form of
the Fifth Commandment given in the Papyrus, because
it practically amounts to an interpolation from the
parallel in Deuteronomy which the Massoretic text of
Exodus has escaped. It is possible, however, that the
received text of Deuteronomy should be corrected here to
agree with the Papyrus, i. e. "that it may be well with
thee" should precede instead of follow "that thy days may
be long."

The variation in order between the Sixth and Seventh
Commandments is probably connected with the similar
change of order in the Tenth. Just as in the Tenth
Commandment the prohibition not to covet the neigh-
bour's wife is placed first in the Papyrus, in the Greek, and
even in the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy, so we find that
in the Papyrus and in many Greek texts (including Philo),
the prohibition of Adultery is put before that of Murder.
But is not the order of the Massoretic text in Exodus
more primitive? Is it not likely that the original form of
the Tenth Commandment was "Thou shalt not covet thy
neighbour's House," the House including the Family as
well as the Property? The reason that in Exod. xx. 17,
the House comes first is not because 'Akiba or some
"Scribe" thought the dwelling more valuable than the
wife, but because the first clause of the Commandment
was once all that there was of it. The rest is explanatory
addition. But the same tendency which has brought up
the prohibition to covet one's neighbour's wife to the head
of the list has most likely brought up the prohibition of
Adultery in front of Murder. Here, again, the Nash Papyrus
represents the popular tendencies of a not yet Rabbinized
Judaism (if I may be forgiven the phrase), while the Masso-
retic text gives us the scholarly archaism of the Scribes.
We come at last to the *Shema*’ (Deut. vi. 4 f.), undoubtedly the most remarkable part of the new discovery. What are we to say of the new Preface, and what are we to say of the addition of ΧΙΩ after ΔΗΧ? What reasons are we to give for the omission of this Preface and for the omission of ΧΙΩ on the assumption that they are genuine portions of Deuteronomy? The question seems to me to be altogether parallel to the question raised by the variations in the Commandments and to demand the same answer.

Let us begin with the obvious consideration that the Nash Papyrus once more brings out the essential faithfulness of the Greek version of the Pentateuch to the Hebrew that underlies it. The new Preface is found in the Greek prefixed to the *Shema*’, and in ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ἜΣΤΙΝ the last word corresponds to ΧΙΩ, just as in Gen. xli. 25 ΤΟ ΕΝΥΠΝΙΟΝ ΦΑΡΑΩ ἙΝ ἜΣΤΙΝ corresponds to ΧΗΝ ΔΗΧ ΜΑΡΚΗ ΛΛΗ ΘΗ. There is nothing to suggest that the text of the Papyrus has been assimilated to the Greek, and so we may well believe that the Septuagint attests a text of the *Shema*’ which agrees with that of the Papyrus. But here again it is difficult to believe that the Palestinian recension of the passage represented by the Massoretic text (and the Samaritan) is not the more original. Why should the ΧΙΩ after ΔΗΧ have been dropped, if it were originally there? It is such an obvious thing to add: it makes the construction so much clearer. True, it takes away some of the force of the great sentence; it dissociates the assertion of Jahwe's uniqueness from the command to love him with no corner reserved for other objects of devotion; it gives, in fact, a philosophical turn to a positive command. Such a turn is foreign to the style of Deuteronomy, but it is exactly what would attract the Jews of the Dispersion. In this instance also I must prefer the archaistic scholarship of the Scribes to the philosophy of Alexandria.

To the Preface much the same argument applies. Words are really not wanted between Deut. vi. 3 and "Hear, 0 Israel"; in fact, the Preface is a kind of *doublette* to
Deut. vi. 1-3. It reads like a marginal chapter-heading that has become incorporated with the text. It is remarkable how well it fits in with the scheme of the Papyrus. The words *And these are the statutes and the judgments that Moses commanded the sons of Israel when they went forth from the land of Egypt* form an excellent and sufficient transition from the Decalogue which was proclaimed by Jehwe himself to the rest of the Law which was given through Moses only. Mr. Cook has made the bold suggestion that our Papyrus is part of a text of Deuteronomy, in which this Preface actually took the place of the fifteen verses, Deut. v. 22-vi. 3. The Septuagint would in that case represent a conflate text, as it contains both the Preface and the fifteen verses. But Deut. v. 22-vi. 3 is surely a genuine portion of the Book of Deuteronomy it has even run the gauntlet of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (col. 1081). I think, therefore, that the Preface to the *Shema* is an interpolation into the genuine text, which the Massoretic text has happily escaped. It is in every respect similar to Isa. xxx. 6a ("The Burden of the Beasts of the South"), which doubtless was also a marginal chapter-heading, except that in the Isaiah passage the interpolation is found in the Massoretic text as well as in the Greek.

To sum up what inevitably has assumed the form of a discussion of technical points. I believe the Nash Papyrus to be a document of the first century A.D. at latest. The document itself I do not believe to have extended beyond the single column which is in great part preserved, and I think it not at all unlikely that it was folded up and buried with its former owner as a kind of charm. The writing which it contains consists of what were considered to be the chief passages of the Law, the text being taken from the various books, and where there were parallel texts, as in the Decalogue, the Papyrus presents a fusion of the two. The Hebrew text of the Pentateuch from which these extracts were made differed from the Massoretic text, and
had many points of contact with that of which the
Septuagint is a translation. The date of the compilation
cannot be determined, but the Septuagint itself is evidence
that such texts were current in the Ptolemaic period. At
the same time, as far as our fragments extend, the Masso-
retic text approves itself as purer, as a more primitive
recension of the Pentateuch, than the text of the Nash
Papyrus and the Septuagint. Especially is this true with
regard to the text of the Shema’. There is a story in the
Talmud that when Rabbi ‘Akiba was martyred he was
reciting the Shema’, and he died as he was lingering over
the word ה的话题. "Happy art thou, Rabbi ‘Akiba," said the
Heavenly Voice, "that thy spirit went forth at ה的话题." I
think we may venture to echo this Benediction: there is
no need at all for us to add an unnecessary pronoun to
שם ישראל יהי אלהינו יהי אחד.

F. C. BURKITT.

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: thildebrandt@gordon.edu
The Decalogue as Essential Torah
in Second Temple Judaism

Keith A. Burton
Oakwood College

In my 1994 Northwestern University dissertation, I argue that in his letter to the Romans, Paul most often uses the term νόμος (nomos) to refer to the Decalogue. Those among us who are students of New Testament Theology will immediately recognize the radical nature of this thesis. We are no doubt aware of the scholarly consensus that limits the major understanding of nomos in the New Testament to the Mosaic law--particularly in the letters of Paul. However, after years of careful research, I am convinced that the possibility that Paul uses nomos as a reference to the Decalogue must be taken seriously. Of course, this thesis goes against such giants as Sanders, Dunn, Thielman, Hubner, Raisanen, etc. In fact, Thielman, who recently conducted a pre-publication review of my revised dissertation, likes the argument, but is extremely hesitant to concede this possibility. The tough opposition notwithstanding, I am willing to be a David in this field of giants, and feel that there is enough linguistic and historical evidence to support my thesis.

The Decalogue and the Semantic Dilemma

Students of Paul's theology are aware of the problems encountered in Pauline studies with the enigmatic nature of nomos, which is sometimes depicted positively and other times negatively. This apparent contradiction has yielded studies on Paul's incoherence, his psychological shift in attitude, a

3 Heikki Raisanen, Paul and the Law (Tubingen: Mohr, 1987).
4 Hans Hubner, Law in Paul's Thought (Edinburgh: Clark, 1984).
tension in his teaching,\(^5\) and his reinterpretation of \textit{nomos}.\(^6\) I propose that the problem with the interpretation of \textit{nomos} has little to do with Paul's inconsistency, but is due to the nature of language.

Linguists have long recognized that the understanding of a term is determined by the context of its usage. The primary contexts are the literary and social. From a literary perspective, many scholars have recognized the semantic possibilities for \textit{nomos} in the writings of Paul and have suggested several referents: generic law,\(^7\) Torah (Mosaic law),\(^8\) Pentateuch,\(^9\) Tanak,\(^10\) collection of holy writings precious to Jews,\(^11\) Decalogue,\(^12\) Christianity as "new law,"\(^13\) revealed will of God,\(^14\) figurative law,\(^15\) and custom/tradition of Jews.\(^16\)

Although many will concede that there is a range of ways in which \textit{nomos} can be understood, most studies automatically assume that the major referent is Mosaic Law. This assumption is based on the presupposition that \textit{nomos} is the

\(^{5}\) E. P. Sanders, \textit{Paul, the Law and the Jewish People} (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).


\(^{7}\) BAGD, 542, proposes that this is the reference in Rom 3:27a, 7:1f, and Douglas J. Moo, \textit{Romans} 1-8 (Chicago: Moody, 1991), 146-47, suggests 2:14d.


\(^{10}\) BAGD, 543; Louw and Nida, \textit{Lexical Semantics}, 33.56; Guthbrod, "Nomos," 1071.

\(^{11}\) BAGD, 543, suggests that in a strict sense the Pentateuch is often the intended reference, while in a wider sense the referent is Holy Scripture in general. See also Westerholm, "Torah," 336; W. D. Davies, "Law," 4.

\(^{12}\) Guthbrod, "Nomos," 1069, states: "As in Rabb. usage, the gist of the nomos can be stated in the Decalogue, which is thus to some basic degree the Law in a specific sense (R. 13:8ff.; 2:20ff.; 7:7)." See also Best, \textit{Romans}, 26, who comments: "The conception of 'the Law' was central to the Jewish religion; the term itself was used in different ways. It could mean the set of laws which God gave to the Jews at the time of the Exodus: at its simplest this consisted of the Ten Commandments." See also D. M. Davies, "Law," 157.

\(^{13}\) BAGD, 543, proposes this reference for Rom 3:27b and 8:2a.


\(^{15}\) Guthbrod, "Nomos," 1071 (Rom 3:27; 7:21).

typical Greek rendering for the Hebrew noun torah. However, a growing number of scholars are challenging this understanding.\(^{17}\)

E. D. Burton demonstrates the semantic flexibility of both torah and nomos. Torah is not as rigid as some perceive and has a number of referents in the Tanak.\(^{18}\) While it most often refers to the law attributed to Moses (e.g. Josh 8:31; 2 Kgs 14:6; 23:25), it is also used as a reference to the "book of the law" (Neh 8:2, 8; 1 Kgs 2:3; 2 Chr 23:18), and the Decalogue (Exod 24:12). The flexibility of nomos is demonstrated by the fact that the LXX translators use it to translate not only torah, but also hugah, dat, and other related terms.\(^{19}\) Given the probability that the theology of Paul and his audiences was shaped by the Septuagint and the Tanak, one cannot automatically assume that Paul mostly uses nomos as a reference to torah as Mosaic law.

As I mentioned before, Paul's use of nomos must be understood in the literary and social contexts of the particular letter under observation. My investigation demonstrates that the literary context of Romans provides ample support for the thesis that the primary referent of nomos is the Decalogue. Using semantic theory of reference, I establish that whenever Paul reveals the contents of nomos, he only lists stipulations from the Decalogue.\(^{20}\) Indeed, it is precisely because he has the Decalogue in mind that he takes great care to defend its continued usefulness. An investigation of the social context provides further support for my thesis.

**Centrality of Decalogue in Jewish Tradition**

Paul's use of nomos as a reference to the Decalogue was by no means unique in Second Temple Judaism. While the Decalogue is a part of the Torah, it was not unusual for Jewish authors to refer to it as a nomos by itself. In his summary of the Decalogue's status in Jewish tradition, Moshe Weinfeld heralds its unique characteristics:

By contrast with many laws and commands, the performance of which depends on special circumstances in the life of the individual or his social group; for example sacrifices, which depend on the obligations of the person (a vow to fulfill, a sin to expiate) or of the community (maintenance of the sanctuary), or other laws that flow from the incidence of certain events, like the laws of ritual purity and impurity, the Sabbatical and Jubilee years; the civil law and the laws of marriage and divorce; the laws affecting tithes and priestly offerings, and so on, and so on--by contrast the commands in the De-


\(^{19}\) Burton, "Nomos," 445.

calogue obligate everyone. Every single individual, regardless of his
condition or the circumstances in which he finds himself, is required
to observe them. Every Jew undertakes not to worship idols, not to
perjure himself, to keep the Sabbath, to honor his parents, not to
commit murder, adultery or theft, not to bear false witness and not to
covet.21

Weinfeld's observation is shared by a number of scholars who recognize
that the Decalogue has traditionally been understood as a law in itself.22 Indeed,
for Weinfeld, the fact that the tenth commandment forbids an act of the mind
shows that these commands are based on divine and not human judgment. For
the ancient Jew, the rules of the Decalogue "were perceived ... as uniquely re-
vealed imperatives, demands made by the Deity directly on the individual hu-
man being.23

Decalogue Recital and the Liturgy of the Temple and Diaspora

The important place of the Decalogue in Second Temple Judaism is
strongly supported in Rabbinic literature. This is made most evident in the de-
scription of the daily temple liturgy (Mishnah Tamid 5:1):

A. The superintendent said to them, "Say one blessing."
B. They said a blessing, pronounced the Ten Commandments,
the Shema (Dt. 6:4-9), And it shall come to pass if you shall hearken
(Dt. 11:13-21), and And the Lord spoke to Moses (Num. 15:37-41).
C. They blessed the people with three blessings: True and sure,
Abodah, and the blessing of priests.
D. And on the Sabbath they add a blessing for the outgoing
priestly watch.

In his comments on this passage, Rabbi Ba states: "... the Ten
Commandments are the essence of the Shema'. And once one has re-
cited them, he has fulfilled his obligation to recite the Shema' and
need not recite it again with its blessings."24

It has also been observed that the practice of reciting the Decalogue during
daily prayers was not only confined to the temple liturgy, but was a part of the
religious rites throughout diasporic Judaism. Several phylacteries containing the
Decalogue alongside the Shema have been discovered in Qumran.25 Addition-
ally, evidence of the Decalogue's liturgical centrality has been unearthed in
Egypt. For instance, the Nash Papyrus, a first century document,

21 Moshe Weinfeld, "The Uniqueness of the Decalogue and Its Place in Jewish Tradition,"
Ben-Zion Segal, ed. The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition (Jerusalem: Magnes,
Hebrew U, 1990), 4.
22 Peter Stuhlmacher, "Paul's Understanding of the Law in the Letter to the Romans," SEA 50
(1985), 103, comments: "The decalogue was (and is) for Jews and Christians alike, the heart of
the Law." See also Gutbrod, " Nomos," 1069.
24 yBer 1.4,3.
... represents a leaf from the daily liturgy giving the Ten Commandments and the Shema' separated from each other by the verse (found only in the LXX before Deut 6:4 but given here in Hebrew), 'And these are the statutes and the commandments which Moses gave the children of Israel in the wilderness when they went forth from the land of Egypt.'

Furthermore, phylactery discoveries in Babylonia add credence to the recognition of the Decalogue as the essential Torah.

The religious importance of the Decalogue for Jewish life was also noticed by Jewish thinkers who "have often regarded the Ten Commandments as the essence of the Torah." For example, in his essay "About the Decalogue, Being the Principal Laws of Moses," Philo contends that the individual laws of the Torah derive from each of the commandments. In a similar vein, Pseudo Philo describes the giving of the Decalogue as God establishing "the nomos of his eternal covenant with the sons of Israel and ... his commandments that will not pass away." He further suggests that it is by this "everlasting law" that God judges the entire world.

Reciting the Decalogue Prohibited

The liturgical esteem for the Decalogue was to wane during the Second Temple era. In fact, a Rabbinic prohibition halted its recital in the daily liturgy. Rabbi Levi offers a rational for the prohibition with his argument that the full recital was not necessary since "the Ten Commandments are embodied in the paragraphs of the Shema.' However, the Talmud traditions are probably more honest in their explanations. The Jerusalem Talmud reports:


27 For further information on the continuation of this liturgical practice in Babylonia, see A. M. Haberman, "The Phylacteries in Antiquity," *Eretz Israel* 3 (1964), 174- 7. (Hebrew)


29 Philo, Decalogue 154. "Never forget this, that the ten words (nomos) are the sources of the laws (nomos) which are recorded (nomos) in appearance before the entire legislation in the Sacred Books." Elsewhere (Decalogue 176) he refers to them as "ten laws" (nomos).

30 PsPhil 11:5. The rest of the prescriptions that follow the Decalogue are termed "statutes" and "judgments" by the author, as they are in Deuteronomy 4:13.

31 PsPhil 11:2.

32 yBer 1.4, 2. E. E. Urbach, "The Role of the Ten Commandments in Jewish Worship," in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, ed. B.-Z. Segal (Jerusalem: Magnes, Hebrew U, 1990), 167, comments: "It would appear that Rabbi Levi's midrash was spoken at a time when the Ten Commandments were no longer recited every morning, for when that practice was still followed there was no need to seek out parallels to the Decalogue in the paragraphs of the Shema."
Both Rav Matna and Rav Samuel bar Nahmani stated that by rights the Ten Commandments should be recited every day. Why then is this not done? \textit{Because of the antipathy of the Minim. The purpose was to deny their claim that these Ten, and no more, were spoken to Moses at Sinai}.\footnote{yBer 1:5 (emphasis mine).}

A similar reason is given by the Babylonian Talmud in its comment on the clause, "They recite the Ten Commandments":\footnote{mTam 5.1.}

\textbf{Rabbi Judah quoted Samuel:} \begin{quote}
\textit{People wanted to recite the Ten Commandments together with the Shema outside the Temple, but the practice had long been abandoned because of the arguments of the Minim.}\end{quote}

The same has been taught in a baraita: R. Nathan said, people outside the Temple wanted to read in this manner, but \textit{the custom had long been abolished because of the arguments of the Minim}. Rabbah bar Rav Huna thought to institute the practice in Sura, but R. Hisda said to him: The custom was set aside because of the arguments of the Minim. Amemar considered doing the same in Nehardea, but Rav Ashi said to him: \textit{It was set aside because of the arguments of the Minim}.\footnote{bBer 12a (emphasis mine).}

Both the Babylonian and the Jerusalem Talmuds agree that the prohibition was due to a controversy with the \textit{Minim}, who viewed the Decalogue as the center of the law revealed on Sinai. If \textit{Minim} is a designation for those Jews who embraced Christianity (as is generally accepted),\footnote{For a comprehensive study that identifies the term Minim with Christians, see R. Travers Hereford, \textit{Christianity in Talmud and Midrash} (London: Williams & Norgate, 1903), 97-396. After surveying all the Talmudic and Midrashic statements about the Minim, he concludes, 379, "wherever the Talmud or the Midrash mentions Minim, the authors of the statement intend to refer to Jewish Christians."} then these statements portray a Christian-Rabbinic controversy in which Christians maintained that the Decalogue was the only "essential" law.

Apparently, the dispute with the \textit{Minim} affected Rabbinic Judaism to such an extent that "rabbinic writings retain but few references to the centrality of the Decalogue."\footnote{Greenberg, "Decalogue," 119.} However, in spite of this apparent censure, even in the later period of Rabbinic Judaism "there [remain] vestiges of the ancient view that the Ten Commandments are the essence of Torah, or that they include all of Torah."\footnote{Greenberg, "Decalogue," 1.19, refers to A. J. Heschel for support: \textit{Theology of Ancient Judaism} (London/New York: Sonico, 1965), 108-110. However, he advises that Heschel is to be taken critically, for E. E. Urbach has argued against the elevation of the Decalogue in \textit{The Sages} (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975), 360-365. Nevertheless, I agree with Greenberg that this disagreement in the interpretation of the primary sources "reflects the ongoing polemic of the matter." 119 fn. 57. See also Mann, "Genizah Fragments," 284, who suggests that the Nash Papyrus, which he feels is at most second century, "shows that in Egypt the Ten Commandments were recited in spite of the objections from the Rabbis."}
An example of this esteem is evidenced in the following excerpt from a second
century rabbinic homily:

Why were the Ten Commandments not placed at the very be-

ginning of the Torah? This can be explained by a parable: Once a
king entered a city and said to the people, "Let me be your ruler."
They said to him, "Why should we? What good thing have you done
for us?" What did he do then? He built a wall around the city, he
brought in a supply of water, he fought their battles. After all that, he
said to them, "May I be your king?" They answered "Oh yes! Yes!"
So it was with the All-Present. He brought the Israelites out of Egypt,
He divided the red sea for them, He gave them manna, He brought up
the well in the desert, He assembled the quail, He fought the battle
with Amalek. And then He said to them, "Shall I be your King?" And
they answered "Oh yes! Yes!"

The Decalogue in the Liturgy of Emerging Christianity

Given the esteemed place of the Decalogue in Judaism, it was only natural
that it would have a central place in emerging Christianity. Indeed, the problem
between the Rabbis and the Minim is an indication that adherence to the De-
calogue was one of the early articles of Christian faith. Additional support for
the centrality of the Ten Commandments in Christianity is apparently present in
one of Pliny's letters to Trajan, in which he describes the worship habits of
Christians. He informs the emperor that one of the Christian meetings, which
was held on a "certain fixed day before it was light", involved the recital of an
oath in which the participants swore "never to commit any fraud, theft or adul-
tery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called
upon to deliver it up." Assuming that Pliny was not giving a verbatim report
but was recording that which he had heard from his informers, this is more than
likely a loose paraphrase of what was really said. It is quite possible that Pliny
was misquoting Christians who were continuing the Jewish tradition of reciting
the Decalogue in public worship.

Further evidence in support of the centrality of the Decalogue in Christian
teaching and worship, is found in two of the common prayers recorded in the

39 Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael Na-Hodesh V. Cited in Urbach, "Ten Commandments," 172. A
similar sentiment is cited by Everett Ferguson, Backgrounds of Early Christianity, 2d ed. (Grand
Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 507, who in referring to the Rabbinic attitude towards the stipulations
of the Torah, writes: "As is characteristic of most legalisms, there were more negative than
positive commands: 365 negative (the days in the solar year) and 248 positive (the limbs in the
body according to the Targum Yerushalmi on Gen 1:27). The numerical symbolism noted that the
Decalogue in Hebrew has 620 letters, representing the whole Torah plus 7 rabbinical commands."

40 Pliny, Letters 10.96.
41 Pliny, Letters 10.96.
42 In my opinion, the synagogue provides a more likely place to find a parallel than a pagan
shrine, as is suggested by A. D. Nock, "The Christian Sacramentum in Pliny and a Pagan
Counterpart," Classical Review 38 (1924), 58-69, who could probably have made a more forceful
argument with the Decalogue than he has with the fragment from the shrine at Philadelphia.
second century Apostolic Constitutions. In 7.36.4, the "ten oracles" (Decalogue) are referred to as a \textit{nomos}.\footnote{Apostolic Constitutions 7.36.4. This particular prayer defends Sabbath observance, which causes D. A. Fiensy ["Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers," in James H. Charlesworth, ed., \textit{Old Testament Pseudepigrapha} (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2.671] to believe that it is probably a remnant of a Jewish synagogal prayer.} "You gave to them a Law, ten oracles uttered by your voice, and engraved by your hand." And again in 8.9.8 we read about God "who gave an implanted and written law to wo/man, so that s/he might live lawfully as a rational being."\footnote{Apostolic Constitutions 8.9.8.} Thus we see that as late as the second century, esteem for the Decalogue was still central for Christian life and liturgy.

\textbf{Conclusion}

In conclusion, we have seen that the Decalogue, which Weinfeld refers to as "the basic constitution ... of the Community of Israel,"\footnote{Weinfeld, "Decalogue," 27-28.} was highly esteemed within Second Temple Judaism. The earliest Christian communities joined their Jewish parent and siblings in this reverence for God's central law. Although rejecting the ceremonial aspects of Pentateuchal law, Christians recognized the Decalogue as a timeless principle with divine origin and affinity. One could say that the Christian viewed the Decalogue as the essential Torah. The Christian elevation of the Decalogue directly affected Jewish religious practice, as is evidenced by the Rabbinic prohibition of the Decalogue's recital in the daily liturgy. The centrality of the Decalogue in such biblical books as Romans and Hebrews suggests that this interdiction did not affect the Christian theology of law. In fact, both the prayers from the Apostolic Constitutions, and the Letter of Pliny to Trajan show that even in the second century some Christians still viewed the precepts of the Decalogue as central to community life.
In this essay, C. E. Cerling, Jr., a United Methodist clergyman, re-examines abortion and contraception in the light of biblical revelation.

Abortion and Contraception in Scripture

C. E. Cerling

THE PURPOSE of this paper is the examination of the biblical teaching relating to the problems of abortion and contraception. This examination it is hoped will provide a necessary foundation for discussions of the problems in the ethical realm, particularly the problem of whether abortion is equivalent to murder. Before one can consider the problems in terms of specific situations it is necessary to establish general principles that can be applied to all situations.1 By focusing attention on the problems of overpopulation, poverty, and other matters relating to these problems, one moves from the area of theology to situation-dominated ethics.2

Is it fair to ask of documents as old as the Bible questions concerning abortion and contraception, questions that appear to have such modern origins? The questions are fair, because they are not really questions unique to the present age. Noonan,3 who gives the most thorough discussion of the early Church's attitude toward contraception as it developed historically,4 devotes

---

1 Helmut Thielicke, The Ethics of Sex, trans. J. W. Doberstein (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1964), p. 232 states that ethical principles may even present situations where a principle is more important than a life. But he also affirms the importance of difficult cases to test one's ethic (p. 199).

2 J. W. Montgomery, "How to Decide the Birth Control Issue," Christianity Today X (March 4, 1966), 9. William E. Hulme, "A Theological Approach to Birth Control," Pastoral Psychology XI (April, 1960), 26-7. It should also be added that these secondary considerations may force re-examination of one's original position because of factors not considered in scripture because not applicable to the biblical milieu.


4 Noonan writes from the Catholic perspective, but since much of the teaching of the Church is the teaching of the Catholic Church during the early years of development, treatment from the Catholic perspective is valid. See also Lloyd Kalland, "Views and Positions of the Christian Church--An Historical Review," Birth Control and the Christian, eds. Walter 0. Spitzer and Carlyle L. Saylor (Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 1969), 417.
much of his first chapter to a discussion of methods of contraception and abortion in the ancient world. Whole treatises were written on the topics in cultures having intimate contact with the children of Israel.5

A paper on the biblical teaching on birth control automatically excludes any discussion of birth control for the unmarried. The Bible never entertains the idea that sexual intercourse apart from the marital relationship is justified (Ex. 20:14; I Cor. 6:13-20). For this reason the morality of birth control for the unmarried is like the question of whether a bank robber should use a Ford or a Plymouth as his getaway car. The more important question is whether he should ever rob a bank. The question of birth control for the unmarried is also a question of protection in sin, a question never raised.

The question of abortion for the unmarried poses a different problem. Abortion for those involved in pregnancies induced by rape or forced incest and those women whose health would be endangered or who may produce a genetically damaged child should be considered under the sections dealing generally with abortion. This discussion, though, will also not consider the problems involved in the pregnancies of women who have co-operated in illicit intercourse, except for cases covered by the problems stated above. Unmarried women involved in illicit intercourse are not a subject for this study for the same reasons as given in the preceding paragraph concerning contraception and the unmarried.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN POSITION ON CONTRACEPTION AND ABORTION6

One cannot discuss the biblical teaching on contraception without considering at the same time the teaching of the Church and its development.7 Traditional teaching needs to be understood in the light of scripture (sometimes misunderstood), the philosophical climate, the religious climate, and current medicinal practices.8 For example, Paul writes in Romans 1:26-7 of "unnatural

5 See below pp. 48-49.
6 Noonan, Contraception .... ch. one, on whose work this section is based, treats the development of the Catholic Church's teaching from the dawn of the Church age until the modern era.

In this paper the patristic material is examined first because it shows the source of many present day attitudes. We can also see how and to what the fathers reacted in forming their teaching to see if our teaching should be formed through the interaction of scripture and ideas similar to those of the fathers.

Since the I.U.D.'s status as contraceptive or abortifacient is still being debated, further medical research needs to establish where it should be included.

7 Generalizations about the Church do not indicate that the author thinks all churchmen agreed on a given position. What is assumed is that the majority of people writing on a topic agreed on a basic core of teaching that can be fairly called the teaching of the Church.

8 Noonan, ch. two.
acts." The early Church fathers thought that "natural" was the obvious function of an act; they thought the function of sexual relations that is most natural is the procreation of children. This view is now considered a misinterpretation, but it was used to develop the view of sex that dominated the Church for almost two thousand years.

Current medical practice also affected the development of early Church teaching. Contraception and abortion were treated together because of the difficulty of differentiating them in the early stages of pregnancy. Many of the contraceptive methods used were powerful enough to cause an abortion in the early stages of pregnancy. By combining this difficulty with the known fact that abortion and contraception were frequently connected with the work of magicians, it is easier to understand why the Church condemned such practices.

An interpretative principle that one can occasionally see operating in the Church also played a part in the development of the early Church's teaching; this is the principle of maximization. Maximization occurs when a weak or easily misunderstood passage is explained and used as the basis for a strong stand on a controversial subject. The interpretation of Genesis 38 (Onanism) is an example. A passage that is not clear was used to condemn contraception.

The patristic age generally had a pessimistic view of marriage. It would appear that the Church fathers took I Corinthians 7 to heart without the corrective of Ephesians 5. This low view of marriage, combined with the above interpretation of Romans 1:26-7, resulted in a view of sex that was purely functional; therefore intercourse is frequently condemned if it is primarily for pleasure. Since the act is functional, and contraception would interfere with that function, one would only use contraception if one wanted to engage in sex relations for pleasure--something strongly condemned. And if pleasure were not one's intention, covetousness could be the only other reason for prohibiting children, because limiting the size of one's family would be economically advantageous, and covetousness is also wrong.

Abortion was equated with murder very early in the patristic period. In its explanation of the "Two Ways" the Didache represents abortion as murder along

10 Noonan, p. 17.
12 Other passages used in this way are Romans 1:26-7 and I Thess. 4:4. An example more familiar to most people would be the maximization that has taken place in the Roman Catholic Church with regard to Jesus' statement to Peter at Caesarea Philippi. This passage is weak and easily misunderstood as support for papal infallibility, but it is used to justify it.
with the exposure of infants.\textsuperscript{14} This is readily understandable if one reads the septuagint translation (really rewording) or the Hebrew of Exodus 21:22-23\textsuperscript{15} where accidental abortion is punished by the death penalty. Naturally, if accidental abortion deserves death, then intentional abortion should deserve no lesser punishment.

The Jewish understanding of the purpose of intercourse may also have influenced the Church fathers. The Halakah consistently interprets Genesis 1:28 as a command to have children.\textsuperscript{16} A functional understanding of intercourse is also seen in Philo, who expressly condemns intercourse that is not specifically for procreation.\textsuperscript{17} With such an attitude current in rabbinic and Philonic Judaism it is not surprising that the Church fathers (Clement, Justin, Origen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Jerome to name a few) similarly viewed intercourse. Noonan, speaking of the development of the early Church's understanding of the purpose of intercourse, writes:

The construction was not a purely theological enterprise. It was not undertaken in a vacuum, removed from other religious, philosophical, and social strivings. The state of medical knowledge was one factor in the development of theory on marital intercourse. The predominant institutional modifications of monogamous marriage in Roman society, namely, slave concubinage and easy divorce, affected the values which Christians would stress in marriage. Contemporary Jewish thought and contemporary Stoic thought formed other patterns limiting the impact of the Gospels. Gnostic speculation created a current to which Christians reacted.

Within the intellectual and social context of the Roman Empire, the vital acts of selection, discrimination, emphasis, and application of the Biblical texts were performed. In this collaboration between the Christian community and the written word, under the pressures generated by Roman life, the teaching on contraception took place.\textsuperscript{18}

Stoicism influenced the Christian view by eliminating emotion as a legitimate part of life.\textsuperscript{19} The rationale for intercourse then, almost by necessity,


\textsuperscript{15} Exodus 21:22-3 reads in the RSV, "When men strive together, and hurt a woman with child, so that there is a miscarriage, and yet no harm follows, the one who hurt her shall be fined, according as the woman's husband shall lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine. If any harm follows (replaced in the LXX by-'But if it be formed ... ') then you shall give life for life."


\textsuperscript{17} Philo, \textit{De Josepho}, 9.43 and \textit{De Abrahaemo} 137.

\textsuperscript{18} Noonan, pp. 45-6. Yates attempts to show similar influences in the early 20th century that helped change attitudes toward contraception.

\textsuperscript{19} Noonan, pp. 46-8. This influence is directly traceable in extant writings of both the Church fathers and certain Stoic writers. Seneca writes that "All love of another's wife is shameful; so too, too much love of your own. A wise man ought to love his wife with judgment, not affection. Let him control his impulses and not be borne headlong into copulation. Nothing is fouler than to love a wife like an adulteress. Certainly those who say
became procreation rather than love or pleasure. At the same time the influence of Gnosticism caused another reaction. Reacting to the licentiousness of some Gnostics and the asceticism of others, the fathers took a middle ground. By combining reaction and the overvaluation of virginity, intercourse became understood as simply a procreative act.  

Preceding the fourth century there is no clear-cut condemnation of contraception in any official manner, although there are less clear references. The view that came to dominate in the Church was formed by Augustine in reaction to the Manichees and as a result of incidents in his personal life. Along with his theology, his view became for a while the teaching of the whole Church. No official change in the attitude of the Church in any of its major branches took place until a Lambeth conference of the Church of England in the early 1930s declared contraception acceptable under certain limited conditions.

THE OLD TESTAMENT
AND THE PROBLEMS OF CONTRACEPTION AND ABORTION

It is difficult to deal with the problems of abortion and contraception in the Old Testament because of the nature of Old Testament culture. The children of Israel considered children a blessing and sterility a curse:

Grandchildren are the crown of the aged, and the glory of sons is their fathers (Prov. 17:6).
Lo, sons are a heritage from the Lord, the fruit of the womb a reward. Like arrows in the hand of a warrior are the sons of one’s youth. Happy is the man who has his quiver full of them! He shall not be put to shame when he speaks with his enemies in the gate (Psalm 127:3-5).
Your wife will be like a fruitful vine within your house; your children will be like olive shoots around your table. Lo, thus shall the man be blessed who fears the Lord (Psalm 128:3-4).
... and Sarai said to Abram, ‘Behold now, the Lord has prevented me from bearing children; …’ (Genesis 16:2).

that they unite themselves to wives to produce children for the sake of the state and the human race ought, at any rate, to imitate the beasts, and when their wife’s belly swells not destroy the offspring. Let them show themselves to their wives not as lovers, but as husbands.” (Seneca, Fragments, ed. Friedrich G. Haase (Leipzig, 1897), no. 84. See also Jerome, Against Jovinian 1.49).

20 Noonan, pp. 56-72.
21 Ibid., pp. 73, 95.
22 Ibid., ch. four.
23 Bailey, p. 257.
Jacob's anger was kindled against Rachel, and he said, 'Am I in the place of God who has withheld from you the fruit of the womb?' (Genesis 30:2).

... and although he loved Hannah, he would give Hannah only one portion, because the Lord had closed her womb (I Sam. 1:5).

Children are a means of perpetuating the family name and the covenant people. With attitudes such as these being common in Israel, it is difficult to imagine how contraception and abortion could become problems. They may have been rejected without even being seriously considered.

PURPOSE OF MARRIAGE

Much of the discussion surrounding the problem of contraception deals with the creative intent for marriage. Was marriage created by God for the purpose of the procreation and education of children or was the purpose of marriage companionship? Genesis 1:28 and 2:18 seem to conflict at this point. It has generally been the teaching of the Catholic Church that the primary purpose for marriage and intercourse is the procreation and education of children. Until the early years of this century Protestantism generally concurred in this opinion. Now almost all Protestants would say that companionship is more important than procreation. Piper writes, "Although the Biblical writers are aware of the intimate connection between sex and propagation sex is not regarded primarily as a means for procreation of children. The reason that woman was created is that God saw that it was not good for the man to be alone (Gen. 2:18)." He then goes on to state that Genesis 1:28 is not to be taken as a command, but as a blessing given to the original couple. Piper rightly states that "All that the Bible has to say concerning sexual life is incomprehensible if we try to understand it as based on the will to propagote." The intent of the Creator then appears to have been companionship, sex being an important subordinate creative intent.

25 Piper, p. 33.
26 Thielicke, pp. 204-5 states that procreation is a secondary reason for marriage. If the primary purpose, companionship, will be destroyed by the exercise of the secondary purpose, then the secondary purpose may be ignored.
27 Piper, p. 30.
28 Ibid., pp. 32-3.
29 Ibid., p. 32.
Genesis 1:28 does pose a problem. This verse, usually understood as a command, seems to suggest that all couples should have three or more children. (For two to multiply they have to become three.) But is this verse a command? It is imperative in mood, but this mood is used for blessings along with the indicative.\(^3\) There are eight other places in Genesis\(^2\) where the introductory formula, "blessed ... and said . . . " is used with the imperative. Therefore it would appear that Genesis 1:28 is a blessing rather than a command; but it would also appear from this verse that the Creator intended that each couple should produce children.\(^3\) The blessing suggests one of the major purposes of marriage, although procreation is not the purpose of marriage. If it were, the marriage of the sterile and aged would probably have been condemned.

CONTRACEPTION

Leviticus 15:18 may have a bearing on the question of contraception. Waltke interprets the verse to mean that ejaculation without procreative intent is acceptable.\(^4\) If this passage refers to *coitus interruptus* his interpretation is sound. Although the author agrees with Waltke\(^5\) other interpretations are possible. The passage may be referring to sperm that runs from or does not fully enter the vagina and therefore soils either garments or skins. It may also refer to a nocturnal emission while one is sleeping with his wife, since *akhabh* will bear either the rendering "sleep" or "intercourse."

The single most misunderstood passage on the whole topic of contraception is Genesis 38. What was the sin of Onan for which he was killed by God? The traditional interpretation of the Church has been that Onan was condemned for *coitus interruptus*. No modern commentator supports this view. One must go to 19th century works to find support for such a position.\(^6\) Onan's sin is variously

---


\(^2\) 9:1; 14:19; 24:60; 28:1; 35:9; 48:3; 48:15; 1:22 (slightly different).

\(^3\) See also Genesis 9:1, 7. Arguing from the meaning of Gen. 1:28 (although this is not directly stated) Kenneth R. Kantzer, "The Origin of the Soul as Related to the Abortion Question," *Birth Control and the Christian*, eds. Walter O. Spitzer and Carlyle L. Saylor (Wheaton: Tyndale, 1969), 553, argues that abortion is wrong because it goes contrary to the intent of the Creator as here revealed. If what he says is true, it is equally an argument against birth control, which also frustrates the intent of the Creator for a short period of time.

\(^4\) Waltke, p. 19.

\(^5\) Waltke errs in including vv. 16-7. The discussion should be limited to v. 18, since vv. 16-7 refer only to nocturnal emissions. The inclusion of vv. 16-7 clouds the issue under discussion.

explained as mockery of the responsibilities of levirate marriage, to a simple statement that he was condemned not for contraception but for an act (undefined) which God condemned. Even the article in the New Catholic Encyclopedia states that Onan's sin is unclear. The only fact on which all commentators now agree is that Onan was not punished for practicing contraception per se.

Except for the practice of coitus interruptus and anal intercourse most moderns would assume that few, if any, other contraceptive means were known. Noonan gives many examples of methods of contraception found in the ancient world. In particular he refers to Egypt where the children of Israel spent some 400 years. Although the means range from the exotic (a willow bark potion mixed with the burned testicles of a castrated ass) to quite simple devices (a swab of wool coated with honey inserted into the vagina), some must have been effective in at least moderate degrees. Some of these means (particularly potions) have been tested on rats in modern medical laboratories and found to be effective in inducing temporary sterility. The effectiveness of the methods used is also demonstrated by occasional complaints in official sources that the poor are having more children than the wealthy and educated because the poor are not using contraceptive means. (Sounds rather modern!) From all this one can conclude that the Israelites knew of various means of contraception. Whether they used them is a question that will be treated below.

There are no passages in the Old Testament that treat contraception explicitly. A few passages bear indirectly on the topic and may provide some understanding of how the problem was faced. Continence might appear to be a natural form of contraception, but Exodus 21:10 shows that regular intercourse is a duty of marriage even if one has more than one wife, which would suggest that continence would be wrong. Furthermore, the prohibition of intercourse during menstruation (Lev. 15:19-28; 20:18) would work as a reverse contraception. Because one would not have intercourse for seven days after the onset (possibly completion) of menstruation, by the time one could have intercourse again pregnancy would be more likely to occur. Not only would one be closer to the fertile period, but there would be a large accumulation of semen from the period of abstinence. Castration, whether voluntary or involuntary, was grounds

37 Waltke, p. 19.
40 Waltke, p. 9, err in assuming no mechanical contraceptives.
41 Noonan, Contraception ..., ch. one.
42 Waltke, p. 16.
for excommunication from the religious community (Dt. 23:1), which would eliminate a rather gross form of contraception.\footnote{This passage should not force one to conclude that sterilization is wrong. (Waltke, p. 22.) There is a great deal of difference between sterilization and castration.}

Alongside of these negative indications are other more positive indications of the Old Testament attitude toward contraception. If Leviticus 15:18 refers to \textit{coitus interruptus},\footnote{Above p. 49.} then one form of contraception was practiced without the express condemnation of scripture. In various places in the Old Testament sex crimes of various sorts are condemned, but contraception is never listed as one of those crimes.\footnote{Lev. ch. 18; 20:18; 15:16-33; Ez. 18:6; Dr. 27:20-23.}

In summary one can say that contraception was either never an issue with the children of Israel because of their high regard for children, or it was an accepted practice not considered worth mentioning. On the basis of our knowledge of the methods of contraception used in the ancient world one would be inclined to conclude that Israelites not only knew of contraceptive means, but considered them so normal that no mention is ever made of the topic. At the same time one must add the proviso that with the Israelite attitude toward children, people must have had very strong reasons for using them when they did.

**ABORTION**

One faces the same problem in dealing with abortion that one faces in dealing with contraception: no passages deal with the topic directly. The only passage that is assumed by some to treat of abortion is Exodus 21:22-24.\footnote{Viktor Aptowitzer, "Observations on the Criminal Law of the Jews," \textit{Jewish Quarterly Review} XV (1924), 65ff, shows how this passage is used in Jewish thought to support both a "murder" theory of abortion and a rather lax approach. The differences appear to be based on the version of scripture used. The MT supports the lax position; the LXX supports the "murder" theory. This may have a bearing on the Church's position as it developed through the use of the LXX.}

Arguing from the meaning of the word \textit{yeledh} Keil states that the passage deals with a child, and has nothing to do with an abortion.\footnote{C. F. Keil, and F. Delitzsch, \textit{Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament}, II, trans. James Martin (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., n.d.), 134-5.} Other commentators treat the passage as dealing only with a special instance of involuntary abortion that was induced by a second party.\footnote{U. Cassuto, \textit{Genesis} (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1960), pp. 275-6.}

Waltke argues from this passage (Ex. 21:22-24) in comparison with Leviticus 24:18 that a fetus is not a person.\footnote{Waltke, pp. 10-11.} Since the death penalty is demanded...
for murder, and only a fine is paid if the fetus dies without injury to the mother, the fetus is not considered human. He also states that the use of *nephesh* in the second part of the passage shows that the mother is a person while the fetus is not. But the fact that a fetal death is not punished by another fetal death also shows that the fetus was highly regarded.\(^{50}\)

Other passages may also have a positive, although indirect, bearing on the topic. In Leviticus 20:11-21 all sexual crimes punishable by death are listed—no mention is made of abortion. In Leviticus 18:21; 20:2 child-killing is condemned in connection with the worship of Moloch. Abortion is not mentioned here either, although it could be argued that it has no bearing here. Other passages (Lev. 15:16-33; ch. 18; Dt. 27:20-3) dealing with sexual behavior make no mention of abortion.

An Assyrian law states concerning the problem of abortion:\(^{51}\)

(If a seignior) struck a(nother) seignior's (wife) and caused her to have (a miscarriage), they shall treat (the wife of the seignior), who caused the (other) seignior's wife to (have a miscarriage), as he treated her; he shall compensate for her fetus with a life. However if that woman died, they shall put the seignior to death; he shall compensate for her fetus with a life. But, when that woman's husband has no son, if someone struck her so that she had a miscarriage, they shall put the striker to death; even if her fetus is a girl, he shall compensate with a life.

Waltke argues from this law that the death penalty is required in Assyria for inducing an abortion by striking a woman.\(^{52}\) That is true, if the woman also dies, but the quotation may suggest that the death of the fetus only calls for the death of another fetus unless the man has no heir.

Considering the general attitude of the Church through its history toward the problem of abortion that it is equivalent to murder, the failure of the Old Testament to mention it either explicitly or implicitly is significant. Again, it may never have been a problem in a country that desired children as strongly as the Israelites appear to have,\(^{53}\) but if others did it, which we know from

\(^{50}\) Ibid., p. 12. J. W. Montgomery, "The Christian View of the Fetus," *Birth Control and the Christian*, eds. Walter O. Spitzer and Carlyle L. Saylor (Wheaton: Tyndale House Pub., 1969), pp. 88-9 argues that Ex. 21:22-24 does not distinguish the life of the mother from the life of the child in meting out punishment. The injury may be to either mother or child, and if either is injured, punishment equivalent to the injury should follow. Waltke gives an adequate answer to this interpretation when he says that it is possible, but improbable, and rejected by most translations and many commentators. (p. 23, note.)

\(^{51}\) Pritchard, p. 184.

\(^{52}\) Waltke, pp. 11-12.

\(^{53}\) Kantzer, p. 553, states that abortion is never condemned because of the high value placed on offspring. But even in a culture where almost all hold such a value, some will not, and a response would have been made to them.
Egyptian writings, Israelites must have been aware of the problem. If that is true, then silence (although a notoriously weak argument) would appear to suggest acceptance of abortion as legitimate.

THE NEW TESTAMENT
AND THE PROBLEMS OF CONTRACEPTION AND ABORTION

As in the Old Testament, abortion and contraception are never explicitly mentioned in the New Testament. But this does not mean that the authors were ignorant of the problems. It has been shown above that abortive and contraceptive means have been known from ancient times. Not only is that true, but both the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas (although probably dependent on Didache) condemn abortion. The issue was live, but the New Testament is silent.

In a significant article on the New Testament understanding of marriage Montgomery argues that marriage is not simply a means of legalizing procreation nor is mutual love the end of marriage. Christian marital love is meaningful as a reflection of Christ's love for the Church. Since intercourse is the natural result of marital love and children the result of intercourse, contraception needs to be justified in every case. He then goes on to show various reasons that would justify the use of contraceptives. The whole of his argument turns on the idea of marriage as a reflection of the relationship of Christ to His Church. The Old Testament purpose of marriage as companionship is superceded by a greater concept for the Christian, the concept of marriage as an image or analogy of the relationship of Christ to His Church. The analogical relationship then determines what is right and wrong within a marriage. Self-sacrificing love, such as Christ had for the Church, would at times demand contraception.

54 Kahun Papyrus, Ebers Papyrus, Ramasseum Papyrus IV, Berlin Papyrus, Carlsber Papyrus.
55 Noonan, Contraception .... p. 45.
56 Montgomery, "How to Decide ...", pp. 8-10.
57 Cerling, ch. three. The nature of marriage as an analogy of the relationship of Christ to the Church is extensively discussed in its Biblical setting.
58 The foremost example of such love in action would be in a situation where a pregnancy would impose hazards to the mother's health, either physical or mental. A second example would relate to the quality of life between the parents to whom the child would be born. (Quality refers to more than simple economics, although they play a part.) This could include a desire to postpone children for any of a variety of reasons in order that the relationship of husband and wife would be deepened rather than destroyed or hindered by a pregnancy. If the love of Ephesians 5 is to be revealed, a pregnancy should be a means of growth for the couple. If a pregnancy would appear to do otherwise, it should be prevented.
59 Below, p. 54, it will be shown why this same principle is insufficient by itself to justify an abortion.
First Corinthians 7:1-7 gives one element of the New Testament attitude toward marital intercourse. As in the Old Testament, regular marital intercourse is a right and obligation of the spouses to each other. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that continence is the most natural means of preventing births. This passage suggests, contrary to Catholic teaching, that continence is not natural, since it violates a basic purpose for marriage. That purpose as stated in I Corinthians 7:2 is that marriage is a prophylactic against immorality. Continence may only be for short periods of time, by mutual agreement, for the sake of prayer. Therefore continence would not be an acceptable method of preventing births, because regular marital intercourse is a right and obligation of the married.

A few passages that are occasionally brought to bear on this topic are worth mentioning. First Thessalonians 4:4, which refers to a man possessing his vessel in honor, is thought, and has been thought in history, to refer to having only natural means of intercourse with one's wife. Although the verse may be interpreted in that way, even if it is true, the reference is so general as to have almost no meaning to the modern reader. Is anal or oral intercourse being condemned or is the reference generally to contraception? The broadness of this statement makes its helpfulness nil.

Matthew 19:10-12 is sometimes thought to suggest that people castrate themselves for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Again, if this interpretation is true, and that is questionable, it would have no bearing on the contraceptive question because of Paul's injunction in I Corinthians 7 to regular marital intercourse. Self-castration could only be for single people.

Because of the association of contraception and abortion with magicians, Noonan suggests that the Greek pharmakeia (magic or medicine) may refer to medicine in Galatians 5:20; Revelation 9:21; 21:8,15; 18:23, but he then goes on to state that although it may, there is little basis for thinking that it does.

---


62 Noonan, *Contraception*... p. 44. In a later publication on abortion Noonan, "An Almost Absolute Value in History," *The Morality of Abortion*, ed. J. T. Noonan, Jr. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), p. 23, he changes his position. As justification for the change he leans heavily on the attitude of the early church fathers in condemning abortion. The only problem with his argument is that it can be turned either to support or condemn abortion. The condemnation of the early church fathers can suggest that they reflect the thinking of the apostles, or one can argue that their strong condemnations arose out of the necessity of condemning something they thought was a great evil apart from scriptural support, and therefore had to use exceptionally strong language, comparing abortion to murder. One also wonders how Luke would have felt as Paul condemned medicine!
In summary, the New Testament has even less to say directly or indirectly on the topics of abortion and contraception, but the principles derived from Ephesians 5 give guidelines suggesting that contraception may be acceptable. If a fetus is neither a person nor an emerging entity of high value, the same passage may justify abortion. The complete silence of both the New and Old Testaments in explicit references to these topics suggests a permissive attitude toward both contraception and abortion.63

ABORTION CONSIDERED THEOLOGICALLY64

Only one case in the whole of scripture mentions the problem of abortion, and that case has a very limited scope. From this it might be assumed that abortion is permissible under any circumstances. But Thielicke and Piper both raise the same argument against abortion:65 Children are a gift of God; therefore abortion is wrong.

Before considering Thielicke's argument it is well to give consideration to the motivation of one seeking an abortion as this has a bearing on the legitimacy of abortion. The Old Testament attitude is that children are a blessing given to parents by God; therefore to reject a child is to reject a gift of God. Therefore even if abortions are considered acceptable, one must have serious reasons to justify an abortion. Many abortions are for selfish reasons. The motives are related to economic limitations, limitations on one's time, unwillingness to accept the responsibility for rearing another child--because these are selfish motives, abortion should be condemned in these instances.66

But even after the proper motivation exists serious questions must be raised: Is abortion murder? The Bible does not teach directly when a fetus becomes a child.67 O'Donnel states categorically that abortion is murder,68 taking the

63 This conclusion is reached recognizing the weaknesses of any argument from silence.
64 Paul Ramsey, "References Points in Deciding About Abortion," The Morality of Abortion, ed. J. T. Noonan, Jr. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), pp. 64-100, makes some important points concerning arguments for abortion. (1) All arguments for abortion must take into account the question of when the fertilized ovum becomes a human being. (2) Arguments for abortion must not also be arguments for infanticide by logical extension. Under this point he mentions that birth is hardly a line of demarcation for modern medicine. The time when fertilized ova will be placed in artificial wombs is not remote. "There are no theoretical limits on man's scientific ability to push back the time of viability and to treat the patient in utero as a man alive." (87) (3) One must also distinguish between killing and allowing to die, which is very important for point #2.
68 O'Donnel, p. 28.
traditional position of both the Catholic and Protestant churches. Thielicke raises the problem of when a fetus becomes a human being and then dismisses it as mere casuistry. He takes the position that a child is a gift of God and as such to reject a child is to reject God. On that ground he states that abortion is wrong.

To bring the matter into sharp focus Thielicke treats the problem of a woman who will die if her pregnancy is not terminated. In this discussion he gives the most enlightened treatment of the topic available from a biblical or theological perspective. Although he rejects abortion because a child is a gift of God, he still accepts the "murder" theory of abortion. He asks the question if killing a person is ever right. We kill people when we sentence a person to death for a crime. We kill people when we engage in a just war. Therefore killing is sometimes right. Arguing further he asks whether suicide is ever right, for a mother who would not terminate a pregnancy that would kill her is committing suicide. He then shows that under certain circumstances suicide is right. We honor a mother who is killed saving her infant from death. We honor a father who saves his family by giving his life. Suicide is sometimes right and even honorable. He finally asks, if a mother does not hesitate to save the life of her child by giving her life, why does she hesitate in giving her life to save her fetus? He concludes by stating that one can only do what he thinks right in this ticklish situation realizing that we serve a God who will forgive if we are wrong. Thielicke leaves one on the horns of a dilemma, but his approach is basically good, and shows the difficulty everyone faces with this one extreme question.

An important objection needs to be raised in relation to Thielicke's approach. He equates murder and killing. This faulty equation has led to innumerable arguments about taking human life. Exodus 20:13 prohibits murder, but there are circumstances that justify killing another person (self-defense, justice, war). Therefore if abortion is murder, one must take the position of the Roman Catholic Church that abortion is never justifiable as a direct act no matter how serious the danger to the mother nor what the circumstances of her impregnation.

69 Thielicke, pp. 227-8.
70 Ibid., 232-247.
71 Noonan, "Introduction," The Morality of Abortion, ed. J. T. Noonan, Jr. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), makes the point that modern medicine has almost eliminated the extreme problems mentioned most often as justification for abortion. These problems are (1) the life of the mother versus the life of the child; (2) pregnancy resulting from forced intercourse because of the common practice of performing a disinfecting procedure to the vagina and uterus during immediate medical treatment; (3) severe genetic malformations.
72 Kantzer, p. 553, suggests that if abortion were murder Ex. 21:22-24 would demand the death penalty for the one inducing an abortion.
Psalm 127:3 states "Lo, sons are a heritage from the Lord, the fruit of the womb a reward" (RSV). On the strength of this statement alone one could argue that God is directly involved in every pregnancy. When this statement is combined with Old Testament comments about God's involvement in childlessness and pregnancy in old age, one is impressed by the fact that the children of Israel saw the hand of God involved in fertility or sterility. Therefore one must ask, "Are children a gift of God, or were children so important to the Israelite society and their view of the world so theologically oriented that they considered children a direct gift from God?" When one adds to this the mystery surrounding procreation before the advent of modern medicine, one is placed in a difficult position. No one who reads the Old Testament will deny that the children of Israel thought that children were a direct gift from God. The question one must ask is this: "Is this part of the teaching of the Old Testament or is it simply a part of the culture of the Old Testament, such as levirate marriage?" The only argument offerable is weak. If children were a direct gift from God, one would expect to find the explicit condemnation of abortion in the Bible. At the same time one is greatly impressed with the pervasiveness of this view in the Old Testament, and its pervasiveness may be a stronger argument than the argument from silence given above.

The conclusion of Montgomery that abortion can only be justified as the lesser of two evils is a common position. It also can lead to the introduction of factors that are more subjective than rational. In the case of rape or incest is the psychological health of the mother more valuable than the life of the fetus? Even if one places a higher value on the mother's mental health, there is little evidence that a rape- or incest-generated pregnancy and birth will do more permanent and severe psychological damage than the simple fact of the forced intercourse itself. Serious personal crises forced on a person by factors beyond control may be beneficial or detrimental. (This is not to suggest the need for such crises, but to suggest that crisis counseling may have greater long range benefits than abortion--we just do not know.) How can one weigh the life of a fetus against an unknown and presently unmeasurable psychological danger?

If abortion is justified as the lesser of two evils, it may only be justified as such by one whose position is that the fetus is not fully human. If a person

---

73 Maurice Bear Gordon, "Medicine Among the Ancient Hebrews," *Isis* XXXIII (Dec., 1941), 465, writes, "Since the Israelites realized that intercourse was necessary for but did not invariably lead to pregnancy, they felt that successful fertilization was in the hands of God." This inference goes beyond the data, but it is interesting.

74 Those dealing with the problem of abortion usually treat the problem by asking one of two questions: (1) When does a fetus become a human being? (2) Is a child a gift of God? By treating these questions separately one gives the impression that they are not related. The questions can and should be examined in combination as well as separately. The resulting question is, "At what point in its development, if he is, does a child become a gift of God?"

considers the fetus human while claiming that abortion may be justified as the lesser of two evils he places himself in an untenable position. Justification of abortion under these circumstances logically leads to justification for infanticide and euthanasia of the senile or terminally ill. If a fetus can be killed as the lesser of two evils, badly deformed or severely retarded newborns could also be killed. And they could be killed with greater justification because their defectiveness is certain; whereas the defectiveness of a fetus is often uncertain. The same reasoning applies to the senile and those whose life can be saved only at great cost to their personality.

There are four positions on the question of when a fetus becomes a human. The first is represented by traducianism where it is thought that a fetus is a person from the moment of conception. The second is represented by creationism that teaches that the fetus becomes a person when God gives it a soul. (This occurs anywhere from conception to viability.) The third position is concerned with the problem of viability.76 A fetus becomes a person when it would be viable outside the mother's womb. The final position is the view that a fetus is an emerging entity, immeasurably valuable from the moment of conception and becoming increasingly valuable as it approaches birth.77 These positions are integral to larger theological systems and derived more by deduction from other propositions than from direct exposition of scripture. One is on far safer ground when one contends that scripture does not give any information on when a fetus becomes a human being. The greatest direct support from scripture appears to be the application of Exodus 21:22-24 to the fourth position. No position stands on solid ground, but if degrees of solidity are accepted, the fourth position stands on ground that is least shaky.

CONCLUSIONS

The Bible says nothing directly and almost nothing indirectly on the problems of contraception and abortion. One cannot emphasize this strongly enough. If decisions are to be made on these questions they must be made by

76 Viability as a term of distinction is becoming increasingly meaningless. Even considered from the viewpoint of primitive societies, the newborn infant is not viable until he attains a fair degree of maturity. Until the infant becomes a child or even an older youth, he is not viable without a great deal of parental care. Modern medicine, which can save the life of previously hopeless premature infants, makes the use of viability as a term of distinction almost meaningless. When medical science reaches the point where it can place a fertilized ovum in an artificial womb, this term will have lost all meaning.

77 This is the position described by Kantzer in "The Origin of the Soul as Related to the Abortion Question," Birth Control and the Christian, eds. Walter 0 Spitzer and Carlyle L. Saylor, (Wheaton: Tyndale House Pub., 1969). Here he also states "The exact moment or point in development at which a fetus becomes fully human, we cannot determine for this lies in the freedom of God." (p. 557)
deduction from statements relating to the purpose(s) of marriage, the place of children in marriage, and the value of fetal life.

The purpose of Christian marriage given in Ephesians 5 suggests that marital love could involve contraception under certain justifiable conditions. But contraception designed to prevent conception through the whole course of a marriage would go contrary to the intent of the Creator as revealed in his blessing to the first couple (Gen. 1:28).

With regard to abortion, if children are a gift of God, abortion would appear to be unjustifiable except under the most extreme conditions. If one does not accept the "gift-of-God" idea, one must then answer the question as to when a fetus becomes a human being. That a child is a gift from God appears to the author to have the support of the Old Testament. It would also appear that the fetus is an emerging entity, immeasurably valuable at conception and becoming increasingly valuable as the date of its birth approaches.
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DOES GOD
“CHANGE HIS MIND”? 

Robert B. Chisholm Jr.

Most Christian theologians have affirmed that God is immutable. In support of this doctrine they often have cited several Old Testament passages, including Numbers 23:19 (“God is not a man, that He should lie, nor a son of man, that He should repent”), 1 Samuel 15:29 (“And also the Glory of Israel will not lie or change His mind; for He is not a man that He should change His mind”), and Psalm 110:4 (“The Lord has sworn and will not change His mind”). In all these cases “repent” or “change His mind” translates a Niphal or Hithpael form of the verbal root מָחַל. However, many other Old Testament passages, using a Niphal form of this same verb with the same semantic sense, assert that God typically does change His mind (Jer. 18:5-10; Joel 2:13; Jon. 4:2), describe Him doing so (Exod. 32:14; Amos 7:3, 6; Jon. 3:10), or at least assume that He might (Jer. 26:3; Joel 2:14; Jon. 3:9). How can one resolve this tension and apparent contradiction? Some dismiss these texts as “anthropomorphic,” but this is an arbitrary and drastic solution that cuts rather than unties the theological knot. A more satisfying solution exists, if the biblical evidence is allowed to speak for itself.

The thesis of this article is that the question, “Does God change His mind?” must be answered, “It all depends.” This study begins with a lexical survey of the Niphal and Hithpael stems of מָחַל. The article then defines and illustrates the four kinds of forward-looking divine statements in the Old Testament: (a) marked or formal decrees, (b) unmarked or informal decrees, (c) marked or explicitly conditional statements of inten-
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tion, (d) unmarked or implicitly conditional statements of intention. The article then argues that if God has issued a decree, He will not change His mind or deviate from it. However, the majority of God’s statements of intention are not decrees. And God can and often does deviate from such announcements. In these cases He “changes His mind” in the sense that He decides, at least for the time being, not to do what He had planned or announced as His intention.

A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF מָנַה 2

In the Niphal and Hithpael stems מָנַה carries one of four semantic senses.3 (1) In at least nine passages the verb means “to experience emotional pain or weakness” (Gen. 6:6-7; Exod. 13:17; Judg. 21:6, 15; 1 Sam. 15:11, 35; Job 42:6; Jer. 31:19).4 In five of these nine instances, יִקְדָּשׁ introduces the cause of the sorrow (cf. Gen. 6:6-7; Judg. 21:15; 1 Sam. 15:11, 35). (2) In 13 verses the verb carries the sense “to be comforted” or “to comfort oneself” (sometimes by taking vengeance) (Gen. 24:67; 27:42; 37:35; 38:12; 2 Sam. 13:39; Pss. 77:3; 119:52; Isa. 1:24; Jer. 31:15; Ezek. 5:13; 14:22; 31:16; 32:31).5 (3) In perhaps as many as 10 passages the word refers to God’s “relenting” from or “repudiating” a course of action that is already underway (cf. Deut. 32:36 = Ps. 135:14; Judg. 2:18; 2 Sam. 24:16 = 1 Chron. 21:15; Pss. 90:13; 106:45; Jer. 8:6 [man as subject]; 20:16; 42:10).6 (4) The remainder of the occurrences fall into a fourth semantic category meaning “to retract” a statement or “to relent or change one’s mind concerning, to deviate from” a stated course of action (Exod. 32:12, 14; Num. 23:19; 1 Sam. 15:29; Ps. 110:4; Isa. 57:6; Jer. 4:28; 15:6; 18:8, 10; 26:3, 13, 19; Ezek. 24:14; Joel 2:13-14; Amos 7:3, 6; Jon. 3:9-10; 4:2; Zech. 8:14).7 In this semantic category God is the subject of the


3 The Hithpael is used only seven times in the Old Testament. There are no clear examples of a Hithpael use that falls into category one. Four examples fall into category two (Gen. 27:42; 37:35; Ps. 119:52; Ezek. 5:13), two into category three (Deut. 32:36 = Ps. 135:14) and one into category four (Num. 23:19).

4 See Parunak, “A Semantic Survey of NHM,” 519, for semantic indicators of this sense in the respective passages.

5 Parunak points out semantic indicators of this sense in the respective passages (ibid., 520). He also observes that this use reflects a polarization of category one (ibid., 526).

6 Some of these verses might fit under category one.

7 Categories three and four derive metonymically from category one.
verb. Some texts (Num. 23:19; 1 Sam. 15:29; Ps. 110:4; Jer. 4:28; Ezek. 24:14; Zech. 8:14; cf. also Isa. 57:6) indicate that God did/does/will not retract a statement or deviate from a stated course of action, while others assert that He does/will/might change His mind. This fourth category is the focus of this study. Under what conditions does God retract a statement or deviate from a course of action? Under what conditions does He refuse to do so?

TOWARD A SOLUTION: DECREES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

In the Old Testament not all statements of intention are the same. Some are decrees or oaths that are unconditional and bind the speaker to a stated course of action. Others, which may be labeled announcements, retain a conditional element and do not necessarily bind the speaker to a stated course of action.

Two passages in Genesis illustrate this distinction at a secular (nontheological) level. In Genesis 25:32-33 conniving Jacob, desirous of Esau’s birthright and very much aware of his exhausted brother’s vulnerability, made Esau swear an oath, rather than relying on his brother’s rhetorical question. The rhetorical question is equivalent to an announcement. It indicates Esau’s intention to trade his birthright for some stew, but it might be retracted later if he or someone else argued that the deal was made under duress. Jacob wanted the transferral to be unconditional and binding, so he made Esau swear an oath. In Genesis 47:28-30 Jacob, on his deathbed in Egypt, expressed concern that his body be buried in Canaan. Though Joseph indicated his intention to carry out his father’s wishes (“I will do as you have said,” v. 30), Jacob forced him to swear an oath, formally ratifying and guaranteeing the fulfillment of the promise (v. 31; cf. 50:5-6).

One can discern this distinction between a decree and an announcement at the divine (theological) level. A divine decree (or oath) is an unconditional declaration. Because it is certain to come to pass, the response of the recipient cannot alter it, though, as will be seen, the exact timing of its fulfillment can be conditional. An announcement is a conditional statement of divine intention which may or may not be realized, depending on the response of the recipient or someone else whose interests it affects.

Divine decrees are usually clearly marked as such. Something in the statement itself or in the immediate context indicates its unconditional status. For example in Genesis 22:16-18 God swore by His own being that He would bless Abraham. Later references to this promise call it an “oath” and regard it as an un-
Conditional gift (Gen. 26:3; Ps. 105:9-10). In Genesis 15:18-21 God guaranteed Abram and his descendants future possession of the land of Canaan. This declaration is formalized by an accompanying ritual (vv. 9-17), in which the use of the qatal form ־תאתא (v. 18) rather than the yiqtol ־תאתא (12:7; cf. 13:15, 17) further indicates that the deed to the land was actually being transferred to Abram.8 God’s promise to David is also called an oath and is characterized as eternal and unalterable (Ps. 89:3-4, 33-37).

Conditional statements of divine intention are often clearly marked as well. For example in Jeremiah 26:4-6 the Lord announced, “If you will not listen to Me ... then I will make this house like Shiloh, and this city I will make a curse to all nations of the earth.” Sometimes an announcement completes an indirect volitive sequence, implying that it will be fulfilled if the accompanying command is observed.9 For example Genesis 12:1-2 should be translated as follows: “Go [imperative] from your land ... in order that I might make you [waw + cohortative] a great nation, bless you [waw + cohortative], and make your name great [waw + cohortative], and so that you in turn might be [waw + imperative] a blessing.” The blessing is clearly contingent on Abram’s leaving his native land. Similarly Genesis 17:1-2 should be translated: “Walk [imperative] before Me and be [waw + imperative] blameless in order that I might ratify [waw + cohortative] My covenant between Me and you and greatly multiply [waw + cohortative] your numbers.” Again the blessing is contingent on Abram’s obedience to the divine imperatives.10

Most divine statements of intention are unmarked. In these cases one cannot be sure from the form of the statement whether it is conditional or unconditional. For this reason the recipient of such a message sometimes does what is appropriate, declaring, “Who knows? The Lord may be gracious/turn/re lent” (cf. 2 Sam. 12:22; Joel 2:14; Jon. 3:9).

These ambiguous statements of divine intention sometimes prove to be decrees. For example, when Nathan declared that the son conceived from David’s adulterous encounter with Bathsheba


10 For an attempt to harmonize the conditional and unconditional promises of Genesis 12-22, see Chisholm, “Evidence from Genesis,” 35-54.
would die (2 Sam. 12:14), David was unsure if the statement was unconditional. He prayed and fasted until the child died, hoping that God might take pity on him and spare the child’s life (v. 22). God’s refusal to respond to David’s acts of repentance shows that Nathan’s declaration was unconditional. Elijah’s judgment speech against Ahab’s dynasty is also ambiguous (1 Kings 21:20-24). In response to the proclamation, Ahab repented, prompting God to postpone the fall of the dynasty until after Ahab’s death (vv. 27-29). However, the prophecy still came to pass, for it was a divine decree that could not be altered (2 Kings 9-10). The prophecy was unconditional, but the exact timing of its fulfillment remained negotiable from God’s perspective.

Many other ambiguous statements of divine intention prove to be conditional. Micah announced that Jerusalem would become a heap of rubble (Mic. 3:12), but one discovers from Jeremiah 26:17-19 that this judgment was averted by repentant Hezekiah, thus proving the announcement’s conditionalit.Y. Jonah’s seemingly uncompromising declaration (“Yet forty days and Nineveh will be overthrown,” Jon. 3:4) remained unfulfilled when the people of that pagan city repented. The divine promise delivered in Joel 2:26-27 (“My people will never be put to shame”) proved to be conditional. After Joel’s generation (to whom the prophecy was clearly directed, 2:19-25) passed off the scene, God’s people were put to shame on many occasions because of their failure to remain true to the covenant.

To summarize, divine statements of intention can be grouped into two categories: decrees and announcements. Decrees can be formal (marked as such) or informal (unmarked). Announcements can be explicitly or implicitly conditional. On the one hand those verses that declare that God does or will not change His mind pertain to decrees. In fact the declaration formally marks the divine statement of intention as a decree or oath. On the other hand those passages indicating that God does/will/might change His mind pertain to announcements.

PASSAGES IN WHICH DECREES ARE IN VIEW

NUMBERS 23:19

Much to the Moabite king Balak’s chagrin, God would not allow Balaam to curse Israel, but instead prompted this hireling prophet to bless His covenant people. Balaam prefaced the second

---

11 William Lane Craig speaks of such prophecies as containing an implicit “all things remaining the same” (The Only Wise God [Grand Rapids, Baker, 1987], 41).
of his oracles with these words: “God is not a man, that He should lie, nor a son of man, that He should repent; has He said, and will He not do it? Or has He spoken, and will He not make it good? Behold, I have received a command to bless; when He has blessed, then I cannot revoke it” (Num. 23:19-20). The oracle as such speaks of God’s presence with His people (v. 21) and their invincibility through His power (vv. 22-24). Several factors point to the unconditional nature of this oracle. The oracle is designated a divine blessing and cannot be altered. Balaam recognized the blessing’s unalterable character and acknowledged his inability to thwart it through sorcery or divination. This blessing, a prediction of Israel’s success, is an extension of the Lord’s unconditional promise to give Abraham’s descendants the land of Canaan (cf. Gen. 15:16; 17:8; 22:17), and thus it shares the binding quality of that promise. (God’s oath to Abraham is called a “blessing” in Gen. 28:4.) The introduction, in which Balaam affirmed that God would not change His mind or lie, formally marks the blessing as a decree. Both הָנַךְ and the parallel verb בָּזֶה קִנָּה “to lie,” here mean “to retract” (an unconditional promise). The verb בָּזֶה קִנָּה has this same sense in Psalm 89:35, where God decreed, “Once I have sworn by My holiness; I will not lie to David.” While the verbs refer to how God typically acts when He has made a decree, the principle here applies to the specific blessing to follow.

1 SAMUEL 15:29

When Saul failed to destroy the Amalekites, Samuel rebuked him for his rebellion and declared that the Lord had rejected him as king (1 Sam. 15:23). Saul pled for forgiveness, but Samuel repeated the Lord’s decision (vv. 24-26). Samuel then added these words: “The Lord has torn the kingdom of Israel from you today, and has given it to your neighbor who is better than you. And also the Glory of Israel will not lie or change His mind; for He is not a man that He should change His mind” (vv. 28-29).

This was not the first time Saul had heard a rebuke from the prophet Samuel at Gilgal. Earlier, impatient Saul had refused to wait for Samuel’s arrival and had offered up a sacrifice. When

---


Samuel finally arrived on the scene, he accused Saul of foolish disobedience and told him he had forfeited a golden opportunity. Samuel declared, “You have acted foolishly; you have not kept the commandment of the Lord your God, which He commanded you, for now the Lord would have established your kingdom over Israel forever. But now your kingdom shall not endure. The Lord has sought out for Himself a man after His own heart, and the Lord has appointed him as ruler over His people, because you have not kept what the Lord commanded you” (1 Sam. 13:13-14).

This rebuke sounds quite final and unconditional, but, as already suggested, the tone of a statement can sometimes be misleading. Perhaps Samuel’s rebuke was designed as a warning to bring Saul to his senses and motivate him to obedience. After all, God had not yet revealed who the new appointee was, let alone formally anointed him. As Samuel departed from Gilgal (v. 15), it is not certain if his words constituted a decree or an implicitly conditional announcement. Was the fate of Saul (or his dynasty) sealed, or was there still a chance God might relent?

No matter how one initially answers that question, Saul’s subsequent behavior, as recorded in 1 Samuel 14-15, makes it clear that he was on thin ice. He did nothing that would motivate Yahweh to change His mind about the earlier prophecy; in fact his folly and disobedience cause one to anticipate the worst. When Samuel went to confront him at Gilgal a second time, any earlier ambiguity was removed. Samuel’s rejection of Saul’s plea for forgiveness shows that this second rebuke is in fact a decree, as does the temporal marker חֶקֶט, “today” (1 Sam. 15:28). The concluding words, emphasizing that the Lord will not lie or change His mind (v. 29), formally mark Samuel’s declaration as unconditional. Both הָעַבְדָּ֛י and the parallel verb רָקַּב, “to lie,” here mean “to retract.” The Lord had decreed Saul’s demise and nothing could alter His decision.

14 Perhaps the verse should be translated as follows: “He who is the Glory of Israel will not (in this particular situation) lie or change His mind; for He is not a man, that He should change His mind.” In this case the two yiqtol verb forms have a specific future, not habitual, nuance.
15 רָקַב is used in a similar way in Psalm 89:33, where God declared to David that He will not “betray” His faithfulness by violating His decree.
16 See Robert P. Gordon, I & II Samuel: A Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 146. Terence E. Fretheim sees the concluding words in verse 29 as referring specifically to God’s election of David, not to His rejection of Saul (“Divine Foreknowledge, Divine Constancy, and the Rejection of Saul’s Kingship,” Catholic Biblical Quarterly 47 [1985]: 597-98). The election of David is certainly in view here, as Abner’s words in 2 Samuel 3:9-10 make clear: “May God do so to Abner, and more also, if as the Lord has sworn to David, I do not accomplish this for him, to transfer the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to establish the throne of David
What is the relationship between the pronouncement recorded in 1 Samuel 13:13-14 and the decree in 15:29? Two options seem possible. First, perhaps the prophecy in chapter 13 concerns only Saul’s dynasty (the twofold reference to Saul’s “kingdom” might mean his dynasty; cf. the use of the term in 2 Sam. 7:16), while chapter 15 refers specifically to Saul’s personal reign over Israel (“He has rejected you as king” in vv. 23 and 26). In this case the earlier prophecy does not necessarily become unconditional here. The “neighbor” mentioned in verse 28 could be one of Saul’s sons (cf. the use of the term станавли, in 2 Sam. 12:11, where it refers to David’s son Absalom), but developments in 1 Samuel 16 quickly eliminate this prospect.

Second, it is possible that both 1 Samuel 13:13-14 and 15:29 pertain to Saul personally. In this case the first speech could be an informal decree with the second speech simply clarifying the earlier ambiguity. However, if both speeches refer to Saul, it is more likely that the first declaration was an implicitly conditional announcement and that Saul’s doom was not sealed until the second speech. Several factors support this. (1) As noted earlier, David, Saul’s replacement, was not actually revealed and anointed until after the second speech (cf. 1 Sam. 16). (2) Also the Lord’s declaration in 1 Samuel 15:11 (“I regret that I have made Saul king, for he has turned back from following Me, and has not carried out My commands”) and Samuel’s response to it suggest that the earlier warning to Saul had not been final. If Saul’s}

over Israel and over Judah.” However, Fretheim’s distinction is overly fine, for Saul’s rejection and David’s election are two sides of the same coin.

19 The statement in verse 11 (also v. 35), does not contradict verse 29, for the verb יָּשָׁה is used in different semantic senses with different referents in this chapter. In verses 11, 35 it means “to experience emotional pain” and refers to God’s response to Saul’s disobedience which in turn moved Him to decree Saul’s fate. In verse 29 the word is negated and used in the sense of “to retract.” Here it refers to God’s decree that Saul will be replaced by another. In the one case it pertains to a past action (God’s making Saul king); in the other it concerns a future course of action (the rejection of Saul as king). For a similar line of argument see V. Philips Long, The Reign and Rejection of King Saul (Atlanta: Scholars, 1989), 163. Recognizing this semantic variation makes redactional critical suggestions like that of Kyle McCarter unnecessary (I Samuel, Anchor Bible [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 19801, 268). Yairah Amit’s creative literary proposal, which argues that verse 29 reflects Samuel’s erroneous perspective (in contrast to the narrator’s/God’s viewpoint expressed in vv. 11 and 35), also fails to take adequate account of the polysemantic character of the word in this chapter (“‘The Glory of Israel Does Not Deceive or Change His Mind’: On the Reliability of Narrator and Speakers in Biblical Narrative, Prooftexts 12 [1992: 201-12).
doom had already been decreed, why would the prophet experience such grief and spend the whole night crying out to God? (3) The presence of מִידָנָה, “today,” in Samuel’s second speech indicates that God’s decision was finalized at that point, not earlier. (4) The switch from מִשְׁפַּת (“you have not kept,” 13:13) to מָסֵר (“you have rejected,” 15:23, 26) suggests that Saul’s latest act of rebellion was the basis for the judgment pronounced in chapter 15, or at least the “straw that broke the camel’s back.”

**PSALM 110:4**

In this passage Yahweh swore an oath that the Davidic king would occupy a special royal-priestly status, much like that of Melchizedek, the ancient king of Salem. The declaration that God will not change His mind, or retract His statement, clearly pertains to the specific pronouncement that follows and, together with the reference to an oath, marks the statement as a decree.

**JEREMIAH 4:28; EZEKIEL 24:14; ZECHARIAH 8:14**

Jeremiah and Ezekiel attach to a judgment speech a statement about God’s refusal to change, thus marking the prophecy as an unalterable decree. In Jeremiah 4:28 the words ובִּשְׁמִית אֲשֹׁר בִּמְלֹה, “nor will I turn from it,” accompany ובִּשְׁמִית, “and I will not change My mind” (regarding what I have spoken). The former statement is used of God’s oath to David in Psalm 132:11: “The Lord has sworn to David, a truth from which He will not turn back.” In Ezekiel 24:14 the Lord declared that He was no longer open for negotiation; the announced judgment would then come to pass (ותָלַשׁ). Zechariah 8:14, which recalls that God judged the preexilic generation just as He had planned without retracting His decision (ִנְנַחְתָּ֔ちוּ alludes back to the divine decision recorded in Jeremiah 4:28 and Ezekiel 24:14.

**SUMMARY**

In each case God's refusal to retract a statement refers directly or applies indirectly to a specific decree identified in the context—His blessing of Israel in accord with the Abrahamic Covenant (Num. 23:19), His rejection of disobedient Saul (1 Sam. 15:29), His oath to make the Davidic king a royal-priest (Ps. 110:4), and His decision to judge Judah (Jer. 4:28; Ezek. 24:14; cf. Zech. 8:14). Each passage has clear contextual indicators that the declaration is unconditional. The statement that God will not

---

20 Also see Judges 11:35, where Jephthah lamented that he was not able to turn back (לֹא אֱלֹיךָ לִשָּׁה) from the vow he had made.
change His mind, made in tandem with a synonymous expression, formally marks the divine proclamation as a decree.

PASSAGES IN WHICH ANNOUNCEMENTS ARE IN VIEW

EXODUS 32:12, 14; AMOS 7:3, 6

When God saw the Israelites worshiping the golden calf, He angrily announced to Moses His intention to destroy the people and raise up a new nation through Moses. “Now then let Me alone, that My anger may burn against them, and that I may destroy them; and I will make of you a great nation” (Exod. 32:10). The form of the statement (imperative + jussive + cohortative + cohortative) indicates that it is not a decree, but an expression of God’s frustration with His people. The implication is that Moses, if he did not leave God alone, might be able to persuade Him to change His mind.21 In fact this is exactly what happened (vv. 11-14). Moses appealed to God's reputation (“What will the Egyptians think?”), asked Him to relent (אָשֶׁר אָשֶׁר) from His stated course of action (v. 12), and reminded Him of His unconditional decree to the patriarchs (v. 13). Verse 14 states that God did indeed change His mind. Moses was able to succeed because God had only threatened judgment, not decreed it.22

Amos 7 records a similar case of prophetic intercession. The Lord showed Amos two visions of judgment He was planning for Israel (vv. 1-6). After seeing the visions, Amos begged the Lord to be merciful. In both cases the Lord relented from the planned course of action and announced that judgment would not fall. He had simply shown Amos two visions, but had not yet decreed a course of action. However, God’s patience can run out. He showed Amos yet a third vision, which, instead of picturing the nation’s destruction and rousing Amos’s emotions, invited the prophet to reflect on Israel’s moral condition from God’s perspective. Having convinced His prophet of the necessity of judgment, God declared that He would “no longer” spare Israel (v. 8). Understanding God’s words as a decree, Amos offered no objection this time.

JEREMIAH 15:6; 18:8, 10; 26:3,13,19

As already noted, God came to the point where He decreed through Jeremiah that judgment would fall on Judah (Jer. 4:28). However, He issued this decree only after many warnings.

21 See the helpful discussion in Andersen and Freedman, Amos, 648-49.
Early in Jehoiakim’s reign God told Jeremiah to proclaim His word in the temple courtyard in hopes that the people would repent. He declared, “Perhaps they will listen and everyone will turn from his evil way, that I may repent of the calamity which I am planning to do” (Jer. 26:3). When the people threatened to kill Jeremiah, the prophet again urged them to repent and once more promised them that God would retract His announcement of judgment (v. 13). Some of the elders stepped forward and reminded the people that God had retracted such an announcement in the days of Hezekiah, who had heard Micah’s words (cf. Mic. 3:12) and repented (Jer. 26:17-19).

The principle underlying Jeremiah’s message and the elders’ advice is that God will change His mind concerning a stated course of action depending on the response He receives. This principle is articulated clearly in Jeremiah 18:7-10. Here the Lord explained that a nation may avert His threatened judgment if it repents when confronted with its sin. In such cases He will “relent” and not inflict the announced disaster (v. 8). On the other hand, if a nation to whom God intended to show His favor sins, He may “reconsider” (נְחַנּוֹ, v. 10) and withhold His blessing.

Since Judah did not respond to Jeremiah’s call for repentance (cf. 18:12),23 the Lord decided to judge His people, declaring that prophetic intercession, even by such advocates as Moses and Samuel, would not alter His course (15:1-5). He was weary of relenting (לֹא יַחֲנֹן, v. 6) and would no longer postpone judgment. The decree of judgment in 4:28, formalized by the statement “I will not relent,” must have postdated this decision.

JOEL 2:13-14

The locust plague experienced by Joel’s generation was a harbinger of an even more devastating judgment. The Lord Himself was leading an awesome locustlike army toward Judah, but perhaps judgment could still be averted. After all, the Lord Himself was calling His people to repentance (Joel 2:12) and, as Joel reminded his audience, He characteristically relented from sending announced judgments on His covenant people throughout their history (v. 13). Though one could never be certain if the Lord had not been explicit, Joel urged the people to respond appropriately and encouraged them with these words: “Who knows? He

may turn and have pity and leave behind a blessing.” The people apparently took heed to Joel’s advice, for subsequent verses state that the Lord did indeed take pity on His people (v. 18) and promised to restore what the locusts had devoured (vv. 19-26). This important passage again illustrates that God is able and willing to retract announcements of judgment.

Furthermore verse 13 indicates in creedal style that God characteristically relents from sending announced judgment.24 This willingness to change His mind is linked with other divine attributes, such as His grace, compassion, patience, and love. The creed has its roots in Exodus 34:6-7, where, following God’s merciful treatment of Israel after the golden calf incident, the Lord described Himself as follows: “The Lord, the Lord God, compassionate and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in lovingkindness and truth; who keeps lovingkindness for thousands, who forgives iniquity, transgression and sin.” God’s willingness to change His mind concerning judgment is not mentioned in these verses, but the inclusion of this theme in later verses is certainly justifiable in light of Exodus 32:14, for God’s decision to relent stands in the background of the creedal statement recorded in Exodus 34.

JONAH 3:9-10; 4:2

Though Jonah’s announcement of judgment on Nineveh sounded unconditional, it was accompanied by no formal indication that it was a decree (3:4). For this reason the king of Nineveh responded appropriately in hopes that judgment might be averted (v. 9). Like Joel he said, “Who knows, God may turn and relent, and withdraw His burning anger so that we shall not perish?” When God saw the Ninevites’ sincerity, He did indeed change His mind concerning the announced calamity (v. 10), much to Jonah's dismay. In fact Jonah had anticipated this development, and that is why he ran away in the first place. With words almost identical to those of Joel 2:13, he observed that God is “a gracious and compassionate God, slow to anger and abundant in lovingkindness; and one who relents concerning calamity” (4:2).25

---


25 As Rice argues, this passage makes it clear that many warnings of judgment, rather than being unalterable decrees, are actually designed to motivate repentance and in turn, enable God to retract the announced punishment (Richard Rice, God’s Foreknowledge and Man’s Free Will [Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1985], 79-80).
SUMMARY

The texts analyzed in this section clearly show that God can and often does retract announcements. Two of the passages even regard this willingness to change His mind as one of His most fundamental attributes. In every case where such a change is envisioned or reported, God had not yet decreed a course of action or an outcome. Instead He chose to wait patiently, hoping His warnings might bring people to their senses and make judgment unnecessary.

CONCLUSION

Does God change His mind? It all depends. If He has decreed a certain course of action or outcome, then He will not retract a statement or relent from a declared course of action. Verses stating or illustrating this truth must not be overextended, however. Statements about God not changing His mind serve to mark specific declarations as decrees. They should not be used as proof texts of God’s immutability, nor should they be applied generally to every divine forward-looking statement. If God has not decreed a course of action, then He may very well retract an announcement of blessing or judgment. In these cases the human response to His announcement determines what He will do. Passages declaring that God typically changes His mind as an expression of His love and mercy demonstrate that statements describing God as relenting should not be dismissed as anthropomorphic. At the same time such passages should not be overextended. God can and often does decree a course of action.26

26 Some scholars have recently suggested a solution to this problem much like the one proposed in this paper. In following their lead, this writer has tried to bring to the debate greater exegetical clarity and place this proposed solution on a firmer exegetical foundation. See, for example, Rice’s discussion in The Openness of God, 32-33, especially the statement: “In general, then, God’s repentance is a genuine possibility, but one that is foreclosed when God pledges himself unconditionally to a particular course of action.” Andersen and Freedman recognize the importance of an oath in some passages (such as Ps. 110:4 and Num. 23:19) but fail to extend the implications of this observation to all the passages in question (Amos, 638-79).
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The Failure of the Hero:
Moses as A Model for Ministry

GEORGE W. COATS

Modern culture requires that heroes who set their mark for members of the society to imitate must be successful. The corporation executive who maintains a position in the modern world of business can continue in that position only if that position basks in the rich light of success. The modern coach, whether responsible for the work of junior high squads or the leader of a National Football League team, remains a modern coach only if the won-lost record breaks in the coach's favor. The minister of a modern congregation marks the character of ministry by the number of additions to the congregation's membership. In the world of success drives, the failure can find no room at the inn. The person who fails finds no continuation from the board of executives who tolerates only signs of success. The person who fails finds no disciples who imitate the failure's particular pattern of work.

Yet, failure is a realistic factor of modern life. Businesses in today's world will occasionally close because of bankruptcy. Ministers in today's churches will occasionally face a move because of poor support. Marriages will occasionally end in divorce. Students will occasionally drop out of school. Some students even flunk out of school. Nations struggle to find excuses for policies gone awry. Even presidents struggle to cover procedures that have obviously failed.

In the literature of the ancient world, the hero carries the banner for success in leading the people who respond to heroic leadership. The hero successfully defends the people against enemies who would reduce the people to slavery, against hunger or thirst that would drive the people to the edge of death, and against confusion that would capture the people in aimless wandering through endless wilderness. If the hero were unable to lead the people to the end of the wilderness, if the hero failed to defend the people against the dangers of life in the wilderness, then the hero would hardly be heroic.

Yet, failure is a realistic factor in the life of leaders for the modern world. In the face of failure, a typical procedure for a leader is to direct blame for the failure to some other person or even to claim no knowledge or responsibility for the event of failure at all. Some other official must have been responsible for the failure. "The woman whom you gave to be with me, she gave me fruit of the tree, and I ate." Will a leader accept responsibility for a military failure like the Bay of Pigs? Or will

Dr. George W. Coats is professor of Old Testament at Lexington Theological Seminary. He is currently preparing Numbers for The Old Testament Library series to replace Martin Noth's volume.
a leader deny any responsibility for the sale of arms to one faction seeking to overthrow another faction when once that sale becomes public knowledge?

Moses appears in the Old Testament narrative as a hero who commits his life to the task of leading the Israelites out of the oppressive bondage in Egypt. The narrative captures the dynamic task assumed by Moses as a task so overwhelming that from the beginning Moses must struggle with its gigantic portions. "Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh, and bring the sons of Israel out of Egypt?" God responds to this self-abasement from Moses by promising Moses that the divine presence would accompany him in the process of executing the commission. Moses apparently feels the enormous proportions of the task as a seal for failure, given the understanding of himself that controls the response. The promise for presence in executing that kind of ministry must certainly be a promise for success. And indeed, the presentation of plans for this ministry to the people brings an initial mark of success. "And the people believed; and when they heard that the Lord had visited the people of Israel and that he had seen their affliction, they bowed their heads and worshiped."

Exodus 5 is, however, an account of heroic failure. Opening with a single transition word, w'ahar, a word that ties the chapter to the preceding narrative, this brief tale reports the execution of the divine commission that sent Moses and Aaron to the Pharaoh. "Afterward Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said, 'Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel, 'Let my people go, that they may hold a feast to me in the wilderness.' ' " According to the pattern of success, particularly success in presenting God's word for people to obey, the Pharaoh should have acquiesced immediately to God's demand. Or at least the Pharaoh should have opened negotiations in order to work out a compromise. But the Pharaoh responds to the demand in a way that creates immediate tension for the plot of the story. "Who is the Lord, that I should heed his voice and let Israel go? I do not know the Lord, and moreover, I will not let Israel go." Moses and Aaron continue the negotiations by offering a compromise. "The God of the Hebrews has met with us; let us go, we pray, a three days' journey into the wilderness, and sacrifice to the Lord our God, lest he fall upon us with pestilence or with the sword." The compromise offer fails, however. Indeed, the Pharaoh not only refuses the request of Moses and Aaron that the people be allowed to go into the wilderness for a short period in order to sacrifice to their God, but he also increases their burdens of work. In verses 7-9, the text notes the Pharaoh's commands for the taskmasters and foremen, "You shall no longer give the people straw to make bricks, as heretofore; let them go and gather straw for themselves. But the number of bricks which they made heretofore you shall lay upon them, you shall by no means lessen it . . . . Let heavier work be laid upon the men that they may labor at it and pay no regard to lying words." The Pharaoh strongly rejects the efforts of Moses and Aaron to achieve release of the people by negotiations. Indeed, the text paints a picture of the Pharaoh as a man of power who believes that Moses and Aaron are lying to him. He knows that if he permits the Israelites to go a three-day journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to their God they will not come back. They will continue their march away from Egypt. And, in fact, he is right in his impression.
The appeal to the Pharaoh for permission to go into the wilderness a journey of only three days is clearly an excuse to get out of Egypt. Indeed, even if they do in fact hold a feast to the Lord at some point in the journey, it is clear for the storyteller that they would have no intention for coming back. They would continue their journey. The Pharaoh is thus right in his suspicions that the appeal to God's demand for a festival in the wilderness is an excuse to escape the power of the Pharaoh. The plot depends on deception.

But even worse, the Pharaoh responds to the negotiation with an insult to the Lord. In v. 2, "Who is the Lord, that I should heed his voice and let Israel go? I do not know the Lord, and moreover, I will not let Israel go." The question implies that the Lord, the subject of the question, does not demand enough authority to meet the goal of the negotiations to let Israel go. Thus, with an insult to God, the Pharaoh rejects the petition of Moses and Aaron.

Vv. 10-14 demonstrate the intensification of the Egyptian oppression against the Israelite people. In v. 14, "the foremen of the people of Israel, (who were Israelites themselves) who Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them, were beaten. The effort to carry out the commission of God for securing the release of the people thus ended in failure. Indeed, it ended with increased oppression against the Israelites. In this case, failure facilitates even greater tension.

The plot of the tale continues its progression by intensifying the crisis even beyond the mark of heavier oppression. Vv. 15-19 depict the efforts of the Israelite foremen to secure some softening of the labor. "Why do you deal thus with your servants? No straw is given to your servants, yet they say to us, 'Make bricks!' And behold, your servants are beaten; but the fault is in your own people." But the Egyptians reject the appeal with a stubborn repetition of the demand to meet the quota of bricks. In v. 19, "You shall by no means lessen your daily number of bricks." The negotiations end not only in failure to achieve the goal of freedom from oppression, but also in an increase in the oppression.

The failure scene comes to a pitched focus in v. 20. The storyteller describes the anticipated confrontation between the Israelite foremen and Moses/Aaron. Their immediate attack is an appeal for judgment against Moses and Aaron. "The Lord look upon you and judge" The effort by Moses and Aaron to resolve the oppression of the people ends in a lawsuit by the people against Moses and Aaron. No more forceful sign of failure could appear. The very people the heroes intend to lead to freedom turn on them and reject them with a lawsuit.

Moses and Aaron have now made an initial effort to win the release of the people. And that effort ends in failure. But the irony in the failure is that the lawsuit depicts the efforts of Moses and Aaron to save the people from their bondage as an attempt to kill them. "... Because you have made us offensive in the sight of Pharaoh and his servants, and have put a sword in their hand to kill us." The people see the move to save them from oppression as a move to kill them. The image of failure in the scene is not simply a rejection of the hero. It is a rejection of the hero's principal work, the heart of Moses' identity as the hero of the people. The irony in this tragic rejection develops another level of tension. With the rejection by the people heavy on the shoulders of Moses and Aaron, with the
failure of the negotiations to win the freedom of the people still sharp in the pericope, Moses turns the rejection on God. In v. 22, "Then Moses turned again to the Lord and said, 'O Lord, why hast thou done evil to this people? Why didst thou ever send me?'" Again, the question is in the form of an accusation. Formally, it calls for some kind of response from the addressee. Moreover, Moses states the case for the accusation, "... since I came to Pharaoh to speak in thy name, he has done evil to this people, and thou hast not delivered thy people at all." The hero recognizes his own failure in delivering the people. The foremen of the people make the point clear. But now Moses makes a similar accusation against God. In Moses' eyes, God has also failed. Thus, the issue for the pericope arises from the pressure of failure. Moses, the hero, failed to win the freedom of his people by negotiations with the Pharaoh. And that failure Moses places under God's responsibility. When Moses fails, for Moses that means that God, the God who commissioned Moses for the task, also fails. Now what will God do? And as a part of that issue, what will Moses do?

The pericope in Exodus 5 is not structurally a part of the cycle of scenes in the long narrative about Moses' repeated negotiations with the Pharaoh in tireless efforts to win the release of the people. In fact, the tale in Exodus 5 contains the narrative tradition in its most primitive form, a form that provides the tradition-historical roots for the larger negotiations narrative. In Exodus 7-12, an expanded narrative elaborates the kernel of tradition in Exodus 5. Indeed, the end of the negotiations as a narrative motif, Exod. 10:29, puts the issue of tension in the narrative at the very point left hanging in Exodus 5. The complicated process of negotiations between Moses and the Pharaoh ends in failure for Moses. And that failure implies failure for God. In the face of that failure, what will Moses do next? In the face of failure, what will God do next?

The cycle of scenes about Moses' repeated negotiations with the Pharaoh develops in a specialized form. The storyteller constructs the cycle as a palistrophe, a pattern that sets the first scene as a structural parallel with the tenth scene, but not with any other scene. In the same way, the second scene parallels the ninth scene. The third scene follows the pattern with the eighth scene. The fourth scene parallels the seventh, and the fifth parallels the sixth. In the palistrophe, the Passover has no place. It is not a part of the tight structure in the story and thus not an original account of the climax for the narrative. Rather, the narrative in the palistrophe comes to an end in Exodus 10:28-29. "Then the Pharaoh said to him, 'Get away from me. Take heed to yourself. Never see my face again. For in the day you see my face, you shall die.'" Moses said, 'As you say! I will not see your face again.'" With that exchange, the negotiations between Moses and the Pharaoh end. But the Pharaoh has not agreed to release the people. At this point, the negotiations process stands clearly as a failure. And the failure characterizes not only Moses but also God.

At least one exegetical problem arises just at this point. The storyteller notes, just before reporting that the Pharaoh dismissed Moses with a death sentence as the penalty for continuing the negotiations, that the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, and he would not let them go. With that comment, the storyteller
announces that the repeated failure in the negotiations process was the result of God's design for the event. With this element in hand, the exegete can conclude that Moses and God did not fail after all. It was all a part of God's design. When one asks about the tradition history of the negotiations narrative: the problem with the pattern sharpens. In some sense, the motif is a narrative technique designed to enable the storyteller to move from one scene in the sequence to the next. And, indeed, the movement sets up the Passover scene. If the initial audience between Moses/Aaron and the Pharaoh has ended in success, the narrator would have lost the story. There would be no reason for the Passover scene. The hardened heart motif allows the narrative to move from one stage to the next, with the Passover at the end. But the process also depicts the narrator's view of Moses' reaction, indeed, God's reaction to the spectre of failure. When the failure occurs, the hero goes back to the drawing board and creates a new plan. And then he tries again. Indeed, the hero receives a new plan from the hand of God. When God's plan for saving the people fails, then God tries a new plan. The hero demonstrates the tenacity of God to pursue the plan of salvation despite repeated failures in the plan.

The point can be pursued a step farther for this tradition. Exodus 5 shows the traditio-historical basis for the narrative as a tradition about failure. The negotiations cycle ends in Exodus 10 with failure. Where does a resolution for this narrative tension appear? In every respect, the Passover event marks the climax of the tension in the narrative as it now stands. God resolves the issues of failure in the process by creating something new. In a dramatic strike against all of the Egyptians from the poorest to the Pharaoh himself, God kills the first-born of every Egyptian family. But by proper preparation of the ritual, the Israelites protect their first-born from the plague that puts Egyptians in their place. It is a scene of rank violence. But the violent attack forces the Egyptians to submit to the demands of the Israelite hero. They free the Israelites from their dehumanizing slavery, indeed, they drive them away. Finally, in one fatal blow, the Israelite hero and the God he serves win success in delivering the people from their slavery. The issue of the violent means remains a problem at tangent with the design of this paper. The principal point here is that failure did not thwart the work of the hero.

The traditio-historical complexity in the cycle adds to this picture of response to failure. A part of the tradition brings the cycle of negotiations between Moses and the Pharaoh to a conclusion without success in convincing the Pharaoh to release the slaves. The roots of that tradition shape the narrative in Exodus 5. The narrative moves beyond the failure in order to depict Moses' return to the people, prepared to develop a new and quite different plan. In Exod. 12:35, the narrative notes that "The people of Israel had also done as Moses told them, for they had asked of the Egyptians jewelry of silver and of gold, and clothing "The point of this motif emerges with a different description of the exodus event itself, a description unrelated to the Passover, "... the Lord had given the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they let them have what they asked. Thus they despoiled the Egyptians." The same motif appears in Exod. 3:21-22 and 11:2-3 (cf. also Ps, 105:37). This depiction of the exodus assumes that all of the efforts of the
heroes and even the efforts of God end in failure. In the face of the failure, this
tradition shows Moses preparing a new plan. He will lead the people out of Egypt
in a secret escape, without the permission of the Pharaoh.\textsuperscript{6} To escape in the middle
of the night would require preparation for movement at a moment's notice,
"... your loins girded, your sandals on your feet, and your staff in your hand; and
you shall eat it in haste" (Exod. 12:10). Indeed, the picture of the people with
dough for the bread on their backs, before it had time to rise in response to leaven,
sets the pattern for a Feast of Unleavened Bread (12:34). That this event might
have been originally distinct from the Passover seems clear.\textsuperscript{7} Yet, in both cases, the
narrative describes procedures of the hero in the face of failure. When the first plan
fails, then the hero tries again. Whether the try appears as the Passover event or as
the event celebrated during an originally distinct Festival of Unleavened Bread,
still the tradition depicts the hero as the servant of God who does not give up in the
face of failure. Rather, when one who does not succeed with an initial plan
responds to the failure in the manner of the hero Moses, that one develops a new
plan and tries again.\textsuperscript{8}

This pattern of failure and renewed effort to gain success by approaching the
issue from a new direction marks the entire history of God's efforts to save the
people. In the wilderness, Moses fails again. The people murmur against Moses
and God. They rebel against Moses' leadership and threaten to execute him. At
the Mountain, God establishes a covenant with the people through the hand of
Moses. But the people fall from the covenant in a rank act of apostasy with the
Golden Calf. Joshua leads the people across the Jordan into the land of the
promise. The ark of the covenant symbolizes God's presence in this Holy Land at
the event of a covenant renewal at Shechem (so, Josh. 24: 12). But the people fall
from that covenant again and again. The tragedy at Baal Peor is only a prime
eexample of repeated failures. Moses, Joshua, the judges of the tribal confedera-
tion, Samuel, all experience leadership for the people of God under a constant
threat of failure. And each searches for new ways to meet the challenge of
leadership.

A radical new plan to meet the failure in salvation history emerges with the rise
of the kingship. David would be God's special envoy. From the perspective of
tradition in Jerusalem, David would be the Son of God, the heir of Melchizedek.
And with David and his dynasty in Jerusalem, God would rule the world with
justice and righteousness. Yet, even here the ideal world of peace as the place for
God's salvation for all people under the authority of a Davidic king, such as the
Messiah described in Isa. 11:1-9, seems to fail. David corrupts the rule of God in
Jerusalem with Bathsheba and a rank failure to show compassion in his dealings
with her husband, Uriah.\textsuperscript{9} Solomon demonstrates wisdom in administration of
the kingdom. But at his death, his son Rehoboam shows no wisdom. And his
failure leads to the division of God's people between the north and the south. The
Deuteronomistic historian looks for a king in the line of David that would correct
the failure in the ranks of the Davidic dynasty. Indeed, the model for that
successful king would be a Davidic heir who would match the model of leadership
for Israel provided by Moses.\textsuperscript{10} Josiah almost completes the job. His move to unite
the north and the south under the aegis of a Deuteronomic reform opened the
doors for a pattern in his own leadership that stands out for its Mosaic qualities, its
new law and new covenant. But Josiah failed through no fault of his own. On top
of a lonely mountain, he met an untimely death, and the dream of success, so close
to realization, ended in failure effected by an Egyptian king. The New Moses, the
Davidic King Josiah died in the midst of apparent success. How could God avoid
another tragic failure? In the face of so many failures, it is remarkable that God has
continued in a constant pursuit for salvation of the world's human creatures.

Another new Moses, another Davidic Messiah, brought hope for God's
salvation for all the world. Under the reign of Jesus of Nazareth, God's Kingdom
of peace comes in a new form to the world. Yet, even here apparent failure
dominates the scene. Where is this new kingdom, a kingdom that will mark God's
rule of peace for the world? "My kingship is not of this world." Is that not a false
promise? What other world is there for experiencing the success in God's
redemption, in God's rule of peace? But the marks of a kingdom uncontrolled by a
political king do emerge. Political kings sell arms to two sides in a war, just to see
how much destruction money can buy. The king in the Kingdom of God does
other things. "The blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed
and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news
preached to them." Each year, the Christmas celebration marks the hope for God's
success in delivering the people of the world from their petty wars. But the
apparent success meets the same tragic failure that met Josiah. On a lonely hill, the
New David, the New Moses met the callous lack of compassion that belongs to a
world of hostile people. They killed him, just as the Egyptians killed Josiah, just as
the people threatened to do with Moses. Thus, God's plan ended again in failure.
The hope offered by Christmas ends in the despair of Dark Friday. What will God
do now in the face of still another failure?

"Now, after the Sabbath, toward the dawn of the first day of the week, Mary
Magdalene and the other Mary went to see the sepulchre."

Notes

1. George W. Coats, Moses: Heroic Man and Man of God (JSOT Monograph 19;
Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987). A principal goal for the monograph is to show that the
Moses narrative should be understood as heroic saga.
4. Hans Joachim Boecker, Redeformen des Rechtslebens im Alten Testament
(WMANT 14; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964) p. 25-34.

8. As a model for ministry, the Moses figure functions for the modern church in much the same way that it functioned for the Deuteronomistic historian in a critique of the kingship. Modern ministers might profit by developing Mosaic characteristics as marks of their ministry. One mark would be the pattern of response to failure. In the face of failure, the temptation is strong to give up. But the challenge of the model calls the minister confronted by failure back to the drawing board. The admonition is clear. "Get up! Dust yourself off, and start all over again." But the model goes a step farther. In the discouraging and often very lonely setting that emerges in the wake of failure, how can the minister find enough courage to try again? "Fear not! I am with you."
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THE SABBATH AND THE ALIEN

H. R. COLE

Pacific Adventist University
Boroko, Papua New Guinea

Many scholars in modern Judaism have discerned universal dimensions to the Sabbath.1 However, few writers in earlier Judaism ever saw them.2 It is almost superfluous to add that non-Sabbatarian Christians have rarely seen these dimensions either.

This failure to see universal dimensions may seem surprising, for three passages in the Pentateuch affirm that the ger, "resident alien," is to rest on the weekly Sabbath, along with the Israelite (Exod 20:10; 23:12; Deut 5:14). However, rabbinic Judaism has traditionally identified the ger in these passages as the ger saddiq, the circumcised "righteous alien," rather than the ger toshab, the uncircumcised "sojourning alien." The ger saddiq was a newcomer to Jewish territory, but not to the Jewish religion.3

By the rabbinic period, the ger was understood in terms of religious


2 Philo, has an extremely universal view of the Sabbath, as he has of the whole of Judaism, which he strives to present as nothing more than Greek philosophy in its purest form ("On the Account of the World's Creation Given by Moses," 89). Genesis Rabbah 11:5 teaches that if the Gentiles will not keep the Sabbath now, they will be forced to as they suffer in the afterlife. However, the general trend of early Judaism is in the opposite direction, as exemplified in the way the Babylonian talmud tractate Sanhedrin 58b and Deuteronomy Rabbah 1:21 forbids non-Jews from observing the Sabbath under pain of death. See also Exodus Rabbah 25:11. Jubilees has the seeds of universalism inherent in its claim that the Sabbath is first observed by God and the angels at Creation, but immediately restricts its observance on earth to Israel (Jub 2:16-22, 30-33). This apocalyptic tradition is continued in Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 18-20; Pesikta Rabbati 26.3, 9. For more information see Robert M. Johnston, "Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath," AUSS 12 (1974): 98-101.

conversion. The rabbinic distinction between the circumcised and the uncircumcised alien may at first sight seem to be an artificial contrivance to reconcile the apparently conflicting commands of Lev 17:15, 16 and Deut 14:21. For the historical critic, it would normally be enough to develop a theology of the alien and the law for just one of the supposed sources, rather than attempting to identify a coherent pattern across the board. However, the distinction cannot be dismissed out of hand, for while the word רָגַע sometimes does refer to the alien in general, at other times it seems to refer exclusively to the alien who has been circumcised. The question here is whether it is an appropriate distinction to draw in the context of the three Pentateuchal texts where the רָגַע is discussed in relationship to the weekly Sabbath.

John Calvin accepted that the רָגַע in these passages includes

---

4 Jacob Milgrom argues that in the priestly laws, the alien is required to observe the prohibitive but not the performative commandments (Jacob Milgrom, Numbers, JPS Torah Commentary [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990], 399-400). The fact that Deut 14:21 exempts the alien from a prohibitive command is a clear barrier to extending this maxim to the Pentateuch as a whole.

Lev 16:29 is a key peg in Milgrom's argument, since he accepts Ibn Ezra's contention that the phrase, "either the nativeborn or the alien who sojourns among you" qualifies the prohibition against working on the Day of Atonement, but not the immediately preceding performative command to afflict one's soul on this day. See Jacob Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB, vol. 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 1055. However, Ezra's distinction itself seems to be contrived. The grammatical pattern of a performative commandment followed by a prohibition of work then a list of who is included is also found in Exod 20:9-10 and Deut 5:13-14. However, no one claims that the dependents listed are prohibited from working on the seventh day, but are not included in the earlier permission to work the other six days.

5 Lev 18:26-27 forbids the nativeborn and the alien alike from committing the sexual practices listed in the chapter, because the people already in the land have done these things and the land has become defiled. The fact that the present occupants of the land are not a part of Israel has not prevented their actions from defiling the land. Accordingly, the preservation of the land from the defilement under Israelite occupation must presuppose that the Israelites ensure that none of its inhabitants commit these acts, uncircumcised aliens included.

6 Exod 12:19 states that anyone who eats leaven during the Feast of Unleavened Bread will be cut off "from the congregation of Israel" (לֹא יָכְלוּ בָּנָי הָעָם) whether alien or nativeborn. According to Milgrom's maxim, this command applies to aliens (whether circumcised or not) because it is prohibitive rather than performative. However, in Exod 12:47-48 uncircumcised aliens are not counted as part of the congregation of Israel, for in Exod 12:47-48 they are specifically prohibited from taking part in Passover in the same breath as all the congregation of Israel is commanded to observe it.

It is also possible that in Lev 16:29, the רָגַע includes only the circumcised alien, since in vs. 33 the priest is said to make for "all the people of the assembly" (כָּלָה הָעָם), an expression that includes only Israelites and assimilated aliens in Deut 23:3-8 (vss. 4-9, Heb.), just as (מֵעָלָה הָעָם) does not include uncircumcised aliens in Exod 12:48.
uncircumcised aliens, but denied any universal dimensions to the Sabbath by adding that aliens and domestic animals are included not for their sakes, but lest anything opposed to the Sabbath should happen beneath the eyes of the Israelites.... Besides, if the very least liberty had been conceded to them [the Israelites], they would have done many things to evade the Law in their days of rest, by employing strangers and the cattle in their work.  

There seems to be no evidence in Exod 20:10 to establish whether the term גăr is being used in a restricted or a broad sense, or to indicate whether the alien's rest is merely incidental to that of the Israelite. However, there is evidence on both these points in Exod 23:12 and Deut 5:14. The purpose of this article is to explore the place of the alien in these two texts and to use the evidence as it arises to test the traditional rabbinic interpretation and the explanation given by Calvin.

The Alien in Exod 23:12

On the basis of the "catchword" principle, the scheme of six years followed by a seventh year in Exod 23:10-11 naturally lends itself as an introduction to the scheme of six days followed by a seventh day in v. 12:  

Six days you must do your work, but on the seventh day you must stop, so that your ox and your donkey may rest, and the son of your female servant and the stranger may be refreshed.

The inclusion of the גăr in the Sabbath rest is clearly not incidental to the rest of the Israelites in this text. Indeed, the verse does not even mention the benefits of the Sabbath rest for "the addressee and his family." Instead, the

9 Dale Patrick, Old Testament Law (Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1985), 92. This fact does not mean that no benefit for the addressee of the command is envisaged at all, nor that the worship value of the Sabbath is being denied. Instead, it simply suggests that the Sabbath is here presented as having a distinctly humanitarian purpose. Exod 23:1-12 is a list of judgments outlining humanitarian obligations and Exod 23:14-19 contains a list of judgments outlining Israel's festal obligations, with v. 13 forming a boundary between the two. This structure may explain why in
addressee is to rest expressly "so that" (למען) his animals may rest and the son of his female servant and the alien may be refreshed.  

The inclusion of the uncircumcised alien in the statement of Exod 23:12 is confirmed by the fact that nearby in Exod 23:9, the term נְגֵר clearly includes all aliens, circumcised and uncircumcised alike: 

Note: אֲנִי מַעֲלֶה, וְאַבָּדָם, וַאֲנָשָׁה, וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ בְּעֵדֶךָ: 
You must not oppress the alien. You know the life of the alien, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt.

The allusion to the Israelites as aliens in Egypt is suggestive of their erstwhile vulnerability as a dependent minority in a foreign land. It has nothing to say about their adoption of Egyptian religious practice. Conversely, the command not to oppress the נְגֵר must also have all aliens in view, not just those who adopt the Israelite covenant by being circumcised.

**The Alien in Deut 5:14**

The Sabbath commandment in Deut 5:12-15 stands at the heart of the Deuteronomic account of the Decalogue. Verse 14 lists those included in the prohibition against working on the Sabbath and concludes with a purpose clause:

פִּי הַשַּׁבָּת שְׁכַב לוֹ מִלֵּאכָה אֲתָה נְגֵרָם וּבוֹנֵךְ וּבָדֶךְ אֲמַתָּן 

This verse sets forth the prohibition to work on the Sabbath, with emphasis on the inclusion of the נְגֵר. This usage is significant because it suggests the Israelites' desire to ensure that all foreigners, whether circumcised or not, would be treated equally under the law of the Sabbath.

Exod 23:10-12 "there is no allusion to the keeping of a sabbath unto the Lord ... in connection with either the seventh year or seventh day," such as is found in Exod 20:10 and Lev 23:3 (C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, 2 vols., Biblical Commentary, trans. James Martin, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 4th series, vol. 3 [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872]),146. It would also explain the absence of any mention of benefits for the addressee of the command.

10 It has been argued that the welfare of animals, slaves, and aliens is not primarily in focus in Exod 23:12. Instead, a sacral "return to the original state," a *restitutio in integrum,* is in view, and they are to rest simply because "they are an integral part of the creation which ... is to return to its 'rest'" (Martin Noth, Exodus: A Commentary, trans. J. S. Bowden, Old Testament Library [Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1962]),190. However, such a conclusion is not drawn from evidence in the passage itself. See Niels-Erik Andreasen, The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation, SBLDS, no. 7 (Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 135; Jay W. Marshall, Israel and the Book of the Covenant: An Anthropological Approach to Biblical Law, SBLDS, no. 140 (Atlanta, GA; Scholars Press, 1993), 159.

In view of the scattering of the Jewish exiles, it is understandable that the LXX translators would interpret the נְגֵר primarily as a newcomer to the Jewish religion, whenever possible. Nevertheless, their translation of נְגֵר in the last clause of Exod 23:9 as προσέλθοι ("proselytes") is clearly anachronistic. It would have been more appropriate if the terms נְגֵר had been translated as παροικος/παροικοι ("sojourners") in both verses.
However, the seventh day [is] a Sabbath to Yahweh your God. You must not do any work: [not] you, or your son, or your daughter, or your male servant, or your female servant, or your ox, or your donkey, or any of your cattle, or your alien who [is] within your gates, so that your male servant and female servant may rest like you.

"Although only the male and female slave are mentioned in the clause stating the rationale, it seems clear that they represent the entire list of dependents mentioned earlier in the command."\(^{12}\) Accordingly, the extension of rest to the household, the alien, and the livestock is not incidental to the rest of the Israelite householder. Instead, it is placed on a par.

The inclusion of the uncircumcised alien in the command of Deut 5:14 is confirmed by the fact that it is reinforced in v. 15 with an appeal to the Israelite experience of slavery in Egypt.

And you must remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt and Yahweh your God brought you out from there with a strong hand and with a stretched-out arm. Therefore Yahweh your God commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.\(^{13}\)

The fact that the Israelites were aliens in Egypt is not explicitly stated in this verse, but it is implied, in the same way that the inclusion of the alien in the rationale of v. 14 is implied. Accordingly, the issue of the alien's vulnerability is what is in view, not the question of his inclusion in the Israelite covenant through circumcision, just as in Exod 23:9.

**Conclusion and Implications**

A universal dimension to the weekly Sabbath is implied by the presence of three commands in the Pentateuch that specifically include the

---


\(^{13}\) The conclusion of this verse may seem to suggest that the deliverance from Egyptian slavery is being advanced as the reason for Sabbath observance itself, rather than as reason for extending its privileges to one's dependents. However, while Exod 20:11 has an introductory "for" ("כִּי"), the reference to Israel's redemption in Deut 5:15b begins with the "conjunction 'and' and simply enlarges the command" in v. 15a "to include remembrance of the Exodus on the sabbath" (Niels-Erik Andreasen, "Festival and Freedom: A Study of an Old Testament Theme," *Int* 28 [1974]: 284). The "therefore" ("לֵךְ" של) of Deut 5:15b may thus simply be by "analogy of [sic] Exodus 20:8-11, for ... no reason for the sabbath per se is really provided here" (ibid). On the other hand, even if Israel's deliverance from slavery did constitute one reason for Sabbathkeeping, there is no reason to deny that contextually it also serves as a prod to show kindness toward one's dependents (see Martin Rose, 5. *Mose*, 2 vols., Zurcher Bibelkommentare, Altes Testament, no. 5.2 [Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1994], 431).
alien in the Sabbath rest (Exod 20:10; 23:12; and Deut 5:14). Traditional rabbinic interpretation has resisted this implication by claiming that the _OR alien in these verses is the _ger saddiq, the circumcised "righteous alien," rather than with the _ger toshab, the uncircumcised "sojourning alien," who is a newcomer to Jewish territory, but not to the Jewish religion. According to John Calvin, the uncircumcised alien is included, but simply to prevent any stumbling-block to Israelite Sabbathkeeping, not because of any benefit he himself might gain. There seems to be no evidence as to the validity or otherwise of these arguments in Exod 20:10. However, an exegesis of the place of the alien in Exod 23:12 and Deut 5:14 provides strong evidence that these texts do include the uncircumcised alien in their perspective, and that his rest and refreshment is just as much apart of the purpose of the Sabbath as the rest and refreshment of the Israelite householder.

In Christian circles, the continued observance of a weekly Sabbath has generally received wider support than the continued observance of other OT sacred times. A number of reasons might be cited, not least of which is the fact that the Sabbath is the only sacred time that is specifically included in the Decalogue. Rarely has attention been given to the possible significance of a comparative study of the Pentateuchal laws governing the relationship of the alien to different sacred times, and it is beyond the scope of this article to undertake such a study in detail. nevertheless, on the basis of a preliminary investigation, it would seem that the Pentateuch itself does give the uncircumcised alien a special status in relationship to the weekly Sabbath, one that it does not afford to him in relationship to any other sacred time. This distinction may indeed

14 Because of its position in the substance of the "Ten Commandments," the weekly Sabbath retains its binding character on the recipient of the new covenant in a manner which does not apply to the sabbatical year or the year of jubilee" (O. Palmer Robertson, _The Christ of the Covenants_ [Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1980], 74).

15 The uncircumcised alien is specifically barred from observing the Passover (Exod 12:43-49). The alien is prohibited from eating leavened bread during the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Exod 12:19), but the examination of context undertaken above (see n. 6) indicates that the circumcised alien is specifically in view in this verse. The examination of the context of Lev 16:29 undertaken above (nn. 5-6) suggests the possibility that just the uncircumcised alien may be specifically in view in commands given with reference to the alien is apparently permitted and encouraged to observe the Feast of Harvest/Weeks (Deut 16:11, 12; 26:11), but he does not seem to be required to do so (Deut 16:16). The same situation seems to apply to alien observance of the Feast of Booths (Lev 22:42, 43; Deut 16:14, 16). In the Sabbatical Year, provision is made for the sustenance of the uncircumcised alien while the land lies fallow (Lev 25:6) and the uncircumcised alien attending the Feast of Booths that year is included in the comprehensive list of people who are to listen to the reading of the law (Deut 31:11, 12). The provision for the sustenance of the alien may be to ensure his survival as a landless individual during the fallow year. However, his debts are not remitted as the
offer one justification for the special place of honor sometimes accorded the Sabbath in Christian tradition *vis-a-vis* other OT sacred times.

Israelite's are, nor is the non-Israelite slave released after seven years, as the Israelite slave is (Deut 15:1-18). Likewise, in the Year of Jubilee, Israelite servants are to be released, whereas the slaves who are foreigners or the children of aliens may remain enslaved and be passed on from generation to generation (Lev 25:47-54). In none of these cases is there a categorical requirement for the uncircumcised alien to participate fully in the observance of a sacred time, such as we have found in this article with the weekly Sabbath.
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Exodus 21: 22-25 and the Abortion Debate
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As a member of the medical community in America, it is with special shame that this writer views the medically sanctioned, continuing slaughter of millions of unborn infants. George F. Will gently stated that "just as prenatal medicine was beginning to produce marvelous life-saving and life-enhancing achievements, Supreme Court justices made it the law of the land that the patients for such medicine have no right to life."\(^1\) The awful paradox is that despite tremendous scientific and technological advances improving the quality of life in the United States, an equally strong advance, the humanistic ethic has undermined the intrinsic value or sanctity of all human life.

Montgomery commented, "While all sins are equal, some sins are more equal than others.\(^2\) God's wrath, he wrote, seems particularly kindled against certain sinful acts. Uzzah (2 Sam. 6:6-7) or Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5) are examples. Along with His concern for the welfare of the family and the institution of marriage and for the welfare of the Jews, God seems particularly interested in the welfare of children. Jesus said, "Let the little children come to me, . . . for the kingdom of heaven belongs to such as these" (Matt. 19:14, NIV).

Destruction by the horror of being thrown into the sea with a millstone around the neck is associated with Babylon in Revelation 18:21 and with

those who do harm to little children in Matthew 18:1-6. A little child--unable to save himself and fully dependent--is, like the Jewish people, one of those weak things of this world chosen by God to "confound the wise." Those who harm them do so at their peril, both in time and in eternity.  

Many biologists, geneticists, and physicians agree that biological life begins at conception. The Scriptures clearly add to that foundation by teaching that God places value on unborn life a sacred (see for instance Exod. 4:11; Job 10:8-12; Ps. 139:13-16; Jer. 1:5; Matt. 1:18; and Luke 1:39-44). Waltke summarizes an insightful study of the Scriptures relating to the nature of fetal life by concluding that "on both theological and exegetical grounds. . . the body, the life, and the moral faculty of man originate simultaneously at conception."

That the early church fathers recognized this truth is evidenced in the writings of Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine, Clement of Alexandria, and others. The one who studies Old Testament law is surprised, therefore, in light of such evidence to find a paucity of legal information relating to fetal life. Kline observed, "The most significant thing about abortion legislation in Biblical law is that there is none." This lack of legislation relating to fetal life in Hebrew law is made even more significant by the finding several ancient Near Eastern codes of law that deal with the subject. For instance a Middle Assyrian law dated between 1450 B.C. and 1250 B.C. prescribed death by torture in cases of induced abortion. The text reads: "If a woman by her own deed has cast [aborted] that which is within her womb, and a charge has been brought and proved against her, they shall impale her and not bury her. If she dies from casting that which is in her womb, they shall impale her and not bury her." 

Does the silence of Old Testament law lead to the conclusion that God condones the practice of abortion? This question assumes

---

3 Ibid.
greater significance in light of the fact that such an eminent scholar as Waltke proposed such thinking.\textsuperscript{10} The "argument from silence that he proposed has been aptly dealt with by Scott\textsuperscript{11} and Crawley.\textsuperscript{12} In light of their comment Waltke was humble enough to retract his earlier conclusions.\textsuperscript{13}

The silence of Old Testament law referring to feticide does not mean God is unconcerned about fetus. Rather, it should lead one to examine the entire weight of scriptural evidence relating to fetal status. Crawley writes that the omission of feticide is "one indication, among many, of the intense regard felt by the Jewish people for parenthood and the future of their race."\textsuperscript{14} Kline states, "It was so unthinkable that an Israelite woman should desire an abortion that there was no need to mention offense in the criminal code."\textsuperscript{15}

There is, however, one passage in Old Testament Law that mentions the human fetus. The first of three Old Testament lex talionis (law of retribution) passages is Exodus 21:22-25: "And if men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child so that she has a miscarriage, yet there is no further injury, he shall surely be fined as the woman's husband may demand of him; and he shall pay as the judges decide. But if there is any further injury, then you shall appoint as a penalty life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise."

Differences in interpretation of this law have alternately led to both acceptance and rejection abortion by evangelicals.

If it can be established from Exodus 21:22-25 that the unborn fetus is qualitatively inferior to fully human life, then the Bible-believing Christian must give serious consideration to the contention that there are several circumstances that may be greater evils than abortion, such as mental disorder in the mother, the probability that the child will be born malformed, or the trauma pregnancy resulting from rape.\textsuperscript{16}

This article examines Exodus 21:22-25 from historical, legal, medical, and textual (linguistic) points of view to seek to reach conclusion on its meaning, and to answer the question, Does the Old Testament law condone abortion?

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., p. 100.
\textsuperscript{11} Graham Scott, "Abortion and the Incarnation," \textit{Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society} 17 (Winter 1974):
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics} (1914), s.v. "Feticide," by A. E. Crawley, 6:
\textsuperscript{13} Waltke, "Reflections from the Old Testament on Abortion," p. 3, note.
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics}, 6:55.
\textsuperscript{15} Kline, "Lex Talionis and the Human Fetus," p. 193.
The Context

The Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20:22-23:33) contains regulations concerned with fairness and justice in human relationships. Its laws deal specifically with issues such as treatment of slaves, theft and repayment, sexual mores, crimes of violence, and religious practice. While the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20:2-17) summarize the relationship of the covenant God to His people and relationships between His people, the Book of the Covenant amplifies this covenant law.

The passage in question is found in a series of laws concerned with cases of criminal negligence. These are *casuistic* laws (case laws) and as such are designed to answer particular legal questions. *Apodictic* laws on the other hand are designed to state universal truths (e.g., "Thou shalt not kill"). Exodus 21:18-19 deals with injury inflicted during a quarrel. Verses 20-21 concern punishment of slaves and manslaughter. Following the recitation of the *lex talionis* (vv. 22-25), then, are laws on specific injuries to slaves (vv. 26-27) and injuries inflicted by a goring ox (vv. 28-32). At first glance there seems little to relate these laws to one another. But their "casuistic" nature and the placement of the *lex talionis* in their midst does give them some affiliation.

The "law of retribution" is a well-documented legal formula of ancient Near Eastern legal codes. It is cited in the Mesopotamian law codes of Eshnunna (ca. 2000 B.C.), Lipit-Ishtar (ca. 1860 B.C.), and Hammurabi (1700 B.C.).\(^{17}\) In its literal application, exact retribution for the injury (or death) incurred was to be applied to the offender. That the law of talion did not always or even primarily require literal application, but merely application of its principle, has been accepted by numerous scholars.\(^{18}\) Fisher notes the following:

Even in prebiblical times, the principle of monetary substitution (payment of claims and damages) was gradually replacing literal, physical retribution. The code of Eshnunna, for example, states that "If a man bites the nose of another man and severs it, he shall pay one mina of silver. For an eye, one mina; for a tooth one-half mina; for a slap in the face ten shekels of silver."\(^{19}\)

Examination of the two other biblical *lex talionis* texts concurs with the idea that literal interpretation is not mandated. In


Leviticus 24:18 the "life-for-life" principle is applied to the situation in which an animal's life is taken, and this is interpreted three verses later by the statement that "the one who kills an animal shall make it good."

Likewise in Deuteronomy 19:5-21, which speaks of judging false witness, there is "not a simple literal equivalence between the terms of the talion penalty clause and all the variety of cases which a false witness might figure."20

The application of the law talion in Exodus 21 is similarly nonliteral. The kinds of injuries listed in the talion formula (e.g., a burn) are not ones likely to occur in a situation where two men struggle with each other and inadvertently strike a pregnant woman. Furthermore the immediate context refers to the situation in which men quarrel and injury is inflicted (vv. 18-19). Instead of the expected "wound for wound" formula, monetary compensation is mandated. Similarly the passage that follows (vv. 26-27) mandates decidedly nontalionic judgment: a slave's freedom for traumatic loss of eye or tooth.

Clearly then the lex talionis formula provides for exact justice, not for exact retribution. The punishment must be commensurate with the crime, neither too excessive nor too lenient. One might postulate on this basis that the penalty "life for life" might be amended in the case of some cases as well. Certainly the "ransom" allowed in the case of the negligent owner of a goring ox (v. 30) would seem at first glance to fit such a proposition. However, owner's negligence is taken into account here. Keil and Delitzsch note, "As this guilt, however, had not been incurred through an intentional crime, but had arisen simply from carelessness, he was allowed to redeem his forfeited life by payment of expiation money."21 And the homicide was not committed personally, with murderous intent, and therefore fell outside the restriction of Numbers 35:31-32, which allowed no ransom in such situation.

In the case of premeditated murder, even the altar of Yahweh could not protect the offender from the death penalty (Exod. 21:14). The application of lex talionis in Leviticus 24:17-21 makes it clear that while "life for life" may only require compensation if the death of an animal is involved, it most certainly requires capital punishment if a man is killed. Likewise the "cities of refuge" (Num. 35:9-21) were for those who had committed unintentional man-

---

slaughter. One guilty of premeditated murder had absolutely no
recourse. "You shall not take ransom for the life of a murderer who is
guilty of death, but he shall surely be put to death" (Num. 35:31). If
the guilty one fled to a city of refuge, the Law stated that "the el-
ders of his city shall send and take him from there and deliver him
into the hand of the avenger of blood, that he may die" (Deut. 19:12).

Every crime except for premeditated murder could be remedied
by restitution of some sort. Even manslaughter could be remedied
this way, if the motives of the perpetrator were not culpable.

As seen, lex talionis in Leviticus 24 applies the "life-for-life"
formula to the situation of intentional manslaughter. Its application
in the Deuteronomy 19:21 context is likewise to a situation where in-
tentional manslaughter occurs (vv. 11-13) or is intended by false
testimony (v. 19). While many have ascribed the lex talionis pas-
age in question (Exod. 21) to an event of unpremeditated injury,22 it
would seem evident from the biblical context of lex talionis usages
that an intentional event is being judged. A study of talionic law in
Babylonian and Islamic contexts similarly reveals its application
only in cases of intentional homicide and injury.23

In an excellent discussion of the intentional nature of this crime,
Layton analyzes the use of the Hebrew verb מ팟 in Exodus 21:22.24
The use of מ Potato implies a premeditated, physical struggle. This clari-
fies the enigma of a talionic punishment for the mortal injury in this
text. Only in light of intentionality does the use of lex talionis make
sense. Only in such a light can one understand the lack of any provi-
ion for the perpetrator's protection in a city of refuge.

The Case

The law in Exodus 21:22-25 is formulated in a twice-repeated "if
. . . then" fashion. The "if" part of each conditional statement, re-
ferred to as the protasis, speaks of the legal situation. The "then"
part, known as the apodosis, speaks of the legal consequence.25 The
difference between the first statement (v. 22) and the second state-
ment (vv. 23-25) revolves around the word מ Pot, translated "injury."

"The Abortion Epidemic: America's Silent Holocaust," Bibliotheca Sacra 139
October-December 1982): 348; R. Alan Cole, Exodus (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity
The first statement speaks to the situation where there is no ḥalak and a fine is mandated. The second statement speaks to a situation involving ḥalak and the lex talionis is applied.

The protasis in verse 22 sets forth the situation where men are fighting (most likely two men) with intent to cause injury. Unfortunately for all involved, a pregnant woman gets in the way of a blow and is struck. Whether she is an innocent bystander or the wife of one of the assailants is not clear from the text and is inconsequential to the outcome. What is of significance is what happens to the woman. After she is struck, "her children go out" (ḥAy, ḥAy; ʿAy, ʿAy). Because the understanding of this phrase is critical to a correct understanding of this passage, it bears close evaluation. Is this a case of premature live birth or of miscarriage?

The term ḥAy is the common Hebrew word for child or offspring. Why the plural form is used here is unclear. Keil and Delitzsch suggest that it is used in an indefinite sense, to indicate that there might be more than one child in the mother's womb. Kline proposes that the use of the plural is "peculiarly appropriate to an aborted fetus, especially at an earlier, more amorphous embryonic stage." House suggests that it is employed grammatically to indicate "natural products in an unnatural condition."

While ḥAy elsewhere always means "living child" or one capable of living outside the womb (Gen. 44:20; Isa. 9:6), the adopting of the plural in this case is a significant modifier indicating the unnatural state of affairs. But that the circumstances were unnatural does not adequately answer the controversial question of whether the baby "came out" alive or dead.

Many recent interpreters have concluded that the use of the verb xcAyA ("to go or come out") indicates nothing other than the birth of a living child. This conclusion is based on two key points: the Old Testament usage of xcAyA, and the availability of a specific term for miscarriage which was not employed. As for the latter, the Hebrew word for miscarriage is ḥody. This term is used frequently throughout the Old Testament (Gen. 31:38; Exod. 23:26; Hos. 9:14; 2 Kings 2:19; etc.) referring to the miscarriages of women, of animals, and of non-productive land. As for xcAyA it is utilized in reference to the normal births of Jacob and Esau (Gen. 25:25-26), Perez and Zerah (Gen. 38:27-30), and Jeremiah (Jer. 1:5; 20:18). When Job lamented about his own

28 House, "Miscarriage or Premature Birth?" p. 114.
29 Ellington, "Miscarriage or Premature Birth?" p. 337.
birth, he used this word (Job 3:11; 10:18). It has been purported that in every case where יָפָר is used in the context of childbirth it refers to a live birth except in Numbers 12:12. This verse is clearly speaking of a stillbirth, but Cottrell is correct in noting that it is not the verb that communicates the concept of death. In this verse the subject is not יָפָר, "child," but יֶהוֹלָל, "something dead." 31

While יָפָר normally refers to ordinary childbirth, it is a neutral term and may denote anything that "comes out" of the mother's womb. In Numbers 12:12 it refers to a nonviable fetus. In Job 3:11 it is used to describe neither an ordinary delivery nor a stillbirth, but a difficult delivery with resulting perinatal death of the infant, an all-too-common occurrence even today in areas that have inadequate obstetric care.

The word יָפָר as used in Exodus 21:22 may refer to other than a live birth. Kline concludes that "it is not demonstrable either that this language in itself must be understood with reference to a miscarriage or that it cannot be so understood." 34 He astutely notes that even those who allege that this must refer to a live birth take it to refer to a miscarriage when they come to the second conditional statement (v. 23). For here they relate the (possibly) fatal injury to both mother and child. 35 (To maintain that יָפָר must indicate a living child proves difficult at this same point, for a deadly injury to both would obviously result in a miscarriage or stillbirth.) This writer feels that the weight of evidence favors an interpretation of יָפָר in Exodus 21:22 as "miscarriage" and not "live birth." This conclusion is based on the following textual, historical, and ancient Near Eastern legal evidence and on medical evidence.

The Evidence

First, as already noted, the textual evidence does not mandate an interpretation of "live birth." In fact the Mishnah in its commentary on this Exodus 21 passage (Baba Kamma 5:4) uses this precise phrase "unequivocally in the sense of miscarriage." 36

31 Ellington, "Miscarriage or Premature Birth?" p. 336.
33 Ibid., p. 38, n. 35.
35 Ibid.
Second, the historical exegesis of the passage has universally given it the meaning of miscarriage. Waltke quite conclusively makes this point, citing a long list of ancient scholars.37

Third, a comparison with five ancient Near Eastern law codes in similar case law formulations reveal that all of them refer to miscarriage and not to premature birth.38 As Layton comments, These laws cannot be ignored, for virtually all Old Testament exegetes acknowledge the value of them in illuminating the meaning of the legal portions of the text. It would seem incredible for Exodus 21:22 to deal, with premature birth while the other five legal collections deal with miscarriage.39

Fourth, of particular interest to this writer is the medical data that speaks to the viability of infants delivered prematurely after a traumatic incident.

Studies show that trauma of all types occurs in five to ten percent of all pregnancies.40 In the early gestational period the uterus is, protected by the bones of the mother's pelvis and is fairly immune to trauma. In the second and third trimesters of pregnancy the enlarging uterus becomes more and more vulnerable. For this reason penetrating abdominal wounds have a high fetal mortality as pregnancy progresses. The situation described in Exodus, however, appears to indicate blunt injury and not the penetrating variety (a stab wound is not inferred).

Contrary to popular opinion, blunt abdominal trauma that is not severe usually causes no problem to the fetus, well-protected as it is within the uterus and amniotic "shock-absorber."41 Well over two-thirds of blunt trauma in pregnancy in the Western world happens in the course of motor vehicle accidents or physical assault. And even in the high-energy impact of the former, "despite its prominence... the uterus and contents stay intact most of the time."42

Thus it seems fair to assume that the blow delivered in the biblical case was significant. Kline builds a convincing argument for

39 Ibid.
such an understanding of the verb קָנַח ("to strike") based on its use in other scriptural texts.\textsuperscript{43}

The most common reason for fetal demise in such cases is the death of the mother with secondary death of the unborn child.\textsuperscript{44} Kline's suggestion that the mother dies from the blow but the baby lives\textsuperscript{45} is medically nonsensical: a cesarean section might save the baby's life if it were performed within five minutes of the mother's death. If the mother survives and the child is born (in the biblical case), this raises the question of the status of the baby which "comes out" prematurely.

First, it is important to note that injury to the fetus \textit{in utero} may be direct or indirect. Direct injury is rare, mainly occurring late in pregnancy when the head is deep in the pelvis and major trauma causes fetal skull fracture. A recent review of the obstetric literature revealed only 19 such reported cases.\textsuperscript{46} The outcome was almost universally fetal demise, except when cesarean section was performed. There is no report of that particular surgical procedure having been performed in the ancient Near East.

Indirect injury to the fetus occurs when there is disruption of the oxygen supply coming through the umbilical cord. Rarely trauma may result in uterine rupture with grave consequences for mother and infant without immediate surgical intervention. Such event occurs in less than one percent of trauma.\textsuperscript{47} More commonly, in six percent of blunt trauma during pregnancy there is an overt disruption of the normal connection between the placenta and the uterus.\textsuperscript{48} Fetal mortality in such cases, given the best obstetric and neonatal care available in the United States, is 34 percent.\textsuperscript{49} Another reference cites 30 to 68 percent fetal mortality.\textsuperscript{50} Without intravenous methods of fluid therapy for the mother and surgical intervention, it is obvious that the fetal outcome in the vast majority of these cases would be death. Timms states that "following uterine rupture or significant

\textsuperscript{43} Kline, "Lex Talionis and the Human Fetus," p. 198.
\textsuperscript{44} Katz, "Maternal Trauma during Pregnancy," p. 777.
\textsuperscript{45} Kline, "Lex Talionis and the Human Fetus," pp. 198-200.
\textsuperscript{46} Noelle Bowdler, "Fetal Skull Fracture and Brain Injury after a Maternal Automobile Accident," \textit{Journal of Reproductive Medicine} 32 (May 1987): 376
\textsuperscript{47} Katz, "Maternal Trauma during Pregnancy," pp. 777-78.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} Pritchard, MacDonald, and Gant, "Injuries and Malformation of the Fetus and Newborn Infant," pp. 396-97.
\textsuperscript{50} M. Rick Timms, "Blunt and Penetrating Trauma during Pregnancy: Four Cases," \textit{Journal of the Medical Association of Georgia} 74 (March 1983): 159-160.
placental separation, rapid exploration [surgically] and fetal delivery provide the only chance for fetal survival."

Less severe abdominal trauma may result in smaller disruptions of the placenta from the uterus, and less catastrophic outcomes. It is unknown how often an occult (self-limiting) placental separation takes place in these situations, but it may be the cause of common complaints such as "increased uterine activity" or slight cramping. Most of these cases progress to a normal outcome. In an excellent study of trauma in pregnancy Crosby suggests that if fetal oxygenation is impaired, labor or fetal death will occur within 48 hours.

Premature labor is a serious problem after trauma and is aggressively treated in appropriate cases these days with medication to stop uterine contractions. The lungs of the developing infant are not ready for life outside the womb until 33 to 34 weeks gestation (out of 40 weeks in a "full-term" pregnancy). In a nonhospital setting, the mortality rate of these infants is very high.

There are only a few instances, in a nontechnological era, in which blunt trauma serious enough to cause abortion of the fetus would result in a viable birth. If medical data has anything to say about Exodus 21:22, it indicates that the overwhelming probability for such a situation is an outcome of trauma-induced abortion with fetal demise.

The first conditional statement (Exod. 21:22) concludes with the pivotal phrase "yet there is no נָחָשׁ." This word נָחָשׁ is used only three other times in the Old Testament. All three occurrences are in the story of Joseph (Gen. 42:4, 38; 44:29) and describe a severe or deadly type of injury. Jackson, among others, has concluded that this passage must also be relating a mortal injury. But the evidence is not decisive. House comments in response:

Jackson should be tempered a little in his understanding of ason in view of the rarity of the word. He surely demonstrates that the word refers to severe or even fatal injury, but the text in Exodus, the only other section of the Old Testament using the word, could allow for ason to be applied to a lesser injury.

Since the infant has miscarried due to the blow, the "no injury" statement must apply to the mother. Occasionally a woman in such a

51 Ibid., p. 161.
54 House, "Miscarriage or Premature Birth?" p. 120.
circumstance would experience minimal external injury, but the placental disruption would nevertheless result in fetal death and miscarriage.

Some maintain that נִזְטַח must apply to both mother and child,\textsuperscript{55} particularly to the child because of the grammatical structure of the sentence.\textsuperscript{56} Others are equally convinced that the mother alone is referred to by נִזְטַח.\textsuperscript{57} The linguistic evidence is equivocal, and in light of the evidence illuminating one's understanding of the rest of the protasis, it becomes evident that "no נִזְטַח" applies to the mother.

### The Judgment

The apodosis of the first conditional statement (Exod. 21:22) gives the judgment to be rendered in such a case: A pregnant woman is struck inadvertently, in the course of a physical struggle in which men are intending to injure one another, and as a result of the abdominal blow she suffers a miscarriage. In such a case the perpetrator is to be fined as the woman's husband may demand of him, and "he shall pay as the judges decide."

The word "fine" has also been interpreted variously. Kline has expressed his opinion that the Hebrew word here, וָניָים might carry the more general meaning of "punishment" in any form.\textsuperscript{58} Taking that interpretation, he builds a case for the understanding that this punishment would often be death or a "ransom" to be paid in place of death. His conclusion is appealing:

It will appear that even if it were granted that the first penalty has reference to a miscarriage and the second penalty to has suffered by the woman, as the dominant interpretation suggests, it would still not follow that the penalty for the destruction of the fetus was different in kind or even in degree from the penalty for harming the woman.\textsuperscript{59}

However, the evidence is less than compelling for accepting such an understanding of the word וָניָים. In its other Old Testament applications it is used to denote the imposing of a monetary fine (Deut. 22:19; 2 Chron. 36:3). The noun also usually speaks of a monetary
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penalty.60 There are other Hebrew terms, furthermore, which might have been better used to imply physical retribution (e.g., מַכָּנָה "vengeance").

This fine was to be limited and enforced by "judges," as most interpreters have understood the final phrase. House quotes Morgenstern on this point:

It goes without saying, of course, that his law never contemplated that the husband could demand of the offending party any sum of money or any other compensation that he might desire, for then there could well be no limit to what he might claim. Some method of regulation of the demand of the husband, so that it might be kept within reasonable limits, was absolutely indispensable; and just this must have been provided for in the last two words of the sentence.61

Frame expresses discomfort with the idea that a mere fine should be sufficient compensation for, the loss of an unborn Hebrew child.62 While other ancient Near Eastern law codes required such, pecuniary compensation in similar circumstances, it seems incongruous that the Scriptures should present the fetus so clearly as fully human life (as noted earlier) and yet allow a fine here instead of life-for-life retribution.

Some have suggested the casuistic nature of the law sheds some light on this enigma.63 Casuistic law as designed to meet the needs of a particular case. The guilty party, though judged for an intentional crime by lex talionis in the case of the woman, did not strike her abdomen with murderous intent toward the fetus. Therefore in this case the legal decision was not the normal judgment for manslaughter or murder, but a fine. This would fall into the same class as the nearby case law involving the negligent ox-owner (Exod. 21:28-30). His goring ox was a repeat offender and finally gored someone to death. The ox was killed while the owner, though guilty, got off in some instances with a monetary settlement (a "ransom").

One problem with this argument is that the same, "intentionality" that made the offenders liable for the death of the mother should also have made the liable for the death of the fetus, if both were of equal status.

Perhaps it is more accurate to suggest that the Old Testament Law placed different value on different lives. The lives of slaves

61 Morgenstern, cited by House, "Miscarriage or Premature Birth; p. 122,
and aliens were repeatedly given a valuation less than, that of Hebrew citizens. For instance in the preceding case (Exod. 21:20) a slave beaten to death by his master. Instead of the phrase "he shall be put to death," as would have been the ruling for murder, the man was to be "punished" or "avenged." Some suggest that this meant he must be put to death, but this interpretation is doubtful. The next verse is more blunt: "If, however, [the slave] survives a day or two, no vengeance shall be taken; for he is his property" (v. 21).

Allen writes that since a fine was paid for the life of the slave--certainly a human being--in the same way the paying of a fine for the life of the fetus does not indicate a life that was less than fully human. He states, "The less severe penal relates more to the circumstances of the crime than of the kind of life that was lost." While agreeing with the truth of the former statement this writer feels that the logic is reversed in the latter. The circumstances (while of significance) are of less importance, not more. The kind of life lost--though without doubt fully human is of greater importance than the circumstances.

In the case of the goring ox circumstances are exactly the same for three different groups of fully human persons: Hebrew adults, Hebrew children, and slaves. The murderous ox is slaughtered in each case, indicating its blood-guiltiness in the taking of human life. But the culpable owner is in danger of losing his life only if the ox gored to death a free Hebrew person. The slave's life is simply exchanged for 30 shekels. Without question, the kind of life that was lost determines the difference in the severity of the penalty.

The punishment for illicit intercourse with a female slave presents the same scenario: The circumstances of the crime are identical, but the kind of person molested makes a difference when it comes to assigning a penalty. As Leviticus 19:20 states, "Now if a man lies carnally with a woman who is a slave acquired for another man, but who has in no way been redeemed, nor given her freedom, there shall be punishment; they shall not, however, be put to death, because she was not free."

Furthermore as recorded in Leviticus 27, the Lord gave Moses instructions for redeeming persons or items dedicated (enslaved) to the Lord by rash vows. In this passage a monetary value is assigned to individuals. While elsewhere the slave's life is valued at 30 shekels, here an adult Hebrew male is worth 50 shekels. The valuation of a Hebrew female was 30 shekels. Those either younger or older received a smaller valuation. For instance male children

---
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from one month of age up to five ears were given a substitutionary worth of five shekels, and female in the same age-group were valued at three shekels (Lev. 27:6). The priest would assign a redemption price for a person too poor to pay at the usual rate (v. 8).

The God of the Hebrews places high priority and value on all human life. It must be understood that "the moral nature of the Mosaic Law far surpassed the paganism of the other ancient Near Eastern law codes."66 The rights of slaves and others of inferior status were guarded carefully. But incongruous as it may seem, God chose to place a higher value on some lives than others. God chose Israel to be His own special people, and in so doing "chose against" the alien. God chose to value the life of a free Hebrew adult more highly than that of a slave. In the situation where lives were being vowed to the Lord, He placed a lesser value on women than men, on young children than adults. This should help one understand how in Exodus 21:22 the life of the fully human fetus might receive a monetary valuation instead of the life-for-life edict.

The Conclusion

The second conditional statement (Exod. 21:23-25) is now easily understood. If a pregnant woman were violently struck by men fighting together and she subsequently miscarried but suffered no personal injury, a fine was imposed on the guilty individual. If there were any ὁδὸς (grave injury) to the woman, then the lex talionis applied. If she died, as would frequently occur in such a circumstance, life for life was the penalty. For a lesser injury, the punishment was to be in measure, commensurate with the damage done.

It has been shown that the unborn fetus was regarded as fully human life from the time of conception. However, the valuation placed on the unborn was less than that placed on a Hebrew adult or child. Analogously in the context of the passage a lesser value given to the slave. Does this mean, as Cottrell has stated, that there may be rationale for "therapeutic" abortion? Might there circumstances in which the endangered psycho-social health of the mother or the probability of fetal malformation would be greater evils than abortion?

Based on this review of pertinent Scripture, the writer does not believe so. As Frame has written, "Doubtless the unborn child, like the slave, had a lesser status in Israelite society than other persons. It cannot be demonstrated, however, that this lesser status was a

status of nonpersonhood. And that is the point at issue."67 Fetal life is fully human life. The only circumstance that presents a greater "evil" than abortion (and thus would weigh in favor of abortion based on the lesser status of the fetus) is the unusual situation where the gestation presents a life-threatening danger to the mother (one of greater status). Fortunately such an occurrence is exceedingly rare these days, except in the form of ectopic pregnancy.

Jones feels this very situation is the downfall of the principle of "fetal inviolability," and thus he postulates a number of situations in which abortion might not be the greatest evil.68 But his position, has been shown, is not the biblical one. Opting to sacrifice one life in order to save another from death is entirely different from destroying one life in order to save another from distress or discomfort.

It is worth noting that this casuistic law was written to meet the needs of a particular set of events. Those events were wholly different from the events that today lead to an elective abortion. In the latter situation, it is the mother herself who willingly submits to aggression against the human life within her. As Allen has written:

On no account, then, may this text in the Law of Moses be used as a rationale for abortion on demand as practiced today. The circumstances are too different to be compared. How can we compare the accidental miscarriage of a woman caught up in a street brawl to the decision of a woman today to go to one of the clinics that specializes in the purposeful termination of life? There simply is no parallel in he Bible, nor does there seem to be any biblical justification for the current practice of abortion in our culture.69

In any interpretation Exodus 21:22-25 treats the destruction of the unborn child as an unjust and illegal action. Frame is correct in stating that "it is perverse indeed to attempt to justify abortion by reference to a passage that condemns precisely the sort of destruction performed by the abortionist.70 May the truth of Scripture touch people's hearts today and give them renewed motivation to love life as God does and to honor the weak of this world as He honors them.

The etymology of this phrase, of these terms, cannot be established with any degree of finality. This has resulted in a wide variety of explanations regarding both their nature and their use. It would also appear that the etymology has been determined by the theory that is held, so that if these are equated with lots, then the words are made to be opposites rather than similarities. Nathan Isaacs makes a pertinent comment:

If we turn to etymology for assistance, we are not only on uncertain ground, but when Bab. (sic) and other foreign words are brought in to bolster up a theory about anything so little understood as the Urim and Thummim, we are on dangerous ground.¹

Basically there are two main views which prevail. (1) That מִיְּרָעָא is derived from רָעָא, therefore meaning "lights," and that מִיְּמָא is derived from מָא, thus meaning "Perfections." The translations would then be "lights and perfections," or some similar sounding phrase.² This, almost hendiadysitic concept, appears in the Vulgate and Septuagint translations as well.³ (2) That הָרָא is derived from רָא, "to curse" and being thereby an antonym to מִיְּמָא.⁴ The arbitrary translations of the various versions could best have been left as transliterations.⁵ We do not know what the name meant in ancient times, nor what the objects looked like.⁶

Direct Biblical References
Exodus 28:30; Leviticus 8:8

Several facts can be dearly deduced from the text. (1) Moses was to put them into (ליֶא נֹעְפָה) the breastplate. The setting of the precious stones has been described in the preceding verses. They are mounted on the breastplate, whereas Moses put these "in" after Aaron was dressed in his
high-priestly garments. (2) That these are probably two separate objects. The definite article and sign of the definite object are used with both nouns. (3) That these were familiar terms and/or objects to Moses so that no further explanation was called for, (4) that these were an essential part of the regalia of the High-Priest when he entered the Holy Place and came into the presence of the Lord. Aaron now carries on his person "the judgment of the sons of Israel over his heart before the Lord continually (NASB)." מְשַׁמֵּר denotes judgment both in the concrete sense of a verdict or decision and also in the more abstract form of the process of making it.  

Numbers 27:21

Here Moses commissions Joshua as his successor: the new leader of the nation. However Joshua was distinctly different from Moses in the leadership role. Moses was the law-giver and absolute governor who had a special relationship with God (cf. Deut. 34:10), whereas Joshua was to operate through the High Priest in a way in which Moses did not have to do. Leon Wood speaks of Joshua having to regularly consult Eleazar. Such an inquiry was to be carried out "before the Lord" by the means of the Urim (an obvious abbreviation for the compound term). The next phrase, כִּי לְ, can refer to either Joshua, Eleazar, or God. This writer believes that the best alternative is that of Yahweh, the real king of Israel. Moses sought for a leader who would lead the people in and out like a shepherd the sheep (v. 17). Here was their leader moving at the Divine command! They followed their duly appointed shepherd. One cannot help but think of the military campaigns to conquer the Promised Land, and the various movements of the nation as she entered into that Land. This dearly "intimates its use for the guidance and direction of Israel."

Deuteronomy 33:8

Moses blessed the tribe of Levi, and spoke of the Urim and Thummim (here inverted in order) as the right of Levi, who had stood loyally, as represented in Aaron, by the side of Moses at Rephidim (Ex. 17:1-7; Num. 20:2-13), and who had demonstrated, collectively, their loyalty to the Lord against the golden calf worship at Sinai (Ex. 32:26-29).

They could thus be classified as God's "holy one," a tribe set apart for His service. Even though the Urim was only used by the High Priest, being in his garment only, it could still be represented as the right of the tribe.
1 Samuel 28

The Lord did not answer Saul by any of the means through which His will was discerned during that period of Israel's history. This verse cannot be used as evidence for a "no" answer to an inquiry. Saul had already been rejected as the king of Israel by the Lord, and the Holy Spirit had been taken from him and had been given to David (1 Sam. 16). Furthermore the priests had been slain on Saul's orders at the city of Nob and the successor to the High Priest, Abiathar, had escaped to David with the ephod.

Saul's time and privilege of asking guidance in leading Israel had apparently come to an end. The parallel passage, 1 Chron. 10:14, states that Saul did not inquire of the Lord, and died because he inquired of the medium at Endor. His attitude, or motive in asking was of such a nature that according to the Divine interpretation it was as though he had not inquired at all.

The Urim was definitely, according to this verse another form of God's revelation to the leader of the theocratic nation.

Ezra 2:63; Nehemiah 7:65

Zerubbabel ruled that the question of the priests who had lost their credentials for office could not be decided without the Urim. They were, therefore, excluded from the performance of priestly duties. Zerubbabel's words do suggest that he understood the Urim and Thummim to be a means of discerning God's decision in matters about which the leaders could not decide because of the lack of information. The matter of appointing priests was a crucial one because according to the Law they must be of the tribe of Levi. No civil leader could ever legislate in this respect, especially if they were setting out to diligently obey His word. Why did he not ask of a prophet? There is no immediate answer to that question. Further, why make such a statement when the various accouterments and regalia for operating in the Temple had all been destroyed in 586 B.C."

There certainly was no possibility of a priest in the future standing up with the Urim. It was Zerrubabel's way of stating that so far as they could determine there was no other possible recourse than that those men should be excluded from the priesthood.

Inquiries of the Lord

Besides these direct statements there are other passages in which the use of the Urim, even though not specifically stated, is possible. It must be noted that according to Moses' command Joshua was to inquire through the
High Priest who bore the Urim and Thummim, so that, at the least, these two, the Priest and the Breastplate, must be present in such an inquiry. לְהֵמָּה occurs in a number of instances in which the leader, or in the absence of an appointed leader, the people collectively, sought guidance from the Lord.

David's Inquiries

There is more of this activity on the part of David recorded in Scripture than for any other individual leader of any other period of Israel's history.

The High Priest and the ephod

Abiathar, whose father, Ahimelech, had been slain by Doeg the Edomite at the city of Nob, had escaped the massacre and fled to David. He was now the legitimate high priest (1 Sam. 22). He had brought the ephod with him to David. At Keilah David instructs Abiathar to bring the ephod to him, and he proceeds to ask guidance and counsel of God in regard to the military activity at Keilah and the threat of Saul's approach. The ephod should be considered as identical with the breastplate of judgment because the instructions for the binding of the breastplate to the ephod were such that the breastplate was not to be parted from the ephod (garment) (Ex. 28:28; 39:21), so that the term "ephod" could quite conceivably come to embrace the whole composite unit of ephod and the breastplate affixed to it. The question of the man of God to Eli (1 Sam. 2:28) included in the list of priestly duties the carrying of the ephod before Jehovah. This could only mean the breastplate of judgment. So the presence of the priest and the ephod (which includes the Urim and Thummim) leaves no alternative but to classify these inquiries of David as using that God-appointed means of consultation through the high priest. Furthermore, it is hard to conceive of David as deliberately doing that which was in direct violation of the Law and using an incorrect, unsanctioned instrument to discern the will of God. There is no indication of rebuke for these inquiries conducted through the ephod. David actually called for the ephod on two specific occasions (1 Sam. 23:9f; 30:7f). However, all the inquiries of 1 Sam. 23 are carried out in the context of the priest and ephod being present. Verse 6 is a supplementary explanation relative to the inquiry of the Lord by David.

Thus, it is only the 2 Samuel passages which have no indication of the presence of the high priest and the ephod. But the presence of the introductory formula לְהֵמָּה would strongly suggest that a similar procedure has taken place. This formula occurs every time, except in
the middle of the Keilah narrative. The account, after the command to bring the ephod, continues with דַּבָּק which introduces the content of David's prayer to God.18

There is only one instance of information sought which was not military in nature, i.e. where should the new capital of Judah be situated?

The beginning of his inquiries

When did David begin to make these inquiries of the Lord? The passages mentioned above all occur after the arrival of the high priest into David's camp. One passage, at first, seems to suggest that David was already frequently asking of God through the high priest (1 Sam. 22:9f). The emphasis is normally placed on the verb "begin" (לָהַ א and being rendered: "Is today the first time that I have inquired of God for him?"

But that word לָהַ א followed by a construct infinitive can have the emphasis on both the verb and its succeeding infinitive--"Did I begin to inquire..."--not in the sense of having done it already but with the sense of asking whether the king believes that he had made a start of doing it then. Certainly one could wish for a more direct and simple answer by Ahimelech. George Caird refers to this syntactical format and calls it a common Hebrew idiom reinforcing the main verb that follows so that it now means, "Have I indeed inquired of God for him today?"19 This makes more sense in the light of what follows--"Far be it from me!"

In effect he states, "I have not begun to inquire at all," which reads better than, "Far be it from me to do this for the first time today." He also goes further to categorically deny knowing anything of the charge leveled against him. Doeg, the Edomite, convinced Saul of the conspiracy by adding what the narrative in the previous chapter does not even hint at, namely, that Ahimelech had inquired of the Lord for David. All the parties to the interrogation knew the implication of the charge. If you inquired of God for him then you are admitting that David is the king and Saul is not. Perhaps this explains something of the fear which Ahimelech felt at the presence of David, and the reason for his carefully worded answer. Henry Smith in the ICC really separates the answer into two parts aimed at two parts of the charge, i.e. the fact of the inquiry is not to be denied, but the intention of conspiracy is to be strongly denied.20

However, Ahimelech does seem to have pinpointed the main thrust of the indictment: the issue is not aid for David, which he could have given to him seeing that he was a known official representative of the king (v. 14), but the issue is the priestly recognition of kingship.
Craigen: Urim and Thummim

The position of David
According to 1 Samuel 16, God had rejected Saul as king and had anointed His new king with the Holy Spirit. Samuel then on the instructions of the Lord anoints David as the king in the presence of his brothers. He is the one now empowered by the Spirit for the assigned task of ruling over God's people. As such, God's guidance pertains to David and not to Saul.

Other Inquiries

By Joshua
Joshua and the elders were deceived by the Gibeonites because they had "not asked for the counsel of the Lord" (9:14 "ןַּאֲקָתָא֣ יִֽיהָ֑ו לְ֥א שָׁאֵל֙"). The only explanation is to look back to the charge given to Joshua--ask through the Urim. This was a question of vital importance which had a direct bearing on their properly fulfilling the commandments of God in regard to the conquest of the land and the death of the inhabitants.

The question of Achan will be dealt with under lots.

In the Judges period
The sons of Israel inquired regarding the continuation of their war against the Canaanites (1:1-2). These men were close enough to the time of Joshua, and under the influence of Phinehas, the high priest, that they would have followed the procedure used by Joshua (cf. Josh. 24:31).

Later the sons of Israel would again inquire regarding the civil war with Benjamin (20:18f), and as to who would lead them into the battle. The following facts are obvious: (1) Phinehas, the high priest, fulfilled the function of inquirer, even though the people are also spoken of as making the inquiry, (2) the Ark of the covenant was at Bethel (3) there were three positive answers: yet two military failures, and (4) the introductory formula of נַאֲקָתָא֣ יִֽיהָ֑ו בְּֽאֶלְּלוֹ֔יִם is used on two occasions, but נַאֲקָתָא֣ בְּֽיִוֹוהָ֑ו on the first occasion of asking. Weeping, fasting, and offering of sacrifices were necessary before they were promised victory.

A host of questions remain unanswered. Should they have asked if victory was theirs despite their overwhelming numbers? Must there be an attitude of repentance and humility? Does the change of the name of God indicate anything? Was the accompanying activity, weeping, fasting, etc., an attempt to secure God's favor?

The presence of the Ark testified to the presence of the Lord, before Whom the high priest was to stand when making such an inquiry. After the Ark was captured by the Philistines, or access to it was not possible, the presence of the high priest with the ephod was apparently enough.
Joshua and the people in the judges period the Ark and the Tabernacle were close at hand.

By Saul

Besides the account in 1 Samuel 28 in which Saul sought revelation in vain, 1 Samuel 14 is the only other instance of an attempted inquiry by him as the king and before his rejection by God from that position. Saul here commanded Ahijah, the high priest, to bring the "ark of God" to him, or to that place (v. 18). The Septuagint retroverts as ἐφούδα (prosagage for ephod) and this has been taken as the correct reading, thus permitting scholars to postulate the concept of sacred lots because Saul said to the priest "Withdraw thy hand." A comparison with 1 Kings 2:26 does seem to make "ephod" read as "ark" because Abiathar certainly did not carry the "ark" for David while he was a refugee. However the MT also reads Ἐκρηξα at 1 Kings 2:26. One must wonder then whether Solomon was perhaps referring to that important move of the Ark from Obed-edom's house to Jerusalem, and a mover over which Abiathar as the high priest would have presided.

Furthermore, is it possible that Saul had brought the Ark to the battlefield instead of going to where it was, and thus he was able to command it to be brought to him? Whatever the answer, at least Saul knew that the symbol of the right of the high priest to ask of God was a necessary prerequisite before he could initiate that activity. The command to withdraw the hand can be taken as a peremptory, "Cancel that order."

Later in this same chapter, Ahijah advises Saul to inquire of the Lord, but in vain. No answer. The mechanics of receiving an answer, or of knowing that none was forthcoming, still remain shrouded in secrecy. Was this silence the result of sin, as Saul intimates in vv. 38f, or was it the result of a disregard for the proper procedure?

In addition, Saul had already caused the people to sin by his rashly uttered oath which prevented them from eating so that now at the sight of cattle they were driven to kill and eat the meat with the blood in it. Further, Saul had already made up his mind to go and spoil the Philistines and only the advice of the priest hold's him back to make the inquiry, he is perhaps already exhibiting that attitude which was defined in 1 Chron. 10:14. One thing is clear and that is that Saul understood that something was wrong.

The question of Urim and Thummim being equal to lots arises fundamentally from this passage as it appears in the Septuagint, which reads (in English):

And Saul said unto Yahweh, God of Israel, "Why hast thou not answered thy servant this day? If this inquiry is
in me or in my son Jonathan, Oh Yahweh, God of Israel, give Urim; but if this iniquity is in thy people Israel, give Thummim."  

Robertson, and others, favor this rendering and believe it gives credence to the Urim and Thummim as being utilized to indicate "yes" or "no" to specific questions. The answers are really the result of a sacred lot-casting. The idea is that the Urim and Thummim were either thrown on the ground or pulled out of the breastplate pouch.

The use of the verbs לְפִי and דַּקְלֵי would be the first and only time that they are used in the context of inquiring of the Lord. They do appear in the contexts of lot-casting but never in those clear instances of Urim and Thummim being used. Further, in every other clear instance of Urim and Thummim the answers are more than that which is decided by lot-casting (see below). Lindblom, interestingly enough, rejects the Septuagint version and argues for the superiority of the MT, because he feels that Saul has reverted from priestly lot-casting (which would be Urim and Thummim) to civil lot-casting. He determines this on the basis of who was involved in the episode.

It was not particular individual who performed the lot-casting, it was a group; behind the procedure stood the leaders of the army, i.e. a group of laymen. The priest had no function at all.

He therefore translates the controversial מְמִן הָבָא as "give a true decision." The same distinction can be used in another way. Saul did inquire through the Urim and Thummim, but when no reply was forthcoming he switched procedures to that of lot-casting, in order to isolate the guilty party whom he felt had prejudiced his inquiry of the Lord. There is no reason why he should not have prefaced this activity with a prayer, especially as he considered it to be such a serious and solemn affair. Thus he prayed for a true decision to be given by the lots. When בָּרוּ is used as a neuter adjective it is equal to a substantive, meaning "what is complete, entirely in accord with truth and fact."

The fact that the lots fell on Jonathan who was the guilty party can be explained in terms of God's sovereignty (cf. Proverbs 16:33) and not necessarily in terms of God responding to the prayer of Saul as though this were the normal procedure in the land.

Admittedly this passage is a problem and any definitive conclusion must try to take it into account. But a final conclusion on the nature and use of the Urim and Thummim, at the same time, cannot rest solely on a textually debatable passage.
By Samuel

The nature of the answer given by the Lord in 1 Samuel 10:22 is more suitable to Urim and Thummim than the casting of lots. Here, too, it was the people who desired to know the whereabouts of their newly appointed king. The procedure followed until this point of not being able to locate Saul had been by lot (v. 20 פַּטֹּר פַּטֹּר: Each tribe, family, etc. was brought near, and one from among them was taken. Now the language changes and that introductory formula appears at the head of the people's question, why not inserted between those two words.

If this is an adverb expressing a continuance of the previous action then there is a problem of having to make the process of lots be the same as inquiring of the Lord, e.g. NASB translation, "Therefore they inquired further of the Lord." But if the waw consecutive at the beginning, of v. 22 is pleonastic, then the resultant translation can avoid the problem: "Yet they inquired of the Lord." Frankly, there does not appear to have been any need to have made such an inquiry at all, for they could have sent for Saul and brought him forward.

Lindblom concurs that v. 22 cannot be lot-casting and concludes that a "cult-prophet" was speaking.

Answers to Sacred Lots?

Leon Wood reasons that no occasion clearly depicts a message of greater length than the mere affirmation. Although Wood does not accept the idea of two marked stones representing a "yes" and "no" type reply, he, nonetheless, prefers no audible reply through the priest, but argues for a glowing of the stones if the reply was affirmative, otherwise the question would be rephrased until the affirmative glow occurred. How long he went on trying different variations of that question before deciding that it was in vain just cannot be known. It would seem far more likely that the reply was either immediate or not at all. There is no occasion of a negative answer in the Scriptures.

The answers to all of the inquiries noted above are far more than that which would be expected by way of a yes/no indication or by way of a yes-only-and-rephrase-the-question-type procedure (see appendix). Wood's assessment appears to suggest that the words recorded in the text as being the actual words of the Lord are a reworked version of an affirmative glow! Consistently the passages record the words of the Lord, but always more than just "yes."
The identification of the Urim and Thummim with the sacred lots appears to have some possibility, but there are serious difficulties with this view due to the fact that the answers ascribed to the Urim and Thummim are not always equivalent to a "yes" or "no" answer.\(^{39}\)

Leon Wood also adds that the information given in 1 Sam.10:22 ("Behold, he is hiding himself by the baggage") could have been given "by affirmation to a few questions."\(^{40}\) H. Wheeler Robinson adds an interesting little footnote to the effect that private communication with S. R. Driver showed that the latter felt that Urim was connected with an Accadian u'uru (to give an oracular response), but that he did not think of u'uru as ever referring to lot-casting.\(^{41}\)

This writer finds it difficult to accept the author of 1 and 2 Samuel, and of Judges 8 introducing into the text a personal reply of Yahweh, in place of some impersonal mechanically indicated answer. The words of J. Barton Payne are most pertinent:

The judgment of the Urim would thus signify the personal revelation that God granted to the one who wore the high priestly breastplate. In such a way God would answer the official questions that were brought in before the cloud of His presence. Those who question the reality of such supernatural communications generally consider the Urim and Thummim to have been some kind of dice, a sort of sacred lottery. It is true, of course, that lots were known to Israel at this time as a means of making property distributions (Num. 26:55, 56). But dice-casting as a regular means of divine guidance smacks of magic in a way that is unworthy of God's word. 1 Samuel 28:6, moreover, lists Urim in a category that is between dreams and prophets. It suggests that urim is simply another form of God's personal revelation, namely, that which is mediated through priests (cf. Deut. 33:8, 10).\(^{42}\)

**Its Cessation**

There is no further mention of the Urim and Thummim after the time of David until the post-exilic references in Ezra and Nehemiah. Several reasons, which arise from an overview of Israel's history, can be put forward: (1) The increased activity on the part of the prophets, to whom the kings, on more than one occasion, resorted for advice on the affairs of the
nation. Indeed the prophets became the "immediate spokesmen of God, conveying the knowledge of His will to the king."  

(2) The silence of the prophets in calling the leaders to make use of the Urim and Thummim, not withstanding that they called all in Israel to obey the statutes and commandments of the Lord God, (3) the introduction of pagan idols into the Temple during the reign of Solomon, and the consequent corruption of the priesthood and/or rituals associated there with, (4) the God-given wisdom of Solomon to rule over the people, no doubt, obviated his need of directing revelation (cf. 1 Kings 3:5f), (5) the establishment of the kingdom, historically, by David brought an end to that form of revelation which guided the affairs of God's chosen nation through the chosen leaders at times of national crises.  

Summary  

(1) The Urim and Thummim, whatever their material likeness, were not images or teraphim, because these were prohibited by God's own Law. Wood's suggestion that these were precious stones because that would fit the jewel motif of the ornate breastplate is plausible.  

(2) There is not sufficient evidence to support these being used as lots cast on the ground, or utilized in some other way by being withdrawn from the pouch formed by the doubled fold of the breastplate. It is acknowledged that I Samuel 14 is a problem passage in this regard.  

(3) The consistent pattern is an inquiry of the Lord through the high priest who had the Urim and Thummim; understanding that ephod can be identified with the breastplate.  

(4) The persons who asked of God were all divinely-appointed leaders of the theocratic nation. The judges period would be the exception in that the people acted collectively in the absence of an appointed leader. Yoma 7:5 in the Mishnah reads, "In these breastplate et al. were the Urim and the Thummim inquired of, and they were not inquired of for a common person, but only for the king, for the court and for one of whom the congregation had need."  

Indeed there is no evidence of these being used on behalf of a private individual. The function of the priest as teachers of the Law, and the establishment of proper procedure for appeal to the Central Sanctuary in the event of a problem beyond the wisdom of the local priests, and the harsh penalties for refusal to obey the decision handed down at the Central Sanctuary, would definitely seem to support this idea (cf. Deut. 17:8-13). Israel was to obey and meditate upon the Word of God in order to make her way successful and prosperous. The ordinary man did not need this type of directing revelation.  

(5) The Urim and Thummim, being in the breastplate, which itself symbolically represented the right of the high priest to stand before God on
behalf of His people, was also symbolical. It represented the right of this same priest to request guidance for the leader, who could not approach God directly but had to come via the God-ordained religious structure of the nation. After Moses the leadership role functioned at a different level, i.e. they were no longer the Lawgiver, but had to function within the context of that Law, and could never be totally independent from it.

Whatever was done with the objects would have been symbolic and complimentary to the whole process of inquiry. The problem of the function of the objects, therefore, remains unsolved until further archaeological data are forthcoming.48

(6) The content of revelation, the mode of which cannot be explained, was precise and pointed, aimed at answering an immediate situation. "In no sense did it embody principles of permanent validity applicable to later situations or capable of reinterpretation."49 Thus it was a directing revelation.

(7) The replies were more than a simple "yes" and were, so far as can be ascertained, the actual word of God given in reply. If "at His command" in Exodus 28:30 does refer to Yahweh, then somehow the priest passed on the direct command of God, receiving it in the same way as did the prophets.

### APPENDIX

Inquiries of the Lord

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judg.</td>
<td>Who shall go up first for us against the Canaanites to fight against them?</td>
<td>Judah shall go up behold I have given the land into his hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg.</td>
<td>Who shall go up first for us to battle against the sons of Benjamin?</td>
<td>Judah shall go up first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam.</td>
<td>Has the man come yet? himself in the baggage.</td>
<td>Behold, he is hiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam.</td>
<td>Shall I go up and attack the Philistines?</td>
<td>Go, and attack the Philistines, and deliver Keilah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam.</td>
<td>Shall I go up and attack the Philistines?</td>
<td>Arise, go down to Keilah for will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 23:10, 11</td>
<td>0 Lord God of Israel, thy servant has heard for certain that Saul is seeking to come to Keilah to destroy the city on my account. Will the men of Keilah surrender me into his hand? Will Saul come down just as thy servant has heard?</td>
<td>(Repeated by David) give the Philistines into your hand. He will come down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 23:12</td>
<td>Will the men of Keilah surrender me and my men into the hand of Saul?</td>
<td>They will surrender to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam.</td>
<td>Shall I pursue this hand? Shall I overtake them?</td>
<td>Pursue, for you shall surely rescue them all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 2:1</td>
<td>Shall I go up to one of the cities of Judah? Where shall I go up?</td>
<td>Go up. To Hebron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 5:19</td>
<td>Shall I go up against the Philistines? Wilt thou give them into my hand?</td>
<td>Go up, for I will certainly give the Philistines into your hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. (Inquiry not stated) 5:23</td>
<td>Troubled at the presence of the Philistines in the valley of Rephaim.</td>
<td>You shall not go directly up; circle around behind them in front of the balsam trees. And it shall be, when you hear the sound of marching in the balsam trees, then you shall act promptly, for then the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lord will have gone out before you to strike the army of the Philistines.
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"And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah I was not known to them." (Ex. 6:3 A.S.V.)

Anyone who has committed himself to a serious study of the Old Testament is aware of the fact that certain portions of Old Testament history and in particular certain verses have become focal points of critical and theological investigation. The text under consideration is one such text. To a rather large group of Old Testament scholars this verse has been more or less the basic proof text for the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch. Others have either ignored a treatment of the verse or proposed unsupported solutions to the problems it presents. For the conservative scholar, however, it gives unmeasurable light into the relation of the Patriarchs to their God; and more generally, the method and scope of Divine revelation in the Old Testament.

Because Exodus 6:3 has become a basic proof text for the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch, it is imperative that we briefly consider this very popular theory. This theory originated with Jean Astruc, a French physician, who, by the way, did not deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. In his famous treatise, Conjectures Concerning the Original Memoranda which it Appears Moses Used to Compose the Book of Genesis, Astruc proposed that on the basis of the use of divine names two basic documents could be distinguished: one called A (using Elohim) and B (employing Yahweh). It is interesting to note that this idea was applied to Genesis alone. It was not until 1791 that the theory was applied to the entire Pentateuch by Eichhorn. From this time on the variant uses of the Divine names were employed as a basis for distinguishing various documents. The theory gained popularity as the years passed and other methods were also employed to distinguish source material for the Pentateuch. The documentary analysis reached its peak under the leadership of Julius Wellhausen, who died in 1918.

This system as it is held today has basically four source documents: (J) Yahwist, presumed to have been written about 850 B.C., (E) or Elohist, about 750 B.C., (D) or Deuteronomy about 620 B.C. and (P) in the completed Pentateuch about 500 B.C.

Unlike the view of Astruc, those who advocate this theory today deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

Since the days of Wellhausen, there have been many modifications to this classic form of literary criticism of the Pentateuch. The present day efforts are to assume the existence of the documents and extend the analysis even further, that is, back to the "traditions" which are contained in the documents. In this monograph, we shall not endeavor to examine this latter effort in Old Testament criticism. Our major concern is with the basic four document analysis which underlies most of the present day Pentateuchal criticism.
With this rather brief introduction let us proceed to the problems of the text itself.

1. **MINOR PROBLEM:** What is the significance of the name "El-Shaddai" in relation to the Patriarchs?

   There are two basic views in regard to this Problem. We shall consider each with a brief evaluation.

   **A. The Liberal View:** The liberal view generally holds that this name for God is to be traced back to a natural origin. It holds its origin to be like that of the tribal deities of the nations that surrounded the children of Israel in their early history. This view contends that El Shaddai represents a primitive form of worship among the Patriarchs. Their worship, according to this view, was basically the same as the other nations except for the fact that some of their ideas and moral codes were in some aspects higher.

   There are many views as to the etymology of this title among liberal scholars, but the one most commonly held is that "Shaddai" comes from the Babylonian "Sadda'u," the gentilic of Sadu, Sadder, the regular word for mountain. The chief defender of this view is Albright. Another writer states the liberal position in the following words:

   When the Hebrews left Mesopotamia, they brought with them a religion which in many respects was like the nature religion of the Fertile Crescent... Apparently their chief god was known as Shaddai (or El Shaddai), which means "the one of the mountains"—a mountain deity or storm deity usually known by the title Baal (lord) among the Canaanites.

   The liberal view, as previously noted, holds that El-Shaddai was a humanly-conceived mountain god of the Israelites. The relation of El-Shaddai to the Patriarchs, therefore, was merely as a native god, who was only one of many such gods of the land. While this view is extremely popular among the liberal critics, it is not a strong view in the light of Biblical evidence. The refutation of this view is two fold: First, it is a view conceived and based upon a false assumption: namely, that monotheistic religion is a natural evolutionary product of human thought. To this we would reply that religious evolution, upon which this concept is built, is not a proven theory, but a hypothesis; it does not, therefore, provide a sound basis for the liberal view of developed monotheism. Secondly, the Biblical evidence is most clearly against the view that man "conceived" or "became aware" of high moral and religious concepts. The liberal view disregards the many texts which clearly point out the fact that man in his sinful, fallen state, cannot conceive of, and will not seek after a Holy God. (Psalm 14, Romans 3:11-18). Furthermore, this view of the name El-Shaddai does not fit any context in which it appears unless it is forced against the natural reading of the text. The textual and contextual evidence are totally against the idea of this being a "mountain deity."

   If the liberal contention were true, we should expect to find indications of a lower moral and religious idea in the use of this name, but such is not the case. The same moral and religious concepts are associated with this name as with the name Yahweh. For example, the blessing is the same (Genesis 17:1). Notice in this text Yahweh says "I am El-Shaddai." It would seem from this statement that identity and equality are asserted of both these names. The moral demand is
"walk before me, and be thou perfect." To contend that Shaddai is merely a mountain deity is to disregard the place the name is given in the Scriptures. Also, in this regard, it should be observed that in some contexts the names Yahweh and El-Shaddai are used alternately with equal majesty and holiness (cf. Ruth 1:20f.).

It should also be noted that this view fails to provide a motive and a reason why the other nations did not evolve into monotheistic concepts. How did Israel, a small nation surrounded by idolatry and sin, rise above nature worship and arrive at a high monotheism while the other nations did not? Without the fact of Divine intervention and revelation, no reasonable answer is possible. On the basis of these facts, and the positive evidence to be presented, the writer considers the liberal view false and untenable.

B. The Conservative view: The basic understanding of the conservative view is that the name "El Shaddai" is of divine, not natural origin. The name, it is asserted, was revealed by God, and not conceived by man. While all conservative scholars agree on this basic principle, there is little agreement as to the etymology and significance of this name in relation to the patriarchs. There are four basic views in this regard. The first view is that Shaddai comes from the root sadad "to be strong" or "powerful." This view seems to be the more popular. The emphasis, therefore, in respect to the patriarchs, is that of God's power and strength. Oehler favors this view in his Theology of the Old Testament.4

The second view of the name Shaddai is that its root is sadad "to destroy" or "to terrify." This view is held by Mack.5

The third view maintains that Shaddai comes from a compound word (from se (<'aser) and day which in Hebrew means "sufficiency." For a statement of this view compare John Calvin.6

The fourth, and not too well accepted view is that proposed by the Scofield Bible.7 This view contends that the name comes from sad which has primary reference to the female breast. The name, therefore, signified nourishment and strength to the Patriarchs.

The writer feels the conservative view is the proper view and is the one best supported by the Scriptures. The most probable etymology of this title will be discussed in the following arguments in defense of this view. The arguments for the conservative view are two-fold:

1. Exegetical Argument

The phrase under consideration is in the English, "and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob as God Almighty . . . " The key words are "appeared" and "God Almighty" in this phrase. The verb 'era (appeared) is the niptal imperfect first person singular of the root raah. This root has the basic meaning of "to see, to observe, to look at." The niptal, however, carries the idea of "letting oneself be seen," or "to appear," when used with 'el or l'.9 The sense of this statement seems to be that to these Patriarchs God "revealed" Himself or made Himself to appear "in the capacity of" El Shaddai. The prepositional prefix be5 gives the idea of "in the character of" or "in the capacity of."
The name El Shaddai has been the subject of much conjecture and argument especially as to its etymology. The writer has become aware of the fact that this name, apart from Biblical material, may be explained by several suggested roots, which are equally attractive, but he feels that in the light of all evidence that the name Shaddai comes from the root sadad which means "to be strong" or "powerful." Supporting this assumption is a well respected lexicographer, Gesenius, who identifies this name thusly:

Shaddai-Almighty, omnipotent as an epithet of Jehovah, sometimes preceded by 'el Genesis 17:1, 28:3, Exodus 6:3. . . 10

The writer will not attempt to argue further on this point, for the argument would be like the liberal argument, purely subjective. He will let the case rest here and proceed to a stronger and more conclusive proof for this position--the contextual argument.

2. Contextual Argument:

The strongest argument in favor of the view that Shaddai comes from sadad meaning "to be strong," and that this name characterized Yahweh as the Mighty One or the Almighty who was able to perform the things promised, is found in the contexts in which this name appears both in the Pentateuch and in the other books.

The name Shaddai appears some forty-eight times in the Old Testament. The greater majority of these texts regard Shaddai or El Shaddai in the primary aspect of power and might. Power and might are many times demonstrated in special blessings and acts. In the book of Genesis the name appears only six times (Genesis 17:1, 28:3, 35:11, 43:14, 48:3, 49:25) and in almost every case the name is used in connection with some blessing. A careful study of the nature of these blessings will reveal the fact that only an all powerful God could fulfill these promises. The name occurs in Exodus only once (Ex. 6:3), and Numbers twice (Num. 24:4, 24:16). This name really displays its significance in the books of Ruth and Job. In Ruth it occurs only twice (Ruth 1:20, 21) but the basic idea connected with it is that of chastisement and affliction. In Job it occurs thirty-one times and has the same idea basically as that in Ruth. In many of the passages the idea connected with this name is decidedly power and majestic glory. (cf. Job 5:17, 6:4, 14, 8:3, 15:25, 21:20, 22:25, 23:16, 27:2, 34:12). In Job 37:23 Shaddai is clearly characterized as "excellent in power." In use of the name Shaddai in the Psalms (Ps. 68: 14, 91:1) seems to support this meaning also. El-Shaddai is spoken of as "scattering kings," (Psalm 68:14), which is an open display of sovereign power. The other uses of this name, Isa. 13:6, Ezek. 1:24, 10:5 and Joel 1:15 also indicate the same basic idea of power and might. It will be seen from the preceding material that while other etymologies of the name Shaddai such as in (breasted one) could possibly apply in one or two texts, the greater majority of occurrences support the idea of power and might. It should be remembered that these names for God in the Old Testament were not used without purpose or plan. It will be shown that when various ideas and acts of God were discussed, the writer under the leadership of the Holy Spirit, carefully selected the name that characterized the God who was performing or was about to perform these acts.
II. MAJOR PROBLEM: Was the name "Yahweh" known to the Patriarchs?

There are three main solutions proposed for this problem. Each shall be stated and evaluated. A more lengthy treatment of the last view will be given because it is considered to be the proper explanation of Exodus 6:3b.

A. First Occurrence View: This view contends that the name Yahweh was not known to the Patriarchs but was first made known to Moses. It generally argues for a natural origin of the name rather than a supernatural revelation of it. This is essentially the view of all liberal Old Testament theologians. John Edgar McFadyen expresses this view as follows:

Of very great importance is the passage, 6:2-13, which describes the revelation given to Moses, asserting that the fathers knew the God of Israel only by the name El Shaddai, while the name of Jehovah, which was then revealed to Moses for the first time, was unknown to them.\(^{11}\)

Some holding this view trace the origin of the name back to the Kenites, a branch from the Midianites. This view is expressed by Karl Budde as follows: "Yahweh, therefore, is the God of the tribe to which Moses, on his flight from Egypt, joined himself by marriage; the mountain god of Horeb, who appears to him and promises him to lead his brethren out of Egypt."\(^{12}\)

The supposed textual basis for this view is Exodus 18. From this chapter two basic assertions are made which are claimed to be the proof for the origin of the name Yahweh. First, Moses is conceived to be a subordinate to Jethro (Ex. 18:24) and second, Jethro sacrifices to Yahweh (Ex. 18:12). It is concluded therefore, that Jethro, priest of Midian, is in effect a priest of Yahweh. The objections to this view are many.

First: The account in Exodus 18 is hardly a decisive proof of the subordination of Moses to Jethro officially. What Moses received in this chapter was gracious counsel, not an official command.

Second: Verse twelve does not say explicitly that Jethro himself offered the sacrifice but only that he "took" the sacrifice.

Third: Jethro's first mention of Yahweh is after the exodus and after he is told of these events by Moses.

Fourth: Jethro is not called a priest of Yahweh but a priest of Midian. The Midianites were regarded as an idolatrous people (Num. 25, 31). There is no evidence that the Midianites worshipped Yahweh.

Other arguments could be brought to bear which would demonstrate the errors of this view, but the foregoing should suffice.
It may be asked at this point, why this verse is so important to the critics. As previously pointed out, the material found in the Pentateuch can, according to the liberal critics, be traced to four main source documents (J, E, D, P). Up to Exodus 6:3, P (by the critical analysis) is quite careful not to use the name Yahweh. The reason for this, it is claimed, is that P believed that the name was first revealed to Moses and therefore refrains from anachronisms by not using the name in the earlier Genesis narratives. Exodus 6:3 therefore is the reason for the anomaly in P's use of the divine names. The characteristic name for P is Elohim according to their analysis.

The primary basis of the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch, at least originally, was the use of different names of God in various passages. The critics of this school of thought assume that the employment of various names for God indicates the use of various documents in the compilation of the Pentateuch. There are other areas of study that are employed to support this theory, but it is only the use of Divine names that the writer is interested in at this point.

The critics of this school assume that writers of the original source documents never used any name other than was assigned to him or that was in accordance with his peculiar views. This assumption, in the opinion of the writer, is not the result of a careful study of the occurrence of Divine names, but an arbitrary assumption designed to support an untenable theory. If it could be proven that in just one case a writer used a name other than by habit, the theory would collapse.

Against this view we raise the following objections:

First: A careful exegesis of this verse will not support this view. A proper understanding of the idiom "to know the name Yahweh" reveals that a first occurrence of the name is not implied here. A more complete discussion of the exegesis of the verse will be presented later.

Second: If Exodus 6:3 were a reference to merely the name of God as a name only, the passage would prove equally that before this time Elohim was unknown as a name for Deity, and God should appear uniformly as El-Shaddai in Patriarchal history.

Some negative or liberal critics, in answer to this argument would remind us that Exodus 6:3 is the first time P used the name Yahweh. They argue that P was quite careful in his use of Yahweh in order to avoid anachronisms. J and E, however, were not so careful. The writer of this paper will show later, that these assumptions will not stand for at least two reason. First, P does use the name Yahweh before Exodus 6:3 (Gen. 17:1, 21:1). The critics realizing this is a serious problem have concluded that these passages must have been changed by a redactor. This answer is not at all acceptable as will be shown later in this discussion. Second, the assertion that J and E are not careful as to their use of the Divine names is easily disproved by a careful study of the contexts in which these names appear.

Third: The early occurrence of the name in Genesis destroys this assumption.

a. The fact that Yahweh occurs in conjunction with Elohim in Genesis chapter two causes the critics considerable difficulty. How shall the documents be distinguished in this case?

b. There are passages in the book of Genesis where the name of Yahweh is introduced in a way which utterly precludes the supposition that it is used proleptically, or that it is anything but
a correct account of the incident and the actual term employed. For example the use of Yahweh in Genesis 15:7, where God clearly asserts, "... I am Yahweh..." or when Jacob on his deathbed declares "I have waited for thy salvation, Yahweh" (Genesis 49:18). A more striking passage than even these is found in Genesis chapter four. There Eve states, ... I have gotten a man with the help of Yahweh."

c. The use of the name Yahweh after the dispersion of tongues is frequent and vital to the significance of many passages. Genesis 22:14, 24:35, 40, 42, 48, 56, 24:50, 51, 26:22.
d. The name Yahweh is compounded with other names long before the time of Moses.

For example the name appears in the name of the mother of Moses, Jochebed (Yokebed) meaning "Yahweh is glorious" (Exodus 6:20, Numbers 26:59). Against this argument some have suggested that Moses changed her name. This, however, is but a futile attempt to discredit unmistakable evidence. That Moses would have done this, to say the least, is highly improbable. There are also some other names from ancient time which occur in the genealogies in I Chronicles (I Chron. 2:25, 7:8, 4: 18, Ahijah, Abiah) that are compounded with Yahweh.

The occurrence of the name in the word "Moriah" (Hamoriah cf. Genesis 22:14) suggests an early knowledge of the name.

Fourth: The idiom "to know a name" as it is used in the Old Testament will not permit the liberal understanding of Exodus 6:3. Consider the following example, noting the book in which the reference is found and the chronological setting: Isa. 52:5-6: verse six reads:

"Therefore people shall know my name: therefore they shall know in that day that I am he that doth speak; behold it is I." (cf. also Jer. 16:21).

Upon a careful reading of these texts, it is at once obvious that the higher critical view of the expression "to know the name of Yahweh" as it is found in Exodus 6:3 is not only misleading but incorrect. If they are correct, then these texts could mean the name was not actually known until Isaiah's and Jeremiah's time, but this on the other hand, would then be in conflict with the statement of Moses. The contradiction disappears when the proper view of the idiom is realized. For other examples of this expression compare II Chron. 6:33, Isa. 19:20-21, Ezek. 20:5,9, 39:6-7, Psa. 33:18.

Fifth: The higher critical method of analysis mutilates the Biblical text, and beside that, it is not a consistent theory. That this theory mutilates the text is proven by the analysis of Genesis 28:19-29 where writers give many alternate changes from E to J back and forth.

That this theory is saturated with obvious contradictions in application is evidenced by the following facts:

a. The name "Yahweh" occurs in two passages of P before Ex. 6:3 (Gen. 17:1, 21:16). In both cases a redactor or copyist is invoked to provide the solution to this embarrassing occurrence.

b. As to E, the name "Yahweh" occurs in four passages (Gen. 15:1, 2, 22:11, 27:7b). In these cases as in the previous a redactor is employed.
c. J uses the term Elohim in many passages (Gen. 3:1, 3, 5, 4:25, 7:9, 9:27, 16:24). Once again redactors are employed to relieve the difficulty.

d. P contradicts J if the liberal critic's theory is maintained, for J states that God was worshipped by the name Yahweh even before the flood (Gen. 4:25), that He revealed Himself by that name to Abram (Gen. 15:7), while P declares in Ex. 6:3 that the name Yahweh was not known to the Patriarchs.

Sixth: The experience of literary men and the history of literature are here in open conflict with the pretensions of the critics. None of these scholars now claims to discover in the Pentateuch less than four main writers and a "redactor," while most of them require many more. This skill, it might be noted, is asserted in investigating a foreign and ancient tongue, with no outside documents for comparison, and no knowledge of the alleged writers. We therefore ask, what is the basis for these assumptions of the critics? The answer is not a careful, objective study of Biblical literature and language, but an arbitrary, biased presupposition that the religion of Israel is the natural product of evolutionary processes. The fact that there are so many divergent opinions among the critics is evidence that this analysis is not a system, but a scheme. A scheme in which there is an agreement on the end to be accomplished, and on the starting point, but the process is largely the application of individual and subjective notions.

Seventh: A serious logical fallacy is also to be discerned in the use of Divine names as it relates to the documentary analysis. It can be demonstrated that the higher critical method of documentation is to argue in a circle. Differences are first created and then arguments are based on them. Documents are distinguished on the basis of the use of Divine names and then their correspondences with certain assumed traits or characteristics are claimed as proof for the objective existence of these documents.

Eighth: The documentary analysis assumes that the varied use of the Divine names is usually an indication of authorship. The same argument is applied in respect to various literary differences. A more dependable and proven explanation for these phenomena is that different situations and subject matter called for both different literary styles and vocabulary.

The constant appeal, by the critic, to a redactor is a strong evidence that the theory bears many fallacies and weaknesses. The redactor is called to serve in Genesis 2:4b, 3:24, 4:2, 7:9, 9:27, 17:1, 21:1b, 20:18, 28:21, 22:11, etc. Now, the writer should like to ask at this point, how is it to be determined what is and what is not the work of a redactor? If the Divine names are indications of source documents of the Pentateuch, then they must be dependably consistent at this point. If but one name has been changed by a so-called redactor, then how are we to know if the other names have not been changed? Or furthermore, how do we know, for example, that where a redactor is claimed to have changed Elohim to Yahweh in the E document that perhaps the text is correct and a very energetic redactor has not changed the other portion of the context? Perhaps the context was really the work of J and a redactor changed all the names of Yahweh to Elohim. The reader might argue at this point that the writer is arguing from conjecture. The writer would most quickly admit this and at the same time, would point out that the critics holding this theory must be charged with the same fallacy. They have no more objective
proof for their contentions that the passage was an E document in which a redactor changed a name to Yahweh than his contention that it was a J document which had the Divine name changed to Elohim.

B. Interrogative View: This view holds that the reading of the text is in the form of a question not a statement. It would have Exodus 6:3 read:

"And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty: but by my name Yahweh was I not known to them?"

Two writers who find this view acceptable are Jamieson and Scott.

This view is not necessarily contrary to the writer's view, but it is not an easily supported view. The grammar may permit this view but a consideration of the movement of the general context does not easily support such a reading. Such a reading could have been more clearly indicated in the Hebrew if this reading were intended, but it is not. Finally, very few, if any translations have understood this to be the reading of the Hebrew text.

C. The Special Revelation View: The special revelation view contends that the name "Yahweh" was known to the Patriarchs but in a somewhat limited sense. They did not have a complete knowledge of many of the aspects of this name especially in its redemptive significance. Special redemptive aspects of the name were revealed and experienced in the days of Moses and in particular in the exodus from Egypt. This view is expressed clearly by Henry Cowles:

The meaning is, not that the name of Yahweh was never used by them or given of God to them: but that its special significance had not been manifested to them as He was now: about to make it manifest.13

Others who hold this view or a similar form of it are Hastings, Patrick, Wordsworth, Keil, Raven, Wiener, Allis, Unger and Oehler.

In the light of all the evidence from the Biblical text, the writer considers this to be the proper view.

The arguments in support of this view are three-fold:

1. Exegetical Argument: In order to deal accurately with the text at hand, it is imperative that there be a clear understanding of the text as it reads in the Hebrew text. Many of the errors which have arisen in the interpretation of this verse could have been avoided if the language and the syntax of this text were more carefully considered. Since the first part of the text was dealt with under the consideration of the minor problem, the writer shall proceed to examine the last phrase of the text which translated literally reads: "and (in the capacity of) my name Yahweh I was not known to them."

In the first place it should be observed that the emphatic word of the sentence is Semi ("name") and is so considered because it is first in the Hebrew sentence. The fact that this word is
emphatic is not without important implications, for it will be shown that the Hebrew concept of a name is far more than just that of an identifying title. In the Old Testament there was a peculiar signification attached to the name.14

The name "Yahweh" is an important word not only to this text but to the whole Old Testament. The etymology of this word has been disputed by many men for many years. Some have attempted to connect it with the Arabic hawa which means to "blow" or "breathe." Others have traced the origin of this word to Egyptian, Phoenician and Canaanitish influences. Their arguments for this etymology are not convincing at all, especially since they are based upon the presupposition that the religion of Israel may be traced to natural origins as may the religions of the heathen nations.

As to the formation of the name Yahweh, it is agreed among most lexicographers and other writers on the subject that the term Yahweh, however it might be pointed, is the regularly formed Qal imperfect of the verb Havah (to be) an obsolete form of Hayah. This view is not shared by all authorities, however. Some would contend that the name is to be understood as a Hiphil imperfect.15 While this view is permissible grammatically, it is in conflict with Exodus 3:14 where the name is explained. There the form is clearly a Qal. When Moses asked the Lord what name he should use in identifying the "God of your fathers" (vs. 13), the Lord answered saying, 'ehye eser 'ehyeh "I am that I am." He also told them that 'ehye slahni 'alekem "I am has sent me unto you." The verb translated "I am" in both phrases is 'ehyeh, which is the Qal imperfect first person singular of hayah. If 'ehyeh therefore, is understood as the Qal imperfect first person singular from the verb hayah and is His name, it is also reasonable to regard Yahweh as it appears in Exodus 6:3 as coming from the same root and also the Qal stem. The latter form, of course, is the third person singular of that stem and is translated "He is." The only difference between the two names is, that the one is a verb in the first person, and the other is the same verb in the third person. The meaning of the one is "I am," and the meaning of the other is "He is."

Supporting the view that this stem is the Qal is Edward Mack who makes the following remark:

It is evident from the interpretative passages (Exodus 3:6) that the form is the future of the simple stem (Kal) and not future of the causative (Hiphil) stem in the sense of "giver of life" an idea not borne out by any of the occurrences of the word.16

The writer maintains therefore, that the translation "I am" or "He is" is the proper one in view of the fact that the Qal is used in these texts. But the case for this understanding does not rest here. The fact that the imperfect is used in connection with these verbs also supports this conclusion. The imperfect state of the Hebrew verb does not always have to designate future time as some have erroneously assumed. A careful examination of the scope of the imperfect state will reveal that it may have primary reference to present states or actions as well as future.17

By the expression "I am," Yahweh is to be understood as a God who is eternal and self-existent. If the Hiphil stem is understood in regard to His name, the meaning is somewhat lower. He then is regarded as the "first cause of all things" or "life-giver."

That the translation of the verb 'ehyeh is properly "I am" is further substantiated by the rendering of the Septuagint. The first phrase of Exodus 3:14 reads ego eimi ho on. Eimi is a present active indicative and on is a present participle of the same verb, eimi. This phrase would be
literally translated "I am the one who is." The other occurrence of 'ehyeh is also translated with the present participle, on. If the translators had understood the imperfect state with future implications, they would have used the future tense, but such, apparently was not the case.

Another strong argument for the rendering "I am" is found in the translations and interpretation of the name Yahweh in the New Testament. There are three very clear instances where this name is given definite meaning. The first is found in Matthew 22:32. There we read:

"I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

The verb translated "I am" is eimi, a present active indicative. The same form is found in Mark: 12:26 which is a similar quotation of Exodus 3:6. The last instance of this phenomenon is seen in John 8:58. Here the Greek once again for "I am" is ego eimi.

It would seem, therefore, if the idea of the imperfect were "I will be" or "He will be," both the LXX and the Greek of the New Testament would have recognized it. But such is not the case, so the writer therefore contends for the rendering "I am" denoting the eternal, self-existence of Yahweh.

The next word of the phrase under consideration is a vital word, and it is this word that holds the key to the meaning and interpretation of the text under consideration. The word noda'ti which appears in the text of the Hebrew Bible is a Niphal perfect, first person singular, from the verb yada' "to know." The real problem, involved in this word, is to determine what is meant when it is used in the expression "to know a name." The liberal critics have maintained that to know the name is to be acquainted with the title. "To make known a name," to their way of thinking, is merely to present the name for the first time.

This assumption, it will be shown, is not the case, and the fact is, that the uses of this idiom in the Old Testament furnish the clue to the solution of this whole problem. When the expressions "to know Yahweh" or to "know the name of Yahweh" are used in the Old Testament they carry more than the idea of just to be acquainted with the radicals yhwh. For example the verb yada' is used five times in respect to Yahweh in the book of Exodus alone, and in every case it is quite obvious that it has reference to more than just an acquaintance with a name. In every case it suggests an experiential knowledge of both the person and power of Yahweh. In every case the knowledge of Yahweh is connected with some deed or act of Yahweh which in some way reveals both His person and power. In Exodus 16:12 Yahweh spoke to Moses saying "I have heard the murmurings of the children of Israel: speak unto them saying, at even ye shall be filled with bread; and ye shall know that I am Yahweh your God." It should be noted that first, in respect to time, this is considerably later than the account of Exodus 6:3. Is it to be assumed, therefore, on the basis of the liberal or negative understanding of the verb yada', that the children of Israel still didn't know who Yahweh was? Secondly, that his knowledge involves more than just an acquaintance with a name, is proven by the fact that the knowledge of Yahweh was the result of a particular experience of provision by Yahweh. They were to know Yahweh in a special manner. They had already learned of Him as deliverer; now they would know Him as their provider.
The verb yada' is not only used to convey the idea of knowledge of a thing, but knowledge as a result of specific experience. This seems to be the idea expressed in Ezekiel 25:14.19

If the reader is not convinced at this point of this use of the verb yada', there are several more uses of this verb that most clearly demonstrate that its meaning goes far beyond a mere knowledge of facts. This verb is also used for knowledge when both revelation and experience are involved. It is in this sense that the writer feels it is to be understood in the text under question, and to give evidence to this assertion he will present several cases for consideration. First, Jer. 28:9:

"The prophet that prophesieth of peace, when the word of the prophet shall come to pass, then shall the prophet be known, that Jehovah hath truly sent him."

According to this text a prophet was really "known" as the man sent from God when his words were fulfilled. This is the sense of Exodus 6:3, Yahweh was to be "known" or "made known" as He manifested and revealed Himself in the special acts of deliverence. The writer should also if like to point out that here the verb form used in Jer. 28:9 is yiudada' the niphil imperfect third person singular masc. of the verb yada'. It is interesting to note, that the stem used in Exodus 6:3 is also the niphal. It would seem, therefore, that this form, when used, carried more than a superficial knowledge of a thing. It conveyed the idea of knowledge as a result of revelation experience.

Other examples of this idea may be found in Prov. 10:9, Ex. 32:12-17, I Sam. 3:7, Jer. 16:21.

In this exegetical argument, the writer has endeavored to establish the following facts: First, the name Yahweh is the Qal imperfect of the verb hayah and denotes the eternal, unchanging character of God as evidenced by its use in Exodus 3:14. Second, the verb noda'ti used in Exodus 6:3 must mean more than being acquainted with a title as such. Third, the fact that the niphal form is used in Exodus 6:3 strongly suggests knowledge in respect to revelation and experience. Fourth, the idiom "to know Yahweh" or "to know the name of Yahweh" as it is used in the Old Testament, generally signifies knowledge of some particular act or attribute of Yahweh as it is revealed in His dealing with men.

2. Theological Argument: The writer considers Exodus 6:3 to be a positive declaration of the fact that in the past the character of God has been revealed in His names, El-Shaddai, Elohim and Yahweh. But now He is going to reveal Himself further as Yahweh in a special way through revelation and the experience of deliverance. He is going to provide a demonstration of the fact that He is not only Yahweh who made a covenant with Abraham but is Yahweh who is faithful in keeping it. New aspects of His glory, majesty and redemption are to be known by Israel. The great redemptive power of Yahweh was now going to be known in various aspects as it had not been known before. The deliverance from Egyptian bondage is often referred to as the great illustration of this redemptive power in both the Old and New Testaments.

The following arguments are presented in support of this view: First, it is clear from Exodus chapter three that the name "Yahweh" was well established in the minds of the Israelites, for if
this were not the case, why would God tell Moses to tell the people of Israel if they should ask in whose name he comes, that "I am hath sent me unto you" (Ex. 3:14) or "Yahweh, the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you . . ." Did it not occur to either Moses or the Lord that the people might say, "Who is Yahweh?" But there is no problem in this respect. The silence of the Scriptures speak clearly to the fact that no such problem would arise because they know the name of the God of their fathers.

Second, the simple reading of Exodus 6:3 supports the view that a new revelation is meant, not that the name was not known. The text literally reads:

"And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as (or in the capacity of) El-Shaddai but (in the capacity of) my name Yahweh, I was not known to them.

It should be remembered that the verb for "known" is nodat'ti a niphal perfect, first person singular of the verb yada' ("I to know"). If the text meant to say that the name, as such, was not known, the third person singular would have been employed. It was in "the capacity of" the name Yahweh that He was to further reveal Himself.

Third, Exodus 6:3 is not a contrast between the use of Divine names. The name Elohim is not even mentioned in this verse. The text is a comparison of ideas which the names represent. It is a comparison between what has been revealed by Yahweh and what is about to be revealed. The character of Yahweh that is considered in the text as it relates to His name. Fourth, it can be shown that the use of Divine names in the Pentateuch, in most cases at least, is obviously deliberate. For example it may be generally noted that when the power, majesty and faithfulness of God are in view Elohim is generally used (Gen. 1, 6-9, etc.) But when the writer is writing in respect to salvation and the covenant relationship of God with Israel, Yahweh is generally used (Gen. 3:9-15, 4:1, 26, 8:20, etc.)

Fifth, that the name Yahweh could have been known and used by the Patriarchs not knowing its full significance and implications is proven possible from every day occurrences. It is possible for a man to bear the name of a certain office before he fulfills any of its functions. President, magistrate, and policeman are titles which may be borne by several persons to whom they legally belong, before any of the acts peculiar to those offices are performed. The president as acknowledged on his inauguration is known to be such by his administrative acts, the magistrate by his administration of justice and the policeman by the apprehending of criminals.

In the preceding arguments the writer has endeavored to show: 1. That the reading of Exodus 6:3 clearly reveals that a special revelation in relation to the nature and character of Yahweh is under consideration. 2. That Exodus 6:3 is not a contrast between the use or occurrence of Divine names but a comparison of the ideas which El-Shaddai and Yahweh represent. That the use of Divine names in the Pentateuch is in most cases deliberate.

4. That the name of Yahweh has a peculiar redemptive significance in the Pentateuch and is generally used in this sense. 5. That practical experience indicates the possibility of knowing a name or title without having a complete knowledge of all the functions and attributes of that title.
3. **Contextual Argument**: The contextual argument simply consists of an examination of the immediate context to see if the interpretation suggested by the writer fits in logically and naturally.

   It should be observed, first of all, that the children of Israel are, in this book, at a very unique stage of their history. From the moment of their departure, they will be recognized as a nation in the true sense of the term. It is in this capacity, i.e. as a nation, that Yahweh is going to deal with them. It is Yahweh’s intention to reveal Himself as He had never done so before. This covenant-making God was about to demonstrate both His power and faithfulness in the redemption of Israel (cf. Ex. 3:8-12, 15-22). In the immediate context of Exodus 6:3 we find the in which Yahweh was to reveal Himself to Israel. Exodus 6:4 restates the covenant made with Israel. Verses six to eight presents the plan of Yahweh for the nation of Israel. Verse six clearly promises redemption from bondage. Verse seven states Yahweh's purpose in His redeeming the children of Israel. This verse is very important in our consideration for it clearly explains the latter phrase of Exodus 6:3. We have already suggested that there was a particular sense in which Yahweh had not revealed Himself to the children of Israel. That aspect, or part of revelation is explained in this verse. Notice the reading of this verse:

   "And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God; and ye shall know that I am Yahweh your God, who bringeth you out from under the burdens of Egyptians."

   There are two basic assertions in this verse. First, Yahweh declares the election of the children of Israel as a people for His name. Secondly, He states that they shall know Him, not for the first time, but as the one "who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians." This means they would "know Yahweh as their redeemer and deliverer." The whole message of the book of Exodus is centered around this theme (cf. Exodus 7:5, 17, 8:23, 10:3, 12:12-13, 14:13ff, 15:2ff). This revelation and experience was a mountain peak in Israelis history. Whenever Israel slips away from fellowship with Yahweh, as in Micah 6, Yahweh reminds them of this deliverance from Egypt.

   "For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of bondage. . ." (Micah 6:4)

   In the eighth verse of Exodus, chapter six, Yahweh restates His promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and promises its fulfillment. The basis for this promise is "I am Yahweh."

   It is the conclusion of the writer that the immediate context of Exodus 6:3 and the greater context of the book reveal the fact that before this time, the children of Israel had not known all that was involved in the covenant name "Yahweh." Only in these particular circumstances could the truth of the redemptive power of Yahweh be revealed.

   **English Paraphrase**

   And I revealed myself unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob in the capacity of the God Almighty, but in the full redemptive significance of my name Yahweh, I was not made known (revealed) unto them.
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REBELLION, PRESENCE, AND COVENANT: A STUDY IN EXODUS 32-34

DALE RALPH DAVIS

Introduction

THE thesis of this paper is that the narrative of Exodus 32-34 is a basic unity, that it is more likely to stem from one original hand than from a number of contributors plus the final redactor, and that the connections and materials of the narrative itself reveal and support such a unity. There is no claim here that difficulties are non-existent—only that a real basic unity inheres in the narrative if it is approached by way of its canonical presentation. This in turn suggests a methodology: that the text is to be approached holistically with a serious attempt to discern an internal consistency if it be there. This is not to rule out the place of (source) analysis; it is to say that analysis has a tendency to begin too soon, and thus not really to "hear" the text. Most of our attention will be focused on literary concerns with some concluding remarks about the theology of the unit.

The Basic Unity of the Narrative

First of all, it is necessary to deal briefly with the tradition of 32:1-6 which forms the backdrop for all three chapters. It is, of course, rather common to see this tradition taken as a polemic against Jeroboam I's calf worship at Dan and Bethel, the tradition projecting the condemnation backwards in order to denounce it out of the mouth of Moses.1 But this is open to question. In 1 Kings 12 the cult stems from Jeroboam's initiative, while here

the groundswell comes from the people. Moreover, if we are intended to see Aaron in the role of Jeroboam, then the representation is truly inept, for Aaron is here a sort of weak and pressured victim, while Jeroboam appears as the strong instigator. A more astute polemic than this would be needed—Aaron would have had to be cast into more of an image of Jeroboam than this.

Some deny that Aaron's role in vv 1b-4 is original; the original picture of vv 5f. shows him to be only a victim of the people's fait accompli.⁴ Martin Noth, who takes this view, bases the excision of vv 1b-4 on the idea that vv 21-24, which seek to excuse Aaron, are secondary. Thus his role in vv 1b-4 must be likewise. I feel this misses the intent of vv 21-24 (wholly aside from whether they are original), for rather than excuse Aaron they tend to blast him as a sort of Caspar Milquetoast. There is no need to question the unity of vv 1-6.³

Incidentally, there may be good grounds for following NEB at v 5a in repointing the form wayyar' as wayyira' (= "then Aaron feared" instead of "when Aaron saw"); against NEB, I would retain the plural verb of MT in v 4). In this case, the idea would be that when Aaron saw what the people were making of the calf (v 4), he became alarmed and tried to steer the affair back to some semblance of Yahwism by proclaiming a feast to Yahweh for the next day. One could have a diluted if not an orthodox Yahwism.⁴ Now let us consider the larger complex.

---

⁴ I have not dealt with the historical antecedents of the calf/bull worship here. See, among others, Lloyd R Bailey, "The Golden Calf," HUCA 42 (1971) 97-115, and John N. Oswalt, "The Golden Calves and the Egyptian Concept of Deity," EvQ 45 (1973) 13-20. Whatever kind of worship this was intended to be, the cultic confession ("these are your gods, Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt," 32:4, 8) with its plural subject and verb (‘eloheyka . . . he’eluka) shows the writer branded it as idolatry. The plural subject and verb are sometimes thought to fit Jeroboam's two calves more appropriately (1 Kgs 12:28), but this ignores the fact that there was only one at each cult center, thus making the plural no more suitable for 1 Kgs 12 than for Exod 32. On the problem of the
1. Evidence of structural design supports the unity of chap. 32.

If one considers the flow of chap. 32 (through v 29) a definite pattern seems to emerge. In tabular form it would look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idolatry originates, vv 1-6</th>
<th>Idolatry discovered, vv 15-19a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Yahweh's wrath, vv 7-10</td>
<td>Expression of Moses' wrath, vv 19b-21 (or, 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest to conciliate God, vv 11-13</td>
<td>Quest to conciliate Moses, vv 22-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total judgment restrained, v 14</td>
<td>Partial judgment executed, vv 25-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewed as such the narrative appears to have a thematic, parallel development. Of course this is true only of the extant text. However, a common literary analysis holds the basic narrative to have consisted only of vv 1-6, 15-20, 35, while vv 7-14 are usually suspected as being Deuteronomic. This latter point--aside from vv 25-29 (see below)--wipes out three elements of the narrative as depicted in the above table. However, it is only with vv 7-14 that the chapter possesses the symmetry I have attempted to sketch. It might be observed that part of the problem rests with vv 7-8: they are held to be too anticipatory of vv 15ff. as to make Moses' wrath inexplicable since he would have known everything beforehand. Yet Driver sees no difficulty here: "Moses' anger may naturally have been kindled by the spectacle of the doings in the camp, the full character of which he did not before realize." Childs would also retain vv 7-8. Of course, if the extant narrative does possess this structural unity it may simply mean that it has been so arranged by a redactor using his various materials in a skillful

"Jeroboam" and "Aaron" traditions, one would do well to ponder the comments of historian Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft* (New York: Vintage, 1953) 123f., 130f.


manner. This is recognized. However, one of the main reasons for dividing the chapter is usually its alleged lack of unity (see most commentaries). It is the latter which is being questioned here.

There is another manner in which the narrative may be viewed which may indicate a conscious unity behind it. This pattern centers around the sequence in which key persons and items are introduced. It may be set out as follows:

People rebelling, v 1
Aaron's role, vv 2ff.
   Calf produced, v 4
      Two tablets intact, vv 15-16
      Two tablets broken, v 19
   Calf destroyed, v 20
   Anger at Aaron, vv 21-24
   People judged, vv 25-29

This pattern indicates that the primary elements of the narrative are introduced in a particular order in the first portion of the chapter and then are "picked up" and dealt with in exactly the reverse order in the second half of the chapter. Insofar as this may betray conscious literary design it argues for the unity of the piece.

The key function of vv 15-16 in this scheme should be observed. The full and elaborate description of the tables is necessary and reveals the literary skill of the narrator. This intense dwelling upon the two tables seems meant to underscore the vast privilege of Israel in having this gracious divine deposit; yet at the same time it most effectively conveys to us the sense of utter tragedy, for the reader already knows that the covenant has been bartered away for a bastard bull. Again, this would appear to be literary artistry at its best.

Finally, the effective contrast between the beginning and the end of the main narrative in chap. 32 should be appreciated. In vv 1-6 the people gather (qhl) to Aaron, who proves to be a false leader, for rebellion and sin; while in vv 25-29 the Levites gather ('sp) to Moses, the true leader, for Yahweh and in order to execute judgment on sin. Thus there is set up a vivid contrast between "the true congregation" and the false one. The contrast may
mean that vv 25-29 are as "original" as vv 1-6, an anathema to most commentators.

However, with vv 25-29 the question arises as to whether this tradition does not owe its existence to a time when the rights of Levites were being questioned, so that these verses then constitute a levitical apology in face of some need. Obviously the shadow of Jeroboam again casts itself upon the passage, for he clearly excluded Levites from being priests in his royal sanctuaries (1 Kgs 12:31). Is this tradition then meant to justify the levitical claim to priestly office? Not necessarily. If one can put some stock in the tradition of 2 Chr 11:13-17 (also 13:8ff.), the primary response of the priests and Levites was not to argue for their rights but to emigrate to Judah. Moreover, it is just as possible that a tradition like vv 25-29 may explain why Jeroboam did not want the likes of the Levites around--they weren't the type that cooperated with new religious deals.

2. The coherence and progression in Moses' intercession binds all three chapters together.

For purposes of discussion, Moses' intercession will be divided into the following rough segments: 32:9-14, 32:30-34, 33:12-17, 33:18-23, 34:5-10a. The first section, 32:9-14, begins with Yahweh's announcing his intention totally to consume (Piel of klh) the people and begin all over with Moses (vv 9-10). However, after Moses' reasoned and impassioned plea, we read that "Yahweh repented about the punishment [lit., evil] which he had thought of bringing on his people (v 14). Please note: there is not one word about forgiveness in this section. The only success with which Moses' intercession meets is Yahweh's withdrawal of threatened total extinction. The text itself gives no ground whatever for inferring any idea of forgiveness or restoration to favor. Such must be read into the text, and commentators commonly do just that as can be seen via their comparisons of this section with 32:30ff.10 The two sections are not in parallelism (not doublets) but in progression, 32:9-14 only dealing with the turning away of Yahweh's immediate and totally consuming wrath.

In 32:30-34 Moses does plead for Israel's forgiveness even to

---

9 See Noth, Exodus, 250£.
10 Thus Childs, Book of Exodus, 560, 571; Hyatt, Exodus, 303.
the degree of losing his own life if such forgiveness cannot be obtained. And his plea is rejected! Forgiveness is at the least delayed; it is not yet granted. However, the theme of 32:13 is picked up in v 34. Thus the idea probably is that Yahweh, who must be true to his word, will then fulfill the covenant promise which Moses had pleaded in 32:13, albeit in a "distant" manner (see below). Moreover, although the sentence of immediate extinction was withdrawn (32:14), the guilty ones will still meet retribution at some time in the future (vv 33, 34b). The main advance that 32:30-34 makes on 32:9-14 is in Yahweh's assurance of fulfilling the gift of the land to Israel.

The following verses, 33:1-4, expand on what was involved in "my angel will go before you" (32:34).11 Again we hear, "I will send before you an angel" (v 2), and now we understand this as a judgment when we read, "But I will not go up in your midst" (ki lo' e'eleh begirbeka, v 3). Yahweh, then, promises a remote help rather than an intimate presence. The latter is still forfeit; the former is granted in order to fulfill his promise to the patriarchs. The impression received is that Yahweh can only fulfill his "bare" word--the former intimacy is gone. However, even in "lest I consume you along the way" (v 3) there is yet a hint of grace. It is too perilous for Yahweh's presence to accompany them, and thus in mercy he withholds it. Thus the basic problem is twofold and interrelated: Yahweh's presence and Israel's forgiveness.12

The next movement in the motif of Moses' intercession occurs in 33:12-17. Moses is evidently dissatisfied with the vagueness of the "angel promise"--"You have not made known to me whom you will send with me" (v 12). However, a new and crucial datum appears in this section: the special standing of Moses.

11 I recognize the grammatical roughness of 33:1-4 in MT. However, this does not obscure the essential meaning. Nor do I apologize for taking 33:1-4 as a harmonious and natural explanation of 32:34. Since all hands acknowledge the extreme difficulty of analysis in chap. 33 (see Childs, Book of Exodus, 584), no objection can really be lodged against taking these verses as consistently explicative of 32:34 (so U. Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Exodus [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967] 425).

12 Hyatt, Exodus, 312-313, sees an inconsistency between Yahweh's not going up among the people in v 3 and his promising to send an angel in v 2. However, this is because Hyatt identifies the angel of v 2 with that of 23:20ff.
That Moses uses the first person in v 13 shows beyond a doubt that the "I know you by name and, furthermore, you have found favor in my eyes" in v 12 was limited to Moses. That is, the second person singular in v 12 was not corporate (the people) but personal (Moses). Moses seeks for fuller explication of God's ways, attaching to his plea a hint of his desire to include the whole people with himself in the hoped-for answer ("consider that this nation is your people," v 13). Whether v 14 is taken as a question ("Shall my face go with you?") or as a statement is of little immediate concern. Moses latches on to this necessity of Yahweh's personal presence in vv 15-16 as the sine qua non of Israel's existence. But what is especially significant is Moses' tenacious way of seeking to include the people with himself as, objects of Yahweh's favor, as his insistent "I and your people" (twice) in v 16 reveals. Moses contends that it is in Yahweh's "going with us" that they are unique among nations. Yahweh's response in v 17 seems to show that he has granted Moses' plea, because Yahweh views Israel's representative with favor. There is still no explicit word about forgiveness. That it would be implied in the renewed promise of Yahweh's personal presence may well be so, but for the purposes of the narrative it is not yet stated. Even now there remains a certain suspense; the tension has not completely ceased.

I prefer to read 33:14 as a question though it is without the regular interrogative particle. This is not impossible (GKC, sect. 150a), and the text flows more logically if so construed. It is taken interrogatively by Beer, *Exodus*, 158; W. Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966) 103; and M. Buber, *Moses: The Revelation and the Covenant* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958) 155. I might say that I am assuming panim ("face") to be virtually identical with personal presence. So if Yahweh's face will go with them it means that the verdict of 33:3, 5 has been reversed. This follows Cassuto (Commentary, 434), who points to 2 Sam 17: 11 as showing face = person. W. Eichrodt disputes this view (*Theology of the Old Testament* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961-67] 2.37f.) but more on the basis of source division than solid argument--and sources are singularly elusive in Exod 33.

Two additional comments: (i) My treatment of only the successive movements in Moses' intercession makes Yahweh's reversal of his verdict of 33:3 appear abrupt. It should be remembered that at least one, possibly two, "repentance scenes" intervene (33:5-6, 7-11), which will be discussed later. (ii) I cannot agree with those who see the crux of vv 12-17 in the
The division or separation of 33:18-23 from the foregoing passage (vv 12-17) is arbitrary to be sure. Yet since it introduces one to the theophany of 34:5ff., I have severed it from its foregoing context in order to consider it now in conjunction with the final segment of Moses' intercession, 34:5-10a.

Yahweh responds to Moses' prayer to see his glory by promising to show Moses his goodness and to proclaim his name, Yahweh, which is related in 34:5-10a. The revelation there given perfectly answers to the concerns which have burdened Moses' prayers hitherto. It is precisely the proclamation of 34:6-7 which Moses and Israel need to hear. At last the covenant breakers are assured of finding forgiveness in this God who "takes away / forgives iniquity and rebellion and sin." In this climactic proclamation the tension is finally relieved. The basic progression in Moses' encounters with Yahweh should be fairly clear. First, total extinction is averted, that and nothing more (32: 9ff.). Next, forgiveness is sought and refused, though a remote kind of help is promised to fulfill the promise of the land (32:30ff.). Then, Yahweh's previous verdict is reversed and his full personal presence is again assured (33:12ff.; but this is only done because Yahweh regards the mediator graciously and not for any merit on the part of the people, v 17). Finally, the forgiveness for which Israel hangs in the balance is offered and declared (34:6ff.). There appears to be a coherent and conscious progression involved.

Further, it may not be amiss to see a special significance here in the proclamation of the name, Yahweh. I do not mean at this point to kindle all the debate that can rage over the derivation of the Tetragrammaton. However, I am reasonably convinced that the most satisfying explanation (because it is based on actual context) of its meaning in Exod 3:14-15 is found by linking it to the preceding ki 'ehyeh 'immak ("But I will be with you") idea that Sinai is regarded as the real place of the divine presence and that what Moses is concerned about is Yahweh's presence with them when they leave Sinai (so Noth, Exodus, 257; cf. Clements, Exodus, 214). There is no need to see any other problem except that of the narrative context--the rebellion and covenant-breaking of Israel. Moreover, it is clear from 34:5 that Yahweh's presence is not glued to Sinai, for he "comes down" to appear on Sinai. It is simply the place where he manifests himself.
of 3:12. This would indicate that Yahweh is the Present One, the One who is there with his own to act in their behalf as they have need.\textsuperscript{15} If this is cogent, the proclamation of Yahweh's name here in 34:6-7 may well be most appropriate to Israel's existential situation posed in the preceding narrative: despite their covenant breaking Yahweh is nevertheless willing again to be the Present One for them, to go with them. Should this be granted, it would nicely fit the problem of the divine presence with which Moses had been grappling.

Both "prongs" of Israel's dilemma are brought together in Moses final prayer of 34:9. This verse ought not to be separated from its context (as Beyerlin, \textit{Origins}, 90ff., does). It fits perfectly with all of the foregoing. The petition, "May my Lord go in our midst" (\textit{yelek na' 'adonai beqirbenu}), is the final plea regarding the "presence problem" and is directly related to the "hard word" of 33:3 (\textit{lo' 'e'eleh beqirbeka}, cf. also 33:5). The second request--"and pardon our iniquities and our sins"--relates to the other aspect of the problem, the solution of which had just been offered in Yahweh's climactic proclamation (vv 6f.). It should be observed that Moses speaks of "our midst," "our iniquities," "our sins." There is real identification with his people. Verse 10a reads naturally as a sequel to Moses' last it, prayer--"Look! I am cutting a covenant" is the divine response of renewed favor.

This writer then holds that the motif of Moses' intercession forms a unifying thread for these chapters, that it follows a step-by-step pattern to its triumph, and that it betrays conscious literary design. It is Moses' version of Jacob's wrestling: 'I will not let you go until you bless your people.'

3. \textit{The sections about the ornaments and about the tent of meeting (33:4-6 and 33:7-11) consistently fit their niche in the narrative as repentance and Judgment motifs.}

These sections are most problematical and puzzling in one sense. The purpose here is not to untie all the critical knots but to suggest that these sections do make relatively good sense in

the narrative sequence where they are now placed. In the "ornaments" section, v 4 suggests a spontaneous laying aside of this jewelry in response to Yahweh's "evil" word refusing his presence in their midst, while vv 5-6 specify a permanent custom imposed by Yahweh. At any rate, the main idea seems to be one of grief, and repentance, which stands appropriately here.  

How does the tent of meeting section function within the narrative? Basically, we contend, as a judgment motif in the face of Israel's forfeiture of Yahweh's presence. Though vv 7-11 may appear as a kind of "floating" passage, it is nevertheless grounded in the context. It paints an immediate contrast to the action of the people in vv 4-6, since in its opening phrase, "And Moses took" (עまずה ייקח), the position of the subject before the verb form "expresses antithesis or marks a parallelism with the action of another subject." Thus while the people are stripping off their ornaments in mourning the loss of Yahweh's presence, Moses, on his part, pitches the tent of communion outside the camp where he will experience Yahweh's presence. The fact that the tent of communion is now placed outside the camp serves as a visible parable of Israel's predicament--the loss of Yahweh's presence. He cannot dwell in their midst, precisely as he had said (33: 3). So there is a stark contrast between the people and Moses: Yahweh will commune with him, even "face to face" as one speaks intimately with his friend (v 11). Moses is distinctly set apart from the people, a distinction that is clearly presup-

---

16 Some scholars (e.g., Beer, Exodus, 157) assume that there must have been an account of the making of the ark here originally (i.e., that's what the ornaments were used for), which has subsequently dropped out. This is to argue from utter silence and without any hard evidence.
17 Cassuto, Commentary, 430.
18 George Bush, Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Exodus (Andover: Gould & Newman, 1841) 2.229-230. The question of the "tent of meeting" (֝הלוֹם מוֹעֶד) is beyond the proper scope of this paper. Certainly the tent of meeting here (vv 7-11) is not to be identified with that of the tabernacle (27:21ff. passim). Many, link 33:7-11 with Num 11:16-17, 24, 26; 12:5, 10; and Deut 31:14-15 and see in these an alternate tradition to that of P's tabernacle, viz., one that knew of a simpler structure outside the camp; see, e.g., G. Henton Davies, "Tabernacle," IDB 4.502. However, a close reading of these additional texts (Num 11, etc.) indicates that there is no insurmountable problem in identifying their ֝הלוֹם מוֹעֶד with (P's) tabernacle.
19 Buber, Moses, 153-154, draws attention to the fact that in 33:7 Moses
posed in his intercession that follows (33:12ff., see above). It is as if he alone yet stands in covenant with Yahweh.  

Observe that in 34:3 only Moses the mediator is to be involved in the covenant renewal.

4. The covenant (renewal) of 34:10-28 most suitably relates to the preceding narrative in its contents as well as its context.

The covenant of 34:10ff. cannot be discussed without reference to 34:1-9. Initially there appears to be a critical consensus about chap. 34. Though it is customarily recognized as a covenant renewal within its present textual form, it is common for scholars to excise the two references to the "first" covenant tablets in v 1, the similar reference in v 4, and the "ten words" clause of v 28b, and then to view it as J's counterpart to E's Sinai covenant. How to explain chap. 34 then becomes the task, and it is at this point that the apparently solid phalanx of opinion scatters in radically different directions. This writer is not contending that such disparity of opinion is necessarily a support for the view that will be argued here. He does contend that such diversity at least suggests that a consideration of the obvious (the canonical context as primary rather than secondary) is a valid option. Indeed, the unwillingness of most to allow chap. 34 to be a genuine covenant renewal is a little mystifying. Though it is a truism, it is worth pointing out that those who refuse to see a covenant renewal here must purge the evidence which opposes them if taken as it stands. One may be accustomed to such procedure, but it should be remembered that it is most suspect in principle.

pitched the tent "for himself" (lo).

20 So J. H. Hertz, The Pentateuch and Haftorahs (2nd ed.; London: Soncino Press, 1960) 361. The verbs of 33:7ff. are usually construed as "frequentive" (= "used to "), being determined by the initial imperfect yiqqah. I have no objection to this, though, as Cassuto (Commentary, 429-430) has well observed, weqara' (called/named) hardly fits a frequentive pattern. Cassuto would also exclude yiqqah (took) and wenatah (pitched) from the frequentive category. Possibly we are to understand vv 7ff. as a practice initiated" in the situation depicted and continued thereafter (much like the relation between v 4 and vv 5-6).

21 Hyatt, Exodus, 318, 322; Clements, Exodus, 220 ff., but seemingly retaining "ten words"; Beer, Exodus, 159 ff.; also Childs, Book of Exodus, 607.

22 Cf. Childs, Book of Exodus, 604-607, for an excellent survey.
Perhaps it is at least fair to ask whether the necessity (?) to see chap. 34 as J's version of the Sinai covenant is not a desperate attempt to save J from a culpable omission in his materials or oneself from re-examining tenets of one's critical orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{23}

In considering 34:10-28, I intend to approach it primarily in terms of its contents rather than its form (covenant-treaty? legal code?), though the latter is certainly not without its interest. Observe that the primary demand running through vv 12-17 is for total loyalty to Yahweh. This section emphatically underscores the peril of pagan idolatry, warning of its seductions, glowing in the white heat of a God whose name is Jealous. No more suitable covenant demand could be made on the former bull worshipers. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that in all of vv 10-28 there is not one word about the relationships between Israelite and Israelite, as in Exodus 21-23. Nor is this silence at all astounding if the real burden of this covenant was to address Israel's existential situation as it existed in the wake of 32:1-6, the very connection implicit throughout the extant text. In fact, this is precisely the rationale behind the prohibition of "molten gods" (\textit{elohé massekah}) in v 17--it must be a clear broadside to the "molten bull-calf" (\textit{egel massekah}) of 32:4. To wonder why only molten gods are mentioned here and find it rather inexplicable\textsuperscript{24} is to have missed what the canonical context itself supplies.

At v 18 the emphasis shifts toward cultic matters, in which mention of the main feasts is prominent (vv 18, 22f., 25f.). Nor does this seem coincidental. Rather, the delineation of Yahweh's proper feasts serves as a splendid antithesis to Aaron's sorry excuse for a "feast to Yahweh" in 32:5. It is a way of setting

\textsuperscript{23} On chap. 34 Hyatt (\textit{Exodus}, 318) states that there is "little indication that this is in fact a renewal" apart from the notations of it in vv 1, 4. Actually, however, this amounts to saying that there is little indication of renewal here apart from the fact that the text does say just that. I must beg pardon if this sounds too polemical, but it causes one logical anguish to see the invocation of a later redactor for whatever elements do not fit the predominant theory--seemingly without serious consideration of at least the possibility of the integrity of the extant text. See K. Baltzer, \textit{The Covenant Formulary} (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971) 41-42, for one who seems to retain the renewal idea here, even though he too favors taking the renewal phrases of vv 1, 4 as redactional.

\textsuperscript{24} As do Hyatt, \textit{Exodus}, 324, and Noth, \textit{Exodus}, 263.
it, the true cult over against the bull cult. In this view the concentra-
tion on ritual matters is really no surprise. To have the decalogue of chap. 20 here would have been irrelevant to what had just transpired. The stress, therefore, on proper cultic practice in this kind of setting is merely another way of seeking to enforce that undeviating loyalty to Yahweh demanded in vv 12-17.

Finally, a suggestion might be entered regarding v 27 in which Yahweh is addressing Moses. The last words of the verse read: "I have cut with you a covenant and with Israel" (karatti 'itteka berit we'et yisra'el). It is common to regard "and with Israel" as a later addition to the text, and one can see how this could be assumed since we'et yisra'el stands rather isolated at the end of the clause, being severed from its coordinate 'itteka by the intervening object berit. However, I would propose that we'et yisra'el is deliberately elliptical in order to be pointedly dramatic. It then artistically rounds off the whole burden of the preceding chapters, especially in regard to Moses' intercession. It would fit link up beautifully with the "I and your people" concern of Moses in 33:12-17 (see above). It is the gracious Jealous One uttering the climactic assurance of pardon for which Moses had pleaded.

25 See, e.g., Beyerlin, Origins, 78.
26 Note how the last phrase ("the king of Assyria") of Isa 7:17 is "dropped" for effect at the very end of the Hebrew construction; see E. J. Young, The Book of Isaiah (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965-72) 1.295.
27 Space prohibits any lengthy discussion of individual elements in 34:10-28, especially of some which may be regarded as late (e.g., D redactor in vv 11-16, 24, according to Hyatt, Exodus, 319). These brief notes must suffice. (i) On vv 11b-13 one might note the sense of imminent anticipation it reflects; there is no hint of Israel's having endured the battering of the wilderness wanderings. This proves nothing. Yet it does indicate that the piece authentically portrays Israel's situation in terms of their history in the given text. If it is a backward projection it is well done. (ii) Verse 24 must be quite early (contra Noth, Exodus, 264; Hyatt, Exodus, 325), as one could hardly imagine such an ideal view emerging amidst post-conquest or post-settlement realities; nor could one expect much extending of borders in 7th century Judah. (iii) The "house of Yahweh your God," v 26 (cf. v 24c), does not necessarily point to D. In the ancient world it would simply he assumed that a god would have a house. The contrary would be strange. (iv) One might also note that the prohibition of v 26b (boiling a kid in its mother's milk) evidently refers to a pagan ritual practice.
I have tried to sketch what appears to me as a transparent and virile linkage between ch. 34 and its preceding context. It is held that this perspective more satisfactorily accounts for the problems involved, and, if accepted, it means that ch. 34 should be allowed to stand as a true covenant renewal.

5. The veil tradition (34:29-35) forms a connected and meaningful conclusion to the narrative complex.

Literary analysis tends to assign this little piece to P\(^{28}\) while tradition analysis understands it as an attempt to explain Moses' veil, pointing to the analogy of the priest's mask in ancient religion.\(^{29}\) These matters are not the main concern now.

These verses are not as unconnected as they may appear at first sight. Instead their primary emphasis well relates to the preceding account of Moses' receiving the covenant on Sinai. Cassuto observes that the text refers three times to Moses' speaking to Yahweh (vv 29, 34, 35), three times to Moses' speaking with Israel (vv 31, 33, 34), and once to Yahweh's speaking to Moses (v 32)--seven times in all. Such an emphasis hardly seems accidental.\(^{30}\) At any rate, it makes for a firm link to the foregoing covenant renewal and is concerned with the communication of that revelation to Israel, though it is also cognizant of Moses' passing on future revelation as well (vv 34-35).

Could there be more than this intended, particularly in reference to Moses' veil? I would propose the possibility of both a positive and negative function of the veil in light of the preceding canonical context. The fact that Israel sees Moses' face while he is speaking Yahweh's word to them would suggest their restoration to covenant favor. It was precisely the light of Yahweh's


\(^{28}\) Beer, Exodus, 13, 159; Hyatt, Exodus, 326.

\(^{29}\) Noth, Exodus, 267; Clements, Exodus, 225. Note that, according to the text (vv 33, 35), Moses was unveiled when speaking to the people and only veiled himself after he had communicated Yahweh's word to them. The veil was not worn when Moses was addressing the people as Clements, for one, appears to suppose. This seems then to be a strange function for a priestly mask; maybe Moses' veil was only a veil.

\(^{30}\) Cassuto, Commentary, 451.
presence they had bartered away and from which they had been excluded. Now they possessed a clear sign of renewed acceptance, viz., the radiance of Yahweh’s glory reflected from Moses' face. Yahweh's word was thus accompanied by a kind of assuring "sacrament."

Yet there is also a negative touch, for after Moses would convey Yahweh's word to them he would place the veil over his face. Is it stretching the matter to view this action as a visual aid meant to remind Israel of their nearly fatal apostasy, a kind of "caution light" intended to lead them to ever fresh repentance? Thus the covering of the radiance would symbolize for them the catastrophe of rebellion. The significance of the veil then would be a dual one; it would serve as both a true comfort and a needed check. Should this suggestion be valid, these verses would form a most suitable capstone to the whole narrative edifice.

The purpose of this major section has been to furnish evidence for taking Exodus 32-34 as an essential unity. It should be said that this in itself does not decide date(s) and/or writer(s). Its main concern is the integrity of the narrative. The unity of a narrative could be imposed by a redactor far down on the literary time-line. The matter can be involved. I personally incline toward seeing but one hand behind a well-constructed, unitary narrative. The work of a committee is not likely to achieve such a standard --much less if the committee's work extends over long reaches of time.

Concluding Theological Footnotes

Though the literary question is the primary focus of this study, it is proper to conclude by indicating certain theological themes which these chapters underscore. Indeed my conviction is that until one views this material as a literary totality he will have no feeling for its theological potency (i.e., as a general principle: only sane and sympathetic criticism can yield rich biblical theology).

One theme centers around the rebellion of the people. This note is obviously rooted in the basic event of 32:1-6 and is emphatically underscored when Israel is described four times as "a people stiff of neck" ('am qeseh 'orep; 32:9; 33:3, 5; 34:9; this exact phrase is found only two other times, Deut 9:6, 13, both of which
are in a context where the event of Exodus 32ff. is being recounted. And such rebellion is costly: in all of chaps. 32-34 Yahweh never calls Israel his people (not even in 34:10). If anything, they are Moses' people (32:7; 33:1; 34:10). The ornament section (33:4-6) and the veil tradition (34:29-35; see above) indicate that Israel was to remember her rebellion, to keep it always before her in order to live in repentance and true humility, to realize that the proper decor for the people of God is sackcloth and ashes.

A second theme is the cruciality of a mediator or, in tradition-historical terms, the greatness of Moses. This theme pervades the passage and was highlighted in the discussion of his intercession. It is Moses who "brought us up out of the land of Egypt" (32:1), of whom Yahweh promises to make a great nation (32:10), who intercedes repeatedly, persistently, and successfully, who has authority to "dress down" Aaron (32:21ff.), with whom Yahweh speaks "face to face" (33:11), who requests a view of Yahweh's glory and is granted a theophany (33:18ff.), who reflects Yahweh's glory with radiant face (34:29ff.). Yet the greatness of Moses is also seen in his humiliation: he rejects the offer to become covenant father (32:10) and "empties himself" to share the covenant curse (32:32). However, it is especially with respect to the intercession motif that one could say that Moses is so crucial that Israel's destiny hangs on his girdle. This does not suggest some "merits of Moses" idea but does try to take account of him as covenant mediator and as evidently the only Israelite still in covenant fellowship with God and unstained by the smear of apostasy. Yet it must be noted that even Moses has perimeters that limit him. He cannot see the "bare" glory of Yahweh (33:20), and, though he ever remains the bold and adventurous supplicant, he nevertheless remains a supplicant.

Here we see but a forerunner of the One Mediator.

31 The word 'am (referring to Israel) is used 33 times in chaps. 32-34; 9 times in the mouth of Yahweh, 9 times in the mouth of Moses (he is the one who calls them "thy [Yahweh's] people"), once by Aaron, and 14 times by the narrator.

32 The narrative grounds forgiveness not in the merits of Moses (32:33) but in the mercy of Yahweh (33:19; 34:6-7).

33 The first chapter of John seems to pick up on this idea of Moses' limits in Exodus 33-34 and to draw some contrasts between Moses and
The grace of Yahweh is a third emphasis. Surely, the centrality of 34: 6-7 ought to be recognized in such a connection. But the process should be observed as well as the climax (which is why the whole text must be held together). The long, arduous labor of the intercessor, the depicting of the restoration to favor in a progressive but deliberate pattern--this stresses more graphically than any mere statement that Yahweh's grace is not cheap grace! He is not the easy-going, grandfather god of the popular lyrics who "though it makes him sad to see the way we live, he'll always say, 'I forgive.' " There is more tension than that in the God whose name is Jealous! His grace is abundant and profound; but whatever it is, it is not softness. These chapters skillfully present to us the necessary tension in the God who is both loving and just, both gracious and holy. They do not explain how Yahweh's grace and holiness kiss each other, but they do preach grace in such a way that we both fear Yahweh's wrath yet rejoice--with trembling--under his unexplainable grace.

Finally, there is a theology of revelation implicit in our material. Yahweh speaks with Moses "face to face" (33:11) yet that does not dispense with the necessity of the cloud (33:9-10). Yahweh's servant may look upon what glory is given him to see, but he is yet shielded from seeing anything more than the "after effects" (33:18ff.; contrast John 1:18b)--while the sinful people can scarcely tolerate a reflected glory (34: 30). Thereby one understands that here is a God who may be intensely intimate yet elusively invisible. The former should answer the deepest needs of his people; the latter should keep them from going around making calves.
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The Date of the Exodus Reexamined

Charles H. Dyer

Why reexamine the date of the Exodus? Some might object to such a reexamination of the evidence as simply “beating a dead horse.” However, this type of objection fails on two counts. First, each generation needs to reexamine the problem to decide for itself the validity of the possible solutions based on the most recent textual and archaeological studies. New evidence can help condemn or confirm previous hypotheses. Second, the problem must be reexamined because other options are continually being advanced which must be evaluated.1

Because of the limited scope of this article, only the two views which currently hold sway in the Exodus problem will be examined. These are known as the “early date” and the “late date.” The early date places the Exodus in 1445 B.C. while the late date identifies the Exodus as having occurred about 1290 B.C.

The Late Date

The late date is that date held by nearly all liberal scholars and by a fair number of conservative scholars. Four lines of evidence are presented in favor of a late date.

The Cities of Pithom and Raamses

A biblical argument used to support the late date of the Exodus is based on Exodus 1:11. “So they appointed taskmasters

[Charles H. Dyer, Assistant to the Academic Dean, Instructor in Bible Exposition, Dallas Theological Seminary]

over them to afflict them with hard labor. And they built for Pharaoh storage cities, Pithom and Raamses.” The thrust of this argument is this: (1) The Israelites built the city of Raamses just before the Exodus. (2) This city is to be equated with the city of Pi-Ramesse built by Pharaoh Ramesses II, who ruled from 1240 to 1224. (3) Therefore the Exodus must have occurred sometime in the 13th century during the reign of this pharaoh. Kitchen feels that this argument alone is determinative for dating the Exodus in the 13th century.²

Those who hold to this position have failed to prove two links in their chain of evidence. First, they have failed to prove that the city of Raamses mentioned in Exodus 1:11 should be equated with Pi-Ramesse built by Ramesses II. Rather they have assumed the connection solely on the basis of similarity of the words “Raamses” and “Ramesses.” Second, they have failed to prove that a similarity of names requires a chronological unity between the two events. That is, even if the two cities are to be equated, this still does not by itself prove that the events occurred simultaneously. Those holding a late Exodus date must still demonstrate a chronological harmony.

Unger attempts to argue against the late date of the Exodus by using the second argument from the preceding paragraph. He argues that the reference to Raamses in Exodus 1:11 does not provide a chronological marker that can be used to date the Exodus. Instead it is a later “modernization” of the Hebrew text used to designate a city which was in existence before Ramesses II.³

While Unger’s explanation is possible, it does (to this author) raise some questions concerning the validity of the biblical text. And yet the possible validity of his argument must be allowed by those who attempt to use Exodus 1:11 to prove a late date. The reason for this can be explained as follows. If the Exodus took place about 1290 or 1280 B.C. and if Moses was 80 years old at the time of the Exodus (Exod 7:7), then Moses was born in 1370-1360 B.C. The text of Exodus 1 indicates that the building of the cities of Pithom and Raamses preceded Pharaoh’s command to kill all newborn males, which preceded the birth of Moses. Therefore the building of the city of Raamses had to begin sometime before 1360 B.C. This is over 45 years before the start of the Nineteenth Dynasty and the first Ramasside king! Thus either the city of Raamses did exist before the reign of Ramesses II (which would allow for a prior city in Exodus 1:11) or else the name is a later modernization (which would allow for Unger’s

argument). In either case those who hold to a 13th-century Exodus cannot argue against the early-date interpretation of Exodus 1:11 without destroying their own argument.

Because of the doctrine of inspiration, this writer feels more comfortable in adopting the first argument—the lack of evidence for associating the city of Raamses in Exodus 1:11 with the city of Pi-Ramesse built by Ramesses II. In fact, the biblical text provides some support for not making this identification. Genesis 47:11 clearly indicates that the name "Rameses" was in use before the time of Ramesses II. “So Joseph settled his father and his brothers, and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses as Pharaoh had ordered.” Obviously no one would date the entrance of Israel into Egypt during the reign of Ramesses II on the basis of this verse. But since the presence of the term here does not indicate a chronological correspondence, then why does the presence of the term in Exodus 1:11 indicate such correspondence? Why could not Exodus 1:11 be referring to a city of this area called Rameses the name of which existed centuries before Ramesses II? Merrill argues cogently for this possibility.

…it is by no means certain that the city of Rameses was named after the Pharaoh of that name. In fact, Genesis 47:11 states that Jacob and his family settled in the land of Rameses when they entered Egypt in the nineteenth century; unless we postulate an anachronism, for which there is not the slightest proof, we must conclude that there was an area by that name before there was ever a Pharaoh Rameses. It could well be that there had been an ancient Ramesside dynasty long ages before and the Ramessides of the Nineteenth Dynasty were named for them, the city also having taken this name. In any case, there is no need to assume that the mention of the city of Rameses proves that the Exodus must have taken place during the reign of Ramesses II.5

Exodus 1:11 offers little proof for the late date of the Exodus. The city mentioned was founded and named at least 70 years before the reign of Ramesses II even if one assumes the late date. It was located in an area which had been designated as “the land of Rameses” 550 years before Ramesses II. Thus there is no compelling evidence for associating the city with Ramesses II solely on the basis of similarity of name.

The Status of Edom and Moab

The second argument advanced in favor of the late date focuses on the status of Edom and Moab at the time of the

Exodus. “From Kadesh Moses then sent messengers to the king of Edom…. ‘Please let us pass through your land. We shall not pass through field or through vineyard; we shall not even drink water from a well. We shall go along the king’s highway, not turning to the right or left, until we pass through your territory.’ Edom, however, said to him, ‘You shall not pass through us, lest I come out with the sword against you’…. And Edom came out against him with a heavy force, and with a strong hand” (Num 20:17–20). “Then the sons of Israel journeyed, and camped in the plains of Moab and beyond the Jordan opposite Jericho…. And Balak the son of Zippor was king of Moab at that time” (Num 22:1, 4).

These verses indicate that Edom and Moab were populated during the period shortly after the Exodus. However, according to Glueck the Transjordan area was largely uninhabited from about 1800 to 1300 B.C.⁶ Since the book of Numbers refers to established kingdoms in the Transjordan, namely, the kingdoms of the Moabites and Ammonites, through whose territories the Israelites had to cross, and since surface explorations carried on for two decades by Nelson Glueck showed little or no trace of sedentary life in that region until the thirteenth century, some see in this another evidence that the Exodus took place in the thirteenth rather than in the fifteenth century B.C.⁷

The Bible records the fact that Israel encountered the nations of Edom and Moab during its journey through Transjordania. And yet, according to Glueck no evidence of any nations inhabiting this area between 1800 and 1300 B.C. has been found. His archaeological work sought to prove that the Transjordan kingdoms encountered or avoided by the Israelites did not appear till the 13th century.⁸

Can this argument be answered? Merrill offers a simple explanation, which attacks the central weakness of Glueck’s position.

The answer is quite obvious from a careful study of the Old Testament record and even a superficial knowledge of Biblical geography. We are told that Moses wanted to take the King’s Highway, a road which passed through an extremely narrow mountain pass into and out from the city of Petra (Sela). This pass could easily be defended by only a very few hundred well-trained troops, and they need not be sedentary peoples. Nomads or semi-nomads could well have occupied the area in such sufficient numbers that they precluded Israel’s passing through their difficult land; yet the nature of

their existence would explain the lack of any material remains such as permanent structures…. The absence of remains of a settled people need not militate against the early date of the Exodus if the people simply did not leave remains. *Argumentum ad silentum* is not sufficient to overthrow the Biblical position.9

Merrill’s point is well taken. An argument based on negative evidence is always tenuous. Thus it is interesting to note Kitchen’s inconsistency in this regard. He uses Glueck’s survey as his first line of proof from Palestinian archaeology to argue against the early date and for the late date of the Exodus.10 However, he offers a different explanation of the evidence when excavations at Dibon failed to find any support for a settlement there in the 13th century (which would be required according to the Book of Num).

In Moab proper Dibon offers an equally instructive example…. Here, the excavations found virtually nothing of Late Bronze Age date, even though Dibon is mentioned in Numbers (21:30; 32:2, 34, 33:45–46, etc.). precisely like the “gap” at the Negeb sites. However, *in this case we have independent written evidence at first hand to prove the existence of Dibon in the thirteenth century BC*: the war-reliefs of Ramesses II depicting his conquest of Batora and of Dibon “in the land of Moab,” these being shown as fortresses…. the archaeological data from Dibon (Dhiban) are clearly inadequate, as is so often the case with mute, uninscribed, time-worn, incompletely-dug, archaeological sites. *Such evidence is a very unsatisfactory basis from which to pass judgment upon the biblical or any other literary source.*

Perhaps Kitchen should be more consistent in his application of the biblical and archaeological evidence. Glueck’s surface explorations are hardly sufficient to pass judgment on the occupation of the Transjordan area. Archer provides the most complete attack on this position.

But Glueck’s investigations were largely in the nature of surface exploration, and could hardly have been called thorough. Moreover, there has come to light more recently a new line of evidence which seems to belie his deductions. In the *Biblical Archaeologist* for February 1953, C. Lankester Harding reported that the discovery of an ancient tomb in Amman containing numerous artifacts (including black pricked ware, button-base vases, oil flasks, scarabs, and toggle pins) dating from about 1600 B.C. In Harding’s *Antiquities of Jordan* (1959) he also speaks of characteristic Middle Bronze pottery and other objects found at Naur and Mount Nebo. A sixteenth century tomb was discovered at Pella in 1967 (ASOR newsletter, Dec. 1967). A Late Bronze Age temple was uncovered under a runway at the Amman airport in 1955 (CT, Dec. 22, 1971, p. 26). Franken’s excavations at Deir Alla and those of Siegfried Horn at

---

Heshbon have shown that the pottery of Transjordan was quite dissimilar from that produced on the west bank of the Jordan at the same period. Yamauchi suggests that Glueck mistakenly assumed the homogeneity of pottery from both regions and thus may have introduced confusion into his interpretation of the data (ibid.). Further excavation will no doubt uncover more products of this intermediate period and demonstrate once again the fallacy of hasty conclusions from superficial investigations.\(^\text{12}\)

Once again an argument for the late date of the Exodus must be rejected.

The argument is primarily an argument from silence which can be explained in the light of the lack of archaeological evidence left by a nomadic or semi-nomadic people. Also, additional evidence has been trickling in, evidence which does seem to confirm the existence of people in the Transjordan area in the period from 1800 to 1300 B.C.

**The Situation in Western Palestine**

Perhaps the strongest evidence in favor of the late date is found in the archaeology of western Palestine.

Various Palestinian city-sites show evidence of clear destruction in the second half of the 13th century B.C., which would agree with the onset of the Israelites placed at roughly 1240 B.C. onward. Such sites are Tell Beit Mirsim (possibly biblical Debir/Kiriath-sepher), Lachish, Bethel and Hazor.\(^\text{13}\)

The evidence in this section is too numerous to examine in detail. However, some material needs to be considered carefully. Two specific archaeological sites will be considered.

*Jericho.* The biblical account clearly indicates that the first city destroyed by the Israelites as they entered Canaan was Jericho. Since this occurred approximately 40 years after the Exodus, the dating of the fall of Jericho should provide a clue for the dating of the Exodus. Initial work by Garstang seemed to provide good support for the early date of the Exodus.\(^\text{14}\)

While Garstang’s position is still held by some conservative writers,\(^\text{15}\) most have abandoned the position in favor of that proposed by Kenyon. Kenyon has done extensive work at Jericho. Her general conclusions vary from those of Garstang.

The evidence of the published pottery makes it clear, in the first place, that none of the areas excavated were occupied in the thirteenth century, nor the tombs discovered used then. There is no trace of any of the comparatively well-known thirteenth century forms. On the other hand, it is clear that there was occupation within some part of the fourteenth century. Our knowledge of


pottery makes it difficult to assign very exact dates. It would appear that most of the typically fifteenth forms are lacking. . . . 16

The question now, however, is this: which date of the Exodus does the archaeological evidence from Jericho support? Actually the evidence from the ruins themselves is somewhat sketchy. Kitchen notes that “the Late Bronze Age levels appear to have been almost completely washed away during the four centuries that the mound lay desolate from Joshua until Ahab’s time…”17 Thus much of the evidence has been lost or jumbled through erosion and weathering over the centuries. Still, Waltke believes that a date can be established through the use of other archaeological markers.

Now can the fall of the city be dated more precisely during the Late Bronze period? Garstang argued convincingly that the Conquest must have occurred before the reign of Akhenaten, who began to reign ca. 1375 B.C. because (1) not one of the distinctive, plentiful, and well-established archaeological criteria characteristic of Akhenaten’s reign has been found in either the city or in the tombs; (2) there is no reference to Jericho in the Amarna letters dated to Akhenaten’s reign, though numerous cities of Canaan are mentioned frequently; (3) there is no scarab after Amenhotep III (1412 B.C.-1375 B.C.) though there survived an abundant and continuous series of scarabs of the Egyptian kings from the Middle Bronze Age right on down through the reign of Hatshepsut, Thutmose III, and Amenhotep III of the Late Bronze I period. Confessedly these are all negative evidences and may be subject to other explanations than that the Canaanite city ceased to exist before 1375 B.C., but together they lead to the plausible suggestion that the destruction of the city previously established by the ceramic evidence between 1410 B.C. and 1340 B.C. occurred before 1375 B.C.18

While Waltke labels his evidence for a 1375 B.C. destruction “negative evidences,” one item could be considered in a more positive sense as an answer to Kenyon’s position. Kenyon has argued that there is no evidence of occupation suddenly ending about 1375 B.C. However, she is then forced to deal with a 15th-century royal scarab which was found in one of the tombs by proposing a concept that has no supporting evidence.

The suggestion put forward in the report that [the scarab] was the insignia of office of the person buried is tempting, but it is so much at variance with the lack of what we now know as fifteenth century pottery, that it can only be suggested that it was an heirloom. We have not sufficient evidence of how in Palestine such scarabs, which may in origin have been insignia, were treated, to allow such a find by itself to contradict other evidence.19

---

Kenyon seems to be guilty of manipulating her evidence to fit a preconceived idea. If evidence is found which contradicts her thesis she explains it away even though there is no warrant for doing so. Taken as a whole the evidence for Jericho is mixed. While Garstang’s support for the destruction of the walls in 1400 has been challenged by Kenyon, she has not conclusively shown that her alternative is correct. Additional evidence points to a destruction sometime between 1400 and 1375 B.C. Still, the evidence is mixed.

Hazor. The second city to be examined is Hazor. This site has been extensively excavated by Yigael Yadin. He discovered evidence of 21 cities covering a span of 2,550 years from 2700 B.C. to 150 B.C. Yadin accepts the late date for the Exodus and Conquest and associates the destruction of the city “at the end of the Late Bronze Age II in the second half of the 13th cent. B.C.”

However, Yadin does present some other interesting evidence. He notes the discovery of a Late Bronze II period gate erected on the foundation of the earlier Middle Bronze Age II gate. He then writes:

This gate must have been destroyed in a violent conflagration, though the exterior walls still stand to a height of nine feet. Traces of the burnt bricks of its inner walls and the ashes of the burnt beams still cover the floors in thick heaps. The evidence suggests that this destruction occurred before the final destruction of Hazor by the Israelites, but this problem remains to be studied.

While the point could easily be missed, it is significant. Since Yadin accepts the 1250 B.C. destruction as being that of Israel, he is saying that another earlier destruction also took place during the Late Bronze II period. Walton dates both phases of the Late Bronze II period as extending from 1400 to 1200 B.C. Thus if two destructions were in this period, how does one know which is to be associated with the Exodus? The first would correspond to the early date for the Exodus and the second would correspond to the late date for the Exodus. But which destruction is correct? The problem is even more complex because a third period of destruction is also in evidence during this period.

There are then from the Late Bronze Age Canaanite city layers of destruction at ca. 1400 B.C., ca. + 1300 B.C. and ca. + 1230 B.C. Moreover, there is no occupation after 1230 B.C. on the Lower Canaanite City and a probable gap on the tell between 1230 B.C. and the era of Solomon. The interpretive problem then is: “With which of these strata shall one associate Joshua?” Most probably Yadin is

21 Ibid., p. 4.
22 Ibid., p. 8.
23 Ibid., p. 9 (italics added).
24 Walton, Chronological Charts, p. 28.
correct in his suggestion that the destruction level at ca. + 1300 B.C. should be associated with the burning of the city by Seti I (ca. 1318 B.C.). So then one is left with the destruction levels at 1400 B.C. and 1230 B.C. Yadin opted for the 1230 B.C. level.25

Which date should be assigned to Joshua? The Bible itself helps provide an answer. Judges 4:2–3 indicates that Jabin, king of Hazor, oppressed the Israelites during the period of the Judges for 20 years. Israel was finally delivered by Deborah and Barak when they destroyed Jabin (4:23–24). Whitcomb places the defeat of Jabin approximately 165 years after Joshua’s destruction of Hazor.26 This passage argues strongly against the 1230 destruction as that of Joshua since the city was uninhabited between 1230 and the time of Solomon. As Waltke notes, “If the city ceased to exist after 1230 B.C., and if it is still in existence at least three or four generations after Joshua, then Joshua’s destruction cannot be attributed to the destruction level dated at 1230 B.C. . . .”27

Rather than arguing for the late date of the Exodus, the destruction at Hazor actually favors the early date. In fact, neither Hazor nor Jericho argue conclusively for the late date of the Exodus. The data are capable of harmonization with the early date and in fact sometimes fit better with that date.

The Location of Pharaoh’s Residence

A fourth argument in favor of the late date for the Exodus centers on the location of pharaoh’s residence during the time of the Exodus. Those who hold to the late date argue that during the Eighteenth Dynasty (1580-1314 B.C.) the capital of Egypt was in the south at Thebes. It was not until the Nineteenth Dynasty that it was moved to the north to Pi-Ramesses. Thus for the pharaoh to have been geographically close to the Israelites (as the Exodus account seems to indicate), the pharaoh must have been from the Nineteenth Dynasty since only the Nineteenth Dynasty capital of Pi-Ramesses is close enough to the land of Goshen.28

Kitchen concurs with this assessment when he notes, “The official building-works of the Ramesside kings in the E. Delta are usually found to be the first original works there since the Hyksos period four centuries earlier. . . .”29 Obviously if this evidence is true, then one would be hard pressed to place the pharaoh of the Eighteenth Dynasty near the land of Goshen if his capital was located far to the south. However, does the evidence actually support these claims? This writer thinks not.

25 Waltke, “Palestinian Artifactual Evidence,” p. 44.
27 Waltke, “Palestinian Artifactual Evidence,” p. 44.
29 Kitchen, Ancient Orient, p. 59. n. 11.
Davis has amassed several items of evidence which point to the pharaoh’s presence in the Delta region during the Eighteenth Dynasty. However, it is well known both from archaeological remains and important inscriptions that the Eighteenth Dynasty pharaohs did have a keen interest in building projects in the northern part of Egypt. Along with the two red granite obelisks erected by Thutmose III in front of the Temple of Ra’-Heliopolis, a scarab has been discovered that refers to the birth of Amenhotep II as having taken place in Memphis just below Heliopolis. It appears that as a youth Amenhotep II spent considerable time in that area. It has also been demonstrated that in the Eighteenth Dynasty there were two viziers in Egypt, one in upper Egypt and one in lower Egypt. Since Eighteenth Dynasty pharaohs were very active in Palestinian campaigns, it would seem reasonable that they would have established garrisons and store-cities somewhere in the Delta region to facilitate movement between Syro-Palestinian sites and Egypt itself.\footnote{John J. Davis, Moses and the Gods of Egypt (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1971), p. 27.}

Other archaeological evidence found in Egypt confirms Davis’s statement. A stela from Amenhotep II was found in Memphis which recorded some of his military exploits. One section dealt with his victorious return to Egypt. “His majesty reached Memphis, his heart joyful. . . . Now the God’s Wife, King’s Wife, and King’s [Daughter] beheld the victory of his majesty.”\footnote{James B. Pritchard. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, 3d ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 246.} The text seems to imply that the king at least had a temporary dwelling in the Delta area where his family would at times reside and which he would use as his base of operation for excursions into Palestine.

The location of the pharaoh’s residence has little bearing on the date of the Exodus since the pharaohs of both the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties had residences in the northern delta region. Thus the pharaoh could easily come from either dynasty and still meet the scriptural requirements.

**Conclusion**

Much of the evidence advanced in favor of the late date is based on archaeological data which are subject to different interpretations. None of the material offers compelling evidence in favor of the late date. Instead, all the data can harmonize with the early date.

**The Early Date**

The early date of the Exodus (ca. 1445 B.C.) is held by many (but not all) conservative scholars. Several lines of evidence,
both biblical and archaeological, are often presented as support for an early date.

**First Kings 6:1**

Perhaps the strongest evidence in favor of an early date is the statement of 1 Kings 6:1 which dates the beginning of the construction of the temple. “Now it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the sons of Israel came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon’s reign over Israel, in the month of Ziv which is the second month that he began to build the house of the Lord.” Whitcomb dates the fourth year of Solomon’s reign to 966 B.C.\(^{32}\) Thus 480 years prior to the fourth year of Solomon would place the Exodus at 1445 B.C.

Since the statement of 1 Kings 6:1 is so straightforward, one wonders why the early date for the Exodus would ever be questioned. And yet questions are raised.

Against this line of reasoning stands the plain statement of 1 K. 6:1 that there were 480 years between the Exodus and the building of the Temple. If the reasoning is correct, how can that figure be explained? Commonly it is seen as a round figure, the sum of twelve generations of forty years each. The presence of two stock numbers, twelve and forty, is enough to create some presumption in favor of this explanation. Although there is no direction in the text that the number should be interpreted as an approximation, neither is there any evidence that the Hebrew people during the judges period had any need for, or any inclination to keep, an exact overall chronology.\(^{33}\)

This argument is very tenuous. First, Oswalt argues in a circle. He takes the 480-year figure, divides it into two figures (12 and 40), and then argues that the presence of these “stock numbers” points to the fact that the number is an approximation. But where in the text are the numbers 12 and 40? He produced these himself from the 480 figure (i.e., 12 x 40 = 480). Yet the text itself does not have these “stock numbers”; it simply has 480. Second, Oswalt, fails to account for the specifics of the text in which the “480” is couched. This was also “the fourth year of Solomon’s reign.” “the month of Ziv,” and “the second month.” These are hardly “approximations.” Rather the author of 1 Kings was citing a specific date for the beginning of the temple’s construction. Should not this “create a presumption” in favor of a literal interpretation of the 480-year figure? Third, Oswalt is arguing from silence when he intimates that the people during the Judges period did not keep accurate chronological records.


Judges 11:26 indicates just the opposite. Jephthah knew the exact amount of time that Israel lived in Heshbon (300 years). Evidently he did have “an inclination to keep an exact overall chronology.” Furthermore, 1 Kings 6:1 was recorded during the monarchy; and a glance at 1 and 2 Kings reveals that the writer was concerned with chronology. Based on his use of numbers elsewhere in the book it seems probable that he intended the 480 year figure to be interpreted literally.

Wood provides a telling critique of this position.

This explanation, however, must be rejected by one who holds to a high view of inspiration. The text in no way states or implies the thought of twelve generations. It refers merely to the definite number 480, which means that any idea of generations must be read into the text. One is minded to say that if this plain number can be reduced so drastically by this manner of analysis, then many other biblical numbers can be similarly adjusted by parallel methods, making Scriptural numbers very uncertain indeed.34

Those who would seek to reinterpret 1 Kings 6:1 do so on the basis of external archaeological evidence. Thus they are seeking to reinterpret the biblical data to “match” the archaeological data. This is a very dangerous position because archaeology is a very inexact, changing science. Unless there is good textual or contextual evidence to the contrary, it is better to let the Bible stand on its own.

**Judges 11:26**

The second argument in favor of the early date are the words of Jephthah in Judges 11:26. “While Israel lived in Heshbon and its villages, and in all the cities that are on the banks of the Arnon, three hundred years, why did you not recover them within that time?” Jephthah was saying, in effect, that Israel had been occupying the city of Heshbon (and other villages) in Moab for 300 years. These cities were taken by Israel just before their invasion of Canaan (cf. Num 21:25–35). The possession of Heshbon occurred approximately 340 years before Jephthah. The problem for those who hold the late Exodus date is obvious. If the Exodus took place in 1280 B.C., then Jephthah would have been a judge in 940 B.C.—during the reign of King Solomon! However, if the Exodus took place in 1445 B.C., then Jephthah judged in 1105 B.C., well within the period of the Judges.

How does one who holds to a late date for the Exodus answer this? Some use a mixture of agnosticism and circular reasoning,

They begin by assuming that the Conquest occurred around 1240-1220 B.C. Since Jephthah’s remark (made ca. 1100) would mean the Exodus occurred about 1400, his remark cannot be interpreted literally since it does not square with the “evidence.” That is, they must reinterpret Scripture to “fit” their archaeological scheme.

But here again, we do not know the basis of Jephthah’s figure—it could again, be an aggregate of partly concurrent periods (e.g., for Reuben, Gad, and East Manasseh?), but we have no indications on which to build…. Empty speculation is profitless, and sound method would counsel one to await fresh light on matters of this type. No-one is compelled to produce a complete answer when there is simply not enough information to do so.35

Davis makes a notable observation on the context of Judges 11 in which Jephthah’s statement occurs. It is a prose section involving talks between two nations, both of which are aware of the historical situation of Heshbon.

It is scarcely possible, however, that Jephthah should make such a blunder in the midst of important international negotiations. His knowledge of the Torah is evident from the context of Chapter 11 of Judges. It is doubtful that Jephthah could have exaggerated this number as it was used in the argument to the king and have gotten away with it. The King of Ammon had some knowledge of the historical precedence involved in Israel’s occupation of the territory of Transjordan (cf. Judg 11:13). Again it would be well to point out that numerical information given in the passage under question does not appear in a poetic section and therefore probably reflects sober fact.36

It seems best to accept the testimony of Judges 11:26 at face value. There is nothing in the context to argue against a normal interpretation. Thus the early date of the Exodus seems to accord better with the biblical data.

The “Dream Stele” of Thutmose IV

A third argument advanced to support the early date for the Exodus is the “dream stele” of Thutmose IV. This stele records a dream of Thutmose IV in which he was promised the throne of Egypt.

One of those days it happened that the King’s Son Thut-mose came on an excursion at noon time. Then he rested in the shadow of this great god. Sleep took hold of him, slumbering at the time when the sun was at its peak. He found the majesty of this august god speaking with his own mouth, as a father speaks to his son, saying,

35 Kitchen, Ancient Orient, pp. 74-75.
36 Davis, Moses and the Gods of Egypt, p. 31.
“See me, look at me, my son, Thut-mose! I am thy father, Harmakhis-Khepri-Re-Atum. I shall give thee my kingdom upon earth at the head of the living. Thou shalt wear the southern crown and the northern crown on the throne of Geb, the crown prince (of the gods). Thine is the land in its length and its breadth, that which the Eye of the All-Lord illumines.”

The argument here is that had Thutmose IV been the firstborn son, he would have had no need for the god to promise him the throne since he would have already been heir. Thus he must have had an older brother who later died. This would harmonize with the death of the firstborn at the time of the Exodus.

It is quite obvious that if Thutmose IV had been the eldest son of his father, Amenhotep II, there would have been no purpose in divine promise that he should some day become king. He would naturally have succeeded to the throne if he had survived his father. It is a necessary inference, therefore, that the oldest son of Amenhotep must have later predeceased his father, thus leaving the succession to his younger brother. This well accords with the record in Exodus 12:29 that the eldest son of Pharaoh died at the time of the tenth plague.

While this argument sounds impressive, it has some serious difficulties. First, it is an argument from silence. Second, for it to be valid Thutmose IV would have had to be old enough to go hunting and to have such a dream prior to the death of his brother (once the older brother was dead the dream was unnecessary). However, as Aling notes, “This seems highly unlikely, since the prince was at most five years old at the time of the exodus. The events described on the Sphinx Stele should in all probability be dated some years after the exodus, and therefore the stele is definitely not evidence for the death of the Egyptian firstborn.”

While there might be some latitude on the exact date of Thutmose IV’s birth, Aling has presented a strong case against using the dream stele as an argument for the early date of the Exodus. This does not argue against the early date; it merely indicates that the dream stele has no bearing either way on the debate. Thus unless evidence arises which shows that (a) Thutmose IV was old enough to have this experience before 1445 and (b) Thutmose IV had only one older brother, it seems better to eliminate this argument from the evidence for the early date.

The 'Apiru and the Amarna Letters

A fourth argument for the early date of the Exodus focuses on two interrelated events. The first is a class of people who

---

invaded Palestine in the 14th century, and the second is a series of letters written from Canaan to Pharaoh Amenhotep IV (Akhenaten), also from the 14th century.

The important question is whether there is any such invasion of central and southern Palestine hinted at in contemporary records that would suggest the Israelite conquest under Joshua. That there is such an invasion of outsiders recounted in the famous Amarna Letters, which deal with this period from about 1400-1366 B.C., has been known virtually since their discovery in 1886. These invaders, called Habiru, are etymologically actually equatable with the Hebrews. . . .

The letters of this period illustrate Unger’s point. One example is EA, No. 271 written by Milkilu, prince of Gezar, to the pharaoh. He writes, “Let the king, my lord, protect his land from the hand of the ‘Apiru. If not, (then) let the king, my lord, send chariots to fetch us, lest our servants smite us.”

A second example is from ‘Abdu-Heba, king of Jerusalem, who writes:41

As truly as the king, my lord, lives, when the commis [sioners] go forth I will say, “Lost are the lands of the king! Do you not hearken unto me? All the governors are lost; the king, my lord, does not have a (single) governor (left)! Let the king turn his attention to the archers, and let the king, my lord, send out troops of archers, (for) the king has no lands (left)!” The ‘Apiru plunder all the lands of the king. If there are archers (here) in this year, the lands of the king, my lord, will remain (intact); but if there are not archers (here) the lands of the king, my lord, will be lost!42

While this does seem to describe an invasion (a) at the same time as that of an early date conquest and (b) by a people with a similar name to the Hebrews, not all associate the ‘Apiru or the Amarna Letters with the Israelite Conquest. Pfeiffer presents at least four arguments against this identification: (1) “A strong argument against identification comes from the fact that ‘Apiru appear in a wide variety of places of which there is no hint in the Biblical narrative.” (2) “There is considerable evidence that the ‘Apiru were regarded as a social rather than an ethnic group…. The ‘Apiru of the Amarna tablets are never described as invaders.” (3) “Although the place names of the Amarna texts are parallel to those of the Old Testament, the personal names are totally different.” (4) “Most contemporary scholars date the conquest of Canaan after the Amarna Age, suggesting some time around 1280 B.C., as the probable date of the Exodus.”

While Pfeiffer’s points are well taken, his arguments are answerable. The first argument assumes a one-for-one

---

42 Ibid., p. 488.
correspondence between ‘Apiru and Hebrew. If ‘Apiru could denote a larger class of people of which the Hebrews were considered one segment, then the argument has been answered. Much as one today might use the larger designation “American” or “European” to denote an individual who is actually from El Salvador or France, so a Hebrew could have been designated by the larger term ‘Apiru. Pfeiffer’s second argument is also somewhat moot for it is difficult to distinguish social and ethnic traits from the limited material available. Also it is easy to see the invading Israelites as both a social group (with their own laws, patterns of conduct, etc.) and an ethnic group. Pfeiffer’s third argument assumes that individuals had only one name. However, there are examples in the Bible of individuals who had two names (or more). It is possible that the two accounts are reflecting the two different names (cf. 2 Kings 23:34 where Eliakim’s name was changed to Jehoiakim by the pharaoh to signify Egypt’s control of Judah’s king). Pfeiffer’s fourth argument involved circular reasoning. He is assuming what he is trying to prove.

While Pfeiffer’s arguments can be answered, he should cause one to think before indiscriminately applying archaeological evidence to biblical events. Actually the Amarna letters and the ‘Apiru by themselves do not prove the early date for the Exodus. Apart from clear scriptural testimony placing the Hebrews in the same location during the same period of time the evidence would be incomplete. As it is, the Amarna letters and the ‘Apiru can confirm the early date of the Exodus but they cannot prove the early date.

Other Evidence

Other relatively minor arguments are offered in favor of an early date for the Exodus. The first of these is the argument from antiquity. Josephus quoted the Egyptian historian Manetho to show that his records mention the Exodus. Josephus quoted Manetho as saying that “Tethmosis was king when they went away.” However, Josephus then chided Manetho for erring in later declaring that a king named “Amenophis” was the pharaoh at the time of the Exodus.44 Could it be possible that Josephus was preserving a garbled tradition that was associating Thutmose III and Amenhotep II with the Exodus? One cannot say for sure but the similarity is striking.

A second minor argument offered in favor of an early date for the Exodus is based on the chronology of the life of Moses. Moses

---

was 40 years old when he fled from the pharaoh after killing an Egyptian (Exod 2:11–15; Acts 7:23–29). Moses was 80 years old when God told him to go back to Egypt “for all the men who were seeking your life are dead” (Exod 4:19; cf. 7:7; Acts 7:30). Since the pharaoh had been seeking Moses’ life (Exod 2:15), one needs to find a pharaoh who reigned for approximately 40 years to fulfill the chronological gap. Only two kings lived long enough to fill this gap—Thutmose who reigned for 54 years (1504-1450 B.C.) and Rameses II who reigned for 66 years (1290-1224 B.C.). However Rameses II must be eliminated because the pharaoh following him would be Merneptah and it was during his reign that the stele was written which identified his victory over the Israelites in Palestine. Thus Thutmose III must have been the pharaoh of the oppression and Amenhotep II the pharaoh of the Exodus.45

The main argument against this position is that it assumes that the pharaoh must have lived for the 40 years Moses was in the wilderness even though the biblical text never says that. Theoretically the pharaoh could have died years earlier. Thus the argument is interesting, but irrelevant. While it does not prove the early date, neither does it disprove it.

Conclusion

Two types of evidence have been presented—biblical and archaeological. The biblical evidence was seen to be very strong for the early date. Both 1 Kings 6:1 and Judges 11:26, when interpreted normally, point to an Exodus sometime around 1445 B.C. The archaeological evidence is interesting but not quite as strong. The “dream stele” of Thutmose IV, the ‘Apiru and Amarna letters, the testimony of Josephus, and the historical setting provide interesting, but not incontrovertible, evidence in favor of an early date. Some of these arguments are stronger than others, but each of them is capable of another interpretation. Thus the primary support for the early date must still rest on the biblical testimony.

Conclusion

The fact is that the available archaeological evidence simply does not square well with the biblical account of the conquest [and Exodus] regardless of what one proposes as a date. If the Bible and archaeology are to be correlated vis-a-vis the conquest, the claims of the biblical account will have to be modified in some fashion and/or

some of the archaeological evidence will have to be explained away. This brings into focus a crucial methodological issue which divides biblical scholars (and Palestinian archaeologists) more than we generally admit. The issue is simply this: What sort of conclusion is to be reached when carefully excavated archaeological evidence does not seem to meet the minimum requirements of the historical implications of the biblical texts?46

Miller has hit the heart of the question as it relates to the Exodus. Is the archaeological evidence or the biblical text to be the primary source of information? Those who opt for the late date of the Exodus do so primarily on the basis of archaeological evidence. And yet that evidence is always colored by the presuppositions and prejudices of those interpreting the raw data. On the other side are those who opt for the early date of the Exodus. They do so primarily because of the biblical data. So what is the answer? All truth is God’s truth; yet the only truth which can be known absolutely is that truth which God chooses to reveal in His Word. Thus the biblical evidence must be the primary evidence. For this reason the writer accepts the early date of the Exodus as being the better alternative.

A. H. Finn

IN the book of Exodus there are two groups of chapters dealing with the construction of the Tabernacle:—

Group I. Cc. xxv-xxxi. The Divine Instructions.
Group II. Cc. xxxv-xl. The carrying out of the Instructions.

From certain peculiarities in these chapters, and in the LXX version of them, three inferences have been drawn:—

(A) that the Greek translators of Group II were not the same as the translators of Group I;
(B) that the translators of Group II worked from a Hebrew text differing from the Massoretic;
(C) that cc. xxx, xxxi, and xxxv-xl were later additions to the original text of Exodus.

These conclusions have been put forward with a good deal of confidence, and have been accepted by Biblical students of note. Yet they will bear further examination.

(A) DIFFERENT TRANSLATORS.

The inference that the translators of Group II were not the same as the translators of Group I is based solely on the fact that in some cases the translation of certain Hebrew technical terms in Group II differs from that in Group I (see Dr Swete's ‘Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek’, p. 236 ; Dr Driver's ‘Exodus’, Cambridge Bible, p. 378; and Dr McNeile's ’Exodus’, Westminster Commentary, p. 223).

Dr McNeile in his Commentary on Exodus, p. 226, gives a list of seventeen of these variations, and this list is also referred to by Dr Driver.

The instances cited are not very happily selected: several are not technical terms at all but quite ordinary words; at least two depend on what is the true reading of the Greek text; in one instance, the only difference is that between the genitive and dative of the same word; and in another the same verb is used, but compounded with a different preposition.

It would be instructive to examine the whole list in detail, but it will not be necessary here, because even if all the instances were indisputable, the inference would not be justified. For that inference really depends
on an assumption that, as a rule, the LXX translators were fairly consistent in their rendering of Hebrew words. This is not the case.

(i) In both Groups of chapters, the translators have varied their renderings in the same context.¹

A few instances from a list five times the length of Dr McNeile’s will shew this.

Group I. (a) In xxvi 3, the same Hebrew word is rendered by ἐξομεναί, and συνεχόμεναι; in the next verse by συμβολήν; and in the tenth verse by συμβολήν and συναπτοῦσης.

(b) In xxvi 36, the ‘Screen’ is ἐπίσπαστρον; in 37 καταπετάσματι.

c) In xxvii 10, ‘hooks’ are κρίκοι; in 17 κεφαλίδες.

d) In xxviii 37, the ‘mitre’ is μίτρα; in 39 κίδαρις.

Group II. (a) In xxxviii 27, ² ‘sockets’ are κεφαλίδες; in 31 βάσεις.

(b) In xxxix 34, the ‘covering’ is δίφθερας in one clause, and καλύμματα in the second.

c) In xl 36, ‘journeyings’ is ἀπαρτία; in 38 ἀναζυγαίς.

This tendency to vary renderings is not peculiar to these chapters, or to Exodus. ³

In Lev. xxv 39-44, ‘servant’ appears as οἰκέτου, παῖς, and δοῦλον; in v. 55 οἰκέται παῖδες; in some other places θεράπων is found.

In Num. xxii 23-28, ‘smote’ is rendered by ἐπάταξε, μαστίξαι, ἔτυπτε, and πέπαικας.

In Num. xxxv 2-5, ‘suburbs’ is rendered by προάστεια, ἀφορίσματα, συγκυροῦντα, and ὀμορα.

Since then the Greek translators frequently vary their translation of a Hebrew word, whether technical or ordinary, in the same passage and even in the same verse, the fact that some of the technical terms in Group I are differently translated in Group II is absolutely without significance.

Nor is this all.

(ii) In several of the instances adduced as variations, the whole of the evidence has not been considered.

Again, a few instances will shew what is meant.

(a) xxii 3 has πνεῦμα θείον where the parallel xxxv 31 is said to have πνεῦμα alone.

In the latter passage θείον is omitted only by the first hand of B; all the other authorities have it. In the large Cambridge critical edition

¹ This has also been noted by Mr H. St John Thackeray: see 2nd Ed. (1914) of Dr Swete’s ‘Introduction’ p. 236 note 2.
² The references to chapter and verse are according to the Hebrew numbering throughout.
³ See Dr Swete’s ‘Introduction’ pp. 328, 329.
of the LXX πνεῦμα θείον is placed in the text, and the omission of θείον only recorded in a note. It is nothing but a scribal error.

Similarly, xxxviii 6 has χρυσός ὑς where the parallel xxv 18 is said to have χρυσοτορευτά.

But χρυσοτορευτά is scarcely found except in B*; Bᵃ, A, F and other authorities have χρυσά τορευτά, and in vv, 31, 36 τορευτή is the translation of the word (‘of beaten work’) which immediately follows ‘gold’ in xxv 18. That is to say B* and a couple of cursives have combined two words which most of the authorities keep separate, and the alleged difference turns upon a very dubious reading.

(b) xxxi 4 has ἐργάζεσθαι where xxxv 32 has ποιεῖν.
But xxxi 6 has ποιήσονσι, and xxxv 10 has ἐργαζέσθω.
Both passages shew the two renderings of the same verb, which rather suggests that the translators were the same.

(c) xxv 17 has ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα; xxxvii 6 has ἱλαστήριον alone.
Each of the five verses which follow xxv 17 also has ἱλαστήριον alone.
Were these verses due to a different translator from that of v. 17? If not, why must xxxvii 6 be due to a different translator?
In this connexion ἐπίθεμα does not appear again anywhere. It may be due to a variant rendering which has crept from the margin into the text, but there is another explanation possible.

In some cases, the translators seem to have begun with one rendering which they have immediately abandoned for another. Thus, where casting (of metals) is first mentioned in xxv 12 ἐλάσσεις is used, but does not recur again, χωνέυσεις taking its place at xxvi 37. So too at the first mention (xxv 7 and the parallel xxxiv 9) the Breastplate is ποδήρτῃ; at xxviii 4 περιστήθιον; and afterwards (xxviii 15, xxix 5, xxxix 8) λογέιον.
It is therefore possible that when the Mercy-seat is first mentioned the translators thought it advisable to define ἱλαστήριον more closely as a 'covering', and afterwards dropped the explanatory word.

(d) xxviii 11 has γλύμμα; xxxix 6 has ἐκκόλαμμα.
The word is part of the phrase (in Hebrew two words) which in RV. is rendered ‘the engravings of a signet’. The phrase occurs three times in xxviii, and three times in xxxix: the verb alone is found three times in xxviii, and its participle once in xxxix. No two of the Greek renderings agree exactly.

Verb.      Phrase.
xxxix 9 γλύψεις  xxviii 11 γλύμμα σφραγί-  xxxix 6 ἐκκόλαμμα σφρα-  γίδος  γίδος
11 διαγλύψεις  21 γλυφαῖ σφραγί-  14 ἐγγελαμμένα εἰς  σφραγίδας  δον
36 ἐκτυπώσεις  36 ἐκτυπώμα σφρα-  30 ἐκτυπωμένα  σφραγίδος  γίδος  σφραγίδος
In xxxix 6 the participle is doubly translated, γεγλυμμένους καὶ ἐκκεκολαμμένους, immediately followed by ἐκκόλαμμα σφραγίδος as above.

When it is noticed that in six out of the seven cases referring to jewels some form of γλύφω is used, and ἐκτυπῶ in the three referring to the Gold Plate, can it be doubted that this is a deliberate variation to suit the different working of the different materials? The jewels are ‘engraved’; the gold is ‘stamped in high relief’. But if so, the recurrence of this distinction would again point to the identity of the translators.

At any rate, is it quite fair to single out the one case where a difference between the Groups can be made out, and to ignore the marked resemblances, and the variations in the same Group?

(e) xxviii 22 has ἀλυσιδωτῶν; xxxix 15 has ἐμπλοκίου.
No mention is made of the fact that for the same phrase xxviii 14 has ἔργον πλοκῆς, which differs from the rendering in v. 22, and is akin to that of xxxix 15. Moreover, the whole verses should be compared:—

xxviii 22 καὶ ποιήσεις ἐπὶ τὸ λογείου κρωσσοῦς συμμεπλεγμένους ἔργον ἀλυσιδωτὸν ἐκ χρυσίου καθαροῦ.
xxix 15 καὶ ἐποίησαν ἐπὶ τὸ λογείου κρωσσοῦς συμμεπλεγμένους ἔργον ἐμπλοκίου ἐκ χρυσίου καθαροῦ.

The verses are identical all but one word: ought that to pass unnoticed?
To all these may be added a remarkable instance not included in Dr McNeile's list.

(f) A somewhat peculiar phrase of three Hebrew words in xxxix 6 is rendered

συμμεπορπημένους καὶ περιπεσιαλωμένους χρυσίως

Seven verses further on (v. 13) the very same phrase is rendered

περικεκκλωμένα χρυσίω καὶ συνδεδεμένα χρυσίως

In XXViii 20 (parallel to xxxix 13) the first of the three Hebrew words does not occur, yet the Greek runs

περικεκαλυμμένα χρυσίω καὶ συνδεδεμένα ἐν χρυσίως

Here the points to be noticed are

(I) in the one passage (xxxix 6-13) two quite different renderings of the same phrase are found;

(2) the parallel passages from the two Groups (xxviii 20 = xxxix 13) have much in common, especially if περικεκλωμένα (which does not express the meaning of the missing Hebrew word) is but a corruption of περικεκκλωμένα.¹

The instances marked (d), (e), (f) are all taken from the one pair of

¹ περικεκκλωμένα is actually found in one or two MSS. Others read περικεκλωσμένα, and there seems to have been some uncertainty about the word.
passages (xxviii - xxxix) about the making of the priestly vestments. They should go far to shew that

(1) difference of translation does not mean difference of translators;
(2) there are reasons for thinking that the translators were the same throughout.

(iii) There is evidence that the translators of Group II were acquainted with the translation of Group I.

(a) The consistent translation of the three colours by ὑάκινθος, πορφύρα, and κόκκινος; of ‘Mercy-seat’ by ἰλαστήριον: of ‘hangings’ by ἰστία: and of ‘bars’ by μοχλοί, all tend to shew the use of a common vocabulary where differences might easily occur.

(b) It is not very likely that two sets of translators working independently would reproduce the phrase ὃ αὐξ ού κύκλω τὸν περιστομίον (xxviii 32, xxxix 23) word for word, or the phrase πᾶς ὁ παραπορευόμενος εἰς τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν (xxx 14, xxxviii 26) with only the omission of εἰς in the latter passage.

(c) For ‘onyx stones’ xxv 7 has λίθους σαρδίου, and the same appears in the parallel xxxv 9: but in xxviii 9 they appear as λίθους σμαράγδου, and this variation is reproduced in the parallel xxxix 6; and in xxviii 20, xxxix 13. the same word is rendered ἑπράλλιον.

How could this be possible unless the translators of xxxv 9, xxxix 6, 13 had the renderings of xxv 7, xxviii 9, 20 before them?

(d) xxv 3-6 is a list of materials to be offered, which is repeated in xxxv 5-9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. xxv</th>
<th>c. xxxv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ αὕτη ἔστι ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἦν λήψεσθε</td>
<td>(this clause is not in the Hebrew here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρ’ αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρυσίων καὶ ἀργύριον καὶ χαλκὸν</td>
<td>χρυσίων ἀργύριον χαλκὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ύακίνθον καὶ πορφύραν καὶ</td>
<td>ύακίνθον πορφύραν κόκκινον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόκκινον διπλοῦν</td>
<td>διπλοῦν διανευμησένων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ βύσσουν κεκλωσμένην καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ βύσσουν κεκλωσμένην καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρίχας αἰγείας</td>
<td>τρίχας αἰγείας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ δέρματα κριῶν ημυθροδανωμένα</td>
<td>καὶ δέρματα κριῶν ημυθροδανωμένα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ δέρματα ύακίνθινα καὶ ξύλα</td>
<td>καὶ δέρματα ύακίνθινα καὶ ξύλα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσηπτὰ</td>
<td>ἀσηπτὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ λίθους σαρδίου καὶ λίθους εἰς</td>
<td>καὶ λίθους σαρδίου καὶ λίθους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὴν γλυφὴν</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν γλυφὴν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τὴν ἐπωμίδα καὶ τὸν ποδήρη</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν ἐπωμίδα καὶ τὸν ποδήρη.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only differences are that in the second passage there are a few omissions of καὶ, and the insertion of the one word διανευμησένων, clearly a variant rendering for the preceding erroneous διπλοῦν.

Otherwise the two are identical: both have the notable ημυθροδανω-
me<na and ἄνθρωπο; both include κεκλωμένην, which is not in the Hebrew; both have the same four misrenderings (διπλοῦν; δέρματα ὑάκινθινα; εἰς τὴν γλυφήν; ποδήρη).

Can it reasonably be doubted that whoever wrote the latter passage had the other before him?

(c) Another pair of passages is found in xxviii 16-20, xxxix 9-13, the ‘Breastplate’ and its jewels.

c. xxviii

Ποιήσεις αὐτὸ τετράγωνον. ἦσται τετράγωνον διπλοῦν ἐποίησαν τὸ λογείον,
σπιθαμῆς τὸ μῆκος αὐτοῦ, καὶ σπιθαμῆς τὸ εὔρος.
Καὶ καθυφανείς ἐν αὐτῷ ὑφασμα κατάλιθον τετράστιχον.
στίχος λίθων ἦσται, σάρδιον, τοπάζιον, καὶ σμάραγδος,
ὁ στίχος ὁ ἐἷς.
Καὶ οἱ στίχοι ὁ δεύτερος,
ἀνθραξ, καὶ σάπφειρος, καὶ ιασπις.

Kαὶ οἱ στίχοι ὁ δεύτερος,
ἀνθραξ, καὶ σάπφειρος, καὶ ιασπις.

Kαὶ οἱ στίχοι ὁ τρίτος,
λιγύριον, ἀχάτης, ἀμέθυστος.
καὶ οἱ στίχοι ὁ τέταρτος,
χρυσόλιθος, καὶ βηρύλλιον, καὶ ὄνυχιος,
περικεκλωμένα χρυσίω συνδεδεμένα ἐν χρυσίῳ,
ἔστωσαν κατὰ στίχον αὐτῶν.

Surely independent translators would never have hit on translations so nearly alike. For instance, both have ὑφασμα κατάλιθον, though the corresponding Hebrew is missing from the second passage; and in the same verse (xxviii 17 = xxxix 10) both seem to have transferred λίθων from the first clause to the second. Yet in this very verse Dr McNeil finds one of his differences because one has καθυφανείς, and the other συνυφάνθη!

Is it conceivable that, if the translations were altogether independent, no one of the twelve jewels should be differently translated? Further:

(iv) There are indications that the translators were the same throughout.

The evidence just considered might possibly be consistent with Group II being due to translators who had the translation of Group I before them, and yet were not the same as the former translators. But it is not at all likely that two sets of people would exhibit the same peculiarities and follow the same methods.
(a) In both Groups there is a tendency to make the same kind of careless mistakes.

In. xxvii 18 the translators have mistaken the Hebrew word which means 'cubit' for a similar word meaning 'hundred'; in xxxviii 9, 11 (a different part of the parallel passage) the same mistake is made in places where the earlier chapter has the correct rendering.

Similar confusions of words that are somewhat alike are found in xxix 5 ('Breastplate' put for 'Band of Ephod'); in xxvi 34 (the 'Veil' instead of the 'Memory-seat'); and in xxvi 36 ('board' instead of 'clasp'). In the same way in Group II xxxv 21, 22 have 'brought' instead of 'came'; xxxv 22 has 'seals' instead of 'brooches'; and in xxxviii 18 'the height in the breadth' has been turned into 'the height and the breadth', which (as the length has been already specified) would give three dimensions to the Screen, making it 5 cubits in thickness!

(b) Certain of the technical terms seem to have been little or not at all understood by the translators, who betray their perplexity by sometimes leaving them untranslated and sometimes giving inconsistent renderings.

In both Groups the same set of words has been misunderstood, e.g. 'board', 'clasp', 'grating' (of the Altar); 'woven band' (of the Ephod); 'finely wrought' (garments); 'lace'. In both Groups σκηνή is used sometimes of the Tabernacle and sometimes of the Tent where the two words occur together, the translators have been puzzled to know what to put for the Tent, and in each case have adopted a different rendering (xxvi 7 σκέπην; xxxv 11 παραπύματα; xl 19 αὐλαίας; in xxvi 11 the Tent, standing alone, is translated δέρρεις).

The substitution of 'mingled' for 'salted' in xxx 35, and of 'fasted' for 'served (as a host)' in xxxviii 8, both seem to be attempts to read an easier word for a more difficult one.

In both Groups the translators are puzzled by the same words, and use the same methods to avoid difficulties.

(c) In both Groups there is a tendency to soften down expressions that might suggest a human conception of the Deity. 'Dwell among you' in xxv 8 becomes 'be seen among you', and in xxix 45, 46, 'be called upon among you', while in xl 35 the same verb is translated 'overshadowed'. Possibly a hint of the same tendency is found in the curious inversion in xl 35 by which the phrase 'the Glory of the LORD filled the Tabernacle [the Dwelling]' is turned into 'the Tent was filled with the Glory of the LORD', as though to avoid personifying the Glory.

In xxix 46, 'I am the LORD their God' is changed into 'and to be their God'; in xxxvi 1, 'to whom the LORD gave wisdom' becomes to whom was given wisdom'. In both cases the personal Name is avoided.
(d) In both Groups there is a tendency to omit or paraphrase perplexing passages, and occasionally to insert explanatory words or phrases.

(e) The deliberate and frequent use of different Greek words to represent the same Hebrew has already been shewn to run through both Groups, and the opposite tendency to use the same Greek for different Hebrew words is also found in both (e.g. ἐσχαταὶ represents three Hebrew words in the two verses xxvii 4, 5; and αὐθαίρετα stands for three different words in xxxv 21, 22, 29). Had one Group been fairly consistent in its renderings while the other varied them, there might have been reason to suspect a difference of translators. As it is, the same inconsistency is found in both, and in much the same degree.

In short, the translation exhibits the same characteristics throughout.

To sum up.

In support of the assertion that the translators of Group II were not the same as the translators of Group I only a comparatively few instances of varied renderings are brought forward, and several of these are decidedly doubtful.

On the contrary, a considerable amount of evidence (yet not nearly all that might be brought) has been adduced to shew that--

(i) differences of rendering in one and the same passage abound, and therefore difference of rendering does not shew difference of translators;

(ii) in a considerable proportion of the instances of difference alleged, the whole evidence has not been considered;

(iii) there is abundant reason for believing that the translators of Group II were acquainted with and made use of the translation of Group I;

(iv) there is fair reason for believing that the translators were the same throughout.

It is surprising that scholars of deservedly high repute (such as those mentioned on p. 449) should put forward as probable the assertion that the translators were different, without a hint of the weight or evidence against it. Can it be that they have reproduced a statement from some less reliable source without themselves verifying the facts?

Why should this question be of any importance? What does it matter whether the translators were the same or not?

If the translators were different, it would be probable that cc. xxxv-xl were not in the text used by the original translators, and were therefore a later addition to the book. If the translators were the same, it would
be evidence that as far back as 250 B.C. the book of Exodus was substantially complete as we now have it.

(B) DIFFERENCE OF TEXT.

The second inference is that the translators of Group II had before them a Hebrew text differing from the present Massoretic text.

It is strange that those who put this forward, together with the assertion that the translators were not the same as those who translated Group I, do not perceive that the two contentions are not altogether consistent. In order to prove that the translators were different, it has to be assumed that they had the same technical terms to translate, and translated them differently. But if the translators of Group II had before them a text different from that which we now possess, how can we be sure that they had the same words to translate? It is scarcely admissible to argue as if these translators had the identical terms before them, and in the next breath to assert that their text was different.

However, it is to be noted that where difference of text is spoken of, something more than mere difference is intended. That might only mean that the text from which the Greek translation was made differed from the present Hebrew in having been altered from it: whereas what it is sought to establish is that the Hebrew has been modified by subsequent additions and alterations.

'It is permissible', says Dr Swete ('Introduction' p. 236), 'to suppose that the Hebrew text before the original translators did not contain this section, and that it was supplied afterwards from a longer Hebrew recension of the book in which the last six chapters had not yet reached their final form.'

In other words, the allegation is that the LXX text differed from the Massoretic in being nearer to the true original.

The main (if not the sole) argument for this conclusion is drawn from the fact that in the section xxxvi-xxxix the order of the contents in the Greek differs remarkably from that in the Hebrew (see Swete 'Introduction', p. 235; Driver 'Exodus' p. 378).

The difference is very striking, but it does not stand alone. In both Groups (xxv-xxxi and xxxv-xl) the Greek shews a large number of variations from the Hebrew, and all of these should be taken into account. They may be classed under four heads: (a) Greek words or phrases not in the Hebrew; (b) Hebrew words or phrases not in the Greek; (c) difference of substance; (d) difference of order.

VARIATIONS IN GROUP I.

(a) Greek words or phrases not in the Hebrew.
I. Sometimes these are words frequently associated with the accom-
panying word, and therefore likely to be inserted inadvertently; e.g. ‘fine twined linen', xxv 4; 'with pure gold', xxv 28: ‘Aaron thy brother', xxix 5.

2. Sometimes they are manifest errors, such as the insertion of ‘the tent’ in ‘the ark of the tent of the testimony', xxx 26; and of τὸ ὑψός in xxvii 14, 15, 16, which would make the height of the hangings inconsistent with that given in v. 18.

3. Sometimes phrases that have recently occurred are repeated where evidently they are not needed. Thus the whole phrase ‘and in the candlestick four cups made like almond blossoms' which commences xxv 34 is in the Greek unnecessarily repeated at the end of v. 35. Similar repetitions are found in xxvii 13, xxix 20, and xxx 21. They are probably scribal errors due to 'similar endings'.

4. Sometimes the additional words are by way of explanation; e.g. in xxv 34 'in the one branch' after ‘four cups made like almond blossoms', in xxviii 33 ‘of the robe below’ after ‘upon the skirts'; in xxx 19 ‘with water' after 'shall wash their hands and their feet'.

The character of the words and phrases peculiar to the Greek is such that they may reasonably be considered additions by the translators, and not omissions in the Hebrew.

(b) Hebrew words or phrases not in the Greek.

In xxv 33 the Hebrew repeats the phrase ‘three cups made like almond blossoms, a knop and a flower' because the branches were in pairs: the Greek has the phrase only once.

In xxviii 34 the Hebrew repeats ‘a golden bell and a pomegranate’ to convey the idea of repeated alternation: the Greek has the phrase only once.

In xxv 35 the Hebrew has the phrase ‘a knop under two branches of one piece with it' three times because there were three pairs of branches, and each pair had a knop below their junction with the stem. The Greek reads ‘a knop under the two branches out of it, and a knop under the four branches out of it'. It can hardly be doubted that the translators had the triple phrase before them, but combined the second and third clauses into one.

Similar omissions of a repeated phrase, quite in keeping with the Hebrew idiom, are found in other parts of the Pentateuch.

2. xxviii 23-28 in the Hebrew is a lengthy and complicated description of how the Breastplate was to be attached to the Ephod by rings and chains; in the Greek only vv. 24, 25 are represented. Yet those two verses are intimately connected with the context, and the whole passage is fully represented in both the Hebrew and Greek of the parallel.

1 In Cod. B. Cod. A omits the second clause.
xxxix 16-21. It is therefore probable that the original text of c. xxviii also had the whole passage, and that the translators have omitted a considerable part of it.

3. In Hebrew xxx 6 reads
   ‘And thou shalt put it before the Veil
   that is by the Ark of the Testimony
   before the Mercy-seat that is over the Testimony.’

   The third clause is not in the Greek. The translators may have passed it over accidentally owing to the similar ending of clause 2; but, quite as probably, they may have mistaken Caporeth (Mercy-seat) for Parocheth (the Veil), and omitted the clause as redundant after clause i.

   The character of the words and phrases peculiar to the Hebrew is such that in all probability they are part of the original text, and their absence from the Greek is due to omission (accidental or intentional) by the translators.

   (c) Difference of substance.
   The principal instance of this in Group I is in c, xxviii.

   Massoretic.

   (23) And thou shalt make upon the breastplate two rings of gold, and shalt put the two rings on the two ends of the breastplate.

   (24) And thou shalt put the two wreathen chains of gold on the two rings at the ends of the breastplate.

   (25) And the other two ends of the two wreathen chains thou shalt put on the two ouches, and put them on the shoulderpieces of the ephod, in the forepart thereof.

   It will be seen that the Hebrew gives quite clear directions for attaching the Breastplate to the Ephod by means of chains attached to rings on the Breastplate at one end, and to ‘ouches’ on the Ephod at the other. In the Greek (since in v. 22 кρωσσούς ... ἔργον ἀλυσιδωτῶν is the equivalent for ‘chains ... of wreathen work’) the rings are altogether omitted; the ‘ouches’ are simply placed upon the shoulderpieces of the Ephod; and no connexion between the two is even suggested. Clearly the Greek is incomplete, and yet bears sufficient resemblance to the Hebrew to shew that it was derived therefrom.

   There can be little doubt that the Greek is at fault, and not the Hebrew.
(d) *Difference of order.*

1. In xxix 20, 21 the Hebrew directs that the blood of the ram is to be sprinkled upon the altar round about, and then proceeds (v. 21), ‘And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar’,--the natural sequence. The Greek places the instruction to pour out the blood upon the altar at the *end* of v. 21, so that Moses is directed to take of the blood ‘that is upon the altar’ before there is any intimation that any blood would be there.

2. In the directions to anoint the various parts of the Tabernacle, xxx 26-28, the Hebrew has ‘the Table and all the vessels thereof’ at the beginning of v. 27, between the Ark and the Candlestick, its natural position: the Greek has the Table and its vessels in v. 28, between the Altar of Burnt Offering and the Laver, altogether out of place.

Also the Greek text shows signs of perturbation in v. 27. The Vatican MS begins the verse with the Candlestick and its vessels, and then, between this and the Altar of Incense, has ‘and the Tent of Witness and all the vessels thereof’; an impossible reading, for (1) it is incredible that the Tent should have been mentioned here; (2) it is a repetition of what has been already stated in v. 26; (3) the Tent could scarcely be said to have ‘vessels’. The other authorities begin the verse with ‘and all its vessels’ (which cannot refer to the immediately preceding Ark), thereby betraying that something which had ‘vessels’ ought to stand here.

3. In c. xxviii the Hebrew has the verse (29) directing Aaron to bear the names of the children of Israel upon his heart after the directions for attaching the Breastplate to the Ephod, where it clearly belongs since the Breastplate had the names of the tribes engraved on the twelve jewels: the Greek has this verse after v. 22 between the direction to make golden chains, and the direction to place the chains on the Breastplate, as clearly an unsuitable position.

It will be noticed that this one passage (xxviii 23-29) shows three of the classes of difference: (i) a large part of the Hebrew does not appear in the Greek; (2) what does appear differs in substance; and (3) there is a difference of order. Yet in all three it is the Hebrew and not the Greek which is justified.

Where the order differs, the Hebrew order is natural, and the Greek improbable.

Altogether, then, Group I furnishes instances of all four classes of variation, yet

(i) So much of these seven chapters (xxv-xxxi) is the same in both versions that it is unlikely that the texts were materially different;
(ii) Where the two differ, the Greek and not the Hebrew is suspicious; (iii) No claim is made that the translators had a different text in this Group.

VARIATIONS IN GROUP II.

When we turn to Group II, we find the same four classes of variations, only on a larger scale, and therefore more noticeable.

(a) Greek words or phrases not in the Hebrew.

1. Words commonly associated with the accompanying word:--
   xxxv 12, 'the ark of the testimony'; xxxix i, 'Aaron the priest';
   xxxix 16b, 'the two golden rings'.

2. Phrases that have recently occurred repeated:--xxxvii 13, 'two on
   the one side and two on the second side', of the rings for the staves of
   the Table (repeated from v. 3 of the staves of the Ark); xxxviii 11, 'and
   the side towards the south, a hundred by a hundred', repeats the
   immediately preceding phrase, only changing 'north' into 'south'
   (superfluous here as the south side has already been specified, v. 9);
   xxxviii 20, 'and these were silvered with silver', repeats the, last clause
   of v. 19 (inaccurately, for v. 20 concerns the pins of the tabernacle
   which were of bronze and not silvered).

3. Explanations:--xxxvii 6, 'the mercy-seat above the ark'; xxxvii 8,
   'at the end of the mercy-seat' (twice; xxxvii 17, 'the Candlestick which
   giveth light'; xl 17, 'in the second year of their going forth from Egypt'.

   Two of the Greek passages not found in the Hebrew are noticeable
   as suggesting that they were influenced by the parallel passage in
   Group I.

   xxxv 10-19--the list of things to be made-closes with 'the Anointing
   Oil and the Incense of Composition', not in the Hebrew, and not wanted
   here as they have already been mentioned in the preceding list: the
   parallel passage in Group I, xxxi 6-11, has them in this position at the
   end of the list, and not earlier.

   After the making of the Laver (xxxvii 8) the Greek adds, 'in the day
   when he fixed it: and he made the Laver that in it Moses and Aaron
   and his sons might wash their hands and their feet when they were
   entering into the Tent of the Testimony; or whenever they approached
   the Altar to minister, they used to wash in it, as the LORD commanded
   Moses'.

   Here the inclusion of Moses with the priests, and the closing 'as the
   LORD commanded Moses', show that this is really aversion of xl 31, 32
   (absent from the Greek of c. xl). It was probably transferred to this
   place because the parallel xxx 17-21 has a somewhat similar ending.

   Besides all these, at the beginning of xxxvii 1-7, where the Hebrew
   has 'and he made the Altar of Burnt Offering of acacia wood', the Greek
reads, ‘this man made the Brazen Altar out of the brazen censers which belonged to the men who rebelled with the company of Korah’. Not only is this a manifest anachronism, but it does not agree with the account in Numbers, which represents that the censers were beaten into plates to make a covering for the Altar, not that the Altar was made of them.

Near the beginning of xxxix 32-43, after the words ‘so did they’, the Greek has, ‘But of the remaining gold they made vessels wherewith to minister before the LORD; and of the remaining blue and purple and scarlet they made ministering garments for Aaron, so that he might minister in the Holy Place’. The whole of this is superfluous, for the making of the gold vessels has already been recorded in xxxvii 16-23, and the making of the vestments in the passage corresponding to xxxix 1-31. Also, it breaks the connexion between the verse recording the completion of the work, and the verses recording the delivery of the finished work to Moses.

Even more clearly than in Group I, the character of the words and passages peculiar to the Greek points to the conclusion that they have been inserted by the translators, and not omitted by the Hebrew.

(b) Words and passages in the Hebrew not found in the Greek. Nearly one quarter of the contents of the Hebrew Group II does not appear in the Greek, but this chiefly concerns two chapters, xxxvi, xxxvii. From these, two entire sections (the Framework of the Tabernacle, and the Altar of Incense), and the greater part of a third (the Curtains) are absent from the Greek. These will be noticed later on (see p. 468 and pp. 475, 476).

Of the lesser instances of Hebrew passages not in the Greek, many concern minor details such as the staves of the Altar (xxxv 16, xxxviii 7, xxxix 39), and its horns (xxxviii 2); the cords of the Tabernacle and Court (xxxv 18, xxxix 40); the measurements of the Table (xxxvii 10), of the Mercy-seat (xxxvii 6), and of the Altar (xxxviii 1); and the details about the Cherubim (xxxvii 7-9). As all these are fully given in Group I, it is not unlikely that the translators thought it unnecessary to repeat them here.

In xxxviii 17 the Hebrew reads, ‘And he made the Candlestick of pure gold: of beaten work made he the Candlestick’; the last four words are not in the Greek: in xxxvii 15 the Greek puts together the making of the staves for the Ark and the staves for the Table, recorded separately in the Hebrew (just as it inserts καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια at the beginning of xxxi 8, while the Hebrew mentions the two altars separately afterwards) in xxxviii 5-7, after recording the placing of four rings on the grating of the altar, the Greek continues έν αὐτοῖς τὸ
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Thus combining 'to lie places for the staves' of v. 5 with 'to bear it withal' of v. 7, and omitting the intervening making and placing of the staves. These three instances have all the appearance of condensing the passages to avoid repetition.

xxxvii 24 (the Candlestick and its vessels made of a talent of gold) and xl 29b (sacrifices offered on the Altar of Burnt Offering) are not in the Greek. It is at least as likely that the translators passed over these because not very important as that a Jewish scribe took the trouble to interpolate them.

One matter calls for fuller notice.

In the Hebrew, xxv 6 and xxxv 8 (in the lists of materials to be provided) mention the Oil for the Light, and spices for the Anointing Oil and for the Incense: these verses are not in the Greek, and the Greek has no mention of the Oil for the Light in xxxv 14, 28. Both Hebrew and Greek have instructions about this oil in Group I (xxvii 20, 21), but in Group II neither mentions it among the things that were made, and yet in xxxix 37 both include it among the things delivered to Moses.

The variations seem perplexing enough, especially as the lighting oil is hardly important enough to call for insertion in the Hebrew, or deliberate omission from the Greek. Yet there is a clue.

xxvii 20 has no direction for making the Oil for the Light, but only defines it as 'pure olive oil beaten', i.e. clear and of the finest quality (see Driver's 'Exodus', p. 296). Bearing this in mind, the Hebrew is consistent throughout. In xxv 6 the oil is included among the materials to be provided, but it does not appear among the things to be made (xxxvi 6-11) because it needed no compounding. The Anointing Oil and the Incense, on the contrary, were composite. Therefore in xxv 6 the requisite spices are included among the materials to be provided; in xxv 22-38 full directions for compounding them are given; and in xxxvi 6-11 they are named as among the things to be made.

In Group II, the direction to provide oil and spices is repeated (xxxv 8), and they are included among the offerings brought (xxxv 28); no mention is made of making the oil (in xxxv 14 it merely appears along with the lamps as an accessory of the Candlestick); while the making of the Anointing Oil and the Incense is recorded (xxxvii 29), and all three are finally specified in the list of what was delivered to Moses (xxxix 37, 38).

The real harmony of the Hebrew account is so little on the surface that it can hardly be suspected of being artificial. The Greek account, on the other hand, is singularly incomplete. It gives the instruction as to the nature and quality of the lighting oil, and mentions it in the list of things delivered to Moses, but has no direction for providing it, and no mention of it among the offerings. It also gives every mention of
the Anointing Oil and the Incense, excepting only the two verses (xxv 6, xxxv 8) which prescribe the provision of the necessary spices. Where the **offering** of these spices is recorded (xxxv 28) there is a tiny but significant bit of evidence. The Hebrew runs, ‘and the spice, and the oil for the light, and for the anointing oil, and for the sweet incense’ the Greek is καὶ τὰς συνθέσεις, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐλαιον τῆς χρύσεως, καὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ θυμίαματος, where the second καὶ breaks the sense. Does not this suggest that the italicized clause, which would complete the sense, has been omitted? If so, then the fact that the same words are missing from the Greek of xxxv 14 would imply that in both places they were deliberately omitted.

On the whole, the **character of the words and phrases peculiar to the Hebrew** (as in Group 1) makes it probable that they belong to the original text, and have been omitted by, the translators.

(c) **Difference of substance.**

1. xxxvi 3 narrates how Bezaleel and his companions received from Moses the offerings which the children of Israel brought for the service of the sanctuary, and then continues, ‘And they’ [emphatic, referring to the nearer subject, the children of Israel] ‘brought yet unto him [Moses] freewill offerings every morning’. The Greek translators, not realizing the force of the emphatic ‘they’, have thought that it must be the same as the ‘they’ which commences the verse, viz.: Bezaleel and his companions. Accordingly they have changed ‘brought’ into ‘received’; have omitted ‘unto him’, and substituted ‘from those that brought’.

The Hebrew gives a terse and vigorous picture of the Israelites bringing more and more offerings to Moses morning by morning: the Greek turns this into the feeble statement that Bezaleel and his fellow-workers continued to receive the offerings from those that brought them (not from Moses as in the earlier part of the verse).

2. xxxvii 17-23, the construction of the Candlestick, is the one passage of any length where the substance of the Greek differs seriously from the Hebrew. This, like the similar instance of differing substance in Group I, deals with a rather lengthy and complicated description. The Hebrew, however, though minutely detailed with a good deal of repetition is clear and free from ambiguity: the Greek is confused, hardly intelligible, and has every appearance of having been condensed (not very intelligently) from the longer statement.

Where the substance differs, as in Group I, the Hebrew is to be preferred to the Greek.

(d) **Difference of order.**

1. In xxxv 23 the Greek places the δέρματα ὑακίνθινα before the ‘rams’ skins dyed red’, which is not the usual order: in xxxvi 9 the
Greek puts ‘the same [measure] was to all [the curtains]’ *between* the measurements of the length and of the breadth of the curtains: in xxxix 28 the Greek has the 'head-tires' of the priests before the 'mitre' of the High Priest. These are probably instances of scribal inadvertence, transposing clauses.

2. In xxxv 10-19 the Hebrew has a complete list of the things to be made, arranged in regular order: the Tabernacle and its framework; the Ark, Mercy-seat, and the Veil; the Table, Candlestick, Altar of Incense (with the Anointing Oil and Incense), and the Screen of the Door; the Brazen Altar and Laver: the Hangings and Screen of the Court; the pins and cords; and finally the priestly Vestments. The Greek list is incomplete and strangely disordered. It begins in the same way with the Tabernacle and its framework, the Ark, Mercy-seat, and Veil. But then follow the Hangings of the Court; the Emerald Stones; the Incense and Anointing Oil; the Table and Candlestick; the Altar; the Vestments; and finally the Anointing Oil and the Incense over again. Can this possibly be the original account?

3. In xxxix 33-41 the Hebrew has a perfectly regular list of the completed articles delivered to Moses in the same natural order as the list of c. xxxv. The Greek begins with *στολή*, where the Hebrew ‘Tabernacle’ is clearly right, being followed by the Tent and framework. Then follow the Ark, the Altar,1 Anointing Oil and Incense, Candlestick, and Table; the Vestments; the Hangings of the Court; the Screen of the door of the Tent, and of the gate of the Court (bringing together two separate things); all the vessels of the Tabernacle and all its service; the skin and other coverings; the pins; and all the service of the Tabernacle (already mentioned).

The order here not only differs from the Hebrew, but also from the Greek in c. xxxv (notice especially the Vestments at the end of the list in c. xxxv; in the middle of that in c. xxxix).

It may be argued that the imperfect and disordered lists of the Greek may represent an original text which was afterwards systematically rearranged and filled in so as to form the present symmetrical Hebrew. This argument ought hardly to be urged by those who hold that the whole description of the Tabernacle was an ‘ideal’ plan drawn up by men whose writings are specially characterized by system and order. Anyhow (r) it is unlikely that lists drawn up by the same writers would be so much at variance as these two; (2) it is very unlikely that the original lists would have shewn such utter confusion of the various parts

---

1 If this is the Altar of Burnt Offering it is strangely out of place: the association with Ark, Incense, Candlestick, and Table would rather suggest the Altar of Incense.
of the Tabernacle as is found in the Greek; and (3) original lists would hardly contain the little anomalies (such as repetitions) which the Greek presents.

Unskilful condensation and rearrangement of a fuller original would account for all these peculiarities.

*Where the order differs, the Hebrew is consistent and natural, the Greek confused and contradictory.*

So far it has been shewn that, apart from the difference of order in the contents of xxxvi 8b-xxxix 43, the Greek of both Groups shews a large amount of variations from the Hebrew, and that in most (if not all) of these, there is good reason for thinking that the translators used a good deal of liberty in dealing with their text; adding, omitting, altering, and rearranging. The remarkable difference of order in that particular set of chapters is, then, not an isolated phenomenon; and if the other variations are due to the translators, it is not unlikely that this one also may be due to them, and not to a difference of text.

The difference in question will be best shewn in a Comparative Table.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew.</th>
<th>Greek.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>see below.</td>
<td>Vestments (a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Curtains.</td>
<td>Curtains (fragment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework.</td>
<td>Veil and Screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veil and Screen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see below.</td>
<td>Court 1 (b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Ark.</td>
<td>Ark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table.</td>
<td>Table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlestick.</td>
<td>Candlestick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altar Incense.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal-work (c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Anointing Oil and Incense.</td>
<td>Anointing Oil and Incense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altar of Burnt Offering.</td>
<td>Brazen Altar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laver.</td>
<td>Laver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court. (b) Summary.</td>
<td>see above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Account of Metals.</td>
<td>Account of Metals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Vestments.</td>
<td>see above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Delivery to Moses.</td>
<td>Delivery to Moses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The Comparative Table in Dr Swete's 'Introduction' p. 235 is incomplete and obscures some points of resemblance.
From this it is clear that the arrangement of the sections marked I to V is practically the same.

In section III the first two subsections are transposed in the Greek, but that relating to the Anointing Oil and Incense is only a single verse which might easily be displaced, and the Hebrew order is more natural.

The chief differences are with regard to sections (a), (b), and (c).

(a) The Vestments.

1. In the Hebrew these come quite at the end after all the details of the Tabernacle, which is intelligible enough, and agrees with the order of things to be made (cc. xxxi and xxxv): in the Greek they come at the very beginning, as though these were the first to be taken in hand. No doubt a great deal of the work would be carried on simultaneously by different sets of workers, but each set of workers would have to receive instructions from Moses, and he would probably first set to work those who had to execute the heavier tasks of the structure and furniture of the Sanctuary.

2. In the Hebrew the section begins with ‘And of the blue and purple and scarlet, they made finely wrought garments’, following quite naturally on the account of the metals: the Greek begins with ἐποιήσε τὰς στολὰς τῶν ἁγίων, αἱ εἰσὶν Ἰακὼβ τῷ ἱερεί [= Heb. xxxix 1b]. If the translators had decided (for whatever reason) to place the Vestments first, it is quite easy to see how this combination would be made: it is not easy to see how the Hebrew would be derived from the Greek.

3. The section ends with ‘as the LORD commanded Moses’, which fits very well with what follows in the Hebrew, ‘Thus was finished all the work of the tabernacle of the. tent of meeting: and the children of Israel did according to all that the LORD commanded Moses, so did they’ (xxxix 32): according to the Greek, it only leads up to ‘And they made for the tent ten curtains’, the commencement of making the Tabernacle.

4. In the Greek the declaration just quoted, that the children of Israel did as the LORD commanded, is followed by a passage (not in the Hebrew) containing a statement that out of the remaining blue and purple and scarlet they made ministering garments for Aaron, which resembles xxxix 1, the beginning of the Hebrew ‘Vestments’ section. This looks very much as though the translators were conscious that originally some account of the Vestments belonged hereabouts. Thus in the Hebrew order the section connects naturally with what precedes and with what follows: in the Greek it fits neither, and there

---

1 The absence of the Altar of Incense from the Greek will be considered later on, see pp. 475, 476.
is an indication that there was some statement about the Vestments near the very place where the Hebrew places this section.

(b) The Court--Summary.

Following on the account of the making of the Court, both Hebrew and Greek have a short passage (xxxviii 21-23) which begins 'This is the sum of the things for the tabernacle'. In the Hebrew this is quite in place, for it comes at the very end of the things made for the Tabernacle, and is only followed by the account of the quantity of metals and the making of the priestly Vestments: in the Greek it stands before the making of the Ark, Table, Candlestick, great Altar, and Laver; clearly out of place. There could hardly be a plainer indication that this passage and the Court section to which it is attached have been removed from their true place at the end, where the Hebrew has them.

(c) Metal-work.

After the account of making the Ark, Table, and Candlestick, but before the Brazen Altar and Laver, the Greek has a passage containing some miscellaneous details of metal work.

Its position is not very appropriate, as one would hardly expect such minor matters as the rings, hooks, bases, and pins to intervene between the furniture of the Tabernacle and the great Altar. Also, at first sight, it seems as if there were no such passage in the Hebrew, but on closer inspection it will be found that there are scattered fragments in other parts of the Hebrew which do correspond.

The passage begins with a fairly close translation of xxxvi 34, and a sentence founded on xxxvi 36; then follows a blending of xxxvi 13 and 18; then a version of xxxviii 17 re-arranged, and finally a version of xxxviii 20.

Now xxxvi 34 is part of the account of the Framework, otherwise wholly absent from the Greek; and xxxvi 13, 18 belong to that larger part of the Curtains section which is not in the Greek. It would seem then that the considerable portion of c. xxxvi which is otherwise absent from the Greek was not wholly unknown to the translators. On the other hand, the verses from c. xxxviii are a repetition in a different rendering of what has already (in the Greek order) appeared in the Court section.

Further, the passage is marked by a curious change. The preceding sections commence with 'And Bezaleel made', or 'and he made', the subsequent details being only joined on by a simple καί: here, each fragment commences with Ὄντος (with different verbs). The fragmentary nature of the section is clearly indicated.

There can hardly be room for doubt that odd verses relating to the common subject of metal-work have been here grouped together, in
which case the passage exhibits plain traces of omission, re-arrangement, and varied translation, which must have been deliberately done.

Thus each of the three sections in cc. xxxvi-xxxix wherein the Greek order differs from the Hebrew affords indications that in the Greek they are misplaced. Their evidence goes to shew that the Hebrew has preserved the true order of which the Greek is a dislocation.

Dr Swete (‘Introduction’ p. 235) notices that both the Greek and the Massoretic version of these chapters ‘follow a system, i. e. that the sequence is due to a deliberate re-arrangement of the groups’, and suggests as a possibility that ‘the Alexandrian translator has purposely changed their relative order, giving precedence to the ornaments of the priesthood’. This would account for the Vestments section standing first, but not for the position of sections (b) and (c).

System of a kind, however, is to be found in the Greek arrangement. Supposing that the translator had some reason for placing the priestly Vestments first,¹ he has grouped along with them the Curtains, the Veil and Screen, and the Hangings of the Court. That is to say, all the parts involving the use of textile materials are put together. Then come the parts requiring the use of metals: the Ark, Table, and Candlestick; the metal overlaying and casting; and the Bronze Altar and Laver. In this connexion it is significant that the Greek omits all mention of ‘acacia wood’ in the construction of the Ark, the Table, and the great Altar, as though these were wholly made of metal. In the same way, it omits the whole section about the Boards and Bars, only preserving in another part, section (c), the one verse which speaks of their being overlaid with gold.

This grouping, according to material, may perhaps furnish a clue to the arrangement of the Greek.

If it be asked why this Group of chapters (and indeed Group I also in a lesser degree) should shew an amount of perturbation not found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, the answer is simple.

It is precisely these chapters which contain an unusual amount of repetition, peculiar technical terms, and complicated descriptions, and that in matters which the translators might consider of no great interest to those for whom the translation was being made.

The inference, then, that the translators of cc. xxxv-xl had before them a text differing from the present Hebrew rests only on a portion of the evidence. It is based upon the disorder of one particular set of chapters: it disregards the evidence of all the other variations in both Groups, and the special evidence of the three passages which constitute

¹ Can this have had reference to some Egyptian practice or prejudice?
the chief difference between the Greek and the Hebrew in the disordered chapters.

The evidence taken as a whole rather points to the conclusion that the variations in both Groups are due to the translators; and that in cc. xxxvi-xxxix the Hebrew has preserved the true order, from which the Greek has been derived by a process of re-arrangement.

(C) LATER ADDITIONS TO THE HEBREW TEXT.

The two inferences already considered (that the translators of Group II were not the translators of Group I; and that their text differed from the Massoretic) are only of any real importance in so far as they would serve to confirm a third and graver inference, viz. that the Massoretic text contains a large amount of matter which does not belong to the original book but was added subsequently.

It is held that there are strong reasons for considering that cc. xxx, xxxi are a later addition to Group I; and that the whole of Group II is a still later addition (see Driver 'Exodus' pp. 328 and 378).

I. Cc. xxx, xxxi an 'Appendix' to Group I.

The reasons given for believing that these chapters are a later addition to the Instructions relate to two matters; the Altar of Incense, and the anointing of priests. The latter subject will be considered first.

(a) The anointing of the priests.

It is held that originally only the High Priest was anointed because (1) the anointing is confined to Aaron in Exod. xxix 7 (and his successors, v. 29) and in Lev. viii 12; (2) in various passages the High Priest is called the anointed Priest, which would be no distinction if all the priests were anointed. Therefore it is held that Exod. xxx 30 and other passages which extend the anointing to Aaron's sons must belong to a later period (see Driver 'Exodus' pp. 329 and 337).

Exod. xxix 7 directs that Aaron is to be anointed by the pouring of the anointing oil on his head, and in the verses that follow nothing is said about anointing his sons: Lev. viii 12 records that Aaron was so anointed, and v. 13 does not mention any anointing of his sons. In neither passage is there any express exclusion of the sons: it is not said that only Aaron was anointed. That the sons were not anointed is at best only an inference from the silence of these passages.

On the other hand, besides the direction of xxx 30, an earlier passage (xxviii 41) includes the sons the anointing, and xl 15 is very explicit; 'thou shalt bring his sons . and thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father . and their anointing shall be to them for an ever-lasting priesthood'. Also the anointing of the sons as well as of Aaron is mentioned in Lev. vii 35, 36, and allusions to it are found in Lev. x 7, Num. iii 3.
It comes to this, then, that because two passages speak of Aaron being anointed without mentioning his sons, the express testimony of six passages to the anointing of the sons is to be discredited as belonging to later interpolations.

This is surely an unusual way of estimating evidence. If two witnesses testify that a famous personage was knighted without saying anything at all about others, while six witnesses testify that others less famous received that honour at the same time, should we be justified in concluding that only one person was knighted, and that the others were only included by an after-invention? One would think that, by the ordinary rules of evidence, the positive statement of the six would far outweigh the merely negative silence of the two.

Is it not possible, and even in accordance with Hebrew tradition, that there was some anointing of the sons (whether the sprinkling with blood and oil specified in Exod. xxix 21, Lev. viii 30, or not) which was not the solemn anointing by pouring the sacred oil on the head (cf. Ps. cxxxiii 2)? If there was this special anointing of the High Priest, and only a subsidiary anointing of the sons, this would at once account for the latter not being mentioned in Exod. xxix 7, Lev. viii 12 (both referring to the pouring on the head), and also for the High Priest being styled ‘the anointed priest’ *par excellence*.

Whereas, on the later addition theory, we should be required to believe in an interpolator who has been careful to include the sons in Exod. xxviii 41, but failed to mention them in xxix 8, ten verses later; and in the same way has included them in Lev. vii 35, 36, and left viii 13 (fifteen verses further on) without them. He has also inserted precise directions in Exod. xxx 30, xl 15, and allusions in Lev. x 7, Num. iii 3, but left the mentions of ‘the anointed priest’ untouched. He must have been very careless.

The one view is simple and supported by the weight of evidence the other involves some considerable improbability. It can hardly be said that this argument for the late origin of cc. xxx, xxxi is very convincing.

(b) The Altar of Incense.

The arguments for considering the golden Altar of Incense a later addition, are drawn from (i) the position of the Instruction for making it; (ii) the annual rite of atonement; (iii) the Altar of Burnt Offering called ‘the’ altar; (iv) the use of censers (see Driver ‘Exodus’ p. 328).

(i) The position of the Instruction.

The Altar of Incense has long been regarded as almost of supreme importance, next indeed to the Ark of the Covenant, and according to Exod. xxx 6 was to be set in the Holy Place with the Table of Shewbread and the golden Candlestick. Yet the Instruction for making
it is not found in c. xxv with the Instructions for making the Table and Candlestick: it is only first mentioned in xxx 1-10, ‘when the directions respecting the Tabernacle seem to be complete, and brought to a solemn close by the promise in xxix 43-46 that Jehovah will take up His abode in the sanctuary so constructed’: and is not even mentioned in xxvi 34, 35 ‘where the position of the vessels in the Tabernacle is defined' (Driver ‘Exodus’ p. 328).

No doubt, if these chapters were (as is alleged) an ‘ideal’ scheme drawn up by a systematic writer ‘as the embodiment of certain spiritual ideas' (Driver ‘Exodus’ p. 428), it would be very surprising to find this Altar so far removed from the other furniture of the Holy Place. But if these chapters are, as they profess to be, Divine Instructions, then, except so far as they may guide us, we are not qualified to judge what reasons may have determined this particular order, or what was the precise importance of this Altar in the Divine scheme. Now, however important the Altar may have come to be considered in after ages, in these Instructions it appears to be treated rather as an accessory to the golden Candlestick, the burning of incense being directly associated with the preparation and lighting of the lamps (xxx 7, 8).

This view is the more probable because there is a similar instance in this same chapter. The Instruction for making the Bronze Laver is found here, and not along with the Instruction for making the Altar of Burnt Offering in c. xxvii. As regards the Court, there can be no question that the Altar was the main feature, and the Laver subordinate. It is therefore not impossible that, as regards the Holy Place, the Candlestick and Table were the matters of primary importance, and the Altar of Incense only secondary.

Further, between the Incense Altar and the Laver comes the Instruction that every man was to give a half shekel as ‘a ransom for his soul'. Why is it placed here? The ransom money was to be applied to ‘the service of the tent of meeting’ (xxx 16), and in xxxv 24, xxxvi I ‘the service' undoubtedly refers to the construction of the Tabernacle. The obvious conclusion is that the ransom money provided the silver which was needed, and this is distinctly stated in the Account of Metals (xxxviii 24-31) where this provision of silver (placed between the freewill offerings of gold and bronze) is recorded to have been used for the casting of sockets, hooks, and the like. The silver, then, was for the construction and ornamentation of subordinate parts.

If, then, the Altar of Incense was of secondary importance, the whole of c. xxx is occupied with accessories; and the placing of the Ransom money between the Golden Altar and the Bronze Laver (preserving the order ‘gold, silver, bronze’ of xxv 3, xxxv 5) indicates that the chapter
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is a deliberate and orderly arrangement, and not a miscellaneous collection of after-thoughts.

But does not all this follow after the ‘solemn close’ of xxix 43-46? and does not that shew that these were no part of the original Instructions?

Most of the Instructions in cc. xxv-xxxii end with a passage defining the position or use of the articles which were to be made. c. xxviii gives the instructions for making the priestly vestments: c. xxix continues with the ceremonies to be observed at the investiture of the priests, and the sacrifices to be then offered, leading on naturally to the daily sacrifices (vv. 38-42). The chapter, then, is something of a digression from the making of the vestments to the consecration and duties of the priests who were to wear them; and it is this digression, not ‘the directions respecting the Tabernacle’, which is brought to a close by the promise of vv. 43-46.

xxvi 34, 35 defines the position of the Mercy-seat, Candlestick, and Table, for the making of which directions had already been given: it could hardly include the position of that which had not yet been ordered to be made.

(ii) The annual rite of atonement.

In xxx 10 an ‘annual rite of atonement’ is prescribed to be performed upon the Altar of Incense: there is no notice of this in Lev. xvi, ‘where the ceremonial of the day of atonement is described in detail’; and in that chapter ‘only one altar, the altar of Burnt-offering’ is mentioned (Driver ‘Exodus’ p. 328).

Lev. xvi 12-16a describes in full detail what Aaron was to do ‘within the veil’, i.e. in the Holy of Holies: v. 16b adds ‘and so shall he do for the tent of meeting’, i.e. the Holy Place, but here no details are given. We have no right to assume that this did not include the rite prescribed in Exod. xxx 10.

‘The altar’ in vv. 18-20 is outside the Tent and he shall go out unto the altar’, v. 18), and there, of course, there was but the one altar. vv. 20 and 33 distinctly mark three stages in the ceremonies: (i) the holy place; (2) the tent of meeting; (3) the altar.

(iii) The Altar.

In a number of passages (e.g. Exod. xxvii-xxix; Lev. 1-i, v-vi, viii, ix, xvi) ‘the altar of Burnt-offering is referred to as “the altar”, implying apparently that there was no other’ (Driver ‘Exodus’ p. 328).

Exod. xxvii-xxix comes before the Instruction to make the Altar of Incense, so there was only one altar to refer to: in Lev. 1-i, v-vi the connexion with sacrifice is so close that only the sacrificial altar could be meant: in Lev. xvi the altar is outside: but in Lev. iv ‘the altar of sweet incense’ is distinguished from ‘the altar of burnt offering’ (vv. 7,
10, 18, 25, 30, 34). Where there is no possibility of mistake, the Bronze Altar is simply styled 'the altar': elsewhere it is distinguished.

More than that, there were reasons for styling the sacrificial Altar pre-eminently 'the altar': (i) the Hebrew word for 'altar' is derived from the root meaning to kill or slaughter, and therefore intimately connected with animal sacrifice; (2) there is reason for thinking the Incense Altar subordinate, while the Altar of Sacrifice was of primary importance; (3) the Incense Altar was secluded from view and small (cubits 1 x 1 x 2); the Bronze Altar was conspicuous in the open court and of great size (cubits 5 x 5 x 3, more than thirty-five times as large).

The use of the term 'the altar', therefore, no more implies that 'there was no other' than the mention of 'the chair' at a public meeting implies the absence of all other chairs. In a description of St Peter's at Rome, 'the altar' would be readily understood to mean the High Altar without any suggestion that there are no others.

(iv) The use of 'censers'.

Lev. x i, xvi 12, Num. xvi 6, 7 mention 'incense being offered on pans or censers' (Driver 'Exodus' p. 328): hence it is inferred that incense was originally offered in this way, and the incense altar was a later development.

Lev. x has to do with the irregular offering of Nadab and Abihu; Lev. xvi directs the High Priest to take the censer into the Holy of Holies, where there was no altar: Num. xvi deals with the test of the claim of Korah and his company which took place 'at the door of the tent of meeting' (v. 18).

All of these are clearly exceptional, and therefore no possible proof that there was not an Altar in the Holy Place for the ordinary daily burning of incense.

None of the four reasons for considering the Altar of Incense a later innovation is really convincing when closely examined, and the most plausible (No. i, the position of the Instruction) may fairly be taken to tell the other way.

We are asked to believe that originally there was no mention of any Altar of Incense, and that the Instruction to make one (Exod. xxx 1-10) was added by some one at a later time. Does it not stand to reason that such an one, if he had any sense, would be careful to put his insertion in the most appropriate place? Why should he put it 'after the directions respecting the Tabernacle seem to be complete and brought to a solemn close'? It would have been just as easy for him to insert it in c. xxv with the directions for the Table and the Candlestick. It is possible (as shewn above) to see a reason for this Altar occupying a subordinate position in the original Instructions: it is not possible
to imagine any reason for an interpolator inserting this direction anywhere but in the obviously natural place.

Then, again, there are the other contents of the two chapters, xxx, xxxi, to be taken into consideration.

The Instructions about the Altar of Incense and the anointing of priests only occupy 11 verses (xxx 1-10, 30) out of 56. What of the other 45? Were these also part of the later addition?

Dr Driver seems to think so for he marks both chapters P₂, and summarily dismisses four-fifths of the contents with the remark (p. 329), ‘The other subjects treated in chs. xxx-xxxii are such as would naturally find place in an Appendix’.

What are these other subjects? (1) ‘The ransom of souls at a census’; (2) the construction of the Laver; (3) the composition and use of the Anointing Oil; (4) the composition of the Incense; (5) the nomination of Bezaleel and Oholiab; (6) the summary of things to be made; (7) injunction to keep the Sabbath.

Was there really nothing of all this in the original Instructions? Was the Laver also an afterthought? The Anointing Oil is referred to in xxix 7, 21: was there no direction about this originally? Incense was ‘offered on pans or censers’; was there no hint as to its composition? Did the original account make no mention of the principal workers, and contain no summary of the things to be made?

It is difficult to believe that all these ‘other subjects’ were absent from the original: it is equally difficult to guess why, if they were absent, an interpolator should have thought it necessary to insert some of them. He might be tempted to bring in an altar for burning the incense, and a laver for the priests’ washing mentioned in xxix 4; but why should he invent an imaginary census tax? or imaginary workers? or add a seemingly irrelevant injunction to keep the Sabbath? Yet if there was in the original document an ‘Appendix’ containing some of these things, the insertion of the Altar of Incense among these instead of in the earlier instructions becomes more unaccountable than ever.

The Septuagint furnishes some further evidence.

It is remarkable that in Group II (the carrying out of the Instructions) the passage which narrates the making of the Altar of Incense, xxxvii 25-28, and the mentions of it in xxxxv 15, xxxix 8 are not found in the Greek. So also the notices of the Laver in xxxxv 16, xxxix 39, xl 7, 11, 30 are not represented.

At first sight this looks like a confirmation of the view that both Altar and Laver were later additions which had not yet found their way into the text used by the translators of xxxxv-xl.

But then, while the Altar is not mentioned anywhere in cc. xxxxv-xxxix,
in c. xl there are two passages (vv. 5, 6, and 26-28) which recognize both this Altar and the distinctive title of the Altar of sacrifice. Was this one chapter translated at a different time from the preceding five, and after the additions of cc. xxx, xxxi had been introduced into the Hebrew?

Again, while the Greek of c. xl has no mention of the Laver, xxxviii 8, which narrates the making of the Laver, is not only found in the corresponding Greek, but is there actually emphasized by the addition (borrowed from xl 31) about the washing. Are we to suppose that the translators of c. xxxvii had not the passage about the Altar but had the passage about the Laver in c. xxxviii, while the translators of c. xl knew about the Altar, but not about the Laver? If not, then the absence of the Altar from some parts, and of the Laver from others, can only be instances of omission on the part of the translators.

Then, too, all the other subjects in xxx, xxxi--the Census money, Anointing Oil, Incense, chosen workers, summary of things to be made, injunction to keep the Sabbath--are all fully recognized in the Greek of xxxv-xl. If, then, cc. xxx, xxxi are (as marked by Dr Driver) an integral whole, the translators of Group II must have had the whole of these chapters (including the Incense Altar and the Laver) before them, in which case the absence of the Altar section from the Greek is a marked instance of omission.

Yet, as the Altar of Incense is recognized in c. xl, the translators of Group II could hardly have had any reason for deliberately omitting the section about its being made. Now, just where this section occurs in the Hebrew, the Greek has the section about Metal-work (see the Comparative Table, p. 466) made up of miscellaneous fragments: and this section is almost exactly the length of the Greek of xxx 1-5, which corresponds to the Hebrew of xxxvii 25-28, which does not appear in the Greek. Can it be that for some reason, such as the mutilation of a page, the text used by the translators was here defective, and that they therefore filled up the gap by stringing together the fragments about the metal-work from other parts?

At any rate, the LXX version of cc. xxxv-xl does not confirm the theory that cc. xxx, xxxi form a later ‘Appendix’ to the original Instructions. That theory is only founded on a small part of the chapters in question; the reasons drawn, from that small part are far from strong; and the theory involves some serious improbabilities as to the action of the supposed interpolator.

II. **Group II later than cc. xx, xxxi.**

The theory that cc. xxxv-xl are later than xxx, xxxi depends on the difference in order between the two Groups of chapters, the ‘most
noticeable variation' being the difference in the position of the Altar of Incense and the Bronze Laver, which in Group I are relegated to the ‘Appendix’, and in Group II are ‘introduced in accordance with the place' which ‘they would naturally hold’ (Driver ‘Exodus’ p. 378).

Of course on any theory cc. xxxv-xl were written after cc. xxv-xxxi, and this rearrangement might have been made even if both Groups were due to the same author.

The two Groups, however, differ in other respects besides the order. Group II is by no means the replica, with trifling changes, of Group I which it is sometimes represented to be, though both Dr Driver (‘Exodus' p. 376) and Dr McNeile (‘Exodus' p. 223) characterize it as practically a verbatim repetition.

But cc. xxxv-xxxix are the record of the work of construction, and therefore verses not enjoining constructive work (e. g. xxv 8, 9; 15, 16; 22; 37b; 40; xxvi 9b; 12, 13; 30; &c.) are not included in them. So too directions as to the position or use of the furniture or hangings (e. g. xxv 21; xxvi 33-35 ; xxx 19-21) are transferred to xl 17-33, the setting up of the Tabernacle; and the whole of c. xxix (the Investiture of the Priests) is found in Leviticus, not in this Group.

The omissions in these chapters are not casual but deliberate, to suit the purpose of the account.

In like manner, in Group II there are considerable passages (xxxv 20-29, the offerings that were made; xxxvi 2-7, the delivery of the materials to the workmen; xxxix 33-43, the delivery of the finished work to Moses) narrating what was actually done, which therefore could by no possibility be included in the Instructions.

Lesser instances also are not without significance.

The Instruction about the Oil for the Light (xxvii 20, 21), and that about the Urim and Thummim (xxviii 30), do not appear in Group II. These do not seem to have required any making, and therefore are not included in the work done.

In the account of making the Ephod xxxix 3 has the addition, ‘they did beat the gold into thin plates, and cut it into wires’: xxxix 28, 29 has some added details about the priestly robes (the breeches ‘of fine twined linen’, and the girdle ‘of fine twined linen, and blue, and purple, and scarlet’). These are explanations of how the Instructions were actually carried out.

Neither omissions nor additions are accidental or unmeaning: they shew purpose, and are required by the essential character of the two Groups.

What then of the difference in order? Does that shew any traces of plan or purpose?
The differences (by no means confined to the position of the Incense Altar and Laver) will again be best seen in a Comparative Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxv. see below, (I). Materials to be offered</td>
<td>xxxv. Observance of Sabbath. Materials to be offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see below, (f).</td>
<td>Summary of things to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>The offerings and offerers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see below, (e)</td>
<td>The workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>xxxvi. Delivery of materials to workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Superabundance of offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table.</td>
<td>Table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlestick.</td>
<td>Candlestick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework.</td>
<td>Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veil.</td>
<td>Veil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen.</td>
<td>Screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see below, (a).</td>
<td>Altar of Incense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see below, (d).</td>
<td>Anointing Oil and Incense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see below, (c).</td>
<td>Laver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangings, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Hangings, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Account of Metals: gold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see below, (b).</td>
<td>silver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil for Light.</td>
<td>bronze.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breastplate.</td>
<td>Breastplate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urim and Thummim.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe of Ephod.</td>
<td>Robe of Ephod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Plate.</td>
<td>Gold Plate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other robes.</td>
<td>Other robes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxix. Investiture.</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES AND STUDIES

Group I. Group II.

xxx. (a) Altar of Incense. (b) Census money.
     (c) Laver.
     (d) Anointing Oil and Incense. see above

xxxi. (e) Workers.
     (f) Summary of things to be made.
     (g) Observance of Sabbath.

----- Delivery of articles completed.

Here it will be noticed that, at the commencement of the work, the
Furniture and Structure sections have changed places in Group II.
Why?

The Instructions begin at once with the Ark (the most sacred of all),
the Table, and the Candlestick, the Structure that was to enshrine them
coming after: in the work, the external Structure is first put in hand,
and the more elaborate Furniture after. This is just what might be
expected; the one arrangement is in order of importance, the other
according to the order in which the work would naturally be under-
taken.

So in the Vestments section, the Instructions place the Gold Plate
before the other robes because of its importance: in the work, the other
robes follow the Robe of the Ephod, and the Gold Plate, differing in
material and workmanship, follows.

Once more the different character of the two Groups is traceable.
Next, it is to be observed that not only the Altar of Incense and the
Laver but all the contents of cc. xxx, xxxi are altogether differently
placed in Group II. The most remarkable variation of all is that the
Instructions of c. xxxi which end Group I are found at the beginning of
Group II, and in reverse order:--
End of Group I Workers: things to be made: Sabbath.
Beginning of Group II Sabbath: things to be made: Workers.

Why is the injunction to keep the Sabbath inserted at all?
Surely to preclude the possibility of the people supposing that the
sanctity and urgency of the work might supersede the law of the Sabbath
rest. Not even for so sacred a work might that be broken.

Consider then the order of the Instructions.
A list of the materials needed naturally stands first. Next comes the
detailed description of the Sanctuary to be erected, beginning with its
most sacred part, the Ark of the Covenant and its Mercy-seat. Then
follow the Table and Candlestick of the Holy Place, and then the
Curtains, Framework, Veil and Screen which were to enshrine all these in an awe-inspiring seclusion. After these, the great Altar of the open Court, and the Hangings, pillars, and Screen of the enclosure to guard it. Then the holy Robes in which the priests might enter to minister, and the ceremonies by which they were set apart for their sacred office. After these again come the accessories: the secondary Altar of the Holy Place; the provision of silver; the Laver for purifying ablutions before ministering; the Consecrating Oil, and the Incense.

When the directions for the work to be performed are complete, then the designation of the chief workers, and a short summary of the work they were to do, follow most suitably. Is it not obvious that the command to observe the sacred days of rest makes a most fitting, almost inevitable, conclusion to all that has gone before?

When the whole group of chapters (xxv-xxxi) is regarded as containing the Divine Instructions, an admirable order and unity can be seen to run through them. Could that have been produced by two sets of writers, working independently, and separated by a considerable interval of time?

In the narration of how these Instructions were obeyed, however, clearly some notice is needed of how Moses, who alone had received them, conveyed them to the people. Accordingly c. xxxv begins with Moses assembling the people, and telling them ‘what the LORD hath commanded’, and now the solemn warning against infringing the Sabbath, which so appropriately closed the Instructions, becomes an equally suitable preface to the address to the assembled people. Before they are told of the work, they are cautioned as to its limitation, and to this caution is made the significant addition, ‘Ye shall kindle [lit. make flame, or burn] no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day’. Not only are they themselves to rest, but the special injunction against the use of fire is added lest they should think it necessary to keep alive the fires for casting and fashioning metals. All work is to cease.

This prefatory warning given, the people are next informed what materials are wanted, and the short summary of things to be made is added so that the people may understand to what purposes these materials are to be applied.

Quite simply and inartificially the matters which form the suitable close to the Instructions come as an equally fitting prelude to the performance of the work, and precisely in that reverse order in which they are actually found.

In response to Moses' address the offerings pour in: men and women bring their golden ornaments, the men bringing also the ready-made materials they possessed, as well as silver, bronze, and acacia wood, the
women contributing to the supply of materials by their spinning, and
their rulers providing the precious stones, the spice, and the oil. Then
the workers are convened, the materials delivered to them, and the work
of construction commences.

In this account of the performance of the work, those things which,
as being of lesser importance, only appear towards the close of the
Instructions, are naturally associated with the parts to which they
belong. So we find them: the Incense Altar with (but after) the
Furniture of the Holy Place; the Anointing Oil and Incense (coupled
because of similar composition) immediately after the Altar on which
the Incense was to be offered; the Laver after the Altar of Sacrifice;
and the Ransom silver in its appropriate place between the gold and the
bronce of the freewill offerings.

Again, a perfect order and unity runs through the arrangement of
Group II, and, though the order differs so much from that of Group I,
it is the order which exactly harmonizes with the professed character of
these chapters, viz. the narration of how the Instructions were obeyed.
Is it credible that this harmony, so real and yet so far from obvious,
could have been produced by yet a third set of writers, merely re-
arranging somewhat slavishly the Instructions of Group I 'in order to
dwell on their detailed fulfilment' (McNeile 'Exodus' p. 223)?

The inference that the different order of Group II shews that these
chapters belong to a later period than Group I really rests on a small
part of the evidence: it disregards the significance of the way in which
the contents of cc. xxx, xxxi are re-arranged, and it disregards the fact
that the omissions and additions in Group II shew a deliberate purpose
agreeing with the different character of the two Groups.

The view that Group II gives a straightforward account of how the
Instructions were carried out is consistent with the evidence as a whole,
explains all the variations (omissions, additions, differences of order),
and is coherent and intelligible throughout.

The three inferences to be examined were
(A) that the translators of xxxv-xl were not the translators of xxv-
xxx; 
(B) that the text used by the translators of xxxv-xl differed from the
present Massoretic text; 
(C) that cc. xxx, xxxi were a later addition to xxv-xxix,
and cc. xxxv-xl a still later addition.

It has been the aim of these papers to shew that each of these
inferences has been drawn from an imperfect survey of the evidence,
and that a consideration of the whole evidence shews that there is good reason for believing that

(1) the translators were the same throughout;

(2) the differences of the Greek from the Hebrew are due to the translators, and not to a difference of text;

(3) cc. xxx, xxxi are an integral portion of the original Instructions, and xxxv-xl a plain narrative of how the Instructions were obeyed.

A. H. FINN.
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Exodus 6:3 in Pentateuchal Criticism

SHAWN D. GLISSON

Kirksey, Kentucky

The verse with which this paper deals has no difficult words and presents no significant problems in translation. Nevertheless, Exodus 6:3 has become a very controversial passage in Pentateuchal criticism.1 Because of the supposed historical incongruity of this verse with much of the book of Genesis (e.g., Gen. 4:26, "To Seth also a son was born, and he called his name Enosh. At that time men began to call upon the name of the Lord.")2,3 many Old Testament scholars found what they thought was the

---

1 E.g., Otto Essfeldt, "El and Yahweh," Journal of Semitic Studies 1 (1959):25-37, by assuming a modified form of Wellhausen's documentary hypothesis, theorizes that Exodus 6:2-3 indicates how Yahweh was at one time separate from El, but supplanted his supremacy by assuming his name and later becoming the one God of Israel. But G. Ernest Wright, The Old Testament Against Its Environment (Chicago: H. Regnery Company, 1951), p. 13, rejects this idea. Furthermore, several scholars now reject the entire documentary theory because they are convinced that no distinction can be made on the basis of divine names and titles. E.g., Moses Hirsch Segal, "El, Elohim, and YHWH in the Bible," Jewish Quarterly Review 46 (1955):89-115.

2 All Bible quotations are taken from the Revised Standard Version.

3 John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh, Scotland: T. & T. Clark, 1910), pp. 126-127, asserts that Enosh "was the founder of the worship of Yahwe." He does this by noting that the expression qr'bsm literally means to invoke the divine name. But John T. Willis, Genesis, The Living Word Commentary (Austin, TX: Sweet Publishing Company, 1979), pp. 157-158, suggests the possibility that this expression simply means "to praise or give thanks to the Lord" (see Isa. 12:4; 1 Chron. 16:18; Pss. 105:1; 116:17). From this he concludes that "the emphasis would not be on the divine name 'Yahweh,' but on 'the calling the name of Yahweh,' and 'Yahweh' would be used because this was the name familiar to the author of Genesis. .. " Another possible explanation is offered by Samuel Sandmel, "Genesis 4:26b," Hebrew Union College Annual 32 (1961) :19-29. He notes three other possible textual understandings of the verse aside from the accepted text: (1) Rabbinic exegesis viewed the verb huchal as meaning "profaned" (i.e., "Then men profaned the name of God in their prayers."); (2) the LXX renders the same verb "hoped" (i.e., "He hoped to call on the name of the Lord God."); (3) Aquila, as preserved by Origen, renders the verse "Then there began the being named in the name of God" (i.e., the use of theophoric names). Sandmel rejects these possibilities and holds to the MT. He concludes, "Of course, the verse [Gen. 4:26] clashes [with Exod. 6:3, etc.]. But why emend the text?"
first clue to various documents existing in the Pentateuch. Thus, Exodus 6:3 was ascribed to the Priestly source (P), while portions of Genesis containing YHWH (except for 17:1 and 21:1b) were ascribed to the Yahwistic writer (J).

This alleged historical incongruity between the J and P sources was compounded when Exodus 3:13-15 was brought into the picture:

Then Moses said to God, “If I come to the people of Israel and say to them, ‘The God of your fathers has sent me to you,’ and they ask me, What is his name?’ what shall I say to them?” God said to Moses, “I AM WHO I AM.” And he said, “Say this to the people of Israel, ‘I AM has sent me to you.’”

God also said to Moses, “Say this to the people of Israel, ‘The Lord, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Issac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you’: this is my name for ever, and thus I am to be remembered throughout all generations.... “

In this passage Moses is at Mt. Horeb (cf. Exod. 3:1), while in Exodus 6:3 he is in Egypt (cf. Exod. 5:1). No difficulty would exist had it not been for the supposition that both of these accounts are referring to the same calling of Moses by Yahweh. It is also said that both are recounting the first time the tetragrammaton was made known to Moses.

---


5 In the English-speaking world, Samuel Rolles Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891), was the first to use the Graf-Wellhausen documentary hypothesis to divide the Pentateuch into the JEDP sources. For a more recent study of the J source, see Peter F. Ellis, *The Yahwist: The Bible's First Theologian* (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1968).

Even though several scholars still look to the Kenites for the beginnings of Yahweh-worship in Israel,7 or perhaps to some other nation,8 most would agree that the P source has the most accurate account of the three supposed biblical references.9 It is thought that the J source was attempting to make Yahweh worship seem to exist from the beginning of time. It is also explained that the E source in Exodus 3 was attempting to show the significance of Mt. Sinai by putting Moses at Horeb (Sinai) when he encountered YHWH. This would explain why E has both the calling and the revelation accounts at Horeb instead of Egypt as in P.10


But it must be asked at this point, is it necessary to attribute the accounts of Genesis 4:26b (15:1-2, etc.); Exodus 3:13-15; and Exodus 6:3 into three different sources? In view of (1) the historical background of the Exodus passages in their ancient Near Eastern setting, (2) the Hebrew text and syntax of Exodus 6:3, and (3) the theological significance of this passage in the book of Exodus as a whole, it would seem that such is not necessary.11 Perhaps a discussion of these points will make this conclusion seem reasonable.

A study of the historical background of Exodus 6:3 and Exodus 3:13-15 reveals that neither passage suggests that this was when Moses first learned of the name YHWH.12 But in Exodus 3:13, this conclusion seems to contradict this, for it speaks of Moses as having the people of Israel asking "What is his name?" Even though this inquiry may seem to suggest to the modern reader that Israel was ignorant of the tetragrammaton, this was not the case for the ancient Hebrew reader. When a person wished to know the simple name of someone or something in Hebrew, the interrogative pronoun mi was generally used (cf. Gen. 33:5; Num. 22:9; Josh. 9:8).13 The interrogative pronoun mah, on the other hand, was generally used when one wanted to understand an inner quality or characteristic of someone or something (e.g., Exod. 16:15).14

This understanding seems natural since the explanation of the Name which is given in verse 14 suggests that the tetragrammaton was commonly known. Here Moses has just asked a question of character, i.e. "What kind of God are you?" The Lord responds paronomastically, "I am who I am."15

12 McNeile, The Book of Exodus, p. 34, however, says that both essays depict God "revealing the Name for the first time."
This was not an evasive answer, but a revelation of divine character. Perhaps the emphasis is upon the ever-presence of the Lord: "I shall be there for whatever help I am to be there." Or perhaps the emphasis should be upon the fact of his existence as in B. N. Wambacq's paraphrase: Je suis, J'existe. Au moment voulu, vous in aurei l'expérience. Croyez-moi! It ought also to be noticed that the context of Exodus 3 is against the idea that Moses and Israel did not know the name Yahweh (cf. verses 15-16). As Sigmund Mowinckel accurately notes, Yahweh is not telling his name to one who does not know it. Moses asks for some "control" evidence that his countrymen may know, when he returns to them, that it is really the god of their fathers that has sent him. The whole conversation presupposes that the Israelites know this name already.

The language used in Exodus 6:2-3 also presupposes a knowledge of the name of Yahweh. This is made clear when one understands the introductory phrase, 'ani YHWH, in the light of its ancient Near Eastern setting. From the perspective of this time period, this formula becomes the introduction of the well-known God of Israel, rather than a revelation.

17 Moses Hirsch Segal, The Pentateuch: Its Composition and Its Authorship (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967), p. 5, correctly notes, "The actual answer to the question: 'I am that I am' (v. 14) does not give the name of the Deity. It gives the significance and the interpretation of the name YHWH, but not the name itself."
18 Kaufmann Kohler, "The Tetragrammaton and Its Uses," Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy 1 (1919):21, gives this as a possible rendering among several others.
19 'Eheyeh aser 'eheyeh," Biblica 59 (1978):336. This also seems to be the emphasis of the LXX in their rendering: Ego eimi ho on. See also Edward Schild, "On Exodus iii 14 -"I Am That I Am," Vetus Testamentum 4 (1954) :296-302, who translates it, "I am the One who is."
of the divine name. For example, the introductory formula in Yehawmilk's inscription is "I am Yehawmilk, king of Byblos ..." Of Kilamuwa, king of Y'dy, it is written, "I am Kilamuwa, the son the Hayya." Azitawadda begins, "I am Azitawadda, the blessed of Ba'l, the servant of Ba,l." From these examples it becomes clear that the use of the first singular personal pronoun was often employed as introductory formulas by kings already known by the people. It is very plausible that Exodus 6:2 is following this custom.

The problem of Exodus 6:3 can also be approached by examining the syntax of the text. Several possibilities have been suggested, which would alter the general rendering of the text. But the explanation that

21 Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967), pp. 76-77, gives four reasons for this verse not being a revelation of a new name not previously known: (1) The custom of Eastern monarchs was to begin with a similar introductory formula; (2) if it was a new revelation, it would read, "My name is YHWH," not "I am YHWH"; (3) the phrase "I am YHWH" is often used in the Old Testament and it is not understood as a revelation in these cases; (4) this formula is also in Exod. 6:6, 7, 8 and it is not understood as a revelation in these verses.


25 E.g., L. August Heerboth, "Was God Known to the Patriarchs as Jehovah?" *Concordia Theological Monthly* 4 (1933):345-349, argues that Exod. 6:3 should be a question, even though the he-interrogative is absent from the verse. He renders the verse, "I am Jehovah and have appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as God Almighty. And regarding my name Jehovah was I not known to them?" This interpretation has difficulties because (1) it does not fit the context of Exod. 6 well, and (2) it is not supported by any Hebrew grammarians. See Hinckly Gilbert Mitchell, "The Omission of the Interrogative Particle," in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, vol. 1, ed. Robert Francis Harper, Francis Brown, and George Foot Moore (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908), pp. 115-129, who restricts the number of occurrences in the Old Testament to 39, of which he attributes 12 or 17 to a corruption of the text. Exod. 6:3 was not one of the 39 occurrences. Another possible solution is offered by William J. Martin, *Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the Pentateuch* (London: Tyndale Press, 1955), pp. 16-17. He believes that the 'lo' in Exod. 6:3 should be lo. He thus renders the verse, "I am the Lord. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as God Almighty, and verily (lo), by my name the Lord I did make myself known to them." This idea, however, cannot be proved. There is no indication of a corrupt text in this verse. Yet a number still hold this view. Cf. Raymond F. Surberg, "Did the Patriarchs Know Yahweh?" *Springfielder* 36 (1972):125-126; and Robert Dick Wilson, "Yahweh (Jehovah) and Exodus 6:3," in *Classical Evangelical Essays in Old Testament Interpretation*, ed. Walter C. Kaiser (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1972), pp. 29-39.
can best be supported on an objective grammatical basis is the following rendering: "I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as God Almighty, but as for my reputation as the Lord, I was not known to them." This translation is supported by at least three grammatical reasons.

First, the $b$ in the phrase $b^{̂}el$ shaddai may mean "in the capacity of," "in the character of," or "as." Second, since the latter half of the verse (i.e., $wush^{̂}mi$ YHWH) has no governing preposition, the preposition from the first half of the verse probably governs both halves. And third, the term $shemi$ means "my reputation, fame, or character" in Exodus 6:3. But the problem would not be resolved if one stopped here. The nagging question still persists: Why does Exodus 6:3 say that the patriarchs did not know the character of YHWH? The answer comes when one realizes the meaning of knowing YHWH in the theology of the book of Exodus and in the theology of the Old Testament as a whole.

To the Hebrew mind, knowledge and experience were closely connected. The Hebrew work $yadae$ which is used in Exodus 6:3 in the niphhal, means "to know," "to yearn to know," and "to come to know in the process of things" (i.e., by experience). Therefore, when one speaks

---

26 See Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, p. 379; and Raymind Abba, "The Divine Name Yahweh," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961):323-324, both of whom cite this verse as an example of this meaning.


29 Unacceptable is the solution of Fred G. Smith, "Observations on the Use of the Names and Titles of God in Genesis," *Evangelical Quarterly* 40 (1968):103-109, who argues that the Genesis writer inserted the tetragrammaton into the Genesis text because at the time of its writing it was the common name of God. Smith, however, offers no explanation for Gen. 4:26 and admits that he is "baffled" by it. Furthermore, he does not explain Gen. 22:14, which would seem to be even more baffling to one who holds this view.


of knowing someone in the Old Testament, he is implying some kind of recalled experience (e.g., sexual--Gen. 4:1; visual--Gen. 12:11; political--Exod. 1:8).

In the book of Genesis the patriarchs knew God in the character of God Almighty. John Alexander Motyer accurately notes the significance of this name in Genesis:

... it was the claim of El Shaddai to be powerful where man was weakest, and He exerts this claim supremely by promising to an obscure and numerically tiny family that they should one day possess and populate a land which, in their day, was inhabited and owned by people immeasurably their superiors in number and power.

Motyer substantiates this observation by pointing out three ways God made known his character as an Almighty God to the patriarchs. (1) He took over human incapacity in the lives of the patriarchs in order to raise up a great nation; (2) he changed the name of Abram and Jacob to symbolize their transformed human nature; (3) he promised to them boundless posterity in the land of promise. In these important ways, the patriarchs came to know God as El Shaddai by experience.

When one turns to the book of Exodus, he sees that it was God's desire to fulfill his promise which he had made to the patriarchs. Before he could do this with any meaning, however, God had to show to the people what kind of God he was. This meant acting in a significant way, because at this time no one knew YHWH, since no one had experienced his forthcoming actions. This is seen very clearly in Exodus. It is recorded that Pharaoh did not know him (Exod. 5:2); the patriarchs had not known him (Exod. 6:3); Israel did not know him (Exod. 6:7); Egypt did not know him (Exod. 7:5); even Moses did not know him (Exod. 8:22).

Because of this widespread ignorance of YHWH--ignorance of his character, not of his name--something had to be done in order to educate the people. This first came in the form of the plagues (Exod. 7:5,17; 8:10, 22; 9:14, 29, 30; 10:2; 11:7) and second by the exodus itself (Exod. 6:7; 14:4,18; 16:6, 12). After these experiences it could then be said that

33 The Revelation of the Divine Name, pp. 29-30.
34 Ibid., p. 29.
the people knew YHWH (cf. Exod. 18:11; 29:46; Deut. 4:35, 39; 7:9; 29:2-6).

With this understanding in mind, the difficulty of Exodus 6:3 no longer seems to exist. This is so because knowing the Lord, which is a major theme of the book of Exodus,\textsuperscript{35} could come only after the people of Israel had experienced the exodus. Therefore, the patriarchs (or anyone else for that matter) could not have possibly known YHWH in this way. Only those who were able to recall the most significant event recorded in the Old Testament were able to know YHWH in a fuller sense. This is not to say, however, that the patriarchs did not know the name YHWH. On the contrary, they knew and used the name often, but without the significance it took when God delivered his people and kept his promise.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35} This theme of knowing the Lord is picked up by the prophets. They lament the state of the people, since they do not know YHWH (e.g., Isa. 1:3; Jer. 9:3, 6), but they tell of a day when they would know the Lord. It would come only after they had experienced his judgment (e.g., Isa. 49:23, 26; 52:6; 60:16; Jer. 16:21; Ezek. 6:7, 10, 13, 14; 7:4).

\textsuperscript{36} 1 Sam. 3 provides the best analogy for this point. Samuel was born to a YHWH-worshipping family. His mother prayed (1 Sam. 1:10ff.), worshipped (1 Sam. 1:19), and sacrificed to (1 Sam. 1:24) YHWH. His father also sacrificed to YHWH (1 Sam. 1:3, 21). When Samuel was young, he was dedicated to YHWH (1 Sam. 1:22) and he ministered before YHWH (1 Sam. 2:18) under Eli (1 Sam. 3:1), who was a priest of YHWH (1 Sam. 1:9). Year by year Samuel grew in the presence of YHWH (1 Sam. 2:21, 26). Yet, even with this background, 1 Sam. 3:7a says, "Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord (YHWH) . . ." Obviously, the meaning of this verse is that Samuel had not yet come to know the Lord by experience.
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THE ABORTION DILEMMA

Michael A. Grisanti
Associate Professor of Old Testament

In recent years Supreme-Court actions legalizing abortion have crystalized two ethical positions: pro-choice and pro-life. A series of cases resulted in decisions granting women the right to choose whether or not to have abortions. As a consequence, several methods of aborting unborn children have come into prominence: suction aspiration, dilation and curettage, dilation and evacuation, saline injection, hysterotomy, prostaglandin chemical, RU-486, and partial-birth abortion. Viewpoints on abortion break down into four categories. Some say abortion is always right, others say sometimes, still others rarely, and some say never. The Bible gives several reasons why abortion is wrong because it does not distinguish between a person's state before and after birth, because it indicates God "knew" certain ones before birth, because it indicates King David was a sinner from conception, and because John the Baptist reacted while still in his mother's womb. Both sides in the debate have used Exodus 21:22-25 to prove their cases, but the passage has a number of exegetical difficulties that keep it from being a strong argument. Though several Ancient Near Eastern law codes are similar to the Exodus passage, the biblical law is distinguishable from these in several ways. Questionable situations when some would use the mother's health, pregnancies caused by rape or incest, and pregnancies facing fetal handicaps do not furnish sufficient grounds for abortion.

The Supreme Court's decision in 1973 to legalize abortion at almost any time in a woman's pregnancy and for a wide variety of reasons thrust the issue onto the platform of heated national debate. Discussion and debate over the abortion issue occurs within families, in and among churches, in communities, in legislatures on the state and federal level, throughout the court system, and in the Executive Branch of each state and in the federal government. Proponents on both sides of the issue feel great passion for their position and expend great energy defending the legitimacy of their perspective on the issue. Organizations, publications, billboards, and websites that advocate a certain position concerning abortion abound. As with a number of ethical issues, believers are on both sides of the fence. Though some Christians fiercely oppose abortion in any circumstance, others just as fervently defend the right of a woman to have access to an abortion.
What does the Bible have to say about the practice of abortion? How should that belief affect Christian conduct in a world given over to paganism? In other words, how does a believer flesh out his belief about abortion in his life and ministry?

By definition, an abortion involves the "expulsion of the human fetus ... before it is capable of surviving outside the womb."  The two general categories of abortion are the spontaneous and the induced. A spontaneous abortion is one that takes place naturally, with no external intervention. It represents a situation over which the mother has no control. In a number of cases, a fertilized egg never implants in the mother's womb and passes out of her body during her monthly period. Another kind of a spontaneous abortion involves a miscarriage. In this instance, the mother's body expels the developing fetus before the baby is able to live outside the womb. The second category of abortion involves an induced abortion, i.e., one brought about by medical means (discussed at length below). Statistically speaking, since the Supreme Court's decision of 1973 (Roe v. Wade), the annual number of abortions has risen from 744,600 to a peak of 1.6 million (approximately 1.6 million abortions were performed annually from 1980-1992). After 1992 the number of abortions performed annually slowly dropped to 1.4 million in 1.996. From 1973 through 1996, an estimated 34.4 million unborn babies have died in hospitals and abortion clinics throughout America. In the past 4 years, abortions terminated between one-quarter and one-third of all pregnancies in America. Approximately 52% of women obtaining abortions in the U.S. are younger than 25. Over half of unintended pregnancies worldwide end with induced abortion. It has become the second most common surgical procedure in our country, circumcision being the first.

The basic question in this debate is "Are you in favor of abortion (pro-abortion) or opposed to it (anti-abortion)"? Or to put it another way, "Are you pro-choice or pro-life?" The foundation for this decision is this: Does a woman have the right to do whatever she wishes with her body (choice), or is the human responsibil-

3 These statistics are available on numerous web sites dealing with the issue of abortion. For two examples, see the home page for the Alan Guttmacher Institute, a pro-choice research center (www.agi-usa.org/pubs/fb_induced_abortion.html) and the Ohio Right to Life home page (www.ohiolife.org/stats/us_1996.htm).
4 Women aged 20-24 obtain 32% of all abortions while teenagers obtain 20% (www.agi-usa.org/pubs/fb_induced_abortion.html).
5 According to the Alan Guttmacher Institute, this involves 46 million pregnancies (and abortions) worldwide (www.agi-usa.org/pubs/ib_0599.html).
6 According to J. Kerby Anderson (*Moral Dilemmas: Biblical Perspectives on Contemporary Issues* [Nashville: Word, 1998] 227 n. 1, drawing on material from the National Center for Health Statistics, Atlanta, Ga.), abortion is the most frequently performed surgery on adults in America.
ity to preserve life at all times (life)?

Neither set of proponents finds total agreement with the titles given them. The pro-abortionist does not regard herself/himself as anti-life even though he or she does not view the fetus as a person. A number of women regard themselves as pro-choice but not pro-abortion. Nor is the anti-abortionist really anti-choice. A woman does have the responsibility to take care of her body. However, the issue of abortion touches two lives, those of the mother and of the unborn child. Those who oppose abortion contend that the mother's preferences should not have preeminence over the unborn child's life. Consequently, the debate over abortion is normally categorized by two basic positions: pro-choice and pro-life.7

THE LEGAL BACKGROUND OF ABORTION

Various sources document the legal history of the abortion debate. As part of their discussion of the larger issue, numerous volumes that focused on the issue of abortion or ethics in general provide a helpful overview of this legal history.8 More recently, various websites offer the full text of the various legal decisions as well as links to other related websites.9 One has only to type the word "abortion" in one of the major web search engines to find hundreds of places to find information of this kind.

Roe v. Wade (1973)10

On January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court ruled that an unborn child is the property of the mother. It concluded that she might dispose of it for any reason during the first six months of pregnancy, and at any other time (last trimester) if, in the opinion of a single licensed physician, it is necessary to preserve her life and health. During the first three months of pregnancy, abortion may not be regulated. During the second trimester, it may be regulated only with reference to the protection of the "mother's" health.

7 The complaint of this writer about media coverage of this issue is the frequent use of unequal terms for the two sides. Those in favor of abortion are said to be pro-choice (not pro-abortion or anti-life). But those opposed to abortion are referred to as anti-abortion or anti-choice (not pro-life).

8 Feinberg and Feinberg, Ethics 48-50; Scott B. Rae, Moral Choices: An Introduction to Ethics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995) 118-22; Curt Young, The Least of These (Chicago: Moody, 1984) 21-32.

9 Abortion Law Homepage (http://members.aol.com/abtrbng/index.htm); cf. www.abortioninfo.net /facts.

10 410 U.S. 113 (1973).
In a companion case decided on the same day as *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court struck down a Georgia law that placed several limitations on abortion. Any attempts to place limits on a woman's right to an abortion had to conform to "a compelling state interest." It is important to note that the Supreme Court justices interpreted the mother's health to include her psychological and emotional health in addition to her physical health.

**Planned Parenthood v. Danforth (1977)**

This case removed some of the limits that had been placed on abortion by *Roe v. Wade* (e.g., spousal consent, parental consent for a minor child). The woman and her physician were the only ones legally involved in the decision-making process.

**Webster v. Reproductive Health Services (1989)**

This case represented one of the first significant limits on an individual's right to an abortion. Reversing certain lower court decisions, the Supreme Court upheld a Missouri law that prohibited the use of public funds or medical facilities for "non-therapeutic" abortions. Building on the Hyde Amendment that dealt with the use of federal funds for abortions, this case concerned the right of states to limit or prohibit the use of tax funds to pay for abortions.

**Planned Parenthood v. Casey (1992)**

Pro-choice proponents brought this case to the Supreme Court to protest limitations placed on abortion in the state of Pennsylvania (Casey was the governor of the state). The state law in question required that a woman seeking an abortion give informed consent after receiving certain relevant information 24 hours before the procedure (explanation of procedure, risks of abortion, probable gestational age of fetus), informed parental consent for a minor child, and evidence of spousal notification. Pro-life advocates regarded this case as the best opportunity to overturn *Roe v. Wade* and pro-choice proponents hoped that the Supreme Court would strike down all the limitations. Neither side was totally satisfied with the outcome. The Supreme Court did not overturn *Roe v. Wade* but retained all the
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limitations except the spousal notification feature.

**Clinton's Withdrawal of Executive Support for the Unborn**

Although it does not belong to the legal/court history of the abortion battle, one should remember President Clinton's contribution to this debate. On January 20, 1993, while the annual protest against *Roe v. Wade* was going on outside the White House, President Clinton reversed more than a decade of executive support for the unborn with one stroke of the pen.\(^\text{15}\) He signed an executive order that did three things:

- He lifted the "gag rule" that had prohibited workers in federally funded health clinics from mentioning abortion as an alternative to dealing with an unwanted pregnancy.
- He lifted the federal prohibition against performing abortions on military bases and in military hospitals.
- He ended the moratorium on federal funding for research that utilizes fetal tissue procured from induced abortions.

**Stenberg v. Carhart (2000)\(^\text{16}\)**

At least 30 states have passed a ban on partial-birth abortions. Shortly after Nebraska passed a law of this kind (June 1997), a physician who performs abortions, Leroy Carhart, filed a complaint challenging the constitutionality of the statute. In September of 1999, the 8th Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals declared Nebraska's partial-birth abortion law unconstitutional.\(^\text{17}\) On January 14, 2000, the Supreme Court agreed to hear its first partial-birth abortion case, *Stenberg v. Carhart*. Attorneys for both sides presented oral arguments for the case on April 25, 2000, and the court rendered a decision on June 28, 2000, overturning Nebraska's ban on partial-birth abortions by a 5-4 vote. Supreme Court justice Stephen Breyer, writing for the majority, affirmed that the Nebraska law results in an "undue burden upon a woman’s right to make an abortion decision."\(^\text{18}\)

**THE METHODS OF ABORTION**

"Abortion" describes the act of bringing forth young prematurely. A spontaneous abortion is one that takes place naturally, a situation over which the

\(^{15}\) Rae, *Moral Choices* 117.

\(^{16}\) 99-830. For a brief summary of this case and the perspective of Planned Parenthood, see http://www.planneciparenthood.org/library/facts/stenberg.html.

\(^{17}\) For the full text of this case presented at the state level to the U.S. District Court, see http://lw.bna.com/lw/19970909/ 3205a.htm.

mother has no control. An induced abortion is one that is brought about by medical means. The various methods of induced abortion receive brief attention in the following paragraphs.\(^{19}\)

**Suction Aspiration**

This procedure is used in 80 percent of the abortions up to the 12th week of the pregnancy (1st trimester). The mouth of the mother's cervix is dilated. A hollow tube with a knifelike edged tip is inserted into the womb. A suction force 28 times stronger than a vacuum cleaner literally tears the developing baby to pieces and sucks the remains into a container.

**Dilation and Curettage (D & C)**

The cervix is dilated with a series of instruments to allow the insertion of a curette--a loop-shaped knife--into the womb. The instrument is used to scrape the placenta from the uterus and then cut the baby apart. The pieces are then drawn through the cervix. An attending nurse must then reassemble the tiny body to make sure no parts remain in the womb to cause infection.

**Dilation and Evacuation (D & E)**

This procedure occurs at 12-20 weeks. Since by week 12 the baby's bones are hardening and can no longer be sucked apart, abortion is achieved by dismem-berment. After dilating the cervix, forceps with sharp metal teeth tear the baby apart. The head is usually too large to be removed whole and must be crushed and drained before it is removed from the womb. As with the above procedure, an attending nurse inventories the body parts to avoid infection in the womb from parts left behind.

**Saline Injection**

This procedure is also called "salt-poisoning" or hyper-natremic abortion and is generally used after 13 weeks of pregnancy (2nd trimester). A long needle is inserted through the mother's abdomen to remove some of the amniotic fluid surrounding the baby and to replace it with a toxic, saline solution. The baby then breathes and swallows this solution. In most cases, the unborn child dies in one or two hours from salt poisoning, dehydration, and hemorrhaging. The mother goes into labor about 24 hours later and delivers a dead (or in a few cases, dying) baby.

\(^{19}\) Numerous sources provide an overview of these techniques. For two examples, see Feinberg and Feinberg, Ethics 51-53, and Young, *Least of These* 83-99.
Hysterotomy

During the last three months of the pregnancy (3rd trimester) this procedure is used. The womb is opened surgically and the baby is removed, as in a cesarean section. However, the purpose of this procedure is to end the infant's life. Instead of being cared for, the baby is wrapped in a blanket, set aside, and allowed to die.

Prostaglandin Chemical Abortion

This procedure involves the use of chemicals recently developed by the Upjohn Pharmaceutical Company. Prostaglandin hormones, injected into the womb or released in a vaginal suppository, cause the uterus to contract and deliver the child prematurely--too young to survive. A saline solution is sometimes injected first, killing the baby before birth. A self-administered tampon has been going through clinical testing. The procedure has several side effects and live births have been common (when saline solution is not used). This procedure is most common in India, China, and Eastern Europe.

RU-486 (The Abortion Pill)

After receiving approval for distribution in France, Great Britain, Sweden, and the People's Republic of China, the RU-486 drug caught the attention of pro-abortionists around the world. After RU-486 became a viable alternative as an abortion technique, numerous countries considered allowing distribution within their borders. In 1994, a research organization (The Population Council) began conducting the first nationwide study of the French abortion pill (RU-486) in a number of different clinics throughout the United States. In September of 1996 the FDA gave RU-486 tentative approve for distribution in the United States (after an amazingly short 6-month approval process). Final approval depended on FDA's inspection of the company chosen to manufacture the drug in the United States. Danco Laboratories LLC have agreed to serve as the distributors for the RU-486 drug, but have not named their manufacturing source.

Although proponents of the RU-486 drug expected final approval in late spring or early summer, the FDA made an important decision in June 2000. In a letter to The Population Council, the FDA set September 30, 2000 as a tentative

Supporters and opponents of RU-486 have debated the potential complications of the drug. For a recent study that highlights some of those negative side-effects (written by advocates of the drug), see a recent article written in the following well-known medical journal: Irving M. Spitz, C. Wayne Bardin, Lauri Benton, and Ann Robbins, "Early Pregnancy Termination with Mifepristone and Misoprostol in the United States," *New England Journal of Medicine* 338/18 (April 30, 1998):1241-47. The following website provides an abstract of the article and gives careful attention to those potential medical complications: www.lifeissues.org/ru486/ru98-05.html.
deadline for approving the drug. To the dismay of the drug's proponents, the FDA placed three key restrictions on the distribution of the RU-486 drug.

Only health professionals trained in surgical abortion, medical abortion, and sonography can distribute the drug. Any physician who administers this drug must have admitting privileges at a hospital within one hour of their office in case something goes awry. An accredited agency must verify that all doctors who intend to administer this drug meet the training requirements stated above.21

In the summer of 1999 the RU-486 drug received approval in eight other European countries (Germany, Greece, Belgium, Finland, Austria, Denmark, Spain, and the Netherlands). The drug as been registered in Switzerland and Russia. Canada is waiting for final approval in the U.S. before they give approval to the drug. A Canadian doctor in Vancouver recently began that country's first clinical trial of the RU-486 drug.

A woman first takes RU-486, which blocks the action of progesterone, a hormone that prepares the lining of the uterus for pregnancy and is essential to maintain a pregnancy. Two days later she then takes two tablets of a prostaglandin, which causes the uterus to contract. In most cases, the embryo is expelled in four hours. RU-486 is normally taken no later than 63 days after pregnancy and is supposedly successful in about 96% of the cases. Complications increase after 49 days of pregnancy.

**Partial-Birth Abortion**

In a partial-birth abortion the person performing the abortion partially delivers (legs, arms, and torso only) a living unborn child before killing the unborn child and completing the delivery. Before the delivery is completed, the person performing the abortion punctures the back of the skull with scissors or another instrument, inserts a suction curette into the skull, and suctions the contents of the skull so as to collapse it.

**IS ABORTION EVER RIGHT?: A SPECTRUM OF VIEWS**

A survey of the voluminous pages written about this debate from all perspectives demonstrates that people answer the question, "Is Abortion Ever Right?," in four ways: always, sometimes (tinder certain circumstances), rarely, and never.

Always ("abortion on demand")

In the original Roe v. Wade decision (1973) the Supreme Court ruled that an unborn child is not entitled to legal protection of his or her life and can be aborted at anytime up until the moment of birth. Though several pro-abortionists limit abortion to the first two trimesters of pregnancy, some abortion clinics will perform an abortion at any time before birth.

Various factors contribute to a woman's decision to have an abortion. Some of these are very complicated and make the issue of abortion even more difficult. Here are some of the reasons proposed by those who advocate abortions:

- Therapeutic - the life of a mother may be at risk should she carry a child to term.
- Eugenic - the baby is retarded, deformed, or handicapped in some way.
- Psychiatric - the mother's mental health.
- Socio-economic - to ease economic pressures on an individual/family.
- Violation - in cases where the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest.
- On demand - for any reason important to the mother.

Sometimes (under certain circumstances)

Within the anti-abortion movement, there is disagreement whether abortion might be legitimate in certain cases. For the most part, pregnancies that threaten the mother's health and those caused by rape or incest are the ones debated and discussed within the pro-life movement as possible instances where an abortion may have legitimacy.

Rarely

This reason applies only when the mother's life is actually at stake, primarily in the case of ectopic or tubal pregnancies. With an ectopic or tubal pregnancy the fertilized egg implants in the fallopian tube rather than the mother's uterus. The doctor has only two options. On the one hand, he can intervene and take the baby's life by surgically removing the fetus from the fallopian tube and save the mother's life. His other option is to do nothing and let both mother and baby die. There is abundant medical information available that no ectopic/tubal pregnancy ever resulted in childbirth.

This is an issue to which pastors and potential parents must give careful attention. Over the last twenty years the number of ectopic pregnancies has increased fourfold. It now accounts for about eleven percent of maternal deaths. Sexually transmitted diseases (that damage the fallopian tube), a retained IUD,

22 IUD stands for "intra-uterine device," a formerly popular birth control device.
tubal ligation, and tuboplasty appear to be causes for this significant increase in the occurrence of ectopic pregnancies.

With regard to the "Sometimes" and "Rarely" positions, the concerns for the mother's health are normally limited to genuine medical health risks. This could involve the discovery of an aggressive form of cancer, a serious heart condition, or some other serious disease. In all of these cases, the attending physician has a legitimate desire to safeguard the life and health of the mother. In each of these instances the husband and wife must wrestle with the doctor's evaluation of the probable course of the ailment and the life of their baby. Since these circumstances have life and death in the balance, they require decisions that are far from easy. This writer seeks to limit a legitimate use of abortion to the case of an ectopic pregnancy. This kind of circumstance appears to be clear. In the other cases, this writer would do everything possible to preserve both the mother's and child's life. In the end, unless it was clear that both mother and child would die, he would not end the life of the child for the sake of the mother's health.

Never

According to the proponents of this perspective, no extenuating circumstances legitimate an abortion. Those who take this position would even exclude an ectopic pregnancy as a legitimate cause for agreeing to an abortive procedure.

THE FOUNDATIONAL ISSUE: WHEN DOES LIFE BEGIN?

(WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?)

No Difference Whether before or after Birth

The Bible recognizes no essential difference between the being in the womb and the being after birth. From the point of conception and forward, the individual is a person. According to Genesis 4:1, "Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain, and said, 'I have acquired a man from the LORD.' The passage views Cain's life as a continuity, and his history extends back to his conception. Eve makes no distinction between his conception, birth, and life. Eve regards conception and life as part of the work of God. Job affirms, "May the day perish on which I was born, And the night in which it was said, 'A male child is conceived'" (Job 3:3). Job's life has become an intolerable burden to him. As Job laments his existence, he connects his birth and his conception as parallel items in a poetic unit. Both his conception in his mother's womb and his birth from his mother's womb form an integral part of his existence.

23 Feinberg and Feinberg, Ethics 414 n. 18.
24 Scripture quotations are taken from the New King James Version unless otherwise noted.
God "Knew" Certain Persons before Birth

The Bible speaks of God "knowing" certain persons *before* their birth, indicating that God regarded them as persons that early. The psalmist writes,

For You formed my inward parts; You covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; Marvelous are Your works, And that my soul knows very well. My frame was not hidden from You, When I was made in secret, And skillfully wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Your eyes saw my substance, being yet unformed. And in Your book they all were written, The days fashioned for me, when *as yet there were* none of them (139:13-16).

David rejoices over Yahweh's careful watchcare over him even in his mother's womb. Verse 13 points to God's personal regard for the psalmist that began when he was yet in his mother's womb. Verses 14-15 highlight that David was the product of God's creative work in his mother's womb. Ronald Allen writes:

The Bible never speaks of fetal life as mere chemical activity, cellular growth, or vague force. Rather, the fetus in the mother's womb is described by the psalmist in vivid pictorial language as being shaped, fashioned, molded, and woven together by the personal activity of God. That is, as God formed Adam from the dust of the ground, so He is actively involved in fashioning the fetus in the womb.  

God affirmed to the prophet Jeremiah, "Before I formed you in the womb I knew you; Before you were born I sanctified you; I ordained you a prophet to the nations" (Jer 1:5). God "knew" Jeremiah even before he was conceived. God "sanctified" Jeremiah and "ordained" him a prophet before he came from the womb. Also, God Himself is the One who forms the fetus and orchestrates the natural processes that bring about the miracle of life (cf. Job 31:15; Ps 119:73; Eccl 11:5, which suggest that God's providence rules throughout the gestation period of a fetus). King David Was a Sinner from Conception King David himself acknowledged that he was a sinner from the moment of his conception. In Psalm 51:5 (NIV) he affirms, "Surely I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me." In reflecting on the sin in his heart, David recognizes that the sin of his heart is not something recent but goes back to the point of his conception in the womb of his mother. Such a moral state could be ascribed only to a person. It is also important to note that the psalmist links his birth with his conception.

John the Baptist Reacted Personally While Inside Elizabeth's Womb

John, the Baptist is said to have reacted personally when he was yet in the womb of Elizabeth (in the sixth month of her pregnancy). According to Luke 1:44, Elizabeth told Mary, "For indeed, as soon as the voice of your greeting sounded in my ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy." When Mary entered the room to see her cousin Elizabeth, her cousin exclaimed that her unborn child leaped for joy in her womb.

Exodus 21:22-25: Accidental Miscarriage or Premature Birth?

Proponents of a pro-choice as well as a pro-life perspective have used this verse to support their interpretations of the Bible's contribution to this issue. Since it is a difficult passage and it finds a place in the argumentation of both sides of the issue, it deserves careful attention. The NIV and the NASB translations provide a good comparison of the two primary interpretations of these verses.

NIV: "(22) If men who are fighting hit a pregnant woman and she gives birth prematurely (יָסֵא' הָזֶדַע, yase'u yeladeha), but there is no serious injury) (אָסָון, 'ason), the offender must be fined whatever the woman's husband demands and the court allows. (23) But if there is serious injury (אָסָון, 'ason), you are to take life for life, (24) eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, (25) burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise."

NASB: "(22) And if men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child so that she has a miscarriage (יָסֵא' הָזֶדַע, yase'u yeladeha), yet there is no further injury (אָסָון, 'ason), he shall surely be fined as the woman's husband may demand of him; and he shall pay as the judges decide. (23) But if there is any further injury (אָסָון, 'ason), then you shall appoint as a penalty life for life, (24) eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, (25) burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise."

Interpretive Options

Pro--abortion/pro-choice interpreters customarily contend that these verses present the occurrence of an accidental miscarriage, while anti-abortion/pro-life interpreters suggest that the passage depicts a safe, premature birth.

Accidental Miscarriage (Normal Pro-Abortion Interpretation). According to this interpretation, verse 22 depicts an accidental miscarriage for which only
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a fine is levied. Verse 23 refers to a mortal injury inflicted on the mother and the fetus for which an "eye for an eye" punishment is required (see NASB translation). Since the punishment for accidentally killing an unborn child is less severe than the punishment for killing an adult, some proponents of this interpretation conclude that the unborn baby must be considered less than human (that is, of less value than an actual person). According to this view, the "harm" does not happen or happens to the mother, not the premature child.

Safe, Premature Birth (Normal Anti-Abortion Interpretation). In this view, verse 22 presents a safe premature birth for which a fine is levied. The next verse describes some kind of harm brought upon the mother and/or child for which the judges require an "eye for an eye" punishment (see NIV translation). According to this perspective, when harm of any kind comes to the mother or child, the


payment of a fine is not a severe enough penalty. A penalty appropriate to the "harm" is required. Notice that the "harm" does not happen or happens to the premature child and/or the mother.

**Primary Issues Involved in Interpreting This Text**

Since this passage is used as support for both sides of the debate, an overview of some key issues related to this text is in order: the term "child," the verb "to go out," the term "mischief/harm," the lex talionis principle, and the medical feasibility of an infant in biblical times surviving a premature birth caused by trauma.

**The term "child"** (דִּ֨לְיָדְיִ נְדָלְיָדְיִ, yeled), Customary lexical sources point out that דִּ֨לְיָדְיִ (yeled) refers to living people. It often occurs in a manner similar to בן (ben, "son"), though with less emphasis on relationship to parents. It occurs with regard to family relationships, political administration, prophetic ministry, and eschatology.

Hamilton demonstrates that the nuances of this noun range from newborns (Exod 1:17, 18; 3:6-9), to children who have been weaned (Gen 21:8), to teenagers (Gen 21:14-16), to youths (2 Kgs 2:24), to young men old enough to serve in foreign courts (Dan 1:4, 10, 15, 17), and to descendants (Isa 29:23). The noun yeled never refers elsewhere to a child unrecognizable as human or incapable of existence outside the womb. In fact, two Hebrew terms might have been used if Moses had a miscarriage in mind: גֹּלֶם (golem, "embryo" or "fetus," Ps 139:16) or נֶפֶל (nepel, "stillborn child," "miscarriage," Job 3:16; Ps 58:9 [English 58:8]; Eccl 6:3).

A final issue that deserves some attention is the plural form of the noun yeled. Of the 89 occurrences of this noun, 47 instances are plural. The noun occurs with a pronominal suffix 17 times and appears exactly as it occurs in Exodus 21:22 in four other verses (Gen 33:2, 7; Exod 21:4; Ruth 1:5). Outside of Exodus 21, yeled refers to the children of woman (Leah, a slave woman, Naomi). The reason for a plural form of yeled has mystified many interpreters.

The passage depicts a single pregnant woman who seeks to break up a fight between men. In the midst of the chaos of the conflict, the men strike her, causing her to go into labor prematurely. The Hebrew text reads, "and her children go out." What is the significance of this plural form in this context? Scholars have suggested five interpretive alternatives.

In the first place, some scholars conclude that this form of the noun is a...
plural of abstraction "with the sense 'the product of her womb,' an apt term for an inadequately developed baby." Sprinkle adds that the plural of abstraction "is used proleptically in anticipation of, or foreshadowing, the fatal outcome." Secondly, the plural could allow for several children and either sex. Thirdly, some regard it as a generic plural used with a view to including both contingencies (vv. 22-23). Fourthly, it might refer to a woman's capacity for childbearing. If this is the case, the verse is not relevant to the issue of abortion. Finally, it could indicate "natural products in an unnatural condition." None of the above options has abundant examples outside of this passage that would serve to provide support. For contextual reasons, the present writer prefers the second or third alternative.

**The verb יָסָר** (yasa'). The term "depart" (יָסָר, yasa') means literally to "go out" and is ordinarily used to describe normal human births (Gen 25:26; 38:28-30; Job 3:11; 10:18; Jer 1:5; 20:18). This verb does occur for a miscarriage in Num 12:12 and possibly Deut 28:57. However, in Num 12:12 "the dead one" precedes the verb, making clear that a live birth is not in view. In fact, Num 12:12 refers to a stillborn birth rather than a miscarriage. The Deuteronomy passage does not clarify whether a live birth or miscarriage is in view. This verbal root does appear one time in the OT with the idea of a miscarriage with reference to oxen (a fem. sing. participle, Ps 144:14).

The normal Hebrew verb for miscarriage, both in animals and humans, is יָסָר ( skl, Exod 23:26; Hos 9:14; Gen 31:38; Job 2:10). The verb also refers to, God's punishment of His people by allowing an invading force to take away their children by violent means (Deut 32:25; 1 Sam 15:33; Lam 1:20) or by wild animals (Lev 26:22; Ezek 5:17).

**The term יָסָר (ason).** The term "mischief" (ason, 'ason) means "harm" in a general sense. It is interesting to note that in cognate languages (e.g., Akkadian

31 Sprinkle, "Interpretation of Exodus" 249; cf. L. Schwienhorst-Schonberger, *Dad Bundesbuch* (Ex 20,22-23,33) BZAW 188 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990) 81-83. "Sprinkle, "Interpretation of Exodus" 250. Sprinkle points out that this interpretation does not necessarily imply that a live, unaborted fetus is subhuman. It simply implies that a corpse is subhuman.


34 Kline, "Lex Talionis" 198-99.


36 House, "Miscarriage or Premature Birth" 114.

and post-biblical Hebrew) this term connotes healing or refers to a physician. Its five occurrences (Gen 42:4, 38; 44:29; Exod 21:22, 23) in the OT appear to be euphemistic references to serious or even fatal injury.\(^{38}\) In other words, it highlights circumstances in which medical attention is required.\(^{39}\)

Proponents of the premature birth position contend that since no preposition and nominal suffix ("to her") is included, the harm cannot be restricted to the mother. Unlike the ANE law codes, where the mother receives the focus of the attention and no "child" is mentioned, Exodus 21:22 refers to the pregnant woman and the "child" that prematurely leaves the womb. A natural reading of the passage would suggest that the "no harm" or "harm" applies either to the child or the mother. Also, it is difficult to understand how Moses could describe a violently induced miscarriage as "no harm."\(^{40}\)

**Lex Talionis.** This Latin phrase literally means "the law for retaliation." It sought to establish a standard of justice and to limit retaliation to the exact extent of the injury inflicted.\(^{41}\) It countered the tendency of unlimited revenge.\(^{42}\) This concept of retaliation ensured quality of treatment for the less privileged members of Israelite society.

The legal principle of *lex talionis* advocated, first, the principle of equal justice for all and, second, the penalty must be commensurate with the crime, nothing more or less.\(^{43}\) The statement of the *lex talionis* principle in Exodus 21 permits no misunderstanding as it lists eight illustrative equivalences.

Several proponents of the view that a miscarriage takes place in both instances (verses 22 and 23) argue that the lex talionis principle was not necessarily understood literally. In many instances, the demanded punishment (whether execution or damage to a certain part of the body) was often replaced by a punitive fine or "ransom."\(^{44}\) Building on that conclusion, Sprinkle contends that the fine demanded in the wake of the death of the fetus in verse 22 and the lex talionis verdict in the verse are both monetary in nature.\(^{45}\) Although a difference in degree

---


40 Proponents of the miscarriage view contend that since the ANE law codes (see below) only refer to the mother and not the fetus/infant, there is no reason to expect Moses to refer to anyone other than the mother (e.g., Fuller, "Exodus 22:22-23" 183).


44 Sprinkle, "Interpretation of Exodus" 237-43.

Medical Feasibility. A number of proponents of the miscarriage position contend that in the medically primitive time of the OT, it is unlikely that any infants survived a premature birth under severe duress caused by blunt force trauma.\(^{46}\) Although this observation has validity, it does not pose an insurmountable obstacle to the premature birth view. By giving this law, Moses is not implying that many infants born prematurely as the result of blunt force trauma will live. However, he could be establishing a law that stands distinct from the ANE law codes of his day. Not only is there severe punishment in the wake of unintentional mortal injury to a mother or a fetus, but even forcing an early delivery of an infant through violence, in the event that the infant lives, faces a demanding penalty.

What about the Input/Example of Other ANE Law Codes?\(^{47}\)

A number of Ancient Near Eastern law codes contain scenarios similar to that found in Exodus 21. An overview of the data found in those law codes and a brief evaluation of its impact on the issue at hand follows below. For the sake of brevity, the law codes are presented in chart form.

### The Code of Hammurabi (ANET, 175, laws 209-14).

- An injury causing a *gentleman's daughter* to miscarry 10 shekels
- An injury causing a *gentleman's daughter* to miscarry and die life for life
- An injury causing a *commoner's daughter* to miscarry 5 shekels
- An injury causing a *commoner's daughter* to miscarry and die 30 shekels
- An injury causing a *gentleman's slavewoman* to miscarry 2 shekels
- An injury causing a *gentleman's slavewoman* to miscarry and die 20 shekels

### The Hittite Laws (ANET, 190, laws 17-18).

- An injury causing a slave woman to miscarry (in the 10th month) 5 shekels
- An injury causing a free woman to miscarry (in the 5th month) 5 shekels
- An injury causing a free woman to miscarry (in the 10th month) 10 shekels

### The Middle Assyrian Laws (ANET, 181, 184-85, laws 21, 50-53).

- An injury causing a daughter to miscarry a punitive fine, public flogging, and royal service
- An injury causing a free wife to miscarry life for life
- An injury causing a prostitute to miscarry life for life

---


\(^{47}\) For a more complete explanation of this issue (from an accidental miscarriage view), see Fuller, "Exodus 22:22-23" 171-74.
• An injury causing a wife to miscarry a punitive fine
• A self-induced miscarriage life for life

Numerous scholars argue that since these and other significant ANE law codes address the occurrence of miscarriages and not premature births in their legislation and since the OT legal stipulations frequently are quite similar to ANE legal statements, one can assume that Moses is dealing with miscarriage and not premature birth. If Moses was introducing a new, unique law, he would have avoided any misunderstanding by utilizing precise terminology to distinguish his legislation from that of other ANE law codes.

In response, it is essential to observe that although numerous scholars contend that the Exodus passage must be interpreted in light of the various ANE law codes (where miscarriage appears to be in view), the biblical law dealing with this issue is different in some key areas. For example, Exodus 21

• Makes no distinction concerning the age of the fetus
• Makes no distinction with regard to the social status of the injured woman
• Introduces a different fate depending on whether or not "harm" took place
• Specifies that a child (yeled) "comes out" from a pregnant mother's womb.

Most of the ANE law codes refer to a case where someone causes a woman "to drop that of her womb" (ANET, 175 n. 137) in a very generic fashion.

In summary, the Mosaic Law demanded that the unborn child be protected as a person and that the same penalties be assessed when the child was injured as when an adult person was injured. In the first instance, the men guilty of hitting the woman must render monetary compensation for the trauma of premature birth and any discomfort caused the mother. In the second place, the legal principle of lex talionis is invoked for the men guilty of striking a mortal blow, leading to the death of the child and/or the mother.

**Key Observations on Exodus 21:22-25**

• Opponents of abortion should not view this passage as one of their strongest biblical arguments against abortion (in light of the interpretive complexities).
• Although these verses do not provide an absolute prohibition of abortion, they clearly do not teach that an unborn child is less than human.
• Even if verse 22 presents the accidental miscarriage of an unborn child, this

---


conclusion in no way legitimizes the intentional aborting of an unborn child.
• Even according to the accidental miscarriage view, since a fine is levied against
  the guilty parties for causing this tragedy, the death of an unborn child is
  not acceptable.
• If an accidental miscarriage results in a fine levied against the guilty party, how
  much more serious would be the intentional killing of an unborn child? It is
  totally inappropriate to use this passage to sanction abortion, an intentional
  killing of a child.
• The different penalties levied, a fine in one case and lex talionis in the other
  case, does not necessarily indicate anything about personhood and worth.
  As a rule, Moses did not impose a mandatory death penalty in cases of
  accidental killing (Exod 21:13, 20-21).
• The relatively "light" sentence in verse 22 in no way indicates that the
  fetus/infant is less important or less than a person. In the immediately
  preceding passage (21:20-21) a slave owner who kills his slave
  unintentionally escapes with no penalty at all. Does Mosaic law regard
  slaves as less than human persons? Legal status rather than personhood are
  in view in both instances.

This writer agrees with Youngblood who writes, "The complexities
involved in attempting to interpret verse 22 make it unwise to press it into service
in the abortion controversy, pro or con."50 McQuilkin affirms that "Such an
unclear and hotly disputed passage could hardly be used to establish the status of
the unborn with unassailable biblical authority."51

WHAT ABOUT THOSE QUESTIONABLE CASES
(e.g., mother's health, rape, incest)?

Between the polar positions that suggest that abortion is always or never
permissible, a number of people wrestle with the possibility that in some cases
abortion might represent a potential consideration. The most common position
among those who are generally against abortion is that abortion can serve as an
acceptable option in the case of a pregnancy causing risk to the mother's health, or
when the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.52 Narrower still, there
are people who would limit abortions to ectopic pregnancies (see above for
explanation). The following paragraphs survey those possibilities.

The Mother's Health (Therapeutic Abortion)

At the outset, it is important to note that the present writer intentionally
limits this discussion to the mother's physical well-being. Many individuals
include

50 Youngblood, Exodus 105.
51 Robertson McQuilkin, An Introduction to Biblical Ethics (Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1989)
320.
52 Most politicians who oppose abortion fall into this camp.
her psychological, social, and economic situation as part of the mother's health. 

D. Gareth Jones rejects abortion on demand but contends that "unresolvable dilemmas" in which the fetus places the mother's life in great jeopardy provide an acceptable ground for abortion. 

Most proponents of this position contend that the actual person (the mother) is of greater intrinsic value than the potential person (the fetus) she is carrying.

First of all, statistically, this "dilemma" of facing the potential loss of a mother's life is a rarity, and when it occurs, the decision is not one of choosing whose life to take and whose life to save. Instead, it is a choice between losing both patients or saving the mother. In the rare case where a pregnancy must be abbreviated to protect the life of the mother, the proper procedure would be to give the child extraordinary care with the hopes of bringing it to maturity. C. Everett Koop, former Surgeon General of the U.S. and a leading pediatric surgeon, has stated, "In my thirty-six years in pediatric surgery I have never known of one instance where the child had to be aborted to save the mother's life."

Pregnancies Caused by Rape/Incest

No doubt victims of these horrible crimes experience humiliation, fear, and anger. The unborn child is a tangible reminder of the abusive act that traumatized the woman. According to those who would allow abortions in the wake of this abuse, it is "unfair" that a woman who has endured rape or incest should have to carry the evidence of her tragedy through nine months of pregnancy and subsequent childbirth. Another complicating factor is that victims of incest are normally fairly young and are later along in their pregnancy before it is diagnosed. Because of their relative youth, their pregnancies may be more difficult and the childbirth more strenuous. Nevertheless, while it is "unfair" that the victim of rape/incest goes through the demands of pregnancy and childbirth, would it not be a greater injustice to kill the unborn child?

Pregnancies Facing Fetal Handicaps

Some examples of fetal handicaps that serve as justifiable circumstances

---

53 The 1973 Supreme Court case of Doe v. Bolton included a woman's emotional and psychological health with her physical health as elements to be considered as part of the woman's health (as it relates to justification for having an abortion).

54 D. Gareth Jones, Brave New People: Ethical Issues at the Commencement of Life (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985) 76-77.


56 C. Everett Koop, "Abortion: Deception-on-Demand," Moody Monthly 80:9 (May 1980):24. Koop is apparently referring to instances of aborting a fetus that has attached itself to the mother's womb. From the perspective of the current writer, an ectopic pregnancy provides the only clear and legitimate occasion for a therapeutic abortion. If a physician does not remove the fetus from the mother's fallopian tube, as a result both mother and infant will without question die.
for abortion are anencephaly (part or all of the brain is missing), Tay-Sachs (severe enzyme deficiency causing blindness and paralysis), spina bifida, and Down's Syndrome. For example, D. Gareth Jones regards anencephaly as legitimate ground for abortion but rejects Down's syndrome as a viable occasion for abortion. He comes to this conclusion because anencephaly, where the major brain centers are lacking, signifies that "there is no prospect of anything remotely resembling human life." He contends that Down's syndrome does not rob the fetus of the potential of having many personhood qualities. The debate revolving around this "hard case" focuses on the following alternatives: Quality of life vs. Sanctity/Value of life.

**Quality of life.** Fundamental to this emphasis is the idea that human life is not possessed of any inherent worth, and thus the individual human being must achieve a serious right to life. Though some scholars suggest objective criteria to guide one's decisions when facing situations of this kind, for the most part the decision-making process has little objectivity. The projected "quality" of life for the fetus is the basis for the decision to abort or not.

Because of the untold suffering that might be experienced by the fetus as well as the agony, pressure, and financial strain that would come upon the parents, pro-abortionists will recommend abortion in certain instances.

**Sanctity/Value of life.** Those who give emphasis to life's sanctity regard human life as distinct from all other life, possessing an inherent dignity which renders it worthy of protection and preservation simply because it is human life. According to Genesis 1:26-27, man is created in the image of God (Gen 1:26-27). At the very least that indicates two things. In the first place, God's image in man renders man distinct from all other created beings on this earth. Secondly, God's image in man renders man worthy of protection; to shed innocent blood is reprehensible because "in the image of God He made man" (Gen 9:6). This majesty or dignity is not acquired or achieved, nor is it affected by the individual's personal worth to society, but God endows it. It is part and parcel of our humanness. Throughout Scripture, God invites man to enter into a personal relationship with Himself through His Son Jesus Christ. Since life has sanctity and value given by God Himself, we cannot judge its quality by our mortal standards.

Although life's realities are complex at times, from the perspective of this writer, very few situations provide an occasion to consider abortion as a legitimate option. An ectopic/tubal pregnancy provides the only clear justification for abortion in the life of a believer. The instances of pregnancy caused by rape or incest or the potential of a fetus afflicted with a serious handicap place undue attention on the

---

58 Ibid., 181. Whether or not Tay-Sachs disease would warrant an abortion depends on the potential impact of the child on the rest of the family unit (ibid., 181-82).
potential quality of life for the fetus or place an improper focus on the abuse experienced by the unwilling mother. The human "injustice" of those scenarios must be subordinated to God's definition of justice.

CONCLUSION

Since the Supreme Court case of Roe v. Wade in 1973, almost 40 million pregnancies have ended in abortion. Pro-abortion proponents enthusiastically lobby for the continued legality of abortion-on-demand. Those opposed to abortion fall into three general camps: abortion is acceptable sometimes (risk to life of the mother, in the wake of rape or incest), rarely (ectopic pregnancies), or never.

The Bible affirms the personhood of the fetus in a number of ways. Exodus 21:22-25 (which receives the bulk of this article's attention) should not be used as a compelling "proof-text" for either the pro- or anti-abortion camps. One can draw certain important conclusions from this important passage. An unborn child is not less than human. Even if Exodus 21:22 depicts an accidental miscarriage (for which only a fine is levied), this conclusion in no way legitimizes the intentional aborting of an unborn child.

ADDENDUM

After "The Abortion Dilemma" had gone through the editorial process for this issue of The Master's Seminary Journal, the FDA announced their approval of the early abortion pill known as RU-486. Instead of implementing the potential restrictions mentioned above in this article (176), the FDA has granted almost unlimited approval. Any physician will be able to prescribe the drug if he/she has a backup who can provide surgical intervention in cases of complications. Consequently, this drug will find its way into family-practice clinics as well as into abortion clinics.

This material is cited with gracious permission from:
The Master's Seminary
13248 Roscoe Blvd.
Sun Valley, California 91352-3798
Web site: www.tms.edu

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: thildebrandt@gordon.edu
A LITERARY STRUCTURAL OVERVIEW OF EXOD 25-40

RALPH E. HENDRIX
Andrews University

1. Introduction

The first two studies on Exod 25-40 dealt primarily with the etymology and use of *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed* within the passage, and so provided an overarching, "terminological" structure. This final article provides a structural overview which takes its cue from the literary, topical, and grammatical dimensions within the passage.

The structure of the Masoretic text of Exod 25-40 shows several dimensions. To correctly describe the complex, multi-dimensional structure of the passage, clear terminology is essential. In this study, the term "axis" is used to describe that dimensional plane along which the text divides itself. This structural axis (or form of the text as determined by internal parameters) may be seen in terms of structural size (sub-structural components within larger structures). "Literary structure" is determined by the order of these
components within the text. One stratum or level within a structure of the text is called an "element."

Literary structures may be delimited both by "numbers" of elements (in this case, six- or nine-element groups) or by "type" of elements (physical items, verbal ideas, etc.). A large, overarching literary form ("maxi-structure") may encompass smaller substructures ("midi-" and "mini-structures"). A "terminological" structure takes its form from the use-pattern of a certain term or phrase (as in the case of *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed*). A "topical" structure receives its form from the recurrence of a common theme or topic or subject. A "grammatical" structure reflects patterning at the level of grammar. In short, literary axes concern the overall form of the text and may include variations such as lists, parallels, inverse parallels (chiasms) gathered in such a way as to augment the surface meaning of the text.

In practice, structure is not as difficult to recognize as it may be to describe. For example, the structure of Exod 32:1-33:6 is a six-element inverted-parallel structure, thematically focusing on its central structural element. As shown below, Exod 40:1-8 is a simple list of nine elements which is parallel to Exod 40:17-33 (which has the same nine elements in the same order).

The previous analysis of the use of *miskan* and *ohel mo'ed* in Exod 25-40 provided a concrete example of a "terminological" structure. Table 1 of that study displays the existence of four terminological units which occur within the basic literary structure of the passage. This terminological axis, missed by many scholars, has resulted in insensitivity to the discrete and separate connotations of *miskan* and *'ohel moed*. *Miskan* is used in contexts describing the physical construction, primarily associated with commands to manufacture and assemble the Dwelling Place of YHWH, but secondarily in its generic sense simply as "dwelling place." The phrase *'ohel mo'ed* appears where the concern is the cultic function of the habitation. The house of YHWH must,
therefore, be understood as a transient dwelling place, corresponding to the dwelling places of nomadic peoples (and so the choice of *miskan*), yet its continual function of fostering the cultic relationship (best expressed by the choice of *'ohel mo'ed*) must also be acknowledged. All of this is evident from the terminological structure of Exod 25-40.

The structural analysis which follows is not exhaustive. It is meant to point a direction and to encourage further sensitivity to literary structure as an aid to understanding the biblical text.

2. Overview of the Literary Structure

*A Structural Summary.* The terminological maxi-structure formed by the succession of occurrences of *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed* forms an important literary dimension in Exod 25-40. This was presented in the second study, mentioned above. As I shall present below, this large, overarching, four-part maxi-structure encompasses two sub-structures (Exod 25:1-31:18 and Exod 35:1-36:7). Further, each of these two main sub-structures is also sub-divided. Exod 25:1-31:18 includes six midi-structures: the second (Exod 27:20-21) and fifth (Exod 30:1-10) of which are transitional passages, and the first (Exod 25:1-27:19), third (Exod 28:1-43), fourth (Exod 29:1-46), and sixth (Exod 30:11-31:18) of which are divided into four sub-structures of six major elements each. Taken together, the passage consists of alternately-sized structures: LARGE-small-LARGE-LARGE-small-LARGE (Table 1). Next come four supportive, interlocutory narratives (the Golden-Calf episode, Exod 32:1-33:6; the episode of Moses' Tent, Exod 33:7-11; the Theophany, Exod 33:12-23; and the Giving of the Second Tables, Exod 34:1-35) as presented in Table 2. Exod 35:1-40:38 has four smaller midi-structures, which alternate with four nine-element midi-structures: small-LARGE-small-LARGE-LARGE-small-LARGE-small (Exod 35:1-36:7, 36:8-38:20, 38:21-31, 39:1-43, 40:1-8, 40:9-16, 40:17-33, and 40:34-38) as shown in Table 3. Taken together, these three tables present the overarching literary structure of Exod 25-40. These midi-structures are, themselves, composed of even smaller sub-structures: topical, grammatical, and terminological.
3. Instructions for Making the Miskan: Exod 25:1-31:18

The first midrash includes instructions to make the holy precinct for YHWH. The literary structure is composed of six sections which will be considered individually.

Exod 25:1-27:19. This section includes three introductory statements: YHWH speaks to Moses (25:1) saying, bring offerings (25:2-7), and make a *miskan* (25:8-9). These are followed by six topical elements: Ark (25:10-22), Table (25:23-30), Lampstand (25:31-40), the Dwelling Place (26:1-37), Altar of Burnt Offering (27:1-8), and the Courtyard (27:19). The concern of this passage is the design of the dwelling place: its size, pattern, and materials. The name for the physical structure described here is exclusively *miskan*. The phrase *'ohel mo'ed* does not occur in this section. Here first appears a connection between the idea of "construction" and the term *miskan*.

Exod 27:20-21. This next section deals with how the Dwelling Place is to be used. These verses mark the transition from a "construction" context to a "function" context: Exod 27:19 instructs that the tent pegs for the courtyard be made of bronze, but Exod 27:20-21 gives instructions on how the sons of Israel are to bring olive oil for the lamp so it can burn continually before YHWH. These are clearly two different types of activities. At precisely this transition in context, comes a transition from *miskan* to *'ohel mo'ed*. Both topically (construction versus function) and terminologically (*miskan* versus *'ohel mo'ed*), Exod 27:20 begins a new literary substructure, characterized by three elements: Command (to bring oil, Exod 27:20), Explanation (of its cultic function, Exod 27:21a), and Duration (lasting ordinance, Exod 27:21b).

Exod 28:1-43. In this passage come the commands to gather the priests (28:1) and to make garments (28:2-5). A consideration of six more topical elements follows: Ephod (28:6-14), Breastpiece (28:15-30), Robe (28:31-35), Turban (28:36-38), Tunic and small garments (28:39-41), and Undergarments (28:42-43). Each topical element further includes the Command to make it, and an Explanation of its function within the cult. The literary structure of this section is similar to that of Exod 25:1-27:19, considered above: Said-Bring-Make-Six Elements / / Bring-Make-Six Elements.

Exod 28:1-43 emphasizes the function of each item. The Ephod was to act as a memorial (28:12). The Breastpiece, with its Urim and Thummim, was to be Aaron's means of making decisions
(28:29-30). The Robe, with its bells, was to preserve Aaron's life (28:35). The Turban and plate enabled Aaron to bear the guilt of the sacred gifts (28:38). The Tunic and small garments were to bring the priests "dignity and honor" (28:40). The Undergarments were to be worn by the priesthood as they ministered so that they would not "incur guilt and die" (28:43). The subject matter clearly concerns the cultic function of the topical elements, rather than simply manufacturing instructions. In this cult-functional context, the dwelling place is called only 'ohel mo'ed, thereby linking the cult-function with the phrase 'ohel mo'ed.

What is particularly interesting, from the perspective of analyzing the literary structure of Exod 25-40, is that a comparison of Exod 25:1-27:19 and Exod 28:1-43 reveals the interrelation of two different structural dimensions: terminological and topical. The terminological structure (miskan in the first section and 'ohel mo'ed in the second) meshes with the topical structure found in both (Bring-Make-Six Elements). Since the first, six-element section is strictly a miskan section, and the latter is exclusively an 'ohel mo'ed passage, the intentional use of two different denominatives within a single literary structure is apparent.

Exod 29:1-46. Still within the 'ohel mo'ed terminological structure (the phrase occurs seven times), this section considers the consecration of cultic objects. Two preliminary instructions, consecrating (make holy) the priests (29:1a) and bringing the priests and sacrifices (29:1b-4), are followed by six elements: Dressing the priests (29:5-9), the Bull (sin) Offering (29:10-14), the Ram (burnt) Offering (29:15-18), the Ordination Ram (Wave) Offering (29:19-24), the Ordination Ceremony (29:25-37), and the "Daily" Offering (29:38-41). All of this action is to take place either in the 'ohel mo'ed or at the entrance to the 'ohel mo'ed (further cementing the association of cult-function and 'ohel mo'ed). Once again, six elements are introduced with commands to "make" and "bring" (although in inverted order from that in the preceding sections). Exod 29:42-46 acts as an Epilogue.

Exod 30:1-10. This section is another short transitional passage, similar to Exod 27:20-21. Two commands (to "make," Exod 30:1-5, and to "place," Exod 30:6, the incense altar), are followed by an explanation of the altar's use (Exod 30:7-10b) and a statement regarding its duration (generations to come, Exod 30:10c). Hence, we find the same basic elements in both this transitional section (Exod 30:1-10) and the previous one (Exod 27:20-21), namely:
Command(s), Explanation, and Duration. This similarity occurs in the linguistic dimension as well, with both sections including the root: *drt* in reference to perpetuity. This second transitional section serves, as did the first, to link two larger sections. Thus, the two transitional sections are similar in three ways: topically, linguistically, and functionally.

*Exod 30:11-31:18.* This section includes the now familiar six-elements: Atonement Money (30:11-16), [Wash] Basin (30:17-21), Anointing Oil (30:22-33), Incense (30:34-38), Craftsmen (31:1-11), and the Sabbath(s) (31:12-17). Following, comes an Epilogue (31:18). Each of the six elements begins with a similar phrase: "YHWH spoke (*dbr*) to Moses saying (*’mr*)" (Elements 1, 2, 3, 5), "YHWH said (*’mr*) to Moses" (Element 4) or "YHWH said (*’mr*) to Moses saying (*’mr*)" (Element 6). The repeated use of the roots *dbr* and/or (*’mr*) provides internal grammatical structure.

*Summary of Exod 25:1-31:18.* The literary structure of this passage is based on four sections, each composed of six elements. The first two and last two are divided by smaller, transitional sections, providing a LARGE-small-LARGE-LARGE-small-LARGE pattern. The transitional sections are characterized by Command(s)-Explanation-Duration elements. The first two large sections have introductory Bring-Make elements, while the third has a Make-Bring sequence. The last two large sections have Epilogues. The first section uses the term *miskan*, while the latter five sections use *’ohel mo’ed*. Noteworthy is that these structures co-exist along different dimensional axes.

4. Interlocutory Narratives

Four narratives appear next in the literary structure of Exod 25-40. The Golden Calf episode (Exod 32:1-33:6), the episode of Moses' Tent (Exod 33:7-11), the Theophany (Exod 33:12-23), and the Giving of the Second Pair of Tables (Exod 34:1-35) divide the previous midi-structure (characterized by six-element topical structures) from the closing midi-structure which will be seen to have nine-element structures.

Rather than being interruptions in the flow of the *miskan/’ohel mo’ed* (Dwelling Place/Tent of Meeting) construction account, these four narratives serve to focus the reader's attention on YHWH's uninterrupted desire to dwell among the people. The first and last narratives exemplify the basis of YHWH's relationship with the people: law/grace. The middle two narratives manifest the purpose
of the *miskan/*'ohel mo'ed to allow YHWH to live amid the people (by Moses' representation in his tent and then by direct theophany).

The Golden Calf Episode: Exod 32:1-33:6. This narrative has been treated previously, and will not be presented in detail here. The passage is structurally divided as follows: A (32:1-6) people act/ Aaron reacts, B (32:7-10) YHWH's two utterances, C (32:11-14) Moses intercedes, D (32:15-20) Moses goes down the mountain, E (32:21-25) Moses investigates judgment F (32:26a) opportunity for repentance, E† (32:26b-29) Moses executes judgment D† (32:30) Moses goes up the mountain, C† (32:31-32) Moses intercedes, B† (32:33-33:3) YHWH's two utterances (inverted from previous order), A† (33:4-6) YHWH acts/people react. The central structural element F, is a call for repentance and illustrates that the narrative is about a more fundamental human issue than anger, idolatry, or law: it is about the opportunity for repentance.

The Episode of Moses' Tent: Exod 33:7-11. There is considerable disagreement over the relation of the *'ohel mo'ed mentioned here with the *'ohel mo'ed mentioned elsewhere in Exodus. Theological and historical issues arising from the passage should be considered in another forum. Whatever the interpretation of the passage, its structure is linear. It is divided on the basis of its action: Moses took an *'ohel (33:7a), pitched it outside of camp (33:7b), called it the *'ohel mo'ed (33:7c). All the people who were inquiring of YHWH went to the *'ohel mo'ed (33:7d). When Moses went to the *'ohel, the

8See note 6.
9Brevard S. Childs sees that "the canonical function of Ex. 32-34 is to place the institution of Israel's worship within the theological framework of sin and forgiveness" (Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture [Philadelphia: Fortress Press], 175).
people arose (33:8a); each person stood at his own 'ohel (33:8b); they watched Moses enter the 'ohel (33:8c). When Moses went to the 'ohel, the Cloud Pillar came (33:9a); it stayed at the entrance of the 'ohel (33:9b); it spoke with Moses (33:9c). All the people saw the Cloud stand at the entrance of the 'ohel (33:10a); all stood (33:10b); all worshipped at the entrance of their own 'ohel (33:10c). YHWH spoke with Moses face-to-face (33:11a). He (Moses) returned to camp (33:11b); Joshua did not leave the 'ohel (33:11c). This forms a certain pattern in terms of who performs the action: Moses-Moses-Moses-People-People-People-Moses-Cloud-Cloud-Cloud-People-People-People-YHWH-Resolution (Moses, Joshua). The parallel of Moses/ /Cloud Pillar, of People/ /People, and of Moses/ /YHWH is evident.

The content is undoubtedly one of cult-function and it is not surprising that 'ohel or 'ohel mo'ed occurring eleven times in the five verses. Moses acts in the priestly role as representative of the people. YHWH is present in the "Pillar of Cloud" which "stayed" or "stood" at the entrance to the tent (precisely where the cultic ministry took place; cf. esp. Exod 29:1-46 and Lev 8). This context of close intimacy between YHWH and the people is paralleled in the next interlocutory narrative.

The Theophany: Exod 33:12-23. Here Moses glimpses the "faces" of YHWH. This straightforward dialogue parallels the previous section (and perhaps compliments Exod 34:5-9), indicating that the central two interlocutory narratives emphasize YHWH's insistent longing to dwell amid the people; His desired immanence. Based on the verb wayy'omer (and he "said"), the structure of the narrative is: A (33:12-13) Moses said, B (32:14) [YHWH] said, A₁ (33:15-16) [Moses] said, B₁ (33:17) YHWH said, A₂(33:18) [Moses] said, B² (33:19) [YHWH] said, B³ (33:20) [YHWH] said, and B⁴ (33:21) YHWH said.

The Giving of the Second Pair of Tables: Exod 34:1-35. This last interlocutory narrative concerns the events surrounding the giving of a second set of tablets including A (34:1-3) YHWH's command to Moses, B (34:4) Moses' response: made tablets, A₁ (34:5-7) the theophany, B₁ (34:8-9) Moses' response: worshipped, A₂ (34:10-26) the specifics of YHWH's Covenant, B² (34:27) YHWH's command to Moses to write the covenant, and an Epilogue (34:28). The passage provides historically and theologically important information which precedes the resumption of the process of establishing the miskan/ 'ohel mo'ed.
In the overall literary structural framework of Exod 25-40, these interlocutory narratives form the center, between a pattern of six-element structures and a pattern of nine-element structures. These four interlocutory narratives also thematically form a structure: A-B-B₁-A₁. The "A" elements both deal with a tablets/covenant context; while the "B" elements both deal with the immanence of YHWH. Therefore, the central focus of the literary structure of Exod 25-40 appears to be the co-elements: Exod 33:7-11 and 33:12-23, both of which emphasize the immanence of YHWH among the people.

5. Making and Assembling the Components: Exod 35:1-40:38:

The final chapters of the segment analyzed provide the second maxi-structure of Exod 25-40. It is composed of a linkage of midi-structures in a manner similar to that found in the first maxi-structure (Exod 25-31). Notably different is the number of topical elements which make up each sub-structure. Here, the number of elements is nine, rather than six as found in the first. There are four nine-element sections which alternate with smaller structures in a small-LARGE-small-LARGE-LARGE-small-LARGE-small pattern.

Exod 35:1-36:7. These verses form an introduction to the task of actually making the components of the Dwelling Place/Tent of Meeting which were already described in Exod 25-31. Exod 35:4-9 very closely parallels Exod 24:2-7, both enumerate the specific offerings of raw material in some detail. The Sabbath reminder of Exod 35:1-3 is generally equivalent to Exod 31:12-17, though the Exod 35 section has a more specific focus. Exod 35:30-36:1 parallels Exod 31:1-11 regarding the craftsmen Bezalel and Oholiab.

Overall structure is given by the term *siwwah*, "commanded." This appears as "YHWH commanded" at the beginning of Element A (Exod 35:1-4a) and Element B (Exod 35:4b-19) and at the end of Element B₁ (Exod 35:20-29) and Element A₁ (Exod 35:30-36:1). The verb, placed at the beginning two elements and the end of the other two, provides the passage's inverted parallel literary structure (chiasm). Verses 2-7 provide an epilogic response to call for materials.

Miskan appears three times in this passage (35:11, 15, 18) and 'ohel mo'ed appears once (35:21). Although both words appear, *miskan* occurs much more often than *'ohel mo'ed*, and so begins the
third terminological literary structure, a "miskan-dominant" section.\textsuperscript{11} Here for the first time both terms occur in the same literary unit, which marks the transition between the second terminological literary structure (‘ohel mo’ed-only) and the third terminological literary structure (miskan-dominant).

The first element, A (Exod 35:1-4a), deals with the Sabbath and specifically with a prohibition against lighting fires. This prohibition is remarkable in the context of the construction of YHWH's dwelling, especially since fire is essential for smelting ore and working with gold, silver, and bronze. Later, in the epilogue of this passage, the Israelites respond with more offerings than needed. Perhaps such a prohibition was necessary as a restraint against those, who in their overzealousness, were tempted to work seven days a week. According to the literary structure of this passage, this prohibition is parallel to the element detailing the provision of workmen (A\textsuperscript{1}): Bezalel, Oholiab, and their helpers, as if to indicate that there is no need to break the Sabbath, as YHWH has provided enough workers.

The appeal for raw material offerings in vv. 4b-19 (Element B) has its parallel in the bringing of those offerings by the people in vv. 20-29 (Element B\textsuperscript{1}). Exod 36:2-7 provides an epilogue regarding the abundance of offerings which resulted from the plea. The literary structure of Exod 35:1-36:7, therefore, exhibits four elements in an inverted parallel pattern provided by siwwah: A-B-A\textsuperscript{1}-B\textsuperscript{1}, followed by the Epilogue.

Exod 36:8-38:20. The narrative moves directly to the account of making the components of the Dwelling Place/Tent of Meeting. Again, this section parallels the previous "command" section (Exod 25:8-27:19). Terminologically, this passage continues the miskan-dominant structure of the preceding section.

The call to construct the miskan in Exod 25:8, with its resulting treatment of six elements (Ark, Table, Lampstand, Miskan, Altar of Burnt Offering, and Courtyard), is augmented here with three additional elements: Altar of Incense (seen in the transitional passage, Exod 30:1-10, esp. vv. 1-5); the Anointing Oil and Incense (from Exod 27:20-21; 30:34-38); and the [Wash] Basin (found also in Exod 30:17-21). The passage contains a list of nine elements, the first of four such nine-element lists which characterize the literary structure of the latter portion of Exod 25-40.

\textsuperscript{11}See Hendrix, "Use," p. 8.
The order of the elements is the same in both the "command" and "execution" passages, except for the rearrangement of the miskan-element, from the fourth place into the first place, and the addition of three new elements. The overall terminology of the passages is also very similar, almost as if in the course of the narrative, the author were purposely drawing attention to the minute and detailed fulfillment of YHWH's design orders.

Exod 38:21-31. Now follows the second, short passage within the Exod 35:1-40:33 midi-structure. It is an account of the gold, silver, and bronze used in the manufacturing process. The passage continues the miskan-dominant terminological structure of the preceding sections. Its topical structure consists of an introduction (38:21), a discussion of the workers (38:22-23), and a tally of the amount of raw materials used in the manufacturing process (38:24-31).

Exod 39:1-43. Here is the second, nine-element passage. Terminologically, it continues the miskan-dominant section while the verb siwwah ("commanded") provides the literary structure. Each of nine elements ends with YHWH commanded, providing little room for error in recognizing its inherent structure. This second passage in the "execution" section parallels Exod 28:1-43, the second passage in the "command" section. It incorporates five of the six elements of the preceding passage and inverts the preceding order of elements four and five.

In contrast to Exod 36:8-38:20, the total number of nine elements in this passage is made up of emphasized events as well as physical objects. The nine elements are: an Introduction (39:1), Ephod made (39:2-5), Stones assembled (39:6-7), Breastpiece made (39:8-21), Robes made (39:22-26), Tunic made (39:27-29), Plate made (39:30-31), the Miskan presented (39:32-42), and the Miskan inspected (39:43). As this is a combination of physical objects and literary statements, it is the use of the verb siwwah which insures recognition of each structural element. The inclusion of nine elements within the literary structure appears to be intentional, bringing this section into balance with the other sections in the literary structure.

Exod 40:1-8. This forms the third, nine-element passage which follows the general order of Exod 25:1-19 and 36:8-38:20. These nine elements include an Introduction (40:1), the Miskan (40:2), Ark (40:3), Table (40:4a), Lampstand (40:4b), Incense Altar (40:5), Altar of Burnt Offering (40:6), [Wash] Basin (40:7), and the Courtyard (40:8). The miskan element in Exod 40:2 is rearranged from the
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order of Exod 25:1-19, just as it was in Exod 36:8-38:20. The *anointing oil/incense* element of Exod 36:8-38:20 is not present here; an element of introduction is added. Still, the major elements of the Dwelling Place/Tent of Meeting are included and generally retain their order of appearance as in parallel passages. Terminologically, *miskan* and 'ohel mo'ed appear both alone and grammatically linked. Thus, a new terminological sub-structure is introduced, the "mixed miskan-'ohel mo'ed" section.

*Exod 40:9-16.* This short passage continues the section that mixes the terms *miskan-'ohel mo'ed*. Its five-element linear structure concerns the Anointing of the *Miskan* (40:9), the Altar of Burnt Offering (40:10), the [Wash] Basin (40:11), the Priests (40:12-15), and an Epilogue (40:16).

Exod 40:17-33. This passage rounds out the group of four substructures, each with nine elements. It is a virtual rehearsal of the elements included in the commands to assemble the Dwelling Place/Tent of Meeting given in Exod 40:1-8. The elements include an Introduction (40:17), the *Miskan* (40:18-19), Ark (40:20-21), Table (40:22-23), Lampstand (40:24-25), Golden Altar (40:26-28), Altar of Burnt Offering (40:29), [Wash] Basin (40:30-32), and the Courtyard (40:33). Terminologically, this passage continues the mixed *miskan-'ohel mo'ed* structure found in the immediately preceding passages.

*Exod 40:34-38.* One final passage remains for consideration. This provides an epilogue to the accounts of Exod 25:1-40:33. A straightforward, linear structure (A-B-A¹-B¹-A²-B²) is apparent. Exod 40: 34a, 35a, and 36-37 (the "A" elements) concern the Cloud; Exod 40:34b, 35b, and 38 (the "B" elements) concern the immanence of YHWH (Glory, cloud-by-day, fire-by-night). The passage closes out the mixed *miskan-'ohel mo'ed* terminological structure of the preceding three sections, and completes the description of the construction of YHWH's Dwelling Place among the people.

6. Summary

Exod 25-40 has at least three maxi-structural axes: literary, topical, and terminological. It has at least one subsidiary, mini-structural axis: grammatical. Its structural integrity, particularly that integrity demanded by the presence of overarching maxi-structures, has given strong argument for approaching the biblical text in its canonical form.

As considered in a previous study, in Exod 25-40 the terms *miskan* and 'ohel mo'ed provide a four-section terminological
structure. In these sections the term(s) used to name the physical construction were variously miskan, 'ohel mo'ed, miskan-dominant, and mixed miskan-'ohel mo'ed. Within this terminological structure, coexisted topical structures (generally presented in lists of six or nine elements) and literary sub-structures such as parallelism, inverted parallelism, and linear lists. In their co-existence, none of the literary structures negated the others, but rather complemented them along axes within differing literary dimensions.

Exod 25:1-31:18 exhibits six literary midi-structures: four with topical structures of six elements each, and two small literary midi-structures each with three parallel elements. These basic elements show a pattern: 6-3-6-6-3-6. This topical structure provides continuity over the transition between two of the miskan/ 'ohel mo'ed terminological structures. The term variation within the literary maxi-structure minimizes the likelihood of an intentional source seam between literary structures. The overarching literary structure argues strongly in favor of a unified literary product. The six midi-structures concern the design of the physical Dwelling Place/cultic Tent of Meeting.

Exod 32:1-34:35 incorporates four interlocutory narratives: the Golden Calf Episode (Exod 32:1-33:6), the episode of Moses' Tent (Exod 33:7-11), the Theophany (Exod 33:12-23), and the Giving of the Second Set of Tablets (Exod 34:1-35). These range in structure from complex, inverted parallelism (Golden Calf) to simple, linear narrative (the others).

Exod 35 begins the second, major maxi-structure of the Exod 25-40 complex. In Exod 35:1-40:38, there are eight midi-structures: four of which are very short, transitional, structures, and four of which exhibit a nine-element topical form. In terms of numbers of elements, these eight midi-structures follow a 5-9-3-9-9-5-9-3 pattern. The first four structures are miskan-dominant; the latter four are mixed miskan-'ohel mo'ed. The first four structures consider the making of the Dwelling Place/Tent of Meeting; the latter four concern its assembly. Exod 33:7-11/Exod 33:12-21 provide the thematic focus for Exod 25-40, namely, the immanence/indwelling of YHWH among the people of Israel.
"Command Narratives"

TABLE 1: LITERARY STRUCTURE OF EXODUS 25-31
"Interlocutory Narratives"

TABLE 2: LITERARY STRUCTURE OF EXODUS 32-34
"Execution Narratives"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>miskan Mixed-dominant terms</td>
<td>miskan Mixed-dominant terms</td>
<td>miskan Mixed-dominant terms</td>
<td>dominant terms</td>
<td>terms</td>
<td>terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3: LITERARY STRUCTURE OF EXODUS 35-40.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Sabbath</td>
<td>miskan 1 Intro.</td>
<td>Intro. 1 Intro.</td>
<td>Intro. 1 Intro.</td>
<td>1 Intro. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Offering</td>
<td>Ark 2</td>
<td>Workers 2</td>
<td>Ephod 2 miskan 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Offering</td>
<td>miskan 2 Function</td>
<td>Table 3 Amounts</td>
<td>Stones 3 Ark 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>Ark 3 Duration</td>
<td>Lamp 4 Breast 4 Table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>Work 4 Lamp</td>
<td>Incense 5 Robe 5 Lamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Epilogue 5 Incense</td>
<td>Lamp 6 Oil 6 Incense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burnt 7 Plate 7 Burnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basin 8 Present 8 Basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basin 8 Basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Court 9 Inspect 9 Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A LITERARY STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE GOLDEN-CALF EPISODE IN EXODUS 32:1-33:6
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Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104

The following is a literary structural analysis of the Golden-Calf episode as found in the MT of Exod 32:1-33:6. This analysis does not purport to deal exhaustively with the manifold exegetical, homiletical, textual, and theological issues encountered therein. Rather, its goal is to reveal the structural framework of the passage within which these issues arise.


There is quite a variety of source-critical views on the Golden-Calf episode, with no scholarly consensus in sight.¹ Brevard Childs, on the other hand, warns against focusing too closely on such topical "polarities"--a procedure which has "often led literary critics to fragment this chapter into multiple layers and sources which lack all cohesion."²

OT scholars recognize the multiplicity of themes within the episode. The central theme has been identified variously as disobedience, rebellion and atonement, or as the overarching theme of the danger of the departure of YHWH’s presence from among his


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LITERARY STRUCTURE OF EXODUS 32:1-33:6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 32:1-6</td>
<td>People act, and Aaron (YHWH's High Priest) reacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 32:7-10</td>
<td>YHWH's two utterances: <em>wayedabber, wayyomer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 32:11-14</td>
<td>Moses intercedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 32:15-20</td>
<td>Moses goes down the mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 32:21-25</td>
<td>Judgment: investigative phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. 32:26a</td>
<td>Opportunity for repentance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E'. 32:26b-29</td>
<td>Judgment: executive phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'. 32:30</td>
<td>Moses goes up the mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'. 32:31-32</td>
<td>Moses intercedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'. 32:33-33:3</td>
<td>YHWH's two utterances: <em>wayyomer, wayedabber</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'. 33:4-6</td>
<td>YHWH acts, and People react.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE GOLDEN-CALF EPISODE

people. These various identifications, however, do not take into account the literary structure of the passage, a structure which reveals a different central theme. The following discussion will attempt to remedy the situation.

2. Literary Structural Analysis of Exodus 32:1-33:6

The central theme of Exod 32:1-33:6 is a two-phased judgment of the people (investigative and executive), divided by an opportunity for repentance. Source-critical division leaves the "original" pericope asymmetrical and splintered. By contrast, the canonical form of the episode is balanced and coherent, pointing directly to the central theme of the passage, preceded and followed by sections that serve as counterparts in a chiastic pattern with the A-B-A' form. Table 1 sets forth this pattern in outline form, and the following paragraphs provide brief elucidation of the general content, concepts, and relationships involved.

A / / A'--Exodus 32:1-6//Exodus 33:4-6

In the first section of the pericope, Exod 32:1-6, the people desire cult modalities (v. 1). They lose patience with Moses, and by extension also with YHWH, so they ask Aaron to provide for their desires without YHWH's guidance. This Aaron does in the form of the infamous golden calf (vv. 2-4). The people act; and Aaron, as YHWH's representative, reacts. In the parallel section at the end of the pericope, 33:4-6, YHWH warns Moses and orders the removal of ornaments (v. 5). The Sons of Israel take off their ornaments (v. 6). Here YHWH acts, and the people react. The action/reaction is thus inverted in these paralleling sections.

Moreover, the activity involved in each section is similar: the disposition of jewelry. In the initial episode, the men provide (at Aaron's request) gold earrings belonging to their wives and daughters and sons for the purpose of making the image (32:2-3). In the closing episode, the Sons of Israel remove (at YHWH's request) their own ornaments (33:5-6).


4E.g., Childs, p. 559, whose interpretation would leave the "original" pericope with a partial investigative phase, lacking a levitical executive phase, and having no opportunity for repentance (32:26).
Hence, sections A and A' both concern the question of following YHWH, an activity that is related closely with the issue of self-adornment. Both sections have actors and reactors, but they are inverted as to sequence. As indicated above, in the first section the people act by disregarding YHWH's leadership, with Aaron, as YHWH's representative, reacting. In the corresponding section it is YHWH who acts, and it is the people who react, doing so by showing their submission to YHWH's leadership.

B / B'--Exodus 32:7-10 / Exodus 32:33-33:3

In Exod 32:7-10, two words come from YHWH. In v. 7, YHWH "spoke," wayyedabber; and in v. 9, YHWH "said," wayyomer. This phraseology is paralleled, but inverted in Exod 32:33-33:3. Here YHWH again utters two words, and the text makes use of the same form of the same roots: first wayyomer (32:33) and then wayyedabber (33:1).

Additional evidence for the parallelism between these passages lies in the subject matter of YHWH's utterances in the two instances. YHWH's wayyedabber statements both refer to the people "whom you brought from the land of Egypt" (32:7, 33:1; identical phrases are used in the MT). Both of the wayyomer statements concern the destruction/punishment which YHWH will mete out upon the people (Exod 32:10, 34). Together, the terminology and subject matter in the two sections provide strong guidance for understanding the literary structure.

C / C'--Exodus 32:11-14 / Exodus 32:31-32

In both Exod 32:11-14 and Exod 32:31-32 we find Moses interceding for the people before YHWH. In the first intercession, Moses argues for salvation of the people of Israel on the basis of YHWH's reputation among the nations and his covenant promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Israel. In the second intercession, Moses requests forgiveness for the people, without excuse for their sin, and adding only that he himself desires to share in their fate. Thus these two textual passages are parallel on the basis of Moses' intercessory activity.

D / D'--Exodus 32:15-20 / Exodus 32:30

In the next sections that are in inverse position--Exod 32:15-20 and 32:30--we find a contrast revealed through the particular direc-
tion of movements and actions. Moses' movement in going down
the mountain in v. 15 is balanced by his going up the mountain in
v. 30. His activity of breaking the tablets in v. 19 is balanced by his
desire for restoring the people in v. 30. Still further, Moses' forcing
the Israelites to drink the dust-laden water in v. 20 parallels his
declaring their guilt in v. 30.

**E / / E'--Exodus 32:21-25 // Exodus 32:26b-29**

Exod 33:21-25 and 32:26b-29 record two successive phases of
Moses' judgment process. In the first phase, Moses questioned Aaron
(v. 21) and he observed the camp (v. 25) in order to assess the sin of
the people. That is to say, he investigated the condition of the
people before deciding their fate. In the second phase, Moses related
the will of YHWH and commissioned its enforcement. Childs com-
ments: "The word is of judgment directed to the Levites as its agent
who immediately proceeded to execute the awesome punishment."5
Thus Moses' judgment of the people was comprised of an investiga-
tive phase and a successive executive phase.

**F--Exodus 32:26a**

The structurally central verse of the Golden-Calf episode is
Exod 32:26a, which sets forth the question, "Who is for YHWH?"6
Implicit in the very raising of this question is the concept that there
is opportunity for repentance. Thus, the question has enormous
theological significance. This is especially so, inasmuch as it occurs
between the reporting of the investigative and executive phases of
judgment.

Although investigation of the full theological implications of
this phenomenon extends beyond the scope of this brief essay, it is
pertinent to this study to notice and appreciate the placement of
Moses' plea in this fashion within the literary structure of the
pericope. In short, because section F is the central structural feature
of the Golden-Calf episode, it directs attention to the central concern
of that episode. Moses' plea in Exod 32:26a presents the ultimate
question, the apex toward which all the emphases within Exod
32:1-25 are directed and from which all the tensions in Exod 32:26b-
33:6 move toward resolution and abatement.

---

6Cole, p. 219.
3. Summary and Implications of the Literary Structure

The Golden-Calf episode in Exod 32:1-33:6 displays an inverted parallelism or chiastic structure that utilize several specific features: inversion of actions (A ↔ A'), inversion of terminology (B ↔ B'), parallelism (C ↔ C'), contrasts of movements and of actions (D ↔ D'), and succession of events (E ↔ E'). The only structural element that remains without parallel is Moses' offer of repentance to his people (F), this being so because that element is the centerpiece for the chiasm. In this capacity it serves, as well, as the central element for the judgment process that is depicted.

The foregoing analysis of the literary structure of the Golden-Calf episode exemplifies the importance of studying the text in its canonical form. The structure of the text reveals the intention of the writer, and it cannot be dismissed or discounted if we are to ascertain the meaning of the passage. Indeed, the inverted parallel structure gives emphasis to a basic point in the pericope: namely, that the Golden-Calf episode is one that calls forth, and provides opportunity for, repentance within the context of a two-phased judgment. The two phases of that judgment are investigative and executive in nature.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

I am indebted to William H. Shea for pointing out two further parallelisms within the Golden-Calf passage. These may be summarized as follows:

1. In B and B'(32:13 and 33:1):
   a) "Abraham, Isaac, and Israel. . ."
   b) "to whom thou didst swear. . ."
   c) "land . . ."
   a') "to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob"
   b') "of which I swore. . ."
   c') "land . . ."

   a) "Aaron. . ."
   b) his failure
   a') "Sons of Levi. . ."
   b') their success and loyalty
   
   It will be noticed that in the first set of these paralleling sections, not only are the sections themselves chiastic (B and B') but so also are the three items of phraseology (a/b/c and c'/b'/a'). In the second set of paralleling sections, the expressions are not inverted but occur in straight-forward sequence (a/b and a'/b'), with the sections themselves, however, being chiastic counterparts (E and E'). This additional material shared with me by Shea thus amplifies still further the validity of the chiastic structure that on other grounds I have elucidated in my discussion above.
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MISKAN AND 'OHEL MO'ED: ETYMOLOGY, LEXICAL DEFINITIONS, AND EXTRA-BIBLICAL USAGE¹

RALPH E. HENDRIX
Andrews University

Miskan and 'ohel mo'ed are names for the cultic dwelling place of YHWH described in Exod 25-40. This, the first of three studies on miskan and o'hel mo'ed, will consider the etymologies of the terms, their lexical definitions, and parallel terms found in non-Semitic languages. Particular attention will be given to their usage in Ugaritic and their translation or interpretation in the LXX. The intention of this paper is to form some notion of the basic meaning of these terms/phrases as a foundation for a second study which focuses on their usages as witnessed within the text of Exod 25-40. A third study will present the literary structure of Exod 25-40, which these terms help to form.

1. The Etymology and Lexical Definition of Miskan.

Miskan is a nominal form of skn, a verb which has the meaning of "self-submission" (once), "settle," "rest," "stop," "live in," "inhabit," "sojourn," "dwell" (in its qal form); "let/make to live/dwell" (in the piel); "settle, "let/make to live/dwell" (in the hiphil).² Its Assyrian cognate is sakaru ("set," "lay," "deposit") which yields the nominal form maskanu ("place," "dwelling place").³

¹The author wishes to express appreciation to J. Bjornar Storfjell, Richard M. Davidson, David Merling, and Randall W. Younker, members of the faculty of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, for their patience in overseeing the preparation of this and related studies.


³BDB, 1014. See also A. L. Oppenheim and E. Reiner, eds., The Assyrian
The Hebrew noun *miskan* is generally understood to mean "dwelling place," the identity of which is determined by the context in which the term is found. In addition, Holladay indicates its use for "home," "tomb," and "(central) sanctuary." J. O. Lewis suggests that *skn* is "rooted in the nomadic past of Israel and literally means 'to pitch a tent.'" He distinguishes *skn* from *ysb*, noting that the latter is the normal term used for "dwelling in houses," from a basic meaning "to sit down." That is, *skn* refers to a nonsedentary dwelling place (Lewis suggests a tent) while *ysb* refers to a sedentary dwelling place (e.g., a house). Thus, one may arrive at the preliminary conclusion that the verb *skn* refers generally to some form of nonsedentary dwelling, perhaps "camping" in modern parlance, and that the noun *miskan* therefore refers to the place of that activity: a nonsedentary "dwelling-place," a "camp," or perhaps a "camp site." The emphasis of *miskan* is therefore on the nature of the camp--its nonsedentary nature.

*Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, volume 10, part I (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1977), 369-373, where the following basic definitions for *maskanu* are given: "1. threshing floor, empty lot, 2. small agricultural settlement, 3. emplacement, (normal) location, site (of a building), base (of a statue), stand (for a pot), residence, position, 4. tent, canopy; 5. fetter (for a slave), 6. pledge given as security, and 7. sanctuary (?)." Definition #4 indicates a broader meaning than simply "tent" or "canopy" (372). An appropriate interpretation may be "camp," as suggested by at least two of the seven examples given.


5Holladay lists these primary texts: Num 16:24; Isa 22:16; Lev 15:31; and notes the meaning as "(central) sanctuary (74 of 130 times), tabernacle Exod 25:9" (219).

6Lewis, 545.

7Ibid. Cf. Holladay, 146. F. M. Cross points out that the usual "priestly" word for people "dwelling" was *ysb*, and was never used of YHWH except when referring to His "throne" or "to enthrone" (F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Tabernacle," *BA* 110 [1947]: 67). M. Haran ("The Divine Presence in the Israelite Cult and the Cultic Institutions," *Bib* 50 [1969]: 259) concurs with a differentiated use of *skn* and *ysb* in the deuteronomistic writings where *skn* speaks of "God's presence in a chosen place," but *ysb* refers to "his staying in heaven." For various uses of these two roots, see M. H. Woudstra, *The Ark of the Covenant from Conquest to Kingship* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1965), 69-70.
Especially important is the fact that no particular object is inherently associated (etymologically) with the term, which may apply either to a living being or an inanimate object. The breadth of the meaning of *miskan* must be taken into account in determining its use in context. To understand the meaning of *miskan*, one must ask: "Dwelling place of what or of whom?" The answer must be found in the context. In practice, the answer is subject to interpretation flavored by theological and hermeneutical presuppositions.

As a case in point, considerable discussion has been generated concerning how *miskan* relates to the dwelling place of YHWH as described in the biblical text. R. Friedman defines *miskan* as the "inner fabric" over which is the "outer fabric" ('*ohel*), both comprising a "single structure." F. M. Cross defines *skn* "to encamp" or "to tent"; therefore, he suggests that *miskan* originally meant "tent" and later came to mean "the" tent par excellence. On the basis of Ras Shamra evidence, G. E. Wright defines *miskan* as "tent-dwelling." G. H. Davies takes a broader view, defining *miskan* as "tabernacle, dwelling, dwelling-place, habitation, abode, encampment"; however, he allows that the term may refer to the "shrine as a whole" (Exod 25:9) or "virtually the holy of holies" (Exod 26:1). Here then is provided the prevalent scope of definition: as specific as the "inner fabric" within the tent, yet as broad as "abode" or "encampment."

To add confusion, *miskan* is often translated "tabernacle," which in turn, is derived from the Latin Vulgate's *tabernaculum*, meaning

---

8 R. E. Friedman argues that the Mosaic construction was just the right size to fit into the Most Holy Place of the Solomonic Temple ("The Tabernacle in the Temple," *BA* 43 [1980]: 243, 245). Friedman's "outer tent" (*miskan")/"inner tent" ('*ohel mo'ed*) idea is clearly at odds with their relationship described in Exod 26:7 (see below, in the main text).

9 Cross, 65-66.


11 G. H. Davies, "Tabernacle," in IDB, 1962 ed., 4:498. The breadth of this definition is not justified in Exod 25-40. Certainly Exod 26:1 is not only the "holy of holies," as Davies suggests. The larger context of which Exod 26:1 is a part (Exod 26:1-37; especially v. 33) includes both *haggodes* ("the holy") and *qodes haq'dasim* ("the holy of holies"). In Exod 26:1, *miskan* refers to the two-compartment unit
"tent." Since there is a completely different Hebrew word for "tent" (‘ohel), this use of tabernaculum is problematic. Inappropriate translation conveys a notion of synonymity, not evident in the Hebrew, but adopted in modern theology. If the two terms are identical, the meaning of phrases like Exod 26:7, "tent over the tabernacle" (NIV), might remain obscure. However, as the Hebrew for that verse is le ‘ohel 'al hammiskan, "to/for [the] tent on/over the dwelling place," the distinction is apparent. While it is certainly true that the furniture within the miskan suggests a habitation or a dwelling, the term itself is not synonymous with "tent."

The trend of scholarly definition of miskan is correct; however, as a broad term, it has often received too narrow a definition. Miskan almost always is automatically taken to mean "The dwelling of God" or even redefined as "sanctuary," "tabernacle," or "temple," without regard for the actual terminology. It would be safer to state that miskan connotes a special type of habitation; the term indicates the presence of the dweller while emphasizing the temporary nature of the dwelling place. In anthropological terms, this is a matter of sedentary or nonsedentary habitation.

If the dwelling place itself is nonsedentary, the dweller may be seen as nonsedentary as well. This choice of nonsedentary terminology may reflect the inculturalization of YHWH's commands in Exod 25-40, since the people to whom YHWH uttered the command to build the miskan were, as the biblical record shows, nonsedentary. A command to build a permanent, sedentary dwelling (such as the later Solomonic hekal, "temple" or "palace") might well...
have been incomprehensible or even reprehensible, given the circumstances of the earlier period. The writer called the dwelling place by a term which was immediately understandable within his cultural framework. Miskan, it seems, calls to mind a nonsedentary type of dwelling place: the "camp," not particularly a structure itself, but a place where an object or a being abides.

2. The Etymology and Lexical Definition of 'Ohel Mo'ed

The genitival construct 'ohel mo'ed is often translated "tent of meeting" in modern versions. The Hebrew word 'ohel means "tent." Variations of the word are found in Aramaic ('ahala'), Phoenician ('h1), Ugaritic ('hl), and Egyptian [('a)har(u)]. The Assyrian cognate is alu. The Vulgate translates both 'ohel and miskan as tabernaculum (occasionally, tentorium), obscuring the discrete meaning of the Hebrew terms. The term mo'ed is a nominal form of the verb y'd: "designate," "appear," "come," "gather," "summon," "reveal oneself." Its basic meaning is "appointed time/place/sign," "meeting place," "place of assembly," or "to meet by appointment." The word occurs in Ugaritic (mo'idu) and Egyptian (mw'd).
Combining the two words, the phrase 'ohel mo'ed carries the notion "tent of the place of meeting/assembly/appointment," or perhaps more interpretively: "tent where YHWH reveals Himself." Brichto calls this the "Tent of Encounter" or "rendezvous." This tent was the place of appointed gathering, known more by the event associated with it (meeting, gathering, or assembly) than by its physical character (hides over a wooden frame). In the YHWHistic cult, it was perceived to be the location of the ultimate cult event. With 'ohel ma'ed, the focus is on the event: "meeting/assembly/appointment/revelation." This is quite distinct from miskan, which focuses on the place rather than the event.

3. Parallel Terms in Ugaritic Sources

The Ugaritic language provides a lexical cross-reference for Semitic-language documents written in the Middle Bronze in (IIC) /Late Bronze I time frame. Useful for this study are cognates for miskan and 'ohel mo'ed which appear in the Ugaritic corpus, especially instances in which the terms are found in close literary formation.


The Egyptian equivalent for 'ohel mo'ed (mw'd) is also found in the Tale of Wen-Amon (ca. 1100 B.C.B.), referring to a city "assembly," and in a document from Byblos (7th cent. B.C.E.); see Mullen, 129, n. 31; and Wilson, 245. For more on these two documents, see Cross, 65; R. J. Clifford, "The Tent of El and The Israelite Tent of Meeting," *CBQ* 33 (1971): 225; and H. Goedicke, *The Report of Wenamun* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), 123.
The verb form skn occurs sixteen times in Ugaritic literature; its noun form (msknt) appears twice.\(^{24}\) The paucity of occurrences of msknt makes definition problematic. Both occurrences of the noun are plural and both seem to refer to the multitudinous gods' private "dwelling places," not a meeting chamber or council place.\(^{25}\) The Ugaritic equivalent of mo'ed is limited to a single occurrence of the phrase puhru mo'îdu meaning "the gathered assembly."\(^{26}\) An equivalent to the Hebrew phrase 'ohel mo'ed does not appear in Ugaritic texts.

The equivalent term for 'ohel (Ugaritic, 'hl) does occur and is especially important for this study in that the term occurs in association with msknt in each of its two occurrences.\(^{27}\) Two lines of the Keret epic read:

\[
\text{ti'tayu 'iluma la-'ahalihum,} \\
\text{daru 'ili la-miskanatihum.}\(^{28}\)
\]

Mullen provides the following translation, noting the association of la-'ahalihum and la-miskanatihum:

The gods proceed to their tents
The assembly of 'El to their dwellings.\(^{29}\)

---

\(^{24}\)Por a list of occurrences of skn, see R. E. Whitaker, *A Conordance of the Ugaritic Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), 594. For the occurrences of msknt see p. 436.


\(^{27}\)Whitaker, 436, reads: tity. ilm.1 ah1 hm. / dr il1 msknt hm ... The word 'hl [cf. ahl] occurs in CTA 17.V.32; CTA 15.111.18; CTA 19.1V.214; CTA 19.1V.222; CTA 19.1V.212; ibid., 9. Msknt occurs in CTA 17.V.32 and CTA 15.10.19; ibid., 436.

\(^{28}\)CT A 15.111.18-19.

\(^{29}\)Ibid. Mullen states that there is "here the parallelism of 'ahalihum and miskanatum, thus equating the tent with the tabernacle structure (note 42)."
Here 'ahalihum ("their tents") is poetically associated with miskanatihum ("their dwelling places"). However, there is no equivalent Ugaritic phrase for 'ohel mo'ed. The lack of an exact parallel demands an interpretive step by the reader. The terms are associated in the Ugaritic, but perhaps not in the same way as they are in the Hebrew. One would expect identical phrases if the Ugaritic and the Hebrew were synonymous or identical. In fact, the narrative speaks of a plural number of gods going to their plural tents. This is quite unlike the context of Exod 25-40 (and of the whole MT which allows no plurality of true gods). In line 19, the "assembly" is going to a plural number of "dwellings." The tents are not "tents of assembly," or of "meeting," or of "appointment," or of "revelation." They are simply personal tents, private tents, not a community tent.

The word msknt also appears in the Ugaritic Aqhat epic:

\[
\begin{align*}
    & h.tb'.ktr. l ahl, \\
    & h.hyn.tb'.l msknt^{30}
\end{align*}
\]

H. Ginsberg provides the following translation:

Kothar departs for/from his tent,
Hayyin departs for / from his tabernacle.\(^{31}\)

Although "tabernacle" is a poor translation for msknt (better would be "dwelling" or "dwelling place"), the terms 'hl and msknt clearly associate linguistically, in poetic parallelism. This parallelism, however, does not necessarily imply synonymy. The absence of the equivalent for the Hebrew 'ohel mo'ed limits this passage's possibility of clarifying the Hebrew text. Thus, an in-depth analysis of this Ugaritic text is unnecessary for the current study.

Parallelism is common in Hebrew literature (cf. Num 24:5; Isa 54:2; Jer 30:18; etc, where 'ohel and miskan are in parallel)." Mullen accepts that the miskan "may be equated with" the 'ohel, a conclusion accepted without critical evaluation (pp. 168-175, passim) and therefore misunderstands the term as used in the Hebrew text. Poetic parallelism should not be confused with synonymy, either in the Hebrew text or in the Ugaritic material, especially since there is a difference in actual terminology ('ohel mo'ed compared with the Ugaritic 'hl) and a perceived contextual connotative nuance.

\(^{30}\)CTA 17.V.31-33; Whitaker, 436.

\(^{31}\)H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Myths, Epics, and Legends," in ANET, 151. See his n. 19 for the "for/from" alternative reading.
Summarizing: the Ugaritic literature witnesses two instances of msknt, both times in close connection with 'hl. While clearly in poetic association, the words need not be synonymous. So, little additional definition from Ugaritic sources is added to the definition of miskan and 'ohel mo'ed already obtained from Hebrew (by way of lexica and word studies). No occurrence of "tent of assembly" ('hl m'd) is witnessed in Ugaritic materials currently available. In short, the Ugaritic evidence shows a similarity in basic meaning between the two terms (that is, both are places to inhabit), but does not offer additional insight in regard to the nuance of their definitions. The Ugaritic language makes no clear distinction in meaning between the words msknt and 'hl, whereas the Hebrew clearly does. The reason for this may be related to cultural factors. The texts quoted above are normally dated in the Middle Bronze III (IIC)/Late Bronze I, between the 17th and 15th centuries B.C., when Ugarit was already an urban center. The chapters in Exodus, according to traditional views on the authorship of the book and the internal chronology of the book, deal with the late 15th century. Israel was at the time a pastoral and non-sedentary people who became sedentarized much later. Given these divergent cultural conditions, it is possible that msknt and 'hl did not convey the non-sedentary / sedentary differentiation simply because of cultural constraints. Furthermore, it is possible that the miskan and 'ohel mo'ed phraseology typical of contemporary Late Bronze Semitic cultures may have been redefined when adopted into the terminology of the YHWHistic religion. Terms commonly used by surrounding peoples, who had a pantheon of gods, were inadequate-without redefinition-to convey the appropriate theological meaning within the YHWH cult.

4. Parallel Terms in the Septuagint

This work is concerned primarily with the contextual use of miskan and 'ohel mo'ed in Exod 25-40 of the Hebrew. The way these

32"The reality of a period of Israelite non-sedentary pastoralism is currently the subject of discussion within the archaeological community. The issues are multiple and complex, but some scholars contend for some sort of non-sedentary pastoralism (see I. Finkelstein, The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1988).
words are translated in the LXX is surveyed in a search for further information. *Miskan* is translated exclusively by *skene*, while the common translation for *'ohel mo'ed* is *skene tou martyriou.*\(^{33}\) Hence, both *miskan* and *'ohel* (in the phrase *'ohel mo'ed*) are translated by the same word *skene*. W. Bauer defines *skene* as "tent" or "booth."\(^{34}\) J. Thayer agrees with this definition--"tent" or "tabernacle"--and adds that *skn* is used "chiefly for *'ohel* [in the LXX and] often also for *miskan.*"\(^{35}\) Bauer notes the use of *skene* for both *miskan* and *'ohel* in his definition of *he skene tou martyriou*, "the tabernacle or Tent of Meeting.\(^{36}\) Like the English and Latin translations, the LXX shows little differentiation in its choice of terms for *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed.*\(^{37}\) As a significant or textual tradition, the LXX witnesses to an understanding of the Pentateuch which postdates its writings by many centuries. That both *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed* are translated most often by *skene* may be attributed to several causes, one of which is a diluted perception of their connotational nuance. That is, by the time of the LXX, the two terms had come to mean virtually the same things; Israel had by then long been sedentarized.

5. **Summary and Conclusions**

The noun *miskan* (derived from the verb *skn*) means "dwelling, place." It concerns a "place" or "site" (similar to the modern word "camp"), and carries connotations of transience. It should not be

---


\(^{36}\) Bauer, 754.

\(^{37}\) The argument could be made that *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed* are synonymous, and therefore the single Greek term is adequate for both. The analysis of the use of these terms in Exod 25-40 clearly shows the terms to be similar but not synonymous (see note 2, above). For a more comprehensive view of the occurrences of *skene* in Exod 25-40, see G. Morrish, ed., *A Concordance of the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), 222-223.
limited to a specific form of "dwelling" (particularly not the English "tent" or Latin tabernaculum), as this leads to confusion with 'ohel. The phrase 'ohel mo'ed is a genitival construct meaning "tent of assembly" or "encounter." It was the name of the structure in which the Divine and human met, emphasizing the event rather than the structure.

Parallel terms found in the Ugaritic literature provide no additional information beyond that already known from the Hebrew. In fact, the Ugaritic literature offers only limited insight because the word 'hl does not appear in genitival construction with mo'ed or its equivalent. Furthermore, the differentiation between the nonsedentary and sedentary meanings of the words in Hebrew appears to have been lost.38 As was noted, the reason for this could well have been that Ugarit, unlike Israel, was sedentary and urban. The LXX, by translating both miskan and 'ohel by skene, obscures the meaning of the Hebrew terms. It would seem that by the time the LXX was translated, the words were understood as synonyms. Again, the cultural setting of a sedentary and urban people would have assisted in eroding the differences. The Vulgate, likewise, fails to distinguish between the two.

Two future articles on miskan and 'ohel mo'ed will complete the study of the meaning of the words. The first will deal with the usage of the terms in Exod 25-40. The second will present an overview of the literary structure of those chapters. This introductory study has shown scholarly insensitivity to the connotational nuance of the words. The next two studies will reveal the pitfalls resulting from this insensitivity.

38This suggestion, made to the author by David Merling, finds support in Mullen (170), who recognizes "that the deities were pictured as tent dwellers, even by the highly urbanized culture of Ugarit." Mullen wonders at this anachronism, yet misses the significance of this for interpreting the Hebrew text (see Whitaker, 436). The vital point is that a nonsedentary (tent-dwelling) culture is being described by a sedentary (urbanized) writer, thus potentially giving rise to the blurred terminological nuance posited above.
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THE USE OF MISKAN AND 'OHEL MO'ED IN EXODUS 25-40

RALPH E. HENDRIX
Institute of Archaeology
Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0990

The previous study\(^1\) in this series on miskan and 'ohel mo'ed in Exod 25-40 concluded that miskan means "dwelling place," that it concerns a "place" or "site" (similar to the modern noun "camp"), and that it carries connotations of transience. It should not be limited to a specific form or kind of "dwelling" (particularly not what is implied by the English word "tent" and by the Latin tabernaculum), since such a usage leads to confusion with 'ohel. Regarding the phrase 'ohel mo'ed we found that it is a genitival construct which means "tent of assembly" or "tent of encounter," that this was the name of the structure in which the Divine and the human met, and that the term emphasizes the event rather than the structure.

The previous study further revealed that Ugaritic parallels to these two Hebrew terms provide no additional helpful information beyond what is already known from the Hebrew itself, except possibly that the Hebrew differentiation between nonsedentary and sedentary connotations of the words seems to be lost in the Ugaritic. I suggested that the reason for this difference in usage could be the fact that Ugarit was sedentary and urban at the time the literature we examined was written (MB III [II C) to LB I), whereas Israel was nonsedentary during the period depicted in the book of Exodus.

\(^1\)Ralph E. Hendrix, "Miskan and 'Ohel Mo'ed: Etymology, Lexical Definitions, and Extra-biblical Usage," \textit{AUSS} 29/3 (1991):213-224. The author here wishes to express appreciation to J. Bjonar Storfjell, Richard M. Davidson, and Randall W. Younker, members of the faculty of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, for their patience in overseeing the preparation of this and related studies.
Finally, we found that by translating both miskan (dwelling place) and 'ohel (tent) as skene (tent), the LXX has obscured the difference between the two Hebrew terms, as does the Vulgate in its use of tabernaculum. I suggested that perhaps the two terms were considered to be synonyms by the time of the translation of the LXX, and that if so, this may be another example of sedentarization obscuring the terms.

Building upon this initial etymological analysis, subsequent study of the MT of Exod 25-40 has revealed that the expressions miskan and 'ohel mo'ed are discrete and specific; they are not interchangeable. The term selected in each case depends on the literary context in which the term appears. Miskan is the biblical writer's expression of choice when the construction or assembling of the dwelling place is the subject, while 'ohel mo'ed is the expression of choice when the context is cultic. Thus the habitation of YHWH may properly be called the "Cultic Dwelling Place," a phrase which conveys both aspects of this duality.

Both past and contemporary structural analyses of Exod 25-40 lack sensitivity to the distinctions between miskan and 'ohel mo'ed.2 This may be due to the application of an external methodology

---

rather than making use of a literary-structural analysis.\textsuperscript{3} Under these circumstances, a terminologically sensitive analysis of Exod 25-40 is timely. The present study is an endeavor to fill this vacuum for Exod 25-40. A third (and concluding) article will present an overview of the literary structure of Exod 25-40, through which this terminological pattern weaves.\textsuperscript{4}

1. Occurrences of the Terms

Statistical Analysis

\textit{Miskan} and \textit{'ohel} (most often in the phrase \textit{'ohel mo'ed}) are names of YHWH's habitation which the text of Exod 25-40 indicates Moses was commanded to construct, equip, and ceremonially prepare for service. Other appellative expressions for this habitation either do not occur in chapters 25-40 or occur only once, whereas \textit{miskan} and \textit{'ohel} occur in reference to the habitation some fifty-eight times each.\textsuperscript{5} The present study will be limited to the contextual usage of these two denominatives.


\textsuperscript{5}All statistical data are derived from Gerhard Usowsky and Leonhard Rost, \textit{Konkordanz zum Hebraischen Alten Testament} (Stuttgart Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958). \textit{Hekal} (palace, temple) does not occur in Exod 25-40. \textit{Miqdas} (holy precinct), and \textit{Bayit} (house) in reference to the divine dwelling, each occurs only once, in Exod 25:8 and 34:26 respectively.
The word *miskan* (dwelling place) occurs 139 times in the OT. Of these occurrences, 104 (74.8%) are found in the Pentateuch as follows: fifty-eight (55.8%) in Exodus, four (3.9%) in Leviticus, and forty-two (40.4%) in Numbers, with none in Genesis and Deuteronomy. Every occurrence of *miskan* in Exodus (41.7% of all OT occurrences) are found in Exod 25-40.

The word *'ohel* (tent) occurs 344 times in the OT. In the Pentateuch it is found 214 times in one or another of the expressions *'ohel* (tent), *'ohel mo'ed* (tent of meeting), *'ohel hamiskan* (tent over the dwelling place), and *'ohel ha'edut* (tent of the testimony). It is used in the Pentateuch to refer to a personal tent forty-seven times (13.7%), with all twenty-three occurrences in Genesis (6.7%) being of this nature. It occurs forty-four times in Leviticus, forty-three (97.7%) of which are in the phrase *'ohel mo'ed*. In Numbers, it occurs seventy-six times, of which fifty-six (73.7%) are in the phrase *'ohel mo'ed*. Deuteronomy has nine occurrences, four times (45.4%) either in the phrase *'ohel mo'ed* or with this phrase as its antecedent.

In Exodus *'ohel* without an antecedent appears four times (6.5%). It occurs in the phrase *'ohel mo'ed* thirty-four times, plus three more times with *'ohel mo'ed* as its antecedent, for a total of thirty-seven occurrences (59.7% of its Exodus occurrences). It is found in the phrase *'ohel al-hamiskan* two times, but with twelve more occurrences with *'ohel* in reference to *'ohel al-hamiskan*, for a total of fourteen times (22.5% of the total Exodus occurrences). In Exod 33 it is found seven times as the *'ohel* of Moses (11.3% of the Exodus occurrences). *'Ohel ha'edut* (tent of the testimony) does not occur in Exodus. Thus, in one form or another *'ohel* occurs a total of sixty-two times in Exod 25-40 (29.1% of its OT occurrences). There are fifty-eight times in Exod 25-40 wherein some form of *'ohel* refers to the habitation of YHWH, the most common being thirty-four occurrences in the phrase *'ohel mo'ed*.

The Patterning of the Occurrences

A sequential listing of the occurrences of *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed* in Exod 25-40 reveals a terminological pattern.6 The data in

---

the Table on page 8 (derived from Lisowsky and Rost)\textsuperscript{7} make it apparent that the use of *miskan* continues uninterrupted (nineteen times) from Exod 25:9 through 27:19. Then in Exod 27:20, the beginning of a second terminological unit is evidenced by an abrupt shift to *'ohel mo'ed*, a term which continues through to Exod 33:7 (seventeen occurrences in all).\textsuperscript{8} In Exod 35:1-39:43 we find a third terminological unit, one that is "predominantly *miskan*." In it, *miskan* occurs twenty-two times while *'ohel mo'ed* occurs five times. Finally, a fourth terminological unit constitutes a "mixed" *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed* passage encompassing Exod 40:1-38. Here *miskan* occurs seventeen times and *'ohel mo'ed* twelve times.

The terminological structure of *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed* in Exod 25-40 consists therefore of four compositional units: *miskan* only, *'ohel mo'ed* only, predominantly *miskan*, and mixed *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed* expressions. Why is this so?

2. Explanations and Solutions

Among the scholarly analyses noted, only that of G. V. Pixley acknowledges a terminological aspect of the text. He does so, however, only once and without explanation.\textsuperscript{9} I suggest that it is the literary context in which each of these expressions is used that provides the key to understanding the terminological structure. A broad study of the literary structure of Exod 25-40 will be presented in a forthcoming article; however, the overview that will be given therein is not necessary in order for us to analyze here the contextual usages of *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed*.\textsuperscript{10}

"Miskan Only" Terminological Unit
(Exod 25:9-27:19) I

*Miskan* (occurring nineteen times) is the only term used to name the habitation of YHWH in the text of Exod 25:9-27:19. This

\textsuperscript{7}Lisowsky and Rost, 30-33, 873-874.
\textsuperscript{8}Pixley, 199.
\textsuperscript{9}See specific references in Cole, Durham, Fretheim, Hurowitz, Johnstone, Kearney, Joe O. Lewis, Noth, and Rylaarsdam mentioned in n. 2, above. See also Pixley, 199, and Sarna, 176, regarding the shift from *miskan* to *'ohel mo'ed* in Exod 27:19-20.
\textsuperscript{10}This article is scheduled for publication in the next issue of AUSS.
###Occurrences of Miskan and 'Ohel Mo'ed in Exodus 25-40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miskan 'Ohel Mo'ed</th>
<th>Miskan 'Ohel Mo'ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Miskan Only&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Predominantly Miskan&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:9</td>
<td>35:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:1</td>
<td>:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:6</td>
<td>:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:7</td>
<td>36:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:12</td>
<td>:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:13</td>
<td>:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:15</td>
<td>:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:17</td>
<td>:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:18</td>
<td>:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:20</td>
<td>:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:22</td>
<td>:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:23</td>
<td>:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:26</td>
<td>:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:27</td>
<td>:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:27</td>
<td>:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:30</td>
<td>38:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:35</td>
<td>38:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>:40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;'Ohel Mo'ed Only.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
passage is part of a slightly larger section (Exod 25:1-27:19), the content of which consists of commands for constructing the dwelling: its size, pattern, and materials. This section also details the physical arrangements of the dwelling: an ark (throne), a table (for eating), a lampstand (for light), an audience chamber and private compartment, an altar (kitchen), and a courtyard (public area). All of these elements were common to dwellings in general, and thus the writer's use of miskan is not surprising.

"Ohel Mo'ed Only" Terminological Unit
(Exod 27:20-34:35)

In Exod 27:20, there is a change of context which witnesses an abrupt shift in denominatives. Exod 27:21 contains the first instance of the use of the term 'ohel mo'ed. This phrase, which occurs seventeen times, is used exclusively for the divine habitation in Exod 21:20-33:7.

Whereas the literary context of miskan was about construction, the literary context of 'ohel mo'ed appears to involve the function of the cult of YHWH. Exod 27:20-21 concerns the cultic function and use of oil in the liturgy. Exod 28:1-43 concerns the priests, their garments (ephod, breastpiece, robe, turban, tunic, and undergarments), along with the time and manner of their function in the cult. Exod 29:1-46 describes the process of consecrating and dressing the priests. It also speaks of offerings (sin, burnt, and wave); ordination; and the continuous, "daily" burnt offering. Exod 30:1-10 concerns the incense altar: its placement, use, and perpetuity, but these verses do not give evidence of either name for YHWH's habitation. Exod 30:11-31:18 concerns atonement money, the priests' wash basin, the anointing oil, incense, the providential provision of craftsmen, and the sabbath(s). Where an expression naming the habitation of YHWH is found in each of these literary subsections of Exod 27:20-33:7, the term is exclusively 'ohel mo'ed. In this cult-functional context, the biblical writer chose 'ohel mo'ed rather than the previously used miskan.

Because of the cult-functional use of 'ohel mo'ed, this phrase continues into the four narratives of Exod 32-34. It occurs twice in Exod 33:7, in the narrative of the Theophany in Moses' Tent. In the preceding narrative about the Golden Calf and in the subsequent two narratives about the Theophany on the Mountain and the Episode of the Second Tablets, the phrase does not occur. Thus, although the phrase is used only twice, and this in conjunction
with only the second narrative, all four narratives are apparently cultic and may be considered as being in a cult-functional context.

Predominantly Miskan Terminological Unit
(Exod 35:1-39:43)

The suggested term-context association seen in the first two terminological units appears straightforward. Individual expressions are used in clearly definable literary contexts. However, the two mixed terminological units found in Exod 35:1-39:43 and 40:1-38 provide both a challenge to, and vindication of, the term-context relationship suggested in this study. We find within the literary structure of Exod 35:1-39:43 that miskan occurs twenty-two times, while 'ohel mo'ed occurs five times. For convenience, it is designated as a "predominantly miskan" terminological unit.

Exod 35:1-36:7 relates to the construction of the equipment of the habitation (which explains the presence miskan), but it also includes the mention of the cult function (hence the presence of 'ohel mo'ed in Exod 35:21). Miskan is used three times in the construction context; 'ohel mo'ed occurs once, in a cult-function context.

Exod 36:8-38:20 is an "assembly" passage which parallels the "command" passage in Exod 25:8-31:18. It primarily concerns construction. Thus the writer uses miskan, except in Exod 38:8, where the concern is cult-functional (necessitating the use of 'ohel mo'ed). Miskan is used thirteen times, in construction contexts; and 'ohel ma'ed is used once, in a cult-function context.

Exod 38:21-31 concerns the metal used in constructing components of the habitation. Here miskan occurs three times in construction contexts, and 'ohel mo'ed occurs once in the context of the bronze altar. This is the altar of burnt offering (the incense altar was gold) and may be considered as cult-functional.

Finally, Exod 39:1-43, the "assembly" parallel to the Exod 28:1-43 "command" section, concerns the priestly garments, ephod, stones, breastpiece, robe, tunic, and plate/turban. Here, however, the emphasis is not on the cultic function of this equipment, but on its construction.

Apparent exceptions to this construction context are Exod 39:32 and 39:40, where both miskan and 'ohel mo'ed are found in the same literary phrase. The two verses are worded in the Hebrew in such a way as to be rendered in English as "the dwelling place of
the Tent of Assembly." Here the context is still construction: namely, the construction of the dwelling place of the Tent of Meeting. Up to this point, miskan has been used solely in reference to YHWH's Dwelling Place. But just as 'ohel can refer to other tents besides YHWH's, so too can miskan simply mean a "dwelling place." Here it is consistent with the previous differentiation of terms for miskan to mean "dwelling place" as a reference to the dwelling place of the 'ohel mo'ed.

The Combined Miskan and 'Ohel Mo'ed Context
(Exod 40:1-38)

The fourth unit, Exod 40:1-38, exemplifies the combined miskan and 'ohel mo'ed context. Here miskan occurs seventeen times and 'ohel mo'ed twelve times. The terminological distinction is much more narrow (as an "assembly" context might require); however, the same constructional and cult-functional usages are detectable. Exod 40:1-8 concerns the assembling of the whole Cult-Dwelling from component parts. Although the cult articles are mentioned, this is in the context of construction. Hence miskan occurs once as the Dwelling Place of YHWH, and it also occurs twice as the "dwelling place" of the Tent of Meeting (in genitival construct). 'Ohel mo'ed occurs alone only in Exod 40:7, in the context of the placement of the priests' wash basin--clearly a cultic object that pertains to cult-function.

Exod 40:9-16 concerns the command to anoint the miskan, its furnishings, the altar of burnt offerings and its utensils, and the wash basin and stand, as well as the priests. That this is clearly cult-functional (as the term "anoint" suggests) is verified by the presence of 'ohel mo'ed. Here the command to anoint the miskan may seem troublesome unless one allows for its generic meaning "dwelling place." The apparent problem is resolved, however, if one reads miskan as the "dwelling place" of the Tent of Assembly, rather than as the "Dwelling Place" of YHWH.

Exod 40:17-33 concerns the placement of certain objects. Miskan is the primary term of the passage where it refers to the Dwelling

11 My translation. Exod 39:32 is simply a genitival construct wherein miskan is in the construct state and 'ohel mo'ed is its genitive: "dwelling place of the Tent of Assembly." Exod 39:40 is not a genitival construct, but 'ohel mo'ed is preceded by the dative prefix l, which may carry the genitival idea "of" and therefore retains the same meaning and translation in Exod 39:40 as in Exod 39:32.
Place of YHWH (v. 17) and the typical dwelling furniture therein (vv. 18-21). In vv. 22-24, a very close association of *miskan* and *'ohel* is witnessed; however, this is not in actual or effective genitival construct as before, but rather in a literary association with theological import: YHWH's dwelling furniture (table and lampstand) are placed in the structure that is called by its cult-functional name! This suggests that the act of placing the furniture was considered by the biblical writer to be cultic, not constructional. In other words, there is more to the placing of this particular furniture than merely mimicking what is done with household furniture. The text, in mid-sentence, explicitly unites the constructional and cult-functional aspects of the Cult-Dwelling: YHWH both dwells and conducts cultic placement of furniture in a single physical structure. Thus there is one Structure with two aspects.

In v. 29, the same genitival construct relationship is witnessed as before: "the dwelling place of the Tent of Meeting," a construction context. In vv. 30-32, straightforward cult-functional contexts (concerning the washing of the priests) use *'ohel mo'ed* without difficulty for the reader. Finally, in v. 33, the writer switches back to *miskan* in the constructional context of putting up the curtain around the courtyard.

Exod 40:34-38, the final passage of Exod 25-40, exhibits the closest literary relationship between *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed* found in this study up to this point. Here the subject is the indwelling of YHWH in the Cult-Dwelling. As one might expect in the light of YHWH's roles, the indwelling occurs simultaneously in the *miskan* and the *'ohel mo'ed*, since both are dual aspects of one single physical entity. The terms remain connotatively distinct while referring to the same physical Structure. The Glory of YHWH resides inside the *miskan*, while the Cloud hovers above the entrance of the *'ohel mo'ed*.

3. Summary and Conclusions

Four terminological units occur within the basic literary structure of Exod 25-40. This terminological "axis" has generally been overlooked by scholars, resulting in an insensitivity to the discrete and separate connotations of *miskan* and *'ohel mo'ed*. By tracing the terms along the terminological axis through the literary structure, this study has suggested that *miskan* is used in constructional contexts, primarily associated with commands to
manufacture and assemble the Dwelling Place of YHWH, but secondarily in its generic sense as simply "dwelling place." The phrase 'ohel mo'ed appears in literary contexts where the cultic function of the habitation is the concern.

This relationship between the context and the precise term that is used suggests intentionality: i.e., particular terms are used in particular contexts. Specifically, what is suggested by the usage is that the biblical writer wished to associate miskan with construction contexts and 'ohel mo'ed with liturgical, cult-functional contexts. When writing about the command to construct a dwelling and to establish the cult, the writer could easily use the discrete terms separately. The writer dealt first with one subject (construction), and used an appropriately "constructional" name for the structure. In dealing with the second subject (cult-function), the writer used a totally distinct, but equally appropriate expression. We must realize that the writer was distinguishing dual, yet discrete, aspects of a single physical reality.

When describing the assembly process, these discrete denominatives are used in close association, but not necessarily synonymously. Even though the two terms occur at times in a single paragraph or sentence, it is always with discrete connotations. This is evident in the two terminological units where miskan and 'ohel mo'ed occur separately, and it is discernibly consistent in the latter two terminological units, where, in tightly-worded texts, the terms are in close association.

Thus, in all contexts within Exod 25-40 the biblical writer has masterfully controlled the use of miskan and 'ohel mo'ed in order to clarify the dual nature of YHWH's habitation. That habitation was to be understood as a transient dwelling place, such as was consistent with the dwelling places of nomadic peoples; therefore the choice of miskan. But yet, that habitation also had the continuing function of fostering the cultic relationship, and this aspect was best expressed by the choice of 'ohel mo'ed.
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The Duration of
The Egyptian Bondage
Harold W. Hoehner

When one looks at the various passages of Scripture concerning the length of Israel's bondage in Egypt one immediately discovers that there are apparent disagreements in the biblical record. Various scholars have attempted to resolve the apparent discrepancies. The purpose of this article is to discuss and evaluate the various views and then attempt to present a solution to the problem.

I. THE SCRIPTURES INVOLVED

Before discussing the various theories, a review of the Scripture passages concerning the duration of the bondage is in order. The passages are the author's own translation.

PASSAGES MENTIONING 400 YEARS

*Genesis 15:13.* And he said to Abram: "Know with certainty that your descendants shall be strangers (sojourners) in a land that is not theirs and they shall serve them and they shall oppress them for 400 years."

*Genesis 15:16.* And in the fourth generation they shall come back here again. . . .

*Acts 7:6.* And God spoke in this manner; that his [Abraham's] descendants shall be strangers in a land that is not theirs, and that they shall enslave them and maltreat them for 400 years.

PASSAGES MENTIONING 430 YEARS

*Exodus 12:40-41.* Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years and it came to pass at the end of the 430 years, on that very day it came to

---

1 The LXX adds here "and shall maltreat them." When this verse is quoted in Acts 7:6 this phrase is retained.
2 The Samaritan Pentateuch (hereafter designated as SP) as well as the Alexandrinus and Lagardiana codices of the LXX add "and their fathers." Since there is no other MS evidence for this additional reading, the Masoretic text (hereafter designated MT) should stand as is.
3 The SP has: "in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt." The LXX has the same words but in inverted order. Again because of weak support, the MT should stand as is.
pass, all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt.

Galatians 3:17. Now this I say: "The law which came 430 years afterward does not make void a covenant previously ratified by God so as to invalidate the promise.

PASSAGE MENTIONING 450 YEARS

Acts 13:17-20. The God of this people Israel chose our fathers, and exalted the people when they sojourned in Egypt and with a high arm he led them out of it, and for approximately forty years as a nursing father he bore them in the wilderness. And when he destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan he gave (them) their land as an inheritance for approximately 450 years. And after that he gave them judges until Samuel the prophet.

II. THE PROBLEM STATED

One sees immediately that there are three figures for the length of Israel's sojourn in Egypt. Was it 400, 430, or 450 years? Can these differences be resolved in a way which will satisfy the given data in all these passages?

Some MSS add the words "in Christ." Although the weightiest MSS omit the words, their inclusion or exclusion is of no significance for this study. The textual variant "cared for" has about equal weight as the reading used in the above translation. The same two variants are found in the LXX of Deut. 1:31, the passage to which Paul is alluding, but the MT has simply which means "to bear."

This word is inserted for clarity in English and is included in some MSS. The Textus Receptus which the AV follows has the phrase "and after that" preceding the words "approximately 450 years." This would mean that there was an approximate 450-year span between Joshua's conquering of the land and Samuel the prophet. Thus the period of the judges was about 450 years. The reading of the Nestle text is better because: (1) it is favored by the more weighty MSS (p74, 33 81 181 it-ar c vg arm geo), and (2) it fits better with I Kings 6:1 where there is a 480-year period from the Exodus to the fourth year of Solomon-otherwise if one accepts the Textus Receptus reading, one would have to squeeze into the 480-year period the 450 years of the judges period, the reigns of Joshua, Saul, David, and the first three or four years of Solomon's reign, and forty years of wilderness wanderings. Accepting the reading of the Nestle text, viz., the placing of the approximate 450 years from the commencement of the Egyptian bondage until Joshua's conquest of the land, will be discussed in the text below.
III. THE PROBLEM DISCUSSED

There are two major views to be considered at this time after which the present writer's view will be given.

AN EGYPTIAN BONDAGE OF 215 YEARS

Statement of the position. Anstey,8 Mauro,9 Cooper,10 Thiele,11 and The New Scofield Reference Bible12 favor the position of a 215-year Egyptian bondage. The adherents of this view take the 430 years mentioned in Galatians 3:17 as beginning with the call of Abraham (Gen. 12:1-3) and ending with the Exodus. The 400 years has reference to the period from the weaning of Isaac and the casting out of Ishmael (Gen. 21:10.) until the Exodus. Therefore, one would have a 215-year sojourn in the land of Canaan and another period of 215 years in Egypt,13 hence making a total of 430 years for the sojourn.14 It may be outlined as follows:

The call of Abraham who was 75 years old (Gen. 12:4)        0
Isaac born when Abraham was 100 years old (Gen. 21 :5)       25
Isaac was weaned and Ishmael was cast out when Isaac was 5 (this begins the 400-year period)      5
Jacob and Esau born when Isaac was 60 (Gen. 25.26)          55

9 Philip Mauro, The Chronology of the Bible, pp. 37-40 "
10 David L. Cooper, Messiah: His First Coming Scheduled, pp. 129-34.
11 Edwin R. Thiele, "Chronology, Old Testament," The Zondervan pictorial Bible Dictionary, ed. Merrill C. Tenney, pp. 166-67. This is in agreement with The Seventh-Day Adventist Bible Commentary, I, 184-, 192. Thiele is one of its contributors and it may be that he wrote the section "The Chronology of Early Bible History" (ibid., I, 174-96).
13 Rowley has gathered material of those in the Jewish tradition that hold to this position (H. H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, pp. 67-69).
14 Dewey M. Beegle (The Inspiration of Scripture, pp. 56-58) has another view which will not be considered separately. He thinks that there was a sojourn of 215 years in Palestine and one of 430 years in Egypt, thus making a total of 64-5 years. Hence he concludes that Paul's statement in Gal. 3:17 is inaccurate for he states: "Evidently it seemed good to the Holy Spirit to let Paul use the traditional 430 years without informing him that he was technically wrong and should be using 64-5 years as found in Hebrew" (ibid., p. 58). However, it is obvious that Beegle does not try to find a solution, rather he attempts to demonstrate inaccuracies within Scripture and yet be inspired (cf., ibid., pp. 189-93). But the present writer believes that one can plausibly resolve the problem and consequently the Scripture being inspired must be accurate in its details.
Jacob was 130 years old when he went to Egypt (Gen. 47:9, 28)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sub total} & \quad 215 \\
\text{Remaining 215 years were in Egypt} & \quad 215 \\
\text{Total} & \quad 430
\end{align*}
\]

Those who hold this position make a distinction between 430 years and 400 years. The 400-year period begins not with Isaac's birth but when he was acknowledged as the seed and heir and consequently Abraham cast out Hagar and Ishmael (Gen. 21:8-10). This 400-year sojourn is deduced from Genesis 15:13 and Acts 7:6 which states that the 400-year sojourn in a land that is not theirs is made by Abraham's seed which would have reference to Isaac at the time he was weaned.\(^{15}\)

The proponents of this view also mention the fact that in Genesis 15:16 it was prophesied that they would return to Palestine in the fourth generation which they did according to Exodus 6:16-20; Numbers 3:17-19; 26:57-59; I Chronicles 6:1-3; 23:6, 12, 13 (Jacob-Levi-Kohath-Amram-Moses).\(^{16}\) To fit four generations into a 215-year period is much more reasonable than a 430-year span.

In conclusion, the 430 years went from Abraham's call to the Exodus. The first 215 years was their sojourn in Palestine and the last 215 years in Egypt. The 400 years was from the weaning of Isaac to the time of the Exodus.

*Objections to the position.* Firstly, the tenor of Scripture for their sojourn in Egypt is more than 215 years. Both Genesis 15:13 and Acts 7:6 state that they will be in a land that is not theirs and be oppressed for 400 years.

Secondly, Galatians 3:17 does not state that the 430 years was from the time of Abraham's call to the time of the Mosaic covenant. Rather it is to be measured from the confirmation (not its institution) of the Abrahamic covenant until the Sinaitic covenant.

Thirdly, to say that Isaac was weaned and Ishmael was cast out when Isaac was five years old is mere guesswork. There is no statement in Scripture stating that Isaac became heir at five years of age. This is deduced from the need of


an extra five years after Isaac was born so as to make a total of thirty from the time of Abraham's call to Isaac's being weaned which would account for the 430 and 400-year periods. If one would carry this out logically then Isaac, Abraham's seed, would be the one in bondage for 400 years. All Genesis 15:13 and Acts 7:6 are saying is that Abraham's progeny would be sojourners and be afflicted for 400 years. This does not compel one to think it has reference to Isaac personally but that the descendents of Abraham sometime in the future will be in bondage for 400 years.

Fourthly, with regard to their return to Palestine in the fourth generation (Gen. 15:16), it seems evident that this would have reference to the 400 years mentioned in the same context (15:13). Thus each generation was thought of as 100 years (Abraham was 100 when he bore Isaac) and consequently the bondage would be four centuries. Furthermore, although the ancestry of Moses from Jacob through Levi, Kohath, and Amram is repeatedly given (Ex. 6:16-20; Num. 3:17-19; 26:57-59; I Chron. 6:1-3; 23:6, 12, 13), there are in Joshua 17:3 six generations from Joseph to Zelophehad, a Manassite who died in the wilderness wanderings; in Ruth 4:18-20 and I Chronicles 2:2-10 there are six generations from Judah to Nahshon, a tribe in the time of Moses; in I Chronicles 2:18 there are seven generations from Judah to Bezaleel, the builder of the tabernacle; and in I Chronicles 2:2; 7:20-27, 29 there are at least ten generations between Jacob and Joshua (Jacob-Joseph-Ephraim-Reseph-Resheph-Telah-Tahan-Ladan-Ammihud-Elishama-Nun-Joshua). Also Thiele succinctly states: "that some considerable period [between Jacob and the Exodus] was involved is clear from the fact that Joseph before his death saw the children of the third

17 The word הָלַל is translated generation but it may have the idea of a lifetime which of course would be longer than a generation, cf. W. F. Albright, "Abram the Hebrew: A New Archaeological Interpretation," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 163 (October, 1961), 50-51. This would mean that oppression in Egypt will last three full lifetimes and part of another, or 400 years.

18 Cf. C. F. Keil, The Pentateuch, II, 30. Beegle states: "While the genealogies indicate only four generations from Levi through Moses, the preponderance of evidence which archaeology offers at the present time favors the 430-year stay in Egypt as noted in the Hebrew text" (op. cit., p. 57). However, Beegle did not check the Hebrew text! As mentioned above, the Hebrew text does indicate more than four generations. Thus there is no discrepancy between the biblical text and archaeological evidence.
generation of both his sons (Gen. 50:23), and that at the time of the Exodus Amram and his brothers were already regarded as founders of clans.”

It is a well recognized fact that there are gaps in genealogies and thus the passages cited above which mention only three or four links account for only the most prominent figures in the line. Therefore, since there are at least ten generations during the Egyptian bondage, they "can hardly be reconciled with a mere 215 years (especially considering the longer life span of pre-Exodus Israelites), but it fits in very plausibly with an interval of 430 years."  

Fifthly, to have an increase from a family of seventy or seventy-five to a nation of more than two million (on the basis that there were 603,550 men of arms mentioned in Num. 1:46; 2:32) would need more than 215 years. Archer states that if one were able to cram seven generations into the 215-year period "there would have had to be an average of four surviving sons per father." This is high especially in the light of the severe bondage, at least in the last years, which would discourage having large families. However, assuming that from each married couple an average of three sons and three daughters were born for the first six generations and two sons and two daughters in the last four generations, Keil calculated that by the tenth generation there would be 478,224 sons over twenty years of age and 125,326 men of the ninth generation still living, hence making a total of 603,550 men by the 400th year of the sojourn who were more than twenty years old." This calculation is based on the ordinary number of births and is far more reasonable than trying to fit it into a 215-year span requiring an astronomical growth in such a short period.

19 Thiele, Zondervan Pictorial, p. 167.
21 The MT of Gen. 56:27 and Ex. 1:5 states that there were seventy persons of the house of Jacob who went into Egypt. In both of these passages the LXX states that there were seventy-five persons. In quoting from the Old Testament, Stephen follows the LXX of seventy-five persons (Acts 7:14). The difference can be resolved by the fact that the LXX adds in Gen. 46:27 three grandsons (Machir, Sutalaam, and Taam) and two great-grandsons (Galaad and Edom) which were probably taken from Num. 26:28-37 and/or I Chron. 7:14-22 (cf. Anstey, op. cit., I, 122; W. Arndt, Does the Bible Contradict Itself? pp.12-14).
22 Archer, op. cit., p. 212.
23 Keil, op. cit., II, 29. His calculation begins with the forty-one grandsons of Jacob and figures ten generations of forty years each making a total of 400 years.
In conclusion, from biblical and other lines of evidence an Egyptian bondage of 215 years is highly improbable and unlikely.

AN EGYPTIAN BONDAGE OF 430 YEARS

Statement of the position. The second most prevalent view is that the 430 years of Exodus 12:40-41 refers to the length of the Egyptian bondage and the 400 years of Genesis 15:13 and Acts 7:6 is only a round number is advocated by scholars such as Jack, Unger, Archer, Whitcomb, and Kitchen. Whitcomb thinks that the 400-year period as a round number is analogous to Paul's figure of "about 450 years" in Acts 13:19-20.

Objections to the position. Firstly, this view does not adequately explain the difference between the 430 years and the 400 years. To pass the 400 years off as only a round number seems to do an injustice to the text. The proponents of this view do not cite any other examples of such a phenomenon. Most of the authors cited above take other figures such as the 480 years in I Kings 6:1 and the 300 years in Judges 11:26 literally. Whitcomb's attempt to prove the use of a round number by using the analogy is untenable since Acts 13:19-20 specifically states it as being "about 450 years" which is not the case for the 400 years in Genesis 15:13 and Acts 7:6. This is especially noteworthy since Luke seems to be very interested in chronology.

Secondly, the advocates of this view usually have little or no discussion on the 430 years mentioned in Galatians 3:17. Kitchen states: "Paul in Gal. 3:17 is concerned to establish one single point: that the Law came long after God's covenant with Abraham. He therefore makes his point, not by laboriously calculating the actual interval between these events but simply and incisively by citing the well-known figure-the 430 years-included within that interval." However, can one really think this of Paul who was so well schooled in the

29 Whitcomb, op. dt., explanatory sheet.
Scriptures and the Jewish traditions?

Thirdly, it seems strange for Paul to give the duration of the Egyptian bondage as being, on the one hand, 430 years in Galatians 3:17 and, on the other hand, 400 years in Acts 13:16-20 (the actual figure is 450 years, but this would include the 400 years for bondage, 40 years for the wilderness journeys, and about 7 years for conquest--thus about 450 years). One would think that Paul would have been at least consistent.

Fourthly, those who hold to the 430-year period of Egyptian bondage make little, if any, attempt in trying to reconcile the "about 450 years" of Acts 13:19-20 and the 430 years of Exodus 12:40-41 and Galatians 3:17. An Egyptian bondage of 430 years plus a 40 year wilderness journey and about 7 years for the conquest of the land (all of which are included in Acts 13:16-20) would make a total of 477 years. Certainly the "about 450 years" cannot be stretched to 477 years!

Fifthly, if one holds to any sort of doctrine of inspiration it seems difficult to pass off the 400 years as a round number. Would not this allow great liberty in interpreting other numbers in the Scriptures? One must be careful and see if there is a reason for the differences in these two figures before relegating either figure as a "round number."

In conclusion, it seems that this view does not adequately explain all the biblical data.

AN EGYPTIAN BONDAGE OF 400 YEARS

Statement of the position. The Egyptian bondage refers to the 400-year period stated in Genesis 15:13, 16 and Acts 7:6. The 430 years expressed in Exodus 12:40-41 and Galatians 3:17 is that period of time from the confirmation of the Abrahamic covenant to the Mosaic covenant (which is only two months after the Exodus). There are several reasons for the tenability of this position.

First, Galatians 3:17 specifically states that the 430-year period began with the confirmation, not the institution, of the Abrahamic covenant. The last recorded confirmation of the Abrahamic covenant before going into Egypt was given to Jacob in Genesis 35:9-15. Jacob's name was confirmed as Israel at that time. It is interesting to note that Exodus
12:40-41 mentions that it was the children of Israel—not the children of Jacob—who sojourned for 430 years. Thus if one accepts Thiele's\textsuperscript{31} and Whitcomb's\textsuperscript{32} date of 1445 B.C. for the Exodus, the confirmation or the covenant would have been in 1875 B.C.

Second, it gives credence to the 400 years of Egyptian sojourn (mentioned in Gen. 15:13, 16; Acts 7:6) as being one of bondage. Thus if one accepts the above Exodus date, it would mean that Jacob and his family went to Egypt (Gen. 47:9, cf. 47:28) in 1845 B.C.

Third, this view does full justice to Acts 13:19-20 which states that it was about 450 years from the commencement of the Egyptian bondage until after the conquest of Palestine. This would mean 400 years for the Egyptian bondage, (40 years for the wilderness journey, and 7 years\textsuperscript{33} for the conquest of the land, making a total of 447 years or "about" 450 years" as the text states.

In conclusion, this view reconciles the 400, 430 and 450 years mentioned in the Scriptures for the duration of Israel's sojourn.

*Objection to the position.* One objection to this view which may be rightly raised is the fact that Exodus 12:40-41 states that their Egyptian bondage was 430 years.

Several observations must be made. First, both Exodus 12:40-41 and Galatians 3:17 speak nothing of a bondage lasting 430 years but only of a sojourn lasting that long. On the other hand Genesis 15:13, 16 and Acts 7:6 speak specifically of a 400-year bondage in a land that is not theirs, namely Egypt. Hence, the 430-year sojourn would include the 400-year bondage in Egypt plus another 30 years of sojourning outside of Egypt.

Second, there is a need for a review of the various translations of the relative pronoun \textit{rwx} of Exodus 12:40. The ASV and RSV translated it that, its antecedent being "time"


\textsuperscript{32} Whitcomb, *op. cit.*, chart and explanatory sheet. Of course this is based on Thiele's work.

\textsuperscript{33} This is calculated from Josh. 14:7, 19 where Caleb states that from the division of the land back to the time when Moses sent him as one of the spies from Kadesh-barnae was a period of 45 years. Since he was sent as a spy in the second year of their wilderness journey one would subtract 38 remaining years which would leave 7 years for the conquest of the land.
whereas the AV translates it who which refers back to "the children of Israel." Since רָעָשִׁי is indeclinable and its antecedent may be singular or plural and may be of either gender, it allows for great latitude in translation. However, here it seems best to have "the children of Israel" as its antecedent rather than the word "time." The reasons are twofold. Firstly, the phrase "the children of Israel" would be closer in position to רָעָשִׁי. Secondly the noun מָאוֹשֵׁב which comes from בֵּית which has the primary meaning to sit, rest, dwell and hence the noun is translated dwelling-place, dwelling, dwellers, assembly, or seat. The ASV and RSV translation time is a derived and secondary meaning. In fact מָאוֹשֵׁב which occurs forty-four times in the Old Testament is never so rendered by the ASV and RSV translators in any other place except in Exodus 12:40. Even in Exodus 12:20 they translate it habitations and dwellings respectively. Thus the AV translation sojourning is an acceptable rendering. This would mean that the clause ("who dwelt in Egypt") would be nonrestrictive and only gives additional information concerning the sojourners. The commencement of their sojourning would have been the last confirmation of the Abrahamic covenant as given in Genesis 35:9-15, if one notices that from Genesis 35 onwards the children of Israel never remained in one place in Canaan but were always travelling (cf. Gen. 35:16, 21, 27; in 37:1 they dwelt in the land of Canaan with no specific location mentioned).

Thirdly, it is interesting to notice that whereas in Exodus 12:40 the MT has "now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years. . . ." the SP and LXX has "now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt (the LXX has it in inverted order), was 430 years. . . ." This indicates that the sojourning would include Canaan and Egypt. Although the present writer does not put much stock in the SP and the LXX as far as chronological matters, this inclusion may point back to some early tradition in the text. It is somewhat diffi-

35 Cf. Cooper op. cit., pp. 129-30. Notice in the first part of this article when translating Exodus 12:40-41, the clause "who dwelt in Egypt" is set off by commas. For clarity it could be rendered: Now the sojourning of the children of Israel (who dwelt in Egypt) was 430 years. . . ."
cult to explain its inclusion except that there was some sort of early tradition for this reading.

Therefore, it seems that if one will take the 430 years as the period from the last recorded confirmation of the Abrahamic covenant to Israel (Jacob) before going into Egypt (Gen. 35:9-15) until the time of the Exodus, the 400 years would be that period of time when the nation Israel was in Egypt, that is, from the time when Jacob and his family entered Egypt (Gen. 46) until the Exodus. The phrase "about 450 years" (Acts 13:19-20) would consist of the 400 years of bondage plus the 40 years of wilderness wanderings plus the 7 years for conquering the land of Palestine which makes a total of 447 years or "about 450 years."

IV. THE CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

After considering the two more well-known theories in the attempt to resolve the apparent discrepancies concerning the length of the Egyptian bondage, a third view was presented which takes into account and better explains all the biblical data. Assuming the 1445 B.C. date for the Exodus, it could be charted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirmation of Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 35:9-15)</th>
<th>Jacob and Joseph goes to Egypt (Gen. 37)</th>
<th>Exodus and Mosaic Covenant (Gen. 40)</th>
<th>Conquest at Canaan (Josh. 14:7,10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"430 years sojourn (Ex. 12:40-41; Gal. 3:17)"

"400 years bondage"

(Gen 15:13,16; Acts 7:6)

"447 years = Ca. 450 years (Acts 13:19-20)"
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MISCARRIAGE OR PREMATURE BIRTH:

ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS ON EXODUS 21:22-25*

H. WAYNE HOUSE

THE interpretation of Exodus 21:22-25 has received much attention in the last few years in evangelical circles. This writer's interest was sparked from the article "Old Testament Texts Bearing on Abortion" by Bruce Waltke in Christianity Today and another essay by Waltke in Birth Control and the Christian. In addition, the various interactions between Waltke, John Warwick Montgomery, and Jack Cottrell provided too much interest for me not to examine the area anew for myself. This paper is an exegesis of Exodus 21:22-25 with special attention given to Waltke's position.1

Several basic studies must be done before this passage will lay itself open for the interpreter: (1) One must understand the meaning of ניִּעַי in the text and ascertain whether the translation of the term as "miscarriage," as found in most translations, is correct. (2) Also, one must determine whether the use of הַיָּלָד, the normal word for child, is to be understood as an unborn child of equal worth with an adult, or whether the child was only of property value in the Hebrew culture. (3) Since several Near Eastern legal documents have similar passages, should one consider the Mosaic statement dependent on these, and so to be similarly interpreted? (4) a question of importance

*This paper was delivered at the First Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Section of the Evangelical Theological Society on April 22, 1977 at Dallas Theological Seminary.

1 Waltke has revised some of his thinking on the question of abortion since the publication of the above mentioned works. He recognized the importance of Cottrell's arguments against his position but retorts: "Although I still think that interpretation [the viewpoint on Ex. 21:22-25 he offered] is the proper one, Cottrell made a good case against it and the evidence supporting it is less than conclusive." (JETS, 19, No. 1, 1976, 3). Though I deeply respect the exacting scholarship of Waltke, I think that Cottrell has given us the proper direction for the understanding of this passage.
is whether יָדָע (harm) refers to the mother or child, or both, and what degree of harm is involved in the word יָדָע. (5) How is the lex talionis of verses 24-25 related to verse 22? (6) One must then decide the value of the passage for study on the abortion question.

The importance of interpreting Exodus 21:22 becomes apparent when one reads a statement on the moral legitimacy of abortion such as what follows:

A second argument in favor of permitting induced abortion is that God does not regard the fetus as a soul [Hebrew nephesh], no matter how far gestation has progressed. Therefore, the fetus does not come under the protection of the fifth commandment. That he does not so regard the fetus can be demonstrated by noting that God does not impose a death penalty for the destruction of a fetus. A basic feature of the Mosiac Code is the lex talionis, or principle of ‘an eye for an eye, life for life’ (e.g. Lev. 24:28). The law plainly exacts: ‘If a man kills any human life [Hebrew nephesh adam] he will be put to death’. But according to Exodus 21:22ff, the destruction of a fetus is not a capital offense. The divine law reads: ‘When men struggle together and one of them pushes a pregnant woman and her children come forth but no mischief happens, he shall be fined according as the woman’s husband exact from him ... But if harm does ensue, then you shall impose soul [nephesh] for soul [nephesh] . . . ’ (Ex. 21:22-24). Clearly, then, in contrast to the mother, the fetus is not reckoned as a soul [nephesh]. The money compensation does not seem to have been imposed in order to protect the fetus but to indemnify the father for his loss.2

In contrast to the above translation, Cassuto presents the most accurate rendition of which this writer is aware of the intent of Exodus 21:22:

When men strive together and they hurt unintentionally a woman with child, and her children come forth but no mischief happens—that is, the woman and the children do not die—the one who hurts her shall surely be punished by a fine. But if any mischief happens, that is, if the woman dies or the children, then you shall give life for life.3

THE TRANSLATION OF אצוי

Cassuto translates אצוי as "come forth," a translation contrary to the NASB, RSV, NEB, and a host of others, in addition to a number of ancient and modern commentators. Most, like Waltke, take אצוי as the "child miscarries or aborts"; however, there seems to be no lexicographical or impelling contextual reason for doing so. The consistent use of אצוי in the Hebrew Old Testament hears out the meaning "come or go out." Not only is this true, but אצוי is found in specific texts concerning childbirth.

Gen. 25:25 ויצא הרוחון אידר מנו
And the first came out (was born) red

Gen. 38:28 ויצא ראשה הוה
This one came out (was born) first

Also the adjoining passages Gen 25:26 and Gen 38:29 read similarly.

The Ugaritic uses a cognate for אצוי. Although this writer did not find an example in Ugaritic texts for "birth," the term was consistently used to mean "come out":

Text 68:2 [ ] hy [ ] lassi. hm. ap. amr [ ]
[I shall bring them out]

Text 68:6 [b] ph. rgm. lysa. bspth. wtn gh. kgr
From his mouth the word went forth
From his lips, his utterance

4 Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1907), pp. 422-25. It gives "go or come out" as the basic meaning. Then it lists a number of synonyms. The Ex 21:22 passage is mentioned as meaning "untimely birth." Not one time, however is אצוי used for miscarriage.

5 Cf. also Job 1:21; 3:11; Eccles 5:15; Jer 1:5; 20:18. In one passage, Nurn 12:12, NY+ is used for a still-born birth, but this still is not a miscarriage.

Even as \( ys' \) in Ugaritic, נֵסֶר basically means what the Greek word ἔξελθομαι, conveys, "from within to without." The LXX renders the phrase in question καὶ ἐξέλθη τὸ παιδίου αὐτῆς. So then one may agree with Jackson:

Exod. xxi refers not to a miscarriage, but rather to a premature birth, a *Fruhgeburt*, not a *Fehlgeburt*. This view is not entirely new. Geiger was of the opinion in 1857, and Kiel & Delitzsh, basing themselves on yeladeyhah, and Dillmann also voiced it. Budde objected to it, and Jacob, apparently the last author to have considered this possibility, gave it some approval. But none of these authors considered the evidence in any detail, or attempted to explain the historical development of the law.\(^7\)

Had Moses intended to convey the idea of "miscarriage," he certainly would have used the Hebrew word for miscarriage, שׁבל. This term is used several times in the Pentateuch,\(^8\) as well as elsewhere:

- **Gen 31:38** וְלֹא שׁבָלָם ἡ μάτωμα הַיָּנוֹת<br>  Your ewes and she-goats have not cast (aborted) their young

- **Hos. 9:14** καὶ δόθη στῇ τῇ μεσκᾶλι<br>  Give them a miscarrying womb

- **Ex. 23:26** καὶ δόθη στῇ τῇ μεσκᾶλι βαρὰρ<br>  There shall none be casting (aborting) their young in your land

Hebrew שׁבל has a cognate in Ugaritic, which is τκλ.\(^9\) It apparently carries the significance of the Hebrew term:

- **Text 52:8** mt. wsr. ytb. bdh. ht. tkl. bdh<br>  In his hand is the staff of privation
  In his hand is the staff of bereavement

---

\(^7\) Bernard S. Jackson, "The Problem of Exod. XXI 22-23 (IUS Talionis)," *Vetus Testamentum*, XXIII, 3 (July, 1973), 273-304.

\(^8\) Cf also II Kings 2:19, 21; Isa. 47:8; cf BDB, pp. 1013-1014 for further confirmation.

\(^9\) Root possibly *yld* or *ys'*. 
In addition Virolleaud cites *tkl bmwth* (RS 24. 244:62) "'she (sps) renders sterile his (Hrn's) creative powers'."\(^{10}\) Here the sense might either be a forced sterility or making ineffective the results of his creative ability and so abortion.

**THE MEANING OF וַיֶּלֶד**

Those who would use the passage under discussion as a proof text for abortion seek to differentiate between the fetus and a human being. To quote Waltke again, "God does not regard the fetus as a soul ... no matter how far gestation has progressed." The reason that Waltke believes this is that "God does not impose a death penalty for the destruction of a fetus."\(^{11}\) As will be seen in further discussion, God does require the death penalty for the death of a fetus; our immediate concern is to show that the Hebrew did not distinguish between a fetus and a child already born. Keil, in his commentary on Exodus, when discussing this passage, sees the word וַיֶּלֶד as strategic to his argument.\(^{12}\) וַיֶּלֶד refers in Hebrew literature to a "child, son, boy, youth."\(^{13}\)

There seems to be no distinction in Moses’ mind between a fetus and a normal child. One could posit ignorance on his part, since he did not have the advantage of our arbitrary scientific terminology, but it seems that equal value is on the born and unborn. There also seems no reason to assign arbitrarily a different status to the וַיֶּלֶד of Exodus 21:22, especially with a correct understanding of אֶלֶף, than to the וַיֶּלֶד of Isaiah 9:6 (5).

Montgomery refers to Kiel for evidence of וַיֶּלֶד referring to a child, not only a fetus, with which interpretation Waltke differs:

\(^{10}\) Gordon, *UT, Glossary*, p. 502, entry 2674.

\(^{11}\) Waltke, p. 10. Waltke has subsequently changed his thinking concerning this issue. He has since concluded that the fetus is fully human, its life seminally mediated through the parents, and a possessor, from conception, of the image of God. Bruce K. Waltke, "Reflections from the Old Testament on Abortion," *JETS*, 19, 1 (Winter, 1976), 5-13.


\(^{13}\) BDB, p. 409.
In addition, Montgomery is mistaken when he says: ‘The equality of mother and unborn child in Exodus 21 is upheld ... by a classic Old Testament scholar such as the nineteenth-century Protestant Delitzsch.’ In reality, Keil (not Delitzsch) is making a different point; namely, the child in question is not a fetus but a fully developed human being. Lange calls this interpretation ‘strange’. Obviously, Keil’s interpretation has nothing to do with Montgomery’s conclusion.14

Yet contrary to Waltke, it is not obvious that Keil is referring to a fully developed human being, since the statement by Keil on this issue reads thus:

If men strove and thrust against a woman with child, who had come near or between them for the purpose of making peace, so that her child come out (come into the world), and no injury was done either to the woman or the child that was born, a pecuniary compensation was to be paid, such as the husband of the woman laid upon him ... because even if no injury had been done to the woman and the fruit of her womb, such a blow might have endangered life.”15

Waltke, in interpreting Keil’s comment on this passage, apparently overlooked the context of Keil’s statement. Keil was arguing with Philo and others who viewed the child in the passage as not having assumed human form yet in the womb and so to be considered less than a human being:

But the arbitrary character of this explanation is apparent at once; for only denotes a child, as a fully developed human being [but here Keil understands a fully developed human being inside the womb, not one already born as Waltke intimates, so still a fetus], and not the fruit of the womb before it has assumed human form.16

In addition to the statement of Keil, the biblical text speaks of a premature birth, as will be demonstrated shortly. One wonders what differentiates the unborn child from the born child, unless one presupposes a creationist viewpoint? And, actually what more viability does a new born child have than the unborn? What new factor has entered in that could consider one death just an unfortunate miscarriage, and the other murder? The

15 Keil and Delitzsch, pp. 134-35.
16 Ibid., footnote 1, pp. 134-35.
point that is put forth here is that the Hebrew writers do not differentiate between child born or unborn.

Waltke now acknowledges the truth of this statement:

No evangelical would deny that a baby is a human being and that it is made in the image of God, that is, that it has the capacity for spiritual, rational and moral response. The question, then, is ‘Does the fetus have that capacity?’ The answer is that it does and that this capacity was already present at the time of conception.17

Before passing from the discussion on דָּלִים the reason for the plural will be briefly presented. Keil says that "the plural הֵדָלִים is employed for the purpose of speaking indefinitely, because there might possibly be more than one child in the womb."18 Something more than what Keil has suggested may be involved in the text since the "irregularity of the situation is the fact that the birth is prematurely and maliciously induced."19 The use of הֵדָלִים may be a plural "to indicate natural products in an unnatural condition,"20 giving added evidence for a premature birth being involved in the text.

NEAR EASTERN LAWS ON MISCARRIAGE

Several Near Eastern codes speak to the subject of miscarriage caused by an injury to the woman; intentional abortion was not the normal practice: "foeticide, throughout the course of history, has never become a recognized social practice, but has been in the main sporadic."21 In the Old Testament legal codes there are many laws governing man's relationship to his fellow man, though these are not the oldest Semitic laws:

The Pentateuch does not contain the oldest system of Semitic laws which is found in the jurisprudence of Babylon,

18 Keil and Delitzsch, p. 135.
20 Ronald J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax, an Outline (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1967), p. 8, paragraph 10. I owe credit for this observation to Barry Craig, a former classmate at Western Conservative Baptist Seminary.
mainly as laid down in the Code of Hammurabi. The instances given in this code of the rule of ‘measure for measure’ go far beyond the ‘eye for an eye’ of the Mosaic code, even when the latter is taken in its most literal sense. Thus, where a man strikes a pregnant free-born woman so as to cause her death through miscarriage (cf. the case put in Ex. xxi. 22-23) under that old Babylonian code . . . the daughter of the assailant should be put to death. Again, when through the carelessness of the builder a house falls and the owner’s son is struck and killed in the ruins, the builder's son should be put to death. This extravagant application of the ‘measure for measure’ law is made impossible in Israel by Deut. xxiv. 16—‘Fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers.’

From the previous quote one may see that although there is similarity between the basic idea of lex talionis in the Babylonian and Mosaic codes, there is no necessity for there to be exact parallel. This point is important to the discussion that follows.

Waltke believes that a primary argument in favor of allowing induced abortion is the absence of any biblical text forbidding it:

Here we must appeal to the literature of the Ancient Near East to weigh this negative evidence. In this case the silence of the Bible is significant because an Assyrian law dated between 1450 B.C. and 1250 B.C. prescribed death by torture in cases of induced abortion. The text reads: ‘If a woman by her own deed has cast [aborted] that which is within her womb, and a charge has been brought and proved against her, they shall impale her and not bury her. If she dies from casting that which is in her womb, they shall impale her and not bury her.’

22 The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol X, ed. Isidore Singer (New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1905), 385. Findings at Ebla were not publicized when this paper was written and I have not had opportunity to examine the legal material that may be available from that site. An interesting parallel to the Ex 21:22 passage is found in a papyrus of 89 B.C.: "An inhabitant of Hermopolis complained that another woman ‘met me in the square of Hermes by the court there, and attacking me in consequence of a dispute gave me many blows with her hands on every part of my body, and it was the fifth month that I was with child. The blows caused me to be laid up with sickness and my life is endangered. I inform you in order that T. be brought up and secured until my case be ascertained in the appointed period, so that if anything happens to me, she may be treated according to the enactments concerning such conduct, and if I survive, I may obtain satisfaction from her as is right (λαβω παρ’ αυτης το δικαιον ως καθηκει). Jackson, pp. 295-96.

Again another example is given

With respect to an accidental miscarriage the contrast between the Mosaic law and the Assyrian law is once again instructive. In a similar context the Assyrian law reads: ‘If a seignior struck another seignior's wife and caused her to have a miscarriage, they shall treat the wife of the seignior who caused the other seignior's wife to have a miscarriage, as he treated her: he shall compensate for her fetus with a life. However, if that woman died, they shall put the seignior to death; he shall compensate for her fetus with a life. But when that woman's husband has no son, if some struck her so that she had a miscarriage, they shall put the striker to death; even if her fetus is a girl he shall compensate with a life.’ We should note this contrast between the Assyrian Law and the Mosaic: the Old Testament, in contrast to the Assyrian Code, never reckons the fetus as equivalent to a life.  

Waltke's arguments for induced abortion are twofold: (1) Since the Old Testament does not forbid such an act, in light of other ancient Near Eastern literature that does, it must be legitimate. (2) Nothing is legislated in the Old Testament against abortion as is common in other crimes.

Scott aptly replies to both these problems, first:

In reply one might question the prevalence of abortion among the Israelites whenever the surrounding civilization prohibited it. If we assume that it was not common in the Old Testament community, then we may regard the absence of any Biblical text forbidding it as being due to its exceptional occurrence. What is exceptional scarcely requires an explicit prohibition.

And Scott answers the second argument:

"Again one could argue that this could well be due to the exceptional occurrence of abortion, not only in Israel, but in the surrounding communities." 

One may readily see that an argument from silence, as Waltke has presented, is of very little value, and certainly does not de-

24 Ibid., p. 11. Waltke argues from this law that the death penalty is required in Assyria for inducing an abortion by striking a woman. That is true, if the woman also dies, but the quotation may suggest that the death of the fetus only calls for the death of another fetus unless the man has no heir." C. E. Cerling, Jr., "Abortion and Contraception in Scripture," Christian Scholars Review (Fall, 1971), 42-58.

serve a primary place in argumentation, as he has made it. In this argument of silence the most that would be achieved would be a "stand-off." One could just as easily argue that since there is no prohibition of euthanisia, it too is acceptable (apart from the theological issue of the soul). In reality, all the discussion concerning the lack of lex talionis for the fetus does not apply, since the passage does not deal with abortion, but premature birth, as shall be demonstrated later. Though one might wonder why the Mosaic legislation does not speak to the same issue as does the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Hittite codes, even in view of Scott's reply, a casuistic law, such as Exodus 21:22f, cannot envisage all possibilities. In addition, one familiar with legal literature of the Bible realizes that in many areas the laws of Israel and those of the surrounding nations are not identical. On the contrary, though the writer realizes the exception with Scott, one could argue that the principle in foreign law was so common that it need not be mentioned in the Mosaic law. Thus this line of argument from silence is both perilous, unfruitful, and highly speculative.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF נָתָן

To whom does the נָתָן, refer in verse 22, and what kind of "harm or injury" is to be understood? Montgomery argues that Exodus 21:22-24 does not distinguish between the life of the mother and the life of the child in meting out punishment. The נָתָן could be either to the mother or child, and if either one was injured, lex talionis came into play. Cerling believes that "Waltke gives an adequate answer to this interpretation [the immediately preceding one] when he says that it is possible, but improbable, and rejected by most translations and many commentators." In the Near East may account for the rarity of abortion. Children, born and unborn, were apparently held in high esteem, especially male children. Even child sacrifice, which prima facie is total disregard for the young lives, may be seen, in view of the sacredness of the event for the worshippers, as an offering of their very best. The total lack of a case law on abortion or miscarriage in Israel may he due to the concern for the family name making it unnecessary. As well, it may be due to a Messianic consciousness, of Messiah coming through a Jewish woman, making abortion, or the like, totally unthinkable, and certainly needing no law to counteract it.

Cerling, p. 51, footnote 50.
This viewpoint, no doubt, is why the NASB translates the passage, "she has a miscarriage, yet there is no further injury, he shall surely be fined as the woman's husband may demand of him." Cottrell speaks pointedly to the issue:

The second point I wish to defend is, as stated above, that any injury to the child no less than to the mother would demand the application of the lex talionis. That is, of course, contrary to the popular understanding, in which verse 22 refers to a case in which the fetus is killed but no other harm ensues, the death of the fetus being considered a minor injury that deserves to be penalized only by a fine. According to this view, then, verse 23 would be talking about some further harm of a much more serious nature, i.e., an injury to the mother herself. Only if the mother received injury would ‘an eye for an eye' be required, or ‘a life for a life.'

To add other or further to the text is simply to miss the argument, and also not to understand the meaning of נַפְסָק. The legislation is to be understood as saying that if a pregnant woman is injured so that her child is prematurely born, but no bodily harm or injury takes place, the man liable to the charge must pay a fine for his action. Cottrell states: "The fine presumably is imposed because of the danger to which mother and child are exposed and the parents’ distress in connection with the unnaturally premature birth." The נַפְסָק refers to either the mother or the child as Keil fitly retorts to the alternate view:

In a manner no less arbitrary נַפְסָק has been rendered by Onkelos and the Rabbins אַיְָנוּל, death, and the clause is made to refer to the death of the mother alone, in opposition to the penal sentence in vers. 23, 24, which not only demands life for life, but eye for eye, etc., and therefore presupposes not death alone, but injury done to particular members. The omission of נַל, also, apparently renders it impracticable to refer the words to injury done to the woman alone.

---

28 Cottrell, p. 8.
29 Ibid. Also Jackson, p. 296: "... the fact that the lives of the foetus and the woman were endangered may be a sufficient reason for liability," and again, "The danger of stillbirth, regarded with horror in Biblical times, may be another reason for the sanction."
30 Keil and Delitzsch, p. 135, footnote 1. Also Jackson, p. 293: "... LXX and Philo preserve the meaning of the original, in that they take aswēn, both in v. 22 and in v. 23, to refer to the child. Moreover, the reason why the unusual word aswēn is here used now finds an explanation. Had it referred to the woman, it would be impossible to understand why
Those who believe the passage deals with the paying of a fine because of the miscarriage, and there not being any other harm to the mother, encounter difficulty in that their interpretation does not fit the meaning of יִלְדָּה. BDB gives little help in understanding the word, giving "mischief, evil, harm" as the meaning. The last term, "harm," has been followed by most.

Jackson says that the usage of the word outside this passage gives no support for a minor injury to be understood in Exodus 21:22, 23: "According to this view, (minor injury) aswn may refer to any injury. It thus comprehends the loss of the foetus in v. 22, the death of the mother in v. 23, and the whole range of injuries listed in vv. 24-25. But the usage of the word elsewhere provides no support for this." He then continues his discussion noting the other occurrences of the word in the Old Testament, in the Joseph story in Genesis. Three occurrences besides the Exodus passage are in the Joseph story. Jacob sent his son to buy grain in Egypt but he did not send Benjamin lest harm (ילדה) befall him (Gen. 42.4). Later when Joseph insisted that Benjamin come to Egypt Jacob's reply was that some harm might occur to Benjamin and so he would be in sorrow to the grave (v. 38). This same plea was given by Jacob's sons before their brother Joseph to the effect that their father would be in lifelong mourning if harm occurred to their younger brother Benjamin. Jackson then says that the harm Jacob anticipated as possible for Benjamin was death and although the word does not inevitably mean death it certainly would not apply to a trivial injury: "Driver was correct in taking it to refer to 'some serious, or even fatal, bodily injury.'"

The normal word for death was not used. But where a foetus is concerned, any hesitation to use the normal terminology of death is quite reasonable. It is also avoided by the ancient Near Eastern sources.

31 BDB, p. 62.

32 Jackson, pp. 274-75. Jackson, though, has difficulty with the lexicon that follows the 11::K: "But can all the injuries enumerated in vv. 24-25 be serious enough to constitute aswn? Loss of an eye, hand, or foot may be conceded. More difficult are kewiyah, petza and haburah. But the notion that loss of a tooth is as aswn is quite inconsistent with the meaning of the word." Ibid., 274. His conclusion is based upon a partial word study allowing too narrow a meaning for יִלְדָּה, though for his part the lexicons of Holladay and Koehler-Baumgärtner define יִלְדָּה as "mortal accident," and "deathly accident." William L. Holliday, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerd-
Jackson should be tempered a little in his understanding of \textit{N\textsuperscript{v}s\textit{x}} in view of the rarity of the word. He surely demonstrates that the word refers to severe or even fatal injury, but the text in Exodus, the only other section of the Old Testament using the word, could allow for \textit{N\textsuperscript{v}s\textit{x}} to be applied to a lesser injury. One may conclude that a fine was exacted on the liable person because of either mental or physical discomfort he had caused. If bodily harm (\textit{N\textsuperscript{v}s\textit{x}}) of any significant amount (eye, burn, bruise, etc.) took place against the mother or child, the principle of retaliation took over. As Cottrell concludes, "The text will permit no other understanding."\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{THE LEX TALIONIS}

The \textit{lex talionis} was the law of retaliation in the Ancient Near Eastern legal codes. If an individual was injured or killed, the same injury, or death, was to happen to the offender. In the Assyrian stipulations, as seen previously, if one caused an abortion on the part of a seignior's wife, then the wife of the one who caused the other woman to have an abortion was caused to have an abortion. Exactly the same kind of injury was required. "Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth," then was the \textit{lex talionis}. In the \textit{lex talionis} of the Exodus passage, "life for life" was required for the death (fatal accident, \textit{N\textsuperscript{v}s\textit{x}}) of either child or mother.\textsuperscript{34}

Jackson has difficulty in understanding the entire statement of \textit{lex talionis} as referring to the \textit{N\textsuperscript{v}s\textit{x}} of verses 22, 23. The referring of the "eye for eye, tooth for tooth," hardly could be considered a mortal accident. One would have to see the harm as a very general term, as seen in the Living Bible:

If two men are fighting, and in the process hurt a pregnant woman so that she has a miscarriage, but she lives, then the

\textsuperscript{33} Cottrell, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{34} Contra. J. K. Mikliszanski, "The Law of Retaliation and the Pentateuch," \textit{JBL} 66 (1947), 297: "But significative about this [the Ex 21:24-25 lex talionis] is that exactly when life is to be undoubtedly paid with life the Pentateuch does not use the expression of 'life-for-life' but says in unequivocal terms: 'he shall surely be put to death' (Ex. 21:12; Lev. 24:17)."
man who injured her shall be fined whatever amount the woman's husband shall demand, and as the judges approve. But if any harm comes to the woman and she dies, he shall be executed. If her eye is injured, injure his; if her tooth is knocked out, knock out his; and so on--hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, lash for lash.

With the above translation, understanding the meaning of מִשְׁגָּחִי is obviously difficult. Jackson sees the law of retaliation in the Exodus 21:24, 25 passage as an interpolation. This would solve all the problems. There being no textual evidence against the reading militates against the interpolation, unless one should argue only from subjective, prejudicial opinion. Mikliszanski presents a possible solution to the problem:

Considered separately, the last two verses could rightly be taken as meaning literally evil for evil, or lex talionis, according to which the culprit is to suffer on his body the very same injury he had inflicted on his victim. However, as stated above, a written law must not be separated from its context. In the quoted context ‘eye-for-eye’ is preceded by ‘life-for-life,’ an expression that cannot mean penalty of death in view of the fact that, whether the ‘mischief’ refers to the death of the unborn child or of the woman, the killing was accidental; the Mosaic law does not require death for unintentional murder. ‘Life-for-life’ is not to be taken in its literal sense, but in the sense of proper and full compensation; notwithstanding the wording, the expression cannot literally be the lex talionis. Hence there is no reason to believe that ‘eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand,’ etc., uttered in the same connection, are to be understood as implying real retaliation. Besides, the provisions of blemish for blemish refer to accidentally injuring a pregnant woman, and it would be against the spirit of the Biblical code to assume that such unintentional injury be punished by corporal mutilation. The only possible way of restituting is to pay an indemnity, for as far as damages are concerned, there is no difference between intentional or unintentional acts.

The suggestions of Mikliszanski could alleviate much of the problem, but Ancient Near Eastern evidence seems to point out that the kind of retaliation mentioned in the biblical text was not unusual at all for that culture. The basic problem is to see the verses containing the lex talionis as being both the concluding of one idea and the introduction of others. The entire statement

35 Jackson, p. 291.
36 Mikliszanski, p. 296.
of the *lex talionis* then would not be intended to refer to the possible fatal injury but a concatenation, a joining with what follows. The difficulty with this view is the lack of smooth transition with what follows.

When the mother or child received no injury, the liable person was to pay a fine, according to what the husband would dictate, and the judges would determine. Some have had doubts about this portion of Scripture, even to the point of changing the Hebrew word ומילא יי to מילא יי "for the miscarriage."\(^{37}\) Probably Morgenstern presents the best way to view this supposed inconsistency:

> It goes without saying, of course, that this law never contemplated that the husband could demand of the offending party any sum of money or any other compensation that he might desire, for then there could well be no limit to what he might claim. Some method of regulation of the demand of the husband, so that it might be kept within reasonable limits, was absolutely indispensable; and just this must have been provided for in the last two words of the sentence. Now among the Bedouin, in cases of litigation such as this, where a fine or damages must be paid by one party to another, this amount may be fixed by the sheikh, or in extreme cases by the gady. But not infrequently each party chooses an umpire to represent him. Through the mutual discussion of these umpires, and by a process of bargaining or of give and take, the matter is eventually settled and the size of the fine fixed.\(^{38}\)

### VALUE OF EXODUS 21:22-25 FOR THE QUESTION OF ABORTION

One may see from what has been read thus far that the passage under discussion in Exodus does not concern induced abortion, or miscarriage at all, but instead the purpose of its inclusion is to protect the rights of a pregnant wife and her unborn child. Both are seen as equal in value in the Mosaic casuistic legislation. Even though the weight of scholarly opinion favors an alternate view of this text, as Cottrell put it, "The weight of

---


scholarly opinion . . . is outweighed by the text itself."39 The text then gives no credence to abortion of the fetus but rather reveals the sanctity of both adult and fetal life.

CONCLUSION

The various difficulties posed tip to this point concerning the ἐνδοκαταστατικός and the lex talionis vanish when one views the passage as presenting the situation envisioned in the following paraphrase of Exodus 21:22-25:

And if men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child so that she has a premature birth, yet there is no significant bodily injury, to the mother or child, he shall surely be fined (in view of initiating the traumatic experience) as the woman's husband may demand of him; and he shall pay as the judges decide. But if there is a significant bodily injury to the mother or child, then you shall appoint as a penalty, and according to that which applies, life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise.

This study has presented the teaching of Exodus 21:22-25, especially as it relates to the present controversy on abortion. It has discovered that the passage does not deal with a miscarriage caused by the injury of a pregnant woman in a physical struggle as is so often viewed. Instead the passage concerns a woman who was struck in a struggle and so prematurely gave birth. If there was no bodily injury resulting to the mother or child because of the blow, the liable man was to pay a fine to the woman's husband as he decreed and as it was judged fair by the judges. If bodily injury did occur to the woman or her child, lex talionis was enforced depending on the extent of the injury, from life for life to bruise for bruise. The passage, then, gives no support whatsoever to the legitimacy of abortion.

Longview, Texas

39 Cottrell, p. 9.
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SHEWBREAD

A. R. S. Kennedy

SHEWBREAD.--'Shewbread,' formed apparently on the pattern of Luther's 
Schaubrot, is the tr. first adopted by Tindale, of the Heb. 
шибка (פִּיתִים) לָהּת 'bread of the presence [of J'], of which, accordingly, the more correct tr. is that proposed by 
RVm, viz. 'presence-bread.'

It has been usual hitherto to assign the introduction of the term 'shewbread' 
to Coverdale (see, e.g., Plummer's Luke, 167). But it is found as early as 1526 in 
Tindale's New Testament, He 9:2 'and the shewe bread which is called whoely'
(Offor's reprint). Curiously enough, Tindale not only uses other renderings in the 
Gospels ('the halowed loves,' Mt 12:4, Mk 2:26; 'loves of halowed breed,' Lk 6:4), 
but retains the same inconsistency in his revised edition of 1534, after he had 
adopted ' shewbred' in his Pentateuch of 1530. In the latter on its first occurrence 
(Ex 25:30) be adds the marginal note: 'Shewbred, because it was alway in the 
presence and sight of the Lorde' (see Mombert's reprint, in loc.). Wyclif had 
naturally followed the Vulgate (see below) with 'breed of proposicioun.' The 
Protestant translators and revisers who succeeded Tindale give ' shewbread' in OT, 
'shewe loves," shewbreads,' and 'shewbread' in NT, the last, by the end of the 16th 
cent. being firmly established in both Testaments (the Rheims version, however, 
retaining 'loaves of proposition').

1. NOMENCLATURE.--On the occasion of the earliest historical mention 
of the presence-bread (לָהּת פִּיתִים 1 S 21:6 [Heb.7]) it is also termed 'holy 
bread' (ышר הלחם. ib. 5. 6. [6. 7] RV; AV 'hallowed bread'). The former term is 
that used throughout the Priests' Code (P) of the Pentateuch, with the addition of 
the name 'continual bread' (דַּמְיָה לָהְמִים) Nu 4:7b; cf. 'bread' only Ex 40:23). In the 
post-exilic period we meet with another designation, viz. 'the pile-bread' 
(חַלְמְדִים) 1 Ch 9:32 23:29; Neh 10:33, but with the terms reversed 2 Ch 
13:11, cf. He 9:2; also חַלְמְדִים מֶשֶךְ alone 2 Ch 24). This name is due to the fact that 
the loaves were arranged upon the table in two piles (פְּרוֹת הַפְּרֹת Lv 24:6; this, the 
rendering of RVm, suits the facts better than the 'rows' of the text of EV). The 
tr. varies considerably in the Gr. versions, the most literal rendering of the older 
designation is ξύρτοι τοῦ προσώπου 1 S 21:6, 2 Es 20:33 (but cf. Aquila's 
ץך. προσώπων), ἔνωσις τοῖς προκείμενοι Ex 25:30, of oî ξύρ. τῆς προθεσμῶν, 'loaves of the setting forth.' This, 
the term used in the Gospels (Mt 12:4, Mk 2:26, Lk 6:4), reflects the later Hebrew 
designation above mentioned (cf. προθεσμῶν in LXX to render נַלַע 'to set
in order,' ‘set forth’ [a meal upon a table]).* The variant ἡ πρόθεσις τ. ἀρτων

* Codex BeR (D) has προσθέσεως, with which comp. προστιθέναι for προτιθ. 
in some MSS of the LXX (passim). See for D's reading, Nestle, *Introd. to Text. 
Criticism of Gr. NT* (1901), 237.

(He 9:2) follows 2 Ch 13:11, 2 Mac 10:3. Still another rendering, οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς 
προσφορᾶς, is confined to some MSS of the Greek of 1 K 7:48 (Lucian has 
προθέσεως). The Vulgate also reflects both the Hebrew designations with panis 
facierum (of. Aquila, above) and panis propositionis.

The table of shewbread has likewise in Hebrew a twofold nomenclature: in 
שְׁלֹחַנְתָּא אֵלֶּה in P 'the presence-table' (Nu 4:7), but in Chronicles 
2 Ch 29:18; in both we also find שְׁלֹחַנְתָּא אֵלֶּה 'the pure table' (Lv 24:6, 2 Ch 
13:11, probably because overlaid with pure gold. For other designations now 
disguised in MT see next section.

ii. THE SHEWBREAD IN THE PRE-EXILIC PERIOD.

--The earliest historical mention of the shewbread occurs in the account of David's 
flight from Saul, in which he secures for his young men, under conditions that are 
somewhat obscure, the use of the shewbread from the sanctuary at NOD (1 S 
21:2ff). It is here described, as we have seen, both as 'presence-bread' (v.6[7]) and 
as 'holy' or 'sacred bread' (vv.4. 6 [8-7]), in opposition to ordinary or 
unconsecrated bread (לְוָה). The incident appears to have happened on the day on 
hich the loaves were removed to be replaced by fresh or ' hot bread' (ם הָלֶּךָ) 
v. 6[7]).

It must not be inferred from this narrative that the regulation of the Priests' 
Code, by which the stale shewbread was the exclusive perquisite of the priests, 
was already in force, although this, naturally, is the standpoint of NT times (see. 
Mt 12:4 and paralls.). Ahimelech, in requiring and receiving the assurance that 
David's young men were ceremonially 'clean' (see art. UNCLEANNESS), seems 
to have taken all the precautions then deemed necessary. The narrative is further of 
value as giving us a clear indication of the meaning originally attaching to the 
expression 'presence-bread; for the loaves are here expressly said to have been 
'removed from the presence of J'' (הָלָמִית מָלַמֵּית MT, v.7; of. the similar 
expression Ex 25:30). We next meet with the rite in connexion with Solomon's 
temple, among the furniture of which is mentioned in our present text ' the table 
whereupon the shewbread was' (1 K 7:48 RV). This table is here further said to 
have been 'of gold,' by which we are to understand from the context 'of solid gold' 
But it is well known that in this section of the Book of Kings the original narrative 
has been overlaid with accretions of all sorts, mostly, if not entirely, post-exilic; 
these are due to the idea of this latertime, that the interior decoration of Solomon's 
temple, and the materials of its furniture, could in no respect have been inferior to 
those of the tabernacle of P. See Stade's classical essay, ' Der Text des Berichtes
ueber Salomo's Bauten,' in *ZATW*, 1883, 129-177, reproduced in his *Akad. Reden u. Abhandlungen* (1899), 143ff. Stade's results have been accepted in the main by all recent scholars. Thus he shows that the original of 1 K 6:20b. 21 probably read somewhat as is still given in the middle clause of the better Gr. text of A (ἐποίησεν θυσιαστήριον κέδρου . . . κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ δαβίδ) viz. לשת מלבת ארון ל Sanctum היקרבר 'and he [Solomon] made an altar of cedar-wood (to stand) in front of the sanctuary (the 'Holy of Holies' of P).’ Whether we should retain or discard the words 'and overlaid it with gold,' is of minor importance.*

The altar, therefore, of v. 20b is not to be understood of the altar of incense, which first appears in the latest stratum of P (see TABERNACLE), but, as in the passage of Ezekiel presently to be considered, of the table of shewbread. The express mention of the latter by name in 1 K 7:48b is also part of an admittedly late addition to the original text (see authorities cited in footnote). The same desire to enhance the glory of the Solomonic temple is usually assigned as the ground for the tradition followed by the Chronicler, who states that Solomon provided the necessary gold for ten tables of shewbread (1 Ch 28:16; cf. 2 Ch 48:19). This writer, however, is not consistent, for elsewhere we read of 'the ordering of the shewbread upon the pure table (2 Ch 13:11).' In his account, further, of the cleansing of the temple under Hezekiah, only 'the table of shewbread, with all the vessels thereof' is mentioned (ib. 29:16),—a view of the cage which is undoubtedly to be regarded as alone in accordance with the facts of history.

This table fell a prey to the flames which consumed the temple in the 19th year of Nebuchadrezzar (2 K 25:8, Jer 52:18). The tale related by the Byzantine chronicler (Syncellus, 409), that it was among the furniture concealed by Jeremiah on Mount Pisgah, is but a later addition to the earlier form of the same fable, which we already find in 2 Mac 2:1ff. Notwithstanding these uncertainties, the continuance of the rite under the monarchy is sufficiently assured.

iii. THE POST-EXILIC PERIOD.-Ezekiel in his sketch of the ideal sanctuary likewise contemplates the perpetuation of the rite, for in a passage of his book, which on all hands is regarded as

* See besides Stade, *op. cit.*, the commentaries of Kittel and Benzinger, esp. the latter's Introduction. xvi if., where an interesting study will be found of the gradual growth of the accretions with which 1 K 6:16-21 is now overgrown; also Burney's art. KINGS in the present work, vol. ii. 863b, and his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, in loc.
corrupt, but capable with the help of the LXX of easy emendation, we read thus as emended): 'In front of the sanctuary [this also=P's "Holy of Holies"] was something like an altar of wood, three cubits in height, and the length thereof two cubits, and the breadth two cubits; and it had corners, and its base and its sides were of wood. And he said unto me: This is the table that is before J" (Ezk 41:21, 22; so substantially Cornill and all recent commentators). Here, then, we have not the altar of incense, but once more the table of shewbread. The twofold circumstance that it is here expressly termed an altar, and is of plain wood without a gold covering, is a strong argument in favour of Stade's restoration of the text of 1 K, discussed above. Ezekiel's table of shewbread resembled in its general outline the similar altar-tables so often seen on the Assyrian monuments (see last section) its height was half as much again as its length, and in section it formed a square of at least 3 ft. in the side. The projections or 'horns' were, no doubt, similar to those of the Assyrian altars (see, e.g., Perrot and Chipiez, History of Art in Chaldea and Assyria, i. pp. 143, 255, etc.).

In the temple of Zerubbabel, consecrated in the 6th year of Darius (B.C. 516), the table of shewbread, we may safely infer, had its place in the outer sanctuary, although we have no information as to whether or not it was modelled on Ezekiel's altar-table. After the introduction of the Priests' Code it may have been remodelled according to the instructions there given (Ex 25:23f.); we may at least, with some measure of certainty, suppose that it was then overlaid with gold, since Antiochus Epiphanes, when he carried off the spoils of the temple (1 Mac 1:22), would scarcely have taken the trouble to remove a plain wooden altar. The well-informed author of 1 Maccabees, in the passage cited, includes among the spoils not only the table itself, but 'the flagons and chalices and censers of gold' used in the ritual of the table (see for these art. TABERNACLE, section on Table of Shewbread). The provision of the shewbread, it should be added, was one of the objects to which were devoted the proceeds of the tax of one-third of a shekel instituted by Nehemiah (1032, cf. Jos. Ant. III. x. 7, § 255).

Here attention may be called to two non-canonical Jewish writers who allude to the subject of this article. The earlier of the two, is pseudo-Hecataeus, whose date is usually assumed to be the 3rd cent. B.C. (Schurer, GJV 3 iii. 465; but Willrich, Judea u. Gricchen, etc., 201., argues for a date in the Maccabaean period). This writer, in a passage preserved for us by Josephus (c. Apion. i. 22), describes the second temple as 'a large edifice wherein is an altar (βωμός), and a candelabrum both of gold, two talents in weight.' The former term, in the light of what has been said above with regard to the altar-tables of Solomon and Ezekiel, we must identify with the table of shewbread. The other writer referred to is pseudo-Aristeas, whose date falls within the century 200-100 B.C.. In his famous letter, purporting to give an account of the origin of the Alexandrian version of the OT, he gives the rein to a lively imagination in his description of a shewbread table of unexampled magnificence--all of gold and precious gems, and of unsurpassed artistic worlananship--which Ptolemy Philadelphus is said to have presented to the temple at Jerusalem (see Wendland's or Thackeray's edition of
Aristeas' letter-tr. by the former in Kautzsch's Apocryphen u. Pseudepigraphen, ii. 6 ff.). This table is admitted to have had no existence outside the pages of Aristeas.

To resume the thread of our narrative, we find that on the re-dedication of the temple (B.C. 165) Judas Maccabaeus had new furniture made, including the shewbread table (1 Mac 4:49)--now, we may be sure, constructed in entire conformity to the requirements of Ex 25:23ff.--upon which the loaves were duly set forth (v.51). This table continued in use till the destruction of the temple by Titus in A.D. 70. Rescued from the blazing pile, it figured along with the golden candlestick and a lull of the law in the triumph awarded to the victorious general (Jos. BJ vii. v. 3-7, esp. 5, § 148). Thereafter, these were all deposited by Vespasian in his newly built temple of Peace (ib. v. 7), while a representation of the triumph formed a conspicuous part of the decoration on the Arch of Titus, erected subsequently. Few remains of classical antiquity have been so frequently reproduced as the panel of the arch on which are depicted the table and the candlestick, borne aloft on the shoulders of the Roman veterans (see illustration under Music, vol. iii. p. 462). Both seem to have remained in Rome till the sack of the city by Genseric, king of the Vandals, in 455, by whom they were transferred to Carthage, the site, of the new Vandal capital in Africa. From Carthage they were transferred to Constantinople by Belisarius, in whose triumph they again figured. On this occasion a Jew, it is said, working on the superstitious awe felt by Justinian for these sacred relics, induced the emperor to send them back to Jerusalem. They probably perished finally in the sack of Jerusalem by Chrosreos, the Persian, in 614 (see Reinach, ' L'Arc de Titus,' in REJ 20, p. lxxxv f., in book form, 1890; Knight, The Arch of Titus, 112 ff.).

iv. PREPARATION OF THE SHEWBREAD.--According to the express testimony of Josephus (Ant. III. vi. 6), the Mishna, and later Jewish writers, the shewbread was unleavened. Nor does there seem to be any valid ground for the assertion, frequently made by recent writers, that it was otherwise in more primitive times. The absence of leaven best suits the undoubted antiquity of the rite, and, moreover, is confirmed by the Babylonian practice of offering 'sweet' (i.e. unleavened) bread on the tables of the gods (see below). The material in all periods was of the finest of the flour (Lv 24:5), which was obtained, according to Menahoth (vi. 7), by sifting the flour eleven times. The kneading, and firing of the loaves in the time of the Chronicler was the duty of the 'sons of the Kohathites,' a Levitical guild (1 Ch 9:32); in the closing days of the second temple their preparation fell to the house or family of Gamin (Yoma iii. 11, Shekal. viii. 1). The quantity of flour prescribed by the Priests' Code for each loaf (בנה halls) was 'two tenth-parts of an ephah' (Lv 24:5 RV), which reckoning the ephah roughly at a bushel-represents about 4/5ths of a peck (c. 7 ¼ litres), a quantity sufficient to produce a loaf of considerable dimensions, recalling the loaves which gave their name to the Delian festival of the Μεγάλαρτια.
In the earlier period, at least, the loaves were laid upon the table while still hot (I S 21:6). The later regulations required that they should be arranged in two piles (םשברותא, see sect. i. above). On the top of each pile, apparently,—on the table between the piles, according to another tradition, stood a censer containing 'pure frankincense for a memorial (‘יניברה, for which see comm. on Lv 24:7), even an offering by fire unto the LORD.' Alexandrian writers give salt in addition (Lv l.c. in LXX; hence, doubtless, Philo, *Vit. Mos.* ii. 151). The stale loaves, by the same regulations, were removed and fresh leaves substituted every Sabbath. According to *Sukka* (v. 7 f.), one half went to the outgoing division of priests, the other to the incoming division, by whom they were consumed within the sacred precincts.* In order to avoid repetition, further examination of the details given by post-biblical Jewish writers--many of them clearly wide of the mark—regarding the shape and size of the loaves and their arrangement on the table, as well as regarding the nature and purpose of the vessels mentioned, Ex 25:21, Nu 4:7, is reserved for the section on P's table of

* It is a mere conjecture that the shewbread was originally burned (Stade, *Akadem. Reden*, etc., 180, note 15).
shewbread and its vessels in the general article TABERNACLE.

v. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RITE.--The rite of 'the presence-bread' is one of the fairly numerous survivals from the pre-Mosaic stage of the religion of the Hebrews, and goes back ultimately to the native conception that the god, like his worshippers, required and actually partook of material nourishment. No doubt, as W. R. Smith has pointed out, this idea 'is too crude to subsist without modification beyond the savage state of society' (RS1 212). In the case of the shewbread, it may be suggested that the odour of the 'hot bread' (םְדִיָּה) 1 S 21:6[7]) was regarded in ancient times as a 'sweet savour,' like the shell of the sacrifice to J" (Gn 8:21, Lv 23:13). In any case the custom of presenting solid food on a table as an oblation to a god is too widespread among the peoples of antiquity to permit of doubt as to the origin of the rite among the Hebrews.

The lectisternia, which the Romans borrowed from the Greeks, afford the most familiar illustration of this practice (see Smith's Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiqs. 3 s.et). In the OT itself we hear of Jeremiah's contemporaries kneading cakes for the queen of heaven (Jer 7:18), and, at a later date, of the table which even Jews spread to Fortune (GAD, Is 65:11 RV). In the religious literature of the ancient Babylonians, again, particularly in the ritual tablets to which the attention of scholars has lately been turned, we find numerous references to the various items of food and drink to be presented to the deities of the Babylonian pantheon. The tables or altars, also, on which the food was set out are frequently represented on the monuments (see, e.g., Eenzinger, Heb. Arch. 387; Riemh's HWB 2 1. 148, etc.). And not only so, but, as Zimmern has recently shown, the loaves of sweet or unleavened bread thus presented are, frequently at least, of the number of 12, 24, or even as many as 36 (see the reff. in Zimmern's Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylon. Religion, 1901, p. 94 f.). These numbers, we can hardly doubt, have an astronomical significance, 12 being the number of the signs of the Zodiac, 24 the stations of the moon, and 36 those of the planets (see 2 K 23:5 RVm, Job 38:32, and art. BABYLONIA in vol. i. p. 218a). The knowledge of this ancient practice of offering food on the tables of the gods survived to a late period; see Epist. of Jeremy, v.28ff and the fragment of Bel and the Dragon (esp. v. 11; note also that the food of Bel comprised 'twelve great measures of fine flour'). Hence, if the loaves of the presence-bread were 12 in number from the earliest times,--though of this we have no early testimony,--we should have another of the rapidly increasing instances of early Babylonian influence in the West (cf. Josephus' association of the 12 loaves with the 12 months, Ant. in. vii. 7).

While, however, it must be admitted that the rite of the presence-bread had its origin in the circle of ideas just set forth, it is not less evident that, as taken up and preserved by the religious guides of Israel, the rite acquired a new and higher significance. The bread was no longer thought of as J"s food ("םְדִיָּה") in the sense attached to it in an earlier age, but as a concrete expression of the fact that J" was the source of every material blessing. As the 'continual bread' (לְהָאָלַחְיוֹן)
Nu 4:7), it became the standing expression of the nation's gratitude to the Giver of all for the bounties of His providence. The number twelve was later brought into connexion with the number of the tribes of Israel (cf. Lv 24:8), and thus, Sabbath by Sabbath, the priestly representatives of the nation renewed this outward and visible acknowledgment of man's continual dependence upon God. The presence of the shewbread in the developed ritual, therefore, was not without a real and worthy significance. It may here be added, in a word, that the explanation of the shewbread hitherto in vogue among the disciples of Bahr, according to which 'the bread of the face' was so named because it is through partaking thereof that man attains to the sight of God, accords neither with the true signification of the term, nor with the history of the rite.
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Literature.

The term tabernaculum, whence 'tabernacle' of the Eng. VSS since Wyclif, denoted a tent with or without a wooden framework, and, like the σκηνή of the Gr. translators, was used in the Latin VSS to render indiscriminately the לֹאֵל or goats'-hair 'tent' and the ῥαπθή or 'booth' (which see) of the Hebrews. Its special application by the Romans to the tent or templum minus of the augurs made it also a not altogether inappropriate rendering of the יֶשֶׁם or 'dwelling' of the priestly writers (see § iii.), by which, however, the etymological signification of the latter was disregarded, and the confusion further
increased. The same confusion reigns in our AV. The Revisers, as they inform us in their preface, have aimed at greater uniformity by rendering mishkan by ‘tabernacle’ and ‘ohel’ by ‘tent’ (as AV had already done in certain cases, see § iii.). It is to be regretted, however, that they did not render the Heb. sukkah with equal uniformity by ‘booth’ (e.g. in Mt 17:4 and parallels), and particularly in the case of the Feast of Booths (EV Tabernacles),

i. THE TENT OR TABERNACLE OF THE OLDEST SOURCES.--Within the limits of this art it is manifestly impossible to enter in detail into the problems of history and religion to which the study of ‘the tabernacle’ and its appointments, as these are presented by the priestly authors of our Pentateuch, introduces the student of the OT. The idea of the tabernacle, with its Aaronic priesthood and ministering Levites, lies at the very foundation of the religious institutions of Israel as these are conceived and formulated in the priestly sources. To criticise this conception here--a conception which has dominated Jewish and Christian thought from the days of Ezra to our own--would lead us at once into the heart of the critical controversy which has raged for two centuries round the literature and religion of the OT. Such a task is as impossible to compass here as it is unnecessary. The almost universal acceptance by OT scholars of the post-exilic date of the books of the Pentateuch in their present form is evident on every page of this Dictionary. On this foundation, therefore, we are free to build in this article without the necessity of setting forth at
every stage the processes by which the critical results are obtained.

Now, when the middle books of the Pentateuch are examined in the same
spirit and by the same methods as prevail in the critical study of other ancient
literatures, a remarkable divergence of testimony emerges with regard to the tent
which, from the earliest times, was employed to shelter the sacred ark. In the
article ARK (vol. i. p. 1496) attention was called to the sudden introduction of the
'tent' in the present text of Ex 3:37 as of something with which the readers of this
document--the Pentateuch source E, according to the unanimous verdict of modern
scholars--are already familiar. This source, as it left its author's pen, must have
contained some account of the construction of the ark, probably from the offerings
of the people (33:8) as in the parallel narrative of P (25:2ff), and of the tent
required for its proper protection. Regarding this tent we are supplied with some
interesting information, which may be thus summarized:--(a) Its name was in Heb.
'ohel mo'ed (33:7, AV 'the tabernacle of the congregation,' RV 'the tent of
meeting'). The true significance of this term will be fully discussed in a subsequent
section (§ iii.) (b) Its situation was ‘without the camp, afar off from the camp,’
recalling the situation of the local sanctuaries of a later period, outside the villages
of Canaan (see HIGH PLACE, SANCTUARY). In this position it was pitched, not
temporarily or on special occasions only, but, as the tenses of the original demand,
throughout the whole period of the desert wanderings (cf. RV v.7 ‘Moses used to
take the tent and to pitch it,’ etc., with AV). Above all, (c) its purpose is clearly
stated. It was the spot where J", descending in the pillar of cloud which stood at
the door of the tent (v. 9f, cf. Nu 12:5, Dt 31:15), ‘met his servant Moses and
spake unto him face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend’ (v. 11). On these
occasions Moses received those special revelations of the Divine will which were
afterwards communicated to the people. To the tent of meeting, also, every one
repaired who had occasion to seek J" (v. 7), either for an oracle or for purposes of
worship. Finally, (d) its aedituus was the young Ephraimite Joshua, the son of
Nun, who ‘departed not out of the tent’ (v.11, cf. Nu 11:28), but slept there as the
guardian of the ark, as the boy Samuel slept in the sanctuary at Shiloh (1 S
3:3ff.).

The same representation of the tent as pitched without the camp, and as
associated with Moses and Joshua in particular, reappears in the narrative
of the seventy elders (Nu 11:16f, 24-30), and in the incident of Miriam's leprosy
(12:1ff, note esp. v. 4f), both derived from E; also in the reference, based
upon, if not originally part of, the same source, in Dt 31:14f..

The interpretation now given of this important section of the Elohist
source is that of almost all recent scholars, including so strenuous an opponent of
the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis as August Dillmann (see his Com. in loc.). Little,
therefore, need be said by way of refutation of the views of those who have
endeavoured to harmonize this earlier representation with that which dominates
the Priestly Code. The only one of these views that can be said to deserve serious
consideration is that which sees in the tent of Ex 33:7ff a provisional tent of
meeting pending the construction of the tabernacle proper. This interpretation is
generally combined with the theory that the tent in question was originally Moses' private tent—an opinion which dates from the time of the Gr. translators (λαβών Μουσηῖς τὴν σκηνήν αὐτοῦ κτλ. so also Pesh.), and has found favour with commentators, from Rashi downwards, including most English expositors. This view is a priori plausible enough, but it falls to pieces before the fact disclosed above, that the same representation of the tent of meeting situated without the camp, with Joshua as its solitary guardian, is found in the Pentateuch, even after the erection of the more splendid tabernacle of the priestly writers. Moreover, there is no hint in the text of Ex 33:7-11 of the temporary nature of the tent; on the contrary, as we have seen, the tenses employed are intended to describe the habitual custom of the Hebrews and their leader during the whole period of the wanderings. The closing verse of the section, finally, proves conclusively that Moses had his abode elsewhere, and only visited the tent when he wished to meet with J". At the same time, the preservation of this section of E by the final editor of the Pentateuch, when the preceding account of the construction of the ark (cf. Dt 10:1-5 with Driver's note) was excised, can hardly be explained otherwise than by the supposition that lie regarded the tent of meeting here described as having some such provisional character as this theory presupposes.

During the conquest and settlement, the tent of meeting presumably continued to shelter the ark (which see) until superseded by the more substantial 'temple' of J" at SHILOH. The picture of this temple (יהיה) with its door and doorposts (1 S 1:9; 3:15) disposes of the late gloss (2:22b), based on a similar gloss, Ex 38:8, which assumes the continued existence of the tent of meeting (see the Comm. in loc.). So, too, Ps 78:60, which speaks of the sanctuary at Shiloh as a tent and a tabernacle (mishkan), is of too uncertain a date to be placed against the testimony of the earlier historian. In the narrative of the older sources of the Book of Samuel (1 S 4ff.) there is no mention of any special protection for the ark until we read of the tent pitched for it by David in his new capital on Mt. Zion (2 S 6:17, cf. I Ch 16:1, and the phrase 'within curtains,' 2 S 7:2, 1 Ch 17:1). The later author of 2 S 7:6, however, evidently thought of the ark as housed continuously from the beginning in a tent. 'I have not dwelt in an house,' J" is represented as saying, 'since the day that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a tent ('ohel) and in a tabernacle (mishkan),' or, as the text should more probably run, 'from tent to tent, and from tabernacle to tabernacle' (so Klost., Budde, basing on 1 Ch 17:5). David's tent was known as 'the tent of J" (1 K 2:28ff.). Before it stood the essential accompaniment of every sanctuary, an altar, to which the right of asylum belonged (ib. 1:50). What the tent may have contained in addition to the sacred ark is unknown, with the exception, incidentally mentioned, of 'the horn of oil,' with the contents of which Zadok the priest anointed the youthful Solomon (ib. 1:39). A solitary reference to 'the tent of meeting' in a pre-exilic document yet remains, viz. the late gloss 1 K 8:4, the unhistorical character of which is now admitted (see Kittel, Benzinger, etc., in loc., and cf. Wellh. Proleg. [Eng. tr.] 43f.).
To sum up our investigation, it may be affirmed that the author of 2 S 7 not only accurately represents the facts of history when he describes the ark as having been moved 'from tent to tent and from tabernacle to tabernacle,' but reflects with equal accuracy the opinion of early times that a simple tent or tabernacle was the appropriate housing for the ancient palladium of the Hebrew tribes. This is confirmed both by the analogy of the practice of other branches of the Semitic race, and by incidental references from the period of religious decadence in Israel, which imply that tent-shrines were familiar objects in connexion with the worship at the high places (2 K 23:7 RVm, Ezk 16:16; cf. the names 0holibah and Oholibamah, and art. OHOLAH).

ii. THE TABERNACLE OF THE PRIESTLY WRITERS.
--The literary sources.--These are almost exclusively from the hand of the authors of the great priestly document of the Pentateuch. This document, as has long been recognized, is not the product of a single pen, or even of a single period.

The results which recent criticism has achieved in disentangling and exhibiting the various strata of the composite literary work denoted by the convenient symbol P, end the grounds on which these results are based, must be sought else where, as, e.g.,--to name only a few accessible in English,--Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, 72ff., Driver, LOT⁶ 40ff., the more elaborate tables of the *Oxford Hexateuch*, i. 255, 261, ii. 138, and the art. EXODUS in vol. i. p. 808ff., with the table, p. 810b. Reference may also be made here to the present writer's forthcoming commentary on *Exodus* in the Internat. Critical Series.
The sections of the Pentateuch dealing with the subject of this art. are the following:--

(1) Ex 25-29, a fairly homogeneous section (but cf. Oxf. Hex. ii. 120) of the main or ground-stock of P (hence the symbol Ps), containing minute directions for the construction of the furniture and fabric of the sanctuary (25-27), followed by instructions relative to the priestly garments (28) and the consecration of Aaron and his sons (29).

(2) Ex 30. 31, a set of instructions supplementary to the foregoing. For their secondary character (hence the symbol P') see the authorities cited above and § viii. (c) below.

(3) Ex 35-40, also a fairly homogeneous block of narrative, reproduced in the main verbatim from 25-31 'with the simple substitution of past tenses for future,' but in a systematic order which embodies the contents of 30. 31 in their proper places in the older narrative 25 ff. (see authorities as above). It is therefore younger than either of these sections, hence also P'. The critical problem is here complicated by the striking divergence of the LXX in form and matter from the MT, to some points of which attention will be called in the sequel.

(4) Nu 3:25ff; 4:4ff; 7:1ff contain various references to the tabernacle and its furniture, which also belong to the secondary strata of P (see NUMBERS, vol. iii. p. 568). To these sources have to be added the description of the temple of Solomon in 1 K 6 ff and the sketch of Ezekiel's temple (Ezk 40 ff.), which disclose some remarkable analogies to the tabernacle. The references to the latter in the Bks. of Chronicles are of value, as showing how completely the later Heb. literature is dominated by the conceptions of the Priestly Code. Outside the Canon of the OT, the most important sources are the sections of Josephus' Antiquities which deal with the tabernacle (III. vi.), Philo's De Vita Moysis (ed. Mangey, vol. ii. p. 145 ff., Bohn's tr. iii. 88 ff.), and the 3rd cent. treatise, containing a systematic presentation of the views of the Jewish authorities, הָרִיא הַדָּמָלֵדֶה יַפָּא (ed. Flesch, Die Baraitjha von der Herstellung der Stiftshutte; Eng. tr. by Barclay, The Talmud, 334ff.). The Epistle to the Hebrews, finally, supplies us with the first Christian interpretation of the tabernacle (§ xiii.).

iii. THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE TABERNACLE.* --(a) In our oldest sources the sacred tent receives, as we have seen, the special designation (1) מִזְבַּח הַקָּדוֹשׁ (Ex 33:7, Nu 11:16; 12:4, Dt 31:14, all most probably from E). This designation is also found about 130 times in the priestly sections of the Hexateuch. The verb מִזְבַּח מַעֲזַרְתָּהוֹ (יעד) from which מִזְבַּח is derived signifies 'to appoint a time or place of meeting,' in the Niphal 'to meet by appointment' (often in P).

* Cf. the suggestive note on the various designations of the tabernacle with the inferences therefrom in Oxf. Hex. ii. 120; also Klostermaun in the New kirchliche Zeitsch. 1897, 288ff.; Westcott, Hebrews, 234 ff.
Hence as the name is understood by P, at least—signifies 'the tent of meeting' (so RV) or 'tent of tryst' (OTJC2 246), the spot which J" has appointed to meet or hold tryst with Moses and with Israel. As this meeting is mainly for the purpose of speaking with them (Ex 29:42; 33:11, Nu 7:89 etc.), of declaring His will to them, the expression 'tent of meeting' is practically equivalent to 'tent of revelation' (Driver, Deut. 339, following Ewald's 'Offenbarungszelt'). It has lately been suggested that behind this lies a more primitive meaning. From the fact that one of the functions of the Babylonian priesthood was to determine the proper time (adanu, from the same root as mo'ed) for an undertaking, Zimmern has suggested that the expression אהל מועד may originally have denoted 'the tent where the proper time for an undertaking was determined,' in other words, 'tent of the oracle' (Orakelzelt). See Zimmern, Beitrag zur Kenntnis d. bab. Religion, p. 88 n. 2 (cf. Haupt, JBL, 1900, p. 52). Still another view of P's use of the term מועד has recently been suggested (Meinhold, Die Lade Jahves, 1900, p. 31.). P, according to Meinhold, intends to give to the older term אהל מועד of E the same significance as his own אהל יתדות 'tent of the testimony' (see No. 10 below), by giving to the Niphal of מועד ('make known,' 'reveal one's self,' as above) the sense of מועד 'to testify of one's self.' The LXX, therefore, according to this scholar, was perfectly justified in rendering both the above designations by Ορακός (see below). The rendering of AV 'tabernacle of the congregation' is based on a mistaken interpretation of the word mo'ed, as if synonymous with the cognate Mg.

(2) The simple expression 'the tent' (לֵךְ) Is found in P 19 times (Ex 26:9, 11 etc.). We have already (§ i.) met with the title (3) 'the tent of J"' (1 K 2:28ff). To these may be added (4) 'the house of the tent' (1 Ch 9:23), and (5) 'the house of J"' (Ex 23:19).

(b) In addition to the older 'tent of meeting' a new and characteristic designation is used extensively in P, viz. (6) mishkan (about 100 times in the Hex.), 'the place where J" dwells' (上榜), 'dwelling,' 'habitation' (so Tindale); by AV rendered equally with אהל 'tabernacle' (but 1 Ch 6:32 'dwelling-place'). A marked ambiguity, however, attaches to P's use of this term. On its first occurrence (Ex 25:9) it manifestly denotes the whole fabric of the tabernacle, and so frequently. It is thus equivalent to the fuller (7) 'dwelling (EV 'tabernacle') of J"' found in Lv 17:4 (here || (1), Nu 16:9 etc., 1 Ch 16:39; 21:29), and to 'the dwelling of the testimony' (No. 11 below). In other passages it denotes the tapestry curtains with their supporting frames which constitute 'the dwelling par excellence' (26:1, 6f. etc.), and so expressly in the designation (8) 'dwelling (EV 'tabernacle') of the tent of meeting' (Ex 39:32; 40:2 etc., 1 Ch 6:32). In the passages just cited and in some others where the 'ohel and the mishkan are clearly distinguished (e.g. Ex 35:11; 39:40; 40:27ff., Nu 3:25; 9:15), the AV has rendered the former by 'tent' and the latter by 'tabernacle,' a distinction now consistently carried through by RV.* In 1 Ch 6:48 [MT 33] we have (9) 'the dwelling of the house of God.'
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(c) Also peculiar to P and the later writers influenced by him is the designation (10) מִשְׁכַּן תֶּ坐着 (Nu 9:16 etc., 2 Ch 24:6, RV throughout 'tent of the testimony'; so AV in Nu 9:15, but elsewhere 'the tabernacle of witness'). The tabernacle was so called as containing 'the ark of the testimony' (see § ix). Hence too the parallel designation (11) מְשֻׁרָת תֶּ坐着 (Ex 38:21, Nu 150 etc., EV 'tabernacle of [the] testimony').

(d) In addition to these we find the more general term (12) שְׁמֶן 'holy place or sanctuary; applied to the tabernacle (Ex 25:8 and often; in the Law of Holiness (Lv 17ff.) almost exclusively.

Passing to the versions that have influenced our own, we find as regards the LXX a uniformity greater even than in our AV. Owing to the confusion of מִשְׁכַּן and מִשְׁקָר (both=σκηνή) on the one hand, and of מְשֻׁרָת and מְשֻׁרָת on the other (but cf. Meinhold, op. cit. 3 f.), we have the all but universal rendering ἡ σκηνή τοῦ μαρτυρίου, 'the tent of the testimony,' to represent (1), (8), (10), and (11) above.

This, along with the simple σκηνή, is the NT designation (Ac 7:44 AV 'tabernacle of witness,' Rev 15:5 AV 'tabernacle of the testimony'). In Wis 9:8, Sir 24:10 we have a new title (13) 'the sacred tent' (σκηνή ἁγία, with which cf. the ἱερὸς σκηνῆ of the Carthaginian camp, Diod. Sic. xx. 65) The Old Lat. and Vulg. follow the LXX with the rendering tabernaculum and tab. testimonii, though frequently also ('habitually in Numbers,' Westcott, Ep. to the Hebrews, 234 f.) tab. foederis, the latter based on the designation of the ark as the 'ark of the covenant' (see § ix.). As to the older Eng. VSS, finally, those of Hereford and Purvey follow the Vulg. closely with 'tab. of witness, witnessynge, testimonye,' and 'tab. of the boond of pees (t. foederis).’ Tindale on the other hand follows LXX with the rendering 'tab. of witnesse' for (1) and (10), but then again he restores the distinction between 'ohel and mishkan by rendering the latter 'habitation,' except in the case of (7), 'the dwellinge-place of the Lorde.' Coverdale in the main follows Tindale. It is to be regretted that this distinction was obliterated in the later versions.

iv. THE UNDERLYING CONCEPTION OF THE TABERNACLE – SANCTUARY.--Nature and gradation of the materials employed in its construction.--In Ezekiel's great picture of the ideal Israel of the Restoration (Ezk 401) 'the ruling conception is that of J" dwelling in visible glory in his sanctuary in the midst of his people'. The prophet's one aim is to help forward the realization of the earlier promise of J": 'My dwelling (mishkan) shall be with them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people' (37:27). The same grand conception, the same high ideal, took possession of the priestly writers on whom Ezekiel's mantle fell. The foundation on which rests the whole theocratic structure of the Priestly Code is the provision of
* The authors of the *Oxford Hexateuch* call attention to 'the curious fact that in Ex 25-27:19 the sanctuary is always called the "dwelling" [*mishkan*], while in 28. 29 this name is replaced by the older term "tent of meeting." ... The title "dwelling" is, of course, freely used in the great repetition, Ex 35-40, but the main portions of the Priestly Law in Leviticus ignore it (ii. 120, where see for suggested explanation).
a sanctuary, which in its fabric, in its personnel, and in all its appointments, shall be for future ages the ideal of a fit dwelling for J", the holy covenant God of the community of Israel, once again restored to His favour. That this is the point of view from which to approach our study of the tabernacle of the priestly writers is placed beyond question, not only by the characteristic designation of the tabernacle proper as the miskhan or dwelling (see above, § iii.), but by the express statement at the opening of the legislative section 'Let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them' (Ex 25:8. cf. 29:45).

Such a dwelling could only be one reared in accordance with the revealed will of J" Himself. Moses, accordingly--according to the representation of P--is summoned to meet J" in the cloud that rested on the top of Mt. Sinai, soon after the arrival there of the children of Israel (Ex 24:16ff.). The command is given to summon the Israelites to make voluntary offerings of the materials necessary for the construction of the sanctuary. A pattern or model of this dwelling and of all its furniture is shown to Moses, who is at the same time instructed in every detail by J" Himself (Ex 25:1-9 [Pg] = 35:4-29 [Ps], cf. 38:21-31). In the later strata of P we find the call of Bezalel (so RV), the son of Uri, and his endowment by J" as constructor-in-chief, assisted by Oholiab (AV Aholiab), the son of Ahisamach (31:1-11=35:30-36:1; 38:22f.).

A list of the materials employed is succinctly given at the head of each section (25:3ff=35:4ff). Of these the three great metals of antiquity, bronze (see BRASS), silver, and gold, are used in a significant gradation as we proceed from the outer court to the innermost sanctuary. Of the last-named, two varieties are employed—the ordinary gold of commerce, and a superior quality in which the pure metal was more completely separated from its native alloys, hence known as refined or 'pure' gold (רֹדֵךְ נְתָנים). As to the technical treatment of the metals, we find various methods employed. They might be used in plain blocks or slabs, as for the bases of pillars and for the mercy-seat; or they might be beaten into plates (Nu 17:3 [Heb. 16:38]) and sheets (Ex 39:3) for the sheathing of large surfaces, like the great altar, the frames (but see § vii. (b)), and most of the furniture. The most artistic work is the hammered or repousse work in gold, of which the cherubim and the candlestick are examples.*

The wood used throughout was that of the tree named שִׂית shittah (AV 'shittim wood,' RV 'acacia wood'), now usually identified with the Acacia seyal or A. nilotica (see, further, SHITTAH). Its wood is noted for its durability (cf. LXX rendering $\zeta \nu \lambda \alpha \varepsilon \sigma \tau v\tau o\tau o\tau o$). We come next to a graduated series of

* No account is taken here of the quantities of these metals provided for the tabernacle, for the passage Ex 38:24-31 was long ago recognized (Popper, Der bibl. Bericht über die Stiftshutte, 1862) as a late insertion in a late context. This is evident from the one fact alone that the silver, which provided, interalia, for the sockets or bases at a talent each, is thought to be the produce of the poll-tax of half a shekel, which was not instituted till some time after the tabernacle had been set up (cf. Nu 11; Ex 40:1).
products of the loom. At the bottom of the scale we have the simple shesh (שְׁשָׁה). This material has been variously identified with linen, cotton, and a mixture of both. The history of the textile fabrics of antiquity favours linen (see LINEN, and Dillmann's elaborate note, Exod.-Levit. 3 305 ff.). A superior quality of it was termed 'fine twined linen' (נִשֶּׁה שְׁשָּׁה), spun from yarn of which each thread was composed of many delicate strands. When dyed with the costly Phoenician dyes, both yarn and cloth received the names of the dyes, 'blue, purple, and scarlet' (25:4 etc.). The first two represent different shades--of purple (see COLOURS), and may be conveniently rendered by 'violet' and 'purple' respectively. The spinning of the yarn was the work of the women, the weaving of it the work of the men (35:25-35, cf. 39:3). Among the latter a clear distinction is drawn between the ordinary weaver and the more artistic rokem and hosheb, who represent respectively the two forms of textile artistry practised from time immemorial in the East--embroidery and tapestry. The rokem or embroiderer (so RV) received the web, complete in warp and weft, from the loom, and worked his figures in colours upon it with the needle. The hosheb (lit. 'inventor,' 'artist,' as 31:4; EV 'cunning workman'), on the other hand, worked at the loom, weaving with 'violet, purple, and scarlet' yarn (cf. LXX 28:6 ἐργὸν ὑφαιντὸν ποικίλτοι) his figures into the warp, and producing the tapestry for which the East has always been famed. A gradation from without inwards, similar to that in the application of the metals, will meet us in the employment of these varied products of the loom.

v. THE GENERAL ARRANGEMENT AND SYMMETRY OF THE SANCTUARY. --The Court of the Dwelling (Ex 27:9-19 [Pg] 38:9-20 [Ps]; cf. Josephus, Ant. III. vi. 2).--Once again we must start from Ezekiel. For the realization of his great ideal, Ezekiel places his new temple in the centre of a square tract of country, 25,000 cubits in the side, 'a holy portion of the land' (Ezk 45:1ff; 48:8ff.). Within this area is a still more sacred precinct, the property of the priests alone, who thus surround the temple on every side to guard it from possible profanation. The same idea of the unapproachable sanctity of the wilderness 'dwelling' is emphasized by P through his well-known symmetrical arrangement of the camp of the Israelites. Around four sides of a huge square the tents are pitched, three tribes on each side (Nu 2:1ff; 10:13ff). Within this square is another, the sides of which are occupied by the priests and the three divisions of the Levites, the sons of Gershon, Kohath, and Merari (Nu 3:23ff). In the centre of this second square, finally, we find the sacred enclosure (τεμενος) which constitutes the wilderness sanctuary. This enclosure is the 'court of the dwelling' (27:9, αὐλὴ τῆς σκηνῆς, atrium tabernaculi), a rectangular space, lying east and west, 100 cubits* in length by 50 in breadth (proportion 2:1)--in other words, a space made up of two squares, each 50 cubits in the side. At

*The length of P's cubit is uncertain. For convenience of reckoning it may be taken as 18 inches.
this point it will help us to over-come subsequent difficulties if we look more closely at the proportions of the sanctuary as a whole, as revealed by the accompanying diagram. Beginning with the eastern square we note as its most prominent feature the altar of burnt-offering, lying 'four square' (5 cubits by 5) presumably at the intersection of the diagonals. In the western square stands 'the dwelling,' occupying three of the small plotted squares, of 10 cubits each way, its length being to its breadth in the proportion of 3:1. Like the temples of Solomon and Ezekiel, it consists of two parts, the outer and inner sanctuary, in the proportion of 27:1. The latter is the true sanctuary, the special abode of J", a perfect cube, as we shall afterwards see, each dimension one-half of the inner shrine of the Solomonic temple. It stands exactly in the centre of its square, while its own centre in turn is occupied by the most sacred of all the objects in the sanctuary, the ark, the throne of J", the dimensions of which, we shall find, are 5 x 3 x 3 half-cubits. These data are meanwhile sufficient to prove P's love for 'order, measure, number
and system,' which has long been recognized as one of his most prominent characteristics. From the first section of Genesis (11-28) onwards, with its arrangement by 10 and 7 and 3 (see art. NUMBER, vol. iii. p. 5651), his genealogies, his chronology, his theory of the religious development of Israel,

![Diagram of the Tabernacle Court](image)

Scale 1/32 inch=1 cubit.

are all constructed on a definite system.* Nowhere is this fondness for symmetry and proportion so evident as in the measurements of the tabernacle. Three, four, seven, ten, their parts and multiples, dominate the whole (see further, § xiii. ). The desire to preserve the proportion and ratio of certain parts and measurements has

* Cf. Dillmann, *Num.-Josua*, 649f., who also considers P to have distinguished four periods of the world's history characterized by the decreasing length of human life in the proportion 8:4:2:1.
led to awkwardness and even inconsistency in other parts—a fact which lies at the root of not a few of the difficulties that beset the path of those that attempt to construct the tabernacle from the data of the priestly writers.

The court of the tabernacle is screened off from the rest of the encampment by five white curtains (םִירְֶּרֶנ; kel’aim) of 'fine twined linen' of the uniform height of 5 cubits, but of varying length. Those on the N. and S. long sides measure each 100 cubits, that on the W. 50, while the two remaining curtains of 15 cubits each screen off the E. side, one on either hand of the entrance to the court. The latter is a space of 20 cubits, which is closed by a hanging or portibre (גַּשְֹפְָּר) of the second grade of workmanship explained above, i.e. embroidered in colours on a white ground. All six hangings are suspended from pillars of the same height, standing on bases (נַדְּסָק, EV 'sockets') of bronze. The shape and size of 'these bases can only be conjectured. Elsewhere in OT (Ca 5:15, Job 38:6, and corrected text of Ezek 41:22) נַדְּסָק is the base in the shape of a square plinth on which a pillar or an altar stands. So most probably in the case before us, the wooden pillar being sunk well into the plinth (so the Baraita), which would thus be reckoned to the height of the pillar. The pillars were then kept in position by means of the usual 'cords'† or

† These are first mentioned in Pa (36:18 'the pins of the courts and their cords,' 39:40 etc.).

stays (םִירְֶּרֶנ) fastened to pegs or 'pins' (תְָּרָָנִ) of bronze stuck in the ground. This seems preferable to the view first suggested by Josephus that the bases ended in spikes (σαυρωτήρες) like that by which the butt-end of a spear was stuck in the ground—a method scarcely in place in the sand of the desert. According to P, (38:17), the pillars had capitals (EV 'chapiters') overlaid with silver. Further, 'the hooks or pegs (היַט) of the pillars and their fillets (םִירְֶּרֶנ) shall be of silver' (27:10f., but 38:19 makes the latter only overlaid with silver). The word rendered 'fillet' probably signifies a band or necking of silver (Ew., Dill. et al.) at the base of the capital, rather than, as is more generally supposed, silver rods connecting the pillars. And this for three reasons: (1) only on this view is the phrase 'filleted with silver' (27:17) intelligible; (2) no mention is made of any such connecting-rods in the minute directions for the transport of the tabernacle furniture (Nu 4); and (3) the screen and veil of the tabernacle proper (§ vii. (c)) were evidently attached to their pillars by hooks.

At this point we encounter our first difficulty. How are the pillars placed, on what principle are they reckoned (27:10ff.)? Ezekiel begins the description of his outer court with the wall 'round about' (40:5). P does likewise, only his curtain-wall is like a mathematical line, having length without breadth. It is as though the writer were working from a ground-plan like our diagram. The periphery of the
court measures 300 cubits. This and no more is the length of his six curtains. Not even in the case of the entrance portiere is allowance made for folds*--the first hint that we are dealing with an ideal, not an actual, construction. The pillars must be thought of as standing inside the curtains, otherwise they would not belong to the sanctuary at all. The principle on which they are reckoned is clear. It is that one pillar, and one only, is assigned to every five cubits of curtain. Now, a curtain of 20 cubits' length, like the entrance screen, requires not four, which is the number assigned to it, but five pillars; and on the same principle each of the of smaller curtains on either side of it requires four pillars, not three, and so with the rest. But to have counted twenty-one pillars for the sides, eleven for the end curtain, and 5+4+4 for the front, would have spoiled the symmetry, and so the artificial method of the text is adopted. Counting four for the entrance, as on the diagram, and three for the curtain to the left (vv.16.14) we proceed round the court, reckoning always from the first corner pillar met with and counting no pillar twice. It is thus absurd to charge P with mis-calculation, as his latest commentator still does (Baentsch, in loc.). But the charge is the price paid for the determination to reckon the pillars on the E. side as only ten in all, arranged symmetrically as 3 + 4 + 3 (when there are really eleven), and those of the N. and S. sides as multiples of ten.

vi. THE FURNITURE OF THE COURT.--(a) The altar of burnt-offering, Ex 27:1-8=38:1-7 [LXX 38:22-24],--In the centre of the court, as the symmetry requires, stands 'the altar' (27:1 RV; for the significance of the article see § viii. (c)) of the sanctuary, also termed more precisely 'the altar of burnt-offering' (30:28; 31:9 and oft.), and, from its appearance, 'the altar of bronze,' AV 'brazen altar' (38:30; 39:39), both sets of passages probably belonging to P'. 'Foursquare' it stands, 5 cubits in length and breadth, and 3 cubits in height, a hollow chest† of acacia wood sheathed with

* Josephus is quite wrong, therefore, in speaking of the curtains hanging in a 'loose and flowing manner' (l.c.).
† Nothing in the text suggests a mere four-aided frame to it filled with earth, as is usually supposed.
bronze. From the four corners rise the indispensable horns, 'of one piece with it' (RV), the form and significance of which have been much debated. From the representations of similar 'horns' on Assyrian altars (see Perrot and Chipiez, *Hist. of Art in Chaldea and Assyria*, i. 255 f.), they would appear to have been merely the prolongation upwards of the sides of the altar to a point, for a few inches at each corner. The horns of Ezekiel's altar, e.g., form 1/12th of the total height (see 43:13-17 with Toy's diagram in *SBOT*). The horns play an important part in the ritual of the priests' consecration (Ex 29:12), the sin-offering (Lv 4:18), the Day of Atonement (16:18), and elsewhere.* According to a later tradition, the 'beaten plates' of bronze for the

ALTAR OP BURNT-OFFERING.

covering of the altar' were made from the bronze censers of the rebellious company of Korah (Nu 16:35ff). Round the altar, half-way between top and bottom, ran a projecting 'ledge' (so RV for the obscure כָּרָם, only 27:5; 38:4; AV 'the compass,' etc.), attached to which and reaching to the ground was a grating (RV; AV 'grate,' which see) of bronze. The purpose of these two appendages can only be conjectured (see the Comm. and works cited in the Literature for the numerous conjectures that have been put forward). Considering the height of the altar, at least 42 feet, one naturally supposes that the ledge was for the priests

* For the special sanctity attaching to the horns see ALTAR (vol. i. p. 77). It is open to grave doubt whether this widespread custom of providing altars with these projections has anything to do with the ox or calf symbolism (see CALF [GOLDEN] vol. i. p. 342), as Stade and others suppose. 'Horn' is rather a popular metaphor for the more correct יִנָּחַמ of Ezekiel (41:22; cf. Josephus' phrase γυμνίαι κερατοειδεῖς), and their ultimate raison d'être is probably to be sought in the same primitive circle of thought as ascribed a special sanctity to the four corners of a tube (see FRINGES, vol. 1i. p. 69x). Another view is suggested by RS2 436, Baentsch (Com. in loc.).
to stand upon during their ministrations at the altar, and in Lv 9:22 we actually
read of Aaron 'stepping down' from the altar. Together with the grating, it may
also have been a device to prevent the ashes, etc., from falling upon and defiling
the sacrificial blood, J"s peculiar portion, which could still be dashed against the
base of the altar through the wide meshes of the network. Four bronze rings were
attached to the corners of the grating, presumably where it met the ledge,
to receive the poles for carrying the altar. The necessary utensils were also of
bronze; they comprised shovels or rakes for collecting the ashes, pots (AV pans)
for carrying them away, the large basins for catching the blood of the animals
sacrificed, the flesh hooks or forks, and the fire-pans. The fire is to 'be kept
burning upon the altar continually, it shall not go out' (Lv 6:13), which hardly
accords with the prescriptions of Lv 17 and Nu 4:13.

The idea underlying this unique structure—a hollow wooden chest with a
thin sheathing of bronze, little adapted, one would think, for the purpose it is to
serve—is now generally recognized as having originated in the desire to construct a
portable altar on the lines of the massive brazen altar of Solomon, which was itself
a departure from the true Heb. tradition (Ex 20:24ff). The account of the making
of this altar, which was one-fourth larger in cubic content than the whole
tabernacle of P (2 Ch 4:1), has now disappeared from the MT of 1 K 7, but was
still read there by the Chronicler and references to it still survive (1 K 8:22, 64;
9:25, 2 K 16:14ff.). Its disappearance is easily accounted for by the fact that its
construction appeared to a later age as quite unnecessary, since the 'tent of
meeting' and all its vessels, including the bronze altar of this section, were
considered to have been transferred by Solomon, along with the ark, to his new
temple (1 K 83; see Wellh. Proleg. [Eng. tr.] 44; Stade, ZATW iii. 157 = Akad.
Reden, 164 ; and the Comm.).

(b) The Laver (Ex 30:17-21, Cf. 38:8 [LXX 38:26]). Between the altar
above described and the tabernacle stood the laver of bronze (Ῥύς, λουτήρ), to
the description of which only a few words are devoted, and these few are found
not in the main body of P, but in a section (30. 31) bearing internal evidence of a
later origin (see § ii., and more fully § viii. (c)). Beyond the fact that it was a large
basin of bronze, and stood upon a base of the same material, we know nothing of
its workmanship or ornamentation. It served to hold the water required for the
ablutions of the priests in the course of their ministrations, and is frequently
mentioned in the secondary strata of the priestly legislation (30:28; 31:9 etc.; it is
omitted, however, from the directions for the march in Nu 4). A curious tradition
grew up at some still later period, to the effect that the laver was made of the
bronze 'mirrors of the serving-women which served at the door of the tent of
meeting' (38:8, cf. 1 S 2:22). The latter, needless to say, was not yet in exist-
ence. The temple of Solomon had ten lavers of elaborate construction (see
LAVER), the second temple apparently had only one (Sir 50:3).
vii. THE TABERNACLE PROPER--(a) The Curtains of the Dwelling and the Tent, the outer coverings (Ex 26:1-14=36:8-19 [LXX 37:1]; Jos. Ant. III. vi. 4 [ed. Niese, § 130 ff.]).-Probably no section of the OT of equal length is responsible for so large a number of divergent interpretations as the chapters now before us. It is clearly impossible within the limits of this article to refer to more than a very few of these interpretations, even of those associated with scholars of repute. What follows is the result of an independent study of the original in the light of the recognized principles underlying the scheme of the wilderness sanctuary as conceived by the priestly writers (see § iv.). Fuller justification of the writer's position with regard to the many matters of controversy that emerge will be found in his commentary on Exodus (Internat. Crit. series).

Now, on the very threshold of our study of Ex 26, we meet with a clear statement, the farreaching significance of which has been overlooked by most of those who have written on this subject. It is contained in these few words: 'Thou shalt make the dwelling (יַתְנִפְת, EV 'tabernacle') of ten curtains' (26:1). To this fact we must hold fast through all our discussion as to the measurements and arrangements of the tabernacle. It is the curtains, not the so-called 'boards,' that constitute the dwelling of J'. The full bearing of this fact will appear as we proceed. The walls of the true dwelling, then, are to consist, on three sides at least, of ten curtains of beautiful Oriental tapestry, full of figures of the mystic herubim, woven in colours of the richest dyes, violet, purple, and scarlet (see § iv.). The curtains form, as it were, the throne-room of J'. It is therefore appropriate that the mysterious beings that ministel around His heavenly throne should be represented
in J’'s presence-chamber upon earth (see, further, § ix. for cherubim upon the mercy-seat). The curtains measure each 28 x 4 cubits (7:1), and are sewed together in two sets of five. Along one long side of either set are sewed fifty loops (תּוֹלֶת, RV ; AV 'taches') the two hangings are coupled together to form one large covering, 40 (4 x 10) cubits in length by 28 c. in breadth, for 'the dwelling shall be one' (26:6).

For a tent (הָעֹבֶד) over the dwelling (v.7), eleven curtains are to be woven of material usually employed for the Eastern tent (see CURTAINS), viz. goats' hair, and, to ensure that the dwelling shall be completely covered by them, they are each to be 30 cubits in length by 4 in breadth. These are to be sewed together to form two sets of five and six curtains respectively, coupled together as before by loops and clasps; the latter, in this case, of bronze, and forming one large surface (44 x 30 cubits), that the tent also 'may be one' (v. 11). Thus far there is no difficulty such as emerges in the verses (v.126.) that follow, and will be considered later (§ vii. (c)).

As the dwelling is to be covered by the tent, so the tent in its turn is to receive two protecting coverings, the dimensions of which are not given. Immediately above it is to be a covering of 'rams' skins dyed red' (םְפִּילֵנְם, יָפִּים מַדְדַּה, וְפִּילֵנְם תָּחָשִׁים). The dye employed is not the costly Phoenician scarlet or crimson dye previously met with (obtained from the coccus ilicis, see COLOURS, vol. i. p. 457 f.), but, as the Gr. rendering suggests, madder (ἐρυθρόδανον, rubia tinctoria), a vegetable dye.* The outermost covering is formed of the skins of an obscure animal (win, AV 'badger,' RV 'seal,' RVm 'porpoise'), now most frequently identified with the dugong, a seal-like mammal found in the Red Sea (see note with illustration in Toy's 'Ezekiel' [SBOT], p. 124).

At this point in P's statement, one naturally expects him to proceed to give directions for the pitching of this fourfold tent and for the preparation of the necessary poles, ropes, and pegs. There is thus every a priori probability in favour of the theory of the tabernacle associated in this country with the name of Mr. Fergusson, that the four sets of coverings now described were in reality intended by the author to be suspended by means of a ridge-pole and its accompaniments should have been passed over in silence in the text of P. (For this theory see Fergusson's art. 'Temple' in Smith's DB ; the Speaker's Commentary, i. 374 ff.; more recently, and in greatest detail, by Schick, Die Stifshutte, der Tempel, etc.). On the contrary, P's wilderness sanctuary is to combine with certain features of a nomad's tent others suggestive or reminiscent of the temples of a sessile population. In short, as Josephus puts it, the finished structure is to 'differ in no

* The Heb. name of this dye is נִזְמַנ, frequent in the Mishna. In OT it occurs only as a proper name, e.g. the minor judge, Tolah ben Puah (Scarlet, the son of Madder! Jg 10:1).
respect from a movable and ambulatory temple' (Ant. III. vi. 1 [Niese, § 103]).

(b) The wooden framework of the Dwelling (Ex 26:15-30=36:26-8 [LXX 38:18-21]; Jos. Ant. 1.c. 116ff.). --The right understanding of this important part of the dwelling, by which it is to be transformed into a portable temple, depends on our interpretation of the opening verses of the section (vv.15-17). Literally rendered they run thus: 'And thou shalt make the kerashim† for the dwelling of acacia

† EV 'boards'; LXX στύλοι Jos. and Philo κίονες, both=pillars.'

wood, standing up--10 cubits the length of the single * keresh, and a cubit and a half the breadth of the single keresh-2 yadoth † for the single keresh, mesheslaboth ‡ to each other.' Here everything depends on the three more or less obscure technical terms of the Heb. arts and crafts given in transliteration. The true exegetical tradition, we are convinced, had been lost, as was the case with the still more complicated description of Solomon's brazen lavers (1 K 7:27ff), until the key was discovered by Stade and published in his classical essay (ZATW iii. (1883) 129ff=Akad. Reden, 145 ff., corrected in details ZATW xxi. (1901) 145 ff.). The Jewish tradition, as we find it first in Josephus (l.c.) and in the Baraitha, has held the field to the present day. According to these authorities the kerashim were great columns or beams of wood 15 ft. high, 2 ft. 3 in. wide, and by a calculation to be tested in due time-1 ft. 6 in. thick, i.e. 10 x 1 1/2 x 1 cubits. The yadoth were pins or tenons (Jos. στρόφιγγες, 'pivots') by which the beams were inserted into mortices in the silver sockets or bases. Forty-eight of these beams were placed side by side to form the three walls (S.W. and N.) of the tabernacle, the eastern end or entrance being formed by a screen (for details and reff see below). This interpretation, with numerous modifications in detail, particularly as regards the thickness of the so-called 'boards,' § has been adopted by every previous writer without exception.

We now proceed to test the value of this tradition. The avowed intention of P, it is admitted on all hands, is to construct 'a movable and ambulatory temple' for the desert marches. Could anything be more absurd than to begin by constructing enormous logs of wood, each with a cubic content--on the most usual computation of 1 cubit of thickness--of about 50 cubic feet, each weighing,

* So LXX, Pesh. etc.
† EV 'tenons'; LXX; LXX ἁγκανίσκους=joints or arms; but else where μέρη, 'sides.'
‡ RV 'joined'; LXX ἀντιπίπτονται as in v.5 for
§ The familiar rendering 'boards,' adopted by Tindale, goes back to Jerome, who thought of the tabulae, of which the Roman tabernacula were frequently constructed, and from which, indeed, the name is derived.
according to a recent calculation (Brown, *The Tabernacle*, 1899, 275), close upon 1 ton, and out of all proportion to the weight they would have to bear? And this quite apart from the open question of the possibility of obtaining beams of such dimensions from the acacia tree of Arabia. Further, how is the fact that the tapestry curtains with their cherubim figures are always called 'the dwelling' to be reconciled with the traditional theory that they were completely hidden from view, except on the roof, by the intervention of the wooden walls? This difficulty has been felt by several writers, who have sought to avoid it by hanging these curtains inside the boards as a lining, thereby doing violence to the clear intention of the text (see below). These considerations by no means exhaust the difficulties presented by the current conception of the tabernacle, as may be seen on any page of the commentaries and special monographs cited in the Literature at the end of this article.

The way is now clear for a fresh examination of the technical terms of vv. 15-17. The first of the three (ψυχρ) is practically confined to P's account of the tabernacle, for its only other occurrence (Ezk 27:6) requires light from our passages rather than throws light upon them. The Gr. translators had no clear idea of what the word meant, and were content to render throughout by στύλοι, 'pillars,' a rendering.

|| No use is here made of the argument from Nu 7:8 compared with 3:36, four wagons, each drawn by a pair of oxen, for the transport of the 'boards,' bases, pillars, etc., as these passages are probably from a different hand from Ex 26.
suggested to them by the last word of v.15, which they apparently read מְדַשֶּׁת, the ordinary word for pillars (cf. Dillm. in loc.). Passing, therefore, to the second technical term yadoth (v.17), we find the current text of the LXX responsible for a grave mis-interpretation of this verse, by prefixing ‘and thou shalt make’ to the original text (but AF omit καὶ ποιήσεις). In reality we have here the continuation of v.15, from which it is separated merely by a parenthesis, as translated above. The yadoth are thus seen not to be something additional to the keresh, but to constitute its main component parts (as indeed may underlie the Gr. rendering μέρη in vv.19, 21 and elsewhere). What then is the signification of δ' as a technical term in the constructive arts? In 1 K 10:19=2 Ch 9:18 yadoth denotes the 'arms' of Solomon's throne, of which άγιον is the technically correct equivalent (2 Chron. l.c., see illustration of chair with arms bent at right angles in Rich, Dict. of Antiq. s. 'Ancon'). In I K 7:32-33--as Stade (ll.cc.) has conclusively proved from extant ancient models--yadoth is the technical name for the stays or supports (EV ‘axletrees’) underneath the body or framework of the laver (illustrs. ZATW, 1901, 152, 167), as also for the similar stays projecting from the top of the frame and supporting the stand of the basin (cf. LAVER, Vol. iii. p. 64a).

Technically, therefore, like our own 'arm,' and the classical άγκων and ancon, δ' may denote any arm-like structural element, whether straight or bent, especially if occurring in pairs. This result is strengthened by the phrase that follows, מְדַשֶּׁת כַּעֲלָן הָאָדָם (v. 17, cf. 36:22 and the various renderings in AV and RV). Here again the description of the avers comes to our aid (1 K 7:28f.), for the cognate term there employed (םְדַשֶּׁת, with which cf. the rounds or rungs of a ladder in later Heb.) is now universally understood to mean the cross-rails joining the uprights of the frame of the laver. It seems evident, therefore, that the keresh of P must be a frame of wood, such as builders in all countries have employed in the construction of light walls (see Blunmer, Technologic, etc. iii. 151, for the paries craticius with its arrectarii and transversarii; cf. our own brick-nogged partitions with their timber 'quarters'). This sense suits Ezk 27:6 admirably: 'thy panels are of ivory inlaid in boxwood' (see illustr. in Toy, SBOT 150). We may now tr. v.15ff thus, taking the parenthesis last; ‘And thou shalt make the frames for the dwelling of acacia wood, standing up, two uprights for each frame, joined to each other by cross-rail--10 cubits the height and a cubit and a half the breadth of the single frame.' We now see how it is that a writer so fond of measurements as P has omitted to give the third dimension: a frame has, strictly speaking, no thickness!*

* We may thus claim to have solved what our latest commentator has termed P's 'secret' with regard to v.17 (Baentsch, in loc.; cf. Holzinger, who gives up the verse in despair). Riehm had previously tried to solve the problem by taking the text to mean that each board consisted of two pieces mortised together by means of the yadoth (HIVB2, art. 'Stiftshatte,' 1679f.). Jerome's interpretation is evidently borrowed from the Rabbis, some of whom thought that the yadoth joined one board to another (Flesch, Baraijtka, 61 f.).
The frames, according to our present text, are to be overlaid with gold; but the position of this instruction (v. 29) after the other instructions for the frames have been completed (contrast 25:11; 24; 30:3), the variant tradition of the Gr. of 38:18ff (περιηγρύπωσαν, 'overlaid with silver'), the late origin of the kindred sections in 1 K 6 f. (see TEMPLE), and other considerations, all make it very probable that we have here an addition to the original text, both as regards the frame and bars, and the pillars. Like the pillars of the court, the uprights of the framework are to be sunk in bases of solid silver,—the reason for two bases to each frame being now for the first time apparent,—regarding the shape and size† of which we are equally dependent on conjecture. For reasons that will appear in the next section, we may think of them as square plinths, 3/4 cubit in the side and a cubit in height, forming a continuous foundation wall round the dwelling, with the uprights sunk well down so that the height of the framework was not materially added to.

To provide the necessary rigidity for the frames the simple device is adopted of running five wooden bars along the three sides, passing through rings attached to the woodwork of the frames. Much needless discussion has been raised over the expression 'the middle bar in the midst of the boards (v. 28), which has been taken by various writers to mean that the middle bar of the five is intended to pass from end to end through a hole pierced in the heart of the massive 'boards' of the traditional theory (see diagrams of Riggenbach, Brown, etc. ). But the phrase is merely an epithet, after P's well-known manner, explanatory of the bar in question, the distinguishing feature of which is that it runs along the whole length of its side, north, west, south, as the case may be, in contradistinction to the remaining four, which we may presume run only half-way along—one pair at the top, the other pair at the bottom of the frames. This arrangement of the bars suggests that the frames were provided with three cross-rails—one at the top, rounded like the ends of the uprights to avoid injury to the curtains, another in the middle, and a third immediately above the bases. We thus obtain a double row of panels right round the dwelling (see the accompanying illustration with drawings to scale from a specially prepared model).

The difficulties of this section, however, are not yet exhausted. We have still to grapple with the problem of the arrangement of the frames, and in particular with the much debated vv. 23ff, before we can proceed to discuss the manner in which the curtains were utilized. The discussion of the former problem may best start from the data of 26:33, from which we learn that the veil dividing the dwelling into two parts (see next section) is to be hung 20 cubits, the width of 5 curtains, from the front of the dwelling. Now, the admitted symmetry of the whole sanctuary requires us to infer that the area of the outer sanctuary is intended to measure 20 x 10 cubits, and that of the inner sanc-

† The oldest, but erroneous, conjecture on this point (EX 33:27 has been already dealt with (§ iv. footnote p. 6.56).
tuary 10 x 10 cubits, the measurements in both cases being exactly half those of
the corresponding parts of the temples of Solomon and Ezekiel (see TEMPLE).
With this agrees the direction of the text, that twenty frames, each 1 1/2 cubits
wide, are required for the two long sides, and six for the shorter west side
(vv. 18, 20, 22). Now, an easy calculation shows that since the total area of the
dwelling from curtain to curtain is 30 x 10 cubits, and inside width of the short
side is only 9 cubits (1 1/2 x 6), we must allow half a cubit (9 in.) for the
thickness of the woodwork of either of the long sides. This would allow 6 in. (two
handbreadths) for the thickness of the uprights of the framework and 3 in. (one
handbreadth) for that of the bars.

The assumption of the majority of previous writers, from the Baraitka to
Baentsch, that the measurement, 30 x 10 cubits, gives the clear inside area of the
tabernacle as formed by the wooden 'boards,' implying on the cubit of thickness
theory (see above) an outside measurement of 31x12 cubits, falls to the ground if
the view here advocated of the true nature of the boards' is accepted. But, even
with the traditional interpretation, the theory of inside measurements is absolutely
inadmissible. (1) The true walls of P's dwelling are, as we have already
emphasized, the tapestry curtains, precisely as the linen hangings are the walls of
the court (§ v.). The framework here takes the place of the pillars round the court,
and, like these, must be treated as une quantité négligeable where proportions are
concerned. (2) ADP's other measurements are outside measurements, as in the
altar of burnt-offering, the ark, etc. (3) Only on the supposition that the entire
fabric of the tabernacle covered a space 30 x 10 cubits is the true proportion (3:1)
of the structure and the complete symmetry of the western square maintained. It is
absolutely necessary from P's entirely contained within the centre square of its
own court (see diagram). With an inside area of 30x10, requiring on the traditional
hypothesis an outside measurement of 31x12, the symmetry of the whole
sanctuary is ruined.

We are now prepared to take up the problem of the two frames described
with tantalizing obscurity in the difficult verses 22, 23-25.* These two frames are
expressly stated to be 'for the מְקוֹצֵעַ of the dwelling in the hinder part.' What,
now is the meaning of this rare word? The key, we believe, will be found in
Ezekiel's presumably technical use of it to denote the projecting corners, popularly
known as 'horns,' of his altar of shewbread (41:22, see for these § vi. above; and
cf., besides the Assyrian altars, the plan of a Phoenician sanctuary in
Pietschmann's Geschichte der Phoenizier, 200f.). It is used by later writers to
indicate a part of the wall of Jerusalem akin to, yet distinct from, מַפִּינָה 'a corner,'
apparently there-

* For the extraordinary number of guesses that have been hazarded as to the
meaning of these verses, see, besides the Comm., the text and diagrams of
Riggenbach, Schick, and Brown.
† To be pointed so, with most moderns, for מְקוֹצֵעַ of MT.
fore one of the projecting bastions (2 Ch 26:9, Neh 3:24) which guarded the wall at important changes in its course. We conclude from these data that the word in the passage before us must denote something of the nature of a projecting buttress at the two western corners of the wooden framework. V. 24 has been the despair of many generations of students, and is almost certainly corrupt. If with most modern scholars we read ס祕 (twins) in both clauses, it seems to imply that these corner frames shall be made 'double,' i.e. consist of two ordinary frames braced together for the sake of strength; further, that each is intended to form a buttress sloping upwards and terminating short of the top of the framework, at 'the first' or topmost 'ring' (see RVm), that is, underneath the top bar of the west side (see illustration). In any case, three purposes are apparently served by these corner buttresses. They supply additional strength at the two weakest parts of the framework--the points of meeting of the two long walls with the west wall; they take up the folds of the curtains at these two corners, and--we do not hesitate to add--they raise the number of the frames to a multiple of four (48, so many were the pillars in Solomon's temple according to the Gr. of I K 7:45), and the number of the bases required for the dwelling to a multiple of ten 100, see next section).

(c) The arrangement of the Curtains of the Dwelling and the Tent. The divisions of the Dwelling and the Tent. The divisions of the Dwelling. The Screen and the Veil (Ex 26:9, 12ff. 31-33, 36f and parallels).--In the secondary stratum of P (40:17ff) we read how 'the tabernacle was reared up' by Moses. First he put down its bases, then he placed its frames, put in its bars, and reared up its pillars.' Thereafter 'he spread the tent over the dwelling, and placed the covering of the tent above upon it.' Here the tapestry and hair curtains are strangely enough together named the tent,' and the two outer coverings similarly taken as one.* Now it is worth noting (1) that Moses is said to have 'spread' the curtains over the dwelling, the same word (שׁפָּר) being used as is employed of wrapping up the sacred furniture for transport (Nu 4:6ff § xi.); and (2) that neither here nor elsewhere is the ordinary word for erecting 'or pitching a tent (הַשְּׁלָל) applied to the tabernacle, as it is to the old 'tent of meeting' (33:7) and to David's tent for the ark (2 S 6:17, see § i.). This fact of itself tells against the view, noted above, that the curtains were stretched tent-wise above the dwelling, and in favour of the usual concep-

* The author of this section (P'), however, may not have bad Ex 25 f. before him in quite the same form as we now have it (see § iii. above).
tion, that they were spread over the framework 'as a pall is thrown over a coffin.' The tapestry curtains measuring 40 cubits from front to back and 28 cubits across (§ vii. (a)) thus constitute the dwelling, the centre portion (30 x 10 cubits) forming the roof and the remainder the three sides. On the long sides it hung down 9 cubits till it met, as we may conjecture, the silver bases of the framework, which made up the remaining cubit (so the authorities of the Baraita (Flesch, 50; cf. Philo, op. cit. ii. 148, who no doubt gives the true reason of the vacant cubit, 'that the curtain might not be dragged,' and Jos. Ant. III. vi. 4 [Niese, § 130]). At the back, however, where 10 cubits (40-30) were left over, the last cubit would have to be folded along the projecting base, one of the results of requiring the total length to be another multiple of ten (40 cubits instead of 39). A striking confirmation of the signification here assigned to the kerashim is now brought to light. Instead of nearly two-thirds of the 'all-beautiful and most holy curtain' (παγκαλον και ιεροπρεπες υφασμα, Philo, l.c.) being hidden from view by the so-called 'boards,' the whole extent of the curtain is now disclosed, with, we may fairly conjecture, a double row of the mystic inwoven cherubim filling the panels of the framework, just as they filled the wainscot panels with which the temples of Solomon and Ezekiel were lined (1 K 6:28ff., Ezk 41:18ff).* The view of Bahr, Neumann, Keil, Holzinger, and others (see Literature), that these curtains were suspended, by some method unknown to the text, inside the framework,--in their case the gold-sheathed walls,--has been already disposed of (vii. (b)).

* See illustration.

Over the tapestry curtain was spread in like manner the curtain of goats' hair, the 'tent' of Pg. Our present text (vv.9. 12), however, presents an insurmountable difficulty in the arrangement of these curtains. To cover the dwelling, and that completely, they required to be only 40 x 30 cubits. But even when the sixth curtain of the one set is doubled, as required by v. 9, a total length of 42 cubits remains. The explanation usually given, which indeed is required by v.12, is that 'the half curtain that remaineth' must have been stretched out by ropes and pegs behind the dwelling; an assumption which is at variance with the arrangement at the other sides, and which leaves the sacred tapestry curtain exposed to view. The only remedy is to regard v. 12f as a gloss, as Holzinger does (Kurzer Hdc. in loc.), from the pen of a reader who misunderstood v.9b. Taken by itself, this half-verse plainly directs that the sixth curtain shall be doubled 'in the forefront of the dwelling'; that is, not, as Dillm. and other commentators maintain, laid double across the easter-most tapestry half-curtain, but--as already advocated in the Baraita, p. 58--hanging doubled over the edge of the latter, covering the pillars at the door of the tabernacle and entirely excluding the light of day. This secures that the dwelling shall be in perfect darkness. This is not secured on the ordinary supposition that the edges of both curtains were flush with each other, for the screen could not possibly be so adjusted as to completely exclude the light. The objection, of which so much is
made by Riggenbah, etc., that the joinings of the two sets of curtains would thus coincide and moisture be admitted, is utterly invalid when we recall the two heavy and impervious coverings that overlay the two inner sets of curtains. In this way, then, we find that the goats' hair curtains exactly fitted the dwelling on all three sides, covering the tapestry and the bases as well, and, in Josephus' words, 'extending loosely to the ground.' They were doubtless fixed thereto by means of the bronze pins of the dwelling (27:19 Pg, which makes no mention of cords), precisely as the Kiswa or covering of the Kaaba at Mecca is secured by metal rings at the base of the latter (Hughes, *Dict. of Islam*, s.v.).

Two items still remain to complete the fabric of the dwelling, viz. the screen and the veil. The former (חֵשֵׁן, RV 'screen,' AV 'hanging') was a portiere of the same material as the portiere of the court, closing the dwelling on the east side. It was hung by means of gold hooks or pegs horn five pillars of acacia wood standing on bases of bronze (26:36f, 36:37f. [LXX 37:5f]), a detail which marks them out as pertaining to the court rather than to the dwelling, the bases of which are of silver. Like the rest of the woodwork, they were probably left unadorned in the original text, for the text of P' (36:38, cf. Gr. of 26:37) speaks only of the capitals being overlaid with gold, a later hand, as in 1 K 6 f., heightening the magnificence of the tabernacle by sheathing the whole pillars (26:37).

At a distance of 20 cubits† from the entrance screen was hung another of the same beautiful tapestry as the curtains (v.81), depending from four pillars 'overlaid with gold,' and standing, like the framework, on bases of silver (v. 31). This second screen is termed the paroketh (חֵשְׁנַה, AV 'vail,' RV 'veil'; LXX καταπέτασμα, cf. He 9:3 'the second veil' as distinguished from the veil or screen just mentioned). By means of 'the veil' the dwelling was divided into two parts, the larger twice the area of the smaller (2:1). The former is termed by the priestly writers 'the holy place' (שְׁרוּשׁ 26:33 and oft.) ; the latter receives the name מִשְׁרְעַה שֶׁרְעָה, best rendered idiomatically 'the most holy place,' also literally 'the holy of holies,' § in LXX τὸ ἅγιον and τὸ ἅγιον (or τῷ ἅγιῳ)

* The arrangement of the Kiswa, indeed, affords a striking analogy to that of the curtains of the tabernacle.

†This follows from the fact that the veil is to bang directly under the gold clasps joining the two sets of tapestry curtains, and therefore 5 times 4 cubits (the breadth of the individual curtain) from the front of the dwelling (v. 33). The importance of this datum for the dimensions of the tabernacle has already been pointed out.

‡ This word has an interesting affinity with the Assyrian word parakku, the innermost shrine or 'holy of holies' of the Babylonian temples in which stood the statue of the patron deity.

§ The usage of Lv 16--is peculiar to itself. The 'holy place' P is here curiously 'the tent of meeting' (v.16 etc.); the 'most holy place' is named simply 'the holy place' (vv-3- 16 etc.) shortened from 'the holy place within the veil' (v. 2).
These names first came into use priestly circles in the Exile. The corresponding parts of Solomon's temple were known as the *hekal*, or temple proper (1 K 6:3 RVm), and the *debir* (EV ‘oracle,’ v.16). The former is retained by Ezekiel, while the latter is discarded and the 'most holy place' substituted (414, but also ' holy place,' v.23). P by his nomenclature stamps his sanctuary still further with the attribute of holiness in an ascending scale as we approach the presence of J".

viii. THE FURNITURE OF THE HOLY PLACE.--(a) The Table of Shewbread (Ex 25:23-30=37:15-16 [LXX 38:9-12] ; Jos. *Ant.* III. vi. 6).--This section is intended merely to supplement the art. SHEWBREAD by giving the barest details regarding the presence-table' (גֶּפֶן הַקָּלִים, see l.c. § i.) of the priestly writers.

Our understanding of this section is materially assisted by the representation of the table of Herod's temple, which may still be seen on the Arch of Titus at Rome. Careful measurements were taken and drawings made both of the table and of the candlestick (see next section) by friends of Adrian Reland in 1710-11, at a time when the sculptures were less dilapidated than at present. These were published by him in his work, *De spoliis Templi Hierosolymitani*, etc., 1710.

The material was acacia wood, overlaid like the ark with pure gold. The sheathing of these two

|| The presence of the term 'most holy place' in 1 K 6:16 etc is now recognized as due to post-exilic glossators.
sacred articles of the cultus and of the later altar of incense (§ viii. (c)) is quite in place, and stands on quite a different footing from the sheathing of such secondary parts of the fabric as the framework and the pillars at the entrance, the originality of which we saw reason to question. The height of the table was that of the ark, 1 ½ cubits, its length and breadth 2 cubits and 1 cubit respectively. The massive top --in the Roman sculpture 6 in. thick--was decorated with a zer (rze, AV and RV 'crown,' RVm 'rim or moulding') of gold. The precise nature of this ornament, which is also prescribed for the ark (v.11) and the altar of incense (30:3), is unknown. That it was some species of moulding may be regarded as fairly certain. The Gr. translators render variously by στεφάνη, whence the Vulg. Corona and 'crown'; by κυμάτια στρεπτά; or by a combination of both. The authors of the divergent Gr. text of 35-40 omit this ornament altogether (LXX 38:1ff). The phrase κυμάτια στρεπτά suggests a cable moulding, as explained by pseudo-Aristeas (Epist. ad Philocratem, ed. Wendland, § 58, 'worked in relief in the form of ropes'), which also suits Josephus' description (τό ἐδαφὸς ἐλικος [a spiral], l.c. § 140). On the other hand, the same phrase is used in architecture of an ogee moulding, and this is certainly the nature of the, ornament on the table of the Arch of Titus (see Reland, op. cit. 73 ff., and plate of mouldings opp. p. 76). In any case, both the sides and ends of the massive top were separately decorated by a solid gold moulding, which gave them the appearance of four panels sunk into the table (Reland, ut sup., and cf. Jos. § 140, κοιλαίνεται δὲ καθ' ἐκαστὸν πλευρὰν, κ. τ. λ.). The legs, according to Josephus, were square in the upper and rounded in the lower half, terminating in claws, a statement confirmed by the sculpture and by the analogy of the domestic art of the ancients. They were connected by a binding rail (τηγμα, EV 'border') 'of an handbreadth round about' (v.25), also ornamented with a cable or an ogee moulding. It doubtless marked the transition from the square to the round portions of the legs. The broken ends of this rail are still visible on the arch with a pair of trumpets leaning against them (illustr. under Music, vol. iii. p. 462). At its four corners four gold rings were attached, through which, and parallel to the sides, the two poles or staves were passed by means of which the table was moved from place to place.

For the service of the table a number of gold vessels (cf. Reland, op. cit. 99-122), presumably of hammered or repousse work, were provided. These comprised, in our RV rendering, 'dishes, spoons, flagons, and bowls to pour out withal' (v.29, cf. AV). The' dishes' were the flat salvers or chargers on which the loaves of the presence-bread were conveyed to, or in which they were placed upon, the table, or both together. The 'spoons' were rather the cups containing the frankincense (LXX τὰς θυίσκας) which entered into this part of the ritual (Lv 24:7), two of which were still visible in Reland's day. The 'flagons' were the larger, the 'bowls' the smaller vessels (σπονδεῖα καὶ κύαθοι) for the wine, which we must suppose also entered into the ritual of the shewbread. The silence

* A flagon is a favourite type on Jewish coins (MONEY, VOL iii. p. 431a).
of the OT on this point led the Jewish doctors to give novel and absurd explanations of the vessels last mentioned—such as hollow pipes between the loaves, or parts of a frame on which they lay. Similarly, these authorities differ as to whether the loaves were laid in two piles lengthwise across the width of the table—as one would naturally suppose—or along its length. A favourite tradition gives the length of each loaf as ten handbreadths (2 1/2 ft.) and the breadth as five. Since the width of the table was only 1 cubit or six handbreadths, the loaves were baked with two handbreadths [their 'horns'] turned up at either end, thus taking the shape of a huge square bracket I (For these and similar speculations, as curious as useless, see Menahoth xi. 4 ff.; the Baraita, § vii., with Flesch's notes and diagrams; Edersheim, The Temple, 154 ff.; and Ugolinus' treatise in his Thesaurus, vol. x.). The position of the table was on 'the north side' of the holy place (26:35).

(b) The golden Lampstand (Ex 25:31-40 = 37:17-24 [Gr. 38:13-17]; cf. Jos. Ant. III. vi. 7, BJ vii. v. 5) --Of the whole furniture of the tabernacle, the article to which, since Wyclif's time, our Eng. versions have given the misleading designation 'the candlestick,' afforded the greatest opportunity for the display of artistic skill. It was in reality a lampstand (הַלְמָנָה, λυχνία— the latter in Mt 5:10 and parallels, where RV gives ' [lamp]-stand,' Vulg. candelabrum) of pure gold (§ iii.), hence also termed the 'pure lampstand' (318 3937 etc. [cf. 'the pure table,' Lv 248]; for other designations see below). See also LAMP.

The lampstand on the Arch of Titus differs from that described in the text of P in several particulars, notably in the details of the ornamentation (see Reland's plate, op. cit. 6). In this respect it agrees better with the description of Josephus, who speaks of its 'knops and lilies with pomegranates and bowls,' seventy ornaments in all. The base, further, is hexagonal in form and ornamented with non-Jewish figures, while Jewish tradition speaks of the lampstand of the second temple as having a tripod base. The earliest known representation of the stand is found on certain copper coins doubtfully attributed to Antigonus, the last of the Hasmonwans (Madden, Coins of the Jews, 102, with woodcut). At a later period the seven-branched 'candlestick,' more or less conventionally treated, was a favourite motif with Jewish and Christian artists on lamps," gems, tombs, etc.

Like the cherubim above the propitiatory (§ ix.), the lampstand was of 'beaten (i. e. repoussé) work' (נשפף). A talent of gold was employed in its construction, the general idea of which is clear (see illustration): from a central stem three opposite
THE GOLDEN LAMPSTAND.

pairs of arms branched off 'like the arrangement of a trident' (Josephus), curving outwards and upwards till their extremities, on which the lamps were placed, were on a level with the top of the shaft. The upper portion of this central stem, from the lowest pair of arms upwards, is termed the shaft (πυρ, so RV; not as AV 'branch'), also the lampstand par excellence (v. 34); the lower portion is the base (so rightly RV for יִשָּׁה ל. lit. 'loins, in the Mishna שַׁבְּדָן Kel. xi. 7). The latter, we have seen, probably ended in a tripod with clawed feet, as in the table of shewbread. The leading motive of the ornamentation on stem and arms is derived

* For one of the best of these, showing the base in the form of a tripod, see PEFSt, 1886, p. 8.
from the flower or blossom of the almond tree. The complete ornament, introduced four times on the stem and three times on each of the six branches, is termed פֵּטֶרֶת (gebia', lit. 'cup,' so RV; AV 'bowl'), and consists of two parts,* corresponding to the calyx and corolla of the almond flower, the קַפְתָּר (EV 'knop') and the פֶּרֶה (EV 'flower') of the text. At what intervals these 'knops and flowers' are to be introduced is not stated (for the speculations of the Rabbis see Flesch, op. cit. with diagrams), nor do we know how the four sets of V. 34 are to be distributed. It is usually assumed that these include the three knops which in v. 35 ornament the points where the branches diverge from the stem. It seems to us more in harmony with the text to regard the three knops in question, with which no flowers are associated, as suggested rather by the scales of the stem of a tree, from whose axils spring the buds which develop into branches. We accordingly prefer to find seven knops on the central stem, viz. two 'knops and flowers' to ornament the base, three 'knops' alone, forming axils for the branches, and two 'knops and flowers' on the upper part of the shaft. Shaft and arms alike probably terminated in a 'cup' with its knop and flower, the five outspread petals of the corolla serving as a tray for one of the seven lamps.† The latter were doubtless of the unvarying Eastern pattern (see LAMP). The nozzles were turned towards the north, facing the table of shewbread, the lampstand having its place on the south side of the Holy Place. To see that the lamps were supplied with the finest produce of the olive ('pure olive oil beaten,' for which see OIL, vol. iii. p. 591a, 592a), trimmed and cleaned, was part of the daily duty of the priests. The necessary apparatus, the snuffers and snuff-dishes (which see) with the 'oil vessels' (Nu 4:9), were also of pure gold.

From the notices in the different strata of P (Ex 27:20f., cf. 30:7, Lv 24:18ff, Nu 8:1ff) it is not clear whether the lamps were to be kept burning day and night or by night only. The latter alternative was the custom in the sanctuary of Shiloh (1 S 3:3). From Lv 24:18f (note v.8)--of which Ex 2720f is perhaps a later reproduction--it would appear that the lamps burned only 'from evening to morning.' At the time of the morning sacrifice they were to be trimmed, cleaned, and replaced (Ex 30:7, cf. Tamid iii. 9, vi. 1), ready to be relit in the evening (30:8, 2 Ch 13:11). Against this, the prima facie interpretation, must be put such considerations as these: (1) the ancient custom of the ever burning lamp alluded to under CANDLE (vol. i. P. 348b) ; (2) the expression תִּשְׁמַךְ עַבָּב, a 'continual

*This appears from 25:33, where the cups are defined as each consisting of 'a knop and a flower'; hence in v. 31 'its knops and its flowers' are to be taken as in apposition Wits cups' (see Dillm. in l.c.), not, as already in Lxx as two additional ornaments (οἱ κρατήρες καὶ οἱ σφαιρουστήρες καὶ τὰ κρίνα; of the similar misinterpretation regarding the frames of the dwelling on the part of the LXX, § vii. (b) above).

† In the Mishna פֶּרֶה (‘flower’) has on this account become the usual term for the plinth or tray of an ordinary lampstand (Ohaloth xi. 8, Kelim xi. 7). Of the ἐνθέμια of the divergent description in the G r. text (37:17ff).
lamp or light' (Lv 24:2=Ex 27:20); and (3) since the dwelling was absolutely dark, there must, one would think, have been some provision for lighting it during the day. The practice of a later period, vouched for by Josephus (Ant. III. viii. 3
[§ 199], with which cf. his quotation from pseudo-Hecatius, c. Apion. i. 22[§ 199]), by which only three of the lamps burned by day and the remaining four were lighted at sunset, seems to be a compromise between the directions of the text and the practical necessities of the case (so Riehm, HWB, art. 'Leuchter'). The Rabbinical notices are still later, and differ from both the data of P and those of Josephus. (On the whole question see Schurer, HJP II. i. 281 f. with full ref., and 295 f.).

The fate of the golden lampstand of the second temple, made under the direction of Judas Maccabaeus (1 Mac 4:49) to replay the earlier stand (την λυχνιαν του φωτος, ib. 121, Ben Sira's λυχνια αγια, 26:17) carried off by Antiochus iv., has been narrated under SHEWBREAD (§ iii.). Onias in furnishing his temple at Leontopolis was content with a single golden lamp, suspended by a chain of gold (Jos. BJ VII. x. 8).

(c) The Altar of Incense (Ex 30:1-5=37:25-28 [the latter absent in Gr.]; Jos. Ant. III. vi. 8[§ 147 IL]).—No part of the furniture of the tabernacle has been the subject of so much controversy in recent years as the altar of incense, which in our present text of Exodus occupies the place of honour in front of the veil. The attitude of modern criticism to Ex 30. 31 has been already stated (§ iii.), and it must suffice here to indicate in a summary way the principal grounds on which recent critics, with one voice, have pronounced against the presence of this altar in the tabernacle as sketched by the original author of Ex 25-29 (cf. EXODUS, vol. i. p. 810; INCENSE, vol. ii. p. 467 f.; TEMPLE).

(1) The tabernacle and its furniture have been described in detail, as also the dress and consecration of its ministrant priests, and the whole section brought to a solemn close with 29:5f. Advocates of the traditional view must therefore explain the absence from its proper place in ch. 25 of an article ex hypothesi so essential to the daily ritual (30:7f) as the altar of incense. They have also to account for the fact that the position of Ex 30:1-10 varies in the MT, the Samaritan-Hebrew, and Or. texts (being altogether absent from the latter in the recapitulation in ch. 37). (2) Pg in the most unmistakable manner refers to the altar of burnt-offering as 'the altar' (so not less than 100 times, according to the Oxf. Hex. ii. 127), implying that he knew no other. Only in strata that bear other marks of a later origin does it receive a distinguishing epithet (§ vi. (a)). (3) The reference in 30:10 'is clearly based on, and is therefore younger than, the ritual of the Day of Atonement as described in Lv 16:12-14. But this chapter ignores the altar of incense, and, in harmony with Lv 10:1 and Nu 16:17, requires the incense to be offered on censers. (4) Careful examination of the MT of 1 K 7 and Ezk 41 (see SHEWBREAD, TEMPLE) has disclosed the fact that an incense altar found a place neither in the real temple of Solomon nor in the ideal temple of Ezekiel. The references in 1 Ch 28:18, 2 Ch 4:19 etc., are too late in date to enter into the
argument as to the contents of P. The first historical reference to the 'golden altar' is found in the account of the sack of the temple by Antiochus iv. (1 Mac 1:21). On the other hand, the extreme scepticism of Wellhausen (Proleg., Eng. tr. 67) and others as to the existence of such an altar even in the second temple is unwarranted (see Delitzsch, 'Der Itaucheraltar' in Zeitschr. f. kirchl. Wissenscha-ft, 1880, 114-121)

Assuming, then, that we have to do with a later addition (novella) to the original code, we note that this second altar is named מִבְּנֵי מַכָּעֶר מִטְלַה (30:1); or simply מִטְלַה (3027 etc.), also the 'golden altar' (3938 etc., 1 'Mac 121); in the LXX τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θυμιάματος, in Philo and Josephus τὸ θυμιάτηριον—so Symm. and Theod. 30:1; for He 9:4 see end of section. Like the larger altar it is 'four square,' a cubit in length and breadth, and 2 cubits in height, and furnished with horns (for these see § vi.). The material is acacia wood, overlaid with pure gold, the ornamentation a moulding of solid gold (ץ, see § viii. (a)), with the usual provision for rings and staves (v. 4f). 'Its position is to be in the Holy Place, in front of 'the veil that is by the ark of the testimony' (v.8). Aaron and his sons shall offer 'a perpetual incense' upon it night and morning, when they enter to dress and light the lamps of the golden stand (v. 7ff). Once a year, on the Day of Atonement, its horns shall be brought into contact with the atoning blood (v.10). Owing to the ambiguity in the directions of v.6 (cf. 6) with 64 in MT, Sam., and LXX; also Holzinger, in loc.) if taken by themselves, and to the influence of the late gloss (1 K 6:22b), a tradition grew up, which finds expression in the famous passage He 9:4, that the incense altar stood in the Most Holy Place, 'which had a golden altar'

* Differently expressed from Pg.
of incense * and the ark of the covenant. The same verse contains a similar divergent tradition regarding the contents of the ark (see next section).

ix. THE FURNITURE OF THE MOST HOLY PLACE. --The Ark and the Propitiatory (Ex 25:10-22=37:1-9[Gr. 38:1-8]; Jos. Ant. III. vi. 5). --Within the Most Holy Place stood in solitary majesty the sacred ark, on which rested the propitiatory or mercy-seat with its overarching cherubim. The history of the ancient palladium of the Hebrew tribes, 'the ark of J" of the older writers, has been given under ARK. We have here a more elaborate shrine, to which P gives by preference the designation 'ark of the testimony' (τοῖς εὐαγγέλιοις τιμίων 25:22 and often, ἡ κατασκευασμένη τοῦ μαρτυρίου), a phrase parallel to and synonymous with that favoured by Deut. and the Denteronomistic editors, 'ark of the covenant.' In both cases the ark was so named as containing the Decalogue (τοῖς εὐαγγέλιοις 'the testimony,' 25:16, 21), written on 'the tables of testimony' (31:18). The ark itself sometimes receives the simple title 'the testimony' (16:34 etc.); and the tabernacle, as we have seen (§ iii.), as in its turn containing the ark, is named 'the dwelling of the testimony' and the tent of the testimony.† See TESTIMONY.

The ark of P is an oblong chest of acacia wood overlaid within and without with gold, 2 1/2 cubits in length, and 1 1/2 in breadth and height (i.e. 5 x 3 x 3 half-cubits). Each of its sides is finished with a strip of cable or ogee moulding (κορώνη, EV 'crown,' see § viii. (a)) of solid gold in the same manner as the top of the table of shewbread; with this difference, however, that in the former the upper line of moulding must have projected beyond the plane of the top of the ark, probably to the extent of the thickness of the propitiatory, in order that the latter, with its cherubim, might remain in place during the march. Within the sacred chest was to be deposited 'the testimony' (v. 16) or Decalogue, as already explained. Before it—not within it, as a later tradition supposed (He 9:4)—were afterwards placed a pot of manna (Ex 16:33f.) and Aaron's rod that budded (Nu 17:10).

Distinct from but resting upon the ark, and of the same superficial dimensions (2 1/2 x 1 1/2 cubits), was a slab of solid gold, to which the name kapporeth is given (only in P and 1 Ch 28:11 EV 'mercy-seat').

The familiar rendering 'mercy-seat;' first used by Tindale, following Luther's Gnadenstuhl (cf. SHEWBREAD, § i.), floes back to that of the oldest VSS (LXX ἰαστήριος, Vulg. propitiatorium)—and is based on the secondary and technical sense of the root--verb ἐπαίνεσθαι, viz. 'to make propitiation' for sin. Hence the Wyclif-Hereford rendering 'propitiatory,' derived from Jerome, is preferable to Tindale's 'mercy-seat.' In our opinion the rendering 'propitiatory' must be maintained. The alternative 'covering' (RVm) adopted in preference by so many

* So RVm and American RV in text for χρυσοῦς θυμιατήριον, with most recent interpreters; AV and RV 'a golden censer.
modern, particularly German, scholars (cf. ἐπιθεμα in Gr. of Ex 25:17, and Philo, op. cit. [ed. Mangey, ii. 150] ἐπιθεμα ἄσανει πύμα [a lid]), is open to two serious objections. On the one hand it is based on the still unproved assumption that the primary signification of רפֶּל was 'to cover,'‡ and on the other hand the kapporeth was in no sense the lid or cover of the ark, which was a chest or coffers complete in itself. Dillmann and others have unsuccessfully attempted a via media by taking kapporeth in the sense of a protective covering (Schutzdach, Deckplatte, etc.) See, further, Deissmann, Bible Studies [Eng. tr.], p. 124ff.

Near the ends of the propitiatory stood, facing each other, two small § emblematic figures, the cherubim, of the same material and workmanship as the golden lampstand, viz. 'beaten' or repousse work (ニュー, χρυσοτορευτα) of pure gold. Being securely soldered to the propitiatory they are reckoned as 'of one piece' with it (v.19). Each cherub was furnished, like the larger and differently placed cherubim of Solomon's temple (1 K 6:23ff), with a pair of wings which met overhead, while their faces were bent downwards towards the propitiatory. Whatever may have been their significance in primitive Hebrew mythology, the cherubim as here introduced, like the kindred seraphim in Isaiah's vision, are the angelic ministers of J", guarding in the attitude of adoration the throne of His earthly glory (cf. Book of Enoch, ed. Charles, 717). The propitiatory, with the overarching cherubim, was, in truth, the innermost shrine of the wilderness sanctuary, for it was at once J"s earthly and the footstool of His heavenly throne.* (cf. 1 Ch 28:2). Not at the tent door, as in the earlier representation (Ex 33:7ff.), but 'from above the propitiatory, from between the cherubim' (25:22), will J" henceforth commune with His servant doses (30:6). 'There, in the darkness and the silence, he listened to the Voice' (Nu 7:8).

For the transport of the sacred chest, its propitiatory and cherubim, two poles of acacia wood overlaid with mold are provided. These are to rest permanently (Ex 25:18, otherwise Nu 4:6, where the staves are inserted when the arch begins) in four rings, attached, according to our present text, to the four 'feet' (_losses, v.12, so RV, but AV 'corners') of the ark.

But this text and rendering are open to serious question. For (1) of the shape, length, and construction of these 'feet' nothing is said; (2) why should the author employ the Phoenician word ( أثن) for 'foot' here in place of the usual לו (v.26)? (3) If the rings were attached so far down, a state of dangerously unstable equilibrium would result; (4) all the oldest versions apparently read, or at least, as our own AV, rendered as in v.28), לו its four corners.† We must suppose, then, that the rings were attached, perhaps below the moulding, at the corners.

† In the art. ARK (§ i.) attention was briefly called to the three sets of designations of the ark characteristic of the early, the Deuteronomic, and the priestly writers respectively, of which all the other OT titles, some twenty in all, are merely variations and expansions. See for later discussions H. P. Smith, Samuel, 33; 'Ark' in Encyc. Bibl. i. 800 f.; Meinhold, Die Lade Jahves, 2 ff.
of the short sides of the ark (so the Baraita, Neumann, Keil), along which, and not along the long sides (as Riggenbach, Dillm., and most), the poles rested. The object of this arrangement is to secure that the Divine throne shall always face in the direction of the march. The weight of the whole must have been considerable, with poles, certainly not 'staves,' and bearers to correspond.‡

In the second temple there was no ark, and consequently no propitiatory, notwithstanding the statement in the Apocalypse of Baruch (6:7) that it was hidden by an angel before the destruction of the temple, A.D. 70. According to P the sole contents of the ark, as we have seen, were the two tables of testimony on which the Decalogue was inscribed. Once a year, on the Day of Atonement, the high priest alone entered the Holy of Holies to bring the blood of the sin-offerings into contact with the propitiatory (Lv 16:14f.; see ATONEMENT, DAY OF, vol. i. P. 199).

x. ERECTION AND CONSECRATION OF THE TABERNACLE.--In the oldest stratum of the Priests' Code the directions for the preparation of the sanctuary and its furniture (Ex 25-27), which have engaged our attention up to this point, are followed by equally minute instructions as to the priestly garments (28), and by the solemn consecration of Aaron and his sons for the priestly office (29). The altar alone of the appointments of the

‡ The most recent research seems to point in favour of the alternative 'to wipe off'; see Zimmern, Beitrag zur Kenntniss d. babyl. Religion, 92; Haupt in JBL, xix. (1900) 61, 80.

§ It must be noted that, with bodies bent and wings out-stretched, the cherubim were accommodated on a surface less than 4 ft. from end to end.

* For this idea and its possible bearing on the ultimate historical origin of the ark as the empty throne of an imageless deity, see Memhold, Die Lade Jahves (1900), 44 and passim, based on the researches of Reichel in Ueber Vorhellenisehe Gotterculte (esp. 27ff.); cf. also Budde in Expos. Times, June 1898, p. 396ff. (reprinted [in German] in ZATW, 1901, p. 194f.).

† Cf. 1 K 7:30, where מכסה of MT (AV here also 'corners') is similarly regarded by recent commentators as a corruption of מכסה or מכסה.

‡ The propitiatory, even if only a fingerbreadth thick, would alone weigh 760 lb. troy. The weight of the whole must be put at about 6 cwt. The Talmud mentions four bearers (Flesch, op cit. 66). Two sufficed for the historical ark (ARK, vol. i. p. 1506)
sanctuary is singled out for consecration (29:36f). In the first of the accretions to the older document (30, 31), however, we find instructions for the anointing of 'the tent of meeting' and all the furniture of the sanctuary with the 'holy anointing oil' (30:26ff), with which also the priests are to be anointed. When we pass to the still later stratum (35-40; see above, § iii.), we find a record of the carrying out of the preceding instructions to the last detail, followed by the erecting of 'the dwelling of the tent of meeting' (40:1ff) on the first day of the first month of the second year, that is, a year less fourteen days from the first anniversary of the Exodus (40:1, 17, cf. 12:2, 8). A comparison with 19:1 shows that according to P's chronology a period of at least nine months is allowed for the construction of the sanctuary and its furniture. Some of the questions raised by 40:18, 19 as to the manner in which the curtains 'were spread over the dwelling' have been discussed by anticipation in § vii. (c); it must suffice now to add that after the court and the tabernacle proper had been set up, and all the furniture in its place, the whole, we must assume, was duly anointed by Moses himself in accordance with the instructions of the preceding verses (40:9ff), although this fact is not mentioned until we reach a later portion of the narrative (Lv 8:10ff, Nu 7:1). This consecration of the sanctuary naturally implies that it is now ready for the purpose for which it was erected. Accordingly 'the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of J" filled the dwelling' (40:34ff). J" had now taken possession of the holy abode which had been prepared for Him. With the new year, as was most fitting, the new order of things began.

xi. THE TABERNACLE ON THE MARCH (Nu 2:17 325-38 41ff, etc.). -- The cloud which rested on the dwelling by day and appeared as a pillar of fire by night accompanied the Hebrews 'throughout all their journeys' in the wilderness. When 'the cloud was taken up from over the dwelling' (Ex 40:37, Nu 9:17) this was the signal for the tents to be struck and another stage of the march begun; while, 'as long as the cloud abode upon the dwelling, whether it were two days or a month or a year,' the children of Israel remained encamped and journeyed not (Nu 9:18ff). The charge of the tabernacle and of all that pertained thereto was committed to the official guardians, the priests and Levites (Nu 3:5ff). When the signal for the march was given by a blast from the silver trumpets (10:1ff), the priests entered the dwelling, and, taking down the veil at the entrance to the Most Holy Place, wrapped it round the ark (4:5ff). This, as the most sacred of all the contents of the tabernacle, received three coverings in all, the others but two. Full and precise instructions follow for the wrapping up of the rest of the furniture (47-14). This accomplished, the priests hand over their precious burden to the first of the Levitical guilds, the sons of Kohath, for transport by means of the bearing-poles with which each article is provided (v.15f.). The second guild, the sons of Gershon, have in charge the tapestry curtains of the dwelling, the hair curtains of the tent, the two outer coverings, the veil, and the screen (3:25ff; 4:24ff). For the conveyance of these, two covered waggons and four oxen are provided by the heads of the tribes (7:3-7). The remaining division of the Levites, the sons of
Merari, receives in charge the frames and bars of the dwelling, together with the pillars and bases of the dwelling and of the court, with four waggons and eight oxen for their transport (ib.). *

* The fondness of the priestly writers for proportion (2 :1) has again led to strange results, for, even with the colossal ‘boards’ of previous writers reduced to frames (see § vii. (b)) the loads of the Merarites were out of all proportion to those of the Gershonites. Nu 7, however, is now recognized as one the latest sections of the Hexateuch.

Everything being now in readiness, the march began. The Levites, according to Nu 2:17,--and as the symmetry of the camp requires,--marched in the middle of the line, with two divisions of three tribes each before them and two behind. This, however, does not accord with Nu 10:17ff, according to which the sons of Gershon and Merari marched after the first division of three tribes, and had the tabernacle set up before the arrival of the Kohathites with the sacred furniture between the second and third divisions.

xii. THE HISTORICITY OF P'S TABERNACLE.--After what has been said in our opening section--with which the art. ARK must be compared--as to the nature, location, and ultimate disappearance of the Mosaic tent of meeting, it is almost superfluous to inquire into the historical reality of the costly and elaborate sanctuary which, according to P, Moses erected in the wilderness of Sinai. The attitude of modern OT scholarship to the priestly legislation, as now formulate in the priestly (see §§ i. and iv. above), and in particular to those sections of it which deal with the sanctuary and its worship, is patent on every page of this Dictionary, and is opposed to the historicity of P's tabernacle. It is now recognized that the highly organized community of the priestly writers, rich not only in the precious metals and the most costly Phoenician dyes, but in men of rare artistic skill, is not the unorganized body of Hebrew serfs and nomads that meets us in the oldest sources of the Pentateuch. Even after centuries spent in contact with the civilization and arts of Canaan, when skilled artists in metal were required, they had to be hired by Solomon from Phoenicia. Again, the situation of P's tabernacle, its highly organized ministry, its complex ritual, are utterly at variance with the situation and simple appointments of the Elohistic tent of meeting (see § i.). With regard, further, to the details of the description, as studied in the foregoing sections, we have repeatedly had to call attention to the obscurities, omissions, and minor inconsistencies of the text, which compel the student to the conviction that he is dealing not with the description of an actual structure, but with an architectural programme, dominated by certain leading conceptions. The most convincing, however, of the arguments against the actual existence of P's tabernacle, is the silence of the pre-exilic historical writers regarding it. There is absolutely no place for it in the picture which their writings disclose of the early religion of the Hebrews. The tabernacle of P has no raison d'etre apart from the
ark, the history of which is known with fair completeness from the conquest to its removal to the temple of Solomon. But in no genuine passage of the history of that long period is there so much as a hint of the tabernacle, with its array of ministering priests and Levites. Only the Chronicler (1 Ch 16:39; 21:29 etc.), psalm-writers, editors, and authors of marginal glosses, writing at a time when P's conception of Israel's past had displaced every other, find the tabernacle of the priestly writers in the older sources, or supply it where they think it ought to have been (cf. 2 Ch 16:39 with 1 K 3:2ff). See, further, Wellh. Proleg. (Eng. tr.) 39 ff., and recent works cited, in the Literature at the end of this article.

xiii. THE RULING IDEAS AND RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TABERNACLE.--If, then, the tabernacle of the foregoing sections had no historical existence, is its study, on that account, a waste of time and labour? By no means. On the contrary, the tabernacle as conceived by the priestly writers is the embodiment of a sublime idea with which are associated many other ideas and truths of the most vital moment for the history of religion. In
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...is impossible to do more than indicate in summary form some of these vital religious truths to which reference has been made. We have already (§ iv.) expressed the conviction that the only standpoint from which to approach the study of the true significance of the tabernacle, as designed by the author of Ex 25-29, is that laid down by this author himself. Following the lead of Ezekiel, his chief aim, and the aim of the priestly writers who expanded the original sketch, is to show to future generations the necessary conditions under which the ideal relation between J" and Israel may be restored and maintained. This ideal is expressed by Ezekiel and by P as a dwelling of J" in the midst of His covenant people (reff. in § iv.). The methods, however, by which these two kindred spirits sought to impress this ideal upon their contemporaries are diametrically opposed. Ezekiel projects his ideal forward into the Messianic future; throws his backwards to the golden age of Moses. Both sketches are none the less ideals, whose realization for prophet and priest alike was still in the womb of the future. Both writers follow closely the arrangements of the pre-exilic temple, P, however, striving to unite these with existing traditions of the Mosaic tent of meeting. It is the recognition of these facts that makes it possible to say that 'a Christian apologist can afford to admit that the elaborate description of the tabernacle is to be regarded as a product of religious idealism, working upon a historical basis' (Ottley, Aspects of the Old Test. 226).

The problem that presented itself to the mind of P was this: Under what conditions may the Divine promise of Ezk 37:27 ('my dwelling shall be with them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people') be realized? This we take to be the supreme idea of the priestly code, the realization of the presence of God in the midst of His people (Ex 25:8; 29:48). This thought, as we have seen, is expressed in the characteristic designation 'the dwelling,' given by P to the most essential part of the sanctuary which is to be the concrete embodiment of the thought.

The Divine dwelling must be in accordance with the Divine character. Now, in the period from Deuteronomy to the close of the Exile, the two aspects of the Divine character which the inspired teachers of the time place in the forefront of their teaching are the unity and the holiness of J". Each of these attributes has its necessary correlate. The unity of J" requires the unity or centralization of His worship, which is the keynote of Deuteronomy. The holiness of J" demands the holiness of His people, which is the recognized keynote of the Law of Holiness (Lv 19 ff.). The crowning result of the discipline of the Exile may be summed up in the simple formula 'one God, one sanctuary,' a thought which dominates the priestly code from end to end. That there should be but one sanctuary in the wilderness, a symbol of the unity of J", is therefore for P a thing of course, requiring neither justification nor enforcement.

With regard to the other pair of correlates, a holy God and a holy people, the whole ceremonial system of the priestly code expends itself in the effort to give expression to this twofold thought. The centre of this system is the tabernacle and its priesthood, and every effort is made to render the former a visible embodiment of the holiness of the God who is to be worshipped in its court. We have seen (§ iv.) the precautions taken by Ezekiel to guard his new sanctuary from
profanation; the same thought is prominent in H (Law of Holiness), and is impressively exhibited in the arrangement of the desert camp in P. Between the tents of the twelve tribes and the throne of J" there intervene the cordon of the tents of the tribe of Levi, the court, and the Holy Place--into which priests alone may enter, all so many protecting sheaths, to borrow a figure from plant-life, of the Most Holy Place, where J" dwells enthroned in ineffable majesty and almost unapproachable holiness. Once a year only may the high priest, as the people's representative, approach within its precincts, bearing the blood of atonement. Not only, therefore, is the one tabernacle the symbol of JX"s unity, it is also an eloquent witness to the truth: 'Ye shall be holy, for I, J", your God am holy' (Lv 19:2). Yet these precautions are, after all, intended not to exclude but to safeguard the right of approach of J"s people to His presence. The tabernacle was still the 'tent of meeting,' the place at which, with due precautions, men might approach J", and in which J" condescended to draw near to men. It is thus a witness to the further truth that man is called to enjoy a real, albeit still restricted, communion and converse with God.

One other attribute of the Divine nature receives characteristic expression in the arrangements of P's sanctuary. This is the perfection and harmony of the character of J". Symmetry, harmony, and proportion are the three essentials of the aesthetic in architecture; and in so far as the aesthetic sense in man, by which the Creator has qualified him for the enjoyment of the beauty and harmony of the universe, is a part of the Divine image (Gn 1:26f) in each of us, these qualities are reflexions of the harmony and perfection of the Divine nature. The symmetry of the desert sanctuary has already been abundantly emphasized. The harmony of its design is shown in the balance of all its parts, and in the careful gradation of the materials employed. The three varieties of curtains (§ iv.) and the three metals correspond to the three ascending degrees of sanctity which mark the court, the Holy Place, and the Most Holy respectively. In the dwelling itself we advance from the silver of the bases through the furniture of wood, thinly sheathed with gold, to the only mass of solid gold, the propitiatory, the seat of the deity. As regards the proportions, finally, which are so characteristic of the tabernacle, we find here just those ratios which are still considered 'the most pleasing' in the domain of architectural art, viz. those 'of an exact cube or two cubes placed side by side . . and the ratio of the base, perpendicular and hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle, e.g. 3, 4, 5 and their multiples' (see art. 'Architecture' in Encyc. Brit.9). The perfect cube of the Most Holy Place is universally regarded as the deliberate attempt to express the perfection of JX"s character and dwelling-place, the harmony and equipoise of all His attributes. The similar thought, the perfection of the New Jerusalem, 'in which no truth will be exaggerated or distorted,' is expressed by the fact that 'the length and breadth and height of it are equal' (Rev 21:16).

* For 'the fundamental sense of unapproachability which is never absent from the notion of J"s holiness,' see Hoaurss, vol. ii. P. 397"
The 'symbolism of numbers' in the measurements of the tabernacle, of which so much has been written, is too firmly established to admit of question (for general principles see art. NUMBER). The sacred numbers 3, 4, 7, 10, their parts (1 1/2, 2, 21, 5) and multiples (6, 9, 12, 20, 28, 30, 42, 48, 50, 60, 100), dominate every detail of the fabric and its furniture.† In all this we must recognize an earnest striving to give concrete expression--in a manner, it is true, which our Western thought finds it difficult to appreciate--to the sacred harmonies and perfection of the character of the Deity for whose 'dwelling' the sanctuary is destined.

† The curious student will easily detect these measurements and numbers in the previous sections.
On the other hand, that the author of Ex 25-29 intended to give expression to ideas beyond the sphere of X's relation to His covenant people, or even within that sphere to invest every detail of material, colour, ornament, etc., with a symbolical significance, we do not believe. Following in the wake of Plilo (op. cit.) and Josephus (Ant. III. vii. 7), the Fathers, and after them many writers down to our own day, among whom Bahr stands preeminent, have sought to read a whole philosophy of the universe into the tabernacle. Now it is designed to unfold the relations of heaven and earth and sea, now of body, soul, and spirit, and many wonderful things besides. Happily, the taste for these fanciful speculations has died out and is not likely to revive.

Quite apart from the authors of such far-fetched symbolisms stand several of the NT writers, who see in the tabernacle the foreshadowing of spiritual realities. Once and again the terminology of St. Paul betrays the influence of the tabernacle (e.g. the laver of regeneration, Tit 3:6 RVm). For the author of the Fourth Gospel the tabernacle on which rested the Divine glory in the cloud prefigured the incarnate Word who 'tabernacled (ἐσκήνωσεν) among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father' (Jn 1:14). In the Epistle to the Hebrews, again, the tabernacle, its furniture, and ministering priesthood supply the unknown author with an essential part of his argument. With 'singular pathos,' to borrow Bishop Westcott's apt expression, he lingers over his description of the sacred tent and all its arrangements. Yet, like the whole Levitical ceremonial, it was but the shadow of the heavenly substance (8:5), a 'parable for the time present' of 'the greater and more perfect tabernacle' (9:11) which is heaven. Into this tabernacle Jesus Christ has entered, our great High Priest, by whom the restricted access of the former dispensation is done away, and through whom 'a new and living way' has been opened of free access into the 'true' Holy of Holies (9:24), even the immediate presence of God. Last of all, in the Book of Revelation we have the final consummation of the kingdom of God portrayed under the figure of the tabernacle: Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall tabernacle (σκηνώσει) with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them' (Rev 21:3--for v.16 see above)--in which the final word of revelation takes up and repeats the sublime ideal of Ezekiel and the priestly writers. 'In this representation of the New Jerusalem culminates the typology of the OT sanctuary' (Keil).
LITERATURE.--Works on the tabernacle are legion, but there is no monograph from the standpoint of the foregoing article. The student must start from a careful study of the text of Exodus and of the more recent commentaries, such as Dillmann-Ryssel, Strack, Holzinger, Baentsch. The commentary in the International critical series by the writer of this article is in preparation. The critical problems are treated by Popper, *Der bibl. Bericht uber die Stiftshutte*, 1862; Graf, *Die geschichtl. Bucher d. AT*, 618., 1866; Kuenen, *Hexateuch*; Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*; and more recent writers (see § ii. above). In addition to the relevant sections in the *Archeologies* of Ewald, Haneberg, Keil, Benzinger, Nowack (vol. ii.), the articles should be consulted in the Bible Dictionaries of Winer, Riehm, and PRE2 (by Riggenbach), all under 'Stiftshutte'; artt. 'Tabernacle' and 'Temple' (the latter especially) in Smith's DB. The more important monographs are by Neumann, *Die Stiftshutte*, 1861; Riggenbach, *Die Mosaische Stiftshulte* 2, 1867; Schick, *Stiflehutte unit Tempel*, 1898; and (in English) Brown, *The Tabernacle*, 1899. The most exhaustive treatment of the tabernacle, its arrangements and its significance, is Bahr's *Symbolik d. Mosaischen Cultus*, 2 vole. 1837-39 (Bd. 1. 2nd ed. 1874), full of fanciful ideas. On somewhat different lines is Friederich, *Symbolik d. Mos. Stiftehutte*, 1841. Sound criticisms of both, and an attempt to reduce the symbolism to saner limits, characterize Keil's full treatment in vol. I. of his *Archeology* (Eng. tr.). See also Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1889, Essay on 'The general significance of the Tabernacle,' p. 233 ff.; Ottley, *Aspects of the OT*, esp. p. 281 ff., 'The symbolical significance,' etc.

A. R. S. KENNEDY.

Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible (vol. 4) (1902)
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Three days from Moses' song to the murmuring of sedition. How shocking this is in the light of Israel's recent history. They witnessed the discriminating plagues in Egypt. They were delivered from slave labor with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, passing through the Red Sea on dry ground. As they reached the other side, they turned just in time to see the walls of water collapse, crushing Pharaoh's army. The whole assembly erupted with shouts of great joy; they sang the song of Moses and the women danced Miriam's dance. Yet three days later, the murmuring of rebellion. What could have produced such a failure of trust?

We have before us an account of God's wilderness proving (in the Old English sense of "testing"). And what kind of trial was it? No doubt it was a physical trial. Three days dwindled Israel's water supply, and without water nothing can live. You can imagine how each day, as the jugs got a little emptier, the song of Moses got a little quieter, and Miriam's dance and timbrel got a little slower, until no more song, no more dance, only the murmuring of rebellion. No doubt it was also an emotional trial. As the Israelites saw water from afar, an oasis in a vast desert wasteland, you can imagine their excitement. They ran to it, kneeling down to drink, expecting it to taste so refreshing and sweet. But as they drank the water--bitterness! Bitterness not only because of the taste, but
because it was the exact opposite of the sweetness they expected.

But more than a physical trial, more than an emotional trial, the bitter water of Marah represented a spiritual trial that challenged the very heart of God's promise to Israel. At the beginning of the book of Exodus, God heard the groaning of his people and promised to deliver them on account of the covenant he made with their fathers. And from what did God promised to deliver them? Exodus 1:14 tells us: the Egyptians made the lives of the Israelites bitter with hard labor. And as the Israelites left Egypt, they ate the bitter herbs in remembrance of the bitterness of Egypt (Ex. 12:8). Egypt was characterized by bitterness. God's promise to deliver Israel from Egypt was a promise to deliver them from bitterness. And now, after the Red Sea redemption, Israel finds herself drinking from the bitter waters. Do you see the trial? Bitterness in Egypt, bitterness in the wilderness: has God really done anything at all? Beyond physical need, beyond emotional frustration, this trial reaches down to the very depths of faith in the God of Israel.

As the first narrative on the other side of the Red Sea redemption, this text teaches us something important about the character of the wilderness. The wilderness is a place of trial, where the promise of God seems to have come to naught. Though she has been redeemed through the Red Sea, though she has the presence of God in the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night, Israel does not yet have the fullness of her inheritance. The wilderness is Israel's already/not yet experience, her semi-realized eschatology. Though definitively delivered, she awaits the consummate rest of the promised land. She has not yet crossed the border into the land flowing with milk and honey. And in the meantime, Israel is confronted with proving trials which seem to call into question the truthfulness of God's promises.

And what did Israel do? She became bitter. The water was bitter and Israel became bitter. The bitter water acted like a catalyst for the bitterness of Israel's soul. Israel tasted not just the bitterness of the waters but the bitterness of forsaking the Lord (Jer. 2:19). God's people, on the other side of their salvation, have become bitter.

You must grasp this because Israel's wilderness sojourn is your wilder-
ness sojourn. Speaking of Israel's wilderness journey, Paul writes, "Now these things happened to them as types, and they were written for our instruction, upon whom the ends of the ages have come" (1 Cor. 10:11). Israel's wilderness sojourn is a type (often poorly translated in 1 Cor. 10 as "example") of the church's heavenly journey. You are the last, the heavenly, the eschatological wilderness community. You are the wilderness community upon whom the ends of the ages have come. You are not between redemption from Egypt and the land of Canaan, but between the realities to which they point. You are between the redemption from the bondage of sin and the new Jerusalem. You have been redeemed from sin, you have the down payment of the Spirit, but you do not yet have the fullness of your inheritance. You have not yet come to the land flowing with milk and honey. Rather, you have proving trials which appear to invalidate God's promise. You find yourself in this life before the Lord returns in a period of trial, in a wilderness where it seems that the promise of God has come to naught and you are tempted to be bitter. Israel's story is your story.

But our text is not only an account of God's wilderness proving, but also of his wilderness provision. God provides a tree to heal the bitterness of the waters. At this point let me encourage you not to make too facile of a jump from the tree to the cross, for if you do you will miss something very significant about our text as well as an answer to a source-critical objection often lodged against it. Many commentators want to reject the unity of our text, assigning verse 25a to one source and verses 25b-26 to another. They cannot see how the verse on throwing the tree into the water relates to the verse on the statute and the regulation to keep all God's commandments. Therefore, they say that the verses came from two different authors and were put together at a time well after Israel's exile.

What I want you to see is that there is an essential unity between the throwing of the tree into the water (v. 25a) and the statute and regulation to keep all God's commandments (vv. 25b-26, which I will hereafter refer to as the Marah statute). What is implicitly pictured in God showing Moses the tree and Moses throwing the tree in the waters is explicitly stated in the Marah statute in the following verses. Both implicitly and explicitly, what is being revealed to us is the requirement for the Israelites' obedience to receive blessing.
God shows Moses a tree. The word translated "show" is a word which means to instruct.\textsuperscript{1} It is the word from which we get Torah. When the passage says that God showed Moses a tree, what we have is God instructing Moses concerning a tree. We could translate the verse, "God gave Torah to Moses." Even if the translation of "showed" is preferred, God clearly showed Moses the tree to tell Moses what to do with it. Moses then followed God's instruction by throwing the tree into the water and the water became sweet. Note the progression: God gave Moses instruction, Moses followed God's instruction, and the result was healing and sweetness. The whole focus of what happens at Marah is on the effect of obedience to God's word. When Moses follows God's instruction, the result is sweetness. The sign indicates the blessing and healing that comes from being obedient to God's commands.

This, then, is what is explicitly stated in verses 25b-26. The statute conveys the exact same message: if you are obedient to God's commands, God will be your healer. Note here the relationship of works to blessing. This is not evangelical obedience. This is "do this and live" obedience. If Israel is not obedient, God threatens them with the diseases of the Egyptians, the marks of divine curse. The statute hearkens back to the relationship of works to blessing in the garden. As the people are being led to Mt. Sinai where they will receive the yoke of the law and will themselves ratify the law covenant, they are already being prepared for the theocratic principle of inheritance. If the people want to retain the blessings of God, if the people want God to be their healer, they must follow his Torah.

Yet Israel's history in the wilderness is a sad testimony of their inability to keep the Marah statute. This is the generation that fell in the wilderness. They could not keep the commandments of God and God was not their healer. Even once a new generation entered the land, they failed to keep the commandments

\textsuperscript{1} Most English versions translate verse 25 as "God showed him," because of their dependence on Brown-Driver-Briggs which lists one of the meanings of \textit{yrh} as "to show," citing this text. But \textit{yrh} in the Hiphil with the double accusative has the clear meaning "to instruct someone concerning something," so much so that many of the new dictionaries no longer list "to show" as a meaning. For an example, see Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, ed. D. J. A. Clines (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), vol. 4, p. 291-292. For other passages with the same grammatical construction as ours, where the meaning is clearly God instructing someone concerning something, see Psalms 27:11, 86:11 and 119:33.
of Yahweh and were cast out of the promised land in exile, a type of judgment.

Israel's failure points to the need for a new Israel, an Israel which can be obedient to the commandments of God if God is to be our healer. While the wilderness trial is a type of the Church, it is first and foremost a type of Christ. The obedience required of the Israelites to merit God's healing is fulfilled in Christ. He is the true Israel, "Out of Egypt I called my Son" (Mt. 2:15; Hos. 11:1). In Matthew 4 and Luke 4, it is Christ who passes the probation in the wilderness. This is a recapitulation of the temptation experiences of Adam and Israel. Where Adam and Israel failed, Christ prevailed.

The glory of the new covenant is that the Marah statute points not to what you must do, but what has been done for you. Christ is the one who gives earnest heed to the voice of the Lord, and does what is right in his sight, and gives ear to his commandments, and keeps all his statutes. Hence it is on account of the obedience of Christ that God is our healer.

Did not the Israelites already see this as they looked into the face of Moses and saw a covenant mediator who was obedient to God's command and healed the bitterness for the people? Yet this is the generation that perished in the wilderness, despite Moses' mediation. Despite Moses' obedience and intercession, the bitterness and rebellion of the people made God lay them low in the wilderness. Moses himself could not usher them into the Promised Land (which he himself did not enter). So just as Israel's failure points ahead in the history of redemption to a new Israel, Moses' failure points ahead in the history of redemption to a new Moses. This Savior is so glorious, he is so wonderful, that in his person the typology of Israel and Moses converge. Christ is the faithful covenant mediator who acts on behalf of the people by being obedient to all of God's commandments. He is the one who brings healing to the people. He does this by his resurrection. Christ is greater than Moses because Christ himself drank the bitter waters of Marah on the cross. And because death had no hold on him, he was raised into the new paradise. His resurrection now guarantees our access into the Promised Land.

What then of the tree? Perhaps you thought I was going to leave this out! God did not show Moses a rock, Moses did not put his staff in the water. The reference to the tree is not incidental. The tree is obviously the instrument of
healing. Does not the collocation of tree and healing immediately bring to mind Revelation 22, where in the new paradise there is the tree of life whose leaves are healing to the nations? That which was the future reward held out in the garden, that which is the final provision of the heavenly Jerusalem, is already intruding itself into the wilderness. The tree represents nothing less than the new order penetrating into the old. As Geerhardus Vos wrote, "The kingdom of God, what else is it but a new world of supernatural realities supplanting this natural world of sin." And access to this tree of life comes only via Calvary's tree. The sweetness of heaven, the new heavenly order, comes to us by the work of Christ. His obedience merits for us the eschatological reward of the tree of life. He drank the bitter waters on the cross, he endured the bitter wrath of God, he tasted the bitterness of death, that you might know the sweetness of the forgiveness of sins, the sweetness of sonship, the sweetness of communion with the Father. Christ has taken the bitterness out of your wilderness sojourn, because even now in your wilderness you have access to this tree of life, because of Jesus' tree.

Notice how our text end. God brought them to Elim in the wilderness. It is no doubt a picture of paradise: twelve springs of water and seventy date palms. Elim is the promise that the wilderness sojourn has an end. What gives the wilderness meaning and makes it bearable is its relationship to paradise. And as surely as God has brought Israel to Elim, he will bring his people to the promised land, the new paradise of God.
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THE HA-BI-RU -KIN OR FOE OF ISRAEL?

MEREDITH G. KLINE

FIGURING in near eastern history for something over a millennium of Old Testament times was an enigmatic entity called the ha-BI-ru. Successful of old in capturing the spoil in biblical lands, they have in modern times been even more successful in capturing the attention of biblical scholars. More than half a century of general scholarly interest culminated in a united effort to identify the ha-BI-ru at the fourth Rencontre assyriologique internationale held in Paris in the summer of 1953. But that gathering did not succeed in altering the previous state of the question which has been described in the terms: quot capita tot sententiae. The ha-BI-ru, therefore, continue an enigma, and the curiosity which has prompted the present study may be forgiven though its consequence be to confound yet worse the confusion with yet another conclusion.

Of particular attraction to those concerned with biblical history and faith has been the apparent identity in name between the ha-BI-ru and the Hebrews. This has spawned a variety of theories sharing as a common nucleus the idea

1 The syllabification of ha-BI-ru represents the cuneiform orthography and the capitalization of the second syllable designates a particular cuneiform sign without prejudice to the question of which of the two most common values of it, namely bi and pi, is to be adopted.
2 J. Bottero, Le Probleme des Habiru (Paris, 1954) p. xxviii. This work presents a collection of the known ha-BI-ru texts and a compendium of notes contributed by various scholars in connection with the Paris meeting, along with Bottero's own interpretation of the problem.
3 This study was undertaken in the preparation of a doctoral dissertation under Cyrus H. Gordon at the Dropsie College of Hebrew and Cognate Learning. In its present revised form it gives greater prominence to the biblical aspects of the problem in view of the particular interests of the majority of the readers of the Westminster Theological Journal.
4 The questions of the proper normalization of ha-BI-ru and of its supposed phonetic equivalence with יָרֵבָה, "Hebrew", will be reserved in this study until Ha-BI-ru-Hebrew relations are under consideration.
that the biblical Hebrews originated as an offshoot of the 
*ha-Bl-ru* of the extra-biblical texts. It is recognized by all 
that a complete identification of *ha-Bl-ru* and Hebrews is 
impossible since their historical paths do not for the most 
part coincide. In the Amarna Age, however, their paths 
do converge in Canaan in a way that demands systematization 
and has further encouraged the theory that the Hebrews 
stemmed from the *ha-Bl-ru*. This theory has moreover proved 
a dominant factor in shaping reconstructions in the vital 
area of the origins of Hebrew religion, when it has been 
adopted by scholars who, discarding the *prima facie* biblical 
account, would locate those religious origins as late as the 
Amarna Age.

There are then two problems to be investigated. First, 
the identity of those denominated *ha-Bl-ru*. Second, the 
relation of the *ha-Bl-ru* to the Hebrews.

### I. THE IDENTITY OF THE *Ha-Bl-ru*

What is the identifying mark of the *ha-Bl-ru*--the specific 
quality which distinguishes them among the manifold elements 
of ancient near eastern life? Is it racial or ethnic or national? 
Or does *ha-Bl-ru* denote membership in a particular socio-
economic class or professional guild, either inter-ethnic or 
super-ethnic' in composition?

---

5 The *ha-Bl-ru* are mentioned in texts originating everywhere from 
Asia Minor to Babylon and from Assyria to Egypt throughout the course 
of roughly the 2nd millennium B.C.

6 This term denotes the period of the 15th and 14th centuries B.C. 
when Amenophis III and IV ruled in Egypt. It is derived from Tell el 
Amarna in Egypt where hundreds of tablets were discovered containing 
the official diplomatic correspondence of these pharaohs with Asiatic 
rulers. They are of great importance for the present study because of 
their frequent references to the disturbing activities of the *ha-Bl-ru* in 
Canaan. It was, indeed, the discovery of these tablets beginning in 1887 
that first introduced the *ha-Bl-ru* to modern historians.

7 Cf., e.g., the elaborate hypothesis of H. H. Rowley in *From Joseph to 

8 I.e., within several ethnic groups (as e.g., mercenaries, dependents, 
fugitives or *hupsu*) or composed of several ethnic units (as e.g., the general 
category of nomadic tribes).
A. The Word Ha-BI-ru.

A clue to the identification of the individuals designated as ha-BI-ru has naturally been sought in the word itself. There are three avenues by which the signification of the term ha-BI-ru can be approached: its etymology, its ideographic equivalent (SA-GAZ), and its morphology.

1. The Etymology of Ha-BI-ru. On the assumption that the word is Semitic the following etymological explanations have been ventured. The root is the verb 'br in the sense of "pass (from place to place)" , i. e., a nomad or in the sense of "cross (the frontier) ", i. e., a foreigner. The meaning "one from the other side (of the river)" is obtained if ha-BI-ru is derived from the preposition 'br. The root 'apar, "dust", has been cited with the supposed secondary meanings "man of the steppe lard" or "dusty traveller". Also suggested is a hypothetical Semitic *'pr, "provide", with verbal-adjective, epirum, "one provided with food".

9 Since it is now certain that the first radical is 'Ayin (see below) early explanations based on a root hbr may be ignored.
10 So e. g., E. A. Speiser, Ethnic Movements in the Near East in Second Millennium B. C. (1933), p. 41. W. F. Albright, Journal of the American Oriental Society (hereafter, JAOS) 48, 1928, pp. 183 ff., held it was an intransitive participle meaning "nomad" originally, though it was later used in the sense, "mercenary."
11 So J. Lewy, Hebrew Union College Annual (hereafter, HUCA) XIV, 1939, p. 604; cf. his note in Bottero, op. cit., p. 163.
12 So Kraeling, American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures (hereafter, AJSL) 58, 1941, pp. 248 ff.
14 E. Dhorne, Revue historique CCXI, avril-juin, 1954, pp. 256-264. The ha-BI-ru were "des 'poussiereux', autrement dit: ceux qu'on appelait jadis les 'peregrins' et qu'on appelle aujourd'hui ... les personnes 'd'parents' Ce sont des emigrants que se refugient a l'etranger". For criticism of this approach see Greenberg, The Hab/piru (New Haven, 1955), p. 91, n. 25.
15 So Goetze in Bottero op. cit., pp. 161-163. It appears from Akk. eperu, "provide" and Eg. 'pr, "equip", that 'pr is Hamito-Semitic. The
There is the further possibility that the root of \textit{ha-BI-ru} is non-Semitic.\footnote{That \textit{ha-BI-ru} is not Akkadian has been maintained on these grounds: It begins with an 'Ayin; there are no Akkadian roots \textit{hpr} or \textit{hbr} that yield a suitable sense; and the word is preceded in one Amarna letter, J. Knudtzon, \textit{Die El-Amarna-Tafeln} (hereafter, \textit{EA}) 290:24, by the diagonal mark used to designate glosses and non-Akkadian words. That \textit{ha-BI-ru} is not West Semitic has been argued on the grounds that no West Semitic root \textit{'pr} (assuming the certainty of the \textit{p}) provides a plausible meaning and that the verb \textit{hab/paru} (regarded as a denominative from \textit{ha-BI-ru}) is found at Kultepe where a loan from West Semitic was not possible. On this last text see Bottero, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 10, 11.} Landsberger now holds that the word is Hurrian or belongs to some other substratum of the languages of our documents\footnote{Agreeable to a Hurrian derivation would be the Nuzu personal names \textit{ha-BI-ra} and \textit{ha-BI-ir-til-la}, if these represent the same word as our \textit{ha-BI-ru} and if Purves, in Nuzu Personal Names (1943), p. 214, is correct in his assumption of a Hurrian base (\textit{hapir}) for them.} and in meaning is a synonym of \textit{munnabtu}, "fugitive".\footnote{Thus, in Bottero, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 160, 161.} The Egyptian \textit{'pr}, "equip"\footnote{So Albright, \textit{Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research} (hereafter, \textit{BASOR}) 125, 1952, p. 32, n. 39.} and the Sumerian \textit{IBIRA}, "merchant",\footnote{Bottero mentions this view of E. Forrer in the article "Assyrien", \textit{Realllexikon der Assyriologie} (Berlin, 1930), I, p. 235.} have also been noted.

2. SA-GAZ, \textit{The Ideographic Equivalent of Ha-BI-ru}.\footnote{The cuneiform orthography of many Sumerian words was carried over with the cuneiform system of writing into Akkadian texts to represent (ideographically) the corresponding Akkadian words.} In some passages SA-GAZ is to be read \textit{habbatu},\footnote{For the texts see Deimel, \textit{Sumerisches Lexikon} 11:1, 260; Greenberg, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 54, 55, nos. 145-154; Bottero, \textit{op. cit.}, nos. 157, 168-180. In the lexical texts the consistent equation with \textit{habbatu} is obvious, while in the omen texts the reading \textit{habbatu} is required by phonetic gloss (as in Bottero, \textit{ibid.}, nos. 173, 175) or by play on words (as in i., no. 168, cf. 170). Landsberger (in \textit{ibid.}, p. 159) states that though \textit{habbatu} is the proper reading in these Akkadian texts and is normally so in Sumerian legal and literary texts, everywhere SA-GAZ appears in Old Babylonian, Hittite or Syro-Palestinian texts it is to be read "\textit{hapiru}". This conclusion is rendered dubious by certain Amarna data: \textit{EA} 318:11-13 reads \textit{SA-GA-A[Z\text{MES}] ha-ba-ti u \textit{LUMES} Su-ti-i} and the gram-} but that this lack of a West Semitic equivalent need not surprise for it is not uncommon for Akkadian to stand alone among the Semitic languages in matching Egyptian.
ideogram is frequently to be read as *ha-BI-ru* is no longer seriously questioned.\textsuperscript{23} If then *ha-BI-ru* is a proper name, its mathematical relation of the first two is apparently exegetical apposition; cf. the parallel in *EA* 195:27, *EA* 299:26 reads \textsuperscript{LU}SA-GAZ\textsuperscript{MES}tum (c f. *EA* 207:21, [i-na \textsuperscript{LM}GAZ\textsuperscript{MES}ha ...). The phonetic determinative, *tum*, almost certainly requires the reading *habbatu* (or plural, *habbatutum*). Bottero, *op. cit.*, p. 110, n. 2, suggests the possibility of reading a plural "*habirutum*" but it is most unlikely.

\textsuperscript{23} This is so even though Akkadian lexicographers, so far as known, never use *ha-BI-ru* as an equivalent of SA-GAZ. The equation first became apparent in the alternating use of the terms in the god lists of the Hittite treaties and in the Amarna letters. In line with it was the appearance in the administrative texts of SA-GAZ and *ha-BI-ru* in the same role at Larsa during the reigns of Warad-Sin and his successor Rim-Sin. More recently confirmation has been found at Ugarit in the equation of \textsuperscript{a\textit{Hal-bi}}L\textsuperscript{LU}MES\textsuperscript{SA}GAZ with *Hlb prm* and in the use of the phonetic determinative *ru* (?) after \textsuperscript{LU}MES\textsuperscript{SA}GAZ twice in the unpublished no. 1603 of the Collection of tablets found at Ras Shamra (hereafter, *RS*) (cf. Bottero, *ibid.*, no. 158). The interchange of the terms in the Alalah tablets is further proof. Even where *habbatu* is to be read, the *ha-BI-ru* may be in view. This is illustrated by the appearance of "*ha-bi-ri-is-as*" in the Hittite text, *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazkoi* (hereafter, *KUB*) VIII, 83:9. For this text is the Hittite version of an Akkadian *summa izbu* text where it is clear, as observed in the preceding note, that *habbatu* is the proper rendering of SA-GAZ, and *ha-bi-ri-ia-as* occurs in precisely the place where SA-GAZ is usually found in the formula. The Hittite text, moreover, is earlier than the Akkadian omen texts. That the *ha-BI-ru* are in view everywhere that SA-GAZ might be used does not follow necessarily, though it may be the case in all the texts at our disposal, even the earliest Sumerian texts, leaving out of view the lexical texts. Greenberg (*op. cit.*, p. 86, n. 1) argues that the *ha-BI-ru* are in view wherever SA-GAZ is used (even if *habbatu* be read) but he falsely shifts the burden of proof to those who would dissociate the two. The very existence of a general term like *habbadtu* (whichever meaning be in view) as an alternate reading to the specific *ha-BI-ru*, and especially its exclusive employment as a lexical equivalent of SA-GAZ would put the burden of proof on Greenberg's position. Beyond this the existence of homonyms of *habatum*, the equivalence of SA-GAZ with more than one of these (which some dispute but Greenberg accepts), and the extreme improbability that any other reading of SA-GAZ like *ha-BI-ru* (either as appellative or proper name) covered exactly the same semantic range makes it almost certain that SA-GAZ was used at times without the *ha-BI-ru* being in view. It is, therefore, a question whether the SA-GAZ of a given text, like one of the Ur III texts or the Sumerian literary and legal texts of the Isin-Larsa age, are the *ha-BI-ru*. That the *ha-BI-ru* may be in view in some or all of these is suggested by the reference to the *ha-BI-ru* in the 19th century Cappadocian
ideographic equivalent, SA-GAZ, will provide a significant characterization of the ha-BI-ru people or possibly (if the ideogram was originally applied to them by enemies) a calumnious caricature. If ha-BI-ru is an appellative, it might, but not necessarily, be equivalent in meaning to SA-GAZ. The Sumerian SA means "cord, tendon" and GAZ means "strike, kill". The meaning "strangler" or "murderer", therefore, is suggested for the combination SA-GAZ.24 Or if SA is a variant here for SAG the meaning will be "strike the head" or simply "smite".25

Possibly, SA-GAZ is a pseudo-ideogram. Such was formerly the position of Landsberger who said it was formed from saggasum as RA-GAB from rakkabum.26 It has been argued texts. Some support could be found for reading SA-GAZ as ha-BI-ru if SA-GAZ should turn up even in Dynasty of Akkad texts since the Old Hittite translation of the Naram Sin epic may accurately reflect the original situation in its mention of ha-BI-ru either as prisoners or guards, and the proper name ha-bi-ra-am is found on a text from Tell Brak (F 1159, cf. Bottero, ibid., p. 1) contemporary with the dynasty of Akkad.

24 So Albright in Journal of Biblical Literature (hereafter, JBL) 43, 1924, pp. 389 ff. Commenting on the Hittite translation of the Naram-Sin inscription, he then held that SA-GAZ is the ordinary Hittite equivalent for "Semitic nomad". Ungnad, Kulturfragen, I, 1923, pp. 15 ff., interpreted SA-GAZ as "slinger".

25 Landsberger (in Bottero, ibid., p. 160) has now adopted this view suggested long ago by Langdon (see note 30). He would render it as a substantive, "frappeur de tete" and regard this as equivalent to simply "brigand". SAG-GAZ is indeed found twice at Ugarit (see Bottero, ibid., nos. 154 and 157), once certainly as the designation of the ha-BI-ru. Moreover, in an astrological omen text (ibid., no. 170) one of the woes predicted is: LU SA-GAZ qaqqada inakkiss, "the SA-GAZ will cut off the head". This is surely a pun, but whether on the sound or on the sense (whether partially or wholly) is the question. Landsberger's approach is uncertain for as Bottero observes (ibid., p. 148), "le SAG-GAZ qu'enregistrent les vocabulaires connus paraissant marquer d'abord un verbe mahasu, 'frapper', dont la specification nous échappe". The common spelling GAZ is understandable then for GAZ=daku which is broadly synonymous with mahasu=SAG-GAZ. The reading SA-GA-AZ (found, however, only once) would be problematic since it divides the essential element.

26 Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts (hereafter, KAV) 1, 1930, pp. 321 ff. So also Goetze, BASOR 79, p. 34, n. 14 (cf. less certainly in Bottero, ibid., p. 163); and DeVaux, RB 55, 1948, p. 340. In rejecting this view now, Landsberger cogently observes (in Bottero, ibid., p. 199,
that the variant spellings like SA-GA-AZ and, especially, SAG-GAZ confirm this view, while the objection has been leveled against it that the Amarna spelling of GAZ alone would then be inexplicable. If SA-GAZ is a pseudo-ideogram formed from *saggasu* it would probably mean "murderer". Further light may be sought from the other equivalent of SA-GAZ, *habbatum*. The *qattal* form from the root *habatu*, "plunder", would mean "robber". There are, however, homonyms of *habatu* which require attention. From *habatu*, "borrow, obtain, receive", Goetze suggests a *nomen professio-

27 So Goetze, *op. cit.*, and De Vaux, *op. cit.* Cf. Deimel, *op. cit.*, p. 115, no. 42. In the spelling SA-GAZ-ZA (found once at Ugarit and once at Amarna) the ZA would be a sort of phonetic complement.


29 Another possibility lies in the fact that in the Gilgamesh Epic (1:4:7) *saggasum* is used for Enkidu, describing him as an uncivilized native of the wild steppe-lands. It has also been suggested that *saggasu* may have been colored with the connotation of West Semitic *sgs* and so meant "disturber" or "one who is restive". (So Greenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 89, 90).

30 Such a pejorative meaning clearly attaches to SA-GAZ in the early Sumerian literary and legal texts and this is preserved in the later Akkadian omen texts, as we might expect in this conservative genre of literature. The meaning "brigand" is required in a Ras Shamra word list (Bottero, *ibid.*, no. 157) where it appears between IM-ZU "thief" and LUGAN.ES, "malefactor", and in the unpublished RS 17341 (cf. Bottero, *ibid.*, no. 162), and elsewhere. Indeed, Landsberger, in *ibid.*, p. 199 insists that "LU(SA-GAZ) signifie partout et toujours ‘Rauber’".

S. H. Langdon, *Expository Times* 31, 1919-20, pp. 326-7, reasoned that *habatu* meant originally "smite with violence" (cf. Code of Hammurapi, Law 196) and was used exclusively with a military signification and, therefore, the idea of plundering was a natural nuance (since Asiatic armies customarily plundered defeated foes). *Habbatu* then meant "fighting man" and this was translated into Sumerian correctly as SA-GAZ = SAG-GAZ, "smite the head, slay".

It is perhaps significant that habdtu in this sense is conjoined with the *ha-BI-ru* in *EA* 286:56: *LU.MES* *ha-BI-ru ha-bat gab-bi matal* sarri.

nis meaning "one who obtains his livelihood from somebody else, works for his livelihood, i. e., without wages, merely for board and keep"; and Albright, "mercenaries". Habatu, "move across, make a razzia into enemy territory", would yield a gattal meaning "raider" or "migrant".

How did SA-GAZ become an ideographic equivalent for ha-BI-ru? The simplest explanation, if both terms are not proper names, would lie in a semantic equation of the two. Such would be the case, for example, if SA-GAZ signified habbatu in the sense of "one who receives support" and ha-BI-ru meant "one provided for". A less direct semantic relation might also account for the interchange, as, for example, if SA-GAZ be understood as "thug" and ha-BI-ru as "nomad". Or, the usage might be explained on historical grounds quite apart from semantic considerations. If, for

32 So in Bottero, ibid., p. 162; cf. Greenberg, op. cit., p. 89. For the root cf. The Assyrian Dictionary, habatu B. From this root apparently derives the habbatum found in association with ag-ru, "hired laborer", and e-si-du, "harvester", in the lexical occupation lists (Univ. of Pa., Publications of the Babylonian Section V, no. 132; Tablets found at Kouyoundjik, British Museum (hereafter, K) 4395; cf. Bottero, ibid., nos. 177 and 180; Greenberg, ibid., nos. 150-152). The Akkadian legal text, Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of J. B. Nies VII, no. 93, also mentions two ha-ab-ba-ti-i who appear to be engaged in peaceful employment.

33 Cf. Deimel, Sumerisches Lexikon, III, 2, for habatum, "interest-free loan, loot"; and hubtu, "tax exempt". Albright (JAOS 48, 1928, pp. 183-185) deduced from hubutati and hubuttu, which he translated "tax-free property" and "the condition of being tax-free", respectively, that the habatu received hubutati in return for their services and were thus mercenaries who were rewarded with a grant of rent-free land, i. e., condottieri. He also suggested that when the Aramean nomads, the "Habiru", became known throughout Mesopotamia as such mercenaries, their name replaced the original habbatu as the term for "mercenary".

34 See habatu D, in The Assyrian Dictionary. Note the lexical datum (ha-ba-tu) sa a-la-ki (K 2055) and cf. Greenberg's remarks, op. cit. p. 89. Lewy (in Bottero, op. cit. p. 163) identifies habatu with Arabic habata, "to wander about".

35 Albright (JBL 43, 1924, pp. 389-393) supports this combination on the grounds that there was no clear distinction between bands of robbers and bands of Bedouin, the same word meaning "Bedawi" in Egyptian (sose) and "robber" in Hebrew (soseh). Cf. Bohl, Kanaander and Hebraer, 1911, p. 89, n. 2. Albright adds that the similarity in sound between habbatum and ha-BI-ru as pronounced by the Akkadians likely suggested the use of SA-GAZ for ha-BI-ru.
example, the SA-GAZ were of mixed character but were predominantly \textit{ha-BI-ru}, a secondary equivalence of the terms might arise.\textsuperscript{36} Or, if the \textit{ha-BI-ru} were generally disliked, they might have received as a name of opprobrium, SA-GAZ, "thugs".\textsuperscript{37}

3. \textit{Morphology of Ha-BI-ru}. Is \textit{ha-BI-ru} an appellative or a proper name?\textsuperscript{38} The spelling \textit{ha-BI-ru} could be the gentilic shortened from \textit{ii-um} to \textit{u}.\textsuperscript{39} But the fact that the feminine is found at Nuzu as \textit{ha-BI-ra-tu}\textsuperscript{40} rather than the feminine gentilic \textit{ha-BI-ri-i-tu} would suggest that the ambiguous \textit{ha-BI-ru} is also non-gentilic. The situation is, however, complicated by several instances of both earlier and later varieties of the gentilic forms, i. e., \textit{ha-BI-ru-u}\textsuperscript{41} and \textit{ha-BIR-a-a}\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{36} So Albright. See note 33.
\textsuperscript{37} So J. Lewy, \textit{HUCA} 14, p. 605, n. 90, who argues that in the early 2nd millennium the \textit{ha-BI-ru} "constituted troops of soldiers--comparable to the French \textit{legion etrangere}--in the service of governments". Similarly, Bottero, ibid., p. 196, maintains that some of the \textit{ha-BI-ru} fugitives, organized outlaw, marauding bands and so \textit{ha-BI-ru} fugitives came to be called SA-GAZ, "brigands". Goetze (in Bottero, ibid., p. 163) cites the possibility that SA-GAZ (taken as a pseudo-ideogram for \textit{habbatum}, "robber") was extended to cover "one who works for board and keep", adding, "It might have been difficult to distinguish between the two".

\textsuperscript{38} They miss the point who dismiss the question of whether \textit{ha-BI-ru} is a proper name or an appellative with the observation that all proper names were once appellative. So Jirku, \textit{Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft} (hereafter, ZAW) N. F. 5, 1928, p. 211; and Gustavs, \textit{Theologische Literaturzeitung} 1, 1925, col. 603. For the issue here is not that of ultimate etymological origin, but of usage in the literature at our disposal. On the other hand, whether \textit{ha-BI-ru} is gentilic or not is not decisive for that usage, for a gentilic need not be a proper name and a non-gentilic might be a proper name.


\textsuperscript{40} This form is used for the masculine plural (\textit{Harvard Semitic Series} (hereafter, \textit{HSS}) XIV 53:18 and 93:6) and the feminine plural (\textit{Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi} (hereafter, \textit{JEN}) V 453:11).


\textsuperscript{42} Rawlinson, \textit{Cuneiform Inscriptions of W. Asia} IV, pl. 34, 2, 5; Hilprecht, \textit{Old Babylonian Inscriptions} I, II, no. 149, obv. 22. Cf. Ungnad,
respectively. The form ha-BI-ru-u seems to be a stereotyped gentilic, for it is used as masculine and feminine and in the singular and plural of each gender. Moreover, the awil babili type of gentilic formation is found in awilat ha-BI-ri and awil ha-BI-ri.

This variety of forms is paralleled in the forms used, for example, in the Old Testament for "Israelite". In addition to the rare gentilic נֵלְכֹּל כָּלִיא the simple נֵלְכֹּל may be used with the meaning "Israelite(s)". It would seem possible then that the simple form ha-BI-ru (or for the feminine, ha-BI-ra-tu) is used interchangeably with the gentilic ha-BI-ru-u in an ethnic sense.

There is thus an adequate explanation of the variety of forms, i.e., if they are all understood as variations of a proper name denoting an ethnic group. But it is difficult to account for all the facts on the assumption that we are dealing with an appellative. While it is true that the gentilic is simply the adjectivalized form of the noun and is not necessarily ethnic,


43 Cf. Chiera, op. cit. Due to the Nuzu scribes' lack of regard for case endings ha-BI-ru-u is used once for the genitive (SMN 2145).

44 JEN V, 465:2.


46 E.g., Ex. 9:7; I Sam. 2:14; 13:20; 14:21; etc.

47 Landsberger (KAF I, 331) cites certain difficulties in the gentilic view: (1) When ideograms render gentilics they are regularly followed by the place-determinative KI. (But ethnic-gentilics usually refer to a people which may be identified with a particular place and that was not the case with the ha-BI-ru. Moreover, for Amarna Age Syria, the most settled situation enjoyed by the ha-BI-ru, there are one or two instances of SA-GAZKI: (a) a-na LU-SA-GAZKI, or perhaps, a-na awil SA-GAZKI (EA 298:27); (b) EA 215:15. Cf. ha-BI-ri, Memoires de la delegation en Perse (hereafter, MDP) XXVIII, 511:2; EA 289:24. KI is used also, however, with the nomadic Sutu, Idri-mi Inscription, line 15.) (2) There is lack of analogy for an ideogram being equated with both an appellative and a gentilic, as would be the case if SA-GAZ=habbatu, an appellative, and SA-GAZ=ha-BI-ru, regarded as a gentilic. (But the fact is that the gentilic forms of ha-BI-ru occur at times, and one type is clearly ethnic - see below.)
the gentilic forms of ha-BI-ru can hardly be disposed of with that observation. For the question would remain as to why, if ha-BI-ru were already an aptly descriptive appellative, it would ever have been adjectivalized. Moreover, the ha-BIR-a-a type formation is used to adjectivalize the names of nations only.

The hope of discovering in their name some incontrovertible clue to the identity of the ha-BI-ru seems to be disappointed by the complexity of the possibilities. Of the data just examined the morphological affords the most direction. But the whole matter of the ha-BI-ru name appears more illuminated by, than illuminative of, the other evidence in the case. To the investigation of this broader contextual evidence our study, therefore, proceeds, in connection with a critical survey of past and current theories of the ha-BI-ru and the attempt to formulate a satisfactory interpretation. The relevance of the ha-BI-ru and SA-GAZ designations to the various theories will be noted en route.

B. Critical Survey of Theories.

1. Nomadism. Early proposed and still advocated is the theory which defines the ha-BI-ru in terms of nomadism. This interpretation was suggested by the assumed root 'br,

---

48 Lewy (HUCA 14, 1939, p. 587, n. 1) suggests that at Nuzu the preference for the nisbe form may reflect the influence of the Hurrian language there, since "there was in the Hurrian languages a strong tendency to replace nouns (particularly proper names) by enlarged (adjectival) forms" of the same stem. If anything, this favors the view that ha-BI-ru is a proper name, not appellative. Moreover, it does not explain all the variants.

49 Bottero, op. cit., p. 133, says that in this case, in order to designate the persons as descendants of ha-BI-ru, an adjectival form was coined after the type which was ordinarily ethnic. But Greenberg, op. cit., p. 78, finds this point quite awkward and can only hope that eventually the ha-BIR-a-a forms may prove unconnected with our ha-BI-ru.

50 Among the earlier suggestions were the views that the ha-BI-ru were prisoners of war or foreign enemies or bound exiles. The failure of these concepts to do justice to the rapidly accumulating texts was soon recognized.

51 So Winckler in 1897; Bohl, Kanaander and Hebraer (1911); E. Speiser, Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 13, 1933, pp. 34 ff.;
"pass (from place to place)"; the large-scale migration of ha-BI-ru into Canaan (according to some interpretations of the Amarna letters); their wide dispersal; and occasional references to them in association with the nomadic Sutu.  

More recently support has been seen in the migration of individual ha-BI-ru to Nuzu and the impression in the Mari texts of their being roving raiders.

Conflicting evidence, however, emerges which identifies ha-BI-ru either as to origin or present residence with particular localities and depicts them as an integrated element in settled communities. The presence of a specific SA-GAZ territory in the realm of the Hittite king is revealed by a 13th century Hittite-Ugaritic treaty, agreeably, a particular ha-BI-ri settlement is mentioned in a Hittite text dealing with a temple and its property. Evidence of ha-BI-ru settlements in Palestine-Syria is found in the reference to the town (or quarter of) Halab of the SAG-GAZ in the tax-lists of Niqmad II, king of Ugarit in the 14th century, in the 15th century Idri-mi inscription's account of the ha-BI-ru holding open country as a tribal unit near Ammia; and in the identification of the SA-GAZ with permanent settlements all about Alalah in the SA-GAZ texts from Alalah's 15th century level.

Similar evidence comes from the eastern end of the Fertile Crescent. The 15th century Nuzu documents identify various localities and specific communities with ha-BI-ru settlements in the region.


53 E. g., JEN 455:2, 8; 1023:3; SMN 3191:19.
54 E. g., Archives royales de Mari (hereafter, ARM) II, 131; 13, 14.
55 R.S 17238:7 (no. 161 in Bottero, op. cit.).
56 Collection of Tablets found at Boghazkoi 4889:48 (no. 137 in Greenberg, op. cit.). The Alishar letter pictures ha-BI-ru in non-nomadic state in Asia Minor in the 19th century.
57 R 9 11790:7. Cf. hlb 'prm in RS 10045:1; 11724+11848:12.
58 Thus S. Smith, The Statue of Idri-mi (London, 1949), p. 73; cf., however, Greenberg, op. cit., p. 64, n. 16.
59 AT 161, 180-182, 184, and 198. Possibly it is in terms of these ha-BI-ru settlements in Syria on the eve of the Amarna letter period that the forms LU.MES.SA-GAZ (EA 215:15; 298:27) and LU.MES ha-BI-ri (EA 289:24) are to be understood.
ha-BI-ru as "from Ashur", "from Akkad", and "from Zarimenca". Three centuries earlier the Mari texts possibly reflect a more permanent association of ha-BI-ru with certain towns than that of temporary military quarters. Additionally, it is probable that when the ha-BI-ru were engaged as auxiliary troops by Hammurapi and earlier, in the Larsa dynasty, they had their own settlements. Relevant here is an economic text from Susa during the first dynasty of Babylon which mentions a ha-BI-ri as one of the localities where Amorite troops were quartered.

The accumulation of such evidence has led to the judgment that we see the ha-BI-ru in our texts evolving from a semi-nomadic life into a settled state. But no such simple evolution can be traced through the course of the texts; the divergent data are to be otherwise explained. For the term ha-BI-ru, the significance of ha-BI-ru being found in both semi-nomadic and settled states is that it renders unconvincing an appellative meaning founded on either of these opposite aspects of their chequered career. Moreover, such appellative

---

60 JEN V 455, 458, 459; JEN 1023; HSS XIV 176; SMN 152. Their servant status in the Nuzu area was also far from nomadic.

61 For example, the thirty Yamutbalite ha-BI-ru (Unpublished letters from Mari (hereafter A) 2939) and the ha-BI-ru from Eshnunna (A 2886). Cf. also the messenger named Hapirum from Eshnunna (A 2734) and the Hapirum identified as an awil su-h-i-ini (A 2523). Of course, the mode of life of many other ha-BI-ru in these texts seems similar to their status in Amarna Age Palestine.

62 Collection of tablets of the British Museum 23136.

63 Cf. the administrative texts of Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin. Nos. 9-16 in Bottero, op. cit.

64 MDP XXVIII, 511:2. It is apparently on the Elamite-Babylonian boundaries. Perhaps ha-BI-ru had founded the village or were currently quartered there.

65 R. DeLanghe, Les textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit, etc. 1945, II, pp. 458 ff. and R. Vaux, op. cit. Noth's view (op. cit. pp. 110 ff.) was that ha-BI-ru was the self-designation of nomads who had entered a settled area and tented there without property rights. Still further removed from the idea of pure desert nomadism was Speiser's view that the ha-BI-ru "were nomads not in the same sense as the Bedouin, but in so far as they were not settled permanently in any definite locality; as such they were naturally foreigners to all with whom they came in contact so that the name would come to denote both nomads and foreigners of a certain type" (op. cit. p. 41).
ideas would be too general to be distinctive of only those known as *ha-BI-ru*. Not all the desert roamers along the fringe of the Fertile Crescent were *ha-BI-ru* but they all had the same type of relationship with the inhabitants of the Sown as did the *ha-BI-ru* in their semi-nomadic moments. And certainly the settled *ha-BI-ru* held no monopoly on that condition.

2. Dependency. In diametrical opposition to the nomadic theory is the view adopted by Moshe Greenberg in his excellent recent treatment of the question. He concludes that the majority of the *ha-BI-ru* were of urban origin and were dependents of states, cities, or individuals. They had in common only their generally inferior social status which was due to their being as a rule foreigners where they are found and to the presence among them of vagrant elements. As for the word *ha-BI-ru*, "just as the socio-legal classifications *hupsu* and *musekenu* became international currency for similar classes in distinct cultures, so, apparently, was the case of *saggasu/'apiru*".

Social inferiority was, indeed, the *ha-BI-ru* lot in some situations as witness their servitude contracts at Nuzu, their slave labor in Egypt, and their position in the Hittite social scale as that is delineated in a Hittite ritual. And undeniably the *ha-BI-ru* were at times dependents, as witness, for example, the Old Babylonian administrative texts and some more recently noticed Nuzu ration lists. Nevertheless, the

---

66 As a concrete example, it is found in the Mari texts that the Beni-laminu and the Beni-Simal play essentially the same role as the *ha-BI-ru* along the Middle Euphrates and in northern Mesopotamia, while still other groups of similar character are active east of the Tigris and elsewhere on the Euphrates. Cf. Dossin, *Syria* 19, 1938, p. 116. Any appellative meaning suggested for the *ha-BI-ru* such as nomads or mercenaries would be equally applicable to these other groups and, therefore, cannot serve as the distinctive appellation of the *ha-BI-ru*.

67 Moshe Greenberg, *The Hab/piru* (New Haven, 1955). He reproduces almost all the known *ha-BI-ru* texts and provides much valuable information in his analyses of the sources.

68 Ibid. p. 91. He favors Goetze's derivation of *ha-BI-ru* from Semitic *pr* with verbal adjective *'apir* meaning "one provided for".

69 *KUB* IX, 34 with its duplicates (no. 91 in Bottero, *op. cit.*).

70 *HSS* XIV, 46, 53, 93, and 176. Greenberg regards as comparable the
common denominator Greenberg suggests as an appellative value for *ha-BI-ru* is inadequate for there is evidence of *ha-BI-ru*, both individually and collectively, who were not in a dependent status or even a socially inferior status.

There are several instances in the Syrian area. A 14th century record\(^1\) of Mursilis II's arbitration of a dispute between his vassal cities of Barga and Carchemish discloses that a SA-GAZ named Tette is the head of Barga (as well as of Nuhassi)\(^2\) and that the city of lyaruwatas had been given to his grandfather by the Hurrian king. At Ugarit SA-GAZ men apparently function as government officials; for among other privileges a certain grantee receives immunity from serving as royal messenger and from having either an ubru or \(\text{LU.ME} \cdot \text{SA-GAZ-ZA}\) enter his house.\(^3\) The meaning "stranger" is attested for *ubru* elsewhere,\(^4\) but the *ubru* seems to function as a government collector in another text from Ugarit in which immunity from the entry of the *ubru* into the house is accompanied by the declaration that the grantee's possessions will not enter the palace.\(^5\) The SA-GAZ associ-

Alalah situation as indicated in AT 350:6, 7, a sheep census. (Cf. AT 292:9, a list in which the name *ha-BI-ru* is found for one of sixteen persons receiving barley rations.) As for the sheep census, it is doubtful if the 240 sheep of the SA-GAZ are state rations since the same list mentions besides these and 268 of the *sanannu* soldiers, 115 of Alalah and 402 of Mukish (?). Greenberg argues (op. cit., p. 65, n. 19) that military groups would not be "required to shepherd their rations while they were still on the hoof".

This objection, however, seems to overlook the whole situation at Alalah and vicinity where the SA-GAZ were an element in the normal peace time societal structure with their own settled dwellings (whether scattered among the rest of the population or separate and tribal) and their own shepherds (AT 198:39, 48; cf. Wiseman in Bottero, ibid., pp. 38, 39), and where they were regarded as a population unit in all government administration.

\(^1\) *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghaskoi* III, 3, I, 6 and 7 and duplicates.
\(^2\) If this Tette is the same Tette as Suppiluliuma, father of Marsilis II, had made king of Nuhassi (cf. E. Weidner, *Boghazkoi-Studien* 8, pp. 58 ff.).
ated with the *ubru* would likely also be agents of the government, possibly occupied in conscripting men or materiel for military enterprises. This interpretation is supported by the usage of *LU ha-BI-ri* in an Alalah name list which cites the professions of those listed.\(^76\) That *LU ha-BI-ri* indicates there a high government position is most probable since two persons thus designated appear between an *awil biti*, "officer of the palace", and a *mar sar-ru*, "prince".\(^77\) Other superior positions held by *SA-GAZ* in the Alalah sphere were *hazannu-official*,\(^78\) *baru-priest*,\(^79\) and chariot-owning *maryannu*.\(^80\)

\(^{76}\) AT 164:3-7.

\(^{77}\) Or "official representative of the king". Cf. Speiser in *JBL* LXXIV, 1955, p. 253, n. 5.

\(^{78}\) AT 182:13. According to Wiseman the heading of such a list: sabu\(^{MES}\) *SA-GAZ*, is to be translated, "The troops of the SA-GAZ-man", so that the names which follow would not necessarily be all SA-GAZ, as is the case if the rendering "SA-GAZ troops" is accepted. The evidence of a SA-GAZ/H. official could be used to support Wiseman's view. The specific designation of one man in a similar list (AT 181) as LUGAZ (1.19) might imply the others were not (SA)-GAZ. But on Wiseman's view this man would also be a GAZ-officer and why then would he be listed among the ordinary troops? The translation "SA-GAZ troops" is favored by the parallel appearance of the sabu\(^{MES}\) *sa-na-nu* in some texts (e. g., *AT* 183, 226, and 350), the usage in the contemporary Idri-mi inscription, Amarna letters and elsewhere, the quantities of pasture-sheep assigned to the SA-GAZ, comparable to those for a town (*AT* 350), and the large number of those who have *LU*SA-GAZ holdings (*AT* 183:4-5, 1 *li-im* 4 ME 36 bit *LU*SA-GAZ, "1436 having SA-GAZ holdings"). The singular bit is a collective and corresponds to the singular found elsewhere with large groups (e. g., *AT* 226:7, 8; 213 bit *ha-ni-a-hu* 33 bit *e-lai-el-e*) though the plural, *bitatu*, is also used (e. g., *AT* 185). This bit apparently means "property" rather than "family" (though the presence of families would be implied) for parallel with *bitatu*\(^{MES}\) *ehelena and bitatu*\(^{MES}\) *haniahena* is found *bitatu*\(^{MES}\) *sa narkabati*\(^{MES}\), "chariot sheds" (*AT* 189). Finally, the singular LUSA-GAZ may signify a plurality as in *AT* 184:5, *[an]-nu-tunn*\(^{LU*SA-GAZ}, "these are SA-GAZ".*

\(^{79}\) AT 180:20; 182:16.

\(^{80}\) AT 198: rev. 42. (See comments of Wiseman in Bottero, *op. cit.*, pp. 38, 39.) This list mentions also an awil gassi and a herdsman (rev. 38, 39) among the SA-GAZ. It is relevant to note here the close association of the *ha-BI-ru* with the *maryannu* class, an aristocratic status which was hereditary but also obtainable by royal release. Numerous charioteers (who were probably *maryannu*) are listed among the SA-GAZ troops of Alalah. Observe also that some *ha-BI-ru* at Nuzu are owners of horses (*HSS* XIV 46:18, 19: 53:17, 18: cf. 93:4-6; 176:8, 9. Cf. C. H. Gordon in
In the latest strata of the extant *ha-BI-ru* register are found Harbisipak, influential in the court of Mutakkil-Nusku of Assyria (and even the power behind the throne according to the remarks of Ninurta-nadin-sumati of the second dynasty of Isin);\(^1\) and Kudurra, friend of the Babylonian king Marduk-ahhe-eriba from whom he receives a royal grant of land.\(^2\)

There are also those general historical situations where the *ha-BI-ru* collectively are found operating as independently organized bodies. According to the Mari texts the *ha-BI-ru* at times conducted independent razzias in the region of Upper Mesopotamia in the manner of nomads and semi-nomads.\(^3\) That their autonomous activities in the 18th century were not confined to this area appears from the date formula on an Alalah document reading, "the year king Irkabtum made peace with Shemuba and the *ha-BI-ru* warriors".\(^4\) Peace treaties are not formulated between kings and dependent social classes. A similar role is played by the *ha-BI-ru* in Palestine in the Amarna age, for their service, whether in the employ of native chieftains or of the Egyptians, was also on a free-booting basis. Moreover, if the SA-GAZ of the Akkadian omen texts may be equated with *ha-BI-ru* groups, the *ha-BI-ru* were notorious for their incursions into *Orientalia*, 21, 1952, p. 380). In certain Egyptian texts the *ha-BI-ru* and maryannu are in close association also (cf. Papyrus Harris and Papyrus Harris 500).\(^5\)

\(^1\) Rawlinson, *Cuneiform Inscriptions of W. Asia*, IV, 34, 2, 5 and duplicate (Bottero, *ibid.*, nos. 165 and 165').

\(^2\) As described on a *kudurru* stele (H. Hilprecht, *Old Babylonian Inscriptions* 149:20-22). Another possible example are the *ha-BI-ru* found in Asia Minor in the 19th century B. C. (Gelb, *Inscriptions from Alishar*, no. 5) who were, according to a plausible interpretation, men of wealth capable of paying a high ransom and operating in the service of a prince. So J. Lewy in *Archives de l'Histoire du Droit oriental II*, 1938, pp. 128 ff. and in Bottero, *ibid.*, pp. 9, 10. For other interpretations see Bottero, *ibid.*, p. 193.

\(^3\) See A 49, 109, 566 (nos. 20, 25, and 28 in Bottero, *op. cit.*). Even in cases where the *ha-BI-ru* are seen supporting the cause of local princes (e. g., *ARM II*, 131 and A 3004, 3056; nos. 18, 19, and 21 in Bottero, *ibid.*) they appear to be independent tribes voluntarily serving as mercenaries.

\(^4\) *AT* 58:28 ff.
settled communities. For the standard prognostication attending unfavorable omens is "the SA-GAZ will appear in the land".85

In addition to these cases where the idea of inferior dependent status is inappropriate, there are others where, though not awkward, such is not the compelling significance of the ha-BI-ru or SA-GAZ designation. It is difficult to regard these with Greenberg as "few exceptions" or not characteristic of "the core of the SA-GAZ/H."86 What forbids one's regarding the free-booting episodes as typical and the instances of dependency as atypical?87 And whichever way the scale might tilt on that, the discovery of ha-BI-ru in both states makes precarious if not impossible the view that the term ha-BI-ru is an appellation for either one. Moreover, even if it could more successfully be shown that the ha-BI-ru were characteristically dependent it could not be shown that all dependents were ha-BI-ru or, in other words, that ha-BI-ru was a class designation, like hupsu or muskenu, applicable to all of inferior dependent status.88 The precise identifying trait of an ha-BI-ru would still be elusive.

3. Foreignness. A characteristic which would be compatible with any of the contrasting theories already surveyed and was, indeed, explicitly mentioned as a subordinate element by some of their advocates, is that of foreignness.89

85 See in Bottero, op. cit., nos. 168-174 for this formula, LUSHA-GAZ ina mati ibassi, and for variants like LUSHA-GAZ ibassu and LUSHA-GAZ innadaru, "the SA-GAZ will wreak havoc".


87 Greenberg (ibid., p. 88), for example, makes a quite unfounded assumption in suggesting that the Mari and Amarna freebooters had been under masters but had seized an opportunity to break away.

88 For example, if the Akkadian and Alalah ration texts prove the ha-BI-ru were dependents, they equally prove to be dependents other groups mentioned in them, yet distinguished from the ha-BI-ru.

89 Undeniably it is often plain that the ha-BI-ru are not part of the indigenous population. Thus in Egyptian texts the use of the throw-stick determinative with 'pr-w (and according to Albright's reading, the use of the foreign warrior determinative on the Beisan stele) shows that the ha-BI-ru are foreigners in Egypt. The practice of the ha-BI-ru in Amarna Age Palestine of serving with equal enthusiasm the loyalists and the rebels reveals that it was not in the peace of this land that they looked for their
By itself, however, foreignness is too broad a characteristic to provide the solution to our common denominator riddle. No matter how successfully it might be shown that all the ha-BI-ru were foreigners where they are found, it could always be shown that there were in those same places other foreigners, not identified with the ha-BI-ru. But what if the concept of foreignness be more specifically circumscribed? Might it not then have the qualities of comprehensiveness and specificity both of which are necessary for an appellative? There are enough scholars who believe it might, to make this approach in one variety or another the most popular answer abroad today for the ha-BI-ru question.

The position of J. Lewy has consistently been that the ha-BI-ru were immigrant foreigners or resident aliens, who, having left their native lands, found their living elsewhere in the service of governments or, less frequently, in the service of private citizens. E. Dhorme now believes that the ha-BI-ru were emigrants who fled to a strange country for one reason or another; in short, displaced persons. A. Alt has long held that the ha-BI-ru were a congeries of rootless characters whose former fortunes and social position had suffered shipwreck in the turmoil of changing orders and who, thus torn loose from former tribal connections, found themselves without standing, means, or rights in a new order.
B. Landsberger even earlier presented and still maintains a similar view: the *ha-BI-ru* are ethnically mixed bands of family-less, tribe-less, isolated fugitives in foreign lands.93

J. Bottero, finally, aligns himself with the Lewy-Landsberger-Alt approaches which he deems complementary and, taken together, a comprehensive enough framework for all the *ha-BI-ru* texts. In developing this, Bottero's chief emphasis falls on flight from original environment as the *ha-BI-ru* common denominator.94

In these variations of the view that the *ha-BI-ru* are those who have crossed the boundaries into foreign territory there are two elements: the present condition of the one who has crossed the frontier and the cause or manner of his doing so. It will be our first concern to indicate that those varieties of this approach which emphasize the fugitive's present condition are unsuccessful in their effort to discover the definitive feature of the *ha-BI-ru*.

Lewy emphasizes the resident, servile character of the *ha-BI-ru* immigrant. In that respect his position is about identical with Greenberg's definition in terms of settled, dependent status and it is open to the same criticisms. Even if Lewy's definition were more adequately comprehensive it would not be sufficiently specific. For example, the *ha-BI-ru* do appear to be alien servants as they are seen in the realm of the Hittites but what then is the distinction between the *ha-BI-ru* and the Lulahhu, who were also foreign servants there? Or did not the Sutu play the same role of foreign mercenaries in Amarna Age Palestine as did the *ha-BI-ru* from whom they are nevertheless distinguished?95 And while the *ha-BI-ru* at Nuzu had only recently entered the Mitannian area and were servants to the state and to private individuals, uprooted, propertyless persons" or as a group which "served as a magnet to attract all sorts of fugitive and footloose persons who were impelled by misdeed or misfortune to leave their homes" *(op. cit.*, pp. 87, 88).


other foreign servants not identifiable as ha-BI-ru worked side by side with them there.\textsuperscript{96}

Landsberger, Alt, and Dhorme accent the negative in describing the condition of the ha-BI-ru subsequent to his crossing the frontier of his native land. He is family-less, tribe-less, property-less, right-less, rootless.\textsuperscript{97} This evaluation of the ha-BI-ru does not, however, satisfy all the evidence. J. Lewy correctly insists that the Nuzu evidence refutes Landsberger's assertion that the ha-BI-ru were "heimatlos" and without "Familienzugehörigkeit".\textsuperscript{98} And it is quite impossible to take account of the status of the ha-BI-ru in Syria from about the 13th to 15th centuries B.C. (and possibly for a considerable while earlier) as revealed in the Ugarit and Alalah material and to conclude that it was of the essence of the ha-BI-ru status to be property-less, right-less and rootless. For in that situation is found a large ha-BI-ru population with its own property holdings and cattle, with its share of government officials, aristocracy, military officers, and cultic functionaries along with its contributions to the lower ranks of wardum, sarraqu and shepherd.\textsuperscript{99}

Bottero shifts the emphasis to the nature of the act of emigration in order to discover the identifying trait of an ha-BI-ru. He suggests that all the antinomies can be resolved by the supposition that the ha-BI-ru were refugees, men who had fled their native lands. This would explain why they appear as strangers, why they are found well-nigh everywhere,

\textsuperscript{96} Figuring in servant contracts similar to those of the ha-BI-ru but not labeled ha-BI-ru are individuals identified as "Assyrian" (JEN VI, 613:2; cf. JEN V, 456:9 ff.) and as "from the land of Izalla" (JEN V, 462:3).

And there were, of course, the highly prized Lullian slaves.

\textsuperscript{97} According to Landsberger, the individuals gave their name to the bands in which they organized themselves. The relation of these to the more settled population blocks depended on the condition of the latter. If the local authority was strong, the ha-BI-ru were content to be dependents in the state employ; if things were anarchic, the ha-BI-ru played the independent opportunists.

\textsuperscript{98} HUCA 14, 1939, p. 606. The text JEN V, 464 concerns a "ha-BI-ru along with the people of his household". For family ties among the ha-BI-ru see also JEN 1023 and JEN V, 455.

\textsuperscript{99} See above for the evidence and cf. AT 182:14; 180:16; 198:39. It may be added that no solid basis appears for the view of Alt (op. cit.) that the ha-BI-ru of the Amarna letters are a social class in revolt.
and why they have such a variety of names. It would account for the fact that some settled down in assigned places subject to the local authorities, while others organized into independent, outlaw bands. It would account, too, for the fact that while some may have been absorbed into the new culture, others preserved some of their native traditions and thus are found, for example, to have their own gods. It would also explain why the term ha-Bl-ru sometimes denotes a social class (i.e., fugitives) and yet is used as the equivalent of an ethnic term (i.e., they were all men of foreign origin who had renounced their place of origin). What fortune, from kingship to slavery, might not befall the fugitive ha-Bl-ru?100

In support of this ha-Bl-ru--fugitive equation, Bottero appeals to the general fact that flight into strange countries was a common phenomenon in the Near East, especially in the 2nd millennium B.C.101 He appeals also to certain specific items in ha-Bl-ru texts: In a treaty of Hattusilis III with the king of Ugarit, the Hittite monarch pledges himself to the extradition of all subjects of the Ugaritic king, whether of high or low social status, who revolt against their king and flee into the territory of the SA-GAZ of the Hittite king.102 That SA-GAZ is here to be read ha-Bl-ru and not habbatu is clear from the fact that ordinary robbers would not be so available to the control of the Hittite king that he could engage himself to return refugees hiding among them. From the fact observable here that the territory of the ha-Bl-ru among the Hittites was the natural haven for political refugees or runaway slaves heading in that direction from Ugarit, Bottero would draw the conclusion that the ha-Bl-ru were those who had escaped from some former social environment into a new country.

While the just-mentioned treaty appears to Bottero the only text that offers the elements for a definition, he finds that other texts confirm that definition. A Cappadocian text dealing with one Shupiahshu who leaves Kanish for the

101 Cf. ibid., p. 127, n. 5, for the frequent references to the munnabtu, "fugitive", in the legal, administrative, and historical documents of this period. A similar observation is made by Landsberger (in ibid., p. 160).
102 RS 17238. In Bottero, ibid., no. 161.
country of Ziluna in order to escape from his creditors, describes this action by means of the verbal form "ih-Bl-ar-ma." According to Landsberger, this verb, "haparum", is a denominative from "hapiru"; according to J. Lewy, it is an Akkadianized form corresponding to West Semitic "br, "pass over", and ha-Bl-ru is derived from it. In either case, if there is any etymological connection one way or another between this verb and ha-Bl-ru, the meaning of the latter would be "fugitive" or "one who crosses over the frontier". But it is uncertain whether or not that is a condition which is contrary to fact.

In a letter written by Iasim-El to the court at Mari, the author mentions an ha-Bl-ru who had fled from Eshunna and in search of whom he is engaged, perhaps for purposes of extradition. Idri-mi, when he had to flee from Aleppo and failed to find satisfactory asylum elsewhere, came and abode among the ha-Bl-ru warriors during the seven years of his political exile before his restoration to his throne. Similar is the experience in Canaan of the king of Hazor who left his city and went over to the SA-GAZ. So also did Amanhatbi, a lord of Hazi, when loyalist forces brought pressure to bear on him. And Iapahi of Gezer laments that his younger brother having revolted against him had departed and given over his two hands to the SA-GAZ.

In this connection may be recalled the observation of Landsberger that peoples who used Akkadian or "Accado-grammes" and in whose language munnabtu is frequent do not employ the word "hapiru" and vice versa.

This formulation of Bottero then is not committed to any specific traits as essential to the condition of an ha-Bl-ru-

---

103 Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of J. B. Nies VI, pl. 71, no. 226.
104 In Bottero, ibid., p. 160.
105 Ibid., p. 11.
106 A 2886; no. 30 in Bottero, ibid.
107 Idri-mi Inscription, esp. lines 26-30.
110 EA 298:22-27. Bottero also suggests but with less force that the Nuzu contracts give the impression of dealing with fugitives in the case of the ha-Bl-ru who are from Assyria or Akkad and who in some cases have arrived within the year. Still less cogent is his mention of the ha-Bl-ru of the Alishar text who are held for ransom.
immigrant in his new environment (other than the foreignness involved in his being an immigrant) but would rather discover the mark of the ha-BI-ru in the circumstances of his emigration. His view is, therefore, not as vulnerable as the others to direct contradiction by specific documentary evidence; for though there is considerable information concerning the area where Bottero is non-committal, the reconstruction of the phase of the ha-BI-ru career which he singles out as their hallmark is much more a matter of deduction from scattered hints. At the same time such an approach places the burden of proof heavily on Bottero's position and it is exceedingly doubtful that the supporting data are adequate to sustain the load. The argument for the meaning of "fugitive" from the term ha-BI-ru itself hangs from a thread. The one ha-BI-ru fugitive hounded by Iasim-El is after all the lone ha-BI-ru of all our documents caught in the act of flight. And while there is a strong case for the fact that an ha-BI-ru camp or settlement was, in some areas at least, about as good a place as any for a fugitive to find concealment or refuge beyond the reach of authorities, whether nearby or remote, that is certainly not proof that all or even a large percentage of the ha-BI-ru were themselves fugitives. Other explanations of the phenomenon are ready at hand. In the instances from the Amarna letters, for example, it is clearly a case of native leaders seeking refuge among independent bands of mercenary troops. Among the Hittites, the SA-GAZ were a foreign settlement and as such a more logical goal for a fugitive than a native Hittite center where extradition laws could be more readily enforced. Moreover it is most unlikely that an appellative that designated a man as having been a fugitive or even as the descendant of one who had been a fugitive would persist as the identifying epithet of men long after they or even their fathers had become an integrated and respected element in a given social structure. Such appears to have been the case with the ha-BI-ru at least in the Syrian area.  

(to be continued)

112 Compare also the prominent Harbisipak and Kudurra, the 12th-11th century ha-BIR-a-a.
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THE HA-BI-RU--KIN OR FOE OF ISRAEL?
SECOND ARTICLE
MEREDITH G. KLINE

C. An Ethno-Professional Interpretation.

It has appeared that the currently dominant identifications of the ha-BI-ru as a social class of one sort or another are inadequate. They fail to discover a common denominator for all the ha-BI-ru (and the ha-BI-ru alone) that will satisfy all the known documents. The investigation must turn to other possibilities. Was ethnic unity the peculiar stamp of the ha-BI-ru? Was their hallmark the practice of a particular profession?

1. Ethnic Unity. Examination of the morphological data led to the conclusion that the variety of forms found for the word ha-BI-ru is most readily explained in terms of variations of the proper name for an ethnic group.113

Other features point in this same direction:

There are indications of family relationships among the ha-BI-ru114 and of self-contained communities or tribal organization in the ha-BI-ru pattern of life.115

The word ha-BI-ru is used in contrast to particular ethnic terms and, therefore, as at least the equivalent of an ethnic term itself. Repeatedly in Hittite rituals and treaties the ha-BI-ru are paired with the Lulahhu (the people of Lullu). In one ritual116 this pair appears in a list of social classes,

---

113 See supra, WTJ XIX, pp. 9-11.
114 See ibid. p. 21, n. 98 and cf. JEN V, 452, 453, 456, 465; SMN 2145 for mention of ha-BI-ru women with their children or alone.
115 E. g., at Ugarit, Alalah and among the Hittites. DeVaux (RB 63, 1956, pp. 264-265) aptly compares the ha-BI-ru among whom Idri-mi found political asylum to the tribe in Retenu in which Sinuhe passed his years of exile.
116 No. 91 in Bottero, op. cit.
suggesting that "the Lulahhu and the ha-BI-ru" had become a cliché among the Hittites for the social category of foreigners.\textsuperscript{117} Such usage, however, would be only local and secondary in the case of the ha-BI-ru as it obviously must be in the case of the Lulahhu. As a matter of fact, once it has been established that the ha-BI-ru cannot successfully be identified as a social class, all evidence that they were regarded in particular areas as one specific group of foreigners,\textsuperscript{118} becomes so much support for the interpretation of them as a specific ethnic entity.

Certain Egyptian texts also mention ha-BI-ru in lists containing ethnic elements. In the Memphis stele Amenophis II lists 3,600 'pr (i.e., ha-BI-ru) among those he took captive on his second Asiatic campaign. They are preceded by 127\textsuperscript{119} princes of Rtnu (Syria-Palestine) and 179 brothers of princes. They are followed by 15,200 S3s.w (Bedouin of the desert region adjoining Egypt to the east), 36,300 Hr.w (Hurrians, used in the sense of the settled population of Syria-Palestine) and 15,070 Ngs (people of Nuhassi). The intermediate position of the ha-BI-ru in sequence and numerically between the aristocracy and the ethnic terms would make it precarious to determine from this text alone whether the ha-BI-ru were a social class or ethnic group. Similar ambiguity is present in the testamentary enactment left by Ramses III in which he cites the properties accumulated by the temples of Thebes, Heliopolis, and Memphis through his benefactions. In the Heliopolitan section the serfs of the temple are listed as follows: "warriors, sons of (foreign) princes, maryannu, 'pr.w, and the settlers who are in this place: 2,093 persons".\textsuperscript{120} What is clear is that the ha-BI-ru were in the eyes of the Egyptians an easily identifiable group distinct from the Bedouin and the general population of Syria-Palestine--a fact incompatible

\textsuperscript{117} Perhaps more specifically, foreign servants. They are located in this list on the border of the upper and lower strata of society. In the somewhat similar list, \textit{KUB XXXV}, 45, 11, 2 ff., they are closely associated with the slaves.

\textsuperscript{118} See supra, \textit{WTJ} XIX, pp. 18 ff.

\textsuperscript{119} Or 217 or 144.

with the theory that the *ha-BI-ru* were an indistinct social class. Of course in Egypt they were slaves but this like their foreign status among the Hittites was a local and temporary condition. It is clear, too, that their presence in Egypt is as prisoners of war belonging to a military corps from Syria-Palestine, which was somehow distinct from other such troops both general (e.g., the *Hr.w*) and elite (e.g., *maryannu*). One plausible explanation of their distinctiveness would be that it was ethnic.

From the Mesopotamian area too come examples of *ha-BI-ru* used as the equivalent of an ethnic term. In the Mari texts, for example, the *ha-BI-ru* are distinguished from such ethnic groups as the Beni-laminu, Beni-Simal, and "the men of Talhaya". So again in the Palestinian area the

---

121 G. Posener, *ibid.*, p. 175, observes that in the case of the term *pr.w*, "Les determinatifs les designent simplement comme des strangers; it ne s'ajoute aucun signe qui caracterise une classe sociale, un genre de vie ou une occupation, comme on en trouve, d'une fagon reguliere ou sporadique, apres des appellatifs d'emprunt comme *mri*, *mrjn*, *mskb*, *n'rn*, *kt* (*n*), etc." According to Albright, the foreign warrior determinative is used on the smaller Beisan stele of Seti I.

122 Cf. also the stele of Ramses IV in the Wadi Hammamat recording the personnel of an expedition sent to procure blocks of stone (Couyat and Montet, *Inscriptions hieroglyphiques du Ouadi Hammamat*, no. 12). The high priest of Amon heads the list followed by nine civil and military officers (Nos. 2-10), 412 subordinate officers (Nos. 11-16, 18, 21, 22), 5,000 men of the army (No. 17), 800 *pr.w* (No. 19), 2,000 slaves (No. 20), 130 quarrymen and stone-cutters (No. 25) and ten skilled artificers and artists (Nos. 23, 24, 26, 27). Similarly, two hieratic papyri from Memphis dated to the reign of Ramses II depict *pr.w* drawing stone. (Papyrus Leiden I, 348, recto 6:6; 349, recto 15).

123 The Beisan stele attests the presence of some *ha-BI-ru* in that area near 1300 B.C. and the Papyrus Harris 500 account of the taking of Joppa locates *ha-BI-ru* there in the 15th century (though the manuscript itself is 13th century).

124 If the 12th century proper name, *p3-pr* (see no. 191 in Bottero, *op. cit.*), has anything to do with the *ha-BI-ru*, it might be an indication of their ethnic distinctiveness since names of the type article plus substantive are often ethnic (e.g., *p3-hr*); they are, however, also professional (e.g., *p3-hm-ntr*, "the priest").

125 See supra, *WTJ* XIX, p. 14, n. 66. Cf. A 109. Contrary to Bottero (*op. cit.*, p. 188) *ha-BI-ru* is not shown to be an appellative by the Mari texts and others which designate certain towns or countries as the place of proximate origin or residence of the *ha-BI-ru*. The *ha-BI-ru* of these
ha-BI-ru, according to the Amarna and other evidence, were a well-defined group which could be contrasted with ethnic elements like the Sutu, native Palestinian troops, and "men of the land of Kashu".

Another feature which comes as no surprise on the assumption that the ha-BI-ru were an ethnic group is the mention of the "gods of the ha-BI-ru" in the Hittite treaties. It would not be as common for inter-ethnic professional groups to have guild deities and it is unlikely that a general social class had its own gods. Relevant here is the god ha-BI-ru found in an Assyrian Gotteradressbuch and in Hittite ritual. Possibly the similarity of ha-BI-ru and LU ha-BI-ru is accidental but otherwise there could be evidence here of the tribal character of the ha-BI-ru in the appearance of their eponymous tribal god.

texts may also be understood as a distinct ethnic element not indigenous to, or only temporarily located in, these places.

126 Cf. e. g., EA 195:24 ff.; 246:5 ff.; 318:10 ff.
127 Gustavs (ZAW, N. F. 3, 1926, pp. 25 ff.) disposed of the opinion of Jirku (Orientalistische Literaturzeitung, 1921, pp. 246 ff.; 1922, p. 38; and Der Alte Orient, 1924, pp. 18 ff.) that the proper translation is "the gods Ha-BI-ru". Jirku was compelled to regard as a scribal error: ilaniMES sa LUSA-GAZ (Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazko (hereafter KBo) I, 2, Rs. 27; cf. I, 3, IV, 5). Nor could he explain the genitive found in all cases but one (excluding, of course, the use of the ideogram). The one exception is a Hittite nominative: (KBo V, 3, I, 56) which Gustavs treated adjectivally. (Cf. Goetze in Bottero, op. cit., p. 81). Might this reflect the fact that what appeared like a nominative elsewhere, i. e., ha-BI-ru, was a shortened gentilic? Gustavs also proved groundless Jirku's view that the ilani was a plural of majesty.
128 In India certain professions have patron gods.
129 Greenberg (op. cit., p. 87, n. 9) argues that the summary type formula used to designate the gods of the ha-BI-ru points to an agglomeration of gods from diverse sources, not to a single pantheon of an ethnically unified group. That this is gratuitous is apparent from the use of the same summary formula for the gods of the ethnically unified Lulahhu.
130 KAV 42, II, 9. It is part of a corpus known as the "Description of the city of Ashur" and dates from the 7th century B. C.
131 Collection of tablets found at Boghazkoi (hereafter Bo) 5239:7 and 6868:2.
132 W. von Soden (in Bottero, op. cit., p. 135) says of the Neo-Assyrian dha-BI-ru that it represents the Akkadian ha'iru, hawiru, "spouse".
133 So Jirku, op. cit. Of uncertain relation to ha-BI-ru and LU ha-BI-ru are the personal names ha-BI-ra-am (of Old Akkadian texts), ha-BI-re/ri
There are also instances of peace treaty and covenant oaths governing the relation of \textit{ha-BI-ru} groups to kings.\footnote{Cf. supra, \textit{WTJ} XIX, p. 17 and n. 84; and P. A. Pohl, \textit{Orientalia} 25, 1956, p. 429. See below for further treatment of these texts as evidence of the \textit{ha-BI-ru} professional character.} These are compatible with an ethnic but not with a social class interpretation.

The ethnic view is not without problems. Often urged against it is the onomastic evidence, for \textit{ha-BI-ru} names range inside and outside the Semitic sphere.\footnote{The analyzable Old Babylonian names are Akkadian; those from Alalab are, with few exceptions, non-Semitic; one of the two from Anatolia is non-Semitic; from Babylon and Ashshur of the Middle period -Kassite. At Nuzi H. names, mostly Akkadian, differ in a marked degree from those of the local (in this case, Hurrian) population . . .". So Greenberg summarizes. \textit{op. cit.}, p. 87.} Caution, however, is required in drawing ethnic conclusions from onomastic data. A migratory group will adopt names current in their new land, for imitation of the higher social strata is a common human foible.\footnote{While granting that this is a "proven tendency", Greenberg, \textit{ibid.}, n. 9, says that the edge of the above argument has "been dulled by frequent use". It may be the beginning of scholarship to realize that an accumulation of authorities does not validate a view but it is a bit novel to judge that popularity invalidates one.} According to an ethnic interpretation of the \textit{ha-BI-ru} they will everywhere have assimilated their names to the indigenous population except, as far as the evidence goes, at Nuzu where they are apparently recently arrived from a Semitic area and even there the process of assimilation to Hurrian names may be seen to have begun.

and \textit{ha-[BI]-ir-di-il-la} (from Nippur), \textit{ha-BI-ra}, \textit{ha-BI-i-ra}, and \textit{ha-BI-ir-ti-la} (from Nuzu), and the Egyptian personal names containing the element 'pr. Gustavs (\textit{ZAW}, N. F. 17, 1940, pp. 158, 159) judged \textit{ha-BI-ir-ti-la} to be "H. is lord" and thus further evidence of \textit{ha-BI-ru}. If that were correct, the fact that \textit{-til-la} is a common element in Hurrian names would suggest Hurrian associations for \textit{ha-BI-ru} (cf. supra, \textit{WTJ} XIX, p. 4, n. 17). Moreover, most of the Nuzians who bear the names \textit{ha-BI-ra} and \textit{ha-BI-ir-ti-la} appear to have Hurrian relatives. And along with \textit{ha-BI-ru} in the Assyrian Gotteradressbuch are mentioned the Hurrian deities \textit{Seris} and \textit{Hurris} (cf. Albright, \textit{BASOR} 81, 1941, p. 20. n. 20).

Problematic, however, for Gustavs' interpretation are the facts that in every other case the word compounded with \textit{-til-la} is verbal or adjectival and \textit{til-la} is itself a Hurrian deity or surrogate for one.
The wide dispersal of the ha-BI-ru throughout the Fertile Crescent and adjacent areas which has earned for them in modern studies the epithet "ubiquitous" has also been thought a difficulty for the theory of ethnic unity. But it is reasonable to envisage this ubiquity of the ha-BI-ru as the sequel of an ethnic wave that dashed across the Fertile Crescent before even the earliest extant mention of ha-BI-ru in Babylonia.\(^{137}\) If so the question arises whether their ultimate origins lay in the desert enclosed by the Crescent or in the tracts beyond.

In opposing the ethnic view Greenberg appeals to what he believes to be evidence in the Amarna letters of accretions to the ha-BI-ru ranks. Thus, Abdi-Ashirta is called the GAZ-man,\(^ {138}\) "the townsmen of Lachish, after committing an offense against the king, are said to `have become H.'"\(^ {139}\); and we read of Amanhatbi that he "fled to the SA-GAZ men".\(^ {140}\) If Canaanites could so readily become ha-BI-ru (or SA-GAZ) how can ha-BI-ru denote an ethnic status? The texts in question, however, mean no more than that certain leaders and villagers of Canaan in rebelling against Pharaoh and his loyalists identified themselves with the efforts of the ha-BI-ru in Canaan. By making common cause with the SA-GAZ these Canaanites did not actually become SA-GAZ but became, in respect to their relationship to the Pharaoh (the recipient of these letters), "like GAZ men" (i. e., rebels).\(^ {141}\)

The major considerations bearing on the possibility of ha-BI-ru ethnic unity have now been surveyed. The hypothesis which accounts with the least difficulty for all the facts

---

137 DeVaux, ibid., p. 265, compares the similarly widespread Sutu and Arameans. Cf. also the Terahites who left elements of the family in Ur and Haran as they migrated to Canaan (Gen. 11:27 ff.). The notion of a general westward movement of the ha-BI-ru from Babylonia about the Fertile Crescent is too much dependent on the accident of archival discovery. Even according to present evidence the ha-BI-ru are found from Sumer to Alalah and Alishar by the 19th and 18th centuries.

138 EA 91:5.

139 So Greenberg, op. cit., p. 75. The text, EA 288:44, reads: \textit{ardutu}^\text{MES} \textit{ip-su a-na} \textit{LU.MES} [h]a-[B]i-[r].

140 EA 185:63.

141 In following Abdi Ashirta the people of Ammiya are said to have become "like GAZ men": \textit{i-ba-as-su ki-ma} \textit{LU.MES} GAZ (EA 74:28, 29; cf. 67:16, 17).
is that the *ha-BI-ru*—at least the characteristic core of them—did represent one ethnic stock.

2. Professional Fraternity. Ethnic unity need not have been the only or even the dominant element in the Gestalt called *ha-BI-ru*. Frequently in the extant record of their exploits it is their professional role which occupies the foreground and that role is military. In fact, they are almost everywhere and always engaged as professional warriors. They man the garrisons at Ur, Larsa, Babylon, Susa, and in Anatolia; conduct razzias along the Euphrates and throughout Canaan; and endure the fate of captives of war in Egypt. Especially illuminating are the new pages in *ha-BI-ru* history from Alalah and Boghazkoi.

At Alalah the term *ha-BI-ru* (or SA-GAZ) denotes the members of a particular military corps. The available details concerning the constituency of this *ha-BI-ru* corps contradict all identifications of the *ha-BI-ru* as a social class such as the *hupsu*. The Hurrianized society of Alalah was divided into distinct social classes. The *maryannu* occupied the top rung, followed by a free class of tradesmen, the *ehelena*. Next came the rural dwellers called *sabe name*, subdivided into the *hupsu* and *haniahu*. There were also, as always, the poor (*muskenu*) and the slaves.142 Now the significant thing is that the membership of the *ha-BI-ru* corps cut across these classes.143 It comprised *ehelena*,144 *muskenu*,145 slave,146 and even the *maryannu*.147

---

142 See Wiseman, *AT*, pp. 10 ff.; Speiser, *JAOS* 74, 1954, pp. 18 ff.; Mendelsohn, *BASOR* 139, 1955, pp. 9 ff. Wiseman equates only the *hupsu* with the *sabe name*, associating the *haniahu* with the *ehelena*.

143 *Cf.* supra, WTJ XIX, p. 16 and n. 78. Eissfeldt recognized this (*Forschungen and Fortschritte* 28:3, March 1954, pp. 80 ff.), but Greenberg blurs the situation when he comments that the SA-GAZ "are grouped with a military class composed of *ehele* and *hanyae*" (*op. cit.*, p. 65).

144 *AT* 182:27; *cf.* 180:27.

145 *AT* 180:31; 182:29.

146 *AT* 182:14.

147 According to the probable implications of the charioteers in the *ha-BI-ru* corps (*AT* 180:24; 182:19; 183:6; 226:1) and the most probable interpretation of the list of family chiefs (*AT* 198, esp. line 42; *cf.* supra, WTJ XIX, p. 16., n. 80). Since the *maryannu* status was obtainable by marriage and royal grant as well as by inheritance and since this class had
Alongside the *ha-BI-ru* as a second military body at Alalah is the *sanannu* corps. The two groups have much in common. The *sanannu* corps too is composed of members of the various social categories. Both groups consist in part of charioteers. The members of both come from towns around Alalah and farther afield. Both are coordinated with towns in civil administration. Thus in a cattle census the totals are given in terms of the sheep, rams, and asses belonging to Alalah, Mukish, the SA-GAZ, and the *sanannu*.

What the distinction was between the *ha-BI-ru* and the *sanannu* corps is uncertain. Perhaps it lay in the area of military specialization. Another possibility, however, in line with the apparent ethnic unity of the *ha-BI-ru* would be that the distinction was (at least on the *ha-BI-ru* side) ethnic, as in the case of David's Pelethites and Cherethites.

Once again in the two new documents from the Old Hittite royal archives at Hattusha the SA-GAZ stand forth as a distinct corps on a level with other regular branches of the Hittite military. In one document the SA-GAZ troops no rigid ethnic barrier (cf. R. T. O'Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim*, Rome, 1948, p. 66) there is no difficulty in the presence of *ha-BI-ru* regarded as substantially an ethnic unity among the *maryannu*.

148 See *AT* 183, 226, and 350.
149 See *AT* 145 and 341.
150 Wiseman suggests that *Mu-ki (-is) -he* be read for *Mu-ki-he*.
252 *AT* 350; cf. 352. The *sanannu* total is elsewhere (*AT* 341) itemized in terms of sixteen towns around Alalah.
152 Albright (*apud* Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 11, n. 4), relating the *sanannu* of Alalah to the *tnn* of the Ugaritic texts, compares Akkadian *sanannu* and suggests *tnn*, "strive", as the common stem; he translates *sanannu* as "archers". Gordon (*Ugaritic Manual*, Rome, 1955, no. 2049) renders the Ugaritic *tnn*, "a kind of soldier"; and the plural, "members of a certain guild".
153 At the time of this writing these documents have not yet been published and I am greatly indebted to Prof. H. Otten for his kindness in making available to me his article *Zwei althethitische Belege zu den Hapiru* (SA-GAZ) shortly to appear in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, in which he presents the texts in transription and translation along with an excellent discussion. Cf. P. A. Pohl's reference to these texts in *Orientalia* 25, 1956, p. 428.
154 The modern Boghazkoi.
155 141/d= *KUB* XXXVI, 106.
are seen joining the troops of Hatti in a pledge of allegiance to the city of Hattusha. Their commitment assumes the form of a self-maledictory oath, the characteristic covenant form found in the ritual of oath taking for Hittite soldiers. In the other document, it is the rights of the SA-GAZ troops which are guaranteed, and that by means of a solemn oath taken by the sovereign. This disclosure of the official status of that ha-BI-ru within the political establishments at Boghazkoi and Alalah suggests that much of the ha-BI-ru activity which has appeared to be independent marauding was directed from the capital of one of the ambitious empires of the day.

3. Proposed Solution. Two elements are integral to the entity called ha-BI-ru: ethnic unity and military fraternity. In the extant records the military connotation is often dominant.

Comparable to this dual character of the ha-BI-ru is that of the maryannu. Professionally, they were the experts in chariotry; ethnically, the characteristic core and majority of them belonged to the Indo-Aryan stock which constituted the ruling and patrician class in the unusual symbiosis of Mitannian society. The maryannu and ha-BI-ru categories are not completely parallel since, as noted, the ha-BI-ru corps cut across the social classes and included maryannu. Nevertheless, the maryannu do offer a social phenomenon in the immediate historical context of the ha-BI-ru analogous to that presented here as an interpretation of the ha-BI-ru, particularly with respect to the essential point of the correlativity of ethnic and professional character in one group. And if the ha-BI-ru

156 Cf. KBo VI, 34 and its duplicate KUB VII, 59.
157 298/n+756/f.
158 Cf. also their employment by governments in the early Babylonian administrative texts and in some of the Mari and Amarna letters.
159 Locally the name develops an even more specialized military significance in the LU ha-BI-ri officer at Alalah (AT 164); cf. the SA-GAZ officer at Ugarit (RS 15109).
160 If it be the case that the ha-BI-ru were not ethnically one but that there were additions from various ethnic groups to the original ethnic stock of the military organization, that too would find its parallel in the maryannu who, though they were predominantly Indo-Aryan, were not exclusively so (cf. above n. 147).
and *maryannu* were kindred phenomena, the *ha-BI-ru* will have been, within the Mitannian orbit at least, a kind of guild.\(^{161}\)

This interpretation has the advantage of being based on that which is pervasive rather than elusive in the texts. At the same time it is able to account for the various types of polarity in the *ha-BI-ru* career. Readily understood for example are both their settled and free-booting phases. The latter isolated from the former has led to the theory that the *ha-BI-ru* were a second millennium B. C. counterpart to the condottieri of the late Middle Ages.\(^{162}\) This theory properly recognizes the family structure and fighting profession of the *ha-BI-ru* but is one-sided in not doing justice to the phase of their history which finds them a long since settled and respected element in a mature cultural complex. Both phases find room, however, within the historical vicissitudes of an ethnic but far-flung group, in the shaping of whose life the controlling factor was a committal to the military profession. The pursuit of happiness for them might become the pursuit of trouble and a hectic chase it led the *ha-BI-ru* at times. But militarists who identify themselves permanently with a particular political cause can there achieve honor and influence. Indeed, the warriors and the priests generally constituted the two highest social groups. Such an exchange of loyalty and recognition marks the status of the *ha-BI-ru* in the Old Hittite empire and especially in the Alalah-Ugarit sector of the Mitannian hegemony.

The Nuzu documents have appeared to present a puzzling exception to the military pattern of *ha-BI-ru* life. If so, was it that though militarists they found no call for their professional services at Nuzu and were obliged to seek more peaceful means of support? The difficulty of making such a transition might well have compelled them to give up a measure of their freedom for a measure of security, as was involved in accepting the terms of their servant contracts. Or was it (as is also possible on an ethno-professional approach) that some individuals belonging to the *ha-BI-ru* ethnic whole did not

\(^{161}\) For the importance of the guild system in the Ras Shamra texts see J. Gray, *The Hibbert Journal*, January, 1955, pp. 115 ff.

\(^{162}\) So, e. g., Albright, *JAOS* 48, 1928, pp. 183-185.
participate in the military guild? Obviously in this category are the ha-BI-ru women who appear alone or as widows (apparently) with children.\(^{163}\)

As a matter of fact, however, traces of the military motif can be detected even in the Nuzu episode.\(^{164}\) Mitanni had only recently secured the Nuzu area and would want to maintain its military strength there. It was a halsu district, an area of farms and hamlets defended by towers and fortified houses. Such areas were occupied in part by military veterans settled as feudal tenants and were, in effect, frontier cantonments.\(^{165}\) Moreover, Tehiptilla, from whose archives the majority of the ha-BI-ru contracts come was the first halsuhlu official appointed over the Nuzu district and it would not be unusual if business conducted in the name of his house were actually official state business.\(^{166}\) In addition, there are Nuzu ration lists which deal with certain ha-BI-ru collectively, citing provisions assigned for them and (significantly for the possibility of a military role) for their horses. The form of these lists recalls the Old Babylonian administrative texts dealing with ha-BI-ru mercenaries.

A unifying strand is suggested, therefore, for all the ha-BI-ru documents in an ethno-professional interpretation. But within that identifying unity there is considerable diversity as to local and secondary conditions. In order to describe more adequately the place of the ha-BI-ru in the history of their age it is necessary to ask not simply what? but when? and where? Especially important is the question of the association of the ha-BI-ru with the Hurrians.

\(^{163}\) See n. 114 above. Cf. the SA-GAZ women singers mentioned in a Hittite text (no. 138 in Greenberg, op. cit.).

\(^{164}\) Not, however, by regarding the ha-BI-ru there as prisoners of war (so Chiera). Such a supposition is contradicted by the voluntary terms of the contracts (cf. ramaniu and pisu u lisansu) and by a text like JEN V, 455, which indicates that the ha-BI-ru Mar-Ishtar had come north from Akkad apart from any military venture.

\(^{165}\) Cf. J. Lewy, HUCA XXVII, 1956, pp. 56, 57.

\(^{166}\) Cf. J. Lewy, op. cit. XIV, 1939, p. 601, n. 75. Possibly the halsuhlu official at Nuzu had a military as well as judicial function. There are indications that the halsuhlu was at times at least a garrison commander. (cf. J. Finkelstein, Journal of Cuneiform Studies (hereafter JCS) 7, 1953, p. 116, n. 30).
4. Political Affiliation. Ha-BI-ru and Hurrian careers in the Near East are roughly coterminal geographically and chronologically. The Mitannian kingdom extended at times from east of the Tigris to Anatolia and ha-BI-ru are found from one end of it to the other. Beyond these borders, both ha-BI-ru and Hurrian individuals and influence penetrated among the Hittites and into Palestine and Egypt as well as into Babylonia. Chronologically, the ha-BI-ru are discovered in the Fertile Crescent from the Ur III period, and probably somewhat earlier, to almost the end of the second millennium B.C., although evidence of the ha-BI-ru in strength vanishes by the close of the 14th century. The date of the Hurrian arrival is a moot point but they too are clearly on the scene well before the Ur III period.\textsuperscript{167} The rise of the Hittite Suppiluliuma in the second quarter of the 14th century marked the end of Mitannian strength in the west and the rise of the Assyrian Shalmaneser I a century later in the east terminated Hurrian political significance.

In short, there is a general contemporaneity of ha-BI-ru and Hurrian careers, with the political importance of each declining sharply by about the close of the 14th century. Bottero mentions the disappearance of the ha-BI-ru from history at the end of the second millennium as a difficult problem\textsuperscript{168} but a far more significant problem is why the evidence of ha-BI-ru community organization and military enterprise disappears about the end of the 14th century.\textsuperscript{169} And it is difficult to divorce the answer to that question from the simultaneous collapse of the Mitannian empire.

The clue provided by ha-BI-ru--Hurrian contemporaneity is confirmed by the evidences of their cultural-political congeniality.\textsuperscript{170} By way of contrast, the welcome afforded the

\textsuperscript{167} There were two Hurrian kings at Urkish in the Upper Khabur area as early as the third millennium. (See J. Finkelstein JCS 9, 1955, p. 6; cf. O'Callaghan, op. cit., p. 47).


\textsuperscript{169} The mention of ha-BI-ru in Egyptian slave gangs after this date is obviously not a real exception.

\textsuperscript{170} Speiser in Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C., 1933, pp. 34 ff., regarded the ha-BI-ru as culturally dependent on the Hurrians and identified the Hurrians and one branch of the ha-BI-ru
"ha-Bl-ru" outside Mitanni was something short of enthusiastic. One of the cliches among the threatenings of prophets of woe was that the "ha-Bl-ru" were coming¹⁷¹ and historians in describing anarchic conditions of the past often observed that the "ha-Bl-ru" had roamed the highways uncontrolled.¹⁷² In the 18th century "ha-Bl-ru" raiders were a plague to Amorite authorities in Mesopotamia and in the Amarna Age "ha-Bl-ru" incursions were a menace to loyalist native chiefs in Palestine. Their reputation is epitomized in the SA-GAZ epithet which seems to have been applied to them as intruders into the Mesopotamian area and is probably to be understood in the sense of "thugs". Of course, the "ha-Bl-ru" were at times employed by various governments as mercenaries, but even among the Hittites where they had their own settlements and enjoyed legal guarantees of their rights as a division of the military, they were still regarded as foreigners.

Within the Mitannian hegemony, however, the exchange of loyalty and respectful recognition which marks the relation of the "ha-Bl-ru" to the government seems to have traditional roots. Especially in the Syrian area the "ha-Bl-ru" are a thoroughly integrated element in the civil-social complex. There they are found in permanent settlements and contribute to the community leadership--civil, cultic, and military. It is, moreover, the Hurrianized pattern of society that forms the native habitat for the "ha-Bl-ru" as a societal species; for in it the "ha-Bl-ru" find organizational analogues to themselves. The evidence for the various elements in this picture has already been given¹⁷³ and may now be supplemented by observations concerning the Amarna and Nuzu situations.

as the main components of the Hyksos. The assumption that "ha-Bl-ru" were involved in the Hyksos movement is plausible in view of their military profession, their known presence in Syria before the Hyksos period, and their role in Syria-Palestine and slave status in Egypt after the Hyksos era.

¹⁷¹ So in the omen literature if the "ha-Bl-ru" may be seen in the SA-GAZ of these texts.
¹⁷² So again if SA-GAZ refers to "ha-Bl-ru" in the Old Babylonian literary texts (cf. in Bottero, op. cit., nos. 6-8).
¹⁷³ See above the comparison of "ha-Bl-ru" and maryannu and cf. WTJ XIX, pp. 12, 15, 16, 21.
Mitannian leaders with their designs of encroaching on Egyptian holdings could only have regarded with satisfaction the activities of the *ha-BI-ru* in Palestine as reflected in the Amarna letters. In view of the contemporary *ha-BI-ru*--Hurrian associations in adjoining Syria, this harmony of *ha-BI-ru* program and Mitannian policy will hardly have been due to coincidence.\(^{174}\) Then the collapse of Mitanni before the expanding New Hittite power confronted the *ha-BI-ru* with crisis and decision. And the noteworthy fact to emerge is that the *ha-BI-ru* as an organized entity did not survive the fall of Mitanni. That suggests that whatever ambiguity may attach to the political allegiance of the *ha-BI-ru* during this crisis,\(^{175}\) their fundamental affiliation had been in the Mitannian sphere where they had enjoyed their most satisfactory social adjustment.

Meanwhile at Nuzu on the eastern extremity of Mitannian dominion *ha-BI-ru* are found in a relationship to the Hurrians rather different from that at Ugarit and Alalah. This difference is perhaps to be explained by the recentness both of Mitanni’s annexation of the Nuzu district and of the arrival of the *ha-BI-ru* there from a non-Hurrian area, in contrast to the long association of the *ha-BI-ru* with the Hurrians in Syria. In any case, even the condition of servitude which the *ha-BI-ru* were obliged to accept at Nuzu, though less attractive an arrangement than the one enjoyed by their colleagues in Syria, may in its own way serve equally well to underscore the unusually cordial association which prevailed between the often ominous *ha-BI-ru* and the kingdom of Mitanni. For the *ha-BI-ru* status of the Nuzu contracts has been convincingly equated by J. Lewy with that of the


\(^{175}\) In the period of Mitannian disintegration the *ha-BI-ru* cooperated with the Hittites in their Palestinian interests. So, for example, they assisted Aziru against the loyalists when he was being used as a tool by the Hittite Suppiluliuma (cf. *Boghazkoi-Studien* VIII, 4). Similarly, during the Old Hittite period *ha-BI-ru* mercenaries are found in the army of a Hittite king at a time when he was contending against the Hurrians (cf. nos. 72 and 72’ in Bottero, *op. cit.*). A lack of coordination among the various contingents of the *ha-BI-ru* military fraternity would lead to such political complications.
'ebed 'Ibri in the biblical legislation.\textsuperscript{176} To the extent that this is so it is evidence (not as Lewy concluded that the \textit{ha-BI-ru} at Nuzu were regarded as foreign servants but) that the Hurrians treated the \textit{ha-BI-ru} there like needy brothers. Such is the plain meaning of the biblical \textit{'ebed 'Ibri} laws.\textsuperscript{177}

Here then is a promising area for future investigation as the volume of \textit{ha-BI-ru} texts continues to grow. Available evidence, however, would seem to warrant the conclusion that within the period of our documents the primary base of operations for the \textit{ha-BI-ru}, their center of family-tribal settlement and societal integration, and their strongest political attachments were in the Hurrian sphere. The implications of this for earlier associations of the \textit{ha-BI-ru} and Hurrians or Indo-Aryans before they appear on the stage of near eastern history are uncertain. In our present state of knowledge it appears more likely that the \textit{ha-BI-ru} were part of the massive migration from the north that brought the Hurrians into the Fertile Crescent in the third millennium B.C. than that they were a native element there.

\textit{(to be concluded)}

\textsuperscript{176} The following parallels are adduced by Lewy: a) there was a fixed terminus understood for the period of service (cf. Exod. 21:2 and \textit{JEN} V, 455:1-7 and 8-16); b) there was the option of choosing to become a permanent slave (cf. Exod. 21:5-6; but see, too, Lev. 25:39-41; and \textit{JEN} V, 452, 453, etc.); c) the servant who left might not take with him a wife given him by his master (cf. Exod. 21:4; but see, too, Lev. 25:41; and \textit{JEN} V, 437; cf. \textit{JEN} VI, 611). Levy's position that there was a law which automatically fixed the term of service in such contracts unless the contract itself stipulated the master's lifetime, is criticized by Greenberg (op. cit., p. 67, n. 28) on the ground that no contracts mention such a feature. It seems, however, that the date formulae of \textit{JEN} V, 455 are best accounted for on an assumption like Lewy's.

\textsuperscript{177} This matter will be more fully examined later in this article. Even if the Nuzu and biblical phenomena are not identified it must be recognized that the \textit{ha-BI-ru} at Nuzu were treated far more favorably than ordinary slaves. They do not sell their persons to their patrons. They may terminate their service by furnishing a substitute. The relationship of servant to master is at times expressed in terms reminiscent of adoption contracts.
THE HA-BI-RU--KIN OR FOE OF ISRAEL?

THIRD ARTICLE

MEREDITH G. KLINE

II. Ha-BI-ru--HEBREW RELATIONS

A fascination with the possibilities of illuminating Hebrew origins has characterized studies of the ha-BI-ru. As observed at the outset, popular theory has it that the Hebrews were one offshoot of the ha-BI-ru. This theory may start with the supposition that the ha-BI-ru were a social class or an ethnic group. Although some form of either approach can be developed without the assumption that the terms ha-BI-ru and 'Ibri can be equated phonetically or at least semantically they are greatly strengthened if such equation can be established. It is necessary in this connection to survey the usage of 'Ibrim in the Old Testament and to face the question of the phonetic relation of ha-BI-ru and 'Ibri.

A. The Usage of 'Ibrim in the Old Testament.

Support for the view that the term ha-BI-ru denotes a larger whole from which the biblical Hebrews originated has been claimed in the usage of the term 'Ibrim in the Old Testament. There is no doubt that the gentilic 'Ibri is ordinarily used in the Old Testament as an ethnicon for Abraham and his descendants of the Isaac-Jacob line.\(^{178}\) In a

\(^{178}\) The word is found almost exclusively in a few clusters which suggests that particular circumstances account for its employment. One such group appears in the narrative of the Egyptian sojourn and bondage; a second in the record of Israelite-Philistine relationships during the days of Samuel and Saul; and a third in a series of texts dealing with the manumission of Hebrew servants. There are besides only the isolated appearances in Genesis 14:13 and Jonah 1:9. The great majority of these are instances of non-Israelites speaking to or about Israelites, or of Israelites speaking to foreigners, or of declarations of God destined for foreigners. Where it is
few passages, however, some have judged that 'Ibrim is used in a non-Israelite or even appellative sense and that in such texts an original, wider (i.e., ha-BI-ru) connotation emerges. These passages must be examined.

1. The 'Ebed 'Ibri Legislation.

In the legislation of Exod. 21:2 and Deut. 15:12 and in the references to these laws in Jer. 34:9, 14 the term 'Ibri has been thought to denote not the ethnic character of the servant but a particular variety of servanthood. J. Lewy develops this theory on the basis of his interpretation of the term ha-BI-ru in the Nuzu contracts as an appellative meaning "foreign-servant", and his judgment that the parallels between the status of the ha-BI-ru servants and the 'ebed 'Ibri of Exod. 21:2 (and the associated passages) are so close and numerous as to indicate identical institutions and identity of meaning for ha-BI-ru and 'Ibri. 179

the Israeliite author who employs the term he is often adapting his terminology to the usage in the context. In several passages a contrast is drawn between Israelites and other ethnic groups.

It has been suggested that 'Ibri uniformly possesses a peculiar connotation. For example, DeVaux (RB 55, 1948, pp. 344 ff.) maintains that it has a derogatory nuance and finds the common element in the fact that the 'Ibrim are strangers in the milieu, while Kraeling (AJSL 58, 1941 pp. 237 ff.) suggests that 'Ibri is an alternate for "Israelite" in situations where the designee is not a free citizen in a free community or on free soil. The latter formulation seems to be successful in unravelling a strand common to all the 'Ibri contexts but it remains uncertain whether such a nuance necessarily attached to the employment of the word. Cf. Greenberg, op. cit., p. 92.

179 HUCA XIV, 1939, pp. 587 ff.; XV, 1940, pp. 47 ff. Cf. his note in Bottero, op. cit., pp. 163-4, where he translates ha-BI-ru as "resident alien". Lewy supports his thesis with the considerations that the ha-BI-ru are present in the Mitannian orbit in the period during which the 'Ibrim became a nation and that the whole area in question had been unified under the Hyksos with the result that the same technical terms and analogous institutions are found throughout. He holds that this social-legal appellative usage of Ibr is the earliest stage (noting its appearance in the first paragraph of Israel's Book of the Covenant) but that later the term was used in an ethnic sense for the descendants of the "Hebrews par excellence". Cf. supra WTJ XIX, pp. 183, 184.
But is the situation on the Nuzu side clearly as Lewy has reconstructed it? There are texts\(^{180}\) in which the person(s) concerned is not designated as an *ha-BI-ru* and yet the essential clauses of the contract are those characteristic of the contracts where the persons are labeled as *ha-BI-ru*. It is, therefore, difficult to insist that we are dealing with a specifically *ha-BI-ru* type of servanthood.\(^{181}\) While, therefore, *ha-BI-ru* are found in the great majority of these contracts, they are not necessarily involved in all of them,\(^{182}\) and one may not assume then the existence in the Nuzu area of a specifically *ha-BI-ru* brand of slavery.

Moreover, even if Lewy's view of the Nuzu evidence were to be adopted, the biblical evidence would contradict the translation of *‘Ibri* as "foreign-servant" in the *‘ebed ‘Ibri* legislation. For the biblical law is patently not dealing with foreign servants but with those who were their masters' brethren. The Deut. 15:12 expansion of the original statement reads, "If thy brother\(^{183}\) a Hebrew man, or a Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee"; while Jeremiah, further expanding it urges "that every man should let go free his man-servant and every man his maid-servant, that is a Hebrew or Hebrewess ; that none should make bondmen of them, namely, of a Jew, his brother" (34:9, cf. vs. 14). While one may then recognize the instructive parallels in the conditions of servanthood at Nuzu and in the biblical legislation, it is impossible to hold that *‘Ibri* is in this legislation a technical term for a

\(^{180}\) JEN VI, 610, 611, 613 (cf. JEN V, 456:9-23); JEN V, 446, 449, 457 and 462.

\(^{181}\) An alternate interpretation has been advocated in the present study. See supra WTJ XIX, pp. 179, 180, 183, 184.

\(^{182}\) Especially relevant is the figure of Attilammu the Assyrian in the servant contract JEN VI, 613:2. Even when this text in abbreviated form is included in the Sammelurkunde JEN V, 456 between two contracts in which the persons are specifically designated as *ha-BI-ru* (i. e., in a situation where there would be a tendency to uniformity), Attilammu is not described as an *ha-BI-ru*. It is further to be observed in connection with the use of *as-su-ra-a-a-u* for Attilammu in JEN VI, 613 that when *ha-BI-ru* from Ashur are so described it is as *sa-‘a* as-su-ur.

\(^{183}\) Note the clear distinction drawn in verse 3 between "the foreigner" and "thy brother" in the law of the seventh year release with respect to debt.
specific type of servanthood and least of all for the idea of "foreign-servant". Its usage is rather ethnic, as always.


It has been affirmed that the 'Ibrim here (cf. 13:3, 7, 19; 14:11, 21) are quite clearly non-Israelites. The proper interpretation of these verses is, indeed, difficult; nevertheless, to distinguish between the ‘Ibrim and the Israelites would be at odds with the decisive evidence in this context of their identity. Thus, in 13:3, 4, and are obvious equivalents (cf. 13:19, 20). Moreover, it is apparently in reference to the hiding of those described in 13:6 as the "men of Israel" that the Philistines say, "Behold, the ‘Ibrim are coming out of the holes where they had hid themselves" (14:11b). Again, the equivalence of with the inhabitants in 13:19, 20 is evident.

To find, then, in the ‘Ibrim of 13:7 a group ethnically distinct from the "men of Israel" in 13:6 would involve for the term ‘Ibrim a change from its contextual significance too abrupt to be plausible. Verses 6 and 7 are concerned with two groups of Israelites. Verse 6 refers to those excused by Saul from military service (cf. vs. 2). These hide in the hills and caves west of Jordan. Verse 7 refers to certain of the selected troops who were with Saul at Gilgal near the Jordan. These, deserting, cross over the river to the land of Gad and Gilead east of Jordan.

184 The 'ebed in the phrase 'ebed 'Ibri (Exod. 21:2) would then be tautological, and Alt feels obliged to excise it from the text.
185 Cf. e.g., A. Guillaume, PEQ, 1946, p. 68.
186 The LXX rendering of the end of verse 3, ὄψιν τῶν φυλάσσων (as though the Hebrew were ἡσσωρίων) seems to be a conjectural emendation occasioned by the fact that comes somewhat unexpectedly on the lips of Saul.
187 13:4b does not describe a regathering of those sent home but simply indicates the new location of Saul and his chosen army at Gilgal.
188 There were originally 3000 chosen by Saul (13:2), but after the approach of the Philistines in force and Samuel's delay there were only 600 left (13:11, 15; 14:2).
In 14:21 it is not necessary to follow the English versions in regarding the 'Ibrim as men who had been serving in the Philistine army. Even if such a translation were adopted, it would still be gratuitous to identify these 'Ibrim as non-Israelites for they might be Israelite turn-coats.

But verse 21 may be translated: "Now the Hebrews were towards the Philistines as formerly when they went up with them in the camp round about; both they were with the Israelites who were with Saul and Jonathan and...". The antecedent of מָעָם, "with them", appears to be "Saul and all the people (or army)" of verse 20. Another possibility is to regard "the Philistines" as the antecedent of "them" but to translate the preposition "against". In either case this passage would contain no mention of 'Ibrim as having served in Philistine forces. Verses 21 and 22 rather distinguish as two elements swelling the unexpectedly triumphant remnants of Saul's army those who had deserted after being selected by Saul to encamp against the Philistines (vs. 21) and those who, after being dismissed by Saul, were frightened into hiding by the alarming course of the conflict (vs. 22).

This distinction in 14:21, 22 is the same as that found in 13:6, 7a. Indeed, the terminology in the two passages is deliberately made to correspond. 'Ibrim is used in both 13:7a and 14:21 for the deserters; and "men of Israel" in 13:6 and 14:22 for the people who hid in the hill-country of Ephraim. The 'Ibrim of 14:21 will then be the deserting soldiers of Saul who had crossed over the Jordan but now resume their former position in the Israelite ranks against the Philistines.

190 Is this an allusion to the circumstance that the original three Israelite positions at Bethel, Michmash, and Gibeah surrounded the Philistine garrison at Geba? If the Massoretic text and accentuation (瞢) stand, the next clause will be a pseudo-verbal construction (as translated above). The LXX and Syriac would read פֶּטֶשׁ, פֶּטֶשׁ, "they also turned", which would provide a parallel to לְנֵי פֶּטֶשׁ (vs. 22).
191 Cf. Brown, Driver and Briggs, op. cit., under נָב 1c.
192 For a similar military development see Judg. 7:3-7, 23, 24.
193 The use of עָלָה in 13:7a suggests the possibility of עָלָה עָלָה, "those who passed over", as the original in 14:21 (cf. the participle, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָם, מָעָמ,

Is ‘Ibri in this its earliest biblical appearance used ethnically? This question may be dealt with in connection with an inquiry into the origin of the term ‘Ibri. Broad contextual considerations indicate that in his use of ‘Ibri in Gen. 14:13, the author had in mind ‘Eber of the line of Shem (cf. Gen. 10:21, 24, 25; 11:14-17). The direct descent of Abraham from ‘Eber had already been traced in the genealogy of Gen. 11:10-26. Moreover, the departure from the stereotyped presentation of the genealogical data in Gen. 10 to describe Shem as "the father of all the children of ‘Eber" (vs. 21) is most readily accounted for as an anticipation of the author’s imminent concentration (cf. Gen. 11:27 ff.) upon the Semitic Eberites par excellence, i.e., the "Hebrews" whom Yahweh chose to be the channel of revelation and redemption. In Gen. 14:13 then, ‘Ibri is a patronymic, applied in this isolated way to Abraham perhaps to contrast him with the many other ethnic elements which play a role in this context.

On the other hand, many regard this usage of ‘Ibri as appellative and then find their interpretations of the term ha-BI-ru reflected in it. The appellative view is ancient, for the LXX renders ‘Ibri as ὁ περατης, Aquila, as περατης; Jerome, as transeuphratensis; and the prevailing view of the rabbis a generation after Aquila was that ‘Ibri in the corresponding member of 14:21). Such a change in the Massoretic pointing would support a corresponding change to ἴβρι in 13:7a. If the Massoretic ἴβρι is original, the author perhaps employed this designation of the Israelites to produce a word play with עִבְרָי.

194 ἴβρι (‘ibri) is the gentilic formation of ἴβρ (‘eber).
195 Cf. also the additional remark in Gen. 10:25.
196 For example, W. F. Albright, JAOS 48, 1928, pp. 183 ff., once found in both the idea of "mercenary"; and DeVaux, op. cit., pp. 337 ff., that of "stranger". Kraeling, op. cit., held that ‘Ibri is used to underscore Abraham's role as a sojourner who pays tribute to Melchizedek.
197 Parzen, AJSL 49, pp. 254 ff., is mistaken in his opinion that the LXX actually found 우בר in the Hebrew text. Noth, "Erwagungen zur Hebraerfrage", in Festschrift Otto Procksch (Leipzig, 1934), pp. 99 ff., is probably correct in stating that the LXX translator simply regarded it as desirable at this first appearance of ‘Ibri to indicate what was, in his opinion, its significance.
designated Abraham as "from the other side of the river".\textsuperscript{198} All of these derived 'Ibri from the substantive meaning "the other side" rather than from the verb 'br.\textsuperscript{199} In line with this view of the etymology is the emphasis in Joshua 24:2, 3 on Abraham's origin "beyond the River". But these facts are far from possessing the weight of the more immediate contextual considerations cited above. Here too then 'Ibri is not appellative but ethnic.

4. Conclusion.

It has appeared from this study that, the term 'Ibrim in the Old Testament has uniformly an ethnic meaning and denotes descendants of Eber in the line of Abraham-Isaac-Jacob exclusively. Deriving from the eponymous ancestor 'Eber the term is probably early;\textsuperscript{200} in particular, its application to Abraham need not be proleptic. To judge from its characteristic association with foreigners in the biblical contexts and the general avoidance of it by the Israelites, it possibly originated outside the line of Abraham. Originally it may have been of wider application than is the usage in the Old Testament, denoting other descendants of Eber than the Abrahamites. This is perhaps suggested by the use of 'Eber in Gen. 10:21 and Num. 24:24.\textsuperscript{201} In that

\textsuperscript{198} Greenberg, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 5, n. 24, directs attention to the evidence for this in B\textit{resit Rabba} 42, 8. A minority opinion of the rabbis was that Abraham was called the 'Ibri because he was a descendant of 'Eber.

\textsuperscript{199} This appears to be so even in the LXX, although later Patristic writings in treating the LXX rendering derived it from a verbal base. (cf. Greenberg, \textit{ibid.}).

\textsuperscript{200} Kraeling, \textit{op. cit.}, offers the strange hypothesis that "Hebrews" is a secondarily personalized form of a geographical name, i. e., "Overites" from \textit{רְמֵא} שְׁבֵי בַּעֲרָא from \textit{רְמֵא} שְׁבֵי בַּעֲרָא adopted by the Israelites as late as the early monarchy in an attempt to orientate themselves to the world in which they had just become prominent. The usage would thus be that of the first millennium even when applied to the Patriarchs. H. H. Rowley counters: (a) in the early monarchy, consciousness of being from over the Euphrates is not apparent among the Hebrews; (b) the term disappeared almost completely from the Old Testament with the establishment of the monarchy; (c) The Israelites would hardly adopt as a symbol of self-esteem a term "generally employed in a pejorative sense". \textit{PEQ}, 1942, pp. 41-53; \textit{From Joseph to Joshua}, 1952, pp. 54-5; cf. further O'Callaghan's criticism in \textit{Aram Naharaim} p. 216, n. 4.

\textsuperscript{201} The validity of conclusions based on the tradition of descent from
case the appearance of such gentilic but non-Abrahamic ‘Ibrim in some non-biblical text of the patriarchal age need not come altogether unexpectedly.

Do the ha-BI-ru qualify? According to the conclusions already reached in this study concerning the probable geographical and ethnic origins of the ha-BI-ru they do not qualify as Semitic let alone Eberite kin of the Hebrews.202 On the other hand, a final judgment on this larger issue is

Eber is challenged by DeVaux's contention (op. cit.) that there are divergent views within the Old Testament. He grants that the composer(s) of the biblical genealogies derives ‘Iibri from the ancestor ‘Eber, but finds in the reference to Jacob as a "wandering Aramean" (Deut. 26:5) a conflicting tradition of Aramaic origin (cf. Gen. 10:22-24). DeVaux believes the latter to be further supported by the description of Laban, grandson of Abraham's brother Nahor, as an "Aramean" (Gen. 31:20). According to the record, however, the term "Aramean" could have been applied to both Jacob and Laban in virtue of their long residence in Paddan-aram and so construed would say nothing about their lineage. DeVaux also insists, but unnecessarily, on identifying the Aram of Gen. 10:22 and the Aram of Gen. 22:21, which would then bring the two passages into hopeless confusion. Finally, DeVaux appeals to the prophetic denunciation of Jerusalem in Ezek. 16:3, "your origin and your nativity are of the land of the Canaanite; the Amorite was your father and the Hittite your mother". Actually, as is apparent from the context (cf. especially vss. 45 ff.), Ezekiel is using a scathing figure to say that from the first Israel was just as much disqualified spiritually from enjoying a covenantal relationship with Yahweh as were her despised heathen neighbors--the point being that Israel's election must be attributed solely to the principle of divine grace. But even if Ezekiel were speaking of literal racial intermixture, the reference would be not to Abraham's family origins but to the subsequent mingling of the racial strain of his descendants with those of the inhabitants of Canaan. DeVaux's view is that the Hebrews and ha-BI-ru were of common Aramaean descent. Starting with the notion that the ha-BI-ru were desert nomads, DeVaux seeks to relate the ha-BI-ru to the Aramaeans by a partial identification of them with proto-Aramaean nomadic Ahlamu.

202 Greenberg, op. cit, pp. 93 ff., provides an example of how the biblical usage of ‘Ibrim can be regarded as consistently ethnic, and ha-BI-ru be deemed an appellative for a social class, and yet the terms be equated and the Hebrews derived from the ha-BI-ru. He suggests that Abraham was an ha-BI-ru, but this epithet as applied to Abraham's descendants became an ethnicon. Later biblical genealogists, unaware of this, invented the ancestor ‘Eber, man of many descendants, in order to explain at one stroke the known kinship of the Hebrews to other Semitic tribes and the origin of their name!
bound to be seriously affected by one's opinion on the phonetic question of whether the term *ha-BI-ru* can be equated with the term *'Ibri* (and so be derived from *'Eber*).\(^\text{203}\)

B. Phonetic Relation of Ha-BI-ru to 'Ibri.

1. Consonants. The common cuneiform spelling of the name is *ha-BI-ru* the final *u* being, according to the usual assumption, the nominative case ending, which yields as the grammatical relations require to other case or gentilic endings.\(^\text{204}\) In this cuneiform rendering the identity of the first two radicals is ambiguous. The initial consonant is ambiguous because Accadian *h* may represent other letters than Hebrew *n*;\(^\text{205}\) among them, Hebrew *v*.\(^\text{206}\) The second is ambiguous because

---

\(^{203}\) In addition to the supposed phonetic equivalence of *ha-BI-ru* and *'Ibri*, support has been sought for the derivation of the Hebrews from the *ha-BI-ru* by appeal to certain parallels in the careers of the two. But the similarities are for the most part superficial or based on misinterpretations of the data on one side or the other. For a recent popular example see H. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel*, 1954; cf. DeVaux *RB* 55, 1948, pp. 342 ff.; H. H. Rowley *From Joseph to Joshua*, 1952, p. 53, n. 1. Items like the following have been or might be mentioned: (a) In each case there is a westward movement about the Fertile Crescent. (But this cannot be demonstrated for the *ha-BI-ru* and, in the case of the Hebrews, it applies not to the group as such but only to Abraham.) (b) The chronological span of the use of the terms *ha-BI-ru* and *'Ibri* is roughly the same. (c) Both groups move in the Hurrian cultural orbit and exhibit the influence of this fact. (d) The military activity of Abraham the Hebrew in Genesis 14 and the attack of Simeon and Levi on Shechem are comparable to *ha-BI-ru* razzias. (But this involves a superficial estimate of both biblical instances.) (e) The *ha-BI-ru* mercenary activity is paralleled by the Hebrews in the Philistine army. (But this is a misinterpretation of the biblical data.) (f) Both groups are in Egypt forced into the corvee. (g) The *ha-BI-ru* are frequently strangers in the milieu and such are the Hebrew patriarchs in Canaan. (h) Both groups deprive Egypt of its holdings in Canaan by military operations during the Amarna Age.

\(^{204}\) Cf. supra, *WTJ* XIX, pp. 9-11.

\(^{205}\) Indeed, as A. Ungnad observes, "Bisweilen wird h fur 3 gebraucht" (*Grammatik des Akkadischen*, 1949, p. 9).

\(^{206}\) In the Canaanite glosses in the Tell el Amarna tablets are found, for example: *hu-ul-lu* (*EA* 296:38) = ʾy (cf. XXX) ; and *hi-na-ia* (*EA* 144:17) = ʾyʾ (cf. XXXX). Cf. E. A. Speiser, *Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C.*, 1933, p. 39.
BI represents among other values that of pi as well as that of bi in all periods of the cuneiform literature.

Further evidence is available, however, for in some cases other signs of the cuneiform syllabary are used to write this name and, moreover, the name has appeared in other systems of writing, syllabic and alphabetic. From Ras Shamra\textsuperscript{207} comes the form 'prm written in the alphabetic cuneiform common in texts from that site, in which the 'Ayin is distinct from other gutturals and the b is distinct from p. This form is, therefore, unambiguous. But the question has been raised whether this form, in particular the second consonant, is original or secondary. If the phonetic equivalence of 'prm and 'Ibrim were to be maintained, the primacy of the p would still be favored by the fact that Ugaritic often preserves a more primitive Semitic form than does the Hebrew.\textsuperscript{208} On the other hand there is evidence of an original b becoming p in Ugaritic.\textsuperscript{209}

In Egyptian hieroglyphics appears the form 'pr.w which is also without ambiguity. But here again the question arises as to whether the p is primary or secondary. It can be shown that Egyptian p may represent foreign, including Semitic, b, especially when the b is immediately preceded or followed by l

\textsuperscript{207} Virolleaud, Syria 21, 1940, p. 132, pl. 8 and p. 134, pl. 10.
\textsuperscript{208} So Kraeling, AJSL 58, 1941, pp. 237 ff. Cf. W. F. Albright, BASOR 77, 1940, pp. 32-3; DeVaux, RB 55, 1948, p. 342, n. 3. In an effort to show that it is "quite possible that the isolated Ugaritic as well as the Egyptian 'pr are secondary forms due to Hurrian influence" J. Lewy observes that "the population of Ugarit included Hurrian elements and that the Hurrians, wherever they appear, are responsible for a confusion in the rendering of Semitic 2 and 3 because their scribes did not distinguish between voiced and voiceless stops" (HUCA 15, 1940, p. 48, n. 7). C. H. Gordon, however, informs me that the Ugaritic scribes who wrote the tablets bearing 'prm carefully distinguish p and b. J. W. Jack (PEQ, 1940, p. 101) attributes the Ugaritic spelling to Egyptian influence at Ugarit.
\textsuperscript{209} There are, e. g., the variants lbs/lps and nbk/npk. Cf. Greenberg, op. cit., p. 90, n. 24. For evidence of confusion in Ugaritic between b and p, and that in the very name ha-BI-ru, attention has been called to the Ugaritic text 124:14, 15 (Gordon, Ugaritic Manual, 1955). Cf. Virolleaud, Syria XV, 1934, p. 317 n., and La Legende de Keret, 1936, p. 74; and H. H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, 1950, p. 50. Actually, the text has nothing to do with the ha-BI-ru or with the Hebrews (as suggested by Virolleaud).
or r. Such, however, is not the rule, and, as Kraeling observes, in the case of the 'pr.w, a people present in Egypt itself, it is difficult to assume an error of hearing on the part of the scribe.

The spelling ha-BIR-a-a is found twice in Babylonian documents of the 12th and 11th centuries B.C. Commenting on this form, B. Landsberger observes that "b nicht p als mittlerer Radikal steht durch die Schreibung ha-bir-a-a (IV R 34 Nr. 2, 5) fest". In signs, however, of the variety consonant-vowel-consonant there is not only vocalic variability but flexibility of both consonants within the limits of their type.

210 For the evidence see B. Gunn apud Speiser, op. cit., p. 38, n. Cf. J. A. Wilson, AJSL 49, 4, pp. 275 ff. W. F. Albright (JAOS 48, 1928, pp. 183 ff.) argues that the equation of Egyptian 'pr with 'eber is difficult since Egyptian of the New Empire regularly transcribes Semitic b by Egyptian b. As for Egyptian hrp for Can. harb (Heb. hereb), he says that it only shows there was the same tendency for a final vowelless sonant stop following a consonant to become voiceless that there is in the modern Arabic dialect of Egypt; but the b in 'eber is medial and cannot have been pronounced as a voiceless p. It should be noticed, however, that in some instances of the use of Egyptian p for foreign b, the b is medial: thus, iṣbr varies with iṣpr ("whip") and Kpn (O. K. Kbn) = Can. Gbl ("Byblos").

211 Gunn op. cit., p. 38, n.: "There are many cases (36 counted) in which a foreign b with r or l either before or after it is represented by b and not by p in the Egyptian writings". Wilson op. cit., pp. 275 ff. affirms that the most straightforward equation is 'pr =ḥpyp.


213 Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, IV, 34:2, 5; and Hilprecht, Old Babylonian Inscriptions, I, 2, pl. 66, no. 149, 22.

214 ZA, N. F. 1, 1923, p. 214, n. 1.

215 See the remarks of C. H. Gordon, Orientalia 19, 1950, pp. 91 ff. There is specific evidence that BIR was used (though not commonly) for pir in the neo-Assyrian period and possibly (the evidence is doubtful) in the middle-Assyrian period. Cf. Von Soden, Das Akkadische Syllabar, 1948, p. 73, no. 237. Bottero, op. cit., p. 132 urges against reading pir here the absence of specific Babylonian evidence for this value to date, plus the availability of the sign UD (pir). However, he acknowledges (p. 156) that this form is not decisive for a root 'br. It may be additionally noted that J. Lewy in defense of reading the second radical as b appeals to the occurrence of the god "Ha-bi-ru in an Assyrian text (Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenem Inhalts, no. 42), i.e., in a text in which ha-bi-ru can hardly stand for *ha-pi-ru" (HUCA 15, 1940, p. 48, n. 7). Bottero (op. cit., p. 135) agrees on the grounds that in the neo-Assyrian era one normally
By way of conclusion, there can be no doubt that the Ugaritic and Egyptian forms of the name definitely require that the consonant represented in the cuneiform syllable *ha* be read as 'Ayin.\(^{216}\) They also strongly support an original *p*. While there is a possibility that 'br is primary, it is highly probable that 'pr is the original form. In fact, unless it can be shown that *ha-BI-ru* is to be equated with the biblical 'Ibri there is no unquestionable evidence for 'br as even a secondary form.\(^{217}\)

2. Vowels. That the first vowel is A-type and the second is I-type is obvious from the cuneiform, *ha-BI-ru*;\(^{211}\) but it is more difficult to determine the length of these vowels. This question requires examination before one attempts to draw conclusions concerning the possibilities of phonetic equation with 'Ibri.

used *PI* to signify *pi*. For evidence that *BI* = *pi* in all periods see Von Soden, *Ibid.*, p. 53 no. 140. Also J. W. Jack states, "In the Hittite documents, for instance, *habiru* clearly has *bi*" (PEQ, 1940, p. 102). E. Laroche (in Bottero, *op. cit.*, p. 71, n. 2) argues, "D'apres le systeme en usage a Boghazkoy, *ha-bi-ri* note une pronunciation habiri (sonore intervocalique non geminee) ". But *ha-ab-bi-ri* appears twice. Moreover, P. Sturtevant maintains that in cuneiform Hittite "the Akkadian distinction between ... *p* and *b* did not exist", adding, "To all intents, therefore, Hittite has dispensed with the means of writing *b*" (Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language, 1933, p. 66). Similarly, J. Friedrich, Hethitishes Elementarbuch I, 1940, p. 6(21). Accordingly, even the form *ha-ab-bi-ri* (*KBo* V, 9, IV, 12) is quite ambiguous, as it would also be in Akkadian cuneiform where *AB* stands in all periods for both *ap* and *ab*. Greenberg (*op. cit.*, p. 90, n. 20) suggests the possibility that a Hittite scribe utilized a native convention, doubling the labial to indicate a sound heard by him asp. Also ambiguous is the sign BAD (*bi* or *pi*) used in the Alishar text. 2,6 Cf. Bottero, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

\(^{217}\) Speiser (*op. cit.*, p. 40), writing at a time when he did not have the benefit of the Ugaritic evidence, begged the question of the phonetic equation with 'Ibri in concluding, "The second consonant is ambiguous both in cuneiform and in Egyptian, but not so in Hebrew: since the latter has b, the labial must be read as voiced in cuneiform, while the voiceless correspondent in the Egyptian form of the name is to be ascribed to local developments".

\(^{218}\) As far as it goes the Egyptian data is compatible. Gunn (*op. cit.*, p. 38, n.) concludes from a survey of the evidence that "we seem to have the alternatives 'apar, 'apir, 'apur, with a possible indication in" the Beth-shan stele of Seti I "in favor of 'apir".


a. The A-Vowel: According to Gustavs,219 the form ha-AB-BI-ri220 shows that the a is short. He explains the doubling of the middle radical on the ground that consonants in Akkadian are often doubled after an accented short vowel.221 This possibility, however, rests on the doubtful opinion that the following I-vowel is short, for otherwise the penult would receive the accent.222 Another possible explanation of the doubling of the middle radical, although the phenomenon is rare and late, is that it indicates that the preceding vowel is long.223

Other unusual forms have appeared which suggest that the A-vowel is long. One is ha-a-BI-ri-ia-as.224 Another is ha-a-BI-i-ri-ia[n?] (cf. ha-a-BI-i-ri-ia-an).225 Finally, from Alalah comes the form ha-a’-BI-ru.226

b. The I-Vowel: Inasmuch as short unaccented vowels between single consonants often drop out227 and the name

219 ZAW, N. F. 3, 1926, pp. 28 f.
220 KBo V, 9, IV, 12. Cf. also ha-AB-BI-ri-ia-an (KUB XXXV, 43, III, 31).
221 Cf. Ungnad, op. cit., p. 18 (6p); W. Von Soden, Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, 1952, p. 21 (20g).
222 Cf. Von Soden, op. cit., p. 37 (38 f).
223 Cf. Ungnad, op. cit., p. 7 (3d).
224 HT 6, 18. This text is a variant of KUB IX, 34, IV. Greenberg (op. cit., p. 90, n. 20) comments, "Were this writing not unique and not in a word foreign to the Hittites it might have deserved consideration as indicative of a participle form".
225 KUB XXXI, 14 (XXXIV, 62), 10; and KUB XXXV, 49, I, 6 ff. (cf. IV, 15).
226 AT 58:29. E. A. Speiser (JAOS 74, 1954, p. 24) observes that the main purpose of this unique form may be to indicate a form like *Habiru. He suggests that even if the sign be given its value ah4 instead of a the h might be a graphic device signifying a long vowel or stressed syllable. Cf. Greenberg (op. cit., p. 20): "Assuming that the scribe was West Semitic he may have noted that his alephs became long vowels in Akkadian: hence, by a sort of back analogy he may have converted what he took to be a long vowel into an aleph". Wiseman (in Bottero, op. cit., p. 37) "The word is unusually written ha-’a-bi-ru. This may be either a case of HAR=AB, or, as I am inclined to think, a case of the scribe erasing by the three small horizontal strokes of the stylus".
227 Cf. Ungnad, op. cit., pp. 12, 13 (5c). The possibility that the i is short but accented is obviated by the fact that were it short, the antepenult with its long a (as maintained above) would receive the accent.
ha-BI-ru is never found without the i, it would seem that this i is long. 228

Further support for this is found in the spelling ha-BI-i-ra 229 used for the Nuzu personal name (assuming this name may be identified with our ha-BI-ru). There are also the forms noted above: ha-a-BI-i-ri-a[n?] and ha-a-BI-i-ri-ia-an.

c. Conclusion: The vocalization is largely a question of how much weight to attach to the exceptional spellings. Quite possibly they require two long vowels, producing the (apparently non-Semitic) form 'apir. Perhaps only one vowel is long. It would be precarious, however, to assume that every indication of a long vowel is misleading and to adopt the form 'apir --or still less likely--'abir.

3. The Hebrew Equivalent. The difference in middle radicals between ha-BI-ru (read as ha-pi-ru) and 'Ibri would not be an insuperable obstacle for the phonetic equation of the two. There are a few examples of a shift in Hebrew from p to b. 230 Nevertheless, this shift is not the rule 231 and the difference in labials must be regarded as a serious difficulty in the case for equation.

If we allow the consonantal equation and examine the vowels it will be found that the difficulties increase and the equation can be regarded as at best a bare possibility. The following are the possible vowel combinations of ha-BI-ru (reading bi for the moment and listing the more probable combinations first) along with their normal Hebrew gentilic equivalents: 'abir, 'עביר; 'abir, 'עביר; 'abir, 'עביר; 'abir, 'עביר; 'abir, 'עביר; and 'abr, 'עביר.

Attempts have been made, however, to derive 'Ibri from one or other of these vowel combinations. The most plausible efforts are those which assume two short vowels, 'abir. 232

228 So C. H. Gordon (Orientalia 21, 1952, p. 382, n. 2): "That the i is long follows from the fact that it is not dropt to become *hapru".
229 JEN 228:29.
231 Cf., e. g., מפר, מפר, מפר, מפר.
232 J. Lewy (op. cit.), assuming the form Habiru, suggests that it "is
Speiser suggests that "the form qitl may go back to an older qatil" with the restriction that such forms derive from stative, not transitive, verbs. In line with this, attention has been called to the derivation of late Canaanite milk, "king", from older malik, "prince". "Whatever validity there may be in the theory of a qatil to qitl shift, it must be remembered that such is not the dominant tendency. Moreover, the degree of plausibility in applying such a principle in the present case is greatly diminished by the following considerations: a) The combination of two short vowels (‘abir) is one of the less likely possibilities; b) The supposed shift from ‘abir to ‘ibr did not occur according to our evidence in extra-biblical documents either earlier than, or contemporary with, the appearances of ‘Ibri in the Bible. It is necessary to assume that the shift took place first and only with the Hebrew authors. And if we may not assume that the Hebrew form is based on a previous shift to ‘ibr elsewhere, then proof is required within the Hebrew language itself, and not merely, for example, from inner-Canaanite developments, of a shift from qatil to qitl.


234 So, e. g., Albright, Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible (New York, 1935), p. 206, and Bohl, Kanaander and Hebraer 1911, p. 85. In an earlier article (JBL 43, 1924, pp. 389 ff.), Albright stated that Hebrew 'Eber for 'Ibr stands by epenthesis for *'Apir, adding that the philological process is familiar in all the Semitic languages; e. g., Arab. bi'sa from ba'sa. Cf. the alternation of ma-si-ri and mi-is-ri in syllabic texts from Ugarit.

235 DeVaux (op. cit.) goes to the extreme of describing the passing of ‘apir into 'ipr as "normal".

236 The qatil type of noun does appear at times in Hebrew like a segholate; cf. Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar, 1910, 93 hh, ii. Most of these are of the getel-type which is usually the A-type but is sometimes the I-type (e. g., קֶסֶב, יֵשֶׁב, דָּמַם; but יֵלֵיל (Eccles. 5:7; Ezek. 18:18) is also found and that is clearly I-type. This phenomenon is, however, confined to the construct.
**Conclusion:** The complete phonetic equation of *ha-BI-ru* and *‘Ibri* is at most a bare possibility. If a difference in morphology were to be allowed while identity of denotation was assumed the difference in the vowels could be explained and only the labial problem would remain as a phonetic obstacle for the theory of common derivation. Even that assumption, however, is implausible in dealing as we are not with apppellatives but proper names. The phonetic situation, therefore, is such as would weaken an otherwise strong case for tracing Hebrew origins to the *ha-BI-ru*, not such as to strengthen a theory already feeble.

C. Amarna Age Encounter.

In spite of the negative conclusions reached thus far the investigation of *ha-BI-ru*--Hebrew relationships is not much ado about nothing. For history apparently did witness an *ha-BI-ru*--Hebrew encounter.

How is the *ha-BI-ru* activity in Palestine as reflected in the Amarna letters to be integrated with the Israelite conquest of their promised land as described in the books of Joshua and Judges? That is the question.

1. Conquest. The Amarna activity of the *ha-BI-ru* has been identified by some with the Hebrew Conquest, more specifically, with its first phase led by Joshua. But quite apart from all the aforementioned obstacles to any identification of the two groups, the Conquest under Joshua differed from the Amarna military operations of the *ha-BI-ru* even in broadest outline and fundamental character.

(a) The Hebrew conquerors were a people which had long been in Egypt and were newly arrived in Canaan. The Ugaritic and Alalah evidence reveals that the *ha-BI-ru* were state. This restriction would not, of course, be significant so far as the gentilic form *‘Ibri* is concerned. It becomes significant though when account is taken of the derivation of *‘Ibri* from the patronymic *rbAf* which is found in the absolute state.

Albright compares a development of gentilic *‘Ibri* from an apppellative *ha-BI-ru* to *Levi*, "Levite", probably derived from *lawiyu*, "person pledged for a debt or vow"; *Qeni*, "kenite", from *qain*, "smith"; or *hopshi*, "free-man", from *hupshu*. 

---

237 Albright compares a development of gentilic *‘Ibri* from an apppellative *ha-BI-ru* to *Levi*, "Levite", probably derived from *lawiyu*, "person pledged for a debt or vow"; *Qeni*, "kenite", from *qain*, "smith"; or *hopshi*, "free-man", from *hupshu*. 

in Syria for a long while before the Hebrew Conquest (on any view of its date). Moreover, since in Syria the *ha-BI-ru* had long enjoyed permanent settlements of their own in well-regulated, peace-time integration with the local population and authorities, while the Amarna letters show the *ha-BI-ru* in Palestine to be on the move, quartered here and there, without absolute loyalty to any one party, it seems clear that the Amarna *ha-BI-ru* were in Canaan as professional militarists to exploit the anarchy there for their northern lords.

(b) Also in conflict with this picture of the *ha-BI-ru* operating in relatively small, detached companies and fighting as mercenaries with no apparent national aspirations of their own as *ha-BI-ru* is the biblical picture of the Hebrew Conquest as an invasion by a united multitude, advancing in their own name in a concerted effort to achieve a common national goal. (c) The natives of Canaan were to the Israelites an enemy to be exterminated; the acceptance of them as allies would directly contravene Israel's purposes. But the *ha-BI-ru* had no special antipathy for the Canaanites as such. Quite the contrary, the Canaanites were their employers, and for the most part the *ha-BI-ru* are found abetting the attempts of those Canaanites who strove to gain independence from Egyptian domination. Complaints are frequently heard from the loyalists that Canaanite rebels are going over to the cause of the *SA-GAZ*.

(d) The goal of Israel in Canaan with respect to the land was to gain possession, and agreeably their general policy in dealing with cities was to exterminate the population and seize the spoil but to refrain from destroying the cities by fire. The *ha-BI-ru*, however, after conquering and plundering, frequently set the city on fire, apparently having no designs to acquire territory or to build an empire.

The difference between the two movements can also be traced in matters of detail.

---

238 Cf. Josh. 11:19. Nothing underscores this more than the anomalous character of the Gibeonite alliance. It should not be overlooked, however, that after the days of Joshua's leadership the original determination gave way frequently to a fraternizing attitude (e. g., Judg. 3:5-6).

239 So repeatedly in *EA* 185.
(a) Names: None of the names of the Israelite leaders is found in the Amarna letters. Moreover, where the names of the rulers of specific Canaanite cities can be checked (as at Jerusalem, Lachish, Gezer, and Hazor) there is in every case disagreement between the Bible and the Amarna texts.

(b) Numbers: In the pleas of the loyalists for military assistance it appears that Egyptian support in the form of fifty or so men will be adequate to turn the tide of battle. It seems unlikely then that these Canaanite kings were confronted with an assault on the scale of Joshua's army.

(c) Places: The ha-BI-ru operated successfully in Phoenicia and Syria, but neither the Conquest under Joshua nor later tribal efforts penetrated that far.

(d) Military Technology: The Israelites made no use of chariots, whereas chariots were a standard division of the ha-BI-ru corps at Alalah and in Palestine.

2. Pre-Conquest. An alternative must be found then to identifying the biblical Conquest under Joshua with the Amarna disclosures. The procedure of the majority of scholars is to place Joshua after the Amarna events. Thus Meek,

---

240 Proposals to equate Joshua with Yashuia and Benjamin with Benenima (or Ben-elima) are phonetically impossible. Furthermore the Amarna men were pro-Egyptian.

241 Cf. Exod. 12:37; 38:26; Num. 1:46; 2:32; 26:51. At the same time it should not be overlooked that even fifty professional soldiers might provide adequate leadership to defend a walled garrison. Moreover, there are larger requests like that of Rib-Addi (EA 71:23-24) for fifty pair of horses and 200 infantry as a merely defensive measure.

242 The way in which this argument is developed by Rowley (op. cit., pp. 42 ff.) is an illuminating exhibition of rewriting history to one's taste. He argues that the exploits of Joshua were mainly if not entirely confined to the central districts while the ha-BI-ru trouble was in the south and north and only at Shechem in the center. It will be recognized that this is the precise opposite of the prima facie biblical account, according to which Joshua's campaigns were notably in the south (Josh. 10) and in the north (Josh. 11:1-14). Rowley rejects Joshua 10 in favor of the supposedly conflicting account in Judges 1; and Joshua 11, in favor of the supposed variant in Judges 4. According to the record itself, Judges 1 records events after the death of Joshua and the events of Judges 4 fall well over a century after those of Joshua 11.

243 Cf., e.g., Josh. 11:9.

244 Cf. EA 87:21; 197:2-11.
though he believes the Amarna *ha-BI-ru* and Joshua's campaign belong to one movement, specifies that "the Amarna account marks the beginning of the movement, while the Old Testament account has to do largely with its final accomplishment". An odd quirk of Meek's view is that the Exodus from Egypt under Moses follows Joshua by more than a century.

Albright, though he posits an earlier, pre-Amarna exodus from Egypt and entry into Canaan on the part of the Joseph tribes and finds their presence in central Palestine before the major Hebrew arrival reflected in the *ha-BI-ru* of the Amarna letters, dates the (second) exodus (*i.e.*, Moses leading out the Leah tribes) and the campaigning of Joshua in the 13th century, long after the Amarna correspondence.

To cite one further variety of this approach, there is Rowley's intricate reconstruction. He also espouses a theory of a two-fold entry into the land, according to which certain Hebrew groups, notably Judah, press northward from Kadesh c. 1400 B.C. (these Rowley would identify with the *ha-BI-ru* of the Amarna letters) while kindred tribes, including Asher, Zebulon, and Dan, exert pressure in the north (these, Rowley conjectures, are the *SA-GAZ* of the Amarna letters). But the exodus from Egypt under Moses and the entry of Joshua into central Palestine he dates late in the 13th century B.C.

It will be observed that all these efforts to locate Joshua after the Amarna episode involve drastic recasting of the biblical data--the rejection not merely of points of detail but of the biblical history in its basic structure. It requires some ingenuity, indeed, to produce one of these elaborate creations by weaving together a host of miscellaneous data sublimated from their original contexts, but the result is fiction not history. Under the mask of a claim of controlling the biblical sources by means of archaeological and extra-biblical sources an almost totally undisciplined biblical exegesis has been introduced. But why the penchant for the hasty rejection of the Old Testament source in favor of


246 BASOR 58, 1935, pp. 10 ff.

interpretations of archaeological evidence which are themselves so uncertain and disputed at countless points?

3. Post-Conquest. There is another alternative for the integration of the Amarna and the biblical histories. It is the reverse of those just surveyed in that it locates the Conquest under Joshua before rather than after the Amarna letters, at least before those of Abdi-Hepa.\textsuperscript{248} This is in

\textsuperscript{248} The historian is at this juncture always embroiled in the complex question of the date of the Exodus. Aware of the difficulties of the early date (i.e., locating Joshua in or before the Armarna Age) and not aware of the proper solution of them all, the writer nevertheless finds insuperable the difficulties of a later date. Relevant as the problem is, limitations of space allow only brief comment on a few salient points: a) The case presented by H. H. Rowley (in \textit{From Joseph to Joshua}) against a Hebrew entry into Egypt in the Hyksos period has not been answered. If valid, that majority of scholars which is certainly correct in dating the patriarchal period early in the second millennium B.C. rather than (with Rowley) in the middle of it must date the beginning of the sojourn before the Hyksos period, not (with Rowley) after it. And that, in turn, virtually necessitates the early date of the Exodus. b) Advocates of a 19th dynasty Exodus constantly appeal to the archaeological evidences of royal building operations at the sites of Pithom and Raamses. G. E. Wright, for a recent example, states, "We now know that if there is any historical value at all to the store-city tradition in Exodus (and there is no reason to doubt its reliability), then Israelites must have been in Egypt at least during the early part of the reign of Rameses II" (\textit{Biblical Archaeology} (Philadelphia and London, 1957), p. 60. Italics his.) That is a curiously misleading statement. Is it not rather the case that, if one has no reason to doubt the reliability of the record in Exodus 1:11 that Pharaoh forced the Israelites to build Pithom and Raamses as store-cities, he cannot possibly identify that pharaoh with Ramses II? For it is inconceivable that anyone should have described the magnificent operations of Ramses II at these sites, transforming one of them into the capital of Egypt, in the "store-cities" terms of Exodus 1:11. The Hebrew building and the Hebrew Exodus must then precede Ramses II. c) Albright has dated the destruction of Canaanite Bethel, Lachish, and Debir, all by conflagration, in the 13th century B.C., and would identify this destruction with Joshua's campaigns as evidence of a late Exodus. Such a deduction does not do justice to the biblical facts that Canaanite reoccupation frequently followed Joshua's conquest of Canaanite cities and that destruction by fire was exceptional in Joshua's campaigns. (Apparently only Jericho and Ai among the southern cities were burned and only Hazor was burned in the Galilean campaign, Josh. 11:13.) The evidence of these Palestinian excavations, therefore, actually requires a date for Joshua considerably earlier than the
precise agreement with the chronological data in Judges 11:26
and 1 Kings 6:1 and assumes a fairly brief period for Joshua’s
campaigns which also agrees with the biblical record.\(^{249}\)

Even more compatible with this view than with the ident-
ification of Joshua's campaigns and the Amarna activity are
certain facts which have long constituted a popular argument
in favor of the latter view.\(^{251}\) Giving it a somewhat different
turn than the advocates of identification, the argument is as
follows: Precisely those cities which appear in the Amarna
letters as under Canaanite control, whether pro-Egyptian or
rebel (and, therefore, likely allied to the SA-GAZ), are those
which were not permanently dispossessed either by Joshua\(^{251}\)
or the early tribal efforts after the death of Joshua.\(^{252}\)

13th century fall of these cities. *A propos* of Josh. 11:13, Yadin's recent
report of the second season of excavations at Hazor is of interest (*cf.
*Biblical Archaeologist*, XX, 1957, pp. 34 ff.). In addition to the latest
Canaanite city which was destroyed in the 13th century (perhaps then,
according to an early Exodus, in the days of Deborah, *cf.* Judges 4 and 5),
remains were found of a 14th century city "approximately in the el-Amarna
period" (p. 44) and of an earlier city of the Middle Bronze Age which
"was effectively destroyed by fire, most probably by one of the Egyptian
pharaohs of the New Kingdom, Amenophis II or more probably Thut-
mose III" (p. 44). The supposition that a pharaoh of the New Kingdom
captured Hazor is questionable; for in spite of their many campaigns into
Canaan, their ignorance of the techniques of siege warfare made the
capture of a fortified city a rarity. But according to the early date of the
Exodus, Joshua was a contemporary of Amenophis II and as for Hazor,
"that did Joshua burn".\(^{249}\) Josh. 14:7 and 10 indicate that the initial phase was completed
within five years of the entry into Canaan.

\(^{250}\) Cf., e. g., Olmstead, *History of Palestine and Syria* (New York, 1931),
pp. 196-197; Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

\(^{251}\) Joshua 10 and 11.

\(^{252}\) The situation at Shechem is problematic. Nothing is said about an
Israelite conquest of central Palestine, but if the transaction of Joshua 24
implies Israelite control of Shechem, they subsequently lost their foothold,
for Labaya ruled Shechem some thirty years after the Israelite entry
(cf. *EA* 289:22 ff.). Similarly, if Albright (*BASOR* 87, 1942, p. 38) is
correct that Debir became the seat of a local chieftain after the Amarna
period, not only Joshua's raid but even Othniel's capture of that city
(Josh. 15:15-17; *cf.* Judg. 1:11 ff.) failed to be permanently effective.
Again, though Joshua's raid had depopulated Lachish and Gezer, these
cities fell again into Canaanite hands according to *EA* 287:14-15, whether
these lines mean that these cities had been assisting Pharaoh's enemies or
Albright has concluded that in southern Palestine of the Amarna period the main city-states were Gezer, Lachish, Jerusalem, and Hebron-Keilah. In the period of Joshua there are in this area five additional city-states: Jarmuth, Makkedah, Libnah, Debir, and Eglon, with still others like Jericho, Bethel and Gibeon nearby. Albright then theorizes that from c. 1375-1250 there had been a gradual reduction in the power of the city-states combined with an increase in their number, which he attributes to a settled Egyptian policy of divide et impera. This decrease in the power of the Canaanite city-states is then judged to have aided Israel in her Conquest. Indeed, this is seized upon as compelling evidence that the Hebrew Conquest was late.

It will be recognized that this reconstruction of the 14th century situation in southern Palestine is based in part on silences in the Amarna letters. Such a procedure is precarious, however, for the silences might readily be accounted for by the fact that the authors of the Amarna letters simply had no occasion to mention the towns in question. To the extent, however, that there may actually have been fewer city-states in the Amarna period than in Joshua's day, a more plausible explanation would be that between Joshua and the Amarna situation the Israelites had been encroaching on the territory of the old Canaanite city-states, reducing their number by conquest.

Furthermore, the spontaneous confederation of Canaanite kings described in Joshua 10 is difficult to explain if it be supposed that Joshua's campaigns were contemporary with or subsequent to the ha-BI-ru activity of the Amarna letters. For these letters graphically exhibit the mutual distrust and growing antagonism among the Canaanite kings during this period. Is it not apparent that neither in the midst of, nor soon after, such intrigues and civil strife could a king of Jerusalem so easily consolidate the surrounding city-states for were to provide for Pharaoh's archers. Such developments indicate that Israel's permanent acquisition of territory in Canaan was a gradual process only initiated by Joshua's campaigns.

253 Besides these, Jarmuth was a minor independency and an Egyptian garrison and official were stationed at Eglon. BASOR 87, 1942, pp. 37-38. Cf. Wright, op. cit., pp. 75, 76.
a joint military venture against a common foe? Abdi-Hepa's futile efforts during the struggle with the ha-Bi-ru is a witness that a king of Jerusalem would find such a task impossible. Again a more plausible reconstruction is that the collapse of the five-city alliance against Joshua terminated the southern confederation and prepared for the Canaanite disunity evidenced in the Amarna letters.

If Joshua is to be placed before the Amarna period, the problem still remains of synchronizing the later Israelite tribal efforts to take actual possession of their allotted inheritances (i.e., the Book of Judges) with the Amarna ha-Bl-ru movements. The arguments already presented against the possibility of identifying the ha-Bl-ru with the Israelites of Joshua's day for the most part hold against any such identification at this point as well. However, in view of the known tendency of the authors of the Amarna letters to stigmatize the cause of all enemies (or at least all accused of disloyalty to Egypt) with the SA-GAZ label, we ought not to be too dogmatic in denying the possibility that some Hebrew activity might be hidden in the Amarna letters under that label.

More significant is the fact that on the chronology followed here the first oppression of Israel in Canaan falls in the late second and in the third decade of the 14th century B.C. This corresponds with part of the era of the ha-Bl-ru in Canaan. Israel's first oppressor was "Cushan-rishathaim king of Aram Naharaim". The area designated by "Aram Naharaim" would include within its southwestern limits the region about Alalah (and probably still farther south) which was a strong ha-Bl-ru center in the 14th century B.C. Though styled

254 Judg. 3:9-10.
255 part of this era corresponds to the career of Labaya which can be dated in the second and third decades of the 14th century on either Albright's or Knudtzon's reading of the date on the hieratic docket on Labaya's letter, EA 254.
256 Judg. 3:8. It is possible that the additional מִבְּנֶשׁ, "double wickedness", was appended by Cushan's victims, perhaps as a pun on מִבְּנֶשׁ. Cf. Burney, The Book of Judges, 1920, pp. 65-66.
melek, Cushan-rishathaim need not have been more than one strong chieftain among several in Aram Naharaim.  

Moreover, the name Cushan is attested in this area both as the name of a geographical district and as a personal name. That there was a district in northern Syria in the 13th and 12th centuries B.C. called Qusana-ruma, is known from the list of Ramses III. Still more pertinent is the 15th century tablet from Alalah which contains the personal name ku-sa-an. This tablet is a fragment of a census list of unspecified purpose, on which 43 personal names remain along with the phrase found on the left edge, "owner of a chariot". The list then might well be one of the numerous military lists and probably includes the names of several maryannu.

Within the framework of synchronization proposed here for Hebrew and ha-BI-ru careers, it is difficult to dissociate the oppression of Israel by Cushan-rishathaim from the ha-BI-ru menace of the Amarna letters. The facts rather suggest that elements of the ha-BI-ru corps from Syria active in southern Canaan as the terror of the loyalist Canaanite city kings began in time to raid the settlements of the more recently arrived Israelites. The Israelites were becoming, like the Egyptians, too dominating a power in Palestine to suit the interests which the ha-BI-ru were engaged to further. It appears then that it was from plundering ha-BI-ru mercenaries that Othniel delivered oppressed Israel.

If so, the ha-BI-ru, certainly not the kin of Israel, were actually Israel's foe--the first oppressors of Israel in Canaan. And then, far from offering a Canaanite version of the Hebrew

---

258 Such is the usage elsewhere in judges. Thus Jabin of Hazor is called "king of Canaan" (Judg. 4:2; cf. 4:23, 24), though he was but one of several Canaanite kings (cf. Judg. 5:19). So also, O'Callaghan, op. cit., p. 123.
260 Wiseman, AT 154.
261 Ibid., p. 140. 36 names end in -an (ibid., p. 10).
262 Since Othniel is associated with the south, this first oppression probably centered there.
march of conquest, the Amarna letters dealing with the
\textit{ha-BI-ru} are a Canaanite portrait of the first scourge employed
by Yahweh to chastise the Israelites for their failure to
prosecute the mandate of conquest.

It is not difficult to surmise what verdict the biblical
historians would have given if they had left to us their inter-
pretation of the data of the \textit{ha-BI-ru} oppression of the
theocratic people in the early 14th century and the almost
total disappearance of the \textit{ha-BI-ru} as a social-political entity
by about the close of that century. Surely they would have
judged that the brief Amarna Age encounter with Israel was
for the \textit{ha-BI-ru} a crucial hour of more than ordinary political
decision. It was an encounter that sealed their destined fall.
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THE TWO TABLES OF THE COVENANT

MEREDITH G. KLINE

“AND he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone" (Deut. 4:13).

It has been commonly assumed that each of the stone tables contained but a part of the total revelation proclaimed by the voice of God out of the fiery theophany on Sinai. Only the subordinate question of the dividing point between the "first and second tables" has occasioned disagreement.1 A re-examination of the biblical data, however, particularly in the light of extra-biblical parallels, suggests a radically new interpretation of the formal nature of the two stone tables, the importance of which will be found to lie primarily in the fresh perspective it lends to our understanding of the divine oracle engraved upon them.

Attention has been frequently directed in recent years to the remarkable resemblance between God’s covenant with Israel and the suzerainty type of international treaty found in the ancient Near East.2 Similarities have been discovered in the areas of the documents, the ceremonies of ratification, the modes of administration, and, most basically of course,  

1 The perashiyoth (pericopes marked in the Hebrew text) apparently reflect the opinion that the "second table" begins with the fourth commandment. (Here and elsewhere in this article the designation of specific commandments is based on the common Protestant enumeration.) The dominant opinion has been that the "second table" opens with the fifth commandment, but Jews usually count the fifth commandment as the last in the "first table", filial reverence being regarded as a religious duty.

2 See G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition", The Biblical Archaeologist, XVII (1954) 3, pp. 50-76. D. J. Wiseman had previously read a paper on some of the parallels to the Society for Old Testament Studies (Jan. 1948). The most adequate documentation for the suzerainty treaty, particularly in its classic form, comes from the New Hittite Empire of the second millennium B.C., but there are references to such international treaties in the late third millennium B.C., and the suzerainty type continues to be attested in its essential form during the early first millennium B.C.
the suzerain-servant relationship itself. On the biblical side the resemblance is most apparent in the accounts of the theocratic covenant as instituted through the mediatorialship of Moses at Sinai and as later renewed under both Moses and Joshua. Of most interest for the subject of this article is the fact that the pattern of the suzerainty treaty can be traced in miniature in the revelation written on the two tables by the finger of God.

"I am the Lord thy God", the opening words of the Sinaitic proclamation (Exod. 20:2a), correspond to the preamble of the suzerainty treaties, which identified the suzerain and that in terms calculated to inspire awe and fear. For example, the treaty of Mursilis with his vassal Duppi-Tessub of Amurru begins: "These are the words of the Sun Mursilis, the great king, the king of the Hatti land, the valiant, the favorite of the Storm-god, the son of Suppiluliumas, etc." Such treaties continued in an "I-thou" style with an historical prologue, surveying the great king's previous relations with, and especially his benefactions to, the vassal king. In the treaty just referred to, Mursilis reminds Duppi-Tessub of the vassal status of his father and grandfather, of their loyalty and enjoyment of Mursilis' just oversight, and climactically there is narrated how Mursilis, true to his promise to Duppi-Tessub's father, secured the dynastic succession for Duppi-Tessub, sick and ailing though he was. In the Bible the historical prologue is found in the further words of the Lord: "which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" (Exod. 20:2b). This element in the covenant document was clearly designed to inspire confidence and gratitude in the vassal and thereby to dispose him to attend to the covenant obligations, which constitute the third element in both Exodus 20 and the international treaties.

There are many interesting parallels to specific biblical requirements among the treaty stipulations; but to mention only the most prominent, the fundamental demand is always for thorough commitment to the suzerain to the exclusion of all alien alliances. Thus, Mursilis insists: "But you, Duppi-

---


Tessub, remain loyal toward the king of the Hatti land, the Hatti land, my sons (and) my grandsons forever.... Do not turn your eyes to anyone else!" And Yahweh commands his servant: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (Exod. 20:3; cf. 4, 5). Stylistically, the apodictic form of the decalogue apparently finds its only parallel in the treaties, which contain categorical imperatives and prohibitions and a conditional type of formulation equivalent to the apodictic curse (cf. Deut. 27:15-26), both being directly oriented to covenant oaths and sanctions. The legislation in the extant legal codes, on the other hand, is uniformly of the casuistic type.

Two other standard features of the classic suzerainty treaty were the invocation of the gods of the suzerain and (in the Hittite sphere) of the vassal as witnesses of the oath and the pronouncing of imprecations and benedictions, which the oath deities were to execute according to the vassal's deserts.

Obviously in the case of God's covenant with Israel there could be no thought of a realistic invocation of a third party as divine witness. Indeed, it is implicit in the third word of the decalogue that all Israel's oaths must be sworn by the name of Yahweh (Exod. 20:7). The immediate contextual application of this commandment is that the Israelite must remain true to the oath he was about to take at Sinai in accordance with the standard procedure in ceremonies of covenant ratification (cf. Exod. 24). Mendenhall finds no reference to an oath as the foundation of the Sinaitic covenant; he does, however, allow that the oath may have taken the form of a symbolic act rather than a verbal formula. But surely a solemn affirmation of consecration to God made in the presence of God to his mediator-representative and in response to divine demand, sanctioned by divine threats against the rebellious, is tantamount to an oath. Moreover,

5 *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, p. 204.

6 There is a formal literary approximation to the invocation of the oath witnesses in Deut. 4:26; 30:19; and. 31:28 where by the rhetorical device of apostrophe God calls heaven and earth to be witnesses of his covenant with Israel. Heaven and earth are also invoked along with the mountains and rivers, etc., at the close of this section in the treaties. *Cf.* Matt. 5:34, 35; 23:16.

Israel's eating and drinking in the persons of her representatives on the mount of God (Exod. 24:11) was a recognized symbolic method by which people swore treaties.  

The curses and blessings are present in Exodus 20, though not as a separate section. They are rather interspersed among the stipulations (cf. verses 5, 6, 7, 11, and 12). Moreover, an adaptation of the customary form of the curses and blessings to the divine nature of the suzerain who here pronounced them was necessary. Thus, the usual invocative form has yielded to the declarative, and that in the style of the motive clause, which is characteristic of Old Testament legislation and which is illustrative of what may be called the reasonableness of Israel's Lord.

There is one final point of material correspondence. It provides the key to the nature of the two tables of stone and to this we shall presently return. The parallelism already noted, however, is sufficient to demonstrate that the revelation committed to the two tables was rather a suzerainty treaty or covenant than a legal code. The customary exclusive use of "decalogue" to designate this revelation, biblical terminology though it is (cf. "the ten words", Exod. 34:28; Deut. 4:13; 10:4), has unfortunately served to obscure the whole truth of the matter. That this designation is intended as only pars pro toto is confirmed by the fact that "covenant" (תְּכֹן; Deut. 4:13) and "the words of the covenant" (Exod. 34:28; Deut. 28:69; 29:8; etc.) are alternate biblical terminology. So too is "testimony" (תָּכוֹנָה; Exod. 25:16, 21; 40:20; cf. II Kg. 17:15), which characterizes the stipulations as oath-bound obligations or as a covenant order of life. Consequently, the two tables are called "the tables of the

\[8\] Cf. Wiseman, op. cit., p. 84 and lines 154-156 of the Ramataia text.

\[9\] Cf. B. Gemser, "The importance of the motive clause in Old Testament law", Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, I (1953) pp. 50-66. It must be borne in mind that the decalogue does not stand alone as the total revelation of the covenant at Sinai. For curses and blessings see also the conclusion of the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 23:20-33) and especially Deut. 27-30.

\[10\] The contents of the treaties are also called the "words" of the suzerain.

\[11\] תָּכוֹנָה is related to the Akkadian ade, which is used as a general appellation for the contents of suzerainty treaties. Wiseman (op. cit., p. 81), defines adu (sing.) as "a law or commandment solemnly imposed in the presence of divine witnesses by a suzerain upon an individual or people
covenant" (Deut. 9:9, 11, 15) and "the tables of the testimony" (Exod. 31:18; 32:15; 34:29); the ark, as the depository of the tables, "the ark of the covenant" or "of the testimony"; and the tabernacle, where the ark was located, "the tabernacle of the testimony".

The two stone tables are not, therefore, to be likened to a stele containing one of the half-dozen or so known legal codes earlier than or roughly contemporary with Moses as though God had engraved on these tables a corpus of law. The revelation they contain is nothing less than an epitome of the covenant granted by Yahweh, the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth, to his elect and redeemed servant, Israel. Not law, but covenant. That must be affirmed when we are seeking a category comprehensive enough to do justice to this revelation in its totality. At the same time, the prominence of the stipulations, reflected in the fact that "the ten words" are the element used as *pars pro toto*, signalizes the centrality of law in this type of covenant. There is probably no clearer direction afforded the biblical theologian for defining with biblical emphasis the type of covenant God adopted to formalize his relationship to his people than that given in the covenant he gave Israel to perform, even "the ten commandments". Such a covenant is a declaration of God's lordship, consecrating a people to himself in a sovereignly dictated order of life.

who have no option but acceptance of the terms. It implies a ‘solemn charge or undertaking an oath' (according to the view of the suzerain or vassal)."

There does appear to be some literary relationship between the legal codes and the suzerainty treaties. J. Muilenburg ("The form and structure of the covenantal formulations", *Vetus Testamentum*, IX (Oct. 1959) 4, pp. 347 ff.) classifies both under "the royal message". Hammurapi in his code, which is still the most complete of the extant ancient Oriental codes, introduces himself in the prologue with a recital of his incomparable qualifications for the promulgation of laws, then presents the laws, and in the epilogue pronounces curses and blessings on future kings as they ignore or honor his code. The identity of the decalogue with the suzerainty treaties over against such law codes is evidenced by features like the covenant terminology, the *ade* character of the stipulations, the "I-thou" formulation and the purpose of the whole as manifested both in the contents and the historical occasion, *i. e.*, the establishment of a covenant relationship between two parties.
But what now is the significance of the fact that the covenant was recorded not on one but on two stone tables? Apart from the dubious symbolic propriety of bisecting a treaty for distribution over two separate documents, all the traditional suggestions as to how the division should be made are liable to the objection that they do violence to the formal and logical structure of this treaty. The results of the traditional type of cleavage are not two reasonably balanced sets of laws but one table containing almost all of three of the four treaty elements plus a part of the fourth, i.e., the stipulations, and a second table with only a fraction of the stipulations and possibly a blessing formula. The preamble and historical prologue must not be minimized nor ignored because of their brevity for this is a covenant in miniature. In comparison with the full scale version, the stipulations are proportionately as greatly reduced as are the preamble and the historical prologue. That would be even clearer if the additional strand of the curses and blessings were not interwoven with the commandments. Certainly, too, there was no physical necessity for distributing the material over two stones. One table of such a size that Moses could carry, and the ark contain, a pair of them would offer no problem of spatial limitations to prevent engraving the entire text upon it, especially since the writing covered both obverse and reverse (Exod. 32:15). In fact, it seems unreasonable, judging from the appearance of comparable stone inscriptions from antiquity, to suppose that all the area on both sides of two, tables would be devoted to so few words.

There is, moreover, the comparative evidence of the extrabiblical treaties. Covenants, such as Exodus 20:2-17 has been shown to be, are found written in their entirety on one table and indeed, like the Sinaitic tables, on both its sides. As a further detail in the parallelism of external appearance it is tempting to see in the sabbath sign presented in the midst of the ten words the equivalent of the suzerain’s dynastic seal found in the midst of the obverse of the international treaty documents. Since in the case of the decalogue, the suzerain

13 Cf., e.g., Wiseman, op. cit., plates I and IX.
14 The closing paragraph of the Egyptian text of the parity treaty of Hattusilis III and Ramses II is a description of the seal, called "What is
is Yahweh, there will be no representation of him on his seal. But the sabbath is declared his "sign of the covenant" (Exod. 31:13-17). By means of the sabbath, God's image-bearer, as a pledge of covenant consecration, images the pattern of the divine act of creation which proclaims God's absolute sovereignty over man. God has stamped on world history the sign of the sabbath as his seal of ownership and authority. That is precisely what the pictures on the dynastic seals symbolize and their captions claim in behalf of the treaty gods and their representative, the suzerain.

These considerations point to the conclusion that each table was complete in itself. The two tables were duplicate copies of the covenant. And the correctness of this interpretation is decisively confirmed by the fact that it was normal procedure in establishing suzerainty covenants to prepare duplicate copies of the treaty text.

Five of the six standard sections of the classic suzerainty treaty were mentioned above. The sixth section contained directions for the deposit of one copy of the treaty document in a sanctuary of the vassal and another in a sanctuary of the suzerain. For example, the treaty made by Suppiluliumas with Mattiwa states: "A duplicate of this tablet has been deposited before the Sun-goddess of Arinna.... In the Mitanni land (a duplicate) has been deposited before Tes-sub.... At regular intervals shall they read it in the presence of the king of the Mitanni land and in the presence of the sons of the Hurri country." Deposit of the treaty before the gods was expressive of their role as witnesses and avengers of the oath. Even the vassal's gods were thereby enlisted in the foreign service of the suzerain.


15 Cf. Koroseg, op. cit., pp. 100-101. On a stele from Ras Shamra an oath-taking ceremony is depicted with the two parties raising their hands over two copies of the treaty (Ugaritica III, plate VI).

16 Translation of A. Goetze, Ancient Near Eastern Texts, p. 205. In various treaties the public reading requirement specifies from once to thrice annually.

17 Cf. II Kg. 18:25 and observations of M. Tsevat, "The Neo-Assyrian
Similar instructions were given Moses at Sinai concerning the two tables. They were to be deposited in the ark, which in turn was to be placed in the tabernacle (Exod. 25:16, 21; 40:20; Deut. 10:2). Because Yahweh was at once Israel's covenant suzerain and God of Israel and Israel's oath, there was but one sanctuary for the deposit of both treaty duplicates. The specified location of the documents as given in Hittite treaties can be rendered "under (the feet of)" the god, which would then correspond strikingly to the arrangements in the Israelite holy of holies. The two tables do not themselves contain instructions concerning their disposition, for the legislation regarding the ark and sanctuary had not yet been given. The same is true of the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20:22-23:33). But it is significant that when such legislation was given after the ceremony of covenant ratification (Exod. 24), the ark was the first object described in detail and directions for the deposit of the two tables in it were included (Exod. 25:10-22).

As for the further custom of periodic public reading of treaty documents, the contents of the two tables were of course declared in the hearing of all Israel and the Book of the Covenant was read to the people as part of the ratification ceremony (Exod. 24:7); but the practice of periodic proclamation was first formulated some forty years later in the Book of Deuteronomy when God was renewing the covenant unto the second generation. When suzerainty covenants, were renewed, new documents were prepared in which the stipulations were brought up to date. Deuteronomy is such a covenant renewal document; hence its repetition with modernizing modifications of the earlier legislation, as found, for example, in its treatment of the decalogue (5:6-21) or of the passover (16:5 ff.; cf. Exod. 12:7, 46). Another case in point


19 Taking Pentateuchal history at its face value, we discover that the Book of Deuteronomy exhibits precisely the legal form which contemporary second millennium B.C. evidence indicates a suzerain would employ in his rule of a vassal nation like Israel at such an historical juncture. It will no longer suffice for negative critics to grant only that certain individual
is Deuteronomy's addition of this requirement for the regular public reading of the covenant law at the feast of tabernacles in the seventh year of release (31:9-13), a requirement that became relevant and applicable here on the threshold of Israel's inheritance of Canaan. The document which was to be brought forth and read was not one of the stone tables but the "book of the law" which Moses wrote and had placed by the side of the ark (31:9, 26). However, even if "this book of the law" is identified with Deuteronomy alone, reading it would have included a re-proclamation of the contents of the tables.

The relevance of the foregoing for higher critical conclusions concerning the decalogue may be noted in passing. Along with a decreasing reluctance in negative critical studies to accept the Mosaic origin of the decalogue20 the judgment continues that the present form of the Sinaitic decalogue is an expansion of the original, which is then reduced to an abridged version of the ten words, without preamble, historical prologue, or curses and blessings, and often without even an abridged form of the second and fourth words. Similarly, even where there is no bias against the Bible's representations concerning its own origins, the supposition has gained currency that it was an abbreviated version of the decalogue which was engraved on the stone tables. Such estimates of the contents of the Mosaic tables are clearly unsatisfactory, since the supposed abbreviated forms lack those very features which distinguish the tables as that which comparative study indicates was called for by the historical occasion, and biblical ancient laws and cultic patterns are preserved in Deuteronomy; for the fact is that its total structure conforms to the classic structure of suzerainty treaties, all six standard sections being represented. The implications of this for the unity and authenticity of Deuteronomy are clear. While the suzerainty pattern has been widely recognized in the Decalogue and in Joshua 24, there has been a strange lack of acknowledgment of all the obvious facts in the case of Deuteronomy. It is to be hoped that the traditionalistic higher criticism will not long indulge in obscurantism out of regard for the unfortunate circumstance that its seventh century date for Deuteronomy is the pivot of the massive volume of modern historical studies of Israelite literature and religion.

is disloyal to Abban. The text deeding Alalakh (part of Abban's gift) pronounces curses upon any who would alter Abban's purpose by hostilities against Iarimlim. All this corresponds perfectly to God's dealings with Abraham. The Lord covenanted territory to his servant Abraham as an everlasting possession (Gen. 12:1, 2; 13:14-17; 15:16, 18) and did so by a self maledictory oath symbolized by the slaying of animals (Gen. 15:9 ff.). Moreover, it is clear that by rebellion against Yahweh's word Abraham would forfeit the promise (Gen. 22:16, 17a; cf. Deut. 28, especially verses 63ff.); and finally, the Egyptians and Canaanites who oppose this territorial grant are cursed (Gen. 12:36; 15:14, 16, 19-21).

God's oath is, therefore, in keeping with the suzerain-vassal relationship and simply enhances the condescension and graciousness of God's covenant reign. Considered in relation to the divine oath and promise, Yahweh's duplicate table of the covenant served a purpose analogous to that of the rainbow in his covenant with Noah (Gen. 9:13-16). This divine condescension anticipated the humiliation of the Incarnation, and this divine oath contemplated the ultimate humiliation of the accursed death of him who should be "found in fashion as a man".

There remains the question of the relevance of our interpretation of the duplicate tables of the covenant for the understanding of their law content. The increased emphasis on the covenantal context of the law underscores the essential continuity in the function of law in the Old and New Testaments. The decalogue is not offered fallen man as a genuine soteric option but is presented as a guide to citizenship within the covenant by the Saviour-Lord, who of his mercy delivers out of the house of bondage into communion in the life of the covenant--a communion which eventuates in perfect conformity of life to the law of the covenant. To stress the covenantal "I-thou" nature of this law is also to reaffirm the personal-religious character of biblical ethics at the same time that it recognizes that covenantal religion and its ethic are susceptible to communication in the form of structured truth. Yahweh describes the beneficiaries of his mercy as "them that love me and keep my commandments" (Exod. 20:6; cf. John 14:15).
Recognition of the completeness of each of the tables provides a corrective to the traditional view's obscuration of the covenantal-religious nature of the laws in "the second table". An hegemony of religion over ethics has, indeed, always been predicated on the basis of the priority in order and verbal quantity of the laws of "the first table", analyzed as duty or love to God, over the laws of "the second table", analyzed as duty or love to man. Nevertheless, this very division of the ten words into "two tables" with the category "love of God" used as a means of separating one "table" from the other suggests that the fulfillment of the demands of "the second table" is to some degree, if not wholly, independent of the principle of love for God.

Our Lord's familiar teaching concerning a "first and great commandment" and a "second like unto it" (Matt. 22:37-40; Mk. 12:29-31) has figured prominently in the speculation about the contents of "the two tables". It is, however, gratuitous to suppose that Jesus was epitomizing in turn a "first table" and "second table" as traditionally conceived. Furthermore, it must be seriously questioned whether Jesus' commandment to love God's image-bearer, ourselves and our neighbors alike, can properly be restricted after the dominant fashion to the fifth through the tenth laws. The nearest parallel in the decalogue to the specific language of Jesus is found in the fourth law as formulated in Deuteronomy (5:14): The sabbath is to be kept "that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou". And does man not best serve the eternal interests of himself and his neighbor when he promotes obedience to the first three commandments? Is that not the ethical justification of the great commission?

But beyond all doubt Jesus' "great commandment" must be the heart motive of man in the whole compass of his life. Restricting the principle of love of God to the sphere of

---

25 In the Westminster Confession of Faith, for example, it is the only proof text cited 'for distinguishing between the "tables" in terms of duty towards God and duty to man (chap. XIX, sect. II).

26 There is no explicit reference to the two stone tables in the context, which is broadly concerned with the generality of scriptural legislation. Jesus relates his two commandments to the totality of Old Testament revelation (Matt. 22:40).
worship prejudices the comprehensiveness of God's absolute lordship which is the foundation of the covenant order.

That the love of God with heart, soul, mind, and strength is as relevant to the tenth commandment as it is to the first is evident from the fact that to violate the tenth is to worship Mammon, and ye cannot love and serve God and Mammon. Or consider the tenth word from the viewpoint of the principle of stewardship, the corollary of the principle of God's covenant lordship. Property in the Israelite theocracy was held only in fief under the Lord who declared: "For the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me" (Lev. 25:23b). Therefore to covet the inheritance of one's neighbor was to covet what was God's and so betray want of love for him. The application of this is universal because not just Canaan but "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein" (Ps. 24:1).

The comprehensiveness of Jesus' "first and great commandment" is evident from the preamble and historical prologue of the covenant document. Being introductory to the whole body of stipulations which follow, they are manifestly intended to inculcate the proper motivation for obedience not to three or four or five of the stipulations but to them all; and the motivation they inspire is that of love to the divine Redeemer. Why are we to love our neighbors? Because we love the God who loves them and, according to the principle articulated in the sabbath commandment (Exod. 20:11), the imperative to love God is also a demand to be like him.

The two commandments of Jesus do not distinguish two separable areas of human life but two complementary aspects of human responsibility. Our Lord's perspective is one with that of the duplicate tables of the covenant which comprehend the whole duty of man within the unity of his consecration to his covenant Lord.

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

27 Considered in this light, there is an exact equivalent to the tenth commandment in a Hittite treaty where the suzerain charges the vassal: "Thou shalt not desire any territory of the land of Hatti". (Cited by Mendenhall, "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," The Biblical Archaeologist XVII (May, 1954) 2, p. 30).
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GOD'S SELF-REVELATION
IN EXODUS 34:6-8

J. Carl Laney

TO GET ACQUAINTED WITH SOMEONE, a person can ask others about that individual. Or a person can meet the individual personally and ask appropriate questions. In seeking to know God many Christians study what others say about Him. But a better way to get to know God is to ask Him about Himself. This is exactly what Moses did in Exodus 33:18 when he said, "I pray You, show me Your glory." The answer to Moses' request is given in 34:6-7, in which God revealed several of His divine attributes. This passage is one of the most important theological texts in Scripture, because it is the only place where God actually described Himself, listing His own glorious attributes.

The importance of Exodus 34:6-7 as a foundation for biblical theology is evidenced by the fact that this statement is repeated many times in the Old Testament (Num. 14:18; Neh. 9:17; Pss. 103:8, 17; 145:8; Jer. 32:18-19; Joel 2:13; Jon. 4:2). Echoes of this self-revelation also appear in Deuteronomy 5:9-10; 1 Kings 3:6; Lamentations 3:32; Daniel 9:4; and Nahum 1:3. The biblical writers clearly regarded Exodus 34:6-7 as a foundational statement about God.

Strangely, this great passage has received little attention from systematic theologians. For example it does not appear in the Scripture index of Chafer's *Systematic Theology*. Berkhofs *Systematic Theology* cites Exodus 34:6 twice and 34:7 once, but only as proof texts for certain divine attributes, without discussion or comment. Erickson cites the text in support of the graciousness of God.

J. Carl Laney is Professor of Biblical Literature, Western Seminary, Portland, Oregon.

God's Self-Revelation in Exodus 34:6-8

God and the persistence of God. Grudem recommends the text for Scripture memory, but offers no comment or discussion. Exodus 34:6-7 has fared slightly better in biblical theologies, but it is seldom given detailed attention as a foundational text for one's understanding of the character and attributes of God.

THE CONTEXT OF THE REVELATION (EXOD. 32-33)

God's self-revelation to Moses is set in the context of one of the spiritual low points in Israel's history. Exodus 32 records how Israel's sin of idolatry resulted in the breaking of the newly established covenant with the Lord. While the Israelites were camped at Mount Sinai, Moses ascended the mountain to meet with God and receive the tablets of the Law. When this took longer than expected, the people approached Aaron with a request, "Come, make us a god who will go before us; as for this Moses, the man who brought us up from the land of Egypt, we do not know what has become of him" (32:1).

Three failures can be noted here. First, the Israelites failed to recognize their exclusive allegiance to the Lord, with whom they had entered into covenant. The first of the Ten Commandments stated, "You shall have no other gods before Me" (20:3), but the people demanded of Aaron, "make us gods [יוֹלְדוֹת הָאָדָם] who will go before us." Second, they failed to acknowledge that it was God, not Moses, who had delivered them from Egypt. In his song Moses had credited God with Israel's deliverance from Egypt (15:1-18). Now the Israelites were attributing their deliverance to Moses. Third, the Israelites failed to rely on Moses, their covenant mediator. Moses had not told the people when he would return from his mountaintop meeting with God. So when Moses delayed, they gave up hope and sought someone else to lead them.

Surprisingly Aaron quickly yielded to public pressure by fashioning a golden calf, which he then presented to the people, "This is your god, O Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt" (32:4). This calf may be reminiscent of the Apis bull cult, which was

---

4 Wayne Grudem, Systematic Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 209.
prevalent in Memphis, Egypt. It may also recall Mnevis bull worship in Heliopolis. But these places were some distance from Goshen, the district where the Israelites lived when in Egypt. Wood suggests that the bull cults connected with the worship of Horus more likely influenced Aaron. Aaron announced to the people, "Tomorrow shall be a feast to the LORD" (32:5). These words suggest that Aaron intended for the image of the calf to represent Israel's God, Yahweh. Cassuto reasons that Aaron's words were an unsuccessful attempt to dissuade the Israelites from worshiping the calf and to encourage them to turn back to the Lord.

On Mount Sinai God informed Moses of the idolatry that had taken place in the camp. God charged the people with having "corrupted" themselves (v. 7). Then He threatened to destroy the Israelites, suggesting to Moses that He could raise up a new nation from his descendants (v. 10). This was a real test for Israel's leader. Would he choose his own exaltation over Israel's preservation? After all that he had experienced with these rebellious people, one can imagine that he was tempted to stand back and let God deal with them. But instead, Moses interceded on behalf of the people, and so God withheld His judgment (vv. 11-13). The words "the LORD changed His mind about the harm which He said He would do to His people" (32:14) are not inconsistent with the doctrine of God's immutability. Announcements of judgment are frequently conditional. God sometimes withholds His judgment in response to repentance or intercession because He is unchanging in His compassion and grace (2 Pet. 3:9).

Because of Israel's failure in the matter of the golden calf, the Lord withdrew His presence from among the people in the camp (Exod. 33:1-7). He promised to send an angel to lead them into the Promised Land, but God would not go on in the midst of such sinful covenant-breakers. Moses was no doubt discouraged by Israel's failure. He wanted to be with God, and yet God had left the camp. To resolve this situation Moses set up a small tent some distance from the Israelite camp, where he could meet with God (v. 7).

---

9 "Tent of meeting" (דֶּתֶן מָקֶר נַחַל) here does not refer to the tabernacle, for it had not yet been built (see Exod. 40). Cassuto concurs with this assessment (The Book of
Sheltered there from the desert wind and sun, Moses spent time alone with the Lord. Whenever Moses entered the tent, the pillar of cloud descended to the tent entrance and God spoke with Moses (v. 9). This must have been a very special experience for Moses. Reflecting on this time he spent with God, he wrote, "Thus the LORD used to speak to Moses face to face, just as a man speaks to his friend" (v. 11). The expression "face to face" (אַלְכִּים אָלַכִּים) is used five times in the Old Testament to describe close intimacy between God and His people (Gen. 32:31; Exod. 33:11; Deut. 34:10; Judg. 6:22; Ezek. 20:35).

More than anything else, Moses wanted to know and experience God. This desire is clearly reflected in his prayer, "Now therefore, I pray You, if I have found favor in Your sight, let me know Your ways, that I may know You" (Exod. 33:13). By desiring to know God's ways Moses wanted to become better acquainted with His actions, directions, and manner of doing things. He wanted to know God more intimately, more intelligently, more personally than ever before. With this desire in mind he said, "I pray You, show me Your glory" (v. 18). The word כָּבוֹד ("glory") is associated with a verb that means "to be heavy." The noun is sometimes used with reference to someone's "weighty" reputation or honored position (1 Kings 3:13). The word refers to being "weighty in the sense of being noteworthy or impressive." Similarly it refers to the reality and splendor of God's glorious presence. Sometimes His glory was made visible in association with the tabernacle or temple (Exod. 40:34; 1 Kings 8:11; Ezek. 9:3-4).

In Exodus 33:18 Moses was asking for a full self-disclosure of God's glorious person--a revelation that would sustain and encourage Moses, enabling him to carry on as Israel's leader. But Moses asked for more than God was willing to grant. The Lord responded by telling Moses that mortal man cannot see God in the fullness of His divine glory and still survive the experience (v. 20; see also John 1:18; Col. 1:15). But God graciously accommodated Himself to Moses by announcing that He would make His "goodness" pass before Moses and would "proclaim" His name in Moses' presence (Exod. 33:19). Durham suggests that "goodness" (םָאֳזִ) here may imply the "beauty" of the Lord and so it anticipated a

Exodus, 430).

theophany. But in this case God gave Moses not a vision of how He appears but a description of what He is. The promise to proclaim His name is probably another way of saying the same thing. In biblical times a person's "name" (םֶרֶשֶׁת) was associated with his or her character and reputation. For Yahweh to proclaim His name meant He would declare or announce His attributes, the essence of His divine character.

God told Moses that He would place him in the cleft of a rock, covering him with His hand until He passed by. Then God told Moses, "I will take My hand away and you shall see My back, but my face shall not be seen" (v. 23). This statement is rich in anthropomorphisms, attributing to God the human features of a hand, back, and face. Since God does not have a physical body (John 4:24), these terms reveal how intimately and personally God would disclose Himself to Moses.

THE REVELATION OF GOD'S GLORY (EXOD. 34:6-7)

God fulfilled His promise to give Moses a fresh revelation of His glory. Once again He called Moses to Mount Sinai (34:1-2), and He "descended in the cloud and stood there with him" (v. 5). In its many uses in Exodus and Numbers, the word "cloud" (נִבְנָא) is associated with and represents God's presence. The last phrase in verse 5, "he called upon the name of the LORD," is somewhat ambiguous. Did Moses "call upon" the name of Yahweh, or did Yahweh "proclaim" His name? Though the Hebrew verb נִפְרַד can be translated either way, it seems preferable in this context to understand that God proclaimed His name or attributes, for this is what He had promised Moses (33:19). Davies points out that there is no change of subject for the verbs "passed by" and "proclaimed" in verse 6. He translates it this way: "Yahweh passed by before him, and (Yahweh) proclaimed. . . ." This interpretation has the support of a number of noted commentators.

is a "virtual exegesis" of Yahweh's name as God disclosed His character and attributes to Moses.

YAHWEH, YAHWEH EL

God began His self-revelation to Moses by pronouncing His divine name Yahweh (יהוה) twice, followed by El (エル), the biblical designation for Deity. This is the only place in the Hebrew Bible where this precise formula occurs. The translators of the Septuagint apparently took the second occurrence of "Yahweh" as redundant, so they deleted it. Cassuto takes the double tetragrammaton as appositional, translating "The LORD, He is the LORD." Davies interprets the construction as a doubling of the divine name followed by a designation and description, "Yahweh, Yahweh, a God..." Durham comments that the double occurrence of יְהֹוָה is "a deliberate repetition of the confessional use of the tetragrammaton, emphasizing the reality of Yahweh present in his very being, linking this proof to Moses in the earlier proof-of-Presence narratives that are begun in Exodus 3, and providing an anchor line for the list of five descriptive phrases to follow." It seems clear that the twofold occurrence of יְהֹוָה emphasizes God's name, thereby causing the listener to pause and reflect on its meaning and the description that follows.

The meaning of God's name Yahweh was first revealed to Moses in Exodus 3:13-15. "God said to Moses, 'I AM WHO I AM.' This is what you are to say to the Israelites: 'I AM has sent me to

15 Fretheim, Exodus, 301.
16 The abbreviation יְהֹוָה ("Yah") does occur twice together in Isaiah 38:11.
17 Cassuto, Exodus, 439.
18 Davies, Exodus, 246.
19 Durham, Exodus, 453.
you" (3:14). The words "I AM" translate a first-person form of the Hebrew verb הָיָה ("to be"). The meaning is that God is the self-existent One. As Allen states, "He exists dependent upon nothing or no one excepting his own will." When God said, "I AM," He was referring to His active, life-giving existence. The words "I AM" express the meaning of God's name, but they are not the name itself. God's name is revealed in verse 15 as Yahweh. The Hebrew name Yahweh is probably best understood as derived from a third-person form of the Hebrew verb הָיָה ("to be"), emphasizing, as in the case of "I AM," that He is the self-existent One.

The word בָּא is an ancient Semitic term used in the Bible as a generic name for "god" and as a designation for the true God of Israel. Scholars have debated the root meaning of the term. Frequent suggestions for the original meaning include "power" or "fear," but these proposals are challenged and much disputed. It is rare to find בָּא in Scripture without some word or description that elevates and distinguishes the true God from false deities that bear the designation "god." Yahweh, the God of Israel, is "the great בָּא" (Jer. 32:18), "the בָּא of heaven" (Ps. 136:26), and "the בָּא most high" (Gen. 14:18-19). In Exodus 34:6 בָּא is used in connection with the double name Yahweh. God identified Himself to Moses with the words "Yahweh, Yahweh God." As the double name provides emphasis, the designation בָּא begins to provide a description. The One speaking to Moses was none other than Yahweh, the true and living God.

THE LIST OF ATTRIBUTES
In critical studies scholars have discussed the origin and use of the list of characteristics revealed in the proclamation of Yahweh's name. Dentan concludes that in Exodus 34:6-8 and related passages the entire "formula" was produced by the circle of Israel's sages and inserted into the Exodus narrative by them in their redaction of the Pentateuch. Other scholars have assumed a cultic origin and liturgical use for this summary of Yahweh's characteris-

23 Ibid., 1:42.
tics. Others argue that the origin of the "formula" must be found in the narrative context of Israel's first disobedience and Yahweh's judgment. Durham has noted the relationship between God's dealings with Israel in the Book of Exodus and the things He said about Himself in His self-revelation. "Yahweh's compassion had just been demonstrated (32:14), and his tendency to be favorable was in the process of exercise (33:12-17). His slowness to grow angry had been attested from the moment of Israel's complaint at the sea (14:11-12), and his unchanging love and reliableness were the reason Moses had still been able to plead after the terrible cancellation made by the people's disobedience with the calf. His keeping of unchanging love to the thousands and the removal of their guilt, their transgression and their sin... were in process."26

God had revealed Himself to Moses by His works in relationship with His people. Now in Exodus 34:6-7 He revealed Himself through words.27

Compassionate. The first thing God revealed about Himself is that He is compassionate. The word מָרָא describes a deep love rooted in some natural bond.28 This love is usually that of a superior being (God) for an inferior being (a human). The psalmist declared, "Just as a father has compassion on his children, so the LORD [Yahweh] has compassion [מָרָא] on those who fear Him" (Ps. 103:13). Girdlestone defines it as expressing "a deep and tender feeling of compassion, such as is aroused by the sight of weakness or suffering in those that are dear to us or need our help."29

The Old Testament uses מָרָא thirteen times. Twelve of those occurrences refer to God, and one (Ps. 112:4) refers to man. When used of God, the word points up the strong bond He has with those He calls His children. He looks on His people much as mothers and fathers look on their children—with concern for their needs and tender feelings of love.

Another concept associated with God's compassion is His un-

---

26 Durham, Exodus, 454.
27 The discussion of these attributes builds on J. Carl Laney, God: Who He Is, What He Does, How to Know Him Better, Swindoll Leadership Library (Nashville: Word, 1999), 48-56.
conditional choice. "I . . . will show compassion on whom I will show compassion" (Exod. 33:19). God's compassion is extended by His sovereign decree to those whom He chooses. God's compassion is also linked with His faithfulness. "For the LORD [Yahweh] your God is a compassionate God; He will not fail you nor destroy you nor forget the covenant with your fathers which He swore to them" (Deut. 4:31). And because He is compassionate, He is also forgiving. The psalmist declared, "But He, being compassionate, forgave their iniquity and did not destroy them" (Ps. 78:38). Through the exercise of His compassion, God spared a repentant people who were deserving of judgment. Deuteronomy 30:1-3 reveals that repentance from sin will be met with God's compassion and restoration to blessing. A brief survey of prophetic literature reveals that Yahweh's compassion provides the basis for Israel's future restoration (Isa. 49:13; Jer. 12:15), national redemption (Mic. 7:19), and eschatological hope (Isa. 14:1; Jer. 33:26; Zech. 1:16). Anticipating the future blessings for His people, God declared, "For a brief moment I forsook you, but with great compassion I will gather you" (Isa. 54:7).

God is a compassionate Father. He loves His own, those whom He chose. And He will never forsake them. He will always be available in believers' times of need, seeking their good for His ultimate glory. Although infinitely holy, His compassion allows Him to deal gently with weak and failing people. He is full of tender sympathy for the sufferings and the miseries of human frailty. Because of His compassion He is always ready and willing to forgive sins and to restore people to Himself. 

Gracious. The second fact God wanted Moses to know about Himself is that He is gracious. The Hebrew adjective נְנָחָה depicts "a heartfelt response by someone who has something to give to one who has a need." The verb נְנָחָה usually refers to a stronger person coming to help a weaker one who has no claim for such favorable treatment. Most of the occurrences of this verb in the Hebrew Bible have Yahweh as the subject. Jacob explained to his brother Esau that his family and property were due to the fact that God had "dealt graciously" with him (Gen. 33:5, 11). In praying and fasting for his dying son, David said, "Who knows, the LORD may be gracious to me, that the child may live" (2 Sam. 12:22). Showing such grace seems to be a divine prerogative, for Yahweh declared to Moses, "I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious" (Exod. 33:19). Often God's grace is seen in His delivering of His own from their

---

enemies or from their sins (Pss. 26:11; 51:1; 123:3).

The word "gracious" is used thirteen times in the Old Testament, eleven times in combination with יִתְנָחא ("compassionate"). Like the verbal form יָתְנָח (the adjective יִתְנָח denotes the free favor of a superior given to one who is needy but undeserving. Yamauchi notes that all the occurrences except one refer to Yahweh, who is favorable toward the afflicted and needy (Exod. 22:27; 34:6; 2 Chron. 30:9; Neh. 9:17, 31; Pss. 86:15; 103:8; 111:4; 116:5; 145:8; Joel 2:13; Jon. 4:2). The single exception to this pattern, in Psalm 112:4, uses the adjective to describe the God-fearing person, who shares certain characteristics with God. Yet with humankind this attribute is not perfect. The kindness people extend to others may not be unbiased or without hope of reward. With God, things are different. He has no ulterior motives. Because God is gracious, He will hear the cry of the poor (Exod. 22:27). Because God is gracious, He will not turn away from the repentant (2 Chron. 30:9). Because God is gracious, He will not forsake His people (Neh. 9:17, 31).

The grace of God is featured throughout the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, emphasizing the theological basis for God's goodness and kindness toward His people. Ryrie wrote, "Christianity is distinct from all other religions because it is a message of grace. Jesus Christ is the supreme revelation of God's grace; salvation is by grace; and grace governs and empowers Christian living. Without grace Christianity is nothing."32

Slow to anger. The Bible reveals that God has a legitimate basis for anger: The sin and disobedience of His people dishonors and displeases Him (Exod. 32:10). But God's anger, though fierce (Num. 25:4; 32:14; Josh. 7:26; Jer. 25:37), is not sinful or evil. It is grounded in His holy character, which is offended by the sinful rebellion of His creatures. God's anger often issues in His chastising (Pss. 6:1; 38:1) and punishing (2 Sam. 6:7; Jer. 44:6) His people. Yet while God may be rightfully angry over sin and disobedience, He is not quick to become angry. The Hebrew expression מַכְּלָא יְרֵעָא ("slow to anger") is used ten times in the Bible to refer to God's patience in dealing with those whose sins arouse His wrath. The expression includes the noun יְרֵע, meaning "long," and מַכְּל, a word for "nose." In Hebrew the nose is associated with anger, apparently because when a person is angry, his or her face and nose may involuntarily redden and appear to "burn."

God's being "slow to anger" means that He takes a long time

31 Ibid, 304.
before getting angry. It is as if He takes a long, deep breath as He deals with sin and holds His anger in abeyance. In discussing this concept Hamilton suggests that God's nose becomes so long that it would "take forever to burn completely." However, this wrongly seems to suggest that God would never actually become angry and express His divine wrath, a view not supported by Scripture (Exod. 4:14; Num. 11:1; 22:22; Josh. 7:1). Because God is holy, He must respond with wrath and judgment on sin and disobedience. His righteousness demands that He not leave wickedness unpunished. Such lenience would be contrary to His holy character. But God does not hasten to punish the sinner. Instead, He exercises His attribute of longsuffering. God's prolonged and patient dealings with the wicked should not be interpreted to mean that sin is not serious or does not matter. Rather, God's patience gives the wicked time and opportunity to repent. As Peter wrote, God is "not wishing for any to perish but for all to come to repentance" (2 Pet. 3:9).

God is in no hurry to judge sinners. Yet there will be a day when the wicked must stand before God's great, white throne and be judged according to their deeds (Rev. 20:11-15). Meanwhile God continues to demonstrate His patience and grace. Though His anger is being kindled by human sinfulness, it is being kindled very slowly.

Abounding in lovingkindness. The next thing God revealed to Moses about Himself is that He is "abounding in lovingkindness and truth." The word בְּרֵאשִׁית (**brach** "abounding") is used to describe what is present in abundant quantity or quality. The phrase לְבֵרֶךְ חַסְדֵי ה' occurs thirteen times in the Old Testament. Some scholars say this phrase is a hendiadys, a figure of speech in which two words represent one idea. Cassuto, for example, says this phrase speaks of the attribute of "lovingkindness of truth," or "true and faithful lovingkindness." Others say the phrase could refer to God's "true love" or "faithful love." However, since there is no absolute certainty that the compound phrase reflects a single idea, and no consensus as to the idea being represented, it seems preferable to treat the words as separate attributes of God.

The Hebrew word דְּשֵׁן variously translated "kindness" (JB), "lovingkindness" (KJV, NASB), "love" (NIV), or "steadfast love" (NRSV), has the basic meaning of "unfailing love" or "loyalty." The

34 Genesis 24:49; 47:29; Exodus 34:6; Joshua 2:14; 2 Samuel 2:6; 15:20; Psalms 25:10; 61:7 (Heb., 8); 85:10 (Heb., 11); 86:15; 89:14 (Heb., 15); Proverbs 3:3; 20:28.
Septuagint uses the Greek word ἐλεος ("mercy" or "compassion") in translating ḫĕṣed.

Glueck points out that in ancient treaties the term ḫĕṣed was used to describe an aspect of the covenant relationship between kings and their subjects. As the king was expected to demonstrate ḫĕṣed to the people with whom he had entered into covenant, so his subjects were to show ḫĕṣed toward their king. This "love" on the people's part suggested loyalty, service, and obedience. As ancient kings entered into a relationship with their subjects, expressed in terms of "covenantal love," so God established His covenant with Israel, promising His loyalty to His people and calling for their loyalty in return.

Not all scholars agree with Glueck's view that ḫĕṣed is so closely tied to fulfilling prior covenantal duties. Others hold that ḫĕṣed expresses love in a more general sense, emphasizing the freedom of God to love without any sense of obligation. Sakenfeld argues that ḫĕṣed denotes free acts of rescue or deliverance, which includes the idea of faithfulness. Clearly God's relationship with His people Israel was formalized and defined by a covenant (Exod. 19:5; 24:8; 31:16; 34:10), but there is freedom, initiative, and grace in Yahweh's ḫĕṣed. That is, all of God's favor is based on His love (Deut. 7:8). God entered into a covenant with His people because of His love. The covenant simply guarantees the perpetuity of His love.

Yahweh's "loyal-love" is an undeserved, selective affection by which He binds Himself to His people for their sake. He graciously and sovereignly grants gifts and blessings beyond anything they might hope for. And He grants these blessings contrary to what people deserve. His abounding ḫĕṣed will never diminish or be exhausted since it is founded on His character and covenant commitment. And so the psalmist wrote, "Give thanks to the LORD, for His ḫĕṣed is everlasting" (Ps. 136:1).

Abundant in truth. Besides being "great" (בְּרָבע) in His loyal love, God also abounds in נָאמָן. The word נָאמָן, which can be translated "truth" or "faithfulness," is associated with the verb נָאמַן, "to confirm, support, or establish." The basic idea of both the verb and the noun is that of firmness, certainty, and dependability. This word is frequently applied to God as a characteristic of His divine na-

ture. The chronicler used it in describing the "true God" (2 Chron. 15:3). The term is fittingly applied to God's words (Ps. 119:142, 151, 160). As a characteristic of God, ניב is the means by which people come to know and serve Him (1 Kings 2:4; Pss. 25:5; 26:3).

In Exodus 34:6 the word may emphasize "truth," or it may focus on "faithfulness." Both, of course, are equally true of God. But reliability, stability, and faithfulness seem to be fundamental to ניב when applied to God. And because He is reliable and faithful, His words can be trusted. As Scott comments, "As we study its various contexts, it becomes manifestly clear that there is no truth in the biblical sense, i.e. valid truth, outside God. All truth comes from God and is truth because it is related to God." God's Word is as sure as His character. Jesus affirmed this when He said, "Your Word is truth" (John 17:17).

Keeping lovingkindness for thousands. God's attributes are not revealed merely to be discussed and admired. They reflect the nature of God who extends Himself and His divine mercies to those in need. The word translated "lovingkindness" in verse 7 is רכז, used already in verse 6. Once again God was revealing His steadfast, loyal love frequently exhibited in terms of covenant loyalty toward His people. But here He declared that He does not limit the exercise of His רכז, but that He extends this abounding love to the multitudes. The participle רכז, translated "keeping" or "who keeps," does not mean "retaining." Rather it means that God extends His רכז to those in need. Cassuto says the word "thousands" means "thousands of generations." This fits the context, which mentions "generations" at the end of verse 7. God extends His loyal love to thousands of generations, the distant descendants of the Israelites who were with Moses at Mount Sinai. God keeps on working to extend His loyal love to the thousands of people who need His help and deliverance.

Forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin. Another great truth God wanted Moses and His people to know about Himself is that He is willing to forgive. Although this is not the last of the divine attributes God noted in this passage, Bush regards this statement as "the climax of the present proclamation." The word רכז ("to forgive") means "to lift up, carry, take away." The verb is used figuratively here and elsewhere of God's "taking away" sin (Ps. 32:1, 5),

39 Ibid., 53.
40 Cassuto, Exodus, 440.
41 Bush, Exodus, 2:246.
so that the guilty receive pardon and forgiveness. This use of נא 나타א appears often in requests for forgiveness (Gen. 50:17; Exod. 10:17; 32:32; Num. 14:19; 1 Sam. 15:25; 25:28). As Kaiser notes, "Sin can be forgiven and forgotten, because it is taken up and carried away."42

Three words are used to describe the actions and attitudes that God forgives. The first word, מִשְׁפָּט ("iniquity"), refers to an action that involves crooked behavior, a turning away from the straight and narrow way. The second word, מעשה ("transgressions"), refers to a breach of relationships, civil or religious, between two parties (Gen. 31:36; Isa. 58:1). In the context of international relationships the cognate verb designates a revolt against rulers. In a religious sense it refers to a rebellion against God's authority. Livingston regards it as a "collective which denotes the sum of misdeeds and a fractured relationship."43 The third word, רָעָה ("sin"), is related to the verb רָע ("to miss the way." Missing God's standards or failing to fulfill His requirements constitutes an act of sin. Cassuto is not convinced that Moses intended to differentiate between three varieties of sin; he says that the three are synonyms that are used to cover "the entire range of wrongdoing."44 While this may be the case, there are significant differences in nuance between the words.

Micah contemplated God's marvelous attribute of forgiveness when he said, "Who is a God like You, who pardons iniquity and passes over the rebellious act of the remnant of His possession. He does not retain His anger forever, because He delights in unchanging love" (Mic. 7:18).

Not acquitting unrepentant sinners. The next attribute features the other side of God's forgiving grace. Although He delights in forgiveness, His grace cannot abrogate His justice. Those who refuse to repent are responsible before the holy God.

The Hebrew text could be translated, "He will most certainly not acquit [the guilty]." The word translated "acquit" (נכון) means "to be clean, pure, or spotless." Fisher and Waltke note that of the forty Old Testament occurrences of this verb the vast majority have an ethical, moral, or forensic connotation.45 In a judicial context it takes on the meaning "to be acquitted" or "to go unpunished." A

44 Cassuto, Exodus, 440.
husband is "acquitted" of any guilt if he, in declaring his wife unfaithful, follows the legal procedures required by law (Num. 5:31). The word is sometimes used with a negative particle, thereby yielding a strong warning of accountability and judgment. Proverbs 6:29 declares that the one who commits adultery with his neighbor's wife "will not go unpunished" [חֵרֵם]. In Exodus 34:7 the verb is used with the negative חָסֵד, to affirm that God will not regard the unrepentant sinner as innocent. Because God is holy and just, as well as loving and forgiving, the unrepentant will face the most serious consequences of their sin and rebellion. God does not leave sinners unpunished (Exod. 20:7; Job 9:28; Jer. 30:11).

Not erasing the consequences of sin. The last phrase in God's self-revelation to Moses reflects on the consequences of sin. While it is in God's nature to forgive the repentant, it is not in His nature to remove the natural consequences of foolish and sinful behavior. Some people assume that the words, "visiting the iniquity of fathers on the children and on the grandchildren to the third and fourth generations," mean that God punishes children for the sins of their parents and ancestors. But Ezekiel 18 shows that this is not the case.

Not erasing the consequences of sin. The last phrase in God's self-revelation to Moses reflects on the consequences of sin. While it is in God's nature to forgive the repentant, it is not in His nature to remove the natural consequences of foolish and sinful behavior. Some people assume that the words, "visiting the iniquity of fathers on the children and on the grandchildren to the third and fourth generations," mean that God punishes children for the sins of their parents and ancestors. But Ezekiel 18 shows that this is not the case.

Of course it would be unjust for God to punish children for the sins of their parents. Yet this is exactly what some people were saying in Ezekiel's day, as expressed in their proverb, "The fathers eat the sour grapes, but the children's teeth are set on edge" (Ezek. 18:2). They were saying that in allowing the Babylonians to destroy Jerusalem, God was punishing the people for the sins of their ancestors. God responded by saying that they should not use that proverb any more (v. 3). Then He announced, "The person who sins will die. The son will not bear the punishment for the father's iniquity, nor will the father bear the punishment for the son's iniquity; the righteousness of the righteous will be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked will be upon himself (v. 20). It is also evident from Deuteronomy 24:16 that God does not hold children responsible for the sinful actions of their parents.

The fact that God will visit "the iniquity of the fathers on the children" means that children can expect to experience the consequences of the sinful behavior of their parents. While God is willing to forgive and pardon, He does not interrupt the certain and natural consequences of sinful behavior. And some of these consequences are experienced by children and grandchildren. When a parent goes to prison, the children suffer loss. Sadly, many children have suffered the tragic consequences of growing up in a family with an alcoholic or abusive parent. God does not interrupt the natural consequences of foolish and sinful actions. Children do reap
what sinful parents sow. Yet the influence of evil is limited to a few generations ("to the third and fourth generations"), while God extends His "loyal love" for thousands."46

THE RESPONSE OF MOSES (EXOD. 34:8)

Earlier in his encounter with God, Moses had prayed, "Show me Your glory" (Exod. 33:18). In response God revealed Himself to Moses in a most unique and memorable way. God passed in front of Moses and proclaimed His own attributes. How did Moses respond to the Lord's self-revelation? He "made haste to bow low toward the earth and worship."

When Moses saw God in the light of His self-revelation, he saw himself with new insight. No longer could Moses stand in God's presence. And it did not take him a long season of deliberation to decide what response was appropriate. Having heard God proclaiming His attributes, Moses "made haste" to prostrate himself on the ground in worship. Good theology is the foundation and impetus for God-honoring worship. May all who aspire to proper theology be as quick to understand and practice its implications.

46 Cassuto, Exodus, 440.
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The Coherence of Exodus
Narrative Unity and Meaning

Arie C. Leder

Until the rise of modern criticism, studies of the Pentateuch focused on problems in the reading and understanding of the received text. Although incoherence in the biblical text had been noted before, it was the serious development of the historically oriented critical methodologies in the eighteenth century and beyond that gave birth and support to a consistent skepticism about the historical, literary, and theological unity of this part of the Christian Scriptures. Enthralled by the inelegance of the pentateuchal text, criticism's identification of the four underlying, primary sources of the Pentateuch left no doubt about the incoherence of the received text. Nevertheless, the critical approaches also suggested the means for recovering a coherent message: Disentangle the primary sources from the secondary accretions, identify their historical and social location, and let these recovered primary sources speak. Furthermore, by analyzing the relationship of the secondary and later editorial additions to the identified earliest level of the text, scholars argued that it was not only possible to recover the compositional process of the text but also to understand the interplay of the different ideological positions represented by the sources and the various additions. Thus, by identifying the compositional history of the received text, locating the underlying primary sources within their sociopolitical and religious contexts, and understanding the interplay of the various layers, the historical critical methodologies sought to explain the contradictions they identified and to support scientifically the continuing meaningfulness of the received biblical text.

The individual books of the Pentateuch, however, disappeared from view, including from the textbooks that introduced theology students to the Pentateuch because they were redistributed among the underlying sources. Literary-critical excavation of the so-called primary documents of the Pentateuch also reshaped pentateuchal theology and the studies of personages of the Old Testament.¹

¹ This article completes the study of Exodus begun in Calvin Theological Journal 34 (1999): 11-35.
² See, for example, Robert H. Pfeiffer (Introduction to the Old Testament [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941], 129-292) who, although he acknowledges that the Pentateuch "is a single work in five volumes and not a collection of five different books" (129), studies the Pentateuch in terms of...
Although the critical students of the Pentateuch held to the incoherence of the received text, they held firmly to the coherence of the primary sources—to the point of distinguishing clearly among the linguistic gifts and peculiar theologies of their authors. Historical-critical studies, it was thought, would yield a fuller comprehension of the text by integrating the results of these studies into an understanding of the received text. In some sense, then, a coherent understanding of this ancient literature was the ultimate goal. Nevertheless, the academy's failure to integrate the results of historical critical exegesis into a fuller understanding of the received text would leave Scripture fragmented and, to a large extent, silent in the church.


See, for example, Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff, The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975); the discussion in R. N. Whybray, The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study (Sheffield, 1987), 47-48; and Fleming James' enthusiastic description of the Yahwist (Personalities of the Old Testament, 196): "About me time when Elijah and Elisha were doing their work in the northern kingdom there lived in the kingdom of Judah a remarkable man, who, though his name is nowhere mentioned in the Bible, stands out today as one of the supreme thinkers of ancient Israel. This man is a discovery of modern scholarship. . . . He was in all probability a single personality. Many scholars, it is true, find two or more strands of narrative. . . . But the J narrative taken as whole is so vivid and colourful, so fresh and full of power, that we can hardly go far wrong in believing it to be the work of single great mind."

See for example, James D. Smart, The Strange Silence of the Bible in the Church: A Study in Hermeneutics (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970). Whether such integration would have been possible is another matter, as James A. Wharton indicated (See below, footnote 5). The academy's separation of the Bible from the church continues in its contemporary claims that the interpretation of biblical documents has no validity beyond "the assent of various interest groups." Such interest groups may, of course, include the church, but typically the reference is to groups determined by ethnic, cultural, gender, or sexual-orientation interests. David J. A Clines, for example, writes: there are no 'right' interpretations, and no validity in interpretation beyond the assent of various interest groups, biblical interpreters have to give up the goal of determinate and universally acceptable interpretations, and devote themselves to producing interpretations they can sell-in whatever mode is called for by the communities they choose to serve. This is what I call 'customized' interpretation." In his "A World Established on Water (Psalm 24)," in The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible, ed. David J.A Clines and Cheryl J. Exum. (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 87.
In 1974, Brevard S. Childs addressed this failure in his critical theological commentary on Exodus. In it he argued that the critical methodologies should, and attempted to show how they could, contribute to an understanding of the canonical text. Thus, while he acknowledged the importance of historical critical exegesis, he required this exegesis to enlighten the received, canonical text. And, when he declared the commentary’s purpose to be theological and "directed toward the community of faith which lives by its confession of Jesus Christ," he acknowledged and argued that the present shape of Exodus, although a composite narrative, was the text to be explained, not the reconstructed sources, traditions, or forms. Although Childs did not argue for the coherence of the received narrative, by subordinating critical exegesis to the received shape of the text, he acknowledged the significance and influence of the canonical text. Recent introductions have begun to refer again to the traditional division of the Pentateuch and, in conjunction with the emergence of the new literary approach, studies have defended the received shape of the individual books of the Pentateuch and of the Pentateuch itself.

Since the eighteenth century, biblical studies have moved from understanding coherence and meaning as located in the world behind the text, in which historical, critical, and compositional issues were crucial, to the world of the text itself, where historical and compositional issues are less, and literary concerns more, important. Some exegetes, however, ignore both of these, sometimes

6 Childs, The Book of Exodus, ix.
8 Distinguished from historical-critical literary readings, the newer approach focuses on the text as we now have it, not on the reconstruction of the history of the text in conjunction with the reconstruction of the history of the social context that produced the text. See, for example, Jean Louis Ska, "Our Fathers Have Told Us." Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1990), and J. P. Fokkelman, Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide, trans. Ineke Smit (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1999).
completely, to argue that the world in front of the text is the locus of coherence and meaning. That is, where Childs relativized the historical issues and linked coherence and meaning to the canonical text, reader-response readings, even those working with the received text, locate them beyond the text: in the reader or the interest group to which the reader belongs.\(^{10}\)

In this article, I will argue for the coherence of Exodus from the point of view of the text itself. I will begin with a brief discussion of the nature of plot and its conflictual aspect, demonstrate how Exodus is shaped by three major conflicts, and finally argue that these conflicts cohere within a larger conceptual framework—the kingship pattern.

**Narrative and Plot**

In its simplest form, narrative has a beginning, middle, and end. It moves from beginning to end by means of emplotted events, complications, and conflicts, to a resolution of the initially defined narrative problem. "Plot," reasons Fokkelman,

determines the boundaries of the story as a meaningful whole. These boundaries... in their own way, draw the horizon of our correct understanding of the story: within it, the reader is looking for the connections between everything and everything else... The full-grown story begins by establishing a problem or deficit; next it can present an exposition before the action gets urgent; obstacles and conflicts may occur that attempt to frustrate the denouement, and finally there is the winding up, which brings the solution of the problem or the cancellation of the deficit.\(^{11}\)

I will briefly illustrate with a brief overview of the entire biblical narrative. Adam and Eve's sin in the garden of Eden defines the narrative problem, or deficit—refusal of divine instruction and the consequent exile from the divine presence—that initiates a series of events, complications, and conflicts between the Creator and humanity that come to a certain resolution with God's selection of Abram. This selection of Abram begins another series of events, complications, and conflicts that concludes just before Israel's entry into the

---

\(^{10}\) Alice L. Laffey (*An Introduction to the Old Testament: A Feminist Perspective* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988]), ignoring both the traditional and source-critical segmentation, focuses on the women of the Pentateuch; and also David J. A Clines, "A World Established on Water (Psalm 24)," 87. Fretheim (*The Pentateuch*, 22-36) provides a brief review of the world behind, of, and in front of the text.

\(^{11}\) Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Narrative*, 77. Claus Westennann (*The Promises to the Fathers. Studies on the Patriarchal Narratives* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980], 36) writes that "a narrative gives literary form to a sequence of events leading from tension to its resolution." Wesley A. Kart (*Story, Text, and Scripture. Literary Interests In Biblical Narrative* [University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988], 1-2) argues that narrative as a primary form provides biblical material with its particular coherence within which "other forms take their places or produce their particular kinds of tension."
Promised Land (Genesis-Deuteronomy). Israel's entry into the land initiates yet another sequence of events, complications, and conflicts that concludes with the destruction of Jerusalem and Judah's exile from the presence of God (Joshua-Kings). Genesis through Kings, then, begins and ends with an exile; but the narrative problem defined in Genesis has not yet been resolved. Not even the narrative directed at the postexilic community, Ezra through Nehemiah, brings about a resolution; only a return to the land and a repetition of the old problems (Neh. 13). A Christian reading of the Old Testament narrative understands that Jesus Christ's coming solves the problem of exile from the presence of God, for he is "God with us" (Matt. 1:16, 23; John 1:14), but Christ's ascension complicates the narrative again for he is no longer with us as he was during his earthly ministry. Even though the Holy Spirit indwells the body of Christ, the ecclesial community experiences much conflict (John 16:33) as it awaits the anticipated resolution (1 Thess. 4:13-18; Rev. 21).

The entire biblical narrative, then, develops the problem of humanity's refusal of divine instruction and the consequent exile from the presence of God and emplots a sequence of events, complications, and conflicts that bring God's people into his presence again, there to be instructed for life in that divine presence. Within this larger narrative, the Pentateuch develops a plot that depicts a particular community, Abraham's descendants, on the way to the presence of God, i.e., the Promised Land and the place the Lord chose for his name to dwell. Although Israel was graced by the presence of God and received divine instruction at Sinai, the Pentateuch ends without complete resolution, for Israel does not enter the land. Each of the books of the Pentateuch contributes to this narrative uniquely, even Leviticus. In the rest of this article, I will examine Exodus' contribution to the pentateuchal narrative, in particular, the development and coherence of its plot from the statement of the narrative problem at the beginning to its resolution at the end.

---


13 Although apparently a collection of laws, Leviticus' laws are set within a narrative framework that begins with a reference to the Tent of Meeting (Lev. 1:1) from which the Lord instructs Moses what to say to Israel. Gordon J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 5. James W. Watts, ("Public Readings and Pentateuchal Law," *Vetus Testamentum* 45, no. 4 [1995], 543) argues that "laws were intended to be heard in the context of other laws and narratives surrounding them..." Unlike law, narrative invites, almost enforces, a strategy of sequential reading, of starting at the beginning and reading the text in order to the end. The placement of law within narrative conforms (at least in part) the reading of law to the conventions of narrative." For more on the reading of law within a rhetorical strategy see James W. Watts, *Reading Law: The Rhetorical Shaping of the Pentateuch* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
Plot in Exodus

In my discussion of plot, I will account for the entire Exodus narrative from the point of view that conflict and its resolution is central to the understanding of plot, though not its only feature. Thus, I will argue that Exodus is composed of three major conflicts, each of which sets the stage for a subsequent conflict. Together, and in their sequence, these conflicts take the reader to Exodus' resolution of the narrative problem defined in Exodus 1-2.

The Narrative Problem of Exodus

Pharaoh's enslavement of Israel, as expressed in the forced building of the store cities (Ex. 1:8-22; 5:1-23), constitutes the narrative problem, or deficit, of Exodus. As depicted in Exodus 1-2, the problem prompts the questions, "Whom will Israel serve?" or, "Who will be Israel's master? Pharaoh or God?" The answer at first appears to be clear from Exodus 15:21; after crossing the Sea of Reeds, Israel is free from Pharaoh and his building project, but the people do not yet know what it means to be with God as their new master. These matters are addressed in the rest of the Exodus narrative.

The narrative problem defined in Exodus 1-2, however, should also be read as an integral part of the narrative problem of the Pentateuch, defined in the opening chapters of Genesis. Briefly stated, Genesis defines the problem as humanity's exile from the presence of God, an exile caused by Adam and Eve's refusal of divine instruction and the consequent human defilement of the presence of God in the Garden of Eden. The narrative depicts God himself initiating the resolution of this problem by instructing Abram to leave his land and to go "to the land which I will show you" (Gen. 12:1).

God's address of this problem includes the promise to increase Abram's descendants; a promise intended to fill the earth with those who acknowledge the Lord (cf. Gen.1:28), not those who fill it with violence (Gen. 6:11, 13). Those

14 In his brief discussion of plot in Exodus, for example, Kort argues for three major characteristics. First, a complexity defined by three patterns: "an almost formulaic pattern of repetition" between Moses and Pharaoh, the plagues, and the responses of Pharaoh; a pattern of conflict and competition; and a melodic pattern that moves the narrative forward. The second characteristic of plot is the juxtaposition of divine description with action. The final characteristic of plot in Exodus is "that it effects change." Although Kort mentions the wilderness and the mountain, his illustrations of these characteristics for the most part fail to take account of the narrative beyond the crossing of the Sea of Reeds. Kort, Story, Text and Scripture, 27. Another study that limits the discussion of plot in Exodus to chapters 1-14 is David M. Gunn, "The 'Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart': Plot, Character, and Theology in Exodus 1-14," in Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature, eds. David J. A Clines, David M. Gunn, and Alan J. Hauser (Sheffield: JSOT, 1982), 72-97.

who fill the earth with violence are the nations, the descendants of Adam who desire to make a name for themselves in the earth (Gen. 11:4, 5). This desire for a name the Lord makes possible, but, at this time in the biblical narrative, and only among the descendants of Abram does the LORD say: "I will make you into a great nation and I will bless you; I will make your name great, and you will be blessing" (Gen. 12:2; cf. Gal. 3:8-9). When this blessing begins to take historical shape in Egypt (Ex. 1:7), Pharaoh objects to Israel's growth and forces the people into his building projects. Because the language depicting Israel's forced participation in Pharaoh's building program echoes Babel's attempt to resolve humanity's problem independently of God, the text also evokes ancient Babel's solution to the human problem. It is from that human solution that God had separated Abraham, and provided him and his descendants with another building program, although that is not explicit in Genesis 12:1-3.

The narrative problem of Exodus, then, is rooted in the fundamental human problem as depicted in the opening chapters of Genesis. Within this larger narrative context Pharaoh's hostility to Israel's phenomenal growth may be read as opposition to God's promised resolution of the fundamental human problem by means of a uniquely created human community, whose unique role among the nations, especially its unyielding and undeflectable growth, summons up fear and opposition. Stated simply, Pharaoh's actions embody the nations' desire to gather against the Lord and his anointed (cf. Ps. 2:2). The narrator uses three major conflicts to arrive at his resolution of the narrative problem stated in Exodus 1-2.

The First Conflict: Pharaoh, the Lord, and Absolute Power

Exodus 3:1-15:21 narrates the contest between Pharaoh and the Lord, mediated by Moses, the Lord's messenger to Egypt and Israel. Of the three main characters, Israel is mostly passive at this time, their servitude renders them unwilling participants (Ex. 5:20, 21; 6:9). Two clusters of keywords define this struggle: the two nouns (מְנַהֲגָּה, מְנַהֲגָּה) and one verb (כְּבָר) describing Israel's servitude and the verbs describing Pharaoh's hardness of heart. God repeat-

16 "The men" (NIV) translates the phrase מְנַהֲגָּה, מְנַהֲגָּה in which מְנַהֲגָּה surely recalls the Adam of the opening chapters of Genesis.
17 The materials used in the construction of Pithom and Rameses, brick and mortar (Ex. 1:13) recall those used for the city and tower of Babel, brick and mortar (Gen. 11:3).
18 See especially Ex. 1:12, 20. Compare this episode with Acts 12, which narrates the persecution of the church after the Passover, thereby recalling the Exodus experience, and shows how persecution could not stop the spread of the word of God (12:14; cf.13:49-50).
19 Balak's fear of Israel's numbers and his solution (Num. 22:2-6) recalls Pharaoh's response lo Israel's increased numbers.
20 For more on these keywords, and others in Exodus, see my article "Reading Exodus to Learn and Learning to Read Exodus," Calvin Theological Journal 34, no. 1 (1999): 11-35. For the discussion of the two above-mentioned clusters, see p. 27.
edly demands that Pharaoh let Israel go to serve him (4:23; 7:16; 8:1, 20; 9:1, 13; 10:3), but he refuses. Pharaoh does urge Israel to leave and serve the Lord, once before the final plague (10:24), and then after the death of the firstborn (12:31). He repents of these words, however, and pursues Israel into the sea and with his army is swallowed by the earth at the command of the Lord (15:7; cf. 7:12). It is only when Israel sees the Egyptians lying dead on the shore that it fears the Lord and puts its trust in him and in Moses (14:30, 31). Thus, the conflict between Pharaoh and the Lord is resolved.

The resolution of the first conflict begets Israel's praise (15:1-21). This song reminds the reader of the wider perspective of the biblical narrative: the nations who will tremble at the passing of God's people (15:14-16), and the establishing of the Lord's dwelling place (15:13, 17). The trembling of the nations indicates that Egypt is not the only nation for whom what God is doing with Israel has consequences; the reference to God's dwelling place indicates that building, especially royal construction (cf. 15:18), is within the scope of the narrative's address of the problem defined in Exodus 1-2. Identification of this dwelling place with a particular mountain anticipates both the building project, which will enable the Lord's presence in Israel's midst, and the place where its design will be revealed, thereby also furthering the resolution of the fundamental conflict between God and the nations stated at the beginning of Genesis. Although Pharaoh's death and Israel's separation and freedom from Egypt resolves the conflict between God and Pharaoh, this resolution is not yet the end of the story. Rather, it occasions the second conflict of Exodus.

The Second Conflict: Israel, God, and Complaints in the Desert

With the conflict between God and Pharaoh resolved, the narrative begins to develop the relationship between Israel and its new master, a relationship characterized by complaints against Moses. Israel's complaints about the lack of water at Marah and food in the Desert of Sin contrast with the plenty of Egypt (Ex. 16:3). In answer to Moses' mediation, God provides Israel with water and food with the result that, after Exodus 17:7, Israel no longer complains about its sustenance in the desert. These provisions, however, do not resolve the conflict between God and Israel because the real issue is not lack of sustenance but Israel's failure to submit to God's instructions.

Israel's complaints about water and food occur in the context of the Lord's expectation that Israel submit itself to his law. Thus, at Marah, the Lord tells Israel that he will not bring the diseases of Egypt upon them if they pay careful attention to his voice, his commandments, and decrees (Ex. 15:25-26). Later, after Israel disobeys his instructions concerning the manna, the Lord asks Moses: "How long will you [pl.] refuse to keep my commandments and instructions?" (Ex. 16:28). Thus, the narrative links Israel's sustenance in the desert to its submission to God's instructions. In the desert pericope (Ex. 15:22-18:27) the question to be answered is not: "Who is Israel's master?" or "Whom will Israel serve?" Rather, after Israel's liberation from Egypt, the question becomes:
"What is the nature of Israel's service to the Lord?" or, more existentially, "How will Israel survive outside of Egypt?" The answer is: Submit to the Lord's commands and decrees (Ex. 15:25-26; cf. Lev. 18:5; Deut. 8:21).

Although Israel's complaints in the desert are found only in Exodus 15:22-17:7, legal vocabulary clustered at the beginning and ending of the desert pericope create a frame (A-A') within which the entire desert episode takes place and within which it should be read. Israel's survival—whether they need food and water, is oppressed by their enemies (17:8-16), or suffers internal problems (18)—depends on conformity to the instruction of the Lord.

Submission to the Lord's instruction in the desert pericope, however, does not bring the conflict between the Lord and Israel to a resolution. It only suggests an answer to the question: "How will Israel outside of Egypt (and not yet in the land [cf. 3:8, 17]) survive?" The final resolution to the conflict in the desert is found in the Lord's covenant offer and Israel's submission narrated in Exodus 19-24. At Sinai, confronted with the good things the Lord has done for it (19:4), Israel promises submission to his words (19:8 [יירא י']), and in consequence of the Lord's terrible descent, his presence and declaration of the law, seals their submission with a self-maledictory oath (24:3, 7). This act of vassal submission brings the conflict between the Lord and his people to a legal resolution and answer the question posed by the first conflict—"Whom will Israel serve?"—because at Sinai Israel legally binds themselves to the Lord as the special people he freed from the terrible bondage to Pharaoh (cf. 20:1-2). After Israel seals the covenant, Moses ascends to the top of Sinai where, in God's presence, he receives instructions for the construction of a building in

---


22 Leder, "Reading Exodus to Learn," 28.

23 These instructions do not solve the narrative problem of refusal of instruction as defined in Gen.2-3 (see p. 255 above); that function belongs to Leviticus. The instructions in Exodus are limited to establishing a vassal relationship between the Lord and his people and to the construction of a building where the Lord will be enthroned amidst his people.
which the Lord would dwell in the midst of this special people.\textsuperscript{24} It is while Moses receives these instructions that the third conflict arises.

The Third Conflict: Israel, God, and the Golden Calf

Israel's complaints in the desert pale by comparison with its rebellious construction of the golden calf, the antitabernacle project\textsuperscript{25} by which it defiles the presence of God, compromises the covenant, and exposes itself to destruction (32:10). Such divine destruction Pharaoh experienced because of his stubbornness, and Israel, stubborn like Pharaoh (33:3, 5; 34:9),\textsuperscript{26} would similarly have been consumed by God's anger were it not for the mediator God himself appointed (32:11-14). Israel suffers the consequences of their rebellion (32:27-29, 35), but God relents of his anger, forgives their sin, and renews the covenant (34:27-28). God's forgiveness brings this conflict to resolution.

This resolution, however, does not constitute the end of the narrative. Divine forgiveness only makes possible what God intended for his people: participation in the construction of the sanctuary (Ex. 35-39). God's grace makes possible the construction of the building central to the expression of God's kingship on earth: "Israel and the church have their existence because God picked up the pieces."\textsuperscript{27} Because God forgave his erring and faithless people, the fire that dwells\textsuperscript{28} in their midst did not consume them (40:34-38; cf. 3:3, 24:17), but it could have, and later did so (See Lev. 10:1-3 and Num. 11:1-3.).

\textsuperscript{24} The text reads, "have them make a sanctuary for me, and I will dwell among them" (emphasis added). The building itself has a secondary importance, it facilitates the Lord's dwelling among his people.

\textsuperscript{25} For a brief discussion of this construction as an antitabernacle project, see Fretheim, \textit{Exodus}, 280-81. The verb נָבַע occurs 323 times in Exodus, 236 times in Ex. 25-40, a keyword in the instructions for the tabernacle and the description of Israel's compliance. Before Israel "makes" the tabernacle (Ex. 35:10), they "make" the golden calf (32:1, 4, 8).

\textsuperscript{26} One of the words that describe Israel's stubbornness (נָבַע) also occurs in the triad of verbs that describe Pharaoh's stubbornness (ְבָה, עַל, יָפֵש).\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{27} Childs, \textit{The Book of Exodus}, 580. For more on the role of Ex. 32-34 in its canonical context, see Childs, \textit{Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture}, 175-76.

\textsuperscript{28} Read in isolation from Genesis, Exodus provides no hint that the theme of the Lord's dwelling with Israel is part of its narrative agenda. Seen from perspective of the narrative problem defined by Genesis (exile from the presence of God), and its initial resolution with the call to Abram (move toward the land, i.e., the place where the Lord would dwell), the appearance of this theme at Ex. 25:8 is not a problem. References to the land in Ex. 3:8, 17 can then be read as part of the larger trajectory that will bring Israel into the Lord's presence. That Israel finds itself in God's "tabernacling" presence before it gets to the land is also important: God's presence and the disclosure of Torah are preland realities that are crucial for life in the land. It is in the desert, at Sinai, that God brings about a partial solution to the human problem: He ends the exile of Adam's descendants (those elected through Abraham) and teaches them to live by his word. In this manner, Israel is led to acknowledge that, like Egypt, the promised land has no resources to effect such a resolution (Lev. 18:1-5), claims of the local religions to the contrary.
The third conflict, and its resolution, also answers a question. This time it is: "Who determines Israel's construction projects?" The outcome of the first conflict indicated that Pharaoh had no authority to make Israel build Pithom and Raamses; the conclusion of this conflict is that Israel itself cannot make such determinations either. God's design would be followed (Ex. 25:9).

Summary

Closely linked together, these major conflicts move the Exodus narrative from one master and one construction project to another. The close relationship and special purpose attached to the relationship between the Lord and Israel occasioned the struggle between Pharaoh and the Lord, during which struggle Pharaoh forced Israel to construct his store cities. Freedom from Pharaoh's construction project led to Israel's complaints about sustenance in the desert. The Lord's resolution pointed Israel to his instruction. After Israel's submission at Sinai, the Lord discloses his desire to dwell among his covenant people by means of a building he wants his vassals to construct according to his own design. Later, after God forgives Israel's rebellious antitabernacle construction project, Israel constructs the appurtenances of the tabernacle, Moses assembles the tabernacle, and the Lord's glory cloud dwells in it.29

Narrative and Coherence

The Exodus narrative moves Israel, and the reader, from social chaos, embodied in the forced building of Pharaoh's store cities, to social orderliness, embodied in the construction project of a building that would be central to Israel's existence as descendants of Abraham. The forced building of Pharaoh's store cities forms the deficit, with which the full-grown story begins, and the construction of the tabernacle solves the problem by cancelling the deficit. The cancellation of the deficit, together with the overcoming of the obstacles depicted in the three conflicts, presents the reader with a unified, coherent narrative. The building programs, then, provide the key for a coherent reading of Exodus. They also provide a link to a conceptual pattern that reinforces the

29 The intimate links between the conflicts, and the move from one master and building project to another, argues against the suggestion that chapters 1-15:21 form the climax of the plot of Exodus and that, as such, these chapters generate meaning for the whole of the Pentateuch, as Severino Croatto suggests ("The Function of the Non-fulfilled Promises," 49-50. This thesis is worked out in detail in his "Exodo 1-15: Algunas claves literarias y teologicas para entender el pentateuco," Estudios Bíblicos 52 [1994]: 167-94.). Chapters 1:1-15:21 generate meaning within the Pentateuch only as they contribute to the entire plot of Exodus. Moreover, his failure to include chapters 15:22 through 40:34 excludes Exodus' solution to the narrative problem stated in its opening chapters.

30 Fokkelman, Reading Biblical Narrative, 77.
coherence of Exodus;\textsuperscript{31} that of a king's doing battle against the threat of disorder in the realm. In the remaining part of this article, I will refer to this conceptual pattern as the kingship pattern.

Narrative Coherence and the Kingship Pattern

The kingship pattern depicts a king who, when confronted with disorder in his kingdom, seeks out the enemy, defeats him, and upon his return to the imperial capital builds a structure emblematic of his victory. The pattern is most clearly demonstrated in the extra biblical \textit{Enuma elish} and Baal epics and other accounts of royal victory and temple building.\textsuperscript{32} The abundant evidence of this pattern suggests it is a well-known literary configuration with central, cosmological significance. Biblical studies has recognized the importance of this conceptual pattern and has applied it to the Genesis account of creation, Exodus 15, Psalms 74 and 89, and Isaiah 40-55,\textsuperscript{33} but its relevance for the entire


Exodus narrative has not yet been explored. The elements of the pattern appear in the epics as follows.

**Enuma Elish**

1. The occasion for the conflict:
   b. Marduk will fight for supreme authority III:65-66

2. The kingship:
   a. Kingship is bestowed IV:14

3. The battle:
   a. The battle IV:33-120
      i. Marduk defeats Tiamat with a warbow IV:101
      ii. Salvation of the gods IV:123-46
   b. The creation of man VI:1-44

4. The palace:
   a. Building of the temple Esharra VI:45-77
      i. bricks made for one year VI:60
      ii. erected at beginning of second year VI:61-62
      iii. Marduk sits down in majesty VI:65
      iv. a victory banquet VI:71-77
   b. Marduk's rule VI:78-81
   c. Praise of kingship and proclamation of the fifty names VI:104ff.

**Baal and Yamm**

1. The occasion for the conflict:
   a. Yamm's messengers demand Baal's tribute CTA 2, i:11, 22, 32-38
   b. Ashtarte urges Baal to seize the eternal kingship CTA 2, i:40ff.

2. The battle:
   a. Baal battles Yamm CTA 2, i:11-17
   b. Baal defeats Yamm with a club CTA 2, i:18-31

3. The kingship:
   a. Baal's kingship is proclaimed CTA 2, i:34
   b. The victory banquet CTA 3 A
   c. Complaints: no house for Baal CTA 3 C, E i:46
   d. Baal travels to Mt. Zaphon CTA 4, iv:19

4. The palace:
   a. A dwelling for Baal requested CTA 4, iv:50
   b. Let a house be built CTA 4, iv:61
      i. the mountains will bring gold and silver CTA 4, iv:80
      ii. lapis lazuli CTA 4, iv:81
   c. Anat brings news of permission to Mt. Zaphon CTA 4, iv:88
   d. House of Baal will be the size of Mt. Zaphon CTA 4, iv:119-20


e. Built by Kothar and Hasis CTA 4, vi:17
   i. to Lebanon for cedar CTA 4,  
      vi: 19-21
   ii. fire turns silver and gold into  
      bricks on the seventh day CTA 4,  
      vi:31-34
f. A victory banquet CTA 4, vi:39-55

g. Baal's rule CTA 4, vii:7, 9-12
h. A window is built in Baal's palace CTA 4, vii: 13-28
   i. Palace is the place from which Baal  
      speaks CTA 4, vii:29-55

Although both epics employ the same major elements in similar patterns, there are some differences: Marduk's kingship is proclaimed before the battle, and the description of Baal's palace construction is more extensive. Extant royal inscriptions recall the king's heroic deeds but do not regularly mention conflict as an antecedent for the building of a temple. Nevertheless, Tadmor has shown that when such inscriptions do change their format, they continue to function as ideological expressions of royal rule. Later inscriptions extol the king's might through his building accomplishments alone; his heroic deeds are not mentioned. Thus, although these literary-historiographical conventions were not strictly limited to a particular sequence they were continually used to communicate the image the king wanted to project.

An examination of Exodus discloses a similar general pattern.

1. The occasion for conflict:
   a. Pharaoh's oppression Ex. 1-2:25
   b. The Lord's messengers demand  
      Pharaoh's submission Ex. 3:1-7:7

36 See also Hanson, The Dawn, 302-3, who also suggests that this pattern is found in the Apsu-Ea conflict in tablet 1: Threat (37-58), Combat-Victory (59-70), Temple built (71-77). Millar, Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic, 71-81, discerns the Baal-Yamm, Baal-Anat-Mot, and Baal-Mot cycles. The Baal-Mot cycle includes a threat to consume humanity if Baal does not turn over one of his brothers to satisfy Mot's rage (CTA 6v, 20-25).


39 Ibid., 14. The pattern does not need to be copied slavishly, as Hanson, The Dawn, 303, argues in his discussion of judges 5. Later (pp. 308-11), he discusses the prophetic abandonment of the (royal) pattern and its reemergence in the exilic and postexilic eras.
THE COHERENCE OF EXODUS

2. The battle:
   a. The conflict
   Ex. 7:8-11:10
   b. The exodus
   Ex. 12:1-13:16
   c. Pharaoh's defeat
   Ex. 13:17-14:31

3. The kingship:
   a. The Lord's victory and proclamation of kingship
   Ex. 15:1-21
   b. The Lord takes Israel to Mt. Sinai
   Ex. 15:22-19:2
   c. The Lord makes Israel his people
   Ex. 19:3-24:11

4. The Lord's palace:
   a. The Lord will dwell among Israel
   Ex. 24:12-25:9
   b. Building instructions
   Ex. 25:10-31:18
   c. Israel's rebellion
   Ex. 32:1-34:35
   d. Tabernacle and furniture crafted
   Ex. 35-39:31
   e. Moses inspects the work and blesses the people
   Ex. 39:42, 43
   f. Moses instructed to set up הָנָשָׁם on first day of second year
   Ex. 40:1, 2
   g. Moses sets up the tabernacle in seven acts
   Ex. 40:17-33
   h. The Lord dwells in the הָנָשָׁם
   Ex. 40:34-38

There are significant differences between Exodus and the nonbiblical stories. The Lord builds his own palace; Baal needs El's consent. The Lord's people craft the tabernacle and contribute the gold and silver themselves; in the Baal epic the gods' craftsman, Kothar wa Hassis, does all the work, and the materials were generally brought in from the mountains. Finally, where in the ancient Near East temples were considered a resting place for the gods, in Exodus the הָנָשָׁם is only the temporary means for the Lord's dwelling in the midst of (Ex.

40 Cross, Canaanite Myth, 142.
41 Gudea brought the materials from the Cedar mountain, having made paths and quarries where none had gone before. "Cylinder A, " xv-vxi 24. Eanatum brought white cedar from the mountains (Cooper, Sumerian and Akkadian Royal Inscriptions, 49). Bringing in such materials and the finest crafts from the periphery to the cosmic center represents the completeness of creation at its center: "at the center of the world there is everything, all is known, all is possessed-creation is complete." Mario Liverani, "The Ideology of the Assyrian Empire," in Power and Propaganda, Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology, no. 7, ed. Mogens Trolle Larsen (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979), 314. See also Pritchard, ANETSup, 275-76 on Tiglath-Pileser I and Assurnasirpal II's journeys to get cedar from the mountains.
25:8; 1 Kings 8:27-30), and later for leading, his people. Nevertheless, the general coincidence of the pattern allows a reflection on its usefulness for understanding the coherence of Exodus.

The kingship pattern does not structure but underscores the coherence of the narrative and provides a key to its meaning. It underscores the coherence of Exodus first, not only because Exodus employs all the elements of the pattern in telling its story but also because the pattern accounts for the entire narrative, unlike the lamentation liturgy suggested by Plastaras and Westermann, which accounts only for Exodus 1:1-15:21.43 Second, because the pattern reaches its climax in a building project, it reinforces the literary frame of the narrative: the building of Pharaoh's store cities in Exodus 1 and the construction of the Great King's earthly dwelling place in Exodus 35:4-40:33. In this connection, it is important to recognize that the Hebrew עבד is used to describe Israel's work on the tabernacle (מָסַר 39:32, 42) and its work on the store cities (מָסַר, 1:14 ["slavery," 2:23, 6:9]). The difference between the two projects is that Pharaoh forced Israel to build his cities, whereas the Lord's forgiveness led Israel voluntarily (Ex. 35:21; 36:6b) to participate in the construction of the tabernacle. In addition, and related to the former, the fourth element of the pattern, the building project, coincides with the narrative's cancellation of the deficit. The cancellation of this deficit is supported by the wordplay between מָסַר (Ex. 1:14) and מָסַר (39:32,33,40; 40:2, 5, 6,9, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 33, and esp. 34-38). Third, the elements of the pattern link the tabernacle section, both covenant and tabernacle instructions, naturally to the preceding events that took place in Egypt, the desert, and at Mt. Sinai and cast them into a coherent narrative. In a cultural context where the kingship pattern was prevalent, it would only be natural to read, after consolidating the victory at Sinai, that the victorious king engaged in a construction project to memorialize the event in some way. In these ways, the kingship pattern supports the coherence of the narrative discerned in its plot structure and development.

The completion of the kingship pattern in Exodus 40 also brings us back to the deficit with which the biblical narrative begins in Genesis: Adam and Eve expelled from God's presence in the Garden of Eden for refusal of divine instruction. In Exodus, when the glory cloud fills the newly constructed tabernacle, God dwells in the midst of the descendants of Adam and Eve through Abraham and Sarah. Adam's descendants are in God's presence not because they found their way back but because God has brought them to himself (Ex. 19:4). Moreover, they are not in his immediate presence: Israel's sinfulness requires a distance (Ex. 19:13; cf. Num. 1:53) that can only be overcome by a specially appointed priesthood (Ex. 29:1; Num. 18:1-7; cf. Heb. 9:19-25). The

43 See footnote 31.
elements of the text that point us in this direction are the phrases in Exodus 39 and 40 that recall the creation narrative:\textsuperscript{44}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thus the heavens and the earth were completed. By the seventh day God had finished the work he had been doing (Gn 2:1-2)</th>
<th>So all the work on the tabernacle was completed. (Ex 39:32) And so Moses finished the work. (Ex 40:33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God saw all that he had made, and (behold, [יהוה]) it was very good. (Gn 1:31)</td>
<td>Moses inspected the work and saw (behold, [יהוה]) they had done it just as the Lord had commanded. (Ex 39:43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And God blessed the seventh day... (Gn2:3)</td>
<td>And Moses blessed them. (Ex 39:43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and made it holy... (Gn 2:3)</td>
<td>...consecrate (the tabernacle and the altar) (Ex 40:9,10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evocation of Genesis 1 and 2 suggests that a proper understanding of the coherence of Exodus is linked to the exposition of the fundamental conflict between God and humanity depicted in Genesis 1-3. With that fundamental conflict in mind, Exodus resolves, tentatively, the problem of humanity's exile from God's presence but does not provide the instruction that safeguards life in the divine presence. Leviticus provides that aspect of the solution to the problem.

The kingship pattern also lends conceptual coherence to Exodus by rendering explicit the meaning implicit in the royal metaphor that shapes Exodus throughout. The noun king is applied consistently to Pharaoh but never to the Lord; his royal status is acknowledged only in the clause "The LORD will reign " (יְהֹוָה, Ex. 15:18). The Lord's kingship does not, of course, depend on the title; his actions disclose who he is. Only a Great King could have done to Pharaoh and Egypt what he did. The kingship pattern supports this not only in the conflict with Egypt but also in the rest of the narrative, including Israel's survival in the desert where God's divisions travel to Mt. Sinai, a journey not unlike

the return\textsuperscript{45} to the empire's center,\textsuperscript{46} its capital, of the great armies of an ancient overlord such as Shalmaneser III or Assurnasirpal; the solemnization of suzerain-vassal covenant between the Lord and Israel; and the instructions and final construction of a royal dwelling place.

The Meaning of Exodus

As a "royal inscription" of a Great King's victory over disorder in his empire, Exodus not only recalls the fundamental conflict between God and humanity and proclaims the Lord's victory over it at the Sea but also witnesses to the construction of a concrete historical monument that proclaims his cosmic\textsuperscript{47} rule from a historically particular building: the tabernacle in the midst of Israel. As a coherent royal inscription, Exodus must be heard as a whole--not from the perspective of one of its subplots, such as the victory at the Sea\textsuperscript{48}--or even that of the Sinai covenant legislation but from the viewpoint of the cancellation of the narrative deficit: the "incarnation" of the triumphant King in the midst of his vassal people in the tabernacle. Neither victory at the Sea, Israel's submission to the covenant, nor the Lord's forgiveness of Israel's idolatry--individually or together--can express the full meaning of the Exodus narrative for they do not resolve the fundamental narrative problem of the Pentateuch that Exodus' plot structure develops: disobedient humanity's exile from God's presence. That resolution only occurs with the glory cloud's indwelling of the tabernacle. From this building Israel receives the holiness instructions that permit life in God's consuming fire presence (Lev. 1:1-2).


\textsuperscript{48} So J. Severino Croatto, see above footnote 29.
It is this building, the place the Lord chose for his name to dwell, especially in its subsequent transformation as the temple on Mt. Zion in Jerusalem, that is central to the Lord's administration of his rule over Israel (1 Kings 8:22-53). The nations will also stream to Jerusalem and from it the torah, the Lord's instruction, will flow to them (Isa. 2:2-4; cf. Isa. 19 with respect to Egypt and Assyria), for none of Adam's descendants can do without God's presence or his instruction. However, when Israel defiles God's presence, the glory cloud departs from the temple (Ezek. 8-10), God permits his servant Nebuchadnezzar Jer. 25:9; 27:6; 43:10) to destroy Jerusalem and the temple, and removes Israel from his presence (2 Kings 24:3, 20; cf. 2 Kings 17:18, 20, 23). According to the New Testament, the body of Christ becomes the temple of God's presence John 1:14; 2:20-21; 1 Cor. 3:16) and Jerusalem loses its centrality: The Lord's disciples move from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8) with the good news of the gospel, the torah of the Lord Jesus.49 Thus, the building project begun in Exodus continues until a temple is no longer necessary and all the nations enjoy the presence of the Great King and walk by the light of the Lamb in the New Jerusalem (Rev. 21:22-27), the joy of the whole earth (Ps. 48:2).

Reading Exodus to Learn and Learning to Read Exodus

Arie C. Leder

Those who read little, learn little about reading; but the little they learn is applied to all they read. Contemporary devotional reading of Scripture has much in common with the fragmentary approach of the critics a generation ago: here a verse, there a clause, everywhere a tidbit. But, with the possible exception of individual proverbs,1 biblical texts do not suffer fragmentary reading willingly nor with impunity. Like a love letter, they are meant to be read in their entirety, from beginning to end. Only by reading and rereading will the addressed lover encounter the depth of the sentiments expressed and thus learn to read the letter as it was intended to be heard. That takes time, commitment, and concentration. Unlike a love letter, however, reading of Scripture is a communal activity. We do not come to Scripture de novo; we read through the well-informed eyes of our ancestors in the faith. By reading and rereading in their light, we learn to read Scripture, we hope, as it was intended to be heard. In addition to time, commitment, and concentration, this will require the humility to listen to those who have gone before us.

Of course, reading starts with the text itself. But, what is the shape of the text? Where do we begin and end? When we select a novel by P. D. James or a sonnet by Browning, the question seems almost impertinent. But a comparison of commentaries on the Pentateuch published in this century will reveal great disagreement: Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Tetratetuch? Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and so forth, or J, E, JE, D, or P, or maybe the Sinai pericope (Ex. 19-Num. 10:10)?2 Similarly the extent of pericopes within Exodus: 1:1-2:25 or 1:1-2:22? 2:23-4:17 or 3:1-4:31? In this article, I will read the text traditionally known as Exodus using six steps that will require time, commitment, and concentration.

1 The social use of proverbs appears to give them an independent existence. Nevertheless, whether social or literary, proverbs function in context. In Scripture they are all embedded in larger textual reality. See Raymond C. Van Leeuwen, Context and Meaning in Proverbs 25-27, SBL Dissertations Series 96 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

Defining Six Steps for Reading to Learn

The Beginning and Ending of the Text

Before reading the entire narrative it is helpful to become familiar with the beginning and ending of the text. Examining these will alert the reader to the narrative problem and its basic themes, usually defined at the beginning, and the manner of their treatment and resolution at the end. Familiarity with the rhetorical device of repetition of key words and phrases will enable the reader to recognize the parameters within which the narrative unfolds. This technique discloses the frame within which the narrative action takes place and the frame that limits the reader's narrative field of reference. For example, after determining that Exodus 1-40 is the object of our analysis, study of the desert narrative will be limited to 15:22-18:27. It will exclude the desert narrative in Numbers, except for purposes of comparison. Within the parameters described by the text's beginning and ending, it will be the reader's task to fix precisely what the text says, and to explain how the text does so. The same mechanism applies to the definition of pericopes within Exodus.

Reading the Entire Text

Consideration of the beginning and ending naturally leads to the following step: to discern the relationship between the beginning and the ending by reading the entire text, observing throughout the reading how the initial motifs, or narrative problem, develop to a final resolution. While this step assumes that the text between the beginning and ending is capable of development or organization, it does not determine the nature of that organization. Thus, the narrative order of the text is not imposed, nor predetermined, but searched out. Reading the entire text in one sitting is preferrable in order to receive the maximum impact of the narrative's continuity and development. If this is not possible, two or three sittings will do.

3 The importance of understanding the beginning and ending of a literary unit was emphasized by James Muilenburg ("Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 [1996]: 12-13): "The first concern of the rhetorical critic... is to define the limits or scope of the literary unit, to recognize how it begins and how it ends... A second clue for determining the scope of a pericope is to discern the relation of beginning to end, where the opening words are repeated or paraphrased at the close..." In his study of the Pentateuch (*The Pentateuch*, 43-56), Fretheim discusses the beginning and ending of the Pentateuch.

4 The consequences of breaking such a frame and the significance of a text are discussed by Erich Auerbach when treating the secularization of the medieval mystery plays, in Erich Auerbach, "Adam and Eve," in *The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 160.

5 Under the influence of the critical methodologies these two distinct narrative units were often treated harmonistically.
Key Words and Phrases

Throughout this reading, the reader should note the themes that are developed and the new ones being introduced. These are often indicated by key words or phrases. A keyword, or phrase, is repeated meaningfully within a text or series of texts. Not every word or root which is repeated within a text or sequence of texts can be considered a key word. In this connection attention should be paid to three aspects: (1) how frequently the word is used in the Bible; (2) how frequently the word is used within the text or series of texts; (3) how near the repeated words are as regards their position in the text. The greater the frequency of the word in the Bible, the more densely should it occur (more often or with greater proximity); and the rarer it is, the less intensively need it occur (less often and at a greater distance).6

The clustering of key words in a text and their reappearance or absence in subsequent, or slightly different contexts, contribute to meaning of the text byway of commentary, analysis, anticipation, or dramatic assertion. Sometimes a key word repetition involves paranomasia, a play on words, by means of a small vowel or consonantal change.

Consider the following examples from Genesis.7 The word there (משם) plays a crucial role in Genesis 11:1-9. In this brief narrative there refers not only to the place of humanity's gathering but also to the location from which the Lord scatters them. At the same time, name ( próxima) occurs twice: Humanity wants to make a name for itself; it receives a name from the Lord-Babel, "confusion." Thus, there where humanity wanted a name, becomes the there from which humanity is expelled and where it receives a name. Significantly, proxima, the word name reappears in Genesis 12:2. The Lord will make Abram's name great, not Abram in the style of Babel. Another significant repetition in the Babel narrative, the phrase, "all the earth" (כל הארץ) occurs once at the beginning, twice in the development of the narrative, and twice in the last verse. As with the words there and name, this phrase participates in the divine reversal of human intentions. Both of these keywords and phrases frame the text with vocabulary crucial for the depiction of the text's central action and for defining the outside limits of the text. The mini clusters of the key words and the key phrase at the end of the text underscore its central interest and the reversal. Thus, key words and phrases not only contribute to understanding the significance of the text but also to its structure.

6 Shimon Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art in the Bible (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989), 212.
7 From here on, Gen. 11:1-9 will be the illustrative example.
The Organization of the Text

A single reading of a text is insufficient to determine the narrative order, organization, or structure of the text. Several attentive readings of the text that include examination of the beginning and end of the narrative, its development, and the occurrence and location of key words prepare the reader for the next step: an examination of the text to determine its organization or structure. Staying with our example of Genesis 11:1-9, the following observations are pertinent. An examination of the narrative and speech portions shows that in verses 1-4, the narrative focuses on what the human community proposes to do in order to prevent being scattered about the earth. But in verse 5, the text switches to the divine perspective. When God comes down to examine the situation, his speech of reversal mimics the residents' speech ("Come, let us . . .," vv. 3, 4; "Come, let us . . .," v. 7). Thus, the narrative movement from the expressed desire of "all the earth" to build community and a reputation, to the divine response that ends in the dispersal of the community with an unwanted reputation, suggests that the text is composed of two scenes: verses 1-4 and 5-9. Verse 5 functions as the pivot upon which the reversal turns: "But the Lord came down. . . ."8

This brief study of Genesis 11:1-9 also suggests four criteria for discerning the text's constituent parts, either internally or in relationship to its context. First there is a **significant shift in major characters**, from the human to the divine; or place, from the perspective of the earth to that of heaven. The inclusios or frames created by the appearance of הַיְדַרְדּוּן יִשְׂרָאֵל at the beginning and ending of the text is an example of how, second, framing repetitions are useful devices for uncovering the structure of a text. Third, **iconographic grouping** around a particular theme, present in Genesis 11:1-9 in the moving toward a place for unity and the scattering from that place provides narrative unity. Hence, the shift to another theme also suggests that the narrative is moving to depict another concern. Finally, the presence of a **culminating** or **summarizing scene** at the end of a series of episodic scenes, indicates the end of a narrative section. Genesis 11:1-9 itself is the last narrative scene of Genesis 1:1-11:26 (Gen. 11:10-26 is genealogical). The first two criteria for distinguishing scenes are well known and acknowledged in biblical and literary studies; the others merit further consideration. I will briefly discuss these with reference to ancient Near Eastern pictorial narrative.

Irene J. Winter's study of the Standard of Ur shows that the narrative is composed of a series of registers. Reading from the bottom up,

---

the horizontal registers progress from battle chariots at the bottom to the gathering of prisoners in the middle to the presentation of the prisoners before a larger central figure, presumably a ruler, at the top. On the other side, the scene proceeds from the amassing of pack animals and goods in the lower register to the procession of food animals and men bearing fish in the middle to the banquet in the upper register that is again dominated by a slightly larger figure in a flounced skirt, probably the ruler. In fact, the dominant, primary position of the ruler at the center of the upper register of the battle side, the culmination of the sequence, is comparable to the position of Eannatum in the upper register of the Stele of Vultures.⁹

According to Winter each register is unique in its depiction by means of the technique of **iconographic grouping**, in which each register is dominated by one central image or icon: amassing for battle, presentation of prisoners, and so forth. The juxtaposition of the individual registers forms a series of episodes whose narrative progression is linear and tends to a particular image that the artist wants to impress upon the audience. This impression the artist places at the end of a series of narrative reliefs, in the **culminating scene**, a register that summarizes the essence of the antecedent account by depicting the central event and its major characters. According to Ann Perkins, the culminating scene depicts "one group of figures, one moment of time, at the climax of a series of events."¹⁰

Iconographic grouping and the culminating scene as organizational devices are not foreign to biblical literature. For example, Ian Parker Kim argues that the "disappearance of three royal enemies in the first part of the frame story is paralleled by the appearance of three royal enemies in the second part of the frame story."¹¹ Grouping of particular characters serves to segment a particular unit and helps us to understand some of its thematic significance. Genesis 11:1-9 fits Perkins' definition of a culminating scene. It stands at the end of a series of events (from creation to this narrative moment), there is a basic group of figures (the Lord and the descendants of Adam [יָכוֹנְנֵי אָדָם 11:5]) at one

---


moment in time (the expulsion by confusion). The image this scene leaves behind is clear: Adam's descendants cannot thwart the Lord's purposes, they will have to take account of heaven in all their cultural activities.

The Argument

The first four steps constitute a geographic reconnaissance of the text in which the reader becomes familiar with the landscape of the text; its hills, valleys, straight places, and unexpected features. Moving from this reconnaissance to the text's significance without keeping its major features in mind allows the reader to forget or avoid parts of the textual landscape. For example, discussions of the Babel passage often emphasize the tower but forget both the city and the fact that after the Lord's descent, they stopped building the city, not the tower. (Artistic representations of this narrative often depict an unfinished tower.) By neglecting the city, the reader can also ignore the city-state imperial structure of that time, a not unimportant feature for hearing the text. Similarly, Exodus commentaries often pay only lip service to the tabernacle section, although it occupies ten chapters of the narrative. Such a practice can only result in a superficial grasp of the text's significance.

Thus, after reviewing the beginning and the ending, understanding the development of the narrative with its key words and phrases, and discerning the structure or narrative order, it is important to state the argument of the text. The argument, the subject of the discourse or an outline, not a debate or controversy, consists of a reduced narration of what the text recounts in great detail; at the same time it preserves substantively the most important details. The purpose of this exercise is to fix most exactly and clearly what the surface structure of the narrative states before moving on to the significance of the text. By using the text's own narrative sequence and vocabulary, closeness to the text is best preserved. Stating the argument of the text is the crucial first step toward understanding its purpose or intention. As an example, I suggest the following as the argument of Genesis 11:1-9:

When all the earth was of one speech people gathered at Shinar. There they decided to build a city with a tower to make a name for themselves and to keep from being scattered over the earth. The Lord came down to see the

12 Calvin prefaces his commentary on Genesis with an argument. See his Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis, trans. John King (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 57-66. The argument proper is stated on pp. 64-65. For further discussion on argument and scope see Gerald T. Sheppard, "Between Reformation and Modern Commentary: The Perception of the Scope of Biblical Books," in A Commentary on Galatians: William Perkins, Pilgrim Classic Commentaries, ed. Gerald T. Sheppard (New York: Pilgrim, 1989), xlviii-lxxvii. A good contemporary example of the argument, called the story line, of the Pentateuch is found in Joseph Blenkinsopp, The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 31-33. Because Genesis 11:1-9 is short, the argument seems inordinately long. This is the result of paying close attention to several key words that are crucial for the text's significance.
city and its tower Adam's descendants were building. Having determined to confound them by confusing their language, the Lord scattered them over the whole earth, so they stopped building the city. He called the city Babel because from there he confused their language and scattered them over all the earth.

Note how I have maintained the text's indefinite subject "they" until they are defined as "Adam's descendants" in the context of the Lord's descent (v. 5). This crucial conjunction of subjects in the middle of the text coincides with the pivot fiat divides the text into two subunits. Naming the Babel builders "Adam's descendants" also links this text with the beginning of human history and the first city builder, Cain, firstborn son of Adam (Gen. 4:17).

The Theme

When the argument of the text is clearly formulated, including the essential details of the text, it is possible to define the theme of the text. By removing the details of the argument, the theme appears as the clearest expression of what the author wants to communicate. Thus, the theme of Genesis 11:1-9 is: The Lord scatters the descendants of Adam over the whole earth by confusing their language at Babel.

In summary, the steps for an attentive reading\(^\text{13}\) of the text are: (1) Examine the beginning and ending of the narrative. (2) Read the entire text to uncover the development of the text. (3) Identify the key words and phrases. (4) Determine the text's organization or structure.\(^\text{14}\) (5) State the argument of the text. (6) Formulate the theme of the text. In the rest of this article, I will use these steps to read Exodus.

Learning to Read Exodus

The Beginning and Ending

An examination of the beginning and ending of Exodus uncovers several themes indicated by the repetition of key words or phrases. They are blessing, filling the earth, building, slavery, and the mountain. Together they form the frame within which the narrative action takes place. I will briefly examine each one of these elements of the frame.

\(^{13}\) These ideas for reading a text are based on the work of Fernando Lazaro Carreter and Evaristo Correa Calderon, *Como se comenta un texto literario* (How to Explain a Literary Text [Madrid: Ediciones catedra, 1980]).

\(^{14}\) As discussed above, the following would be involved in the definition of structure: (a) major change in characters or shift of location, (b) framing repetitions, (c) iconographic grouping, and, (d) culminating scene.
From Blessing to Blessing

After reviewing the arrival of Jacob and his sons, the opening verses of chapter 1 recall Joseph's earlier arrival and his death. But death will not be the last word for these descendants of Abraham, for they live under the marvellous promise of blessing (Gen. 15:5; 22:17). Using the familiar words of the blessing from Genesis 1:28; and 9:1,7, repeated to the patriarchs (Gen. 17:2, 6; 26:4, 23; 35:11), the Exodus narrative counters death in Joseph's generation: "but the Israelites were fruitful (פרת) and multiplied greatly (בראשא) and became exceedingly numerous (פרתא), so that the land was filled (פלתא) with them" (1:7). The Lord's promise of blessing to Israel is fulfilled in Egypt more than that, since these words echo the blessing spoken in Genesis 1 and 9, the Lord's benediction upon all the descendants of Adam and Eve (the nations) is also partially fulfilled. That is, even as all the world came to Egypt to be saved from death by famine through the work of Joseph son of Abraham (Gen. 41:56-57), so now in Egypt, what God wanted for the world is coming true through the instrumentality of Abraham (Gen. 12:3). Exodus begins with a word of blessing, and it reminds the reader that what God began to do with Abraham is being fulfilled in Egypt.

Exodus also ends with blessing. After Israel makes the tent of meeting, its furnishings, and the priestly apparel, we read: "The Israelites had done all the work just as the Lord had commanded Moses. Moses inspected the work and saw that they had done it just as the Lord had commanded. So Moses blessed them" (39:42-43). Two things are remarkable about this text: its echo of Genesis 1:31-2:3 and the object of Moses' blessing.

Parallels between Exodus 39-40 and Genesis 1:31-2:3 have long been recognized. Pertinent are the following texts:

**Genesis**

God saw all that he had made (כל אלהים טוב) and it (היה) was very good. (1:31)

Thus the heavens and earth were completed (יוכל) in all (כלל) their vast array. (2:1)

God finished the work he had been doing (וכל אלהים trabalho) in six days (מלאאץ אפרעם) (2:2)

**Exodus**

Moses inspected the work (כל trabalו) and saw that they had done it (创业板) just as the Lord had commanded (39:43)

So was completed all (וכל כל) the work on the Tabernacle, the Tent of Meeting. (39:32)

And so Moses finished the work. (יוכל 마שה את trabalו) (40:33)

---

And God blessed (יהב) the seventh day. (2:3)

So Moses blessed them (ה_tensors) (39:43)

These parallel texts in Exodus describe Israel and Moses doing what God does in Genesis: the work of creation and blessing. Minimally this suggests that the activities of creating and making the tabernacle are linked--maximally that they are analogical--the tabernacle being a microcosm of the creation. This analogy is reinforced by the reference to Israel's work on the tabernacle (משכן, 39:32) and its echo in Genesis 2:15, where Adam and Eve are instructed to work (עבוד, וַהֲבָא) and guard (Gen. 2:15) the garden in God's presence. Gordon J. Wenham has argued that these verbs are only used elsewhere to describe the Levites' duty in working and guarding the tabernacle. He concludes that "if Eden is seen... as an ideal sanctuary, then perhaps Adam should be described as an archetypal Levi."16 If this is a correct reading, it suggests that Israel's work (作り, 39:32) on the tabernacle is similar to that of Adam's: priestly activity in the mediate presence of God.

Strikingly, after finishing their "priestly" work, the Israelites bring the appurtenances of the tabernacle to Moses and he blesses them, even as God had blessed Adam and Eve (Gen. 1:28). At the end of Exodus, the descendants of Adam and Eve by way of Abraham receive Moses' blessing. Unlike the rest of Adam's descendants who continue life outside of God's presence, these children of Adam and Abraham are beginning to enjoy the presence of God again and to do the work for which all of Adam's descendants were created.

The blessing of Moses in Exodus 39, then, fulfills a double duty: It recalls God's blessing depicted at the opening of Genesis as well as the blessing to which Exodus 1:7 refers by means of its vocabulary. Thus, the ending of Exodus links Israel to God's universal purposes both by recalling the beginning of the biblical narrative and by the particularist application of the blessing at the beginning of Exodus--an application operative in the Old Testament epoch of the biblical narrative. It is the particularist application of blessing, by reference to Israel's growth and priestly work in the Lord's mediate presence, that forms a frame for the Exodus narrative.

From the Filling of the Land to the Filling of the Earth

As a result of the Lord's blessing, Abraham's descendants fill the land (אתים, 1:7; cf. Gen. 1:28: (אתים, אֲנָחָה) of Egypt. In the opinion of the lord of the land, Israel's swarming multitudes threatens its stability. With

---


17 This noun along with and the verb דיבר; form an import cluster of key words that focus the narrative on Israel's servitude, whether that of Pharaoh or of me Lord.
Babel-like language\(^{18}\) the text describes Pharaoh's cruel attempts to contain Israel, but the harder he works them the more Israel grows (1:12, 20) and, presumably, fills the land. At the end of the narrative, after Moses assembles the tabernacle "the glory of the Lord filled (כָּלְמָא) the tabernacle" (40:34, 35). This key word repetition of the verb "to fill" forms an inclusio for the book. What, is the relationship between the occurrences of this verb at the beginning and ending of Exodus?

"The land" (כָּלְמָא) can refer to a specific country such as Canaan (Gen. 12:1), or the whole earth as in Genesis 1:1, 28. Egypt is obviously the primary referent in Exodus 1:7, but its specific blessing vocabulary recalls Genesis 1:28, which focuses on the whole earth. This requires that "the land" in 1:7 perform double duty, a task that supplies a profound ambiguity in 1:7: Israel's filling of the land of Egypt is not only a realization of God's promises to Abraham but also a partial realization of the Lord's purposes for Adam's descendants—to fill the whole earth. Again, the redemptively particular work of the Lord is linked with his originally universal purposes.

Similarly the Lord's "filling" the tabernacle in Exodus 40. Numbers 14:21 states what is apparently a present reality: "as surely as the glory of the Lord fills the whole earth" (כָּלְמָא כֹּבֵד יהוה את כָּלְמָא), as do the words of the cherubim: "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord Almighty; the whole earth is full of his glory" (Isa. 6:3). This reality, that the whole earth is full of the glory of the Lord, is only revealed to Israel at this point (cf. Ps. 147:19-20); it is not acknowledged by the rest of Adam's descendants. According to Paul, it is sinfully ignored (Rom. 1:18-20). But in Israel's midst this reality is anticipated by the Lord's filling of the tabernacle, the microcosm of the creation. Thus, Israel's filling of "the land" and the Lord's filling of the tabernacle both anticipate subsequent redemptive acts that will more fully disclose this truth (John 1:14): the Lord fills the earth (Acts 1:8) with his people (Acts 2:4; Eph. 1:23; Col. 2:10).

From Building for Egypt to Construction in the Presence of God

Pharaoh's fear of Israel's rapid growth generates his decision to force Israel to build the store cities of Pithom and Rameses. The decision to limit Israel's growth by subordinating her strength to the extension of Pharaoh's renown sets him in conflict with the Lord's promise to bless Israel by immense growth. It is not strange, therefore, that the construction materials, "mortar and bricks" (בָּדַיְמָא ובָּלָבַנִּים, 1:14) recall the Babel episode (Gen. 11:3). This paradigmatic episode for human cultural rebellion against God now functions as the hermeneutical background that defines Pharaoh's action as a challenge against the Creator. But his challenge fails; Abraham's descendants swarm all over Egypt (1:7, 12). Nevertheless, Pharaoh insists on yoking (בָּדַיְמָא, 1:13, 14)

\(^{18}\) Note the imperative plus cohortative construction נַתֵּן פְּחַמקָה in 1:10 and the building materials: brick and mortar in 1:14 (cf. Gen. 11:3, 4).
Israel to the interests of his rule; their work (עֶבֶד, 1:13, 14) will build Pharaoh's store cities (עַבְדֵי מַשָּׁכֹת, 1:11).

At the beginning of Exodus, Israel, vassals of the Lord because they are Abraham's descendants, is Pharaoh's de facto vassal people; they work to build his store cities (עַבְדֵי מַשָּׁכֹת). When the Lord acknowledges their cries, he remembers his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (2:23-25) and begins a process that ends in Pharaoh's defeat, Israel's rescue, and a formal covenant ceremony that makes them his special people (19:4-6). At the end of the narrative, they are still building, but now they are constructing the tabernacle (מִשְׁכָּן, 39:32). Thus, the text links Israel's work on the cities and Lord's dwellingplace by assonance: miskan/mishkan. With this wordplay, the text constructs a frame for the narrative: the building of the kingdom of Pharaoh and the building that expresses the reign of God.

From the Land of Slavery to the Land of Service

In addition to Israel's growth, Pharaoh fears that Israel may "go up from the land" (אֵל אֶת הָעָרָים, 1:10). Their leaving implies a loss of valuable service and a loss of face for Pharaoh. But, by the end of the narrative, Israel is on the way, although not on their own; their movements depend upon the lifting (וַיִּקָּח, 40:36, 37) of the glory cloud from the tabernacle (40:36, 37). Israel is on the way to the Promised Land. Although the words the land do not occur at the end of the narrative, the audience knows the promise that the Lord will take them from Egypt, "to bring them up out of that land into a good and spacious land, a land flowing with milk and honey" (בֵּית הָעָבֶד אֲרֵךְ יָמִים הָהֵמָה אֲרֵךְ יָמִים הָאֲדָמָה הָיוּ מִזְבַּח לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, 3:8). The verb "to bring up" (וַיִּקָּח) is also used to depict the movement of the glory cloud from the tabernacle (40:36-38). Israel has become a pilgrim community, but does not wander aimlessly in the desert; the glory cloud leads. Thus, the goal is clear: The Lord is directing them toward the land of Abraham's hope (Gen. 12:1), there to serve him alone (עֲבַד, 23:24, 25).

From the Mountain to the Tabernacle

In the opening scene of Exodus 3, God speaks to Moses from the burning bush in the vicinity of "the mountain of God." In the presence of this theophanic fire (שָׁמָי, 3:3) Moses must remove his shoes. Similarly, when the fire appears on Mt. Sinai, God prohibits Israel from coming close, lest they die.

---

19 Moshe Greenberg writes that "our story assumes that Pharaoh claimed absolute authority over all in his domain. For the Israelites to win their freedom . would not have been so much a loss to Egypt's economy . as a blow to that authority." Later, concerning the phrase, "going up from Egypt," he comments that it "is thematic to the whole account of the Egyptian sojourn." See his Understanding Exodus (New York: Behrman House, 1969), 22-23.
(19:13). After the covenant has been sealed, Israel sees the glory of God as "a consuming fire" (אֶלֶף, 24:17) in contrast to "the bush which did not burn" (אֶלֶף נִנְסֵנָה אֶלֶף, 3:2). The fire of the Lord's presence is potentially life threatening for Israel. At the end of the narrative this dangerous presence is in Israel's midst, hovering over the tabernacle (40:38). The theophanic fire is also part of the frame that encloses the Exodus narrative.

Conclusion

The frame of Exodus enables an integral reading of the narrative by compelling the reader to account for the whole text according to its elements as repeated at the beginning and the ending. Recognizing these elements will guide the reading of the entire text by reminding the reader of the narrative threads interwoven throughout the text and by moving the reader toward the consciously designed ending. Attention to these elements and the way they develop also helps avoid a tendentious or partial interpretation. This frame tells the reader that the narrator takes Israel from slavery to Pharaoh to service in the presence of God. The narrator tells this story by organizing the paragraphs, or subunits, into the narrative before us. So that the audience will properly hear this narrative, essential to its being and survival, it is crucial to discern the limits, organization, and juxtaposition of these subunits.

The Development of the Narrative

Reading Exodus from beginning to ending helps the reader to become familiar with the landscape of the text so that subsequent detailed study is anchored in and shaped by the contours of the text's particular interests. Such a reconnaissance seeks answers to questions such as: What is happening? Who is involved? What literary devices shape the narrative? Where do significant


21 It is important to recognize that canonical literature is read often, that the reader does not come to the text de novo, but time and again. Unlike mystery novels, it is crucial to read the Bible, and the individual books within it, in the light of the ending. Without the ending, of Exodus or Scripture as a whole, we would be engaged in a "hopeless" reading.

22 For example, readings of Exodus that focus primarily on the liberation from Egypt such as J. Severino Croatto, Exodus: A Hermeneutics of Freedom (New York: Maryknoll, 1981) Jorge V. Pixley, On Exodus: A Liberationist Perspective trans. Robert R Barr (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1987); or, a reading that reduces to a minimum the interpretation of the tabernacle narrative such as Rita J. Burns, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers with Excurses on Feasts/Ritual and Typology (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1983), 180-81. This is typical of many commentaries on Exodus.
changes in texture occur? What are the markers that indicate such changes? Now that some of these questions have been addressed in the opening and closing chapters of Exodus, I turn to a first reading of the text to discern the development of the narrative.

Reading Exodus from Beginning to End

The opening chapters introduce the protagonists of the narrative: Israel, Pharaoh, Moses, and the Lord. They also define the narrative problem: Pharaoh's oppression of Israel. This oppression occasions the conflict between him and Israel's Lord. The conflict develops when Pharaoh rebuffs God's messengers, denies knowing the Lord (5:2), refuses to let Israel go, and increases her burdens. Through Moses, the Lord announces the plagues that will cause Pharaoh, Egypt (7:5, 17; 8:22; 9:14), and Israel (10:2) to know that the Lord is God alone. These plagues will also proclaim his power to the nations (9:16). But Pharaoh stubbornly refuses. When the tenth plague overwhelms Egypt's firstborns on Passover night, Pharaoh relents and sends Israel away to serve the Lord, but he repents of this and pursues Israel into the waters of the Sea of Reeds. The Lord manipulates the waters of judgment so that Egypt drowns and Israel passes through safely. When the people of God see their enemy dead on the seashore, they believe in the Lord and his servant Moses (14:30-31; cf. 4:1, 4,8-9). Led by Moses and Miriam, Israel sings the Lord's praises (15:1-21).

The narrative problem enunciated in chapters 1-2 has been resolved: The Lord heard Israel's cry (2:23-25; 3:7-8) and answered with convincing signs of his power. Israel is free from servitude to Pharaoh. The development and resolution of the narrative problem occur within a conceptual framework familiar to Israel: the movement from lament to praise. The psalm of praise, then, effectively concludes the narrative.

Because Pharaoh has died, it would seem that the exodus narrative should come to a close with the psalm; the common use of Exodus suggests this. But the journey begun on Passover night (12:37) moves beyond the sea, into the desert (15:22), where Israel wanders for some time (16:1; 17:1; cf. 19:2). This move in to the desert, away from Egypt, is a further development of the promise that God would take Israel to the Promised Land (3:7-11). But, although the direction is clear, the goal will not yet be realized. The new location is crucial: On the way to the land, that is, in the desert, the narrative develops the theme of dependence upon the Lord. In the inhospitable desert, Israel receives water,

---


24 Other psalms that close a narrative: Gen. 49; 2 Sam. 22, 23:1-7. Psalms that are part of a narrative opening: 1 Sam. 2:1-10; Luke 1:46-55; 67-79.
manna, and divine protection from the nations represented by Amalek. All this is to break her dependence upon Egypt (cf. 16:3). The narrative memorializes Israel's unwillingness, her murmuring against God, and the embarrassing praise of God and wise administration offered by a Gentile, Jethro, Moses' father-in-law.

Noteworthy at the beginning and ending of this material are the clusters of legal vocabulary (15:25, 26; 18:13, 16, 22-26). They not only anticipate the Lord's Sinai speech and suggest that Israel's life outside of Egypt needs the Lord's particular word but also frame the desert narrative. By framing Israel's desert experience, these clusters require the reader to put on the lenses of torah (15:25; 18:16). Bitter service to Pharaoh is a distant memory; now Israel learns to live with the Lord's sweetener of the bitter waters in the desert torah (15:25; cr. Ps. 19:8-10). Self-determination is not a possibility for Israel.

Although Israel remains in the desert, with Exodus 19:1-2 the narrative begins to focus on a specific location within the desert the mountain (19:2; cf. 3:12). Even though the mountain is mentioned in 18:5, the text indicates anew thematic development by the summarizing disjunctive clauses in 19:1-2, which reach back to Egypt and depict Israel's journeys from Rephidim to Sinai. Exodus 19:3 begins the narrative proper of this subunit, an account of Moses' ascents into and descents from the presence of God during which he receives and transmits to Israel the Lord's words. Israel may not touch the mountain nor ascend into God's immediate presence, on pain of death (19:12-13; cf. 20:18-19). In God's dangerous presence, Israel vows covenant obedience (19:8; 24:3, 7) with a self-maledictory oath (24:8). After this, Moses alone ascends into the glory cloud and stays there for forty days and forty nights (24:18).

The narrative accounts of Moses' ascents and descents in chapters 19 and 24 frame the covenant instruction material (20:1-17; 21:1-23:19) and embed it in a narrative that depicts the presence of a God that Israel has heretofore not experienced. This fiery presence of God provides motivation for Israel's obedience at the mountain of God's self-disclosure and warns against faithlessness. Moses' final ascent brings him into the presence of God that Israel thought "looked like a consuming fire" (24:17).

25 The article suggests a specific mountain, which in the context of Exodus can only be the mountain where God revealed himself to Moses, the mountain of which he said "you" (pl.) will worship me there (3:12).

26 Moses' ascents and descents from Sinai continue up to and including Exodus 34. Some commentators argue that these form segmentation markers: Thomas B. Dozeman, "Spatial Form in Exodus 19:1-8a and in the Larger Sinai Narrative," Semeia 46 (1989): 96; Rolf P. Knierim, "The Composition of the Pentateuch," in Seminar Papers: The Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 400-403, argues that this pattern organizes Exodus 19:3-39:43. He takes 34:29-39:43 as the last unit. However, the Lord's speeches in 25-31 are instructions for the building of the Lord's dwelling, not covenant stipulations or instruction.
The Lord's first speech to Moses at the top of Sinai, however, initiates a wholly new, and unexpected, theme: the building of a sanctuary for the Lord's dwelling in Israel's midst (25:8-9). Mimicking the creation account,27 there follow six speeches detailing the offerings, the specifications for the sanctuary furnishings and the sanctuary, the design of the priestly appurtenances and the instructions for their consecration, and instructions for Bezalel and Oholiab (25:1-31:11). The seventh speech (31:12-17) reminds Israel to observe the Sabbath as a sign for the generation to come "so that you may know that I am the Lord, who makes you holy" (31:13); they are to celebrate it "for generations to come as a lasting covenant" (31:16).28 Then, the Lord gives Moses the two tables of the Testimony (31:18).

The distance between God and Israel, already defined in chapters 19 and 24, is redefined in these seven speeches. Where before God brings Israel to himself (19:4) but keeps them at a safe distance (19:12-13), now he wants to dwell in Israel's midst. Even so, the distance is maintained by God's special design of the the tabernacle (25:9). Israel's nature requires the distance; God's grace designs an "incarnational" medium by which the distance is minimized and the nearness maximized so that he might meet with his people. With the tabernacle, God is creating space for his people to know and enjoy him forever (29:43-46).

Throughout 25-31, Moses remains in God's presence at the top of Sinai. Abruptly, however, the narrative shifts the reader's attention to the people who are awaiting Moses at the foot of Sinai (32:1). Motivated by the people's impatience, Aaron fashions a calf in whose presence Israel worships God with a mixture of prescribed and alien elements (32:6). Israel's corrupt worship in the Lord's presence brings on his wrath. Were it not for Moses' intercession in God's immediate presence, Israel would have been consumed by God's anger (32:7-14; cf. 3:2-5). Thereafter Moses descends and breaks the tables of the law, thereby symbolizing the broken covenant; three thousand Israelites die at the hands of the Levites (32:15-29). When Moses ascends to plead for pardon (32:30), the Lord first reminds him that the sinners will die for their own rebellion (32:33) and then declares that Moses will not accompany Israel to the Promised Land because their stubbornness ("stiffnecked," הַעֲנָיָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, 33:3, 5; 34:9; cf. 32:9) may provoke divine destruction.29 Moses continues to plead that God be present with his people and that he show him his glory. The Lord grants his requests and speaks a word of mercy (33:12-23). Moses then prepares two new stone tablets upon which he will write the words of the covenant again

29 The narrative describes Israel with vocabulary reminiscent of Pharaoh's hardness of heart: See the verb (נָעַד) in 7:3 and 13:15 and the adjective in 1:14 and 6:9. How does Israel hear this?
Before the covenant renewal takes place, the Lord reveals his compassionate and gracious nature: He is slow to anger but will not let the guilty go unpunished (34:6-7). This compassionate and gracious God renews the covenant and forgives his stubborn people. Moses again descends, this time with the tablets of the renewed covenant. Thereafter, whenever Moses consults with God in his presence, he veils his face to protect Israel from the full glory of God (34:29-35).

In these chapters, Israel experiences God's anger and his mercy. God has delivered Israel a second time, this time from themselves. Now they are not only free from Pharaoh but also forgiven by God. Only so do they begin to fashion the appurtenances of the tabernacle. A thematic change in 35:1-3 takes the reader back to the subject of the Sabbath, treated immediately before the narrative of Israel's corruption of the Lord's presence (31:12-17).

After the golden calf episode, Moses assembles the community and transmits the Lord's instructions for the offerings (cf. 25:1-7) necessary for the construction of the tabernacle. Israel willingly offers more than necessary and, under the leadership of Bezalel and Oholiab, begins the building project (35:1-36:7). Israel obediently manufactures all the necessary items for the tabernacle, ending with the gold plate for Aaron's turban upon which is inscribed: "Holy to the Lord" (36:8-39:31). Then, in a narrative evocative of Genesis 1:31-2:3, 30 Israel completes the work of the tabernacle in perfect obedience and brings all the items to Moses (39:32-41), who blesses them (39:42-43).

Moses assembles and consecrates the tabernacle and the priesthood on new year's day: the first day of the first month, in the second year (40:2, 17; cf. 12:1).31 After Moses finishes his work (40:33), the glory of the Lord fills the sanctuary: God is in the midst of and leads his forgiven people on their journey (40:34-38).

Conclusion


30 See pp.18-19 above.
31 On this day the flood waters dried up from the earth and Noah removed the covering from the ark, Genesis 6:13.
is the interrelationship among the subunits? In the following part, I will begin

**The Key Words of Exodus**

In this section, I will focus on clustered key words and phrases that not only emphasize the major themes but also support the definition of the major narrative subsections of Exodus as defined above.

The first important cluster of key words refers to servitude (הֲבָנֹת, הֲבָנָא) and occurs approximately ninety-seven times in the Exodus narrative. They are distributed as follows: sixty-seven times in 1:1-15:21, seventeen times in 19-24, two times in 32-34, and eleven times (only הֲבָנֹת) in 35-40. Within 1:1-15:21, these words occur thirty-three times in the plagues pericope (7:8-11:10).

The heavy concentration of this word complex and its complete absence from 15:22-18:27 suggests that 1:1-15:21 forms a major narrative subunit that answers the question: Whom will Israel serve, Pharaoh or the Lord? The song at the sea declares that the Lord reigns forever (15:18); the construction narrative depicts Israel's performing "work" (הֲבָנֹת, 39:32, 42; cf.1:13, 14) on the Lord's behalf.

Other key words help answer this question and support the argument that 1:1-15:21 forms a subunit. First, the verbs describing the hardening of Pharaoh's heart (הַחֲשַׁבָּב, הָשֹּׁבֶב), whether Pharaoh or the Lord is the subject of these verbs,\(^{33}\) occur throughout. Second, the verb "to know" (יָדַע) describes the result of God's mighty acts in Egypt: Pharaoh, Egypt, Israel, and the nations will acknowledge the Lord as God. Third, "to believe, to trust" (מָכָס) in the Lord or Moses, a theme introduced at the time of Moses' commissioning, is resolved at the sea when Israel sees her enemy lying dead on the seashore and then believes in the Lord and his servant Moses (14:31).

These key words, along with the movement from lament to praise and the resolution of the conflict depicted in the opening chapters, support the contention that 1:1-15:21 forms a major narrative subunit.

As already observed in the reading of Israel's desert experience, the geographic shift to the desert distinguishes this part from the previous narrative. Several clusters of key words support this contention. The key words testן), 15:25, 16:4; 17:2, 7), bread (סֵדָא, 16:3, 4, 8, 12, 15, 22, 29, 32), water(יָנָי, 15:22, 23, 25, 27; 17:1, 2, 3, 6), to complain (לִבָּל, 15:24, 16:2, 7, 8, 9, 12; 17:3), and to set out (יָשָׁנָה, 15:21, 16:1; 17:1) typically occur in 15:22-17:7, which depicts Israel's

---

33 Pharaoh hardens his heart ten times (7:13, 14, 22; 8:11, 15, 28; 9:7, 34, 35; 13:15); the Lord also hardens Pharaoh's heart ten times (4:21; 7:3; 9:12; 10:1, 20, 27; 11:10; 14:4, 8, 17).

34 The verb occurs in 4:1, 5, 8, 9, 31; 14:31. Gerhard von Rad ("Beobachtungen an den Moseerzählungen Exodus 1-14," Evangilische Theologie 31 [1971]: 579-88) called attention to the overarching function of this key word.
perceived threat to her life, the Lord's sustenance in the desert, and the probative value of the experience. In 17:8-18:27, the key words are to do battle and battle (תְּחֵל, 17:8, 10, 16), hand (חַיְדָה, 17:9, 11, 12, 16; 18:9, 10), to be heavy, weighty (כָּבד, 17:12; 18:18), to sit ( יִכַּבֵּד, 17:12; 18:13, 14), to judge (וֹסֶל), to save, deliver (יָשָׁר, 18:4, 8, 9, 10), and the phrase everything the Lord/Moses had done (וַיִּירֵשׁ-אֲלֵה-אַלָּֽה, 18:1, 8, 9, 14, 17, 20, 24). With these, the text develops the themes of external and internal threat as represented by Amalek and disputes among the people and how they are resolved.

Most important, however, is the clustering of legal vocabulary at the beginning and end of this unit: to judge and judgment (וֹסֶל, 15:25; 18:13, 16, 22, 26), decree (חֵל, 15:25, 26; 18:16, 20), to command and commandment (חֶלְּקֹת-מָצָה, 15:25; 18:23), to listen to (לְמָצָה, 15:26; 18:19, 24), and to instruct and torah/law (תְּרֻפּוֹ, 15:25; 18:16). By framing the text with these clusters, the narrator leads the audience to evaluate the narrated events from the perspective of God's law as the giver of life, sustenance, and order. It also defines 15:22-18:27 as the second major narrative subunit. The subsequent shift to a specific location in the desert, Mt Sinai (19:1-2), argues for the beginning of a new unit and therefore supports the claim that 15:22-18:27 is the second major narrative unit.

The shift to Sinai in chapter 19 includes a different vocabulary. Three of the following five chapters deal almost exclusively with legal, not building, instructions, and the other two narrate the offer and sealing of a covenant. This suggests that the central concern in these chapters is covenant stipulations. The clustering of related terminology supports this: the word (in reference to the Lord's words; יָשָׁר, 19:6, 7, 8, 9; 20:1; 22:9, 23:7, 8; 24:32, 4, 8, 14); covenant (תְּרֻפּוֹ, 19:5; 23:32; 24:7, 8); judgment (וֹסֶל, 21:1, 9, 31; 23:6; 24:3); and Israel's vow of submission (19:8; 24:3, 7).

Another cluster of words describes the ascents and descents of Moses on the mountain, the descent of the Lord on the mountain, and the fiery presence of the Lord. They are: to go up (לָצַח, 19:3, 13, 18, 20, 24; 24:1, 2, 9, 12, 13, 15, 18); to descend (לָצַח, 19:11, 14, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25); mountain (רְאֵשָׁה, 19:2, 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23; 20:18; 24:4, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18), the Lord's instructions that Israel stay at the foot of the mountain (רְאֵשָׁה-תִּשְׁלַח, 19:17; רְאֵשָׁה, 24:4), and fire (שֵׁא, 19:18; 24:17). The use of mountain and the verbs of ascent and descent almost exclusively in chapters 19 and 24 supports the contention that they form a frame for these chapters and argues for the conclusion that 19-24 form the third narrative subunit.

The speeches of building instruction in Exodus 25-31 and compliance with those instructions in 35-40 distinguish these as separate units within the larger narrative. Since both deal with the structure that will facilitate the Lord's presence among his people (25:8), it will be helpful to treat the keywords they have in common at the same time. We will not address the obvious repetition of
READING EXODUS TO LEARN AND LEARNING TO READ EXODUS 29

Those words that depict the tabernacle and priestly appurtenances.

Both instruction and construction units begin with instructions concerning the offerings of basic materials for the tabernacle construction: The Lord instructs Moses in 25:1-9, and Moses teaches Israel in 35:3-36:7. The Lord says:

Tell the Israelites to bring (בָּאָה) me an offering (מֵרֶה). You are to receive (בָּאָה) the offering (מֵרֶה) from each man whose heart prompts him to give. These are the offerings (מֵרֶה) you are to receive (בָּאָה): . . then have them make (מָצַא) a sanctuary (מְדִינָא) for me, and I will dwell (בָּאָה) in their midst. Make (מָצַא) this tabernacle (מְדִינָא) and all its furnishings exactly like the pattern I will show you. (25:1-3a, 8-9)

After the Lord forgives Israel and renews the covenant, Moses instructs Israel:

Take (בָּאָה) from what you have, an offering (מֵרֶה) for the Lord. Everyone who is willing is to bring an offering (מֵרֶה) of gold, silver. . . .

All who are skilled among you are to come and make (מָצַא) everything the Lord has commanded: the tabernacle (מְדִינָא) with its tent and . . (35:5, 10-11a).

The key words in bold lettering underscore the central action of these two narrative units: Moses gives Israel the Lord's instructions to take (בָּאָה, 25:22, 3; 27:20; 28:5, 9; 29: 15, 31 [plus twelve times]; 30:16, 23, 34; 35:5; 36:3; 40:9) her free-will offerings (מֵרֶה, 25:22, 3; 29:27, 283; 30:13, 14, 15; 35:5; 21, 24; 36:3, 6), and from them make (מָצַא, 212 times) the Lord's dwelling place (מְדִינָא, fifty-six times; "tent of meeting," מִדְּנֵי הָעָם, thirty-four times).35

Three other key words suggest the purpose of the instruction and construction accounts: sabbath, to meet, and to dwell. Sabbath occurs only a few times (31:13, 14, 152, 162; 35:2, 3). Its narrative location at the end of the instruction and the beginning of the construction account, however, is crucial because it argues for an intimate connection between the Sabbath and the building of the tabernacle. Childs, for example, contends that they are "two sides of the same reality" and that "the witness of the tabernacle and that of the sabbath both testify to God's rule over his creation (31:17), "36 The narrative location also forms a frame around the apostasy of Israel and the Lord's renewal of the covenant, thereby distinguishing it from the instruction and complinace narratives. If, in reference to the tabernacle accounts, sabbath evokes the Lord's rule, its linkage to the rebellion of Israel argues that Israel violated that rule. Moreover, if sabbath evokes the Lord's rule over creation, then the verbs to meet (דָּבָר, 25:22; 29:42, 43; 30:6, 36) and to dwell (בָּאָה, 25:8; 29:45, 46; 40:35), along with taber-

35 The word sanctuary (מְדִינָא) occurs only in 25:8 (cf. 15:17). The two words for the Lord's dwelling place are the occasion of many studies arguing for different historical traditions concerning the tabernacle or tent of meeting. See Childs, The Book of Exodus, 584-93, for his discussion of Exodus 33:7-11. Note also 39:32, which states "the work on the tabernacle: the Tent of Meeting, was completed." The appositive "the Tent of Meeting" argues that the received text points to the same referent.

36 Childs, The Book of Exodus, 541-42.
nacle and tent of meeting, evoke the place from which the Lord's rule emanates upon the earth, and the people among whom he effects his particular rule.

Finally, although to bless (וָרַב) is technically not a key word in the tabernacle accounts since it occurs there only once (39:43), it is linked with the key word work, which occurs in the instruction and compliance narratives (תְּמוּנָה, 31:3, 5, 14, 15; 35:2; 21, 24, 29, 31, 33, 35; 36:1, 2, 3, 42, 5, 6, 72, 8; 38:24; 39:43; 40:33). The construction narrative, and thus Exodus, ends with Moses' blessing Israel even as God had blessed the seventh day (Gen. 2:1-3) after God had finished all his work. Remarkably, then, Exodus ends where Genesis begins. Or, to put it another way: The end of Exodus picks up where Adam's and Eve's sin created a disjunction between the presence of God and human history.37

The golden calf account, located between the instruction and construction narratives, presents, develops, and resolves the problem of Israel's rebellion in the Lord's presence. Located here, it forms a significant transition from the instruction to the construction account. Those who manufacture the tabernacle parts and its furniture have experienced the justice and mercy of God. Could a rebellious people participate in such a construction?

Keywords remind us of Exodus 19-24 and Moses' ascents and descents (see the uses of אֶרֶץ וַתְּמוּנָה רַבֶּה on the mountain of God (תְּמוּנָה, 32:1, 12, 15, 19; 33:6; 34:22, 32, 4, 29; 32). But where 19-24 focuses on the making and sealing of a covenant, in 32-34 the issue is Aaron's and Israel's making (תְּמוּנָה, 32:1, 4 [+ fourteen occurrences]) a golden calf (תְּמוּנָה 32:4, 8, 19, 20, 24, 35). In the light of the significance of the verb to make in the tabernacle accounts, this suggests that Aaron's making of the calf is an antisancuary activity.38 The consequences are disastrous. The Lord distances himself from Israel when he describes them to Moses as "your people" (ֵעָּפוּת; plus thirty-two other occurrences of it in 32-34), declares his intention "to exterminate" (תְּמוּנָה, 32:10, 12; 33:3, 5) this "stiff-necked" (חָֽדְשׁוֹת, 32:9; 33:3, 5; 34:9) people and make, (תְּמוּנָה, 32:10) a great people out of Moses. Moses reminds God that Israel is "your people." The deadly prepositional reparte concludes with a summary statement: "Then the Lord relented and did not bring on his people (תְּמוּנָה the disaster he had threatened" (32: 14). In this connection, the verb to exterminate

37 The verb to bless in 39:42 is linked to to sanctify in the Lord's sabbath speech in 31:13. These texts then recall the seventh day speech of Genesis 2:1-3 in which the Lord blesses and makes holy the seventh day. Remarkably, in Exodus, Israel, and not the Sabbath is the object of the Lord's sanctifying power. Similarly Israel, and not the Sabbath, is the object of Moses' blessing. In Exodus, these verbs appear in the reverse order: to bless and to sanctify (Gen. 2:3) and to sanctify (Ex. 31:13) and to bless (Ex. 39:43). This reversal of crucial words is common with quotations and references to other texts according to Moshe Weinfeld, 'The Decalogue: Its Significance, Uniqueness, and Place in Israel's Tradition, in Religion and Law: Biblical-Judaic and Islamic Perspectives, ed. Edwin B. Firmage, Bernard G, Weiss, John W. Welch (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 19.

38 Fretheim, Exodus, 280.
(הך) assumes importance because of the manner in which its conjugated forms mimic the verb to consume (לך) in 3:3. If Israel is stiff-necked like Pharaoh, they are also in danger of suffering the destruction the Lord brought upon him. If Pharaoh stood in the way of the Lord's glory and was destroyed, how much more when Israel gives the Lord's glory to another? Fire comes close (שך, 32:20, 24), and some suffer the Lord's anger. And when the Lord reveals he will not lead Israel to the land, Moses' appeals move the Lord so that his presence (בך, thirty times in 32-34) does accompany Israel. The Lord reveals his mercy, renews the covenant, and inscribes his words on the tablets (הך, 32:15^2, 16^2, 19; 34:13, 42, 28, 29) again. The unique constellation of keywords and phrases in the golden calf account strongly argues that it is a narrative sub-unit.


The Structure of Exodus

Until recently, arguments for a double or triple organization of Exodus were common, and appeared to be based primarily on the geographic movement of the narrative. Closer examination of such analyses, however, would disclose underlying historical-critical assumptions that separated the Egypt and Sinai traditions and that argued that these were only subsequently linked by a redactor. Assumptions about the nature of historical narrative--it must flow unimpeded (Gressman)--and law--the priestly tradition reflects the dry legalism of later Judaism (Wellhausen)--also contributed to the exegetical and hermeneutical separation of the two traditions that not only distinguished history and law but also separated the gospel of salvation from Egypt from the law of God's covenant. Although Fretheim and others have recently challenged this separation of law from narrative, the exegetical use and devotional reading of Exodus still reflects an antipathy toward the legal material and a preference for the narrative and its story of redemption.

The distinction between the genres of law and narrative has also led commentators to define a "Sinai pericope" that moves well into Numbers: Exodus 19:1-Numbers 10:10, which ignores the received segmentation between Exodus-Leviticus and Leviticus-Numbers. It is also true, however, that Israel


camps at Sinai from Exodus 19:1 through Numbers 10:10, that this material is mostly instructional, and that from Numbers 10:11 the people continue the journey they began in Exodus 12:37. This observation, then, has the benefit of emphasizing Sinai as the central locus of divine self-disclosure. And, by extending this Sinai narrative to include Exodus 15:22-18:27 and Numbers 10:11-20:13, the memory of Israel's desert experiences, one before and the other after the Sinai theophany, the narrative frames this central location. These desert experiences, however, are dissimilar: Before the Sinai theophany, Israel complains without consequences; after Sinai, God judges Israel for their complaints. Theologically, this suggests that the fiery presence of God in Israel's midst as they journey toward the land, not yet a narrative reality in the first desert pericope, creates a new community that ignores the divine presence only at their peril.

This brief discussion argues for two conclusions. First, the nature of the literary organization is not neutral—it has hermeneutical significance and theological consequences. Second, the discussion of the larger Sinai pericope suggests that the commingling of narrative and law is not a problem to be solved historically. To the contrary, the present form of the text argues that we read the divine speeches of instruction as embedded in a larger and continuing narrative without positing a tension between narrative and law. This has the effect of letting the flow of narrative shape the hearing of law. Without narrative, law has no context within which its demands make sense; without law, narrative has no power to define the world it depicts. Narrative and law work together to create a text that uniquely shapes the audience's hearing and response. In order to allow the narrative to maximally shape the audience, it is important to discern its rhetorical strategy on the level of its macrostructural organization.

Exodus 25-40 provides an important clue for defining the interrelationship among the six narrative subunits: Chapters 25-31 and 35-40 are linked as instruction and construction narratives. The insertion of chapters 32-34 between them creates a chiastic arrangement. Construction of the tabernacle does not take place until the narrative has moved through Israel's rebellion to its forgiveness. If this is such an obvious linkage, why then do so many still read 19-24 with the tabernacle section? One answer is that both 19-24 and 25-40 contain legal material and much of it reflects the style of the priestly tradition (P). But, is this enough to conclude that 19-24 be read with the tabernacle section, or should it be read with the antecedent material?

Several arguments call for the conclusion that chapters 1-24 also exhibit a chiastic arrangement. Thematically the narrative develops toward Sinai in a

---

41 James W. Watts ("Public Readings and Pentateuchal Law," *Vetus Testamentum* 45, no. 4 [1995]: 543) argues that "narrative invites, almost enforces, a strategy of sequential reading, of starting at the beginning and reading the text in order to the end the placement of law within narrative conforms (at least in part) the reading of the law to the conventions of narrative."
movement from disorder to order. At the beginning of the narrative, Israel is under Pharaoh's control until the Creator's power produces massive disorder in Egypt and the waters of judgment swallow Pharaoh and his army. Shortly after moving through the Sea of Reeds into the desert, Israel complains of thirst. The Lord sustains them with gifts of water and manna, and defends them against Amalek. Jethro's wisdom enables Moses to administer the Lord's will: his torah. After they arrive at Sinai, Israel vows allegiance to the Lord; life will now be determined by the stipulations of the covenant. Life with God at Sinai is radically different from that in Egypt. The two places are linked as antipodes: unwilling slavery and disorder versus willing vassaldom and order. Egypt and Sinai are also connected sequentially by itinerary notices (מַעֲרֵי, 12:37; 13:20; 15:22; 16:1; 17:1; 19:2) that serve as a transition device: They take Israel from Rameses (12:37; cf. 1:11), the place of Israel's bitter servitude, to Sinai (הֵרְכָּז, 19:2) where they willingly submit to the Lord (19:8; 24:3, 7). Finally, a thematic change separates 19-24 from the following chapters. Although Moses ascends to the Lord's presence to receive the tablets of the law (24:12), God's speeches in 25-31 are dedicated to the tabernacle instructions, not covenant making. This unexpected thematic change creates a major narrative break. For these reasons, I suggest that the Egypt and Sinai narratives form the outer elements of a chiasm: At Sinai the former slaves of Pharaoh willingly become the servants of the Lord. The desert narrative provides a transition that comments on certain aspects involved in the change of masters.

Combining the reading of the entire narrative with the insights gained from the clusters of keywords, I understand the interrelationship of the subunits as of Exodus follows:

A  Royal Conflict From Slaves' Lament to Servants' Praise (1-15:21)
B  The Desert: Learning to live with God (15:22-18:27)
A'  The Mountain of God: We will do all we have heard! (19:1-24:18)
C  Tabernacle and Sabbath: Let there be a sanctuary! (25:1-31:18)
D  Corruption in God's Presence: like Pharaoh, like Israel! (32-34)
C'  God's Presence in the Tabernacle: And it was so! (35-40)

In this structure the sigla A-A' and C-C' point to the basic narrative movement in each half; B and D indicate the transitions from one aspect of this movement to the other. This structure suggests that even as B and D nuance the antecedent narratives (A and C) so they shape the audience's hearing of the subsequent narrative (A' and C'). That is, the desert and the apostasy narratives nuance the audience's hearing of the covenant making and the construction of the tabernacle.

This double triadic structure of Exodus depicts a consistent move from Egypt into God's presence at Sinai and the consequent design of an instrument for God's dwelling in the midst of his people and his continuing presence on their continuing journey from Egypt to the Promised Land.
The Argument of Exodus

Having examined the beginning and end of Exodus, followed its development from the initial definition of the narrative problem to its resolution, discerned clusters of key words and phrases, and defined the organization of the text, I will now state the argument, or the subject of the account, in a brief narration of what the text recounts in greater detail.

Fearing Israel's enormous growth, Pharaoh enslaves them to build his cities and devises a plan to murder all newborn males; but Israel continues to grow. After God acknowledges Israel's oppression, he rescues them from stubborn Pharaoh by mighty and terrible acts, announced and mediated by Moses. On Passover night, Pharaoh urges Israel to leave the land, but he recants and pursues Israel into the sea. The Lord moves the waters to defeat Pharaoh but he lets Israel pass through on dry ground. After praising God for his great salvation, Israel enters the desert where they complain to Moses about lack of water and bread. In the desert God supports Israel with water and manna; he also defends them from Amalek's attack. Jethro, the Midianite priest, visits the camp, praises God when he hears about Israel's escape, and helps Moses in the judicial administration of the people. The Lord brings Israel to Sinai where he makes a covenant with them and Israel promises faithful obedience. Afterward God calls Moses to meet him at the top of mount Sinai. (1:1-24:18).

At the top of Sinai, Moses receives instructions for Israel to collect offerings and to make a sanctuary for the Lord to dwell in their midst. While God is speaking to Moses, Israel organizes a corrupt worship of the Lord with a golden calf. This provokes the Lord to destroy Israel, but Moses intervenes on Israel's behalf. Although Israel suffers the Lord's punishment, he forgives his people, promises to lead them to the Promised Land, and renews the covenant. After this, Israel obediently manufactures the various elements of the tabernacle complex and brings them to Moses. He inspects Israel's work and then blesses them. On the first day of the second year, Moses assembles and consecrates the tabernacle and the priesthood. Then the glory of the Lord fills the tabernacle; the fiery cloud guides Israel on their journey (25:1-40:38).

I have written the argument to reflect the narrative structure and to conserve the movement from Egypt to Sinai, and that from instruction to construction. According to the working definition, the argument is descriptive; no interpretation of the text should intrude at this stage, only a keen appreciation of the narrative movement from beginning to end.

42 It is, of course, true that interpretation begins with the act of reading and discerning structure. I mean at this stage to describe as objectively as possible what the text before the audience says, given the structure for which I am arguing.
The Theme of Exodus

For preaching purposes, the theme of a narrative or its subunit should have only one subject and a predicate in order to clearly hear who does what in the narrative. This is an extremely difficult, if not impossible, task for a larger narrative. But the statement of the argument already provides us with a good reduced version of the narrative. I begin, then, with a thematic statement, product of keeping the essentials of each major subunit and of removing details. By mighty signs of power, the Lord rescues Abraham's abundant descendants, Israel, from Pharaoh's slavery in Egypt, sustains them in the desert, and brings them to covenant with him at Mt. Sinai. Through Moses, the Lord instructs Israel to make him a dwelling place; but instead, Israel makes a golden calf. After God pardons their rebellion, Israel makes the tabernacle and Moses assembles it. Then the glory of the Lord fills the tabernacle and leads Israel on their journey.

This thematic statement can be further reduced to: By mighty signs of power the Lord rescues Israel from Pharaoh and brings her to his presence at Sinai in order to dwell in her midst by means of the tabernacle. Exodus 29:43-46 could be considered the narrative's own thematic statement.

Conclusion

In this article, I have provided a brief, first reading of Exodus as an exercise in reading a larger biblical narrative. By following these steps the reader can appropriate the narrative flow such that subsequent readings of smaller pericopes can be placed in the light of the whole narrative. This reading has also shown that the commingling of narrative and instructional genres is not an obstacle to understanding the Exodus narrative. But, there remains the question of the coherence of Exodus; what gives the narrative its unity. This I will address in a later article.
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Introduction to the Ten Commandments
Exodus 20:1-3; Luke 12:48

Jeong Woo (James) Lee

Something quite unprecedented is happening in our text. Never has God so clearly, comprehensively and categorically expressed the duties he requires of his covenant people in all the areas of their lives until now. Beginning from this section and continuing through the end of the Book of Deuteronomy, God will set down specific laws and regulations as guidelines for various aspects of Israel's covenant life as citizens of a new theocratic nation; specific laws and regulations concerning their relationship with God as well as specific laws and regulations concerning their relationship with one another and with other nations. Through the law, Israel will know clearly how to worship God, both in public and private arenas; how to build the tabernacle, ordain priests and offer sacrifices; what religious festivals and holidays to celebrate and how to do so; how to deal with one another as fellow citizens through codes of private, socio-political, judicial and religious ethics—codes covering everything that happens between the birth and the death of man both socially and individually.

The laws given at Mount Sinai (what is popularly called the Mosaic laws) are usually divided into three categories: the ceremonial, the civil and the moral. The ceremonial laws are those which are connected with the Old Testament worship at the tabernacle and temple. They include those regulations
concerning all types of animal and grain sacrifices and temple rituals performed by the Levitical priests. The civil laws are those which are particularly connected with the government and maintenance of the theocratic nation that Israel once was. As the civil laws of the theocratic nation of Israel, they were unique and applicable only to Israel--despite many who insist on implementing the ancient Jewish civil laws in modern non-theocratic nations. The uniqueness of these civil laws stems from the fact that Israel was a theocratic nation in which the state and the church were united. Thus we see in the Mosaic laws many penal codes imposing corporal punishments upon "religious" and moral offenses as well as criminal offenses. We also see provisions made for the executive branch of the government to oversee cultic practices and even to initiate religious reforms. Both the priesthood and the imperial court had the Mosaic laws as their common standards.

The third category of the Mosaic law is the moral laws. What distinguishes these from the ceremonial and civil laws (which were temporary in nature) is their permanent and universal application: they are not unique to Israel, but universally applicable to all peoples of all ages. These moral laws, however, must be divided into two categories: there are some which are permanent temporally; there are others which are permanent eternally. The former deal with human relations; the latter deal with man's relationship with God. For example, the commandment to love God and worship him alone is eternally true, abiding and effective, since our relationship with God is eternal. However, the commandments to honor our parents and love our spouses will not be in effect in heaven because those human relationships, being temporary and temporal in nature, will not be present there: we will all be brothers and sisters. And yet we can talk about even these temporal moral laws as being permanent because they remain valid for all people (whether they are Jews or not) so long as this world continues.

However, we must remember a very important fact. The moral, ceremonial and civil laws are not completely separate, unrelated categories of law. As they all come from the same divine Lawgiver, they are all interrelated. And they are interrelated in this way: the ceremonial and civil laws are temporary, situational applications of the eternal moral laws to the specific religious and social context of the theocratic Israel. After all, the ceremonial laws are concerned with our relationship with God--more specifically, how
we may approach our holy God. Our relationship with God is the central concern also of the moral laws (namely, the first four of the Ten Commandments). Yet, the Mosaic ceremonial laws were temporary in nature because they revolved around the physical temple which was only a type and shadow of the eternal, heavenly temple. This is true for the civil laws as well. The civil laws deal with our relationship with one another--also the main concern of the moral laws (namely, the latter six of the Ten Commandments). The Mosaic civil laws were temporary because the context in which they were applied (the theocracy of Israel) was also temporary: the theocratic Israel was also a type/shadow of the eternal kingdom of God.

What must puzzle you at this point is how God's laws can be subject to situations and be only temporarily applicable. This may sound to you very much like situational ethics. However, there is a fundamental difference between situational ethics and what we are talking about. Situational ethics does not believe in any absolute standard for human morality. Each situation calls for a different code of ethics, fully determined by pragmatic concerns of that particular time and situation. What we are talking about, however, is different. We are not talking about changes; we are talking about a progressive revelation of God's law. And this progression we are talking about is not an evolutionary process--a gradual process of the formation, maturation and perfection of ethical codes and principles through trial and error. The progression we are talking about is of an organic nature--like a butterfly going through different stages of organic growth--going through the egg, the caterpillar and the larval stages to finally become a beautiful butterfly. In each ensuing stage, the preceding manifestation of life is replaced by the new through a wondrous metamorphosis. However, through all the different stages and forms, the essence of the butterfly remains the same. Such is the nature of the progressive revelation of God's law in redemptive history. The eternal law of God is given to his people in different organic stages. Even the displacement or replacement of certain portions of the law (such as the ceremonial laws) does not indicate any change in the fundamental principles. This is so because the law of God is not merely a code of ethics arbitrarily devised by God just for man. The law of God is more importantly God's own self-expression of his holy character given in the form of commandments to his covenant people. As such, the law of God, though given in a progressive manner, is firmly
anchored in the absolute, eternal holiness of the unchangeable, immutable God. As God cannot change in his holiness, neither can the eternal principles from which God's commandments come. And these eternal, immutable principles, emanating from God's holy character, manifest themselves progressively throughout redemptive history. We can say then that the nature of this progression in the revelation of God's law does not consist in any change in essence and principle, but in the increasing clarity of expression and the heightening demand of obedience.

Why such a progression in the first place? you might ask. Why didn't God give us his eternal law from the very beginning? This is a legitimate and important question. This question can be answered only when we reaffirm the law as a divine self-expression of God's holy character. We realize that the full, unrestrained self-expression of God's holiness was impossible in the fallen world, without destroying sinful humanity. We all know too well the destructive power of God's holiness in relation to sinful man. Many, who encountered the theophany of God throughout redemptive history, cried out with fear and despair, "Woe is me, for my eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts!" Due to this total incompatibility between God's holiness and man's sinfulness, the divine self-revelation of his holiness had to be keeping in step with his redemptive work. And the divine redemptive program was progressive in nature--to go through the process of promise and fulfillment--the typological fulfillment first and then the real fulfillment in the end. Thus, the self-revelation of God and his holiness through the law had to come in a progressive manner. There is indeed an intimate and directly proportional relationship between the law of God and the redemptive work of God. The degree and extent of the revelation of God's holiness through the law is directly proportional to the quality and magnitude of God's redeeming work.

Therefore, we are not surprised to find this relationship at work at the beginning of the Ten Commandments. In v. 2, we have what we call the preamble to the Mosaic law: "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery." This preamble provides the historical background and the theological rationale for the giving of the law and for the obedience required of God's people.
Notice, first of all, the redemptive-historical character of this preamble. The Lord declares that he redeemed Israel by bringing her out of the bondage in Egypt. God is asserting his rightful authority to be obeyed by his people as their Redeemer-Lord. Second, notice the causal relationship between God's redeeming work and the giving of the law: it is because the Lord redeemed Israel that she must obey the commandments. Even at the inauguration of the Mosaic covenant, it is made clear that redemption is given freely by God's grace and not by man's own meritorious works. Israel was to keep the commandments because she was already delivered by God, not in order to be redeemed by God.

In the light of this causal relationship between God's redeeming work (the cause) and the giving of the law (the consequence), we may assert that such a clear, comprehensive elucidation of God's will for his people (given through the law) was possible only because of the great redemption which God accomplished in the exodus of Israel. The validity of this claim is not difficult to see. The law had always been present in God's covenantal dealing with man—even in the garden of Eden. There, the cultural mandate to populate the earth and rule over other creatures was given. Also, a prohibition concerning the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was decreed. Although in the garden of Eden before the fall, God's redemption from sin (per se) was not necessary as a provision for the giving of the law, the "law" and its sanctions were given in the garden in accordance with the sinless condition into which God created man.

We also know from God's words to Abram that a certain moral standard was imposed on him (even before the giving of the law at Mount Sinai): "I am God Almighty; Walk before Me, and be blameless" (Gen. 17:1). Though God's specific act of redemption is not clearly stated here, we know from the context that God's demand for Abram to walk before God in a blameless manner was indeed based upon his act of redemption—calling Abram out of Ur of the Chaldeans. Yet God's redemption for Abram—the fulfillment of God's promises—was limited, though a son was given in his late age. Abram did not come into the possession of the land in his life time; Abram did not see his descendants become as many as the stars in the sky; Abram did not see all the families of the earth being blessed because of him. This limited fulfillment of
God's redemption in his life was the very reason why Abram received a version of the law which was sketchy at best, falling far short of the comprehensiveness of the law given at Mount Sinai. The Israel at Mount Sinai, on the other hand, experienced a far greater redemption of God: their number became as many as the stars in the heavens; they were delivered out of the bondage of slavery in Egypt by God's great and mighty power; they were about to receive the promised land as their inheritance, etc. Through God's redemption, the conditions necessary and conducive for a higher level of spiritual living were created; accordingly, a higher and greater demand for covenant obedience is placed upon the redeemed people of God through the fuller revelation of God's law.

Thus, the law begins with a clear affirmation of God's great and mighty work of redemption: "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery." The Lord through the preamble declares that the conditions for the next stage of redemptive history have been prepared by his redemption. Then he proceeds with the giving of the law, starting with the first commandment. We may paraphrase the beginning of the Ten Commandments in this way: "Because I have brought you out of the Egyptian bondage, you shall have no other gods before Me."

However, it is precisely this inseparable connection between God's redemption and the self-revelation of God's holiness through the law, which makes the Mosaic law far from being a complete expression of the holy standard of God. Here, we are not only referring to the imperfections and limitations of the ceremonial and civil laws, but also of the moral laws represented by the Ten Commandments. The exodus of Israel from Egypt was not the ultimate, full redemption of God for his people. The ultimate salvation could not be just an external liberation from physical bondage, as the exodus of Israel was in the Old Testament. The ultimate salvation had to deal with the inner, spiritual corruption of man. For the external, political bondage to which Israel was subject, both in Egypt and later in the promised land as well, was only a physical indication of the inner, spiritual bondage to sin and death. Indeed, Israel's bondage to sin was the very cause of all their miseries. Unless this problem of sin was fully dealt with, man could never experience the true redemption. And this ultimate redemption was what was in God's mind from
the very beginning. All of the redemptive acts of God in the Old Testament, with all of their externality and attending limitations, pointed to the ultimate, perfect salvation to be brought to God's people in the fullness of time. Therefore, the Mosaic law, connected with the imperfect, merely typological salvation of Israel from Egypt, could not be a full expression of God's holiness and of his holy demand from his people. The full expression of God's holiness had to wait until the fullness of time when God's full redemption of his people was accomplished.

Many hundreds of years later, Paul triumphantly declared in Romans 8:3-4, "What the Law could not do, weak as it was through the flesh, God did: sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who do not walk according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit." In the atoning death of Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, the requirement of the law was fulfilled for us. And we know that the requirement of the law, which was fulfilled in Jesus Christ goes far beyond the requirement imposed by the Mosaic law. All that the Mosaic law requires for the forgiveness of our sin is the sacrifices of bulls and goats. This should have been a clear indication of the terrible limitation of the Mosaic law. For the atoning death of Jesus Christ clearly tells us that our sins require something far greater than mere sacrifices of animals. Doesn't the sacrifice of Jesus Christ--God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God--show us what the ultimate law of God requires for the forgiveness of our sins? Did Jesus himself not say that he did not come to abolish the law but to fulfill it? He meant more than meeting the requirements of the Mosaic law. In Jesus Christ, the full expression of the law of God in all of its holiness was given--far beyond the Mosaic law. Isn't it clear that the Sermon on the Mount outshines the Mosaic law in its surpassing righteousness? Isn't it clear that Jesus had to deal with was not the demands of the Mosaic law. He had to deal with what the Mosaic law was a faint reflection of--the absolute standard of God--without any compromise or diminution.

That is why the true nature of our sin in all of its ugliness and repulsiveness could not be exposed until the death of Jesus Christ. The first function of
the law is to bring in the knowledge of sin. Yet, the knowledge of sin brought out by the Mosaic law was not complete. It gave an impression that all that was required for the atonement of our sins was animal sacrifices. However, the death of Jesus Christ on the cross showed that sin, being an offense against an infinitely holy God, is a crime deserving an infinite, eternal damnation. No blood of bulls and goats—though they may be thousands and tens of thousands in number—can atone for our sins. Not even myriads of angels with their deaths could pay for a single sin of ours, for they are finite beings and as such insufficient payment for our infinite sin. Nothing less than the blood of Jesus Christ, the infinite God himself, can pay for our infinite sins.

On the other hand, we must understand that the death of Jesus Christ acquired the full remission of our sins. None of the judgments of God in the Old Testament—as terrible as they might have been—were ever a full expression of God's wrath. That means that there could not have been a full remission of sins in the Old Testament. (This doesn't mean that no one in the Old Testament was saved. Though they were not saved by the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, they were saved through their faith in the coming Messiah, represented in the sacrificial system.) For the divine justice requires the full punishment of our sins for their perfect forgiveness. The horrible death that the generation of Noah died in the flood was not a sufficient punishment for their sin against the infinite God; the burning of Sodom and Gomorrah with fire and brimstone from heaven was not even close to the full punishment which they deserved from God. Those who perished under the sword of Joshua still have to undergo the eternal punishment of God in hell. The full wrath of God was never unleashed in the Old Testament because the full release of God's wrath would have burned up the whole universe in its consuming fire. This full wrath of God is reserved for the time of the final judgment and eternal damnation in hell. But we know that this full wrath of God against the sins of his people was fully unleashed upon Jesus Christ hanging on the cross. What made Jesus pray at the garden of Gethsemane that the cup be passed from him was not the physical pain of crucifixion—as excruciatingly painful as it might have been. He knew full well that, for the first time in eternity, God the Father would look upon him with eternal wrath and pour out on him all that the heinous sins of his people deserved! All of God's righteous wrath against the sins of his people would be concentrated upon this Lamb of
God and Christ would experience, while he hung upon that cross, all the damnation of eternal hell!

In Jesus Christ, the full redemption could be accomplished because the full wrath of God was unleashed and satisfied in the once-for-all sacrifice of the eternal Son of God. How does this affect the law? Did Christ's redemption abolish the law? Of course not! We know that the ceremonial laws were fulfilled in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ; as we come, not bringing bulls and goats but fully trusting in the all-sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice for the forgiveness of our sins, the ceremonial laws are fulfilled. We also know that the civil laws administered through the power of the sword are replaced with the laws of church discipline administered by the moral, spiritual authority of the church. But then, what about the moral law?

The Sermon on the Mount shows clearly what is demanded of those who received their salvation in Jesus Christ. And there we find that far greater is God's demand for New Testament believers than for Old Testament believers. The reason is very simple: the greater the grace, the greater the demand. Because God's grace abounded to the fullest in Jesus Christ, God's demand for holiness from his people becomes perfect as well. Jesus himself said in Luke 12:48, "And from everyone who has been given much shall much be required; and to whom they entrusted much, of him they will ask all the more." This must be understood in terms of redemptive-historical progression, not just in terms of individual gifts. No matter what your individual spiritual gifts may be, all the believers of the New Testament have been given much much more than the believers of the Old Testament—because of Jesus Christ. All of you are to live in a manner worthy of the calling with which you have been called: to be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.

There is a radical reversal in Jesus Christ, however. First of all, a higher demand of holiness does not come any more through a greater volume of commandments. Our life is no longer to be tied up in the web of rules and regulations. Christ told his disciples in John 15:15, "No longer do I call you slaves, for the slave does not know what his master is doing; but I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard from My Father, I have made known to you." We can no longer mindlessly follow the commandments out of fear; now we are called to understand the very heart of God and live in
union with him and his will. This, of course, does not mean that we do away with the law. The law provides for us a framework and boundaries so that we do not become antinomians and heretics. (The antinomians would say that, as long as they have good motives and sincerity, whatever they do for God is good and acceptable. Not so! Our sincerity is not enough unless what we do out of sincerity of our love for God is also according to God's own way prescribed for us in the law. The law provides the boundaries for our actions.) However, when Christ calls us friends, he is calling us to a relationship of love and understanding which no law can express perfectly nor do full justice. A slave does what is required of him--no more nor less. That is why clearer and more detailed directions need to be given to insure that the assigned task be properly executed. A friend motivated by love and understanding, on the other hand, will use all that is at his disposal to bring pleasure and delight to his friend beyond what is required of him. In the same way, if we love our Lord, we will obey his commandments--this is the least we would do for the Lord whom we love dearly. However, to love the Lord is more than just obeying his commandments--that is what slaves do. We go an extra mile to fulfill the spirit of the law.

Second, the demand was already perfectly met in Jesus Christ through his perfect righteousness. The death of Jesus Christ did not just bring us back to the garden of Eden for a second chance. Through faith, we have been brought into a union with Jesus Christ. We now live by the very resurrection power of Jesus Christ--to die to sin and to live to God. In Jesus Christ, God's promise given through Ezekiel is fulfilled: "I will put My Spirit within you and cause you to walk in My statutes." (Ezk. 36:27). The difference of the new covenant from the old is not the absence of the holy demand from God, but the presence of God's effectual help for you to walk in the law--God's effectual and gracious help in Jesus Christ (in his perfect righteousness) and in addition through the Holy Spirit (for our sanctification).

However, we must remember that the law itself has been perfected in Jesus Christ. The Ten Commandments, given in the context of the theocratic Israel, could not fully express the law of God. For there is an inseparable relationship between the law and the environment in which the law must be executed. The law of God could be given its full expression only with the inauguration of the true, heavenly kingdom of
God. This kingdom is the kingdom of God's beloved Son, Jesus Christ (Col. 1:13). That is why the true meaning and the full extent of the Ten Commandments can be seen only in and through Jesus Christ. This is exactly what Paul meant in 2 Corinthians 3:15-16 when he said, "But to this day whenever Moses is read, a veil lies over their heart; but whenever a man turns to the Lord, the veil is taken away." Apart from Jesus Christ, the Ten Commandments can no longer stand as some kind of independent, absolute moral standard: without Christ, there can be no true understanding of the Ten Commandments; neither can there be true obedience without Christ. That means that even the most pious Jews cannot obey the Ten Commandments. Here, we are not just talking about their inability to perfectly obey the commandments. No one can. But the Jews, to whom the Ten Commandments were originally given, cannot even begin to obey them. As a matter of fact, their very (genuine) efforts to keep the commandments result in sin. We know this to be true with regard to their sacrificial system: offering any cultic sacrifices would be a downright rejection of the all-sufficiency of Christ's atoning sacrifice. But this is true even in the moral law. Take the first commandment, for example. The monotheistic faith of the Jews in YHWH is now terribly deficient. No one can come to the Father except through the Son (Jn. 14:6) because the full revelation of God came through Jesus Christ (Heb. 1:2). It is impossible to observe the first commandment without knowing God as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. To continue to worship YHWH without acknowledging Jesus Christ is nothing less than idolatry.

Brothers and sisters, let us rejoice that the kingdom of God has dawned upon us. And in and through Jesus Christ, we have been brought into the kingdom of God to receive all the riches of our heavenly inheritance. That means that we have been given a call to holy living, worthy of being citizens of the heavenly kingdom of God's beloved Son. God's high calling is a testimony to the great redemption accomplished in Jesus Christ, which makes our obedience possible and real. So we may compose a new preamble for the new covenant.

"I am the Lord your God who brought you out of the bondage of sin and death. Therefore do not let sin reign in your mortal body that you should obey its lusts, and do not go on presenting the members of your body to sin but present yourselves to God as those alive from the dead, and your members
as instruments of righteousness to God .... Present your bodies a living and holy sacrifice, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service of worship.”” (Rom. 6:12-13; 12:1).
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A Case Study of the Call of Moses

G. HERBERT LIVINGSTON

METHOD IN THIS CASE STUDY

A method of Bible study at Asbury Theological Seminary is the inductive or discovery method. This method has been used primarily to lead students into the structure and content of the Scripture as translated into the English language. It is equally useful for studying the Scriptures written in Hebrew or Greek.

A primary emphasis of this method is that a student should read and grapple with the biblical text as objectively as possible. The biblical text is those books which make up the canon of the Old and New Testaments. When trying to understand the text, meanings of words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs and literary units should not be assigned to them, but discovered in them.

The biblical text should be read as whole units, whole books, and groups of books as a whole. Their inner composition may be grasped by outlines of their contents, or by visualizing overall structure through the construction of charts or diagrams.

About fourteen years ago, I was on a committee assigned the task of forging a new curricular module called Supervised Ministry. There was much interest at the time in an educational tool called the case study which had been used effectively in several disciplines, especially business, personnel and counseling fields. The committee hoped it could be adapted for this new program.

Several guidelines served to adapt the case study for evaluating ministerial activity. The case study format adopted must help the student (a) deal with actual, recent incidents in the ministerial assignments of the student, (b) describe briefly and accurately what took place, (c) develop skills to observe and analyze personal, intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships on both the behavioral and spiritual levels, (d) isolate and state the key issue embedded in this event of ministry, (e) research the several bodies of knowledge and information in disciplines related to ministry relevant to this event, (f) integrate ministerial practice with
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theory and theology, (g) make judgments as to the validity of insights of other disciplines, especially in the light of biblical and theological issues, (h) assist the student in seeing personal strengths and weaknesses as a minister of the gospel, and finally, (i) confront the need to make necessary, though perhaps painful, decisions which would lead to positive change and improvement.

A case study format was developed and placed in the seminary curriculum in 1975 and has proved to be valuable as an effective means of preparing the student for ministry. Throughout the construction of this format, the inductive procedure used in the division of biblical studies (described above) was drawn upon heavily for ideas and skills.

This case study format is composed of several levels of reflection called Reflection I, Reflection II and Reflection III. Each level has several components.

The Reflection I level takes its clue from the definition "to bend back"; hence, information about the ministerial event under discussion is represented somewhat like a story. The first component, Focus, is a statement of the who, where and when information. It also includes a carefully crafted statement or question which brings to the fore the perceived issue embedded in the ministerial act. The second component, Background, is the placement of that act in the stream of life, with pertinent data about each participant, a resume of events that preceded the event and a timeline which connects all the episodes, and a brief description of significant cultural factors. The third component, Description, is a careful and accurate reconstruction of what took place in the event being discussed, sort of an instant replay. The description may either be a narrative, a verbatim of what was said, or a combination of the two. Actual words exchanged, emotions expressed and body signals are noted.

Reflection II is governed by the definition "to consider subject matter, ideas or purposes." This level is composed of Analysis and Integration-Interaction. This section challenges the student to engage in careful thinking.

Analysis is the process of identifying the several elements of the case and carefully scrutinizing each one in terms of personal, intrapersonal and interpersonal dynamics. Behavioral, psychological and spiritual factors are probed and examined. The basic interests are to find out what was going on in this event, why it happened and how it happened.

The information provided in Reflection II is divided into small blocks of observational data and questions are asked regarding the meanings of key words, phrases and body signals. The next questions start with "Why" and "How." Motivations and implications are probed and speculation seeks to determine what was going on beneath the surface.

The second component, Integration-Interaction, is the research section, after listing several significant issues embodied in the ministerial event, the student chooses the most important one and makes it the focus of the
research. Various theories in other academic disciplines which may bear upon this ministerial act and its focal issue are examined. These disciplines may be biblical, theological, psychological, sociological, behavioral, historical, ethical, etc. The student seeks to build a bridge from his practical ministerial activity to broader knowledge and theory. This reflection interacts with the concepts and proposed solutions (theories) that relate to the case. The goal is to gain some objectivity; and perhaps, a new perspective from which insight could result.

The third level, Reflection III, accentuates the definition "an image given back," and has three components: Judgments, Evaluations and Decisions. The mental activity of this level flows out of the other two levels of reflection, but here the student is a critic and decision maker.

The content of the Judgment component is made up of conclusions about the validity of the theories and insights of the several disciplines explored. From the vantage point of study and of matching theory with practice, choices are made in regard to which theory or parts of theories are valid. Value statements are accepted and fashioned into an improved understanding of ministerial action.

In the Evaluation component, the student engages in self-examination and lays out what are perceived as the strengths and weaknesses of his or her performance as a minister of Jesus Christ in the event discussed in the case.

The Decision component is often a difficult section to write. The student must declare in written statements what changes in attitudes, manner of approach, ways of relating to people, method of presenting the Gospel, will be made. The student must be honest at this point; the statements must be honest, forthright and firm in commitment.

For over a decade I have participated as a faculty leader in reflection seminars in the Supervised Ministry program. I began to wonder whether a case study format heavily influenced by a Bible study method might be brought full circle and adapted for an expositional method of understanding certain portions of the Scriptures. Since my teaching field has centered in the Old Testament, with special interest in the Hebrew prophets, I began to explore this possibility during several Sabbaticals. I determined that in the Old Testament there were at least fifty incidents, involving various Hebrew prophets, that would be suitable for case studies. I decided to select four "call" experiences, those of Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and develop six case studies based on them. My treatment of Moses's call experience is presented here.

In applying the case study format to the above mentioned prophetic experiences, I had to make some adjustments. My presentation shows my adaptation of the case study method. Obviously, the experiences of the prophets were not mine, hence, the study could not be a "slice" of my experience. I must approach the incidents from the perspective of a critiquer who was not a participant. I was not personally acquainted with
the time and culture of the prophets. Furthermore, the accounts of the
prophetic experiences are very old and are not the original documents.
No adaptations are made in the Focus paragraph, but the information in
the Background component often is limited by the scant data about the
participants in the biblical text. The Description is basically the biblical
text, with preference given to passages largely made up of conversation.
Some narrative summary is also provided.

In Reflection II, the Analysis begins with blocks of observational data,
a group of questions and some speculation about the literary structure of
the selected passages and their context. This probing is not exhaustive.
Those with literary interests can pursue this "digging" more extensively.
The same limitation and exhortation applies to the remainder of the
Analysis as well. Hopefully, enough has been said to alert the reader to
the value of this procedure.

In the Integration-Interaction component, a basic issue has been se-
lected for limited research. This issue is also stated in the Focus
component. I searched for information that relates to the basic issue as
stated, and a limited number of scholars, who have published their
research in areas related to the basic issue, are named and their theories
summarized. My own research is in this section.

For the student writing a case study in Supervised Ministry, the content
of the components in Reflection III is intensely personal. In this adapta-
tion of the case study format, this personal element still holds, for I, the
critiquer, must wrestle with the impact of the analysis and research on my
thinking. I must make value judgments about the insights provided by
various theories and decide how previous views must be changed and
unification of new concepts forged. The Evaluation component tends to be
more objective for the prophet involved in the study that is under scrutiny.
For the ministerial student this component is very personal. The same is
largely true of the Decision component. One may perceive what decisions
each participant in the call experience made, particularly the prophet.
But, if application, the involvement of later generations, and especially
the present-day reader, is to be taken seriously, something more must be
said. A brief paragraph is included in the decision component to provide
that contemporary thrust.

Some questions you might ask, are: Does this adapted case study
format open new doors to a more complete understanding of the prophet's
call? Does it add a helpful vantage point so that a somewhat different
perspective can be gained? How may the procedure be modified so that it
is more effective?

THE CASE STUDY: A MESSENGER COMMISSIONED
Scripture:  Context: Exodus 2:1-5:21
Printed: Exodus 4:10-17; 6:28-7:7
A Case Study of the Call of Moses

Focus: At a burning bush on Mount Horeb, the Lord met Moses and commanded him to return to Egypt in order to bring the children of Israel out of Egypt. This event happened long ago. The issue: How did the messenger system provide a framework for the prophetic task?

Background: Lord is the name for the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and their descendents, the Israelites. The Lord had spoken to three men by various means on various occasions. The Lord is present in the Old Testament as the only true God and distinctly different from any of the deities of the polytheistic peoples of the ancient Near East.

The Lord God of the Hebrews presented himself as radically different from the alleged nature gods and goddesses of Egypt. Unlike the nature deities, the Lord was not visible to the human eye, nor located in a thing, or a place, nor was he fettered by time. He was and is distinctly other than nature; he is its Creator. He uses nature, any aspect of it, to display his power and to help him carry out his purposes. These characteristics of the Lord God of Israel are concisely summed up in the Ten Commandments (Exod 20:1-17; Deut 5:1-21) and in Deut 6:4.

The Lord was especially concerned about the welfare of the children of Israel because they were the descendents of Abraham. The Lord had made a covenant with Abraham and had given him definite promises (Gen 12:1-3, 7; 13:14-18; 15:13-17; 17:1-22; 22:15-18; 26:2-5, 24; 28:13-15; 31:11-13; 35:9-12; 46:2-4).

Jacob and his family had moved to Egypt, due to a famine in the land of Canaan, with the help of his son, Joseph, a powerful man in Egypt. As the years passed, the political situation changed in Egypt. The new rulers were unfriendly toward the Israelites who had become numerous in the land of Goshen, an area in the delta of the Nile River. Out of one of the tribes of Jacob (Levi) came Moses and Aaron. Both were born in Egypt in a time of severe persecution of the Israelites. Moses had been hidden from the Egyptians, but a princess had found him and claimed him for her own. Moses was trained by Egyptian teachers; but, one day he saw an Egyptian beating an Israelite slave and killed the Egyptian. Moses had to flee to the Sinai desert to escape punishment. Nothing is known of Aaron's life prior to his meeting Moses after Moses's experience at the burning bush.

The Pharaohs of the New Kingdom of Egypt (1550-1200 B.C.) were powerful persons at that time in the ancient Near East. The exact identity of the Pharaoh in the Exodus event is the subject of sharp debate. The text does not identify him. Whoever he was, he was an awe-inspiring individual. The monuments and buildings built by the Egyptian people still excite wonder and appreciation in those who view them. Their mummified bodies preserved in the Cairo Museum do not look impressive, but the cultural artifacts and extensive inscriptions that remain certainly are outstanding.

At first glance, the Israelites appear unlikely candidates for being a
God-chosen people, who were to serve as a beachhead in a polytheistic world. They were to be the ones through whom faith in one true God was to permeate the world. They were the ones who were to worship that God in spirit and in truth; they were to follow a way of life that embodied the holiness of God.

The Israelites had been slaves to the Egyptians, who treated them brutally. The Lord had promised Abraham and Jacob that their descendants would be brought back to the land of Canaan. It was time for God to fulfill his promise.

The following time line shows the sequence of action in these two passages and their literary context:
2:1-4    Moses born and hidden
2:5-10   Moses found and claimed by Pharaoh's daughter
2:11-15a   Moses kills an Egyptian and flees
2:15b-22   Moses had arrived forty years earlier
3:1-3   Moses sees a bush that does not stop burning
3:4-4:17   The Lord speaks to Moses
4:18-20   Moses goes to Egypt
4:21-23   The Lord speaks to Moses again
4:24-26   Moses circumcises his son
4:27-28   Aaron meets Moses
4:29-31   Both speak to the Israelites
5:1-9   Both speak to Pharaoh
5:10-21   The slavery worsens
5:22-6:13   Moses and the Lord talk together
6:14-27   Moses's family tree
6:28-7:7   Moses's commission renewed
7:8-12:30   The Ten Plagues described
12:31-15:20   The Exodus Event

Description: The Lord used a burning bush to attract Moses's attention. When Moses turned aside to inspect the bush, the Lord identified himself. The Lord told Moses of his decision to deliver Israel from their slavery in Egypt. The Lord commissioned Moses to be his messenger to the Pharaoh of Egypt. Moses, feeling inadequate for the task, complained that he was not qualified. Moses and the Lord talked about his problem on two different occasions.

The biblical record of these two conversations, as found in the New King James Version, follows:

Then Moses said to the Lord,
Moses 1 "O my Lord, I am not eloquent, neither before nor since You have spoken to your servant; but I am slow of speech and slow of tongue" (4:10). So the Lord said to him,
Lord 1  "Who has made man's mouth? Or who makes the mute, the deaf, the seeing, or the blind? Have not I, the Lord. "Now therefore, go, and I will be with your mouth and teach you what you shall say." But he said,

Moses 2  "O my Lord, please send by the hand of whom ever else You may send." So the anger of the Lord was kindled against Moses, and He said:

Lord 2  "Is not Aaron the Levite your brother? I know that he can speak well. And look, he is also coming out to meet you. When he sees you, he will be glad in his heart. Now you shall speak to him and put the words in his mouth. And I will be with your mouth and with his mouth, and I will teach you what you shall do. So he shall be your spokesman to the people. And he himself shall be as a mouth for you, and you shall be to him as God. And you shall take this rod in your hand, with which you shall do the signs" (4:10-17).

Read the section above describing the sequence of action for events spanning the end of this conversation and the beginning of the encounter printed below.

And it came to pass, on the day when the Lord spoke to Moses in the land of Egypt, that the Lord spoke to Moses, saying,

Lord 3  "I am the Lord. Speak to Pharaoh king of Egypt an that I say unto you." But Moses said before the Lord,

Moses 3  "Behold, I am of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh heed me?" So the Lord said to Moses:

Lord 4  "See, I have made you as God to Pharaoh, and Aaron your brother shall be your prophet. You shall speak all that I command you. And Aaron your brother shall speak to Pharaoh, that he must send the children of Israel out of his land. And I will harden Pharaoh's heart, and multiply My signs and My wonders in the land of Egypt. But Pharaoh would not heed you, so that I may lay My hand on Egypt and bring My armies and My people, the children of Israel, out of the land of Egypt by great judgments. And the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord when I stretch out My hand on Egypt and bring out the children of Israel from among them." Then Moses and Aaron did so; just as the Lord commanded them, so they did. And Moses was eighty years old and Aaron eighty-three years old when they spoke to Pharaoh (6:28-7:7).
The Lord continued to explain how he would deal with the negative response of the Pharaoh; namely, by hardening his heart. He would deliver Israel from Egypt and cause Pharaoh to realize that He was truly God. After receiving this message from the Lord, both Moses and Aaron obeyed the divine command.

**Analysis:** The purpose of this component is to: (a) analyze the structure of the passage, (b) probe the significance of its literary placement, (c) evaluate the meanings of words and phrases that occur, and (d) delineate the dynamics of the dialogue. The first printed passage (4:10-17) is the final paragraph of a larger literary unit which begins at 3:1. The second passage (6:28-7:2) is the first part of a unit that extends to 7:7 and is much like the first passage in that the Lord gives Moses a task but Moses complains that he is not competent because he cannot speak well. The Lord then describes how Aaron would function as the speaker for God and Moses.

Why are two accounts of the Lord's call of Moses to this task present in book of Exodus? Did they come from two different Israelite communities centuries after the time of Moses; or is the second account in the text to tell us that Moses had severe inner struggles as he met opposition in Egypt? Both passages are narratives made up of conversations between the Lord and Moses. In the first, Moses speaks twice (10, 13), offering reasons why he cannot be the Lord's spokesman. The Lord responds each time (11-12; 14-17), addressing Moses's reasons. In the second, the Lord speaks first (6:29) and then responds (7:1-7). Moses gives his reason for not being fit for the task in 6:30. Why are the narratives composed mostly of verbal interaction between the Lord and Moses? Does the presence of exchanges of words indicate that Moses actually could hear words being spoken by the Lord? Why preserve conversations that show Moses, the hero of the Exodus, as stubborn and intractable? Perhaps the presence of these conversations in the narrative implies that revelation is more than a thinking process, that it also includes the dynamics of an interpersonal relationship.

The first incident is said to have taken place in the presence of the burning bush on Mt. Sinai [Horeb] (3:1). The second took place in Egypt (6:28). A short but unspecified span of time separated the two incidents. What is the meaning of this change of place and this span of time? Possibly the writer consciously provided this data in order to make it clear that these incidents took place within the flow of a series of events. If so, how may this fact imply that the writer believed these conversations took place at two different times?

Let us now look at the placement of these passages in relation to the units of which they are a part and the placement of the units in relation to surrounding literary units.

As stated above, the first printed text is the last part of a story which
begins at 3:1. This story tells us that the Lord caught Moses's attention and then accosted him by means of a bush that burned but was not consumed. What follows is an interaction between the Lord and Moses cast in the literary form of a lively conversation. And, direct speech in the Old Testament often carries the essential content of a passage. The Lord spoke to Moses six times (3:4a, 5-10, 12, 14-22; 4:2a, 3-9) and Moses responded to the Lord five times (3:4b, 11, 13; 4:1, 2b) up to the printed portion. Within the printed portion, the Lord spoke four times and Moses spoke three times. Most of the statements of the Lord are much longer than Moses's responses. In the second printed portion, the Lord spoke twice and Moses only once. What does this distribution of words imply? Perhaps this phenomenon indicates the dominance of the Lord in the encounter, and the sense of inferiority Moses felt.

Chapter three is preceded by a series of literary units which prepare the reader for the location of the big event but not for the nature of the event itself. The book of Exodus begins with a short genealogy that ties it to the conclusion of the book of Genesis. The same people are involved, they are all descendents of Jacob. They had been in Egypt long enough to have become a populous community. Joseph is mentioned because he was instrumental in the move from Canaan to Egypt (1:1-7). The other units are narratives. The second unit (1:8-22) reveals that a new king in Egypt feared this foreign community and enslaved them as laborers. The king's concern became so great that he ordered the women who delivered Hebrew babies to kill all males. The third unit (2:1-10) tells the story of Moses's birth and remarkable deliverance from death, because a princess found him in a basket floating on the Nile River and reared him in her home. The fourth unit (2:11-25) is an account of Moses's crime, flight to Midian and marriage of a daughter of Jethro. Thus the human deliverer is introduced to the reader.

Why are these units so brief? Surely, the time span covered by these narratives contained many important events. Is it possible the writer's purpose was not to provide a full history; but rather, to present limited indicators of what the situation was prior to Moses's call? Conceivably this could imply that the author had a message about God's concern for Israel he wanted to convey to the reader. Between the two printed passages are several literary units that tell us of Moses's return to Egypt (4:18-31), involving a request for permission from Jethro, the circumcision of Moses's son, the reunion with Aaron, and the wholehearted reception of Moses by the Israelites. Why are only these incidents, and not others, recorded about this journey? What was the principle of selection which omitted description of the landscape, and the customs of the people observed along the way? How may each incident in the narrative have a theological purpose for being there?

The next narrative records the first audience of Moses and Aaron with Pharaoh and his angry refusal to grant their request (5:1-21). The chapter
ends with Moses agonizing before the Lord in prayer, to which the Lord (answered with a command to deliver a message to the Israelites. This time they rebuff Moses (5:22-6:9). The Lord next told Moses to deliver a message to Pharaoh, though Moses protested he lacked the ability to do so (6:10-13).

Why is the throne name of Pharaoh omitted from the text? Surely, the presence of that name would greatly aid later scholars to date this event. Why is the Egyptian belief that Pharaoh was the sun god in flesh not mentioned? How might the author intentionally omit this kind of data in order to emphasize the humanity of this ruler? Perhaps this implies that the awesome power of Pharaoh was being exposed as a "paper tiger," in order for the power of the true God to be understood more easily.

Another genealogy (6:14-27; cf. 1:1-7) of Jacob's sons--Reuben, Simeon and especially Levi--has an emphasis on the family tree of Moses and Aaron. Why does this genealogy appear here? Why not somewhere else in the sequence of narratives, perhaps between 5:21 and 22? Probably this genealogy serves with the initial genealogy as literary brackets of a block of narratives that are centered on the beginnings of Moses's prophetic task.

The second printed passage serves as an introduction to the plague/Exodus sequence and is tied to the first section by the complaint of Moses that he had "uncircumcised lips" (6:12, 30). This second passage also immediately precedes the first of a series of miracles that culminate in the successful crossing of the sea. The two printed passages present key events in the Lord's dealings with a reluctant Moses. The entire context, (1:1-15:21) is prose except for the Song of Moses (15:1-18) and the Song of Miriam (15:21).

Why does this series of narratives concentrate on the Ten Plagues and the Crossing of the Sea and ignore a description of the polytheistic religion of Egypt? This may imply that the main concern of the author was to exalt the wonder-working power of the one true God. What was the essential difference between the Lord's miracles done through the agency of Moses and Aaron, and the magical actions of the Egyptians? How was the authenticity of the display of divine power established by the results? Perhaps the alleged power of the magicians was thus exposed as a lie?

There are several words and phrases in the two passages which are the core of this study and these need to be explained.

Moses's description of his speech impediment contains an interesting twist of meaning on an important Hebrew word (kābōd) usually translated as "glory." The literal meaning of the word is "heavy," but it is used in this literal sense only in 1 Sam 4:18 and 2 Sam 14:26. Often the word is used of parts of the body that are, handicapped, or parts of the body that connote spiritual impairment. For examples of this use of the term, read Gen 48:10, Isa 6:10, 59:1, Zech 7:11. In sequence, the NJKV translates the word as "dim," "heavy," "heavy," (in the sense of deafness) and
"stopped." The word may serve as a figure of speech for severity of life experiences such as labor, slavery, warfare, etc. (Read Exod 5:9, Judg 20:34, 1 Kgs 12:10. Read also an article in *The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. I, pp. 426-428 for an excellent discussion of the word.)

In Moses's case, was the handicap lisping, stammering, or difficulty speaking readily and at a normal speed? Since Moses had been away from Egypt so long, was he worried about his ability to speak Egyptian fluently, especially the kind used in a royal court? If so, probably Moses had legitimate grounds for bringing up the problem.

A striking idiom appears in verse 15: Moses was to "put words in his [Aaron's] mouth." What does this phrase mean? Since words are not physical objects, may this phrase refer to some sort of transfer of a message? Could this phrase be influenced by the then-current practice of the Pharaoh to designate one of his important officials as his mouth, with the task of relaying to others Pharaoh's wishes? If so, would not the idiom indicate a very high status of Moses before the Lord--and, of Aaron before Moses--in communicating to others? Does not the word "spokesman" in verse 16, support this probability?

In the second passage, Moses says he has "uncircumcized lips" (see also 6:12). Elsewhere in the Old Testament, the adjective "uncircumcised" designates ears that do not listen and understand (Jer 6:10). When the word modifies heart, the inner being, it indicates defilement and disobedience (Isa 52:1, Jer 9:26). Other passages contain commands and exhortations that such a heart be circumcised, so undesirable traits are removed and desirable traits are added (Deut 10:16; 30:6; Jer 4:4; Rom 2:28-29: 15:8; Phil 3:3: Col 2:11). What does this phrase mean here? Can it be something like his tongue being slow (heavy, 4:10)? Could it be that since circumcision was a religious ritual that served as a symbol of obedient servanthood to the Lord, that uncircumcision represented lips that refused to obey Moses's wishes? Very likely, this fact made Moses believe his lips were unfit for the Lord's service. Why may Moses have hinted that he was defiled because of his speech handicap and that the Lord ought to correct it by an act comparable to the rite of circumcision?

The Lord told Moses he was to have the status of "God to Pharaoh." It is known from Egyptian literature that all Egyptians regarded the Pharaoh as a deity, a descendent of the sun which was the most important god above many gods and goddesses. The Old Testament nowhere speaks of Pharaoh as a god. What does this placement of Moses as God over Pharaoh mean? How might God thus negate the claim that Pharaoh was a powerful god by elevating Moses above him? How could this kind of statement also establish in Moses's mind that the Lord is the supreme God and that Moses had a high position before the Lord, higher than even the powerful position of Pharaoh in Egypt? In what way may this statement grant Moses great authority in transmitting the divine message to Aaron?
To extend the point further, how might this statement elevate even Aaron above the Pharaoh? Aaron was positioned as a "prophet" who received the divine message from Moses and delivered it orally to Pharaoh. Only Abraham is referred to as a prophet prior to Aaron in the Scriptures (Gen 20:7) and his task was to pray for Abimelech. Moses is called a prophet in Deut 34:10, and the word is used elsewhere in the Old Testament over 160 times of other people. What does it mean that Aaron was to serve Moses as his prophet? How may the word serve as a synonym of "spokesman" in 4:16? In what way may the reference to Aaron speaking to Pharaoh (7:2) serve as a support for that connection?

The Lord told Moses that he would "harden" Pharaoh's heart. This word does not seem to mean that the physical organ had changed from being a soft muscle to some kind of hard substance. It is more likely that this verb represents a proud, stubborn attitude toward Moses's request. Thus "heart" here seems to denote, not the physical organ, but a figure of speech for the inner being. Thus this hardening seems to represent a judgment on Pharaoh's refusal to permit the Israelites to leave Egypt. The Lord promised Moses that he would do many "signs" and "wonders" to demonstrate his mighty power (7:3) to Pharaoh and the Egyptians. What were these signs and wonders? How might the ten plagues and the protection of the Israelites during the plagues, and the dividing of the waters qualify as signs and wonders? Since the Lord does not have a physical hand like humans, how might the word "hand" (7:4, 5) function as a figure of speech for the acts of God in performing these signs and wonders?

The relationships apparent in these two passages center about: the Lord, Moses, Aaron, the Israelites and Pharaoh. What aspects of these relationships point to a network of communication which makes it possible for messages to flow from the source to addressee and back to the source? What implications can be drawn from the fact that these texts present the Lord as the invisible but authoritative source of the messages? Why did the Lord initiate the situation? What motivation did the Lord have in making contact with Pharaoh? Why did the Lord select Moses as his personal representative, and work with him until he obeyed? How was mercy expressed when he selected Aaron as Moses's substitute voice? Why did the Israelites find it difficult to keep on believing, after Pharaoh intensified their suffering?

In regard to the humanness of Moses displayed in prayers of complaint, what implications can you draw about the Lord's wisdom in selecting Moses for this task? What conclusions are justified in regard to Pharaoh sensing a challenge to his pride and power, when he heard the request? On what basis could Pharaoh have surmised that Moses acted like a greater god than he; and thus, should be taught a lesson of humility? How was Pharaoh, in fact, humiliated, when Moses approached him as a representative of a more powerful God, and treated him as not more than a human
king? How might Pharaoh feel justified for reacting harshly in putting down a potential rebellion?

This analysis is a selection from a number of blocks of observational data, questions and speculation that can be directed toward the passages quoted and their context. You may want to add questions that come to your mind.

Integration and Interaction: Among many issues that one may discover in this passage, some are listed below, with one selected for examination.

1. Why did the Lord not immediately punish Moses for his resistance to the Lord's commands?
2. When the Lord said he makes some people mute, deaf or blind, did he mean he commits unjust acts against innocent people?
3. Why should a God of love become angry at anyone?
4. Did the Lord reveal a mean streak in his character when he stated he would harden Pharaoh's heart?
5. How did the messenger system provide a framework for the prophetic task?

The last issue has been selected because the Lord wanted Moses to deliver messages for Him and He indicated that Aaron could perform the same messenger function for Moses. This suggests that the characteristics of the messenger mode of communication between humans may be much like the way the Lord chose to reveal his will to his people.

The basic words and idioms of the call of Moses are that of transferring a message from one person to another by using a messenger. This was an age-old mode of communication among many of the peoples of the world and at every level of society.

Several stories that appear earlier in the book of Genesis suggest a messenger mode of transferring a message which involved a spiritual being. When Hagar and her son Ishmael were ejected from Abraham's encampment, an angel of the Lord appeared to her and gave a promise of a fruitful future (Gen 16:7-12). Verse 13 suggests Hagar understood the angel to be the Lord himself, or at least the representative of the Lord. Note that at the end of verse 11, the Lord is referred to as another person. Note another appearance of an angel to Hagar (Gen 21:17-20). There are other instances where an angel of the Lord conveyed a message to people: Gen 22:11-12; 31:11-13; Num 22:31-35; Judges 2:1-4; 6:11-23; 13:3-22; 1 Kgs 19:5-8; 2 Kgs 1:3; 1 Chron 21:18; Zech 1:9-19; 2:3-5; 3:6-10; 4:1-7; 5:5-11; 6:4-8. In the instances involving Elijah and Zechariah, the messenger statement, "Thus says..." indicates the message was to be relayed to an audience.

An example of a person using a messenger is found in Genesis 32:3-6. Jacob had returned to the highlands east of the Jordan River with a large family, many servants and a multitude of sheep and cattle. Many years before he had wronged his brother Esau and fled north to his Uncle
Laban's to escape Esau's wrath. He knew that Esau lived to the south in Edom, but did not want to meet him face to face. He selected messengers from among his servants and sent them with a verbal message to deliver to Esau. An important phrase in the message is, "Thus your servant Jacob says," for it denotes the source and authenticity of the message the messengers delivered to Esau. The messengers reported back that Esau was on his way with 400 men to meet Jacob.

The second recorded instance is in Gen 45:9-13, 25-28. Joseph had just revealed his true identity to his astounded brothers when he ordered them to deliver a message to their aged father, Jacob. He was now the chief officer of the Pharaoh, and wanted his father and all the family to come live in the land of Goshen. Joseph used a phrase similar to Jacob's, "Thus says your son, Joseph." However, there was a problem in delivering the message. The brothers, years before, had told Jacob his son Joseph had been killed by wild beasts; now they had to tell Jacob his son was alive and a very powerful leader in Egypt. It was difficult for Jacob to believe the message, but the presents Joseph had sent and a word from the Lord (46:1-4) persuaded him the message was authentic. Later events in Egypt verified the truth of the message.

Compare these incidents with Num 20:14-20; 21:21-23; 22:5-19; 1 Kgs 22:26-27; 2 Kgs 18:17-35; 19:2-4; 9-14a. Note also that this same messenger method and messenger statement, with God as the sender, begins with Moses (Exod 3:14) and is used many times in their interpersonal relationships as recorded in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. They also appear in the Lord's messages to his prophets throughout the Old Testament.

An incident in the life of Abraham is also of interest. Abraham sent his representative, his oldest servant, to Laban to obtain a wife for Isaac (Genesis 24). This servant, when he met Laban, simply identified himself as Abraham's servant and did not use the phrase, "Thus says Abraham." The servant did not have a specific message to deliver, but had freedom to negotiate within guidelines. The story does, however, illustrate an ancient practice of using others to convey information and desires to selected people: Compare with Gen 37:13-17; 42:16; 46:28; Josh 2:1-23; 7:22-23; Judg 6:35, 7:24, 9:31-33, 11:12-28, and many others.

In recent years, an abundance of evidence for the practice--especially among government leaders--of choosing messengers to relay messages to others has come to light. Predominantly, the evidence has been letters, decrees and commercial invoices written in several kinds of scripts on clay or stone. These materials have survived the ravages of time, but evidence from Egypt and the eastern coastal regions of the Mediterranean Sea indicate the widespread use of a paper-like papyrus which was easily destroyed by moisture. Rulers sent messages on clay or papyrus with the messengers. These were written duplicates of messages delivered orally. A normal feature of these messages was some variation of the statement,
"Thus says (personal name)." This statement designated the sender, whose authority extended to the person who delivered the message.

Such written messages have been found on clay tablets by the thousands at such places as Ebla (2400-2250 B.C.) in the northwestern corner of modern Syria; at Nippur (1800-1700 B.C.) in the southern part of the Mesopotamian Valley; at Mari (1800-1700 B.C.) on the south bank of the Euphrates River; at Nuzi (1500-1200 B.C.) in the highlands east of the Tigrus River; at Hattusas (1500-1200 B.C.) in the central part of modern Turkey; at Ugarit (1500-1200 B.C.) near the site of Ebla; and, at Nineveh (670-650 B.C.) by the Tigrus River. Many more such messages, mostly on clay but some on papyrus, have been unearthed by archaeologists or found scattered on the ground. These documents span many centuries of time.

Pertinent to this study is a cache of about thirty clay tablets found at Mari. Various individuals from various places near Mari reported to representatives of the king that in a trance or a dream they received messages from idols of the storm god Baal or the mother goddess Ishtar. The representative wrote the message on a clay tablet which was delivered to the king. Typical of these messages is the statement. "Thus says Baal (or Ishtar) to..." These are the only records of prophetic messages found before 1000 B.C. apart from the Old Testament, and associated with a nature deity of a polytheistic religion.

In governments of the ancient Near East, a high official of the governing body was the herald who received messages from the ruler or council and delivered them to whomever designated. The herald could in turn delegate his task to subordinates. The messages were delivered orally, combined with a written message, or consisted simply of the delivery of an inscribed piece of clay or sheet of papyrus. This was common during the time span of the Old and New Testaments.

The establishment of a messenger system between God, his prophets and those addressed was thus not an introduction of a new mode of communication, but an adaptation of a well-known and widely employed method. The mode was an "earthen vessel" by which the "treasure" of divine reality and power was made known to human beings. It was a communication system and vocabulary they understood. There search of several scholars is summarized below to indicate how significant this mode was for the biblical prophets.

Since the biblical record places Moses in a close relationship with the Egyptian culture, one may wonder whether the herald was important in the government of that land. One reference (Gen 41:43) obliquely refers to messengers who proclaimed to the people the importance of Joseph. But A.S. Yahuda provides more precise information from Egyptian inscriptions. Drawing from inscriptions of the New Kingdom, contemporary "with Moses, Yahuda shows that the word "mouth" is a literal equivalent to the title of a high official of Pharaoh's court. Usually this person was heir to the throne and ranked immediately after the king. The task of the
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Egyptian "mouth," or "chief mouth," was to see that the messages of Pharaoh, who the Egyptians regarded as the sun-god in human flesh, were it properly delivered to the intended audience. (See bibliography.)

J. S. Holladay notes that the Assyrian Empire of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. had a high official, with heraldic duties of receiving messages from the emperor and seeing that they were delivered. He saw this practice as a communication model for Old Testament prophecy. (See bibliography.)

Ann M. Vater provides an exhaustive description of eight patterns of stories in two hundred and thirty texts in the Old Testament. Overall these follow the messenger-communication model common in ancient times. (See bibliography.)

T. Y. Mullins shows that comparable narrative forms are found in the New Testament, especially in Luke and Acts. (See bibliography.)

B. S. Childs observes that limiting one's interest just to the system as a model for the call of Moses and all future prophets can be artificial. He stresses the need to see the theological dimensions of this event in the life of Moses. Primarily this involves the dominance in this call of the reality of the one true God intervening in the affairs of an enslaved Israel and their oppressor, mighty Egypt, to redeem his people and bring them to the land of promise. Also to be considered must be the reality of Moses as a real human being, gripped with doubts and fears. (See bibliography.)

The observations made by these scholars are helpful, but there are several factors which seem to be overlooked. I would like to offer additional information that has arisen from my personal study of these narratives depicting Moses's call. (See bibliography.)

In terms of narrative structure, the account in 3:1-4:18, and other discussions of the call (5:22-6:13; 6:28-7:7) are made up of similar components. In the first instance the components are (a) the theophany in the burning bush (3:1-5), (b) God's identity and purpose (3:6-9), (c) commissioning (3:10), (d) objections and assurances (3:11-4:12), (e) request (4:13), (f) help provided (4:15-17), and (g) obedience (4:18). The second section (5:22-6:13) has these components: (a) objection (5:22-23), (b) God's identity (6:1-5), (c) commissioning (6:6-8), (d) obedience (6:9), (e) commissioning (6:10-11), (f) objection (6:12), and (g) command (6:13). The third section (6:28-7:7) has the following components: (a) God's identity (6:28-29a), (b) commissioning (6:29a), (c) objection (6:30), (d) help provided (7:1-2), (e) assurance (7:3-5), and (f) obedience (7:6-7).

Not all components appear in these three sections, nor are they completely in the same sequence. They do, however, provide a vivid series of encounters between the Lord and Moses which offer some basic insights about what the Lord wanted to accomplish, and the means he had decided to use to attain his goals.

The messenger system has several phases in its mechanism for communicating information. These phases are, (a) the decision of the sender to
select a messenger, (b) the awareness of the messenger of being selected, (c) the sender giving a message, and the messenger receiving it, (d) the messenger carrying the message, (e) the messenger delivering the message, (f) the audience, hearing or seeing the message, (g) the auditor, or audience, responding to the message, (h) the messenger hearing or seeing the response, (i) the messenger returning and delivering the response to the sender, and (j) the sender reacting to the response. From this point, the sequence may be repeated many times.

Taking the phases in the order listed, one may illustrate each by the following passages:

(a) Exod 2:24-25, "So God heard their groaning, and God remembered His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob. And God looked upon the children of Israel, and God acknowledged them."
Exod 3:7-9, "And the Lord said: 'I have surely seen the oppression of My people who are in Egypt, and have heard their cry because of their taskmasters, for I know their sorrows. So I have come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up from that land to a good and large land, to a land flowing with milk and honey, to the place of the Canaanites and the Hittites and the Amorites and the Perizzites and the Hivites and the Jebusites. Now therefore, behold, the cry of the children of Israel has come to Me, and I have also seen the oppression with which the Egyptians oppress them."

(b) Exod 3:10-11, "'Come now, therefore, and I will send you to Pharaoh that you may bring My people, the children of Israel, out of Egypt.' But Moses said to God, 'Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh, and that I should bring the children of Israel out of Egypt?' "

(c) Exod 3:15-17, "Moreover God said to Moses, 'Thus you shall say to the children of Israel: . . . ."
Exod 6:6-8, "Therefore say to the children of Israel: . . . ."
Exod 6:13, "Then the Lord spoke to Moses and Aaron, and gave them a command for the children of Israel and for Pharaoh king of Egypt, to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt."
The chief indicators of this phase of the messenger system are terms such as "send," "go," "speak," and the statements "Thus you shall say to . . . .", or "Thus says the Lord."

(d) Exod 4:29, "Then Moses and Aaron went and gathered together all the elders of the children of Israel."
Exod 7:10a, "So Moses and Aaron went in to Pharaoh,
and they did so, just as the Lord commanded."

(e) Exod 4:30, "And Aaron spoke all the words which the Lord had spoken to Moses. Then he did the signs in the sight of the people."

Exod 5:1, "Afterward Moses and Aaron went in and told Pharaoh, 'Thus says the Lord God of Israel: "Let My people go, that they may hold a feast to Me in the wilderness."'"

Exod 6:9a, "So Moses spoke thus to the children of Israel; . . . "

Exod 7:10b, "And Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh and before his servants, and it became a serpent."

(f) Exod 4:30, [implies hearing plus seeing] " . . . in the sight of the people."

Exod 5:1, [hearing evident in this verse].

Exod 7:9-10, [hearing and seeing evident in these verses].

(g) Exod 4:31, "So the people believed: . . . then they bowed their heads and worshiped.

Exod 5:4, "Then the king of Egypt said to them, 'Moses and Aaron, why do you take the people from their work? Get back to your labor.'" [See also 5:5-19.]

Exod 5:20-21, "Then, as they came out from Pharaoh, they met Moses and Aaron who stood there to meet them. And they said to them, 'Let the Lord look on you and judge, because you have made us abhorrent in the sight of Pharaoh and in the sight of his servants, to put a sword in their hand to kill us.'"

Exod 6:9, ", . . . but they would not heed Moses, because of anguish of spirit and cruel bondage."

Exod 7:11-13, "But Pharaoh also called the wise men and the sorcerers; so the magicians of Egypt, they also did in like manner with their enchantments. For every man threw down his rod, and they became serpents. But Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods. And Pharaoh's heart grew hard, and he did not heed them, as the Lord had said."

(h) [The passages given above all assume that Moses and Aaron heard and/or saw the responses of their several audiences.]

(i) Exod 5:22-23, "So Moses returned to the Lord and said, 'Lord, why have You brought trouble on this people? to speak in Your name, he has done evil to this people; neither have You delivered Your people at all.'"
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(j) Exod 6:1-8, "Then the Lord said to Moses, . . . "

These phases are reflected in the composition of many literary units in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. Other passages that are similar in emphasis are, Exod 7:14-18, 25-8:4; 9:13-21; 14:1-8; and 25:1-30:10.

There are nine such units in Numbers 5:5-10, 11-31; 6:1-21, 22-27; 15:1-16, 36-40; 18:25-32; 35:1-8, 9-34. All of these have in them mostly short, sometimes long, portions of the message content. They are concerned primarily with phases (a), (b) and (c).


Another set concentrates on phases (d) through (g). They are Exod 11:4-10; 32:25-29; 35:1-3, 4-29, 35:30-39:43.

The accounts that center on phases (h) through (j) are set up as prayer situations in which Moses discussed with the Lord problems that arose from negative reactions of the addressees. The first such situation arose from the twin negative reactions of Pharaoh and the Israelites (5:19-6:1). Others are Exod 8:8-15; 10:16-20; 14:9-25; 15:22-27:17:1-7; 31:18-32:16; 32:30-35; 33:7-23; Num 9:6-23; 11:1-3; 11:4-25; 12:10b-16; 21:4-9.
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Judgments: As they presently stand in the biblical text, the passages selected for this case study have geographical and chronological continuity with the episodes which precede, come between and follow them. These passages are important because the call of Moses is the first such incident recorded in the Scriptures. Remarkably, the experience of Moses at the burning bush served as a model for all future prophetic calls.

The main character, Moses, is placed in this continuity by a series of
short narratives in one brief chapter. These stories recount his birth, growth to manhood, his crime, his flight to the vast deserts east of Egypt, and his new life in the family of Reuel, also known as Jethro.

The several authors mentioned in the Integration and Interaction section—Yahuda, Holladay and Vater—provide important information about various aspects of the messenger system in the ancient Near East. Ann Vater especially deals with the composition of the narratives related to prophets in the Old Testament, and many of her observations are helpful. However, there are some features of Moses's call narratives that seem to be overlooked. These features are briefly described here.

The call account in 3:1-4:18, and the other discussions of the call (5:22-6:13; 6:28-7:7) are made up of similar components. In the first instance, the components are: (a) the theophany in the burning bush (3:1-5), (b) God's identity and purpose (3:6-9), (c) commissioning (3:10), (d) objections and assurances (3:11-4:12), (e) request (4:13), (f) help provided (4:15-17), and (g) obedience (4:18). The second section (5:22-6:13) has these components: (a) objection (5:22-23), (b) God's identity (6:1-5), (c) commissioning (6:6-8), (d) obedience (6:9), (e) commissioning (6:10-11), (f) objection (6:12), and (g) command (6:13). We have here an example of adaptation of human structures of person-to-person communication, the messenger system, which was well known throughout the ancient Near East and thus familiar to Moses, his people and to the Egyptians.

In Moses's service for the Lord, there was more than a messenger responsibility. A goal of the Lord was to forge a national covenant with the descendents of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob which would fulfill promises made to those patriarchs. The event which accomplished this goal took place at Mt. Sinai after the Exodus from Egypt. A complete coverage of the life and work of Moses must include the significance of this national covenant and the legal, military and religious laws and rites that combined to make the freed slaves into one people under one God. Such coverage will not be attempted in this case study, but it should be noted that the tasks of messenger, covenant mediator, lawgiver and military leader intertwined with common concepts about God, nature, nation and humanity.

B. S. Childs is right in his caution that over-attention on the mechanics of the messenger system and the forms of oral and literary composition can be artificial. There must be a grasp of the theological tenets that infused mode and form.

A basic feature of the two passages before us, in fact in all of the Scriptures, is the dominance of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He had remembered his covenant with them and decided the time had come to redeem their descendents from slavery. The implementation of the divine decision was the sudden impact of his presence by means of the bush that would not burn up. The mode of contact was person-to-person
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Though a bush was used in catching Moses's attention, the Lord did not identify himself as this natural object or as any natural force. He identified himself as the God of ancestors who had lived elsewhere and at a different time. When pressed for a name, the Lord gave the enigmatic, "I am who I am," which suggests he is the Creator, the one who is dynamic being. With the command that Moses go to Egypt, the Lord gave the promise, will certainly be with you" (3:12). He further promised that he would bring the Israelites out of Egypt and lead them into the land of Canaan, the promised land. He was not the shepherd's rod that changed to a snake and back to a rod, nor the leprosy that afflicted Moses's hand and then was healed. These items were not the Lord; rather, they were signs that indicated the Lord was present in an awesome way.

The sovereignty of the Lord was apparent in the mystery of the bush that was not consumed, in the signs and in the commands, promises, anger and provisions evident in the Lord's dealings with Moses. His sovereignty came into the foreground vividly in the series of encounters with the Pharaoh of Egypt.

The narratives associated with the Exodus do not give the slightest hint that the royal court, the religious establishment and the common people believed fervently that Pharaoh was the great sun-god in human flesh. The Pharaohs did not disagree; rather, no effort or expense was spared to keep this belief strong in the hearts and minds of all Egyptians. Pharaoh was not only regarded as a god, he was the State, the absolute ruler of his people. (Although this situation varied during Egypt's history.)

The Egyptians were polytheists, believing in many nature gods of lesser powers than the sun and Pharaoh. This much is acknowledged in the phrase, "gods of Egypt" (Exod 12:12). Magicians at the royal court were also recognized as having a measure of power (Exod 7:11, 22; in 8:7, 18, 19; 9:11).

In the Exodus narratives, the God of the enslaved Israelites fearlessly and powerfully challenged Pharaoh (he is depicted as merely a human ruler), the might of the State, and the faith of every Egyptian. Audaciously, he chose an old shepherd, a murderer who had a combined Hebrew and Egyptian heritage, as his human agent. By instructing Moses and his brother Aaron, and displaying his power, "... by trials, by signs, by wonders, by war, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, and by great terrors..." (Deut 4:34), the Lord invaded Egypt, brought Pharaoh to his knees and delivered the Israelites from slavery.

To emphasize Pharaoh's inferiority, the Lord appointed Moses "as God to Pharaoh" (7:1), an ironic twist in that Pharaoh regarded himself as deity. Moses was to have a position of power and authority over this king, and even Aaron was to have a superior position. As Moses's "mouth," Aaron was his brother's deputy spokesman and thus at a level higher than Pharaoh. The Lord was dramatizing his own sovereignty by elevating his
servants to these high levels and thus demoting Pharaoh.

The other participants in the call experience and the events that followed were the Israelite people. The burning bush experience did not happen in order to give Moses a spiritual high or a good feeling. The significance of the experience was that the Lord commissioned Moses to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, to form them into a nation, and to settle them in the land of Canaan.

Moses's first contact with his fellow Israelites would have encouraged him to believe they would respond positively, but the aftermath of the first encounter with Pharaoh was suffering. Their attitudes radically changed toward their would-be leader and Moses fled to the Lord to pour out in prayer his deep disappointment. The fluctuations of the Israelites between exemplary faith, with accompanying obedience, and apostasy (in calf worship) or just nasty complaining, were hallmarks of the Exodus and the wanderings in the wilderness. They knew the exhilaration of salvation from bondage and flood and could sing with enthusiasm the Song of Moses, part of which reads:

Who is like You, 0 Lord, among the gods?
Who is like You, glorious in holiness,
Fearful in praises, doing wonders?
You stretched out Your right hand;
The earth swallowed them.
You in Your mercy have led forth
The people whom you have redeemed;
You have guided them in Your strength
To Your holy habitation.--Exod 15:11-13

In contrast, when the people suffered hunger and thirst in the desert, they were quick to blame the Lord and Moses and considered returning to Egypt. Numbers chapters 11 and 14 are examples of their rebellion in the wilderness.

An evaluation of Moses's call is not complete without taking the participation of the people seriously. They were the objects of the Lord's redemptive mercy and experienced the trials and triumphs of interacting with divine guidance and grace under the leadership of Moses.

What the Lord did in and through Moses became the model for measuring prophets and their activities in Israel. Deuteronomy 18:15-22 is a summary of this modeling role. Not only would all true prophets be marked by being commissioned to speak words commanded by the Lord, but they were also to separate themselves from idolatry and what they may predict would come to pass.

The role modeling of Moses would extend even further. God would raise up a Prophet and place "words in His mouth." The message spoken by this Prophet would call people to decision; if they rejected the mes-
sage, the result would be death.

Jesus commissioned all his disciples to be witnesses (messengers) throughout the world (Acts 1:8); who, after Pentecost, "went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts 8:4). It has been typical of fervent Christians to be messengers of the word of salvation through Jesus Christ.

Paul had this sense of being sent with a message to the Gentiles (Acts 22:21; 26:17; 1 Cor 1:17); and, as he testified before King Agrippa, "I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision" (Acts 26:19).

Through the centuries, many Christians of all ages, of every status of life, of every nation, have experienced the command of the Lord to witness and preach the gospel.

**Evaluation:** One should not be surprised that Moses had difficulty accepting his appointment to the prophet/messenger status. The surprise should arise from the moderations of Moses's response. Moses could have rejected what he heard as utterly ridiculous and stubbornly refused to consider the matter further.

A justification for such action could have been thought out easily. When one looks at Moses's objections, each seems convincing and his final obedience to the Lord's call quite foolhardy.

Moses comes through as strikingly human. He is not enshrouded with a hero legend or a divinity halo; he is only a shepherd in the wilderness. Nevertheless, memories of earlier years caused him to realize immediately how dangerous this divinely appointed task really was. He also was deeply religious and feared whatever suggested the presence of the God of his fathers.

Moses harbored a pain-filled fear of Pharaoh; the murder he had committed in Egypt forty years before surely would be remembered at the royal court should he appear there in person.

Moses had doubts about his own people, the Hebrews, by whom he would most likely be regarded as an apostate from the traditional faith and thus ignorant of the name of the true God.

To each of these concerns, the Lord had an answer, mixed with explanations and promises.

Moses knew that a key factor in a successful project of the sort the Lord proposed could be convincing evidence of authority and power. A dusty shepherd coming directly from the desert would not impress either Israelite or Pharaoh as being a powerful person. Nor would an invisible God identified with neither nature objects (sun, moon, etc.) or an idol, be regarded as believable. Nevertheless, Moses courageously traveled to Egypt to galvanize his people into action and gain permission from Pharaoh to let the Israelites go into the desert.

The Lord gave three signs to Moses to convince him, and then to convince the Israelites and Pharaoh. First, Moses's shepherd rod changed to a snake and back to a rod. Second, Moses's hand became diseased and
then healed; and, third, Moses was authorized to change water to blood, if need be. Of these measures, the first was to be used frequently in Egypt, the second was purely personal and the third was a measure of last resort (cf. Exod 7:19-21). Answers to Moses's objections seem to have been provided convincingly. Yet, doubts about his capability to carry out his task gripped him and caused profound fear.

When Moses began to base his objections on his internal problems, he soon got into trouble with his Lord. Moses's speech handicap did not match the normal qualification of a messenger, the ability to speak clearly and effectively. This mismatch deeply troubled Moses and created a sense of helplessness in the face of the messenger task. Moses's assessment may be classed as realistic, but it was self-demeaning and evidenced a low self-esteem.

He refused, at the moment, to be impressed by the creative power of God to provide him with words. Moses took the first step of rejection when he requested that someone else be sent to Egypt. More serious than the speech handicap was this display of stubbornness and unbelief that the Lord could really help him.

The sting of experiencing divine anger, and then the wonder of divine grace in designating Aaron as his "mouth," changed Moses's attitude quickly. To Moses's credit, he saw the error of hiding behind personal shortcomings and yielded to the divine call.

Moses exhibited considerable courage when he returned to Egypt, knowing he could be in danger of losing his life. Reunited with Aaron, who readily accepted his new role as Moses's assistant, Moses was successful in gaining the support of his fellow Israelites for the proposed trip to the desert. He was able to gain an audience with Pharaoh, who seemed to know nothing of Moses's earlier crime in Egypt, and boldly presented his request.

The result was angry rejection by Pharaoh and immediate hardship for the Israelites. Their anger and accusations shocked Moses and the imminent failure of his mission sent him, filled with self-pity and despair, to the Lord with a bitter complaint. Moses not only was humiliated by his failure, he was blaming the sad turn of events on his speech defect; and, by implication, accusing the Lord of lack of wisdom regarding the project of convincing Pharaoh to release the Israelites. One must give Moses credit for his quick recovery from despondency, as he listened to the Lord's instructions and promises.

With the help of his Lord, Moses had passed through the first major crisis of his prophetic ministry.

Decisions: In spite of Moses's several arguments against the Lord's call to return to Egypt and lead the Israelites out of slavery, he did obey (4:18) by requesting and receiving permission to go to Egypt. Moses then set out with his wife and family (4:20). He obeyed the Lord: (a) by circumcising
his son (4:24-26), (b) by enlisting Aaron as his spokesman (4:28-29), (c) by speaking to and receiving the support of the enslaved Israelites for the exit from Egypt (4:30-31), (d) by presenting the Lord's message to Pharaoh (5:1-5), (e) by encouraging the frightened Israelites to continue to believe and obey (6:9), and (f) by continuing to convey the Lord's messages to Pharaoh (7:6). All of these actions imply that Moses, and Aaron as well, consciously made decisions to respond positively to the Lord's command and conform their lives to those decisions.

Making decisions and putting them into action, even at great risk, was typical of the remainder of Moses's life, with the exception of the second miracle of bringing water from the rock (Num 20).

Indeed, deciding to conform life to the Lord's commands was typical of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, after the Lord appeared to each of them. Both the Old and New Testaments provide numerous examples of individuals and groups making decisions to yield themselves completely to the Lord's commands and live accordingly. Throughout history since the biblical times, such obedience has occurred again and again.

What of the present? Are individuals and groups still called to listen to the Lord's will and then make a decision to obey him by conforming all activities to the Lord's command to tell others of salvation and judgment?
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THE EXODUS-CONQUEST AND THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF TRANSJORDAN: NEW LIGHT ON AN OLD PROBLEM

GERALD L. MATTINGLY

One of the major arguments used to support a 13th-century date for the exodus-conquest is the alleged Late Bronze Age occupational gap in central and southern Transjordan. Recent archaeological investigations indicate that this gap hypothesis, which was originally advocated by Nelson Glueck, needs to be modified. Although the historical/archaeological picture is still coming into focus, it now appears that Ammon, Moab, and Edom were settled during the Late Bronze Age. The density of this occupation remains an open question. Nevertheless, it appears that the archaeological data from Late Bronze Age Transjordan have become neutral in the debate on the date of the exodus-conquest.

*    *     *

In the opening pages of Redating the Exodus and Conquest, John J. Bimson identifies two major assumptions of his study. First, he maintains that "the biblical traditions of the bondage in Egypt and of the Exodus have a firm historical basis." Second, Bimson insists that these historical events must be and can be connected to an absolute chronology. This emphasis demonstrates that Redating is important reading for anyone who takes the biblical narratives and their historical/archaeological context seriously. Although many readers will have some reservations, Bimson's study is now the most comprehensive and up-to-date examination of the historical and archaeological data pertaining to the OT accounts of the exodus-conquest.

Since its publication in 1978, Redating has received mixed reviews. For example, Miller suggests that Bimson's theory of a mid-15th century exodus-conquest, which calls for the lowering of the end
of MB IIC, is plausible, but the number of secondary explanations needed to support this daring theory neutralize its advantage over the Albrightian hypothesis for a 13th-century date. Miller says that the most significant contribution of Bimson's book is its demonstration "that those who hold to a thirteenth century exodus-conquest have no monopoly on the archaeological evidence."\footnote{Miller, 133, 135.} In other words, Redating re-examines an old problem from a fresh perspective and shows that the questions concerning the date of the exodus-conquest have not been resolved. Not only are there new ways of looking at old data, as Bimson proves, but there is also new evidence that must be considered. The main purpose of this article is to review the ways in which the archaeological evidence from Transjordan relates to the exodus-conquest and to present some new data that bear upon this issue.


ARGUMENTS FOR THE LATE DATE EXODUS-CONQUEST

There are four major arguments used to support the late date for the exodus-conquest: (1) the identification of Pithom and Raamses, (2) the 13th-century destruction of Palestinian towns mentioned in the conquest narratives, (3) the archaeological evidence from Middle Bronze and Late Bronze Age Transjordan, and (4) the military campaigns of Seti I and Ramses II.\footnote{Bimson, Redating, 330-73; cf. K. A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and Old Testament (London: Tyndale, 1966) 57-69; C. F. Aling, Egypt and Bible History from Earliest Times to 1000 B.C. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981) 77-96.} While Bimson refers to the first two arguments as the "main pillars" of the late date, he also regards the third and fourth points as key elements. However, all four of these arguments are still open to further deliberation. The Egyptian evidence, which forms the basis of arguments (1) and (4), is still being reworked and interpreted in different ways.\footnote{See, for example, Aling, Egypt and Bible History, 77-110; idem, "The Biblical City of Ramses," JETS 25 (1982) 129-37; H. Shanks, "The Exodus and the Crossing of the Red Sea, According to Hans Goedicke," BAR 7 (1981) 42-50, and other articles related to Goedicke's theory; B. MacDonald, "Excavations at Tell el-Maskhuta," BA 43 (1980) 49-58.} And, although it is a favorite of many OT scholars, Miller recently delivered a critical blow to the second argument by showing that the "destruction layers" at certain Palestinian tells represent, at best, an ambiguous form of evidence.\footnote{J. M. Miller, "Archaeology and the Israelite Conquest of Canaan: Some Methodological Observations," PEQ 109 (1977) 87-93.} I focus here on the third argument, the lack of Middle Bronze and Late Bronze Age Transjordan.
Bronze and late Bronze settlements in central and southern Transjordan.

Assumptions Behind the Third Argument

The archaeological evidence from Transjordan is important in this debate because Numbers 20ff. and Judges 11 indicate that the Hebrews, while en route to the land of Canaan, were opposed by the kings of Edom and Moab and the Amorite kings to the east of the Jordan River. Therefore, archaeological evidence of occupation in their territories at the time of the conquest should be found, regardless of the date assigned to this event. Because Glueck's surface survey indicated that there was a gap in the sedentary occupation of Edom and Moab from ca. 1900 B.C. until ca. 1300 B.C. (although Glueck's dates fluctuated), the archaeological material from Transjordan seemed to support the late date. Recognizing that the reconstruction of occupational history in this region is crucial to this whole discussion, Bimson observes:

This argument for the 13th century date only holds if the following three assumptions are correct: (a) that the accounts in Num 20ff are historical, (b) that those accounts, if historical, require the existence of a sedentary population settled in permanent towns at the time of the Israelite migration, and (c) that Glueck's interpretation of the archaeological material is correct.8

Before proceeding to a more detailed treatment of the third assumption, including a report on some archaeological data recently recovered in Jordan, I comment on the first two suppositions mentioned by Bimson.

With regard to the first point, Bimson says that he does not doubt the "basic historicity" of Numbers 20ff. He does, however, in agreement with Bartlett, accept the possibility that certain features of these accounts could be late accretions to the earlier traditions. Many conservative scholars will not approve of such concessions, but there is nothing to fear in admitting that such a possibility exists. Indeed, when compared with the negative conclusions reached by Van Seters in his ongoing debate with Bartlett,9 Bimson's openness is not extreme.

Following a thorough discussion of the second assumption listed above, Bimson concludes that the OT does not demand that the

---

8 Bimson, Redating, 61, 62.
Transjordanian opponents encountered by the Hebrews were part of an urbanized sedentary population. In agreement with the earlier studies of de Vaux and Rea, Bimson suggests that "it is therefore possible that the kings we read of in Num 20ff were chieftains of semi-nomadic groups who refused to let another nomadic group, the Israelites, pass through their areas of pasturage."10 This conclusion is plausible, especially if we follow Wenham's theory which calls for a significant reduction in the Hebrew population and its fighting force.11 Otherwise, it would have taken sizeable armies, perhaps from organized kingdoms, to restrict the movement of such a large number of Hebrews.

GLUECK'S SURVEY OF TRANSJORDAN

In the Glueck festschrift, Wright provides a valuable assessment of Glueck's exploration of Transjordan:

Glueck was not the first man by any means who had searched these lands, but he was the first to do as complete a survey as possible with a small budget and few helpers, and he was the first to use the pottery-dating tool as a basic scientific aid. Between 1932 and 1947, he spent nearly all his exploration time in Transjordan and in the Jordan-Dead Sea rift as far south as the Gulf of Aqabah.... Most of Glueck's work in Transjordan had to be on foot or on horseback. Refusing elaborate equipment, the explorer lived for days at a time as a Bedu, drinking what water was available from any source, living as a guest of the bedouin, and so well known and trusted that he was always protected, needed no foreign guards, and was never harmed.12

Having worked for two summers on an archaeological survey in the region of ancient Moab, I have great respect for Glueck, and it seems wise (indeed, necessary!) to preface a critique of Glueck with an acknowledgment of his remarkable accomplishments.

As several scholars have already suggested and as the recent Moab Survey clearly demonstrates, Glueck's surface exploration of Transjordan is seriously in need of updating.13 This does not mean,

13 For further discussion of the weaknesses in Glueck's archaeological survey, see G. L. Mattingly, "A Reconstruction of Early Bronze Age Cultural Patterns in Central
however, that Glueck's work should be jettisoned in toto. Glueck's four-volume *Explorations in Eastern Palestine* (1934, 1935, 1939, 1951) and *The Other Side of the Jordan* (1940; 2nd ed., 1970) serve as benchmarks in the history of research on ancient Transjordan. Glueck's publications also provide valuable information on the condition of Moab's archaeological sites in the 1930s, and his reports illuminate the nature and rate of the present-day resettlement of the plateau. These factors alone justify the continued use of Glueck's works as the starting point for all future archaeological investigations in Transjordan. Thus, although Glueck's volumes cannot be regarded as conclusive, any attempt to disparage Glueck's intentions or abilities must be accompanied by words of praise for his herculean achievement.14

**Glueck's "Gap Hypothesis"**

In his first major report on the survey of Transjordan (which focused primarily on Moab), Glueck set forth five conclusions. The first three read, in part, as follows:

1. There was a strong Bronze Age civilization in ancient Moab between the twenty-third and the eighteenth centuries B.C., when it completely disappeared.
2. Between the eighteenth and the thirteenth centuries B.C. there is an almost complete gap in the history of settled communities in the region visited.
3. There was a highly developed Moabite civilization, which seems to have flourished especially between the middle of the thirteenth and end of the ninth centuries B.C.15

Similar conclusions were reiterated in Glueck's subsequent reports on this region, although several modifications are apparent in the later publications. Glueck's second statement has probably attracted more attention than all the others. Although the second conclusion is directly related to the first and third statements, the Middle and Late Bronze occupational gap is at the heart of the argument over the date of the exodus-conquest. Since this is the focal point of this article, Glueck's 1934 statement, which constitutes his original gap hypothesis, is quoted in entirety:


14 For discussion of Glueck's contribution to archaeology, see Mattingly, "Reconstruction," 242, 243.
Between the eighteenth and the thirteenth centuries B.C. there is an almost complete gap in the history of settled communities in the region visited. With the exception of Jalul and of el-Misna and el-Medeiyineh above Lejjun, at both of which last two mentioned places a few scraps of Middle Bronze II pottery were found, not a single site was found with pottery remains between the end of Middle Bronze I and the beginning of Early Iron I. The Egyptian lists of towns and the Tell el-Amarna tablets are silent with regard to this period in Eastern Palestine. Moab is first mentioned in the inscriptions of Ramses II.16

In spite of the exceptional sites that yielded "a few scraps of Middle Bronze II pottery," Glueck restated his hypothesis in the first edition of *The Other Side of the Jordan*:

There was at about ± 1900 B.C. such a thoroughgoing destruction visited upon all the great fortresses and settlements of the land, within the limits we have examined, that the particular civilization they represented never again recovered. The blow it received was so crushing as to be utterly destructive. Its cities were never rebuilt, and much of Transjordan became the camping ground of tent dwellers, who used for containers perishable skins and not enduring pottery. Permanent villages and fortresses were no longer to rise upon the face of the earth in this region till the beginning of the Iron Age.17

In this same volume Glueck used the term "Bedouins" to explain his gap: "The Semites who took possession of Transjordan at the very end of the 14th or the beginning of the 13th century B.C., probably partly absorbed and partly drove out the Bedouins who since about 1900 B.C. had been the masters of the land."18

Glueck held firmly to his original gap hypothesis right up to a well-known 1967 essay on Transjordan,19 even though evidence was accumulating that seemed to challenge his position. There were two reasons for Glueck's tenacity. First, he viewed the few sites that had Middle Bronze or Late Bronze sherds as "exceptions" to the rule. Glueck even allowed for the possibility that additional sites might be found in Moab, especially since he recognized that there were gaps in his survey. On the other hand, Glueck's discussion of such omissions concludes with this comment: "On the whole, however, the writer is confident that not very many ancient sites in Edom and Moab, whose

16 Glueck, "Explorations, 1," 82. The literary evidence that relates to this issue will be examined in a separate article.
18 Glueck, *Other Side*, 127.
ruins have not been completely obliterated, remain undiscovered. In light of the hundreds of new sites that have been discovered in Moab alone, this was an amazing claim.

Second, Glueck was convinced that the literary tradition of Genesis 14 (the invasion of Transjordan by the eastern kings) would be reflected in "archaeological facts." Thus, Glueck's certainty about an occupational gap in Transjordan was intimately linked to his convictions about the historical trustworthiness of the Bible.

Along with his other famous hypotheses (i.e., the "King's Highway" and Solomon's "smelting and refining plant" at Ezion-geber), Glueck's theory of a Middle and Late Bronze Age occupational gap in central and southern Transjordan was accepted by historians and archaeologists until recently. Without attempting to provide an exhaustive list of the countless scholars who were influenced by Glueck on this point, perhaps McGovern's observation is sufficient: "In one form or another, Glueck's theory found its way into most of the standard biblical and archaeological handbooks."

**General Criticisms of Glueck's Survey Methodology**

Although the general reliability of much of Glueck's work has stood the test of time, various kinds of errors are now known to have entered into his analyses of the ceramic evidence from Transjordan. As a result, his interpretation of the history of this region, which was based largely on the pottery data, has also become suspect. Specifically, the gap hypothesis has been challenged at four levels.

First, it is now known that surface survey, by its very nature, does not recover all the data at any site. Although the value of archaeological reconnaissance has been adequately demonstrated, any historical reconstruction that is heavily dependent on survey data must be viewed as partial and tentative. The pottery collected from the surface of a site may be representative of the site's accumulated debris, but the surface of an archaeological site is not always a

---

21 Glueck, *Other Side*, 114.
22 See G. E. Wright, "Is Glueck's Aim to Prove that the Bible Is True?" *BA* 22 (1959) 101-8.
microcosm of its subsurface contents. The distribution of sherds over the surface of a site is dependent upon too many natural and cultural variables to provide anything but a rough estimate of the site's actual contents.

Second, it is now recognized that Glueck's survey was superficial. Quite simply, Glueck overlooked *hundreds* of archaeological sites in his survey of Transjordan. Again, this is not intended to minimize Glueck's accomplishment, but it is clear that his superficial treatment of the regions involved skewed some of his conclusions. If failure to recover sherds from a particular period at any one site is detrimental to the interpretive process, the omission of a number of important sites in a region can be disastrous.

Third, Glueck's results have been challenged because some scholars believe that his knowledge of ceramics was wholly inadequate for the task to which he applied himself. After a word of praise for Glueck's *Explorations in Eastern Palestine*, Franken and Power make these criticisms:

> It is now, however, becoming increasingly clear that the other part of Glueck's work, that is to say the pottery study, and the conclusions drawn from that study are in many ways both defective and misleading. There are two reasons for making these judgments. In the first instance his work is defective because Glueck assumed that the culture of Iron Age Transjordan was so similar to that of Palestine that the pottery of Transjordan could be compared with and chronologically tied into the known Palestinian repertoire. And in the second instance the work is misleading because Glueck published only those shapes that were familiar to him even in cases where he picked up unknown shapes in the areas immediately adjacent to Palestine, i.e. in the eastern Ghor and in Ammon. Those shapes that he did not recognize he omitted from publication, which is a curious procedure, for a survey of a largely unknown area ought to reveal and indeed to stress the new and the unknown rather than to emphasize the known. But apparently Glueck did not anticipate a differing Transjordanian cultural development.25

In order to show that these criticisms are related to Glueck's gap hypothesis, Franken and Power continue by saying that it is clear that Glueck assumed that he would have recognized Transjordanian Middle Bronze IIB, IIC, and Late Bronze shapes had he found them. From what has already been said it is no longer clear that this assumption can be accepted without question.... Theoretically it

---

is now quite possible that what Glueck called early Iron Age is in part fourteenth century B.C. Transjordanian pottery.26

Furthermore, the pottery typology of Albright, upon whose work Glueck's pottery analyses were based, has been refined in recent years, and the future will bring a better understanding of the development of ancient Transjordan's ceramic tradition. Indeed, many of the changes that Glueck made in the second edition of The Other Side of the Jordan were based upon his more up-to-date knowledge of Transjordanian pottery.

Fourth, Glueck's work has been criticized because some scholars believe that his survey of Transjordan was influenced by his religious convictions. In other words, Glueck is accused of attempting to "fit" his survey results into his preconceived assumptions about a historically trustworthy Bible. For example, Franken wonders whether "a biblical date for Chedorlaomer or an archaeological date for the end of M.B. I civilization" came first.27 Franken makes many other caustic remarks in his attempt to discredit Glueck's reconstruction of Transjordan's history because it "is based on biblical data."28 Although these criticisms of Glueck's methodology and motives deserve further consideration, I move on to a summary of the archaeological evidence that relates to the gap theory.

A SUMMARY OF THE MIDDLE BRONZE AND LATE BRONZE EVIDENCE FROM CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN TRANSJORDAN

Ever since Glueck's gap hypothesis became popular, archaeologists and historians have eagerly reported any discovery that held promise of disproving Glueck's theory. Occasionally, this enthusiasm caused scholars to force the evidence to say more than is warranted. In an attempt to provide a sober evaluation of Glueck's position, I list the places where Middle and Late Bronze data have been recovered in central and southern Transjordan and comment on the nature of this material. I do not claim that the list of sites or the accompanying bibliographical references are exhaustive, but the major reported finds from the period and region in question are mentioned. General discussions of the archaeological data that are thought to fill in Glueck's hypothetical gap can be found in Harding.29

26 Franken and Power, "Glueck's Explorations," 122, 123.
28 Franken, "Other Side," 7.
Today, most of the objections to Glueck's historical reconstruction are based upon the Middle and Late Bronze finds from ‘Amman, Tell Safut, Sahab, Na’ur, Madeba, Khirbet el-Mekhayyat, and Qla’ et-Twal. More recently recovered artifacts from the Hesban region and the Baq’ah


33 Bimson, Redating, 61-68.


35 Most attention is given to an alleged Middle Bronze Age glacis at Tell Safut; see F. S. Ma'ayeh, "Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Jordan," ADAJ 4-5 (1960) 115. Recent salvage excavations should lead to additional reports on this site and clarification of the function and date of this installation.


37 Reference is made to the Middle Bronze Age tomb objects from Na’ur, but I have not located the primary source on this material; cf. Harding, Antiquities, 32, 33.


Valley will undoubtedly enter into future discussions of central Transjordan's Bronze Age remains. The archaeological data from the sites mentioned above are primarily surface sherds and tomb deposits (some of the latter are quite rich), but there is some stratified material and a small amount of architectural evidence. The outstanding example of the latter is the so-called "Amman Airport Temple," a substantial LB II structure that contained a wealth of imported Mycenaean, Cypriot, and Egyptian pottery and other objects.

In addition to the sites already mentioned, significant results were obtained from two archaeological surveys that were completed in 1982. The 1979, 1981, and 1982 seasons of the "Wadi el-Hasa Survey," which investigated a small portion of biblical Edom, witnessed the recovery of surface remains from over 1,000 sites, only a handful of which yielded any sherds from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. Much work still needs to be done in the territory to the south of Wadi Hesa, the boundary between ancient Moab and Edom.


43 The debate over this structure concerns its function and its apparent isolation from any settlement. For more on this discovery, see below and an interesting footnote in Y. Aharoni, The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography (rev. ed., Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979) 277, 278, n. 54.

were well represented at these sites, the number of sherds from these periods was not as large as that from other historical eras. Since the overall results of this project have not yet been officially reported," this brief summary of the ceramic data that relate to this period is preliminary:

**Middle Bronze Age Pottery from Central and Southern Moab**
9 sites yielded sherds that are either Middle or Late Bronze (MB/LB), each site having between 1 and 42 sherds with this designation.
26 sites yielded sherds that are possibly Middle Bronze (MB?), each site having between 1 and 8 sherds with this designation.
31 sites yielded sherds that are definitely Middle Bronze (MB), each site having between 1 and 46 sherds with this designation.
1 site yielded 1 sherd that is possibly Middle Bronze I (MB I?).
2 sites yielded sherds that are definitely Middle Bronze I (MB I), one site having 3 sherds and the other site 4 sherds with this designation.
1 site yielded 6 sherds that are possibly Middle Bronze II (MB II?).

**Late Bronze Age Pottery from Central and Southern Moab**
6 sites yielded sherds that are either Late Bronze or Iron Age I (LB/Iron I), each site having between 1 and 63 sherds with this designation.
47 sites yielded sherds that are possibly Late Bronze (LB?), each site having between 1 and 37 sherds with this designation.
75 sites yielded sherds that are definitely Late Bronze (LB), each site having between 1 and 30 sherds with this designation.
1 site yielded 2 sherds that are possibly Late Bronze I (LB I?).
1 site yielded 1 sherd that is definitely Late Bronze I (LB I).
1 site yielded 8 sherds that are either Late Bronze II or Iron Age I (LB II/Iron I).
6 sites yielded sherds that are definitely Late Bronze II (LB II), each site having between 1 and 46 sherds with this designation.

**RECENT ASSESSMENTS OF GLUECK'S HYPOTHESIS**

Even before the survey of Moab had been carried out, the archaeological finds from Transjordan led scholars to question

---

Glueck's reconstruction. Three stances have emerged in the post-1934 evaluations of Glueck's gap hypothesis: (1) those who hold that Glueck's theory is incorrect; (2) those who hold that Glueck's theory is still correct; and (3) those who hold that Glueck's theory is in need of slight modification. It may appear that the difference between (1) and (3) is a matter of the degree of change that is sought, but there is, in fact, a significant difference in the tone that is used to criticize Glueck. Representatives of each of these positions are easily found; with no attempt to be exhaustive, some of their arguments are presented below. Since the dates of these evaluations are related to the weight of the argument put forth, publication dates are enclosed in parentheses following the scholars' names.


46 For Harding's objections to Glueck's theory, see G. L. Harding, "A Middle Bronze Age Tomb at Amman," PEFA 6 (1953) 14; idem, "Recent Discoveries in Jordan," PEQ 90 (1958) II, 12; idem, Antiquities, 32-34, 63.
50 K. Kenyon, Amorites and Canaanites (London: British Academy, 1966) 64.
58 Bimson, Redating, 64-68.
Beginning as early as 1953, Harding questioned the accuracy of Glueck's hypothesis. While Harding had objections to the methodology that Glueck used in his survey, especially where Glueck's methods influenced his pottery analyses, Harding's real objection to the gap theory was based on the presence of Middle and Late Bronze tomb deposits and other archaeological evidence in Amman and its vicinity. Harding could not believe that these tombs, along with the Amman Airport Temple, were isolated phenomena or the work of tent-dwellers. Furthermore, since Harding assumed a 13th-century date for the exodus-conquest, he contended that the biblical account "requires a fully occupied Edom, Moab and Ammon, and this cannot happen in a generation."

On the basis of their study of the Balu’a stele, Ward and Martin concluded that there had to be a well-established sedentary population in Moab during the Late Bronze Age. They suggested that Glueck's hypothetical "cultural hiatus" is being filled in with newly discovered Middle and Late Bronze sites, and thus "our concept of this area during this period will have to undergo a radical change." In a later publication, Ward softened his critique of Glueck and suggested that "the scanty knowledge we now possess may require a reassessment, or at least a modification, of the current view.

Thompson postulated a cultural continuity for Transjordan from Late Chalcolithic through Late Bronze Age, a continuity perpetuated by the "typical Bronze Age settlement," the small agricultural village. Following his treatment of the theories related to Bronze Age population shifts, Thomson concluded that "the real curiosity is that Glueck's hypothesis was ever taken so seriously-as literally true-in the first place."

After listing a few examples of Middle Bronze finds from the area around Amman, Zayadine asserted that "the theory of Nelson Glueck about a nomadic life in the Middle Bronze Age in East Jordan can no longer be accepted." A similar conclusion was reached with regard to the Late Bronze Age. In place of Glueck's gap hypothesis, Zayadine made the reasonable suggestion that Transjordan's Late Bronze Age culture was similar to the situation that exists today with nomadism juxtaposed alongside urbanism.

60 Harding, Antiquities, 35.
63 Thompson, "Other Side," 66.
64 Zayadine, "Middle Bronze Age," 19.
65 Zayadine, "Late Bronze Age," 20.
Although it is difficult to find scholars who still adhere to Glueck's original gap hypothesis, it is interesting to observe that the early discoveries of Middle and Late Bronze evidence in central Transjordan did not lead to an immediate and wholesale denial of Glueck's historical reconstruction. While accepting the dates and importance of the more recently recovered data, Albright (1937, 1957, 1960), 66 Landes (1961), 67 and Campbell and Wright (1969) 68 continued to hold the view that this period and region witnessed a decline in sedentary occupation. They reasoned that the Middle and Late Bronze tombs from the vicinity of Amman could have been the work of nomadic or seminomadic tribes who lived in the area. Even the discovery and excavation of the Amman Airport Temple did not shake their confidence in Glueck, since it was proposed that this sanctuary could have served as the focal point of a regional tribal league. Following this same line of reasoning, Glueck reaffirmed a strong belief in his gap hypothesis in 1967. 69

Aside from the cautious statement of Bartlett, who in 1973 suggested that "it is as yet an open question how far these finds modify Glueck's view," 70 there is still a third stance that can be taken in evaluating Glueck's hypothesis and in reappraising the archaeological evidence from Transjordan. This third position, which calls for only a slight modification of Glueck's theory, is best represented by Glueck himself (1970), 71 Kafafi (1977), 72 and Aharoni (1979). 73 In


73 Aharoni, Land of the Bible, 102. With regard to his assessment of Glueck's gap hypothesis, it is difficult to discern Ahaoni's viewpoint. For example, on p. 102 Aharoni praises Glueck's survey and supports his reconstruction. On the other hand, Aharoni suggested that Late Bronze Age Midian boasted a sophisticated culture, and he suggested that "the establishment of well organized kingdoms in these areas [Edom and Moab] during the thirteenth century B.C. is more and more attested by archaeology"
addition to these three, Pinkerton (1979), Miller (1979, 1982), and Kautz (1981), all staff members of the Emory University Moab Survey, agree that there was a decline in the sedentary population of central Transjordan during part of Glueck's gap, but they feel that the new data from Moab call for some modification of the original gap hypothesis. I hold this same position.

Many scholars will be surprised to learn that Glueck himself revised his original gap hypothesis in the second edition of *The Other Side of the Jordan* (1970). Indeed, the changes are so substantial that much of the current criticism of Glueck's reconstruction of Transjordan's Middle and Late Bronze history is unnecessary. The pivotal statement in this revision reads as follows:

In much of Transjordan, especially in the areas some distance south of the south side of the Wadi Zerqa (Biblical River Jabboq), the Middle Bronze I period of the Age of Abraham seems to have been followed by a considerable decline in sedentary settlement during the Middle Bronze II and Late Bronze I-II periods, although not as radically as we had once assumed.

In presenting his revised hypothesis, Glueck not only listed the recent Middle and Late Bronze finds from central Transjordan, but he reminded his readers that he had also found some sites from this period in his own survey. Glueck insisted, however, that such materials were not found in sufficient quantities to prove the existence of widespread urbanism. As always, Glueck made provision in his reconstruction for sedentary occupation, a fact that is often overlooked.

If we examine Kafafi's comments on this issue, we notice that he had two distinct advantages over Glueck: (1) Kafafi's study came out seven years after the revised edition of *The Other Side of the Jordan*, thus allowing time for additional archaeological reports to be published; and (2) Kafafi did not have a vested interest in this subject, as did Glueck. Nevertheless, Kafafi holds that attempts to alter Glueck's hypothesis are unsuccessful, since most of these attempts are based on tomb deposits, not the excavation of walled towns. Kafafi concludes (pp. 204-6). D. Baly, (Review of Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography*, *BA* 44 [1981] 251) points out that such a statement is incorrect. To make matters worse, Rainey (as, was pointed out in n. 24 above) points to the Amman Airport Temple as proof of urbanism in central Transjordan.

---

74 Pinkerton, "Examination of Glueck's Conclusions," 70-73.
75 Miller, "Archaeological Survey of Central Moab," 51; idem, "Recent Archaeological Developments," 172.
76 Kautz, "Ancient Moabites," 31-34.
77 Glueck, *Other Side* (2d ed.), 140, 141.
78 Glueck, *Other Side* (2d ed.), 141-42.
79 Glueck (*Other Side* [2d ed.], 142) speaks about a "decline in sedentary settlement."
by saying that much archaeological work must be done before the issue is settled, but the available data do not compel a major revision of Glueck's theory.80

Miller's observations provide a summary of how the Moab Survey data, which were presented above, bear upon the modification of the gap hypothesis:

In short, while our findings agree with Glueck's findings in that we also notice a sudden decline in the abundance of surface pottery representing the Middle Bronze Age, ours do not confirm his conclusion that there was a virtually complete occupational gap which extended throughout the Late Bronze Age and ended specifically during the thirteenth century. There is the prior question, of course, as to whether the relative abundance of surface pottery from a given period is a safe indicator of its degree of sedentary occupation. To the extent that it is, our findings seems to indicate at least a scattering of settlements even during the Middle Bronze Age which gradually increased in number during the Late Bronze and Iron Ages.81

CONCLUSIONS

The presentation of the archaeological data from Transjordan and the accompanying survey of scholarly opinions lead to at least three conclusions.

First, it is obvious that there are Middle and Late Bronze Age artifacts in central and southern Transjordan. It is true, however, that finds from these periods are still not plentiful. For example, in Moab, Middle and Late Bronze sherds are not found at as many sites or in as great a quantity as pottery from other periods (e.g., Early Bronze and Iron Ages and the Nabataean, Roman, and Byzantine periods). In spite of the accelerated pace of archaeological research in central and southern Transjordan, Glueck's gap has not been filled completely. In other words, it still appears that social, political, or economic factors led to a genuine population decline in Middle and Late Bronze Age Transjordan.

Second, the recently recovered archaeological remains from Transjordan, including the new data from Moab, demonstrate that Glueck's original gap hypothesis must be abandoned. Glueck's 1934 theory is still cited as an object of attack, even though Glueck himself revised his position thirteen years ago. Glueck's new historical reconstruction in the 1970 edition of *The Other Side of the Jordan* seems to be in harmony with the archaeological picture that is now emerging.

80 Kafafi, "Late Bronze Age Pottery," x.
81 Miller, "Recent Archaeological Developments," 172.
Third, while archaeologists have not recovered evidence of extensive kingdoms in Late Bronze Age Edom, Moab, or Ammon, it can no longer be said that these regions were devoid of a population that could oppose the migrating Hebrews. This means that one of the four main arguments used to support the late date of the exodus-conquest is no longer valid. Those who appeal to an occupational gap in Late Bronze Age Transjordan prove that they are unaware of the recently recovered archaeological evidence, since the archaeological data from this time and region appear to be neutral in the debate on the date of the exodus-conquest. It should be noted, however, that the Late Bronze material recovered in the territory to the north of Jalul displays a continuity with the Canaanite culture on the west side of the Jordan River.  

82 I am indebted to Dr. James Sauer for this final observation.
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THE SABBATH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT
(Its Origin and Development)

THEOPHILE JAMES MEEK
JAMES MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY, DECATUR, ILL.

THE question of the Hebrew Sabbath is still one of the vexing problems of Old Testament study, despite Langdon's declaration that "the origin and meaning of the Hebrew Sabbath are philologically and historically clear" (Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms, p. XXIII). The conclusions presented in this paper may not be without their difficulties, but to the writer, at least, they seem best to represent the evidence as at present known. It may be of interest to note that they were arrived at quite independently of Zimmern, Meinhold and others, with whose conclusions it was afterwards found they are in general agreement.

It was Zimmern in 1904, in the "Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft", who first suggested in print that the Sabbath was originally the day of the full moon. Meinhold followed him in 1905 with a more elaborate treatment of the thesis, Sabbath und Woche im A. T., and again in 1909 in the "Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft". The hypothesis has been accepted by Beer (Sabbath: Der Mishna-tractat Sabbat) and by Marti (Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion, etc.), but has not received the consideration from English-speaking scholars, I believe, that is its due.

Sabbath in Babylonia

The origin of the Sabbath is certainly not to be found with the Hebrews themselves. Ultimately it is “to be traced back
to those nomadic ancestors of the Hebrews and the Canaanites, who paid chief homage to the moon, whose benign light guided them in their night journeys over the plains of northern Arabia" (Kent, *Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents*, p. 257). The Sabbath most probably harks back to the remotest Semitic antiquity and like taboo, sacrifice, ancestor-worship and the like, was evidently an institution shared by all.

The name, Sabbath, first appears in Babylonia and as an institution may, in fact, be traced back to the early pre-Semitic inhabitants of that land, the Sumerians. In a bilingual tablet, K. 6012 + K. 10684, containing a list of the days of the month, the equation U-XV-KAMI = sa-bat-ti (line 13) appears, i.e. the 15th day of the month was known in Babylonia as the sabattu, and further, it is the only one of the month that is so named (see Pinches, *PSBA*, 1904, pp. 51 ff.). Now the Babylonian month was a lunar month of approximately 30 days and the 15th day, or the middle of the month, would be the day of the full moon. We would infer, then, that the sabattu was identical with the day of the full moon and with it alone.

This is further suggested by all the references to the Sabbath in Babylonian literature that are at present known. In another bilingual text, C. T. XII 6, 24, we have the equation U (Sumerian for "day") = sa-bat-tu, i.e. the Sabbath was to the Babylonians "the day par excellence, one of the great festival days of the month. In the Creation Story, Tablet V 18, the signs, XXXXX are evidently, with Pinches and Zimmern, to be read sa-bat-tu, instead of [um]u XIV-tu as formerly. The usual determinative after numerals in this tablet, as elsewhere, is kam not tu (cf. Creation Story, Tablet V 17, VII-kam; Gilgames Epic, Tablet X col. 111 49, umu XV-kam; etc.). With this restoration line 18 would read: "On the [Sa]bbath thou (the moon) shalt be equal (in both) halves". Likewise in the Gilgames Epic, Tablet X col. III 49 the 15th day or the Sabbath is evidently the day of the full moon.

The sabattu was not a day of rest, on which work was prohibited, for many contract tablets are dated on that day (Kuchler, *Die Christliche Welt*, 1904, p. 296; Johns, *Expositor*, Nov. 1906; Wilson, *Princeton Theological Review*, 1903, p. 246). In C. T.
XVIII 23 it is called *um nuh libbi* i.e. a day for the pacification of the anger of the deity, an appropriate day for penance.

The Sabbath used to be, and by many scholars still is, identified with the Babylonian "favorable, unfavorable days", which for the intercalary month of Elul fell on the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21th, and 28th days, (IV R. 32f.), but there is absolutely no evidence that these have any connection whatsoever with *sabattu*. Indeed, as we have noted, there is as yet no evidence anywhere that *sabattu* was applied to any day other than the 15th, and to assign this term to other days, as Jastrow¹ and many scholars do, is the purest assumption and is based upon a preconceived idea as to what the Sabbath was. Neither is there any evidence that the terms *sabattu* and *nubattu* have any connection with each other.

With the Babylonians the Sabbath was manifestly a full moon festival and the etymology of the word would seem to confirm this. The root *sabatu* in V R. 28 e. f. is equated with *gamaru*, "to complete, fulfill, bring to an end", or intransitively, "to be complete*. *Sabattu*, then, could mean the day on which the moon was complete or full.

**Sabbath in Early Israel**

If the Sabbath was the day of the full moon with the Babylonians, we would expect it to be the same with the early Hebrews, to whom it was more or less indirectly communicated. Here again the evidence would seem to confirm our expectations. The word *טָבָא* is probably contracted from *טָבָא* (so Olshausen, Konig, Driver, W. R. Smith, Cook, ecl.). The root *תָבָא* (cf. Isa. 14:4, 24:8) in its transitive form means "to sever, put an end to"; in its intransitive form "to desist, come to an end, be at an end, be complete" (Arabic, XXXXX "to cut off, intercept"). The grammatical form of *טָבָא*, according to some, suggests a transitive sense, "the divider", i.e. apparently the day that divides the month, the 15th or the day of the full moon. Meinhold (*ZATW* XXIX, 101) takes it in the intransitive sense and argues for *טָבָא* the meaning "the complete,

¹ E.g. in *A. J. Th.*, II, pp. 312ff.
the full moon. So many derivations of the word, however, have been given (for a summary see Beer, Sabbath, p. 13, note 3), that little help can be expected from the word itself, until more positive evidence is forthcoming. It is, at any rate, not to be identified with הָעַל, "to rest, repose". The idea of rest is a later meaning that was read into the word.

All our evidence would seem to indicate that the Sabbath in early Israel had nothing whatever to do with the seventh day of the week. The observance of the seventh day was probably early, for it is prescribed in both J (Ex. 34:21) and E (Ex. 23:12), but it could not possibly have been earlier than the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan, when they began first to engage in agriculture. A periodic rest for a nomadic people is an impossibility, but an economic necessity for a people engaged in agriculture and the like. It probably had no relation to the moon and with the Hebrews came to be arbitrarily designated as every seventh day because of the sacredness attached to the number seven and the sense of completeness which it expressed (see further Meinhold, Sabbat, pp. 13-14; Hehn, Siebenzahl und Sabbat bei den Babyloniern und im A. T.). In Ex. 20:8ff. and Dt. 5:12ff., where the Sabbath is identified with the seventh day, all modern scholars are agreed that the law stood originally, “observe (variant ‘remember’) the Sabbath to sanctify it”. Ex. 20:9-11 is the addition of a late P redactor and Dt. 5 by the large majority of scholars is placed in or near the Exile. In any case it is a late amplification of the earlier, more simply expressed law. In no other passage in the pre-exilic literature of the Old Testament is it even suggested that the Sabbath is to be identified with the seventh day. Jer. 17:10-27, since the time of Kuenen, has been universally regarded as a scribal gloss from a period as late as the days of Nehemiah. The only other references to the Sabbath in pre-exilic literature (with the exception of those mentioned in the following paragraph), II Kings 11:16, 18, throw no light upon its origin.

On the other hand the Sabbath in early Israel is very intimately connected with the new moon and is uniformly coupled with it, e. g. Am. 8:4ff., Hos. 2:13, Isa. 1:13ff., II Kings 4:23 (cf. also the reminiscences of this association in the later literature,
Ez. 45:17, 46:3, Ps. 81:3, Neh. 10:34, Isa. 66:23, I Chron. 23:31, II Chron. 2:3, 8:13, 31:3). Just so in Babylonian literature the first and the fifteenth days are grouped together (Radu, *Early Babyl. History*, p. 315; Pinches, *PSBA*, XXVI, 09). The Harranians had four sacrificial days in each month, at least two of which were determined by the conjunction and opposition of the moon (*Encycl. Brit.*, 11th edition, XXIII, 961). The ancient Hindus observed the new moon and the full moon as days of sacrifice. The full moon as well as the new moon had evidently a religious significance among the ancient Hebrews (cf. Ps. 81:3), for, when the great agricultural feasts were fixed to set dates, the days selected were the full moons.

"Wenn nun in alter Zeit in Israel Neumond und Sabbat neben einander genannt werden, so kann der Sabbat damals nicht der Tag der 4 Mondphasen gewesen sein. Denn dann ware ja auch der Neumond ein Sabbat! Auch konnte der Sabbat nicht schon der vom Mondwechsel getrennte letzte Tag der siebentagigen Woche sein. Denn dann fielen ja Neumond und Sabbat gelegentlich zusammen: es sind aber verschiedene Feste! Dana bleibt also fur den Sabbat nichts anderes ubrig, als im Unterschied zum Neumond an den Vollmondstag zu denken" (Beer, *Sabbath*, p. 12; cf. further Meinhold, *Sabbat and Woche*, pp. 3 ff.). Eerdmans' objection, that the Sabbath is not expressly called the full moon, is of little moment, for is as explicitly full moon as is new moon.

To give further credence to this hypothesis, there is evidently in Lev. 23:11 (P) a trace of the fact that the 15th or the day of the full moon was at one time known as the Sabbath. "Denn der 'nach dem Sabbat' (coming) kommende Tag, an dem der Priester beim Mazzenfest die Erstlingsgarbe fur Jahwe weihet, kann nur innerhalb der 7tagigen Festwoche vom 15.-21. des 1. Monats fallen. Ware der Sabbat hier der letzte Tag der 7tagigen Woche, und fiele ein Sabbat auf den 14., der aber noch nicht zu der Festwoche zahlt, so wurde der erste Sabbat der Festwoche selbst erst auf den 21., also den letzten Tag der Festwoche fallen, so dass der 'Tag nach dem Sabbat' gar nicht mehr zu der Festwoche gehoren wirde! Ganz anders, wean eben der 15. als der Vollmondtag der Sabbat ist. Dann ist
der 16., als ‘Tag nach dem Sabbat’, am besten geeignet für die das
Fest einleitende Weihe der Erstlingsgarbe" (Beer, Sabbat, p. 13).

The fact that Ezekiel so roundly rebuked the previous genera-
tions for desecrating the weekly Sabbath (Ez. 20:13, 16; 21:24,
22:8, 26; 23:38) indicates very clearly that it was not observed in
the earlier period, probably because it was unknown. Just so
Deuteronomy condemned the Hebrews of his day for worshipp-
ing at high places, regardless of the fact that he was the first
to prohibit such worship.

The full moon would constitute a most appropriate occasion
for a sacrificial feast, for the moon has always had a large place
in Hebrew thought, indeed in Semitic thought generally (cf.
Baudissin, Mond bet den Hebraern). It was supposed to exert
both a good and a bad influence on plants, animals and men
(cf. Ps. 121:6). As nomads and shepherds, the Hebrews regarded
the night as benevolent, the day with its withering heat as male-
volent. Most of their journeyings, as with the Arabs today,
were made at night, and it was natural, then, that they should
pay homage to the moon that lighted their way. In Jer. 7:18
8:2; 44:17ff. we have references to the worship of the moon (cf,
also Judges 8:21, 26, Isa. 3:18, II Kings 23:5, Dt. 4:19; 17:3, etc.).
The ancient Semites universally worshipped the moon and the
stars, (cf. Hommel, Der Gestirndienst der alten Araber; B. D.,
III, 434, etc.). The old non-agricultural Germans observed the
new moon and the full moon as religious festivals (Tacitus Ger-
mania II). The Passover was set to the full moon in the spring
(Ex. 12:22) and probably had some connection with the moon
originally (see Meinhold, Sabbat und Woche, p. 30). The Hebrew
traditions connect the early movements of the race with a number
of places intimately connected with moon worship, e. g. Ur and
Haran (where the moon-god, Sin, was worshipped); the wilder-
ess of Sin, which the Hebrews are said to have entered on the
15th (the full moon) day of the month (Ex. 16:1)! The new
moon was always observed as a religious festival (I Sam. 20,
II Kings 4:23, Am. 8:4f., Hos. 2:13, Isa. 1:13ff., etc.). It is not
at all unlikely, therefore, that the full moon was similarly ob-
served (cf. Ps. 81:3), and that this full moon festival was known
as the Sabbath.
Gressmann (Mose und seine Zeit, pp. 461ff.) believes that the origin of the Sabbath is to be found in Ex. 16:23ff., which he regards as an ancient saga of the Hebrews. But this passage is universally regarded as part of the late priestly writings. Its account is so completely out of harmony with all the ancient sources which we have noted, that it can scarcely be believed that we have an old tradition preserved here. It is P's interpretation of an incident in Israel's history and is quite in line with his views elsewhere.

The manner in which the Sabbath was observed lends further support to the belief that it was originally a full moon festival and differentiates it very sharply from the Sabbath as we know it in post-exilic times. The older laws only demand such cessation from daily toil as among all ancient peoples naturally accompanied a day set apart as a religious festival. "The Greeks and the barbarians have this in common that they accompany their sacred rites by a festal remission of labor" (Strabo X 3:9). On both the new moon and the Sabbath there was a remission of general business (Am. 8:5). The animals and servants were not needed for ordinary toil and could be used for other purposes (II Kings 4:22f.). But the Sabbath was not a day of absolute rest, for it was on this day that the guard in the Palace and Temple were regularly changed (II Kings 11) and Jehoiada carried through a revolution against Athaliah on the Sabbath and considered it no desecration of the day (II Kings 11). Like the new moon it was one of the stated religious feasts of the Hebrews and was a day of joy and festivity (Hos. 2:11, cf. I Sam. 20:4ff.); it called men to the sanctuary to make sacrifice (Isa. 1:13); it was a good day to visit a prophet (II Kings 4:22f.). So many people were accustomed to visit the Temple on that day that soldiers were required to police the crowds (II Kings 11, cf. Isa. 1:11ff.). It was in a much later period that the idea of rest and complete cessation from all labor was attached to the Sabbath. Like so many of the other religious institutions, which the Hebrews held in common with their Semitic kinsmen (e.g. circumcision, sacrifice, new moon, etc.), it came in time to acquire with them distinguishing features of a marked kind and to assume a new character.
Sabbath in the Pre-Exilic Prophetic Period

The Sabbath continued essentially the same through the pre-exilic prophetic period, except in one particular. Both it and the new moon seem to have fallen into disrepute with the prophets, evidently because of their association with the moon. The prophets were the mighty mouth-pieces of the Yahweh religion and looked askance upon any institution that savored of heathen association. Hence all forms of astral religion were denounced by them (Am. 5:21, Hos. 2:13, Isa. 1:13, Jer. 8:2, 19:13, Zeph. 1:5, cf also Isa. 47:13);--were absolutely prohibited by Deuteronomy (Dt. 4:19; 17:3); and Josiah, stimulated thereto by Deuteronomy, attempted to stamp it completely out of the land (II Kings 23:5). This antipathy of the prophets to astral religion even went to the extent of causing them to give historical explanations for the feasts, e. g. in the case of the Feast of Unleavened Bread and Passover (Ex. 23:15, 34:18, 12:1ff., Dt. 16:1ff.). The New Moon festival is completely ignored by Deuteronomy or struck out altogether and yet up to that time it was considered a most important feast (cf. I Sam. 20:4ff., II Kings 4:23, Am. 8:5, Hos. 2:13, Isa. 1:13). Deuteronomy proper (i.e. Ch.12-26), nowhere mentions the Sabbath and this is particularly striking in view of the fact that he gives a very complete calendar of feasts in Ch. 16. "Es ware ja geradezu unerhort, dass eine schon auf Mose zurückgehende, das gauze Volksleben durchziehende Einrichtung, nämlich die siebentagige Woche mit einem Sabbat genannten Ruhetag am Schluss, die in nichts mehr den Zusammenhang mit dem Mond verriet, so ganzlich von den deuteronomischen Gesetzgebern ignoriert ware" (Meinhold, Sabbath and Woche, p. 8).

The prophets were great social reformers and little interested in the ritual. With them the element of rest, that was attached to the Sabbath, was given first place, that of worship was made secondary, evidently because of its heathen association. In this probably is to be found the beginning of a movement whereby the Sabbath was separated altogether from the moon and identified with the seventh day and complete rest prescribed for its observance (cf. Dt. 5:13ff.).
Sabbath in the Exilic Period

From what has been said about the attitude of the prophets to the Sabbath, it might be expected that the institution would have disappeared altogether in the period of the Exile. But the very reverse is the case. It was emphasized as it never was before. And this is a fact not hard to explain. The exilic period was in many respects a reaction against that immediately preceding it. Under the influence of the priest-prophet Ezekiel and his school the ritualistic feature of the Yahweh religion was tremendously emphasized. The Yahweh religion stood in such dire peril that it seemed necessary to accentuate its peculiar forms and institutions in order to perpetuate its existence. Hence we have in this period the production of such legalistic writings as the Holiness Code (Lev. 17-26 in large part) and the Book of Ezekiel (particularly Ch. 40-48)--the forerunners of the elaborate Priestly Code of later years. These legalistic writers, in contradistinction from the prophets, were careful to preserve all the institutions of ancient Israel and in their old ritualistic form.

Another reason for the important place given to the Sabbath during the Exile grew out of the Deuteronomic reform. That had closely bound all the religious feasts to the now-destroyed temple and sacred city. Hence they necessarily, for a time at least, fell into abeyance in so far as their observance was concerned. The Sabbath Deuteronomy had not mentioned and it alone could be observed by all the exiles wherever they were. It met a deep need and kept alive their faith in the Yahweh religion. Indeed for many it became the symbol of the ritual as a whole. Its observance became the distinctive mark of a loyal member of the race and was one of the few things that remained to differentiate them from their heathen neighbors. No wonder, then, that it bulked so largely in their thought and literature.

It was in the Exile or in the years immediately preceding it that the Sabbath became dissociated from the moon and came at length to be identified with the seventh day (Ez. 46:1, cf. Ex. 31:15 H'). We have already noted what was probably the
beginning of a movement in that direction. The prophets had vigorously denounced all astral religion. Hence such feasts as the New Moon and Sabbath became odious to them. On the other hand an observance like the seventh day as a period of rest and worship was quite acceptable. The exilic leaders were as much concerned as the prophets to differentiate Israel's religion from all others but they chose to do it in a different way, viz. by a revival of the earlier ritualistic conceptions. Accordingly they were careful to preserve all of the old but dissociated from anything that savored of heathen practice. Hence it was that the Sabbath was revived but now in a new association. It became identified with the seventh day and in course of time grew to be one of the most ritualistic of Jewish institutions.

It is not difficult to conceive how this change came about. It was exactly in line with the general tendencies of the times. The similarity of the words Sabbath (תבש) and seven (שבע) might have had something to do with it, and likewise the meaning of the word Sabbath. In any case it is no more difficult to understand how the term could have been taken over from the full moon festival and applied to the seventh day than it is to understand why it should have been taken over from the seventh day in Christian times and applied to the first day. With the Christians it received a significance radically different from what it previously had and its earlier connection was soon completely lost and forgotten.

The observance of the Sabbath in the Exilic period was altogether in harmony with what we have already said about the period. The primitive ritualistic conception was revived and enlarged, and the necessity of abstaining from labor emphasized, not for man's sake, as the prophets would have put it, but as an element of worship—an end in itself. It was regarded as a sign between Yahweh and his people (Ez. 20:12, 20, Ex. 31:13 H\(^b\)); it was to be observed as a holy day (Ez. 44:24, Ex. 31:14 H\(^b\)) and was not to be desecrated as it had been by former generations (Ez. 20:13-24; 22:8, 26; 23:38); it was to be strictly observed (Lev. 19:3b, 30; 26:2) and to that end sacrifices were prescribed for it (Ez. 44:24; 45:17; 46:1-5, 12). It was altogether a day of abstinence and no longer one of joy and festivity.
Sabbath in the Post-Exilic Period

In the post-exilic period the ritualistic character of the Sabbath was accentuated to a greater degree than ever and it was very definitely connected with the seventh day (Ex. 35:1-2, 31:15-17, Lev. 23:3, Ex. 16:22-26, all from the P document). The tendency was to make the Sabbath a central and saving institution, until in the Mishnah it was given first place among the feasts. The restrictions with regard to its observance became ever more and more detailed and casuistical, e. g. it was unlawful for one to leave his house on the Sabbath (Ex. 16:29) or to carry burdens (Jer. 17:19-27); one could not make a fire on the Sabbath (Ex. 35:3); what food was needed for the Sabbath must be prepared on the day previous (Ex. 16:23); in fact all manner of work was prohibited (Ex. 20:10, Lev. 23:3). It was to be a day of complete rest and cessation from all toil and business of every kind (Neh. 10:32; 3:15ff.). Indeed the priestly law-givers did not cease until they had made labor on that day a capital offence (Ex. 35:2, Num. 15:32-36). Not only was it a day holy to Yahweh (Ex. 16:23; 31:15; 35:2), but its consecration was a law which Yahweh had promulgated at creation (Gen. 2:2f., Ex. 20:11). In this connection, however, it is of interest to note that P never represents the patriarchs as observing it or being at all cognizant of its existence. He probably believed that it was not communicated to the Hebrews until it was delivered by Yahweh to Moses at Sinai (cf. Neh. 9:14). As a holy day the Sabbath was to be kept holy by the people and free from all profanation (Ex. 20:10-11, Lev. 23:3, Isa. 56:2, 4, 6; 58:13), and special offerings were prescribed for its observance (Num. 28:9f., I Chron. 23:3f., II Chron. 2:4, 8:13, 31:3; Neh. 10:33).

It is just a little surprising that the Sabbath is nowhere mentioned in the Psalms or in the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament. It may be that these writers followed more nearly in the footsteps of the earlier prophets and to them, as to the prophets, the priestly emphasis upon the ritual was more or less repugnant and they would have none of it. Their sympathies, at least, were decidedly not with the movement whereby the Sabbath lost completely its early joyousness and festivity
and came finally to be the severest kind of burden, fettered by every manner of restriction and loaded down with ritual. Little wonder that Jesus found the Sabbath of his day unbearable and continually rode rough-shod over its absurd restrictions and by one stroke swept them aside: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath", (Mk. 2:27).
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MERNEPTAH'S ISRAEL AND THE EXODUS

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Bexley Hall, Gambier, Ohio

Since 1896, when Petrie discovered the "Israel Stela" 1 in the ruins of Merneptah's mortuary temple at Thebes, and when Spiegelberg made the first translation 2 of the hymn of victory contained thereon, a voluminous literature has grown up on the relationship between Merneptah and the Exodus of the Children of Israel from Egypt. This was due to the fact that Merneptah, who had usually been assumed to have been the pharaoh of the exodus, is represented in the hymn of victory as having encountered and defeated Israel in Palestine. Now, the inscription on the stela leaves no doubt about the name of Israel, 3 nor is there any doubt that the passage has reference to the defeat and devastation of Israel. There is also abundant evidence to show that Merneptah campaigned in Palestine, and had been in that country in the third year of his reign. 4 Furthermore, Merneptah's father, Rameses II, has been generally accepted as the pharaoh of the oppression. The discovery and publication of the "Israel Stela," therefore, have seemed to introduce considerable confusion in the minds of those students of the Old Testament who have accepted Rameses II as the pharaoh, "who knew not Joseph," and Merneptah as the pharaoh of the exodus. For if Merneptah was the pharaoh of the exodus, how could he encounter and defeat Israel in Palestine in his third year if Israel's wanderings in the wilderness consumed approximately forty years? Many attempts have been made to explain this difficulty.

1 The stela was taken by Merneptah from the mortuary temple of Amenhotep III, and on its back was inscribed a hymn in celebration of the great victory of Merneptah over the Libyans in the fifth year of his reign. In the last section of the inscription occurs the famous reference to Israel.
2 Zeitschrift fur aegyptische Sprache, 34, 1 ff.
3 The transliteration and translation of the passage in which Israel is referred to are: \( wn\ y-s-r-y-a-l\ f\ h t\ b i t\ p r t-f,\) "Israel is laid waste, his grain is not."
4 Breasted, Ancient Records, III. § 605-606.
One attempt places the time of the exodus much earlier than the reign of Merneptah, in the time of Amenhotep II (1448-1420), another places the exodus earlier still, in the time of Ahmose I (1580-1557), and still another places the event much later, in the time of Rameses IV, 1167-1161. Other students of the Old Testament simply accept Merneptah as the pharaoh of the exodus without feeling the necessity of squaring that assumption with the implications of the "Israel Stela." It is the purpose of this paper to show that the reference to Israel in this stela is in close keeping with the reconstructed and probably real facts of the exodus and the entrance into the land of Canaan. If this be so the "Israel Stela" will prove to be a piece of invaluable confirmatory evidence to the general reliability of our Biblical account of the exodus.

Archaeology has been much abused by students of the Bible. They have made it confirm statements in the Bible where it merely illustrates them. The chief use of archaeology in the study of the Old Testament is to furnish a background and atmosphere for many events described therein. It often illustrates Old Testament stories, it sometimes explains them, and now and then it confirms them, and even contributes to a knowledge of Old Testament customs and events. The value of the "Israel Stela" in the study of Old Testament history is chiefly confirmatory. A background and atmosphere for this present investigation will be furnished by some facts established by the archaeology of Western Asia and Egypt. These will now be passed in review before tackling the problem of Merneptah's Israel and the Exodus.

Forgetting for the time being what tradition in the Bible teaches about the Hebrew people previous to their stay in Egypt, archaeology and the history of western Asia and Egypt furnish important information. Babylonian history and archeology make it reasonably certain that the original home of the Semites was in central Arabia. At a very early period a wave of these Semites flowed north through Canaan and Syria and then east to northern
Babylonia. Among the descendants of these Semites were Sargon I and his immediate successors, Naram-Sin and Shar-Gani-Sharri, all of whom were great warriors, and extended their sway and influence westward to the Mediterranean, including Syria and Canaan. Sargon's date is about 2700 B.C. During the First Babylonian Dynasty, 2225-1926, a fresh Semitic element from the west was introduced into the settled Semitic life of the north Babylonian people. In fact the First Babylonian Dynasty was founded by foreign conquerors from the westland or the country of Amurru, and in turn these westerners settled in Babylonia, extended their sway over the land of Amurru. Thus, Hammurabi, the sixth king of this dynasty, was called "king of the land of Amurru." Babylonian laws, customs, traditions, and civilization were widely diffused throughout Amurru, and the Babylonian cuneiform script was extensively employed by these western subjects of the great Babylonian kings. Although the Second Babylonian Dynasty, c. 2000-1700, was predominantly Sumerian, and the Third Babylonian or Kassite Dynasty, 1760-1185, was largely Indo-European, they were mostly Semitic in culture and civilization; and it is quite possible that they were in close contact with the west. Indeed, the use of the horse in the conquest of Babylonia by the Kassites passed over into the west and from there was introduced by the Hyksos into Egypt. From about 1400 till 1000 B.C. Babylonia and her successor Assyria were weak and not in a position to interfere in western affairs. Thus, it is clear that from before the time of Sargon I until 1200 B.C. Semitic Babylonian influence was universal in Syria and Canaan.

Turning to Egyptian history and archaeology, it is found that as early as 1675 B.C. Egypt was invaded and conquered by a Semitic people whom the Egyptians called the Hyksos. These people came from Amurru, making their way southward through Syria and Canaan, and entered Egypt, where they ruled for about

---

5 Poebel, Historical Texts, 1914, pp. 73 ff.
a hundred years. The chances are that Manetho is right in saying that they remained in Egypt 511 years, for although they sat on the Egypt throne for only about a century, it is quite possible that they were not finally driven from Egypt till much later. One of their kings bore the interesting name Ykb-hr, which looks very much like Jacob-hr; and as hr is the name of the god Horus, Jacob-hr may be the equivalent of the Semitic Jacob-el.

Beginning with the reign of Ahmose I, 1580-1557, Syria and Canaan became more and more subject to Egypt. This was due to the decline of Babylonian power. Finally, Thutmose III, 1479-1447, in seventeen elaborate campaigns succeeded in completely conquering Syria and Canaan. Among the numerous places mentioned in his lists are Y-'-k-b-'a-ra and Y-s-p-'a-ra, which are equivalent to the Semitic Jacob-el and Joseph-el. The Egyptians held their own in Syria and Canaan until the reign of the religious king Ikhnaton, 1375-1358. Ikhnaton devoted his attention to a religious reformation, while the Hittites from the far north made common cause with the Amurru of Syria and Canaan against the foreign overlord. Nor was that all. Further south, and coming from the east, were a people called the Habiru, who were contesting the possession of southern Canaan with the Egyptians. These Habiru are interesting. They appear in the Tell el-Amarna letters. These letters or reports are written in Semitic cuneiform and many of them are requests for aid from the Egyptian governors of southern Canaanish towns to their overlord, the king of Egypt. The Habiru press on westward and some of them occupy the district of Shechem. Now, the term Habiru is philologically equivalent to the word Hebrew. Consequently, in the time of Ikhnaton, the Hebrew people were forcing their way westward into Canaan.

8 Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*, pp. 68 f. and pl. LI.
9 Mariette, *Karnak*, 17-21, Nos. io2 and 78.
10 Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Taflen*, No. 289, 1.23.
Another people mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna letters are the SA-GAZ. These Winckler\textsuperscript{11} has proved to be equivalent to Habiru. At any rate, it is certain that the Habiru are to be looked upon as having been a part of the SA-GAZ people. In Egyptian, these people are known as the Sasu. Thus, the Sasu, the SA-GAZ and the Habiru are all Semitic nomads, are all related or are the same people, and are all Aramxans or people of Amurru. In short, the Tell el-Amarna letters picture Aramaean nomads forcing their way into Canaan as early as 1375 B.C.

From 1375 on, general anarchy ruled in Canaan, and the whole of Syria and Canaan became a bone of contention between the Hittites to the north and the Egyptians to the south. Finally, Seti I and his successor Rameses II recovered the land of Canaan and compromised by treaty with the Hittites over Syria in 1271. Both Seti I and Rameses II mention a place, which they call \textit{y-s-ru} and \textit{ya-sa-ru}.\textsuperscript{12} This name seems to be the equivalent of the Hebrew word \textit{םשֹּׁרֶן} and corresponds in location to the position assigned in the Old Testament to Asher. Rameses II was succeeded by his son Merneptah, 1225-1215, and in the third year of his reign he encountered and defeated a group of people in southern Canaan whom he calls \textit{y-s-r-y-a-l}, or Israel. By the fifth year of Rameses III, 1198-1167, Egyptian influence in Canaan was practically dead, as the Report of Wenamon clearly shows; and the Hittites were becoming less and less influential until they ceased as a power in Canaan in 1170 B.C. when they were practically destroyed by the Muskaya,\textsuperscript{13} the Meshech of Gen. X. 2.

During the years of Babylonian and Egyptian weakness that succeeded Merneptah, new peoples began to appear in Canaan. Already in the fifth year of Merneptah, northern sea-peoples appeared in the Egyptian Delta; and by 1193, in the fifth year of Rameses III, there was another invasion by the same peoples among whom were the Pulasati.\textsuperscript{14} They appeared again in 1190,

\textsuperscript{11} Mittheilungen d. deutschen or. Gesellschaft, 35, p. 25 n.
\textsuperscript{12} Abyd. II, 2; LD 140 a; Anast. 1, 23, 8.
\textsuperscript{13} KB I, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{14} Breasted, \textit{Ancient Records}, IV, §§ 35-64.
coming originally from Keftiu, Kaphtor or Crete (Deut. II. 23; Amos IX. 7) and making their way through Canaan. These Pulasati, or Philistines, about 1160 finally settled in the southwestern Canaan and gave their name to the whole country, namely, Palestine.

Having followed in outline the contribution which western Asia and Egypt have made to an understanding of early Syria and Canaan, it is now possible to see how far the traditions preserved in the Old Testament about the Hebrew people previous to the exodus fit into this outline, and to account for Israel in Palestine in the third year of Merneptah.

Hebrew tradition sees in Babylonia the home of Abraham. This accords excellently with the findings of archaeology, for the Habiru were in Babylonia in the time of Rim-Sin, and the SA-GAZ, whom we have seen to be equivalent to the Habiru, were in Babylonia in the time of Hammurabi. Moreover, Hebrew tradition seems to connect Abraham with Hammurabi, if Amraphel of Gen. XIV is to be identified with Hammurabi. The migration of Abraham to the west would also be in keeping with the larger Aramaean movement which certainly continued for many centuries from Babylonia westward. Abraham's connection with Ur and Harran is further attested by the traces of lunar worship--characteristic of the religion of these two cities--which is also evident in early Hebrew religion.

If, however, Abraham, as an individual, be connected chronologically with Hammurabi, and Hammurabi's date be 2123-2081, there will be a discrepancy of about 200 years with the generally accepted chronology of the patriarchal and bondage periods. Of course Abraham and his followers may have formed only a later

15 Revue d'Assyriologie, XII, pp. 114 f.
16 King, Hammurabi, No. 35.
17 The SA-GAZ, Sasu and Habiru were all plundering, Semitic nomads, and since their headquarters were in northern Syria they are to be identified with the Aramxans. Thus Abraham was a Habiru and also an Aramaean, cf. Gen. XXIV-XXV, where Bethuel the son of Nahor, brother of Abraham, is called an Aramaean; and Jacob is also an Aramaean, Deut. XXVI. 5.
branch of those Aramoean peoples who were making their way westward since before the time of Hammurabi, and the later Jewish historian, who wrote Gen. XIV, may have purposely identified the great Hebrew patriarch with Hammurabi for the greater glory of the Jewish race. Again, Abraham may possibly (though not probable, so far as our information leads us) be the name of a clan, parts of which migrated westward at different times. The most likely solution is that the patriarch Abraham migrated west about 1870 B.C. This conclusion ensues from the following considerations.

Students of the Old Testament have long felt that Rameses II was the pharaoh of the oppression. This is hinted at in Exod. I. ii, where mention is made of Pithom and Rameses as store cities built by the Hebrews. This is confirmed by the findings of Naville, who in 1883 excavated these sites and discovered bricks bearing the name of Rameses II. In Pithom were found other memorials of Rameses II. Moreover, the entire narrative of the bondage is in keeping with what we know of Rameses II and the history of Egypt of that time. Nor is there any real conflict between this date and the statement found in I Kings VI. I to the effect that 480 years elapsed between the time of the exodus and the fourth year of Solomon's reign. For, if 480 years be added to the generally accepted date of the fourth year of Solomon, namely 967, the date 1447 will be arrived at, which may well represent the time when the first Hebrew clans began to leave Egypt. However, 480 is a round number and may not be very accurate. Moreover, it does not square with the Biblical dead reckoning for the same period, which far exceeds 534 years.

Taking, then, Rameses II as the pharaoh of the oppression and Merneptah as the pharaoh of the exodus, the date of the exodus would be about 1225. Add to this the 430 years, the Biblical estimate (Exod. XII. 40) of the duration of the sojourn in Egypt, and we get 1655 for the date when Jacob and his sons went to Egypt. Add to this 215 years as the duration of the patriarchal period, on the basis of Biblical reckoning, and we
have 1870 B.C. as the date of Abraham. In this scheme will fit in excellently the evidence which archaeology has furnished. The Hyksos were Semites, most likely Hebrews, one of whose kings was called Ykb-hr, or Jacob-el. According to Egyptian chronology they came to Egypt in 1675. Consequently, the Jacob clans, who, according to our estimate, went to Egypt in 1655, were a part of the Hyksos movement. There is every reason to believe, that all the Jacob clans went to Egypt--in Biblical language, that all the tribes of Israel sojourned in Egypt. In the annals of Thutmos III, 1479-1447, two place names, Jacob-el and Joseph-el, occur. This would be as it should. Hyksos rule in Egypt lasted about a hundred years and the probabilities are that some of the Hyksos began to leave Egypt as soon as this period ended. That would be about 1575. Manetho estimates that the Hyksos were in Egypt for 511 years, making the final exodus come after the exodus under Merneptah. That is, even after the exodus in 1225 some Hebrews were left in Egypt. This is substantiated by the occurrence of the name ‘-pw-r, Hebrew, in the annals of the reigns of Rameses II, Rameses III, and Rameses IV (1167-1161). Meanwhile, between 1575 and 1164 many waves of Semitic sojourners may have crossed the borders of Egypt. The late Hebrew tradition above referred to, which would place the exodus at about 1447 B.C., may well mark the time of one of these waves that left Egypt. At any rate, between 1447 and 1375 when the name Samhuna occurs, which is probably Simeon, it is likely that the tribe of Simeon made up one of those waves of Semites that left Egypt and made its way into Canaan. This would coincide well with the occupation of Shechem by the Habiru in 1375. The late Hebrew tradition of the occupation of Shechem in the time of Jacob may be a reflection of the occupation of Shechem by Simeon in 1375 B.C. It is interesting to note in this connection that it was Simeon and Levi who avenged Dinah in Shechem (Gen. XXXIII and XXXIV). Consequently, Levi may also have made its way into Canaan from Egypt at the same
time. Be that as it may, the occurrence of the name Asher in the time of Seti I and Rameses II would point to a similar migration of the tribe of Asher out of Egypt and into Canaan before 1313 B.C. This is all the more reasonable when it is remembered that the position assigned to Asher in the annals of Seti and Rameses is just that assigned to it in Joshua XIX.

It is now possible to consider the Biblical evidence as to the exodus under Merneptah. Biblical tradition represents all the tribes of Israel as leaving Egypt at the same time and as entering Canaan by the way of the fords of the Jordan under the leadership of Joshua. But these traditions are late. Moreover, a careful reading of the Biblical sources will point to other conclusions. In the first place, there is every reason to believe that the route which the departing Israelites took, after their escape from Egypt, was in the direction of Kadesh and not southward along the eastern shore of the Red Sea. In other words, their intention was to reach Palestine as soon as possible. They would probably have taken the Mediterranean coast road had they not known that Merneptah could have easily headed them off in his ships. They, therefore, took the caravan route to Kadesh, and at once, not after a period of many years, attempted to enter Palestine from Kadesh. It is from Kadesh that the spies were sent out. The late priestly source says that there were twelve (Num. XIII. 1-17a, 21, 25-26a, 32a), and it also says that Caleb as well as Joshua and the others returned (Num. XIV. 38; cf. XXXII. 12). These two spies reported favourably as to an advance through southern Palestine (Num. XIV. 5-7, 10). The spies reported that the Amalekites dwelt in the south, Hittites, Jebusites and Amorites in the hill country (cf. Ezek. XVI. 3, 45, where, in speaking of Jerusalem, he says, "Thy father was the Amorite and thy mother a Hittite"), and Canaanites by the sea and by the Jordan (Num. XIII. 28-29). But Caleb was very anxious to enter Palestine from the south (Num. XIII. 30), and according to the oldest source, J, Caleb drove out the three sons of Anak and conquered Hebron and Debir (Joshua XV.
13-19; cf. Hebron as Caleb's lot, according to E, Joshua XIV. 6-15, and according to J, Judges I. 20). The sources here are probably ascribing to the period of Joshua an event which took place shortly after the exodus. Caleb probably put his wish into effect and, with his followers, penetrated into southern Palestine. It was comparatively easy for him to do so, for Israel was not as yet organized as it was later under Moses and his advisers and assistants.

A careful reading of the oldest source, J, will reveal a duplication which points to the conclusion that two distinct events are united by J into one event. In other words, the account of Judah's entrance into Palestine from the south is combined or confused with the invasion of Benjamin and Ephraim from the north, in such a way as to leave the impression that Judah entered Palestine from the north, when in reality it most likely entered from the south, as Caleb did. Thus, Joshua XV. 63 says that Judah did not drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem. The same is recorded of Benjamin in Judges I. 21. Joshua XVI. 10 says that Judah did not drive out the Canaanites from Gezer. The same is said of Ephraim in Judges I. 29. The probabilities are that the passages in Joshua are duplicates of those in Judges, applied to Judah by a writer who desired systematically to ascribe some undertaking to each of the tribes and to represent them as operating from the north. This conclusion gains credence when we read Judges I. 8-10, where the redactor of J ascribes to Judah, operating from the north, the same work which is ascribed to Caleb by J in Joshua XV. 13-19. The account in Judges I. 8-10 is a duplicate, but may preserve a remembrance of Judah's cooperation with Caleb from the south in much the same way that Judges I. 1-7 preserves a tradition about Judah's operations from the south. The mention of Simeon in this passage is either purely traditional, or it possibly may refer to some portion of that clan which was left behind when Simeon migrated northward over a hundred years before. The same is true of Judges I. 17-19, although this may be a duplicate of Joshua XV. 63
and Judges I. 21 and of Joshua XVI. 140 and Judges I. 29. The conclusion to which all this leads is that the tribe of Judah, although systematically represented as having entered Canaan from the east across the Jordan, really entered from the south with Caleb and some other Arabian Semites, such as the Kenites, Judges I. 16. That is, Judah and those closely related to it, the Calebites, the Kenites and the Jerahmeelites (I Chron. ii), penetrated Canaan from the south. This is in keeping with the feeling expressed in the "Blessing of Moses" that Judah had been separated from his brethren (Deut. XXXIII. 7), with such passages as Judges I. 16-17 and Num. XXI. 1-3, with the fact that Judah is not mentioned in the Song of Deborah, and with the ease with which Judah always found itself separated from the rest of the tribes (cf. 2 Sam. XIX. 41-43). Such passages as Num. XX. 14-21, JE, are ideal reconstructions, representing all the tribes of Israel as acting together.

Simeon, as we have seen, probably migrated northward previous to 1375 B.C. This agrees with the fact that it is not mentioned in the Song of Deborah and is omitted from the "Blessing of Moses." Asher also migrated north before 1313 B.C. This accounts for the fact that it did not respond to the call to arms in the time of Deborah (Judges V. 17), nor is it represented as driving out the Canaanites (Judges I. 30) but dwelt among them. Gad and Dan did not respond to the call of Deborah and Naphtali, Dan, and Zebulun are represented as dwelling among the Canaanites and as not driving them out (Judges I. 30--36). In fact, the only tribes of which conquests are recorded are Judah and Simeon and the Joseph tribes. The conclusion arrived at is that probably Gad, Dan, Zebulun and Naphtali also migrated northward from Egypt and settled in Canaan before the exodus under Merneptah. The same may be true also of Issachar and Reuben. That is, while there is no good reason to doubt the Biblical tradition (e.g., in Gen. XLVI. 8-27) that all the tribes migrated all together to Egypt, there seems to be sufficient reason to believe that migrations of the Hebrews from Egypt extended
over a long period, and that Simeon, Asher, Gad, Dan, Zebulun, Naphtali, Issachar and perhaps Levi and Reuben left Egypt before the exodus under Merneptah, and that Judah left with the Joseph tribes but separated from them at Kadesh and penetrated into Canaan from the south. All the lists of tribes that left Egypt, such as those in Deut. XXXIII and Num. I, are ideal reconstructions of a later period. The only tribes, therefore, which can be said to have entered Canaan under Joshua from the east, across the Jordan, are Benjamin, Ephraim and half the tribe of Manasseh, that is, the Joseph tribes; and these are the only tribes together with Judah (and Simeon), of which conquests are recorded.

Finally, it is now possible to account for the exodus in the time of Merneptah and at the same time for his defeat of "Israel" in the third year of his reign. Briefly stated it is this: Shortly after the arrival of the Joseph and Judah tribes at Kadesh, Judah and his associates, Caleb, the Kenites and the Jerahmeelites, invaded Canaan by the way of Hebron. They met with considerable success and settled in southern Palestine. So soon as Merneptah had realized that the Hebrews who dwelt in Goshen had escaped he planned to attack them in the country for which they were aiming. He perhaps waited until he thought they were settled in Palestine. Then he sent a force by sea, which landed in southern Canaan where he met, among others, just those Israelites, the tribe of Judah and its associates who had entered Canaan from the south, and defeated them. Thus, the "Israel Stela" is not a stumbling block in the way of accepting the traditional date of the exodus in the time of Merneptah, but is a confirmation of that fact, as well as an additional reason for believing that some of the Israelites actually did what the whole exodus intended to do, namely, to reach Canaan by the nearest possible route and at the earliest possible moment.

None of the passages describing the crossing of the "Red Sea" necessarily infer the actual drowning of the pharaoh of the exodus, whose mummy was found in his own tomb. Even Ps. CXXXVI may be rendered, "But shook off Pharaoh and his host at the Red Sea."

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: thildebrandt@gordon.edu
THE SONG OF REDEMPTION

RICHARD D. PATTERSON

One of the loveliest songs in the corpus of Israel's earliest poetry is Moses' song commemorating Israel's deliverance from the Egyptian forces during the Exodus from Egypt (Exod 15:1b-18). The song may be conveniently outlined as follows:

I. Prelude (1b-2)
   A. Exordium (1b)
   B. Opening confession/praise (2)

II. Singing the Song (3-16)
   A. First movement: The victory at the Re(e)d Sea (3-5)
      **Hinging refrain--in praise of Yahweh's invincibility (6)
   B. Second movement: The vindication of God's sovereignty (7-10)
      1. Over his enemy (7)
      2. Over the enemy's plans (8-10)
      **Hinging refrain-in praise of Yahweh's incomparability (11)
   C. Third movement: The vigor of God's activity (12-16a)
      1. As a powerful God of redemption (12-13)
      2. As a fearsome God of rebuke (14-16a)
      **Hinging refrain-in praise of Yahweh's intervention (16b)

III. Postlude (17-18)
   A. Promise: God will return his people to his land and theirs (17)
   B. Praise: May God (God will) reign forever (18)

The text is located within the narrative concerning Israel's departure from Egypt as recorded in Exod 13:17-15:21. The near context (Exod 14:26ff.) describes Israel's safe crossing through the parted waves of the Re(e)d Sea before the waters' return to destroy the pursuing Egyptians. The smooth flow of the prose narrative from 14:31 to 15:19-21 favors the suggestion that the poetic piece in 15:1-18 has been inserted into the text to commemorate the grand event.

The embedded poetry takes its theme from Miriam's song sung with the women who customarily lead with singing and dancing at such happy occasions (e.g., Judges 5; 2 Sam 1:20; 6:5, 14-16, 20-22, etc.). The final placement of the poetic text allows the initial thematic exordium of Moses' song of the sea (15:1) to form an inclusio with the words of Miriam's joyful
song (15:21), the double expression of the theme thus serving as a book-ending device to the whole rehearsal of the passing through the waters. Moses' song has been extensively studied and with many varying results. As for genre, Childs remarks: "The Song has been characterized as a hymn (Fohrer), enthronement psalm (Mowinckel), litany (Beer, Muilenburg), victory psalm (Cross-Freedman), hymn and thanksgiving psalm (Noth)." Structurally it has been declared to have four (Kaiser), three (Cassuto, Freedman, Muilenburg), or two (Childs, Howell) stanzas. This study will treat the poem as a unified victory song consisting of three stanzas (vv. 3-5, 7-10, 12-16a), each followed by a refrain composed in staircase parallelism (vv. 6, 11, 16b), the whole poem being enclosed by introductory and closing material (vv. 1b-2, 17-18). Having considered these data, the study will conclude with an examination of the poem's continuing importance in the preservation of the Exodus theme.

I. Structure and Literary Features

Applying the commonly employed Semitic compositional techniques of bracketing, hinging, and stitching, Muilenburg's structural analysis of the song (15:21), the double expression of the theme thus serving as a book-ending device to the whole rehearsal of the passing through the waters. Moses' song has been extensively studied and with many varying results. As for genre, Childs remarks: "The Song has been characterized as a hymn (Fohrer), enthronement psalm (Mowinckel), litany (Beer, Muilenburg), victory psalm (Cross-Freedman), hymn and thanksgiving psalm (Noth)." Structurally it has been declared to have four (Kaiser), three (Cassuto, Freedman, Muilenburg), or two (Childs, Howell) stanzas. This study will treat the poem as a unified victory song consisting of three stanzas (vv. 3-5, 7-10, 12-16a), each followed by a refrain composed in staircase parallelism (vv. 6, 11, 16b), the whole poem being enclosed by introductory and closing material (vv. 1b-2, 17-18). Having considered these data, the study will conclude with an examination of the poem's continuing importance in the preservation of the Exodus theme.
poem appears to be vindicated at every turn. Thus, the threefold use of staircase parallelism immediately arrests the reader's attention. Such poetic structures are formed by repeating the first poetic line in the third to form the pattern ab/cd, ab/ef:

Your right hand, 0 Yahweh,
Is fearful in strength;
Your right hand, 0 Yahweh,
Shatters the enemy. (v. 6)

Who is like you
Among the gods, Yahweh?
Who is like you
Glorious in holiness,
Awesome in deeds,
Working wonders? (v. 11)

Until there passed over
Your people, 0 Yahweh;
Until there passed over
The people you possess. (v. 16b)

Watson points out that this type of poetry is often used as a variant refrain and gives Exodus 15 as a classic example. The correctness of this conclusion is underscored by noting that each refrain is preceded by the appearance of a stanza-closing simile: "like a stone" (vv. 5, 16a), "like lead" (v. 10). The structural contours of the poem therefore seem clearly established.

It may be added that each refrain proceeds not only on the basis of the prior stanza but points to the one that follows. Thus, Yahweh's great strength (v. 6) displayed in the sending of Pharaoh's forces to the watery depths is sung in both surrounding stanzas. Likewise, Yahweh's incomparable power and holiness (v. 11) find reflection in the surrounding material, as does Yahweh's intervention on behalf of his people (v. 16b) so as to lead them to the place of his holy habitation (vv. 13, 17). Accordingly, the refrains do double duty as hinging devices.

Having established the stanza divisions, one can discern further strophic subdivisions. Within the second stanza (vv. 7-10), each strophe is introduced by the familiar coordinator plus prepositional phrase: "And in the abundance of your majesty" (v. 7); "And by the breath of your nostrils" (v. 8). Each strophe also features a simile: "Like stubble" (v. 7); "Like a wall" (v. 8). The second strophe is marked by a simile in its first and last quatrains ("like a wall," v. 8; "like lead," v. 10) and by the repetition of the word breath (vv. 8, 10) so as to form a tight inclusio. The third stanza (vv. 12-16a) is also made up of two strophes, the first dominated by the employment of the letter 3 with the primary verbs (vv. 12-13), the second focusing on the subject of the terror of the nations in and around Canaan (vv. 14-16a).

Stitching forms a further compositional technique. For example, the divine name Yahweh is threaded through the entire poem. The motif of the sea/waters, found in v. 1, reappears in the first two stanzas (vv. 4, 5, 8, 10); the motif of the right hand/arm of God provides stitching for the second and third stanzas (vv. 6, 12, 16a) as well as the closing promise (v. 17); the theme of holiness, featured in the second refrain (v. 11), is utilized in the third stanza (v. 13) and the closing promise; and the attention to God's people stitches together the two strophes of the third stanza (vv. 13, 16).

Other literary features abound in this short poetic piece. Alliteration and assonance are frequent, with certain letters being especially common (e.g., ב, כ, and ק). In addition to several similes, a metaphor occurs in v. 15 (Edom's leaders are called by a term meaning "rams"), and hendiadys (v. 2, "my strength and defense" = my strong defense; v. 4, "the chariots of Pharaoh and his army" = Pharaoh's chariot forces; v. 14, "the peoples heard, they trembled" = the peoples' fearful hearing; v. 16, "terror and dread" = dreadful terror), synecdoche (v. 1, "horse and its rider" = Pharaoh's military forces; v. 6, Yahweh's right hand = Yahweh himself; v. 16, "by the greatness of your arm" = Yahweh's mighty power; cf. vv. 8, 10, Yahweh's breath), dramatic irony (v. 9), and rhetorical question (v. 11) may be noted, as well as a possible instance of merismus (v. 4, chariots and army = Pharaoh's entire army). Paronomasia is often attested, whether in plays" on roots. (e.g., v. 2, הָנָּה הָנָה, "highly exalted"; v. 7, כָּלֵּא כָּלֵּא, "your majesty") or individual words (e.g., v. 10, בּוּמֶּר מִרְפָּא, In the mighty waters; v. 11, נָאָר בְּכָנָד, "glorious/mighty in holiness").

II. Genre Analysis

On the basis of similar biblical (e.g., "The Song of Deborah," Judges 5) and extrabiblical material, Moses' poem is best read as a victory song celebrating Yahweh's deliverance of his people through the Re(e)d Sea and from the pursuing Egyptians. The poet begins by taking Miriam's

---

9 So van der Westhuizen, "Literary Device," 61, although this is properly denied by Howell, "Poetic Analysis," 21.
spontaneous song (Exod 15:21) as his theme. Following the exordium (v. 1), the author moves to an opening confession and praise of God as Israel's and his redeemer. Yah(weh) is his strong defense and as a delivering God has become his salvation. He announces his intention to sing God's praises in what follows (v. 2). That Yahweh is a primary focus of attention throughout the song is clear in the repeated use of the divine name.

The main body of the song then begins, its first stanza comprising vv. 3-5. Like many an ancient victory song, it features both a war cry, "Yahweh is a man of war" (v. 3), and an exulting in the coming of divine aid during the battle (vv. 4-5). God has defeated Pharaoh's troops by sinking them in the waters of the Re(e)d Sea like a stone. Accordingly, utilizing some dramatic staircase parallelism (v. 6) and a well-designed synecdoche, he sings of God's mighty "right hand," the symbol of his strength, which has shattered the enemy forces.

In the second stanza, the poet returns to his earlier theme of God's exaltation (vv. 1, 2) by praising God's majesty in his mighty fury against Israel's enemy. As is typical of victory songs, the poet once again draws freely upon the use of simile, describing Pharaoh's forces as crushed and consumed like stubble (v. 7). In a second strophe (vv. 8-10), the poet employs several well-known victory themes. (1) He rehearses the setting of the crucial contest: the Hebrews are faced with the prospect of deep waters before them and a mighty Egyptian contingent behind them. (2) Divine aid comes so that the waters are made to congeal and stand up like a wall, thus securing safe passage for God's people. (3) Using the ancient taunt song, he tells of the boastful words from the Egyptians' mouths: they would destroy and despoil their intended prey. Quite the contrary, a mere puff of the


13 Cassuto notes that beginning poetry with an expression like "I will sing" is "a common feature both of Eastern and Western poesy" (Exodus, 174). See further Deut 32:1-2; Judg. 5:3; cf. Ps 45:1(2) and my remarks in "A Multiplex Approach to Psalm 45," GTJ 6 (1985) 35-36. See also B. Childs, who notes that "Then sang Moses... saying..." is a traditional means for setting a poem within a narrative (Exodus, 248; cf. Deut 31:30; Judg 5:1; I Sam 2:1).


15 The parallelism and paronomasia in v. 4 are striking, the poet beginning the first and third lines with words whose initial letter is D, and ending the second and fourth lines with references to the sea:

markebot par'oh wehelo [Pharaoh's chariot forces] yara bayyam [He hurled into the sea;] umibhar salisayw [Even his choicest troops] tubbe'u beyam-sup [Are drowned in the Re(e)d Sea.]

16 Paronomasia is again evident. Earlier (v. 1) the poet had praised God with the phrase הָשמָה הָוגָא, "He is highly exalted"; here he speaks of the ייָ֣֛וּרִב, "the abundance of your majesty."
divine breath had been sufficient to sink them like lead in the mighty waters.  

The sarcasm is evident. No wonder the poet can burst forth in lexultation formed of staccato-like phrases in rhetorical questions, "Who is like you, Yahweh?" For Israel's God is the incomparable One--glorious in holiness, awesome in deeds, and a worker of wonders (v. 11)

Building on this refrain, the author moves to a third stanza, once again falling into two strophes. The first (vv. 12-13) is built purposely around three verbs beginning with the letter £: £ú, £ú, £ú--"You stretch out" (your right hand; cf. v. 6), "You lead" (in your lovingkindness), and "You guide" (them by your strength), The emphasis is threefold: (1) Israel's God is a powerful God; (2) he is one who treats his redeemed people as family; and (3) he is the One who firmly guides them to his "holy [cf. v. 11] habitation"--probably Mount Sinai.

The second strophe (signaled by opening 3/3 meter) advances the thought to post-battle details. Moving past Sinai, the author considers the wilderness experience (vv. 14-16). Once again potential enemies are caricatured as helpless before Israel's God. They are described as trembling and shaking, seized by anguish and horror, and so afraid that they melt away because of the dreadful fear (v. 16a) that falls upon them so greatly that they are rendered incapacitated--"dumb as stone."

The following refrain sings of the peculiar relation that Israel enjoyed with its God. His divine aid had come because, as his redeemed people, they are those whom he has taken possession of for himself (v. 16b). Hence, he protected Israel from potential danger throughout the long and perilous journey through the wilderness.

As the third transitional refrain blends into final postlude, the poet concludes with a promise (v. 17) and a praise (v. 18). In so doing he changes from using past-tense verbs to a future one: "You will bring them." The God who had redeemed his people out of Egypt, and who had delivered them through the Re( e)d Sea and from enemies during the wilderness trek, could be counted on to lead them into the land of promise. As he had

17 Moses literary abilities may be seen in his use of "breath," "waters," an "sea" so as to yield a chiastic effect in vv. 8-10. He also employs paronomasia with great effectiveness, the root utilized to describe God's mighty right hand in v. 6 being used in v. 10 of the mighty waters. He will call upon it again in v. 11 in speaking of God's glorious holiness.

18 M. Howell sees in the recording of the enemy's intentions a touch of dramatic irony--the reader already knows the failed outcome of the Egyptians' efforts ("Poetic Analysis," 28).

19 Placing the terror of the Philistines in juxtaposition with that of the Transjordanian nations reinforces the fear that gripped the whole region, as expressed in the last line of v. 15. The Scriptures (particularly the prophets) characteristically pronounced the fate of the foreign nations in some sort of geographic pattern that crisscrossed the land/country/city that was the focus of the denunciation, See my remarks in "Old Testament Prophecy," in A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible (eds. Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993) 296-309.
brought them to his holy habitation on Sinai (v. 13), he will yet bring them to his intended holy sanctuary and their dwelling place. Accordingly, Yahweh can duly be praised.

III. Transmission of the Song

The victory at the Red Sea, together with the following movements that culminated in the conquest, remained indelibly written in Israel's memory. The song itself was reechoed by many writers in subsequent generations. The opening praise of v. 2 is repeated by the psalmist (Ps 118:14) and Isaiah (12:2). The song's phraseology and/or imagery is often drawn upon by others. Thus, David in Psalm 18 speaks of God as "my strength" (v. 1), "my fortress" (v. 2), and "my salvation" (v. 46; cf. Hab 3:18), all drawn from Exod 15:2, while "the breath of his nostrils" (Exod 15:8) is found in v. 15. The kindling fire of v. 8 may also stem from Exod 15:7. Psalm 77 appears indebted to Exodus 15, employing the imagery of the right hand, the way through the waters, and the divine guiding of God's people (vv. 17, 19, 20). Further allusions may be found in God's "holy dwelling" (Exod 15:13) in Ps 68:6 (cf. Ps 114:2; Obad 16; Hab 2:20; Zeph 3:11), as well as the use of the "trembling earth" of Exod 15:7-8 in Ps 114:7; Judg 5:4-5.22 Isaiah seems to have drawn upon Exod 15:1-18 in many places (e.g., cf. v. 2 with Isa 12:2; v. 8 with Isa 43:16; v. 9 with Isa 9:3; v. 10 with Isa. 11:4; 30:33; 40:7; v. 11 with Isa 6:3, 35:2; 40:5; 46:5, v. 17 with Isa 5:2; 60:21). The memory of the safe passage through the waters, so important to Exodus 15, is often rehearsed (e.g., Deut 11:4; Josh 2:10; 4:23; 24:6; Ps 66:6; 77:16, 19; 106:7-9, 22; 114:3, 5; 136:13, 15; Jer 49:4), as is the subsequent wilderness experience (e.g., Ps 78:52; 107:33-38; Jer 2:2-6; Ezek 20:10; Hos 2:15; Amos 2:10).

Some evidence exists that the Exodus may have also been commemorated in epic fashion. That story can be sketched at least preliminarily not only in several of the above mentioned texts (e.g., Ps 18:8-16; 68:8-9; 77:17-20; 114) but also by comparing Exod 15:1-18 with Hab 3:3-7, 8-15. Like the epics of the nations round about her, Israel's poets in the Exodus cycle focused on a central hero, God himself.24 Other epic elements include:

20 Paronomasiason can also be felt here. He who was glorious in holiness (v. 11) and had guided his people to his holy habitation on Mount Sinai (v. 13) now is seen as having already prepared his holy sanctuary in the promised land of inheritance.
(1) the account of a perilous journey—from Egypt to Canaan; (2) the surviving of a critical contest—the Re(e)d Sea; (3) the hero’s great personal qualities such as magnificence and grandeur, awe-inspiring might, and munificence and concern for others; and (4) the stylistic employment of such literary features as static epithets, set parallel terms, and a lofty tone.25

Whether or not Israel formally possessed such an epic poem, the story of the Exodus was often retold. Indeed, the poetry of the Exodus cycle was to form the basic twofold confession of national consciousness: Yahweh "brought the people out of Egypt" and "brought them in to the promised land."26 The whole story formed one grand event through which a redeemed people was to realize life's full potential and finest blessing.27 Indeed, the Exodus event became the spiritual basis for all of Israel's redemptive experience, nationally and individually. As such it is cited or alluded to throughout the pages of the OT (e.g., Josh 3:5; 4:14, 18-24; 5:10-18; I Sam 12:6; Ps 105:26-45; 106:7-12; Jer 11:7; etc.), the traditional account often being recast by Israel's prophets in portraying God's future intervention on behalf of his people so as to bring them once again to the land of blessing (e.g., Isa 11:11-16; 51:9-11; Jer 16:14-15; 23:7-8; Mic 7:14-15). The Exodus theme also is found in such intertestamental pieces as 3 Maccabees (2:6-8; 6:4), 1 Enoch (89:10-27), and Jubilees (chap. 49), and in many NT contexts, especially the book of Revelation (e.g., 15:3-4), where the traditional Exodus material is often drawn upon to picture coming apocalyptic events.28


28 F. F. Bruce appropriately remarks, "The presentation of the redemptive work of Christ in terms of the Exodus motif in so many strands of New Testament teaching shows how primitive was the Christian use of this motif—going back, quite probably, to the period of Jesus' ministry'’. Jesus' contemporaries freely identified Him as a second Moses—the expectation of a second Moses played an important part in popular eschatology at the time—and with the expectation of a second Moses went very naturally the expectation of a second Exodus" (The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968] 49).

Both in its original setting and in its oft retelling, Moses' great victory song of redemption continues to be felt in the lives of today's redeemed as well as those of yesteryear. Habakkuk's reaction to the contemplation of that grand event can perhaps give assurance and direction to us all; come what may, "Yet I will rejoice in the LORD, I will be joyful in God my Savior, the Sovereign LORD is my strength" (Hab 3:18-19).
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For the importance of the use of the Exodus motif as a basis of future hope, note the comments of W. A. VanGemen, *Interpreting the Prophetic Word* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990) 276: "Just as the restoration from exile was like a second Exodus, so the coming of Christ is like a third Exodus because he has come to lead sinners--Jews and Gentiles--into the full experience of salvation."
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THE DURATION OF
THE ISRAELITE SOJOURN IN EGYPT

PAUL J. RAY, JR.
Berrien Springs, Michigan 49103

From possibly as early as the LXX (ca. 250-150 B.C.\(^1\)), there has been a tradition that the 430 years in Exod 12:40 (or apparently rounded to the 400 years of Gen 15:13) represent only 215 actual years of Israelite sojourn in Egypt, with the other 215 years representing the sojourn in Canaan. The Hebrew MT of both of the above verses, however, appears to indicate that the total years constituted the full period of time of the sojourn in Egypt prior to the Exodus.

The Jewish historian Josephus (first century A.D.) provides a divided testimony—one time apparently following the LXX, and thus associating the rise of Joseph to power as vizier of Egypt with the Hyksos (Dynasties 15-16, ca. 1730-1575 B.C.\(^2\)), and another time following the MT.\(^3\) Rabbinic tradition as reflected in Seder ‘Olam (second century A.D.)\(^4\) and Rashi (eleventh century A.D.)\(^5\) allows but 210 years for the sojourn in Egypt. The Midrash is more vague.\(^6\)

The NT also appears to be divided on the subject. In Acts 7:6-7, Stephen uses essentially the same wording as the Genesis passage, which appears to allocate a full and literal 400 years to the Israelite sojourn in Egypt. In Gal 3:17, however, Paul seems to indicate that the 430 years extended from Abraham to the giving of the Law.\(^7\)

---

1 I.e., if MSS B and h, which carry this tradition, reflect that early a form of the text.
2 Josephus, Ant. 2.15.2; and Ag. Apion 1.14 (trans. Thackeray, in LCL).
3 Josephus, Ant. 2.9.1.
7 Leon Wood, A Survey of Israel’s History (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1970), p. 88, points out that Gal 3:16 says it was "not only to Abraham but to 'his seed" which the
rather than representing the totality of the sojourn in Egypt. In this, he appears to be following the LXX of Exod 12:40.\(^8\) Acts 13:17-20 is a further NT passage that is sometimes seen as having a bearing on this question though its reference to "about 450 years till Samuel the prophet pertains to a period of time subsequent to the Sojourn.\(^9\)

Among the Early-Church Fathers there is also division of opinion on the interpretation of the chronology in these biblical references. For instance, Tertullian supports the short chronology, whereas Hippolytus favors the long one.\(^11\)

Since different versions of the OT have carried these two traditions, and commentators have aligned themselves accordingly to one tradition or the other, it is necessary to examine the various ancient texts, in order to discover the preferable reading. It is also necessary to take a look at the history, archaeology, and other biblical data which may have some bearing on the text, so as to ascertain the best setting for the events dealt with in Gen 15:13-21 and Exod 12:40.

Depending on the interpretation given to the 400 (430) years, the events of Gen 15 happened either during Middle Bronze Age I (2200-1950 B.C.) or during Middle Bronze Age IIA (1950-1800 B.C.)--or more specifically, about 2095 B.C. or 1880 B.C., respectively. Therefore, Abraham came to Canaan either during the Ur III Dynasty (ca. 2112-2004 B.C.) or during the First Dynasty of Babylon (ca. 1894-1595 B.C.).\(^12\) (Through the years considerable attention has been given to the question of the duration of the sojourn, and the covenant promises were spoken; and indeed, just before Jacob went down into Egypt, they were spoken to him for the last time (Gen 46:2-4)--exactly 430 years before the Law was given, if the long chronology is allowed.

\(^8\) This is disputed by Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia* (Grand Rapid, Mich., 1953), p. 136, n. 8.


\(^12\) The foregoing dates are based on the Middle chronology for the beginning of Hammurabi's reign (i.e., 1792 B.C.), and follow J. A. Brinkman, "Mesopotamian
been devoted to the date of the Exodus, and I have obviously opted for an early dating. On this point, see my further discussion in "Excursus A" at the end of this article.)

It will be pertinent to begin our analysis with the two OT passages which are the most relevant to our discussion, Exod 12:40 and Gen 15:13-21, noted at the outset of this article. The former is given within a chronological statement in the context of the account of the Exodus itself, and the latter is in the setting of God's ratification of his covenant with Abram, which included both the confirming of the promises of the seed (vss. 13-17) and the land grant (vss. 18-21).  

I. Textual Evidence on Exodus 12:40

In Exod 12:40, the extent of Israel's sojourn in Egypt is given in the MT as 430 years (the more exact amount for the round number of Gen 15:13). The major manuscript evidence for the LXX, plus the Samaritan Pentateuch, supports the addition of "and their fathers" to the phrase "the children of Israel," as do a number of other ancient versions.

As for the time period itself, the 430 years are divided between Canaan and Egypt in at least two manuscripts of the LXX (LXXBh) and in an obelus of the Syro-Hexapla, as well as in all known manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Vulgate, Peshitta, and the Targum follow the MT. Although when the Samaritan Pendulum of the Historical Period" in A. Leo Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia (Chicago, 1964), pp. 336-337.


The ancient versions follow the MT for the most part in Gen 15:13-21. However, the LXX (all MSS except 82*) adds the phrase "and humble them," to the list of things that will happen to Abram's seed during the 400 years (300 years, MS 79*). There are a few other minor variations that also affect the meaning of this passage very little, if at all. In essence, it is only Exod 12:40 that has a bearing textually on the problem under consideration.

MSS AFM a-tv-c2. The fact that the various manuscripts place this phrase in two different locations in this verse would seem to indicate its secondary character.

MSS ABCDEFG HINPQW X BDCF (=) dln.

Armenian, Bohairic, Ethiopic, Syro-Hexapla, Eusebius-Chron.
Pentateuch and the LXX coincide they are usually considered to be preferable to the MT, the manuscripts in this case do not reflect the exact same original. They are divided in terms of their order of elements, with LXX_B reading "in the land of Egypt and in the land; of Canaan," whereas LXX_h reads "in the land of Canaan and Egypt. It is the latter reading (but with a second "the land of") which occurs in all known manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Interestingly, LXX_B also originally added an extra five years to, the sojourn, here and in vs. 41, whereas the other LXX manuscripts, as well as the other ancient versions, are agreed on 430 years. This deviation of LXX_B and the afore-mentioned one suggest that LXX_B is evidently not to be taken as the original and better reading of this verse. Table 1 gives an overview of the textual data on Exod 12:40:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Samaritan</th>
<th>Josephus</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Other Ancient Versions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (only)</td>
<td>All known</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ant. 2.9.1</td>
<td>AFM</td>
<td>Ar, Bo, Aeth, O. Lat^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a-gi-</td>
<td>Tg, Pesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tv-c_2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaan &amp; Egypt</td>
<td>All known</td>
<td>MSS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt &amp; Canaan</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ant. 2.15.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Syro-Hexapla (obelus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from these data in Table 1, the majority of the ancient texts lend support to the long chronology (for the sojourn in Egypt alone). While this fact does not, of course, provide conclusive support for that chronology, it does indicate a direction of probability as to the original. The LXX_{Bh} and Samaritan Pentateuch, readings seem, therefore, to be Midrashic exegesis, as is Rashi.18

2. Interpretational Problems in Genesis 15:13-21

With regard to Gen 15:13-21, there are two interpretational matters that have a specific bearing on this investigation; namely, (1) the question of who is the oppressor of the descendants of Abraham for the "400 years" (vs. 13); and (2) the significance of the term "fourth generation" in designating the time of return from captivity (vs. 16).

Who Oppresses Whom?

Although Abraham and his descendants were sojourners (ger) in both Canaan and Egypt (Gen 21:34; 26:3; Ps 105:23), there is no record of their being servants to the Canaanites, or being in any way oppressed by them. In fact, these patriarchs were treated well and were allowed to travel freely throughout the land.

It has been pointed out by those favoring the short chronology for the Egyptian sojourn (i.e., 215 years, with the previous 215 years in Canaan) that Isaac was "persecuted" by Ishmael, that Jacob fled from Esau, and that Joseph was sold as a slave by his brothers. However, these events or situations were intra-family quarrels and hardly qualify for the expression "they will oppress them." That expression requires an entirely different entity as the oppressor (cf. the inverted parallelism of vs. 13). The Egyptians are the only ones who would appear truly to qualify for this role.

A further indication that the oppression must relate to the Egyptian sojourn emerges from the fact of God's promise to Abraham in vs. 15 that Abraham would not be involved in these tragedies, but would die in peace. Abraham lived for a century after the events described in Gen 15, Jacob and Esau being 15 years old when he died (Gen 25:7, 26). Oppression to the patriarch's descendants would

Rashi, 2:61). It is also interesting to note that it is an anachronism to call Abraham, Isaac, and even Jacob himself "children of Israel and their fathers" (as in the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch) before Jacob had sons at Haran or had received his new name on his way back to Canaan. This could, however, have added only about 33 years (1913-1880 B.C.)--or the time of Jacob's return to Canaan until the time when he went down to Egypt--if their sojourn was also "in Canaan." (The writer is indebted to William H. Shea for this observation.)

have been oppression to the patriarch himself; and thus, whether oppression had come from his own family or from outsiders Abraham would have had a difficult time dying in peace if, indeed, as the short chronology necessitates, where was already oppression to the patriarch's descendants during his own lifetime.

**Problem of the Four Generations**

"And in the fourth generation they will return here" (Gen 15:16). The time reference in vs. 13 is the "400 years"; therefore, the meaning in vs. 16 appears to be four generations of 100 years each. This length for a generation does not occur elsewhere in the OT, but this is possibly so because people in patriarchal times were recognized as living to be 100 years of age and older, as a general rule. However, there is a more simple solution to this matter. The Hebrews, like other ancient peoples, dated long periods of time in terms of lifetimes, or the cycle of a person's lifetime, the word *dor* coming from a root meaning "to go in a circle." This is to be contrasted with the word *toledot* which is also translated as "generations," but in the biological sense of descendants. Therefore, *dor* should be seen as a circle or cycle of time, rather than generation(s), as both etymology and context would suggest.

Starting from at least the time of Rashi, and using the traditional definition of a generation to mean from the time of a man's birth to the birth of his offspring, those who have favored the short

---


25 Cognates in Akkadian (*daru*) and Arabic *dara* also bear this out (cf. Freedman and Lundbom, pp. 170, 172).

26 Rashi, 1:61.
chronology have pointed to Exod 6:16-27, which would indicate four generations from Levi to Moses. Furthermore, a comparison with another four-generation genealogy in Num 26:57-62 would seem to strengthen their case. On the basis of these two apparently rather weighty pieces of evidence, it would seem that 400 (430) years would be far too long a period of time between Jacob's descent into Egypt and the Exodus, or the time or number of generations between the leaving of Canaan (obviously into Egypt, by either interpretation) and the return into Canaan.

There are indications, on the other hand, that both of the above four-generation genealogies of Moses are stylized and incomplete. Exod 6:14-27, which gives genealogies for Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, begins by saying, "These are the heads of their fathers' houses," a technical term for a collection of families (or more accurately, kin-groups) denominated by a common ancestor, i.e., a lineage. Also included are the names of such sons as were founders of families: mispahot (i.e., lineage segments). Thus, stated in another way, the names included in this genealogy are "the heads [ra'se] of the father's-houses of the Levites according to their families" (vs. 25b--not each individual. The heads of families, thus, are: Levi (actually the tribal or lineage founder), the first generation; Kohath (with his brothers Gershon and Merari), the second generation; and Amram (and his brothers Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel), the third generation. However, this is where the heads of families conclude. The name Amram of vs. 20 may be a conflation of the name of the Amram who was the head of one of the third-generation families of Levi, with the name of a later Amram who was the father of Moses "and Aaron. There was a tendency among the Levites to name their sons after their forefathers (cf. 1 Chr 6:7-13; Luke 1:5, 59-61). Thus, several generations appear to have been telescoped here, with

---

27 This assumes the validity of basing the fulfillment of this verse on Levi's genealogy.
28 Keil and Delitzsch, 1:469.
29 Those listed as sons of Izhar and Uzziel, vss. 21-22, are possibly several generations later, the term "son" thus indicating a later descendant, with the most important names listed first in that they appear in current events surrounding the Exodus (cf. Lev 10:4; Num 3:30; 16:1). For examples of this phenomenon elsewhere, cf. Gen 11:26,32; 12:4; 46:16-18, 24-25.
Amram, the father of Moses and Aaron, probably being at least the grandson of the original Amram, if not even a later descendant.  

(See Table 2.) According to Num 3:27-28, after the numbering of people in the wilderness in the second year after the Exodus, the Kohathites were divided into four families (mispahot). These families of the Amramites, Izharites, Hebronites, and Uzzzielites consisted of 8600 men and boys (not including women and girls), of which about a fourth (or 2150) were Amramites. This would have given Moses and Aaron that incredibly large a number of brothers and brothers' sons (brothers' daughters, sisters, and their daughters not being reckoned), if the same Amram, the son of Kohath, were both the head of the family of the Amramites and their own father.

Obviously, such could not have been the case.

The genealogy of Num 26:57-62 is also incomplete (possibly representing a harmonization with Exod 6). After the list of eight families (mispahot), there is a break at vs. 58. Again Levi, Kohath, and Amram are first-through-third generations, respectively. Jochebed is not the daughter of Levi, but rather a daughter of Levi—that is, "Levitess" (cf. Exod 2:1; the Hebrew of the two verses is the same bat Levi).

Further evidence pertinent to the Levi genealogies may be found in the fact that the genealogies of Judah (1 Chr 2:1-20) and Ephraim (Num 26:35-36; 1 Chr 7:20-27) indicate seven and eight generations, respectively, 52 for the same or a slightly lesser time period than that encompassed in the four-generation genealogies of Levi in Exod 6:16-27 and Num 26:57-62. At the very end of each of these other genealogies, we find reference to several contemporary individuals from the three tribes. Thus, these more-extended genealogies of Judah and Ephraim would seem to indicate incompleteness in the Levi genealogies.

An alternative view is that there is only one Amram, thus leaving the parents of Moses and Aaron unnamed; cf. W. H. Green, "Primeval Chronology," BSac 47 (1890): 293.

Keil and Delitzsch, 1:470.

The genealogical comparisons of this section of the paper (including Table 2) reflect only the data given in the biblical text. I am not attempting here to do a thorough historical reconstruction of these genealogies, which would of necessity include all instances of genealogical fluidity; cf. Robert R. Wilson, Genealogy and History in the Biblical World (New Haven, 1977), pp. 27-36.
My reconstruction of the genealogical data is summarized in Table 2, and further elaboration is provided in Excursus B at the end of this article.

**TABLE 2**
Summary of Genealogical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen., Num26:35-36 and I Chr 7:20-27</th>
<th>Exod 6:16-27</th>
<th>I Chr 2:1-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Joseph</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>Judah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ephraim</td>
<td>Kohath</td>
<td>Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 <strong>Shuthelah Becher</strong> Tahan</td>
<td>Amram</td>
<td>Hezron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bered)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Eran &amp; Tahath</td>
<td>Laadan</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Eleadah</td>
<td>Ammihud</td>
<td>Amram = Jochebed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Tahath</td>
<td>Elishamat*</td>
<td>Aaron* = Elisheba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Zabad</td>
<td>Nun*</td>
<td>Nahshon* = Uri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Shuthelah</td>
<td>Joshua*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ephraim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Ezer &amp; Elead &amp; Beriah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Rephah &amp; Resheph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Telah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contemporaries during the Exodus and after.

Italics indicate founders of families.

3. **Historical Setting**

In the previous two sections, we have dealt with the biblical and textual data as well as the interpretational problems which accompany them in presenting a case for the long chronology. It was found that these data allow for such a reconstruction. In the present section we deal briefly with historical and archaeological data that have significant implications for the "long-chronology" view presented here. These relate to the historical setting for Abraham and for Joseph, and to the time of the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt prior to the Exodus.

**Abraham**

The long chronology for the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt would place the birth of Abraham ca. 2170 B.C., and thus would locate the events of his first year in Canaan, his visit to Egypt, and the events of Gen 15 ca. 2095 B.C. The basic question to be asked here
is this: Are the conditions in Canaan and Egypt at that time compatible with the narratives in Genesis? Indeed, the case seems to be such that we can answer in the affirmative.

Both Ur and Haran were flourishing at the time. Shechem and Bethel were uninhabited, but the Jordan valley was well populated. In the Negev, there was settlement from the twenty-first to the nineteenth centuries B.C., but not before or afterwards (cf. Gen 20:1, 24:62; 28:20). However, in the central hill country there was apparently a sparseness of population, reflected by the fact that Abraham could move freely between Shechem and Beersheba, where he could pitch his tent and graze his flock as he pleased, as did Isaac and Jacob. Archaeological findings reveal the same condition particularly in the interior of Canaan, and further Indicate that during the nineteenth century the cities west of the Jordan were again occupied. It is interesting, moreover, that Asiatics during Egypt's First Intermediate Period (ca. 2181-2022 B.C.) entered the Delta


36 Both Gen 12:6 and 21:31 use the term maqom("place") rather than 'ir ("city") for these sites, as does Gen 28:19 for Bethel at the time Jacob went through on his way to Haran. This terminology indicates that there was no inhabited city at these sites at those particular times (i.e., MBI for the former, and MBIIA for the latter).

region with relative ease. Thus, it would not have been difficult for Abraham to enter the unguarded borders of Egypt at that time.

**Joseph**

If the long chronology puts Abraham in Canaan ca. 2095 B.C., then it also puts Joseph in Egypt during the Twelfth Dynasty (ca. 1991-1782 B.C.), instead of (as with Josephus and tradition) during the Hyksos Period. Likewise, it brings Jacob into Egypt ca. 1880 B.C. Again, it is necessary to see if this period correlates with what we know from the narratives in Genesis and Exodus.

From this point of view, the Beni-Hasan Asiatics (depicted on a wall of the tomb of the nomarch Khnum-hotep III) reflect the time of Jacob and Joseph, rather than that of Abraham. There is also mention of famine during the Twelfth Dynasty. These circumstances correlate with the biblical evidence.

According to Gen 37:2, Joseph was sold into slavery and brought down into Egypt when he was 17 years old; this would be, according to my suggested reconstruction, in 1902 B.C., or late in the reign of Amenemhat II (1929-1895 B.C.). There is concurrence with Egyptian history in that during the Twelfth Dynasty slavery of Syro-Palestinians was growing. Joseph was purchased by an Egyptian official named Potiphar (Gen 37:36), and was made a domestic servant or steward, something which was quite common during the Middle Kingdom (Dynasties XI-XII, ca. 2022-1782 B.C.).

When Joseph became vizier to Pharaoh, he was given Pharaoh's second chariot (Gen 41:43; cf. 46:29). This fact may seem to pose a problem in that the Hyksos brought the horse (cf. Gen 47:17) and chariot to Egypt for use in war. However, a horse burial

---

41 William C. Hayes, ed., *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum* (Brooklyn, 1972), pp. 87, 92 and passim; *ANET*, pp. 553-554.
44 J. A. Thompson, *The Bible and Archaeology*, 3d ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1982), p. 44. For doubts concerning this longstanding argument, cf. John Van Seters,
antedating the Hyksos Period has been found at Buhen in Nubia from ca. 1875 B.C.\(^45\) The wording "second chariot" in Gen 41:43 may suggest, of course, that chariots were uncommon.\(^46\)

Joseph's marriage to the daughter of a priest of On (Heliopolis) as arranged by the Pharaoh (Gen 41:45), is also significant. On was the center of worship of the sun-god Re, and Joseph's father-in-law was no doubt a priest of Re. Although the Hyksos did not suppress the worship of Re, they venerated Seth, who was their primary deity. If Joseph had lived during the Hyksos Period, he probably would have received a wife from the family of a priest of Seth, rather than of Re.\(^47\) It is also possible that Joseph's land reforms during the famine (Gen 47:20-26) may be connected with the breaking of the dominance of the great nomarchs of the land by Pharaoh Sesostris III (ca. 1878-1843 B.C.) at this very time.\(^48\)

A further argument put forward for the view that Joseph was ruler of Egypt during the Hyksos Period is that the Hyksos capital Avaris was in the Delta, and this is coupled with the fact that Joseph told his father to dwell in the land of Goshen so that he could be near him (Gen 45:10).\(^49\) However, the land of Goshen is spoken of as if it were in a part of Egypt other than where the Pharaoh and Joseph resided (see especially Gen 46:29, 31, telling of Joseph's going to Goshen to meet his father, and then going elsewhere to Pharaoh). During the Twelfth Dynasty, the capital was at It-towy (Lisht), a site compatible with the conditions of the narrative, which require a capital neither too near to, nor too far from, Goshen.\(^50\)

There was also a secondary capital, possibly at Qantir.\(^51\) (Both the "land of Ramses" [Gen 47:11] and the storage cities of Pithom

---


\(^{46}\) Aling, p. 45. However, a viable alternative is "second" in the order of procession.

\(^{47}\) Aling, pp. 45-46; d. also Wood, p. 38, n. 45.

\(^{48}\) Battenfield, pp. 82-84.

\(^{49}\) Nichol, 1:462.

\(^{50}\) Battenfield, p. 81.

[probably Tell er-Retabeh] and Per Ramses [probably Qantir], which were built well before the birth of Moses, are probably insertions of later names by a copyist to identify Goshen and the storage cities to readers who would not know the original locations.

As can be seen from the above reconstruction, the Israelite Patriarchal period spans the transition between MBI and MBII. When MBI came to be recognized as a discrete historical period, it was suggested by Nelson Glueck and W. F. Albright that this was the period of the Patriarchs. Since then, this conclusion has been disputed by Thomas L. Thompson and J. Van Seters. A recent survey of the archaeological data, however, supports the position of those initial conclusions for MBI as the period of settlement in the Negev by Abraham and Isaac, but it also suggests, further, that the Jacob narratives belong to MBIIA. It would seem, then, that these archaeological data support a biblical chronological framework based on the long chronology.

The Time of Oppression

We turn our attention next to the time of the Oppression of the Israelites after the death of Joseph, when there arose over Egypt a new king who "did not know Joseph" (Exod 1:8). In Hebrew, the verb qwm plus the preposition 'al often means "to rise against" (cf. Deut 19:11; 28:7; Judg 9:18; et al.), and as such would not indicate a

55 Nichol, 1:473, 497-498; Aling, p. 95.
peaceable accession to the throne of a nation. This statement would, therefore, fit more precisely with a situation in which the Hyksos or other outsiders were taking over the Egyptian throne than it would with the rise of a native Egyptian Dynasty. Although possibly, as is sometimes suggested, it could refer to Ahmose I (ca. 1575-1553 B.C.), the first king of the Eighteenth Dynasty (ca. 1575-1318 B.C.), in taking back a throne that was rightfully his, other considerations seem to go contrary to this. For instance, in Exod 1:9-10, the new king says: "Behold, the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we: come, let us deal wisely with them, lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they also join themselves unto our enemies and fight against us, and go up from the land."

This statement may well have been made long before Israel finished multiplying to the population peak which they reached just prior to the Exodus. The Israelites were, in fact, never more numerous and mighty than the native Egyptians; but they were indeed so, in comparison to the Hyksos, who were never very numerous in Egypt, and who ruled by holding key positions rather than by numbers. If the new Pharaoh "who knew not Joseph" was a Hyksos ruler, he could expect war with the Egyptians at any time; and since Joseph and the Hebrews had been on friendly terms with the Egyptians, he could also expect the Hebrews to join themselves to the Egyptians.

There are other reasons which support the suggestion that it was the Hyksos who began the oppression of Israel. For instance, if Ahmose had been the Pharaoh of the oppression, it would seem illogical that the Egyptians would fear the Israelites after the Egyptians' successful expulsion of the Hyksos, pushing them back into Palestine and even besieging them there. Moreover, if the Hyksos had enslaved the Hebrews, the latter would certainly have had no desire to leave with the Hyksos; and since the Jews were on friendly terms with the Egyptians, a clear distinction would be made.

59 Rea, p. 60.
60 Ibid., p. 61.
61 Ibid., pp. 60-61.
It seems, therefore, that the Hyksos were the ones who enslaved the Hebrews.\textsuperscript{62} They forced them to build the storage cities Pithom and Per-Ramses (cf. Exod 1:11), the latter of which (if at Qantir) has finds from the Hyksos Period and earlier (associating it with Avaris) and which also has finds from the Nineteenth Dynasty (ca. 1318-1209 B.C.), including bricks with the name "Ramses," as well as ostraca which have the name "Per-Ramses." These finds correlate well with the literary sources concerning Per-Ramses.\textsuperscript{63}

There is no need, then, to try to circumvent the lack of Eighteenth-Dynasty remains at Qantir,\textsuperscript{64} for it was not during this period, but rather during the Hyksos Period, that the Hebrews were forced to build these cities. The Hyksos oppression, therefore, probably began about 1730 B.C.\textsuperscript{65} The difference between that date and 1450 B.C., the date of the Exodus, is 280 years. When 40 years for the wilderness wanderings are added, the time is 320 years--or "in the fourth generation or cycle of time" (cf. Gen 15:16), when Israel turned to Canaan.

Indeed, an even earlier, but lesser period of oppression can be seen as existing at the beginning of the reign of Amenemhat III (1842-1797 B.C.), or during a possible coregency between him and his father Sesostris III,\textsuperscript{66} since this was the approximate time that Asiatic slaves appeared in Egypt.\textsuperscript{67} This oppression may be dated to ca. 1850 B.C., in fulfillment of the 400 years of Gen 15:13,\textsuperscript{68} with a more intense period of oppression during the Hyksos domination, as mentioned above. Subsequent to the Hyksos domination, the

\textsuperscript{62} If the tradition in Josephus is correct, the Hyksos did make some people slaves; cf. Ag. Apion 1.14.
\textsuperscript{64} Bietak, pp. 236, 268.
\textsuperscript{65} Rea, p. 61. Gardiner, Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 165; ANET, pp. 252-253.
\textsuperscript{68} Battenfield, p. 84.
Egyptian rulers of the Eighteenth Dynasty, evidently after a brief period of relaxation from the Hyksos oppression, found it to their advantage to oppress the Hebrews.\textsuperscript{69} Thutmose I (ca. 1532-1518 B.C.) who acceded to the throne in 1532 B.C., would be a likely candidate for the Pharaoh of the death decree,\textsuperscript{70} If we reckon an Exodus of ca. 1450 B.C. According to Exod 1:15-22 and 7:7, this decree was probably issued about half way between the birth of Aaron and the birth of Moses.

4. Summary and Conclusion

Ever since the appearance of LXX\textsuperscript{Bh}, with variant translations of Exod 12:40, there has been a division among scholars as whether the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt was 215 (or 210) years long, as the variant reading claims, or 430 years long, as the Hebrew text gives the time period. Although, along with Gen 15:13-21, Exod 12:40 is our primary source, evidences other than the variants of the ancient translations of the Scriptures are needed in order to reach decision with respect to whether the long chronology or the short one for the Israelite sojourn in Egypt is to be preferred.

A comparison of various genealogical data reveals that while on two sons of Joseph, reveal six, seven, and eight generations for the same time period, evidencing that there are some missing generations in the genealogy of Moses. Thus, this genealogy in Exod 6:16-27 should not be taken as support for the 215-year view. The genealogical data favor, instead, a longer time period.

The historical and archaeological evidence also seems to have closer correlation with the biblical data if the 430 years are taken to be the length of the Israelite sojourn in Egypt alone. Especially does the career of Joseph seem to fit well into the Twelfth-Dynasty circumstances in Egypt, with the sojourn and the oppressions varying intensities bridging the reign of Amenemhat III, the Hyksos Period, and the Eighteenth Dynasty. Also, Abraham appears to fit just as well, if not better, into the twenty-first century, than into the nineteenth century. Moreover, not only are the evidences from these various directions compatible with Palestinian and Egyptian

\textsuperscript{69} Rea, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{70} Shea, Exodus, p. 233.
EXCURSUS A
DATE OF THE EXODUS

The dating of the Exodus is very controversial. There are two main periods which have been suggested as fitting best the evidence for this event—one at the end of the Late Bronze Age I, and the other at the end of the Late Bronze Age II. A thirteenth-century date has been favored by most of the scholarly world, with either a low date of ca. 1220 B.C. (cf. W. M. F. Petrie, *Egypt and Israel* [London, Eng., 1911], p. 53) or a high date of ca. 1280 B.C. (cf. W. F. Albright, *From Stone Age to Christianity* [Garden City, N.Y., 1957], p. 256).

However, a fifteenth-century-B.C. date is preferred by other scholars. These scholars, too, hold either to a high date of ca. 1470 B.C. (cf. J. Bimson, "Redating the Exodus and Conquest," *JSOT* 5 [1978]: 144) or a low date of ca. 1445 B.C. (cf. J. W. Jack, *The Date of the Exodus* [Edinburgh, 1925], p. 199).

I have opted for the fifteenth-century "low date," as recently modified to ca. 1450 B.C. by W. H. Shea, "Exodus, Date of the," *ISBE*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1982), 2: 230-238. The dates found throughout my foregoing article are based on this date for the Exodus.

EXCURSUS B
THE GENEALOGIES OF EPHRAIM, LEVI, AND JUDAH

In Table 2 in the preceding main article, I have summarized my reconstruction of data from several genealogical lists: for Ephraim (beginning with his father, Joseph) in Num 26:35-36 and I Chr 7:20-27; for Levi in Exod 6:16-27; and for Judah in I Chr 2:1-20. Although it is not my purpose...
to provide a detailed analysis, a few of the specifics deserve mention, and this excursus is devoted to them.

Nahshon, the sixth generation from Judah, was still alive in the second year after the Exodus and was at that time the prince or leader (*nasi*; cf. Num 2:3; 7:12) of the tribe of Judah. Aaron married Nahshon's sister Elisheba (Exod 6:23). Since Levi was Jacob's third son (Gen 29:34) and at least presumably married before Judah⁷¹ (who took a long time to have a surviving male offspring in Perez [Gen 38]), it is unlikely that Aaron would be the fourth generation of Levi while taking a wife from the sixth generation of Judah. It would seem more probable that Aaron, too, was at least the sixth generation from the sons of Jacob. It may be noted also that Bezaleel (Exod 31:2), one of the builders of the Tabernacle and a contemporary of Moses and Aaron, was of the seventh generation of Judah.

Ephraim was the second son of Joseph (Gen 41:52). Taken together, Num 26:35-36 and 1 Chr 7:20-27 indicate four family lines for this tribe, two of which are treated in detail.⁷² The family of Shuthelah is carried down for twelve generations into the days of the Judges (1 Chr 7:21b-24), whereas the family of Tahan is traced eight generations up through Joshua, who was also contemporary with Moses and Aaron. The sixth generation from Ephraim is indicated as Elishama (Num 7:48), who was the leader (*nasi’*) of the tribe of Ephraim at that time. Indeed, it is possible that the high number of generations for Ephraim might be explained by the population explosion toward the end of the 430 years, or that some of the names represent the sons of one and the same individual. In any case, however, the first generation of Ephraim himself and the last four generations are clearly continuous (Num 7:48; 13:16), reducing Ephraim to six generations, at the most.⁷³ This is consistent with what we have seen for the genealogy of Judah, and thus seems to be the case for Levi also.

On the basis of the above evidence, it would seem plausible that the genealogies of Levi in Exod 6 and Num 26 are incomplete. As such, they are consistent with a view that the 400 (430) years could refer to the Israelite sojourn in Egypt alone. A period of only 215 years would be too small to accommodate the above data; however, 400 (430) years would accommodate those data rather well. It would seem, then, that the expression "in the fourth generation [*dor*]" should be understood as "in the fourth cycle of time," as suggested in Section 2 of the main article.

⁷¹ Levi and Judah were probably only about 1 year apart in age. In fact, it would seem that all eleven sons born to Jacob in his exile, exclusive of Benjamin, were born within a seven-year period (Gen 29:28-30:28; 31:38).


⁷³ Before he died, Jacob prophesied that Joseph's descendants would be fruitful (Gen 49:22). There are also six generations from Joseph to Zelophehad for the tribe of Manasseh (cf. Num 26: 28-33, 21:1, and Josh 11:3).
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The problem of the date of the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt is an old one. Yet it is an extremely important one in Biblical studies, for, as Edwin R. Thiele has said, chronology is the one sure basis of accurate historical knowledge. Scholars have wrestled for over 2000 years with the questions of Hebrew chronology in the O.T. Many dates have long since been firmly fixed to the satisfaction of all; others remain unsettled. With respect to any date still in question new evidence demands new investigation of the problem in the hope that the new insight gained by intensive study may furnish a more reasoned solution.

The chronology of Israel in the first millennium B.C. has been quite accurately determined on the basis of its relationships with Assyrian history. For the chronology of Israel in the second millennium B.C., however, comparison may best be made with Egyptian history, for which scholars have determined dates with the greatest degree of certainly of any nation in the Near East in that millennium. (Yet even Egyptologists differ with regard to their dates about ten or fifteen years for the period in which we are interested, so one cannot yet arrive at dates with absolute finality.) Thus a knowledge of Egyptian history is essential to the O.T. scholar, for the key to the chronology of events throughout the entire second millennium B.C. in the O.T. is the date of the Exodus from Egypt.

Various Solutions of the Problem

The early date.--At present among O.T. scholars there are two main views concerning the date of the Exodus. One is that the Israelites left Egypt during the 18th Dynasty around the middle of the 15th century B.C., and the other is that they did not leave until the 19th Dynasty during the 13th century. The early date view best accords with certain data in the Bible, such as the 480 years between the Exodus and the beginning of Solomon's temple (I Kings 6:1) and the 300 years from the conquest of Transjordan to the time of Jephthah (Judg. 11:26).

A late date.--The view for the date of the Exodus which has been held by a majority of scholars during the past century, and hence which has become more or less "traditional," is the one which places that event at some time in the 13th century B.C. The most persuasive arguments are those of Albright and others who place the Exodus early in the reign of Rameses II, about 1280 B.C. As one surveys the literature of those who support a late date of the Exodus, he soon discovers that very few of the writers believe in a unified movement of all twelve tribes from Egypt and into Canaan under the leadership of Moses and Joshua. In order to handle certain extra-Biblical evidence, such as the date of the destruction of Jericho around 1400 B.C. and the mention of Asher as a territory in southern Phoenicia in the inscriptions of Seti I (c. 1310 B.C.), the proponents of a late...
date are obliged to imagine either a two-fold exodus and entry into Palestine in different centuries or that some of the tribes of Israel never sojourned in Egypt at all. While such theories may attempt to handle all the bits of external evidence, they obviously run contrary to the great body of Scripture which presents the Exodus and the Conquest as an episode which involved all twelve tribes of Israel.

Since the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua clearly teach that the Exodus was a united movement from Egypt, all twelve tribes departing at once, and that the entrance into Canaan was an invasion of the fighting men of all the tribes at the same time; and since the Exodus was of primary importance as the event which gave the Israelites their freedom from bondage and welded them together into a nation under the hand of God; since it was the event most often appealed to by the prophets and psalmists as an example of the mighty working of their God in the affairs of men on earth; and since incidents in the Exodus and Wilderness journey are often spoken of in the N.T. as authentic; then the problem of the Exodus is not merely that of one date versus another date. Rather the problem is doubly serious, for it involves one's method of interpretation of the Scriptures and one's view of the origin of the religion of Israel. As H. H. Rowley says in his book regarding the date of the Exodus, "Much more than chronology is really involved, since the view that we take of Israelis religious development is materially affected by the solution we adopt."1

It is my belief that only an early date for the Exodus agrees with the Biblical data and allows for a unified Exodus and Conquest, and that only a unified Exodus and Conquest are in harmony with the clear statements of the divinely-inspired Scriptures and with the true nature of the religion of Israel.

The Oppression of the Israelites

In any discussion of the dates of the Exodus it is necessary to deal also with certain events which actually took place during the time of the oppression of the Israelites. By approaching the record of Exodus chapters one and two in a superficial manner many writers have arrived at unbiblical conclusions regarding the setting of that greatest of all events in the history of the nation of Israel. Largely on the basis of the names of the two store-cities in Exodus 1:11, Pithom and Raamses, scholars have been quick to place the bondage of Israel and her leader Moses in the time of the Ramesside kings, i.e., in the 19th Dynasty. In so doing they apparently have not cared how many other passages of Scriptures were contradicted or tossed aside.

So far, no inscriptions or documents of any kind have been found in Egypt which bear witness to the occurrence of the Exodus, for the mention of Israel in the stele of Merneptah refers to the later time when Israel was already in Palestine. Yet the absence of external evidence to confirm the Biblical record need not destroy confidence in its historicity. Comparatively little excavation has been done in the Delta of the Nile, in which area the Israelites resided. Furthermore, the pharaohs were not given to telling about their defeats and times of public disgrace. Rather their, inscriptions were cut on temple walls with the purpose of exalting themselves as the living Horus, the son of the god Amun-Re'. And if the pharaoh of the oppression or the pharaoh of the Exodus had mentioned the Israelite slaves or their leader Moses in some public inscription, it would not be out of keeping with the known practice of some of the rulers of Egypt for a later king to have chiseled out the record.

Oppression by the Hyksos

The king who knew not Joseph.--The verse Exodus 1:8, "Now there arose a new king
over Egypt, who knew not Joseph,” perhaps indicates a change of dynasty in Egypt. To what dynasty he belonged, at any rate, is the question. Because of the name Raamses of one of the store-cities many who hold to a late date for the Exodus believe that Rameses I (1315-1313 B.C.) or his son Seti I (1313-1301), the father of Rameses II (1301-1234), is the king involved (e.g., G.E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology, p. 60). Others who also take the late date think, however, that the 18th Dynasty Egyptians enslaved the foreign Israelites when they did not flee from Egypt with the Hyksos, as soon as the latter had been driven out of the Delta (e.g., H.N. Orlnsky, Ancient Israel p. 34). Unger (Arch. & the O.T., p. 144) and many others who subscribe to the early date of the Exodus (in the 18th Dynasty) also interpret Exodus 1:8 in the same way.

Neither of these views, however, takes into consideration all the facts in the context of Exodus 1:1-12. The Joseph narrative in Genesis seems to indicate that Jacob and his sons descended into Egypt to sojourn there before the Hyksos period and in the middle of the illustrious 12th Dynasty, perhaps around 1850 B.C. Now if Ahmose I (1570-1545 B.C.), the founder of the 18th Dynasty, were the “new king,” then nearly 300 years passed before the Israelites began to be oppressed. Or, to state the problem in another way, many more generations than the one specified in verse 6 intervened between Joseph’s death about 1775 B.C. and the beginning of the time of bondage. In Genesis 15:13, however, God told Abraham: "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be sojourners in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years" (italics mine). Yet if the enslavement of the Israelites began around the middle of the 16th century B.C., and if the Exodus took place around 1447 B.C., 480 years before Solomon began the Temple (I Kings 6: 1), then there was only a century of actual infliction.

A second thing to notice carefully is the exhortation made by the “new king” in Exodus 1:9, 10:

And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we: come, let us deal wisely with them, lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they also join themselves unto our enemies, and fight against us, and get them up out of the land.

Several questions may be asked. If the "new king" belonged to the native Egyptian 18th Dynasty, would he, or could he truthfully, say that the Israelites were more and mightier than the Egyptians? Perhaps yes, if only the native Egyptians in the Delta were in mind; but certainly not if the whole nation of Egypt were meant by "his people" to whom he addressed himself. Let it be remembered that at the time when the "new king" arose, the children of Israel had not yet finished multiplying to their eventual complement at the time of the Exodus. Another question: Would the victorious Egyptians who had just driven out the armed Hyksos feel that these Semitic shepherds were mightier than the proud, strong Egyptian armies? A third question: What enemies did the Egyptians fear who might be expected to ally themselves with the Israelites and wage war against the Egyptians? The Hyksos had been expelled, pushed back into Palestine, and their fortress at Sharuhen had been captured by the Egyptians after a three year siege. There does not seem to be any enemy strong enough to invade the Delta anywhere on the horizon by the middle of the 16th century B.C.

The logical answer to these problematic questions would seem to be that a Hyksos king was the "new king" of Exodus 1:8. The text says he "arose over Egypt," wayyaqam...’al Mitsrayim.
In Hebrew the verb qum plus the preposition 'al often have the meaning "to rise against" (e.g., Deut. 19:11; 28:7; Judg. 9:18; 20:5; II Sam. 18:31; II Kings 16:7); but they never have the meaning of assuming the throne of a nation in a peaceful, friendly manner. It is certainly true that the Hyksos arose against Egypt. Furthermore, the Hyksos may well have had reason to hate the descendants of Jacob because of the episode at Shechem (Gen. 34) and Jacob's later fighting with the Amorites (Gen. 48:22), Amorites being one of the main elements of the Hyksos people (Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 202, n.4).

If the "new king" was a Hyksos ruler, the oppression could have begun soon after 1730 B.C., for the Israelites were very near the Hyksos center in the northeastern section of the Delta. From 1730 until 1447 B.C. is not quite 300 years. This is not the full 400 years of affliction of Genesis 15:13, but it is a lot closer than the 100-120 years of bondage if the Israelites were not enslaved until the 18th Dynasty. If the "new king" is a Hyksos ruler, there is no need to say that his complaint that the Israelites were more and mightier than his own people is an exaggeration. The Hyksos filtered into Egypt gradually and were not strong enough at first to capture much of the country. If the "new king" is a Hyksos ruler, he had real reason to expect war with his enemies the Egyptians at any time in the near future. Since Joseph and his people had gotten along so well with the Egyptians, it was only natural for the Hyksos to suspect that the Israelites might join themselves to the Egyptians.

There is one more logical reason why the Hyksos must have persecuted the children of Israel rather than favor them. If the two peoples had been friendly with each other, why did not the Israelites choose to leave Egypt along with the Hyksos when the latter were expelled? For surely the Jews could see clearly the hatred which the Egyptians had for Semitic peoples and would have fled from possible bondage or torture, had they been at one with the Hyksos and not already afflicted and hated by the latter. The question can be put in another way: If the Israelites were associated with the Hyksos, why did the Egyptians distinguish between the two Semitic groups and not drive out the Jews along with the hated Asiatics? But if the Hyksos enslaved the Israelites, then certainly the Jews would have had no desire to depart with the Hyksos, and the Egyptians could have easily seen that there was a distinction between the two peoples. We can surmise that after a brief relaxation of the oppression started by the Hyksos, the Egyptians found it to their liking also to enslave the children of Israel, for both economic and nationalistic reasons. The Jews furnished a source of manpower needed to reconstruct buildings and cities in Lower Egypt, and being semi-nomadic shepherds they were fit to be the objects of the stirred-up hatred on the part of the Egyptians for all Asiatics. That the Egyptians did afflict the Israelites may be seen in the latter half of Exodus 1, beginning with verse 13.

Pithom and Raamses.--The manner in which the enslavement of the children of Israel was carried out is stated as follows in Exodus 1:11, 12:

Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh store-cities, Pithom and Raamses. But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and the more they spread abroad. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel.

The holders of the late date of the Exodus become extremely positive in their assertions concerning this passage. Finegan, e.g., says:
The basis of the theory now to be considered is the statement in Exodus 1:11 that the Israelites "built for Pharaoh store-cities, Pithom and Raamses." Raamses hardly can be other than Per Ramesese, the "House of Ramesses (II)," which has been identified with Avaris-Tanis . . . .

Unless we are to regard Exodus 1:11 as an erroneous or anachronistic statement, we must conclude that Ramesses II was the Pharaoh of the oppression.² (Italics mine.)

George Ernest Wright is much more dogmatic in his statements:

Now the point which must be stressed is this: if the Israelites worked in labor battalions on the construction of the city of Rameses, it must have been during the reign of Ramesses II . . . and perhaps that of his father, but not before . . . . We now know that if there is any historical value at all to the store-city tradition in Exodus (and there is no reason to doubt its reliability), then Israelites must have been in Egypt at least during the early part of the reign of Ramesses II. After much digging at Tanis by the archaeologists Mariette, Petrie, and Montet, not a single object of the Eighteenth Egyptian Dynasty has been found there. The city was destroyed by Pharaoh Amosis I (1570-1546), and was probably not reoccupied before the end of the 14th century.³ (Italics his.)

While the identification Zoan-Tanis-Avaris-Per Ramesese may not yet be absolutely certain, it may be assumed to be correct. Whether this city was at the site of San el-Hagar or at Qantir twelve miles to the south makes little difference, for apparently at neither site have remains of the 18th Dynasty been uncovered. Thus it must be recognized that if Biblical Raamses was Tanis, the Israelites could not have been forced to build Raamses in the 18th Dynasty. Yet the orthodox defender of the early date cannot admit of an anachronism. Furthermore, if there is a better possible explanation of the occurrence of the name Raamses, it would be preferable than to claim that it is the modernization of an obsolete place name by some later scribe, as Unger does (Arch. & the O. T., pp 149f). In not one of the passages where the name Raamses occurs (Gen. 47:11; Exodus 1:11; 12:37; Num. 33:3) is the more ancient name given. One Scriptural method of explaining an archaic name may be illustrated by the case of Zoar: "... the king of Bela (the same is Zoar)" (Gen. 14:2, 8).

If those who insist on the late date of the Exodus believe that Exodus 1:11 is reliable, they certainly have to overlook or discount many other interrelating passages of Scripture. If there is any sense of order and continuity in the narrative in the early chapters of Exodus, then the beginning of the enslavement and the building of Pithom and Raamses took place before the birth of Moses. Certainly chapter two with its account of Moses' birth during the time of oppression necessarily follows chronologically the early stages of the oppression described in chapter one; and the building of Pithom and Raamses was one of the first tasks given to the enslaved Israelites. But Moses was eighty years old at the time of the Exodus (Exod. 7:7); he was 120 at his death. Thus even if the late date of the Exodus (about 1290-1280 B.C.) were correct, Moses would have been born about 1370-1360 back in the 18th Dynasty (1570-1315 B.C.). Therefore it is impossible to hold that Rameses II was the Pharaoh who ordered the Israelites to build for him the store cities of Exodus 1:11, and at the same time to do justice to the rest of Scripture.
Notice that according to the early date of the Exodus (c. 1447 B.C.) Moses would also have been born in the 18th Dynasty, around 1527 B.C. But the first chapter of Exodus clearly indicates that there was quite an interval of time between the beginning of the oppression and the birth of Moses at the time of the order to kill all the male babies born to the Hebrew women. Certainly several generations of Israelites may be indicated by the words of Exodus 1:12. Another period of perhaps a generation may be implied in the blessing which God bestowed on the mid-wives in giving them families and descendants (Exod. 1:20f). The result of combining the Biblical data and the archaeological evidence concerning the Egyptian site of Tanis-Per Ramesese where Hyksos remains were found is that it would seem that the Hyksos were the ones who first enslaved the children of Israel and used them in building their store-cities. This is the conclusion of the French scholar, R. Dussaud (according to Rowley, From Joseph to Joseph p. 25n).

The question then will be asked, if the Hyksos were the oppressors in Exod. 1:11, how are we to explain the appearance of the name "Raamses" in an age prior to the 19th Dynasty? It is my opinion that the name "Raamses" may actually have been used during the Hyksos era, and then discarded by the reactionary Egyptians of the 18th Dynasty. The following 19th Dynasty apparently witnessed antagonism against the domination of the Theban priests and their violent suppression of the theology of Aten, by bringing about a return to Hyksos traditions and to the cult of the despised god Seth. Note the startling conclusions of W.F. Albricht:

The Ramesside house actually traced its ancestry back to a Hyksos king whose era was fixed 400 years before the date commemorated in the "400-year Stela" of Tanis. The great-grandfather of Rameses II evidently came from an old Tanite family, very possibly of Hyksos origin, since his name was Sethos (Suta). . . . Rameses II established his capital and residence at Tanis, which he named "House of Rameses" and where he built a great temple of the old Tanite, later Hyksos god Seth (pronounced at that time Sutekh).4

Now if the Ramesside dynasty may be traced back to the Hyksos rulers, and if the dynastic name Seti or Sethos is a Hyksos name, then it is equally possible that the name Rameses or Raamses was a Hyksos name or at least was used by them in Lower Egypt where few records from that period have been found. Since certain Hyksos kings did use the name of the god Ra or Re' combined with other words in their throne names, it would not be illogical to find such a name as "Ra-meses" in that era.

The Pharaoh of the Oppression

According to the early date of the Exodus Thutmose III (1504-1450 B.C.) was the so-called Pharaoh of the Oppression. He was one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of all the pharaohs of Egyptian history. After he actually gained control of the throne about 1483 B.C. following the death of his hated aunt/stepmother/mother-in-law Queen Hatshepsut (perhaps the pharaoh's daughter of Exodus 2:5, while she was still a teenage princess), Thutmose III reorganized the army of Egypt; he made seventeen campaigns in the space of nineteen years into Palestine and Syria to subdue these lands and to exact tribute from them. For such military exploits Dr. J. P. Free has termed him the "Napoleon of Egypt" (Arch. & Bible History, p. 89).
Thutmose III must be the ruler whose death is recorded in Exodus 2:23. He reigned alone for about thirty-four years (1483-1450 B.C.). This long period agrees well with the Scriptural statement that the pharaoh died after oppressing the Israelites for "those many days." God's command to Moses, "Go, return into Egypt; for all the men are dead that sought thy life" (Exod. 4:19), implies that the same king from whose face Moses fled into Midian is the one who died in Exod. 2:23. Since Moses was in Midian and Horeb for more than 30 years, the reign of the Pharaoh of the Oppression had to be a lengthy one. The only pharaohs in the 18th and 19th Dynasties who ruled more than 30 years were Thutmose III, Amenhotep III (1410-1372), Horemheb (1349-1315), and Rameses II (1301-1234). The evidence of Merneptah's Stela that Israel was already in Palestine by his reign prevents our considering his father Rameses II as being the Pharaoh of the Oppression. Horemheb could not have been that ruler because he was the last king of the 18th Dynasty, and Rameses I, first king of the 19th Dynasty, ruled only a year and four months and was too old to bear the burdens of kingship alone and thus to have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Nor could Amenhotep III very well have been the Pharaoh of the Oppression, for his son, Akhenaten (1380-1363), the "heretic king" who tried to install the worship of Aten as the religion of Egypt, could hardly have been Pharaoh of the Exodus. Akhenaten moved to the site of Amarna and built a new city there for a new capital of Egypt, 200 miles up the Nile from the Delta and the land of Goshen. He was so engrossed in this task and in his religious views that he neglected international affairs and took little interest in building in the Delta region. Also, the character of Akhenaten, who apparently was a sickly, effeminate man who died before he was thirty, does not agree with the strong, cruel nature of the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Thus the only pharaoh of the four that enjoyed long reigns who could have been the predecessor of the Pharaoh of the Exodus and thus himself the Pharaoh of the Oppression was Thutmose III.

One more detail which may indicate that Thutmose III corresponds to the Pharaoh of the Oppression may be noted: If Moses were a favorite of Hatshepsut, whom Thutmose hated with a vengeance, then we can easily imagine that Moses was also the object of the wrath of Thutmose. Thus when Moses killed the Egyptian and brought himself in that way before the attention of the new monarch, he was obliged to remain in exile as long as that great pharaoh lived.

The Location of Pharaoh's Court

The Biblical data.--The entire context of Exodus 5-14 reveals that the place where the pharaoh was residing during the time of the ten plagues and the Exodus itself was not far from the land of Goshen where the Israelites were living. The land of Goshen almost certainly lay in and to the north of the fertile valley which links the Delta region with lake Timsah and the Bitter lakes of the Suez Canal area. This valley is now called Wadi Tumilat. Near its western end lies Tell Basta, the site called Bubastis in the Hellenistic Age, which was situated on the royal canal leading to the Gulf of Suez at the junction of the canal with the easternmost or Pelusiac arm of the Nile. Tell Basta is a mile or two southeast of the present-day town of Zagazig.

Exodus 5:6, 10 and 12:31 force one to conclude that Pharaoh's residence was no more than one to three hours away from the center of the land of Goshen. On the other hand, the phenomena of the plagues of the flies and the hail (Exod. 8:22; 9:25f) falling upon all the land of Egypt but not on the land of Goshen furnish evidence that Goshen was on the very edge of Egypt.
at that time, removed to some extent from the territory which the native Egyptians settled. In the time of the 19th Dynasty, however, when the capital was at Tanis-Rameses, many of the principal building projects of Rameses II were in the Wadi Tumilate or Goshen region itself. At that time the Egyptians lived all around and in the midst of Goshen, not excluding that area as though a despised captive people were dwelling there.

Pharaoh's residence was in a city (Exod. 9:33) and it was in sight of the river, year (7:20-23), which almost invariably means the Nile River or one of its branches in the Delta. Cities like Memphis and Heliopolis, while in the Nile Valley, were several miles from the channel of the Nile at normal stage, too far to see the river through the palms.

The problem of the Eighteenth Dynasty capital.--Since I Kings 6:1 places the Exodus about 1447 B.C., the Biblical date means that the Exodus occurred in the 18th Dynasty. The capital of all the kings of that dynasty, however, was at Thebes, over 400 miles away from the land of Goshen up the Nile Valley. Obviously, the ruler who did all he could to prevent the Israelites from leaving Egypt was not at Thebes at the time of the Exodus. Rowley delineates the problem for those who hold the early date of the Exodus when he says: "No known building operations of this Pharaoh (Thutmose III) took place in the Nile Delta region, and he is not known to have had a royal residence in that district" (FJJ, p. 24). I shall attempt to show that the first half of this statement is incorrect, and that there is a fair amount of evidence that his son, if not Thutmose himself, did have a royal residence in the Delta.

The fact of two viziers in the Eighteenth Dynasty.--The vizier of Egypt was the prime minister, the highest administrative official of the state; he was likewise the commandant of the capital and the chief justice. Up to the reign of Thutmose III all of Egypt came within the sphere of one vizier's authority. But to handle the greatly increased business of government, that pharaoh divided the labors of the vizier's office between two men; one resided at Thebes; the other was in charge of all regions north of Assiut and resided at Heliopolis, six or eight miles northeast of the center of modern Cairo. The very fact that Thutmose III appointed a separate vizier for Lower Egypt proves how important in his estimation was the proper execution of the royal commands in the Delta and the lower reaches of the Nile. If the vizier of the North lived at Heliopolis, it is quite likely that the pharaoh had a secondary residence for himself to stay in on his tours of inspection, in Heliopolis or in a nearby city.

Archaeological evidence of 18th Dynasty buildings in the Delta.--There is much evidence that Thutmose III, Amenhotep II, and other pharaohs of the 18th Dynasty did build extensively in Lower Egypt. It is a matter of common knowledge that two magnificent red Aswan granite obelisks erected by Thutmose III in front of the Temple of Re in Heliopolis now adorn the Thames Embankment in London and Central Park in New York City. In the inscriptions on these obelisks Thutmose called himself "Lord of Heliopolis." It is evident, then, that Thutmose III did conduct building operations at Heliopolis, which is in the Delta. Also it is possible that Israelite slaves could have been employed in the building operations known to have been carried out at Memphis by 18th Dynasty rulers.

But the most pertinent evidence of all comes from Tell Basta, the site of ancient Bubastis, the Pi-beseth of Ezekiel 30:17. This city was the key to the Delta, on the route of all travel to and from Asia, whether by the northern road through Tanis, Daphne, and Pelusium, or by the
southern road through Heropolis at the then extended head of the Gulf of Suez. It was an important position to hold. So strategic was it that the first of the Libyan kings of the 22nd Dynasty, Sheshonq I (the Biblical Shishak, 1 Kings 14:25), transferred his residence to Bubastis. The Egyptologist Naville worked this site in 1887-1889. Several important discoveries of his came from the 18th Dynasty. The earliest of these was a stone of Amenhotep II. It is a red granite slab with two panels. In each panel the king is seen standing and making offerings to the god Amun-Re' who sits on his throne, and is spoken of as "he who dwells in Perunefer." Seti I of the 19th Dynasty reused this stone when he built a temple at Bubastis during his own reign. Naville gave his explanation of Seti's motive as follows: "I believe that when he renewed the monuments of Amenophis II he was actuated by a religious motive, by the desire to propitiate Amon, perhaps at the moment when he entered on his Asiatic campaigns, for which Bubastis must have been the starting point" (ibid., p. 31). Scarabs and remains of a temple built by Amenhotep III have also been found at Bubastis.

Records from the life of Amenhotep II.--Clinching evidence appears in the records about his life that Amenhotep II often resided in or near the Delta. Thus it would not be out of place for him, the Pharaoh of the Exodus according to the early date view, to be staying nearby the "ghetto" of his rebelling slaves. First of all, we know from a scarab that Amenhotep II was born at Memphis; thus the court must have resided at Memphis at some times in his father's reign (the reign of Thutmose III). Then we know that as a youth he would often ride from the royal stables in Memphis to such interest spots as the Sphinx at Giza (ANET, pp.244f). Furthermore, he also built largely at Heliopolis and gave himself the title "Divine Ruler of Heliopolis." Best of all, William C. Hayes states in his recent book; The Scepter of Egypt, concerning Amenhotep II:

In his youth he had been appointed by his father as commandant of the principal base and dockyard of the Egyptian navy at Peru-nefer, near Memphis, where he seems to have maintained large estates and in the vicinity of which he and his successors appear to have resided for extended periods of time.8

Peru-nefer, according to John Wilson of the Oriental Institute, now seems to have been a district near Memphis which had among its population Semitic elements with Phoenician connections. Thus Amenhotep II does not seem to have been averse to residing near Semitic peoples in the Delta area. As the god incarnate he could have stayed in the guest house of the temple he had erected at Bubastis, for Egyptian temples always had guest houses for the convenience of the "divine" Pharaoh. Labib Habachi, a native Egyptian archaeologist, has recently excavated at Bubastis. He has found additional evidence that Amenhotep II erected in Bubastis a building dedicated to its chief deity, the goddess Bastet. He also states with regard to Bubastis: "The town was an important place because it was the point of departure to Sinai and Asia where the king's army and expeditions used often to go."9

Other records indicate that Amenhotep II made three military expeditions into Asia, which came in the third, the seventh, and the ninth years of his reign. If the Exodus occurred in 1447 B.C., that would have been the fourth year of Amenhotep's kingship. He then would have had about three years to rebuild his army after the disaster suffered by his crack troops in the engulfing waters of the Red Sea (Exod. 14:6-28). Bubastis, in the east-central part of the Delta, would have served well as the military base or staging area for the Asiatic campaigns of Amen-
hotep and his father Thutmose III. Thus I conclude that it was Bubastis at the western end of the land of Goshen in which Amenhotep, an 18th Dynasty king whose capital was Thebes, resided during the months of the ten plagues in order to be in close contact with his insubordinate Hebrew slave laborers.

DOCUMENTATION

5. The ruler from whom Moses fled was a man--"He sought to slay Moses" (Exod. 2:15); thus it could not have been Hatshepsut. But Thutmose III ruled alone only 34 years. Moses may have been slightly older than 40 when he broke with the Egyptian court, and yet near enough to that age so that he could be said to be (approximately) 40 years old. Compare Luke's statement that Jesus was about thirty years old at the time of His baptism (Luke 3:23); yet our lord, must have been closer to 33. The only passage which states Moses I age at the time of his escape to Sinai is Acts 7:23; literally it says: "And when a time of forty years was being filled for him, it came into his heart to visit his brethren, the sons of Israel." Instead of the "forty years" referring to his age, it is possible that the length of Moses' training in all the wisdom of the Egyptians after being weaned and taken from his mother, is what is meant. Thus Moses may have been 43 or more when he fled to Sinai and 77 when Thutmose III died, for the Exodus probably occurred in the 4th year of Amenhotep II's reign.
6. This canal was in use during the 12th Dynasty and was employed by Hatshepsut's mariners on their voyage from Thebes to Punt in East Africa (James H. Breasted, *A History of Egypt*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1912, pp. 118, 276). The canal emptied into what is now Lake Timsah near the modern town of Ismailia, proving that the Gulf of Suez used to extend northward through the Bitter lakes and include lake Timsah. Thus the Israelite crossing of the Red Sea took place north of the present port of Suez.
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NEW LIGHT ON THE WILDERNESS JOURNEY
AND THE CONQUEST
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In the previous issue of GRACE JOURNAL (Winter, 1961), the writer set forth his conclusions regarding the time of the Oppression and the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt. Arguments were presented for a date around 1447 B.C. for the Exodus, during the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt (1570-1315 B.C.). This date can be further substantiated by the subsequent experiences of the Israelites under Moses and Joshua.

New Considerations Concerning the Wilderness Journey

The opposition of the Edomites.--One of the weightiest arguments in favor of the late date of the Exodus (13th century B.C.) is advanced by Nelson Glueck concerning the Edomites who denied passage through their territory to Moses and the Israelites. He has charged that no Edomite or Moabite kingdoms would have been encountered in Transjordan by Moses before the thirteenth century B.C. Not until that century did these peoples build houses and fortifications in Transjordan. He writes, "Not a site was discovered nor a sherd found which could be ascribed to Middle Bronze II or to Late Bronze" (Explorations in Eastern Palestine, II, Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, XV, 138). Elsewhere he contends:

Had the Exodus through southern Transjordan taken place before the 13th century B.C., the Israelites would have found neither Edomite nor Moabite kingdoms, well organized and well fortified, whose rulers could have given or withheld permission to go through their territories. Indeed, the Israelites, had they arrived on the scene first, might have occupied all of Edom and Moab themselves and left the land on the west side of the Jordan for late comers. --The Other Side of the Jordan (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1940), pp. 146f.

First of all, we must accept the Biblical statement that it was not so much the superior strength of the Edomites and the Moabites that prevented the Israelites from crossing their territories as it was the direct command of Jehovah not to fight with these distant brethren of theirs (Deut. 2:4, 5, 9). It was God's sovereign plan that His chosen nation not settle in these areas but in Canaan primarily.

Second, while the Bible speaks of the king of Edom (Num. 20:14) and of various cities of Edomite kings (Gen. 36:32, 35, 39), these terms need not prove that the Edomites were yet a sedentary people dwelling in fortified towns. At that period the head of every tribe or city-state was called a king. The five kings of Midian (Num. 31:8) in Moses' day and the two kings of Midian. In Gideon's day (Jud. 8:-5, 12) were surely nomadic chieftains, as was perhaps also Adoni-bezek who had subdued seventy kings (Jud. 1 :3-7). The book of Joshua and the Amarna Letters both testify to the great number of petty kings of city states in Palestine around 1400 B.C. Nor does
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the word "city" mean necessarily a well-fortified site with permanent buildings, for Kadesh-barnea is called "a city in the uttermost of thy (i.e., Edom's) border" (Num. 20: 16). The Israelites lived in and around Kadesh about thirty-seven years, and yet probably never erected any stone buildings it nor made and used much pottery. Their community was centered around the portable tabernacle; thus their's was a tent city. Likewise the Edomites may well have lived in similar tent cities. Note that when Moses sent forth the twelve spies into the territory of the Canaanites, he instructed them to detect "what cities they are that they dwell in, whether in camps or in strongholds" (Num. 13: 19).

Third, a careful study of the location of Edom and Mount Seir in Genesis through Joshua seems to reveal that whereas Edom later on was in southern Transjordan, up through the time of the Conquest Esau and his descendants were living for the most part in the central Negeb, i.e., in the mountainous country with its valleys and oases between Kadesh-barnea and the Arabah. The key to the location of Mount Seir and Edom is the route which the children of Israel took after the Edomites turned down their request to be permitted to pass through Edom. First the Israelites journeyed to Mount Hor, probably a prominent point in the highlands (up to 3000') ten to fifteen miles east or northeast of Kadesh-barnea and on the border of Edom. This location of Mount Hor is likely because after Aaron died there and the congregation of Israel was still mourning for him, the king of Arad who dwell farther north in the Negeb attacked them (Num. 20:22-21:3). The next part of their journey took them to the Gulf of Aqabah: "And they journeyed from Mount Hor by the way to the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom: and the soul of the people was much discouraged because of the way" (Num. 21:4; cf. Deut. 2:1-8). The Israelites had to go all the way to Ezion-geber (Deut. 2:8), for the Edomites were holding the west side of the Arabah, making stops at Punon and Oboth (Num. 33:42, 43; 21:5-10). Punon is probably to be identified with Feinan, the site of ancient copper mines, and is a logical place for the spot where Moses lifted up the copper serpent in the wilderness.

If the Edomites were living in the Negeb instead of in Transjordan at the time of the Exodus, is there any evidence of their existence in the more western area? According to Egyptian records from the 15th century B.C. there were peoples dwelling in the Negeb important enough to warrant an attack by the pharaoh's army. Thutmose III mentions the Negeb in the campaign list of his military operations (James Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts, p. 243). Amen-em-heb, one of Thutmose's soldiers, had the following statement painted on the wall of his tomb at Thebes: "I made captives in the country of the Negeb" (ANET, p. 241). A century later Amarna Letter #256 mentions Udumu as a city or people seemingly in South Canaan in the area of Hebron-Beersheba (Samuel A.B. Mercer, The Tell el-Amarna Tablets Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1939 , II, 666; BASOR, #89, p. 14). Various scholars have identified Udumu with Edom.

The condition of the Moabites.--Two things relevant to the Moabites at the time of the wilderness journey lead one to believe that they were neither settled nor so strong as they were in the thirteenth and following centuries. First, Moab was much weaker than Israel and feared the latter greatly: "And Moab was sore afraid of the people, because they were many; and Moab was distressed because of the children of Israel" (Num. 22:2). Second, Moab was closely associated with the Midianites, so much so that the elders of both peoples acted as one group when they went to the town of Pethor to bring back Balaam (Num. 22:4-7). The Bible depicts the Midianites as largely a nomadic people. The point is this: for the Moabites to have been on such friendly terms with the Midianites, the former also were probably still largely nomadic, since from time imme-
morial there has been strife between the inhabitants of the desert and the residents of the towns in agricultural areas. Therefore the time of Moses must have been before the thirteenth century B.C. when the Moabites began to build permanent towns.

New discoveries near Amman.--Several recent finds in the vicinity of Amman, the capital city of the Kingdom of Jordan, tend to modify Glueck’s sweeping statements that there was no settled occupation anywhere in Transjordan south of the Jabbok River between the eighteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. Four tombs in Amman and one near Madeba discovered in the past decade or so contained hundreds of pottery vessels and scarabs and other objects from the periods known as Middle Bronze II and late Bronze I, i.e., from about 1800 to 1400 B.C. Also, in 1955, a building which appears to have been a Late Bronze Age temple with over 100 pieces of imported pottery of Cypriote and Mycenaean origin, was unearthed when bulldozers were clearing away a small mound by the airport of Amman. (G. Lankester Harding, The Antiquities of Jordan London: Lutterworth Press, 1959 , p. 33). Thus it seems that there was some sedentary occupation in central Transjordan at the end of the fifteenth century B.C. On the other hand the apparent relative scarcity of population in southern Gilead around 1400 B.C. made Moses’ task of conquering that district considerably less difficult than it would have been in the thirteenth century B.C. when so many more cities existed. His campaigns against Sihon and Og lasted only a matter of months compared with the several years necessary for Joshua to subdue Canaan.

The time of Balaam.--In order to invite Balaam the prophet to come to curse Israel, Balak king of Moab sent messengers "to Pethor, which is by the River, to the land of the children of his people" (Num. 22:5). Pethor is the Hittite city of Pitru, captured by Thutmose III and much later on by Shalmaneser III; it lay on the western bank of the Euphrates River a little ways south of Carchemish. The Hebrew word for "his people" is ammo. W. F. Albright interprets this term as the name of the land called 'Amau in the inscription on the statue of Idri-mi found by Sir Leonard Woolley at Alalakh (Wm. F. Albright, "Some Important Discoveries, Alphabetic Origins and the Idrimi Statue," BASOR, #118, p. 16). Idri-mi also found sons of the land of 'Amau and sons of the land of Halep (Aleppo) in the land of Canaan when he went into exile there for seven years. Thus it is not surprising to read of Balaam’s coming from such a distance (350 miles) to Moab in the fifteenth century B.C. As to the date of Idri-mi, Albright dates the statue about 1450 B.C., but Woolley and Sidney Smith date it about 1375 B.C. The land of 'Amau is also mentioned in an inscription from the tomb of an officer who served in the army of Amenhotep II (Ibid., p. 15). My argument is this: if Balaam prophesied at the end of the fifteenth century B.C., according to the early date of the Exodus, then the term 'Amau in Num. 22:5 is found in a proper historical context, along with the occurrences of this name in the Idrimi inscription and the Egyptian text. Only around 1400 B.C. was the Aleppo-Carchemish region--the land of 'Amau--independent and not under the rule of either the Egyptians or the Hittites. During the reign of Amenhotep III (1410-1372 B.C.) northern Syria was able to free itself from Egyptian overlordship, while the Hittites under Suppiluliumas did not conquer this area until about 1370 B.C. But if the Exodus happened in the thirteenth century, then the homeland of Balaam was under Hittite control and would probably have been called "the land of the Hittites" (cf. Josh. 1:4; Jud. 1:26).

New Excavations in Old Canaan

Jericho.--The first fortress city in Canaan which faced the Israelites after they crossed the Jordan River was Jericho. The date of the destruction of Jericho should provide an excellent
check on the chronology adopted for the Exodus and the Conquest, whether around 1407 B.C. or about 1250 B.C. But the date as determined by archaeological methods has become one of the most hotly-contested issues among Palestinian archaeologists.

Both Sir John Garstang, who dug at Jericho from 1930 to 1936, and Miss Kathleen Kenyon, who has been directing a new series of excavations there since 1952, agree that the Middle Bronze Age levels, Garstang’s City III, represent Hyksos occupation ending about 1550 B.C. Both recognize remains from the late Bronze Age, but at that point the agreement ceases. We must be ready and willing to admit that Miss Kenyon’s careful investigations disproved that the parallel fortification walls, built of mud bricks and fallen outwards, belonged to the late Bronze Age city, as Garstang claimed so loudly (Garstang, John and J.B.E., *The Story of Jericho*, 2nd ed. rev. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1948, pp. 133-142). But this does not mean that there were no walls to the Canaanite city in Joshua’s time. In the light of the fact that the mound of Jericho, Tell es-Sultan, has suffered severely from erosion caused by the hard winter rains, the absence now of such walls may in a way be a confirmation of Scripture. Joshua 6:20 states that the wall fell down flat, or, in its place. Since the wall was probably made of mud bricks, after it fell and the city lay unoccupied for the most part until Hiel rebuilt the city in the time of King Ahab (I Kings 16:43), there was nothing to cover the fallen bricks and to prevent their turning back to mud and washing down the slope.

There can be no doubt, however, that there was occupation of the site of Jericho in the late Bronze Age. Garstang’s expeditions discovered in 26 tombs that contained deposits, some 320 late Bronze Age objects out of a total of 2818 specimens including two scarab seals of Amenhotep III (1410-1372 B.C.); also he found late Bronze potsherds in the fosse (moat) and on the mound especially in debris underlying the isolated "Middle Building" (which Garstang attributed to Eglon—Jud. 3:12ff). In 1954 Miss Kenyon uncovered on the eastern side of the mound the foundations of a single house wall with about a square meter of intact floor beside it; on the floor was a small bread oven beside which was a juglet that she says is probably fourteenth century in date. She believes the evidence accords with a destruction and subsequent abandonment of the site, and suggests a date in the second half of the fourteenth century B.C. (*Archaeology in the Holy Land* London: Ernest Benn, 1960, pp. 210f). At any rate, G. E. Wright’s statement seems totally unwarranted: “All that remains which can be assigned with any confidence to the period between 1400 and 1200 B.C. are a few pieces of pottery from three tombs and from the area above the spring, and perhaps the 'Middle Building'" (*Biblical Archaeology* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957, p. 79). Garstang did competent, accurate work on the whole. Miss Kenyon speaks very highly of the fullness of his records (Kathleen M. Kenyon, "Some Notes on the History of Jericho in the 2nd Millennium B.C.," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXXIII 1951, 122f). The Israeli archaeologist, Immanuel Ben-Oor, who was on Garstang’s staff at Jericho, told me personally that much late Bronze pottery was found in the tombs and a good bit of it on the tell itself.

All the evidence so far available seems to suggest that the Hyksos city of Jericho was destroyed by fire about 1550 B.C., presumably by the pursuing Egyptians. Then the mound lay vacant for at least 150 years. Since most of the typically fifteenth century forms of pottery are lacking, reoccupation could hardly have taken place much before 1410. Probably the Canaanites re-used the Hyksos rampart or glacis; this is the conclusion of Miss Kenyon and of Yigael Yadin, the director of the current excavations at Hazor. On the rampart they may or may not have built their own mud brick wall. The reason not more late Bronze pottery has been found may be that the city
was re-occupied such a short time before its divine demolition--this, together with the completeness of the destruction (Josh. 6:21, 24) and the exposure of most of this stratum to erosion.

_Shechem._--As soon as the army of Israel had burned Ai, Joshua led the nation northward more than twenty miles to establish God's covenant with Israel as the law of the land in a ceremony between the two mountains Ebal and Gerizim (Josh. 8:30-35). In order to arrive at the natural amphitheater between the hills the Israelites had to go past the stronghold of Shechem, less than a mile to the east. Years later, Joshua convened all the leaders of the nation at Shechem to renew their covenant commitment to Jehovah (chap. 24). Excavations at Tell Balatah in the last few years clearly confirm that Shechem was inhabited during the Late Bronze Age. (G. Ernest Wright, "The Second Campaign at Tell Balatah Shechem," _BASOR_, #148, 21f). In 1926 two cuneiform tablets were unearthed by German archaeologists at Shechem; they were both written about 1400 B.C. (Wm. F. Albright, "A Teacher to a Man of Shechem about 1400 B.C.," _BASOR_, #86, 28-31). Nor does there seem to have been any widespread destruction of the city and its temple between its capture by the Egyptians about 1500 B.C. and its burning by Abimelech around 1150 B.C. (Jud. 9:49, cf. Edw. F. Campbell, Jr., "Excavation at Shechem, 1960"; Robert J. Bull, "A Re-examination of the Shechem Temple," _The Biblical Archaeologist_, XXIII 1960,101-119). Since Joshua did not attack Shechem, the city must have been in friendly hands. Several of the Amarna letters declare that around 1380 B.C. Lab'ayu the prince of Shechem was in league with the invading Habiru. Certainly we cannot equate the Israelite Hebrews with the Habiru bands wherever they are mentioned in clay tablets throughout the Near East in the second millennium B.C., and probably not every mention of the Habiru in the Amarna Tablets refer to Israelites. But in this case of Lablayu the Israelite Hebrews may be his confederates, stigmatized as Habiru by pro-Egyptian neighboring kings. In fact, some of the Shechemites could possibly even have been descendants of Jacob, whose ancestors had left Egypt in small numbers subsequent to Jacob's death. That some Israelites actually did go back to Canaan is indicated in I Chron. 7:24. I do not mean to imply, however, that one or more entire tribes of Israel left Egypt in some other exodus before the time of Moses.

_Gibeon._--Before 1960 James B. Pritchard, director of the highly successful excavations at Gibeon, had discovered no conclusive evidence of Late Bronze occupation of the site of el-Jib. But in July 1960 an Arab woman revealed in her vineyard the presence of twelve shaft tombs cut in the rock. According to the pottery imported from Cyprus and Syria, the tombs range in date from the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age to the end of the late Bronze period (James B. Pritchard, "Seeking the Pre-Biblical History of Gibeon," _The Illustrated London News_, Sept. 24, 1960, pp. 518f). Since Gibeon did not fall to the Israelites, however, no help in settling the controversy concerning the date of the Conquest can be expected from that site in the future.

_Hazor._--After Joshua had pursued the Canaanites in three directions from the waters of Merom he turned back and took Hazor. He killed Jabin king of Hazor and set fire to the city (Josh. 11:10f). Hazor was undoubtedly the largest city in all of Canaan; its site, Tell el-Qedah and the adjacent lower city, stretches for 1000 yards from north to south and averages 700 yards in width covering an area of about 183 acres. It could accommodate 30,000-40,000 people in an emergency with all their horses and chariots.

There is no need to confuse the two accounts concerning two kings of Hazor named Jabin. Those who try to harmonize the account in Joshua 11 with the one in Judges 4, 5 are those who
accept a late date for the Exodus and the Conquest. They feel compelled to combine the two Israelite victories into one campaign and the two Jabins into one man because of the shortness of the time allotted by them to the period of the Judges. Yet the same scholars would not claim that Rameses II and Rameses III of Egypt must be one ruler because they have the same name. Biblical history requires that in interpreting the archaeological evidence from Hazor one must assign a later Canaanite level to the time of Deborah and Barak than the level which he assigns to the time of Joshua. Therefore, since the last Canaanite city in the vast enclosure to the north of the mound of the acropolis had been destroyed, not to be reoccupied, in the thirteenth century B.C., this last city must be the one in which Jabin of Judges 4 resided. This date agrees well with a date around 1240 to 1220 B.C. for Deborah's battle against Sisera.

In the fourth season of excavations at Hazor, Yadin found what may well be evidence of Joshua's burning of the city. In Area K he and his staff excavated the gate of the Lower City. The gate in the Late Bronze period was erected on the foundations of the earlier Middle Bronze Age II gate, and is identical in plan. Yadin writes:

This gate must have been destroyed in a violent conflagration, though the exterior walls still stand to a height of nine feet. Traces of the burnt bricks of its inner walls and the ashes of the burnt beams still cover the floors in thick heaps. The evidence suggests that this destruction occurred before the final destruction of Hazor by the Israelites, but this problem remains to be studied. --Yigael Yadin, "The Fourth Season of Excavation at Hazor," The Biblical Archaeologist, XXII (1959), 8f.

One may wonder why or how the Canaanites regained control of Hazor after the time of Joshua. This question can be answered by pointing out that in his southern campaign Joshua did not attempt to occupy the cities whose inhabitants and kings he killed. At the end of that campaign "Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, unto the camp to Gilgal" (Josh. 10:43), evidently leaving no garrisons in the cities to hold them. Furthermore, in the cases of Hebron and Debir it is stated that these cities had to be recaptured (Josh. 15:13-17). Joshua's method of warfare seems to have been a series of lightning-like raids against key Canaanite cities, with the purpose of destroying the fighting ability of the inhabitants, not necessarily of besieging and actually capturing and settling the cities which he attacked (see Josh. 10:19f and 10:33 with 16:10 re the king of Gezer). It must be remembered that Joshua burned none of those cities except Jericho, Ai, and Hazor (11:13).

Upper Galilee and Asher.--In conclusion, let me describe some startling new evidence which has appeared, not at the tell of some important ancient city, but at numerous small unnamed sites in Galilee. In 1953 an Israeli archaeologist, Yohanan Aharoni, conducted a systematic survey of an area in Upper Galilee lying chiefly in the south-western section of the territory of Naphtali. Sixty-one ancient sites were examined, and he and his associates made two trial digs. He reports that a chain of eight Bronze Age towns, presumably Canaanite, lay along the present Israeli-Lebanese border in less hilly and more fertile territory; and that nineteen small Iron Age settlements--sometimes only a mile apart--were situated in the heavily forested higher mountains in the southern part of Upper Galilee. At these latter sites his expedition found a "special sort of large jar with thickened rim and plastic ornament, made of gritty clay." In a trial dig at Khirbet Tuleil he discovered in the lowest stratum not a sherd from the Late Bronze Age; rather he found examples of those large jars in situ, together with other types of pottery somewhat analogous to vessels from
Megiddo level VII and Tell el-Ful (Gibeah). Aharoni is of the opinion that this pottery type, dating from the 13th-12th centuries B.C., was introduced by the invading Northern Israelite tribes who took over areas not very suitable for settlement in the harsh mountains where there was no Canaanite population (Y. Aharoni, "Problems of the Israelite Conquest in the light of Archaeological Discoveries," Antiquity and Survival, II 1957, 146-149. Since Megiddo VII is usually dated about 1350-1150 B.C., we may date the beginning of these Iron Age I settlements in Upper Galilee as early as 1300 B.C. This date, then, would agree with the reference to the territory of a people called 'Asaru or Asher in an inscription of Seti I, dating about 1310 B.C. According to a book review by B. S. J. Isserlin (Journal of Semitic Studies, IV 1959, 279f.) of Aharoni's book, The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Upper Galilee, published in Hebrew in 1957, Aharoni readily admits that Israelite infiltration began at least as early as the period of Seti I in the 14th century B.C.

It must be remembered that Joshua returned to Gilgal after defeating Jabin and burning Hazor, without occupying any towns or territory in Galilee. Thus, when Naphtali and Asher received their tribal allotments and migrated northward, they found that the Canaanites had reoccupied their cities and resumed control of most of Upper Galilee. The Israelite tribesmen therefore lived in tents for a century or more until they began to clear fields in the forests and build towns in the mountainous part of Galilee. The fact that Israelite remains as early as 1300 B.C. have been discovered in Upper Galilee is one more argument against a thirteenth century date for the Exodus and the Conquest. Let us remember that the Bible over and over again indicates that all the tribes entered Canaan together; thus, if Asher was in Palestine by the fourteenth century, then all the tribes must have been there also.

**The Silence concerning Egypt**

*The objection.*--Those who favor the late date of the Exodus and of the Conquest make much of the fact that contact with Egypt throughout the time of Joshua and the Judges is seldom if ever mentioned in the sacred text. They claim that Palestine was effectively controlled by the Egyptians as one of their provinces from Thutmose III at least through the reign of Rameses II (1301-1234 B.C.). Therefore they say it was impossible or at least very improbable that the Israelites could have taken possession of Canaan until the reign of Merneptah (1234-1222 B.C.), who mentioned crushing Israel along with certain cities in Palestine in his hymn of victory. This was inscribed on a stela found in the ruins of his mortuary temple at Thebes by Flinders Petrie in 1896. In reply it may be pointed out that in the book of Judges there are two references to the Egyptians (6:8, 9; 10:11). While these mentions probably refer to that people at the time of the Exodus, they may also include later attempts by Egypt to subjugate parts of Israel.

*The probable solution.*--J. W. Jack has discussed this whole problem thoroughly and sanely in his book The Date of the Exodus. He demonstrates from the evidence in the Amarna letters that beginning around 1400 B.C. in the reign of Amenhotep III (1410-1372 B.C.), Egypt's hold on her Asiatic possessions weakened and that Palestine and Syria soon were lost to the pharaoh. The weakness and lack of concern on the part of the Egyptians continued for over three quarters of a century, thus giving ample time to the Israelite invaders to get a foothold in the land of Canaan. Beginning again with the Nineteenth Dynasty pharaohs (whose records can be read on the walls of their great temples at Thebes), Egyptian armies once marched northward into Palestine
and Syria. Seti I (1313-1301 B.C.) led his forces up the coast of Palestine and captured the towns of the Plain of Esdraelon (Armageddon). Taking the bastion-city of Beth-shan, he made it a garrison town for Egyptian troops; he erected at least two stelae of his in that city. From there he crossed the Jordan River and turned northward again to the Lebanon Mountains and the cities of the Orontes Valley. His son, the great Rameses II, re-established Egyptian authority in many a Palestinian town, but these were all in the Maritime Plain and the Shephelah (the Judean foothills), which were not actual Israelite territory at the time, or at least not continuously held by the Jews till long afterward. While Merneptah listed Israel along with the cities of Ashkelon, Gezer, and Yenoam in the land of Canaan, he gave no names of any distinctly Israelite towns as having been captured or socked, which seems to show that he, no more than his father Rameses, penetrated into what was Israelite territory. In the Twentieth Dynasty Rameses III (1195-1164 B.C.) pursued the retreating "Sea Peoples," whom he had repulsed in their attempted invasion of the Nile Delta, along the Mediterranean coast into Syria. He seems to have made no attempt, however, to recapture the coastal towns. Gaza alone, so far as his records show, fell into his hands. Before the end of his reign Egypt was compelled to abandon the whole of her Asiatic dependencies.3

The facts just recited do not furnish reason to say that Palestine was reconquered by the kings of the Nineteenth Dynasty and made so thoroughly an Egyptian province that the Conquest could not well have begun until the latter part of the reign of Rameses III – or even of Rameses II. Sir Flinders Petrie's remarks were too hasty when he wrote: "The Egyptians were incessantly raiding Palestine down to 1194 B.C., and yet there is absolutely no trace of Egyptian action in the whole period of the Judges, which shows that the entry into Canaan must be after that date."4 Jack presents a number of arguments to demonstrate that the Israelites could have been in the land of Canaan from 1400 B.C. onward without there being any necessity of mentioning contact with Egyptians during the period of Joshua and the Judges.5

(1) After Joshua's campaigns or raids to exterminate much of the wicked population of Canaan in obedience to the command of Jehovah, the actual settlement in Palestine by the Israelites took place only gradually and slowly. The names of the towns which could not be conquered and consequently were left for a long period in control of the Canaanites make a surprising list. The inspired record in Judges 1 includes Jerusalem (v. 21), Beth-shan, Taanach, Dor, Ibleam, Megiddo, Gezer, Kitron, Nahalol, Acco, Sidon, Ahlab, Achzib, Helbah, Aphik, Rehob, Beth-shemesh (in Naphtali's portion), Beth-anath, Aijalon, and Shaalbim. The Israelites, then, at least until after the time of Rameses III, were residing chiefly in the hill country, removed from the coastal plain along which the pharaohs were wont to march.

(2) The campaigns of Seti I, Rameses II, and Rameses III were directed mainly against the Syrians and the Hittites to the north of Palestine. From the names of towns and districts mentioned in their records of their marches it seems that the Egyptian armies kept as much as possible to the military route along the Mediterranean coast. There is no indication that they invaded the high central ridge of the land of Canaan south of Megiddo and Beth-shan.

(3) Even supposing that the Egyptians did make some attacks on Israel or repulse some Israelite raids on their positions along their line of march--such as the victory which Merneptah claimed over Israel the fact that the book of Judges made no clear references to such does not afford any valid argument against the early-date theory. No one would claim that the Hebrew records of the time of the Judges are a complete account of every battle and skirmish in which every tribe of Israel participated.
(4) Some of the encounters which the tribes of Israel had with the Canaanites and Amorites (Jud. 1-5) may have been instigated by Egypt, for it is well established that the pharaohs used native levies and mercenaries to maintain control in their provinces. As Jack says, "The struggling Israelites in the heart of the land were beneath the notice of the main Egyptian armies, and could be safely left to the soldiery of the tributary princes to deal with."  

In general throughout the long period of the Judges Israel had little contact with the Egyptians. The pharaohs marched along the coast and through the Valley of Esdraelon, whose cities the Israelites could not capture from the Canaanites at least until the time of Deborah. Concerning any times when the Egyptians did meet the Hebrews, it was not in the purpose of the writer of the book of Judges to mention them in any detail. The Egyptians were never one of the main adversaries of Israel after the days of Moses. Thus no valid objection to the early date of the Exodus and the Conquest can rightfully be made on the basis of the reputed silence in the book of Judges about Egyptian campaigns in Palestine during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties.
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The chronological framework of Biblical events from the time of Abraham to David rests upon two pivotal texts of Scripture. The first is I Kings 6:1, which dates the Exodus from Egypt 480 years before the fourth year of Solomon.

The second pivotal date for the Biblical chronology of this period is Exodus 12:40 which dates the arrival of Jacob's family in Egypt years before the Exodus.

The purpose of this paper will be to discuss the problem of the length of Israel's sojourn in Egypt. This problem is important, as already suggested, because it has to do with dating events in the centuries prior to the Exodus.

There are at least three possible solutions to the problem of the length of Israel's Egyptian sojourn. The first view is that the time span of the sojourn was only 215 years. A second solution is the view of 400 years for the sojourn. The third, and final, solution to be discussed is the idea that 430 years elapsed between the entrance of Jacob and his family into Egypt and their Exodus under Moses' leadership.

The View That The Egyptian Sojourn Was 215 Years

The most commonly held view of the length of Israel's sojourn in Egypt is the 215 year idea. To state the view simply, the chronological notations of Genesis 15:13,
And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years,

and Exodus 12:40,

Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years,

include sojourns in both Canaan and Egypt. From this it is argued that approximately 215 years were spent in Canaan and 215 years in Egypt.

Among the proponents of this view are Anstey, Meyer, Eadie, Alford and McDonald. Anstey is possibly its leading adherent. He reckons the 430 years of Exodus 12:40 from Abraham's call to the Exodus, and considers the 400 years of Genesis 15:13 as embracing the same period, but beginning with the weaning of Isaac. According to Anstey the Genesis passage has to do with the sojourning of Abraham's seed. As he has explained:

Abraham's seed here means Abraham's posterity, viz., Isaac from the time that he was weaned and became Abraham's heir (Gal. 3:29-4:5) and Isaac's descendants.

Holding to the idea that an oriental child was weaned at age five, the conclusion is that the 400 years of Genesis 15 began when Isaac was five years old.

Adding these five years plus the twenty-five years that elapsed between Abraham's call and Isaac's birth to the 400 years of Exodus 12:40 makes the harmonious chronological scheme. Another argument is his interpretation of the phrase "a land that is not theirs" in Genesis 15:13. Since Canaan was actually never possessed by Abraham's seed before the conquest under Joshua, then the 400 years must include both that land and Egypt. The interpretation also of McDonald is significant here as he sees the phrase as being more appropriately applied to Canaan. He has written:

While no particular country is specified, the appellation "a land that is not theirs" was, as regards Abraham and his immediate posterity, more applicable to Canaan than it was to Egypt during the sojourn there. Up to
the time when it was taken possession of by Joshua, Canaan, though the "land of promise", was in every sense a strange (allotria Heb. xi. 9, comp. ac. ii. c), land, Abraham or his posterity having no possession in it beyond a place of sepulture, and no fixed dwelling place, whereas in Egypt they had the land of Goshen by royal grant.\textsuperscript{11}

In connection with this Anstey does not see the servitude and affliction mentioned in the verse as applying to the Canaan sojourn. He skirts the necessity of applying these to the entire four hundred years by the use of an introversion. In other words he breaks down the passage so that it is constructed in the following manner:

Know of a surety that
  A. thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs,
     B. and shall serve them;
     B. and they shall afflict them;
  A. four hundred years. \textsuperscript{12}

In this construction the two A clauses correspond to each other and relate to the same event, that is, the whole period of the sojourning. The two B clauses likewise correspond and are parenthetical and relate to the servitude in Egypt and that alone.

A third argument used to establish the extent of the sojourn is the variant readings to the Massoretic text of Exodus 12:40. The Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch both include Canaan in the 430 year sojourn. The Septuagint version is as follows:

The sojourning of the children of Israel which they sojourned in Egypt and in the land of Canaan, was four hundred and thirty years.

The Samaritan Pentateuch reads:

And the sojourn of the children of Israel and of their fathers in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt.

The clause "and in the land of Canaan" of the Septuagint, and the clause "and of their fathers in the land of Canaan" of the Samaritan Pentateuch are not supported by any other manuscript evidence. Anstey finds support in these variants while not contradicting the Massoretic text. He believes that the Septuagint and Samaritan insertions
... agree perfectly with the Hebrew which is further elucidated, but in no way modified by them. They correctly interpret the meaning of the Hebrew text. . . . But the meaning of the Hebrew is sufficiently clear without the explanatory addition when the text is properly translated.\textsuperscript{13}

To summarize at this point, the major premise for the 215 year view is the interpretation of Genesis 15:13 and Exodus 12:40 as referring harmoniously to both the Canaan and Egyptian sojourns. The support for this is the view that the seed of Abraham, beginning with Isaac, was to dwell in a land not their own, which included Canaan. At the same time the variant readings of Exodus 12:40 interpret that passage as bringing the two sojourns into one.

The final support for reckoning the 430 years from Abraham to Sinai is the implication of Galatians 3:17. This verse, speaking of the covenant of the law which came many years after the Abrahamic promise, reads as follows:

\begin{quote}
Now this I say: A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect.
\end{quote}

The implication of this verse is important to the view under consideration. Fergusson sees this verse as indicating the space of 430 years to be reckoned

\begin{quote}
... from the first solemn sanction and confirmation of the covenant by God to Abraham... and the close of it was at the giving of the law upon Mount Sinai. . . .\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

This supposed interpretation by Paul of the 430 years is also considered by Meyer to be an evidence that Paul used the Septuagint at this point,\textsuperscript{15} which in turn gives support to that version's interpretation of Exodus 12:40.

It is from the standpoint of the major premise of 430 years for the Canaan and Egyptian sojourns that the time span of the latter sojourn is calculated. The time from Abraham's call to Jacob's entrance into Egypt can be determined by particular references in Genesis. According to Genesis 21:5 Isaac was born when Abraham was 100 years old or twenty-five years after Abraham entered Canaan (Gen. 12:4). Jacob was born when Isaac was 60 years old (Gen. 25:26) and entered Egypt at age 130 (Gen. 47:9). The total of the figures of 25, 60 and 130 would be

\textbf{ISRAEL'S SOJOURN IN EGYPT}
215, the time span of the Canaan sojourn. Subtracting this figure from 430 would leave a similar amount of time for Israel's stay in Egypt.

In order to demonstrate the validity of 215 years in Egypt, several arguments are put forth, the principal one being the genealogy of Jochebed. According to Exodus 6:16-20 and Numbers 26:59, Jochebed was the daughter of Levi, who went into Egypt, and the mother of Moses who led the children of Israel out. If the sojourn in Egypt was 430 years, she would have to be over 250 years old when Moses was born. This conclusion is reached by deducting the number of years Levi lived in Egypt, approximately 94, and the age of Moses at the Exodus, 80, from the 430 years. Ellicott summarizes the problem as follows:

Amram, grandson of Levi, marries his father's sister Jochebed (Exod. 6:20; comp. Exod. 2:1; Numb. 26:59). Now as it appears probable by a comparison of dates that Levi was born when Jacob was about 87, Levi would have been 43 when he came into Egypt; there he lives 94 years (Exod. 6:16). Assuming then even that Jochebed was born in the last year of Levi's life, she must at least have been 256 years old when Moses was born, if the sojourn in Egypt be 430 years. . . . 16

Consequently, the 215 year view of the Egyptian sojourn is considered more reasonable as it does not demand such an inconceivable age for Jochebed. McDonald, making his deductions from the 215 year hypothesis, suggests an approximate age of 45 for Jochebed at Moses' birth. 17

Anstey's Joseph to Moses connection is his further demonstration of a short Egyptian sojourn. He subtracts the time span from the call of Abraham to the death of Joseph, 286 years, and the age of Moses at the Exodus, 80, from his 430 year figure of both sojourns and arrives at a 64 year interval between Joseph and Moses. 18 This time period would allow for the events that took place between the two men (Exodus 1:1-22).

The proponents of this view see no difficulty in harmonizing the population increase of Israel in such a short period of 215 years. Anstey first of all, sees confirmation of the 600,000 male population in the later notices in Numbers 2:32 and 26:51. 19 He then argues that such an increase is not beyond comprehension:

Mr. Malthus has shown that with an abundant supply of food, a given population may continue to double its numbers in about 15 years, and in favored cases, in
even less time. At this rate of increase the 70 souls who went down into Egypt would have multiplied in 225 years to 2,293,760, which is perhaps about the number of the entire population including Levites, women and children; the 600,000 mentioned in Exodus 12:37, Numb. 2:32 and 26:51, would be the adult males.20

Others, such as Moller, have attributed the phenomenal growth simply to Divine blessing.21 To summarize, the view of a 215 year sojourn in Egypt is first of all based upon the idea that the period from the call of Abraham to the Exodus was 430 years. This idea is derived from the interpretation and harmonization of Genesis 15:13 and Exodus 12:40. Genesis 15:13 is interpreted in reckoning the sojourn of Abraham's seed in a land not their own from the weaning of Isaac. This interpretation is further supported by adopting the Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch readings of Exodus 12:40, which include both Canaan and Egypt in the 430 year span.

Within this framework of time, the time of the sojourning in Canaan, determined by references in Genesis, is deducted from the 430 year period leaving 215 years for Israel's stay in Egypt. This is then demonstrated by the genealogy of Jochebed and the short span of years between Joseph and Moses. At the same time, the increase in the Hebrew population in Egypt does not invalidate such a short period of time.

There are, however, several objections to this interpretation. To begin, while the Genesis 15:13 passage does clearly indicate that the 400 year sojourning is to be the experience of Abraham's seed, yet the verse does not specify the reckoning of this period to begin with Isaac.

A second objection is to the interpretation of the phrase "a land not their own" in the same passage. While it is true that the Israelites did not take possession of the land of Canaan until Joshua's day, yet the land was still theirs. The very context of the passage is concerned with deeding the land to Abraham and his posterity. The land not their own was in direct contrast to the land of Canaan. Beet has very aptly remarked:

It is also difficult to suppose that in Gen. XV. 13 the 'land not theirs,' in which Israel was to dwell 400 years and which seems to be contrasted with the land promised to Abraham, includes both Egypt and Canaan, countries so different in their relation to Israel.22
Thirdly the passage refers to servitude and affliction during the period of the 400 years. The children of Abraham did not serve others in Palestine, nor were they afflicted by their neighbors in Canaan.\textsuperscript{23} Anstey's introversion of Genesis 12:13 is really a circumnavigation of the real sense of the verse.\textsuperscript{24} Keil and Delitzsch have suggested the importance of the passage as follows:

By this revelation Abram had the future history of his seed pointed out to him in general outlines, and was informed at the same time why neither he nor his descendants could obtain immediate possession of the promised land, viz., because the Canaanites were not yet ripe for the sentence of extermination.\textsuperscript{25}

The fourth objection is to the interpretation of Exodus 12:40 as based upon the variant readings. In refutation of this supporting evidence it may be said the more reliable text is the Massoretic text.\textsuperscript{26} The implication of the Hebrew text is that the residence in Egypt occupied the whole 430 year period. It would certainly be more natural in reckoning the time of the departure from Egypt to give the length of the sojourn there than the period elapsed since Abraham entered Canaan.\textsuperscript{27} While the context of the Galatians passage would seem to support the idea of 430 years elapsing between Abraham's call and the law, a possible solution is that Paul may be looking at periods or ages. This will be discussed later.

The objection, the fifth, here is that support could be rendered to the 215 year view if it could be determined that Paul used the Septuagint. In discussing this point, Ridderbos concludes that it is impossible to determine Paul's chronological source:

The LXX transmits Ex. 12:40 in such a way that the time in which Israel was in Egypt and in Canaan came to 430 years. There is, however, no equivalent for the words \textit{kai en gei chanaan} in the Hebrew text. It is therefore impossible for us to determine whether and in what sense Paul takes his figure from one or another of these data.\textsuperscript{28}

Such being the case, the final interpretation of Galatians 3:17 can not be based on the Septuagint. This relieves one from the necessity of supporting a 215 year Egyptian sojourn at this point, or from facing the definite problem of Paul's use of an inaccurate source.
A sixth objection is the insistence on a strict genealogical record of Exodus 6:16-20. This is admittedly a difficult problem. Keil and Delitzsch argue that the genealogical records are very often incomplete due to missing links. Their argument is as follows:

The genealogies do not always contain a complete enumeration of all the separate links, but very frequently intermediate links of little importance are omitted.Keil and Delitzsch then demonstrate this by a comparison of Exodus 6:16-20 with the other genealogies in which more than four generations between Levi and Moses must have occurred. Numbers 26:29ff, 27:1, and Joshua 17:3 show six generations from Joseph to Zelophehad. Ruth 4:18 and I Chronicles 2:5, 6 show six generations from Judah to Nahshon who was a tribal prince in the time of Moses. I Chronicles 2:18 lists seven generations from Judah to Bezabel. The most significant is possibly I Chronicles 7:20 which lists nine or ten generations from Joseph to Joshua. Keil and Delitzsch significantly have commented:

This last genealogy shows most clearly the impossibility of the view founded upon the Alexandrian version that the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt lasted only 215 years; for ten generations, reckoned at 40 years each, harmonize veil well with 430 years, but certainly not with 215.Archaeologist yes the same problem, although from a slightly different reckoning. His conclusion is that

. . . ten generations can hardly be reconciled with a mere 215 years (especially considering the longer life span of pre-Exodus Israelites), but it fits in very plausibly with an interval of 430 years.

The genealogy of Jochebed, then, does not support a short sojourn of 215 years in Egypt due to the problem of missing links in the genealogy itself.

Added to this is Thiele's statement:

That some considerable period was involved is clear from the fact that Joseph before his death saw the children of the third generation of both his sons (Gen. 50:23), and that at the time of Exodus Amram and his brothers were already regarded as founders of clans (Num. 3:27).
The increase from 70 to approximately one million Hebrews does in reality militate against the 215 year view. This is the final objection to the idea. It is certainly admitted that such an increase is Divinely possible in 215 years. In fact, even in the 430 year view the Divine blessing of Exodus 1:20 should be cited. Yet, the tremendous increase of the nation seems more plausible during a 430 year period. The problem of increase is more paramount with only 215 years of sojourning. Archer views the problem as follows:

If there were indeed only four generations, then the rate of multiplication would necessarily have been astronomical. Even if seven generations should be crammed into the 215 years, there would have had to be an average of four surviving sons per father.34

In conclusion, from a study of the lines of evidence, an Egyptian bondage of 215 years was highly improbable and unlikely.

The View That The Egyptian Sojourn Was 400 Years

Rea35 and Hoehner36 favor the position of a 400 year Egyptian bondage.

Rea proceeds to establish this idea by first of all accepting the Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch readings of Exodus 12:40. The 430 years of that verse would thus apply to both Canaan and Egypt.37 However, Rea reckons the beginning of this period not from Abraham's call, but from Jacob's return from Haran to Canaan with his family. Jacob's name was confirmed as Israel at that time. The grounds for this is an emphasis upon the phrase "the children of Israel" which is found in the Exodus 12 verse. To quote Rea:

The verse therefore states the length of time which elapsed from the return of Jacob from Haran to Canaan with his children, unto the departure of the Israelites from Egypt. The "exodus" of Jacob along with his family from Padan-aram is compared with the exodus of Moses accompanied by the nation of Israel from Egypt. Even when we adopt the longer reading in Exodus 12:40, the 430 years cannot cover the entire patriarchal age and the sojourn in Egypt, that is, from Abraham's arrival in Canaan until the Exodus. The verse distinctly says "the time that the children of Israel dwelt," and that cannot be made to include Abraham and Isaac.38
Galatians 3:17 is viewed as giving support to this in stating that the 430 year period began with the confirmation, not the institution, of the Abrahamic covenant. The last confirmation was made with Jacob in Canaan years before the entrance into Egypt (Gen. 35:9-15). The next step is to subtract the intervening time between Jacob's return to Canaan and his entrance into Egypt from the 430 years. This leaves approximately 400 years for the Egyptian sojourn and produces a harmony of Exodus 12:40 with Genesis 15:13 and Acts 13:19. Commenting on Acts 13:19, 20 Rea makes his conclusion as follows:

According to the Apostle Paul, then, the time that the Israelites spent in Egypt was only four hundred years instead of 430 years. The slightly shorter period accords with the four hundred years of Gen. 15:13 and almost exactly with the 430 years of Ex. 12:40 (Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint Versions), thirty-four of which were spent in Canaan before Jacob and his sons descended into Egypt to sojourn there.

Rea believes that the Acts 13:19, 20 chronological note gives strong support for his view. In dealing with the textual problem connected with this passage, he has chosen the text of the Alexandrian family, the Latin Vulgate and the Armenian Version and made the following translation of the latter half of verse twenty:

He gave them their land for an inheritance--about four hundred and fifty years. And after these things He gave them judges until Samuel the prophet.

This would mean 400 years for the Egyptian bondage. 40 years for the wilderness journey. and 7 years for the conquest of the land under Joshua's leadership, making a total of 447 years or "about 450 years" as the text states.

This is of course the alternative to the King James Version. based on the Byzantine texts, which places the four hundred and fifty years after the phrase "he gave unto them judges." This positioning of the figure would tend to indicate that it was meant to apply to the period of the judges instead of the Egyptian sojourn.

The first objection to this view is the use of the Septuagint and Samaritan renderings of Exodus 12:40. As already noted the Massoretic text is the more reliable text and its rendering of the passage does not include Canaan with Egypt in the 430 years. To include a Canaan sojourn in the reference does seem to be contrary to the point of the
reference which was to give the years spent in Egypt at the time of their termination.

To make the sojourn run from the return of Jacob to Canaan to the Exodus on the basis of the use of the appellation "the children of Israel" does seem rather forced.

A third objection is the restriction of the beginning of the 430 year period of Galatians 3 to the confirmation of the covenant in Genesis 35 when Jacob returned to Canaan. The last confirmation of the covenant to Jacob could very well be seen in Genesis 46 when he entered Egypt. As he journeyed to Egypt the Lord encouraged him and promised to make a great nation of him while in that land. The promise of a great posterity had its roots in the covenant and consequently its reiteration was another confirmation of its provisions. The 430 years would subsequently run from Jacob's entrance into Egypt until the Exodus under Moses' leadership.

In conclusion, this view does not seem to explain adequately the Biblical data.

*The View That The Egyptian Sojourn Was 430 Years*

This second most prevalent view simply states the length of Israel's sojourn in Egypt was 430 years. This period began with Jacob's entrance into Egypt and terminated with the Exodus.

Some of the proponents of this view are Keil and Delitzsch, Archer, Leupold, Toussaint, Lenski, Jamieson, Fausset and Kitchen.

Basically, this view takes Genesis 15:13-16; Exodus 12:40 and Acts 7:6 in their normal sense. The Genesis 15 passage refers to the sojourn in a land not theirs when God has just deeded Palestine to Abraham and his seed (cf. 15:7, 18). Along with this it is also noted that Abraham's children did not serve others in Palestine, nor were they afflicted by their neighbors in Canaan.

The 400 years of the passage is to be considered as a rounded number used in prophetic style with the fourth generation reference of verse 16 denoting the same period of time. Archer has significantly commented:

> It is evident that in Abraham's case a generation was computed at one hundred years, and this was
appropriate enough in view of the fact that Abraham was precisely one hundred when he became the father of Isaac. At least four centuries, then, and not a mere 215 years, would mark the Israelite sojourn in the foreign land.\textsuperscript{52}

An objection has been raised to the view under discussion because of the idea of a rounded number being used. The thought is that such an interpretation could allow too much liberty in the interpretation of other numbers in the Bible and consequently do damage to the doctrine of inspiration.\textsuperscript{53} However, if it can be shown that the Bible does use rounded numbers then the doctrine of inspiration is in no way affected.\textsuperscript{54} Paul, for example, in Acts 13 suggested such a use when he used the phrase "about the space of" in summarizing the years of the Egyptian bondage, the wilderness wanderings and the conquest of Canaan. The author of II Samuel rounds off the years of David's reign at 40 and then explains that the reign was actually composed of 7 years and 6 months at Hebron and 33 years at Jerusalem (II Sam. 5:4, 5). The enumeration of Job's possessions must have involved the use of rounded numbers for it would have been trivial for the author to have given an odd ten or fifty or hundred in figures running into thousands.\textsuperscript{55}

The Bible then, does contain rounded numbers. The real issue is determining, mainly by context, the use of such figures in anyone text.

The normal literal sense of Exodus 12:40, with the Massoretic text being preferred, is a 430 year Egyptian sojourn for Israel.

The Acts 7:6 passage is evidently a quote of Genesis 15:13. It reads as follows:

And God spake on this wise, that his seed should sojourn in a strange land, and that they should bring them into bondage and treat them ill, four hundred years.

Chadwick sees Peter quoting . . . plainly and confidently the prediction that the seed of Abraham should be four hundred years in bondage and that one nation should entreat them evil four hundred years. . . .\textsuperscript{56}

A second argument for this view is the support of Acts 13:19, 20. Following the A. S. V., which is based on B, Aleph, A, and C, the four best texts according to Westcott and Hort,\textsuperscript{57} the four hundred and
fifty years, which preceded the period of the judges, would include the rounded number of 400 for the Egyptian sojourn. Lenski has arranged the chronology of the passage as follows:

The round number "about 450 years" covers the time for the sojourn in Egypt to the possession of Canaan. According to Acts 7:6 (Gen. 15:13) 400 years were spent in Egypt, forty additional years in the journey through the desert to Canaan, and about ten further years for conquering the land which is certainly close to 450 years.58

A third argument is the genealogical tables in I Chronicles 7:20-27, indicating nine or ten generations between Joseph and Joshua. As already suggested ten generations can hardly be reconciled with a mere 215 years. From this a fourth argument is derived. The increase of the Hebrew population from 70 to approximately one million is more plausible with nine or ten generations in 430 years than with three or four generations in 215 years. Such an increase in 215 years is very difficult to comprehend, although it is divinely possible, of course.

Archer has demonstrated the plausibility of the increase in 430 years in the following quotation:

If the sojourn lasted 430 years, then the desired multiplication would result from an average of three sons and three daughters to every married couple during the first six generations, and an average of two sons and two daughters in the last four generations. At this rate, by the tenth generation there would be (according to Delitzsch, Pentateuch, II, 30) 478,224 sons above twenty by the four hundredth year of the sojourn, while 125,326 males of military age would still be left over from the ninth generation. These together, then, would total 603,550 men at arms.59

The problem in connection with this genealogical consideration is the genealogical line in Exodus 6:16-20. This is admittedly a difficult problem. The solution may very well be that there were two men by the name of Amram in this line.60 Amram, the son of Kohath, was probably an earlier ancestor of Amram, the father of Moses.

In fact, a simple comparison of this genealogy with Numbers 3:27, 28 will show the impossibility of assuming that the father of Moses in verse 20 was the son of Kohath mentioned in verse 18. According
to Numbers 3:27, 28 the Kohathites were divided (in Moses' time) into the four branches, Amramites, Isharites, Hebronites, and Uzielites, who consisted together of 8,600 men and boys. If divided equally a fourth, or 2,150 men, would belong to the Amramites. According to Exodus 18:3, 4, Moses himself had only two sons. Consequently, if Amram the son of Kohath, and tribal father of the Amramites, was the same person as Amram the father of Moses, Moses must have had 2,147 brothers and brothers' sons. But this would be absolutely impossible and it must be granted that an indefinitely long list of generations has been omitted between the former and latter descendant of the same name.61

Kitchen argues that Exodus 6:16-20 gives the tribe (Levi), clan (Kohath) and family-group (Amram by Jochebed) to which Moses and Aaron belong and not their actual parents.62

In connection with this 430 year view, there is the problem of Paul's statement in Galatians 3:17 which seems to indicate the time from Abraham to Sinai was 430 years.

Some possible solutions have been suggested. Lenski's suggestion is that the time is an understatement on the part of Paul. His purpose was to convince his opponents the number could have been larger by understating it.63 This is, however, a very weak argument and does not fit the exactness that characterizes the Apostle in his writings (cf. 1:16-2:21).

A second solution has been given by Jamieson, Fausset and Brown. The assertion of this view is that the 430 years are to be reckoned from Jacob to the giving of the law.64 The objection to this view is that the context of Galatians 3 concerns Abraham and not Jacob.

A more satisfactory solution is the one offered by Toussaint which is as follows:

Paul here is considering periods of time. The promises were given during the lives of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This period of time preceded the giving of the Mosaic law at Sinai by 430 years, the length of the sojourn in Egypt.65

As previously discussed, the last recorded confirmation is given in Genesis 46 when Jacob went down into Egypt. From this last recorded confirmation to the Exodus 430 years elapsed.

In conclusion, the 430 year view is based upon a normal interpretation of Exodus 12:40 which indicates a 430 year Egyptian sojourn
for Israel. Genesis 15:13-16 and Acts 7:6 are interpreted as containing rounded numbers. This is true also of Acts 13:19, 20 which summarizes the "about" 450 years before the judges.

Further confirmation of this view is the genealogical table of I Chronicles 7:20-27 which indicates at least nine or ten generations between Joseph and Joshua, making the increase from 70 to approximately one million more plausible. The problem of Amram in Exodus 6:16-20 can be answered by the argument of there being two men in that line by that name.

The interpretation of Galatians 3:17 is answered by the suggestion Paul is referring to periods or ages, i. e., 430 years elapsed between the period of the confirmation of the Abrahamic covenant and the beginning of the period of the law.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study has been to consider three solutions to the problem of the length of Israel's sojourn in Egypt. The views of 215 years and 400 years are rejected as inadequate basically because of their interpretation of Exodus 12:40, i. e., their acceptance of the Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch readings of the verse in contra-distinction to the Massoretic text.

The view of 430 years is set forth as the true solution to the problem, being based upon the better text, the Massoretic, and properly interpreting the pertinent scripture references in their normal sense.
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During the 1964 season of excavations at Tell Deir 'Alla on the eastern side of the mid-Jordan Valley, the Dutch expedition led by H. J. Franken recovered eleven clay tablets from the floors of two storerooms, Rooms IX and X, located across a courtyard from the Late-Bronze-Age temple at the site.1 Three of the tablets were inscribed with texts written in a previously unknown script, seven of the tablets were incised only with dots, and one tablet appeared to be merely a lump of clay squeezed by hand. Franken is to be complimented and thanked for his prompt publication of the find. His manuscript announcing the discovery of the tablets was completed but two weeks after the end of the excavations.2 All three of his articles which dealt with the tablets in one way or another appeared in journals dated to 1964.3

In the present study, the inscribed tablets are designated by Roman numerals, as follows:

Tablet I (or Text I) = Deir 'Alla No. 1449
Tablet II (or Text II) = Deir 'Alla No. 1441
Tablet III (or Text III) = Deir 'Alla No. 1440

The reason for this particular sequence will be made clear in my treatment of the decipherment of the texts and the historical implications involved. Franken has provided line drawings and some

*Editor's Note: The continuation and conclusion of this study, in "Part II," is currently planned for the Summer 1989 issue of AUSS.
photographs of these three inscribed tablets and line drawings of all eight unwritten tablets, plus photographs of six of the latter. My own line drawings given herein are based on those of Franken. The line drawings for the first two inscribed tablets appear below, and those for the third inscribed tablet will be set forth in the subsequent installment (Part II) of this article, in conjunction with the discussion of the dotted tablets that will be given there.

1. Studies of the Tablets

Unfortunately, relatively little has been done in studies of these tablets since they were published. In a passing remark, W. F. Albright suggested that they might have originated with the Philistines because of "their similarity to Minoan tablets." As Trude Dotan noted, however, "this extremely attractive proposal is difficult to substantiate because the derived Philistine pottery at Deir 'Alla was found in the Iron-Age-I levels following the destruction of the temple complex." The first two studies of the Deir 'Alla tablets appeared the year after they were discovered. In the first study of them, A. van den Branden concluded that their script was most directly related to early Arabic scripts. While van den Branden made a useful beginning in the study of these tablets, his special reliance upon Arabic scripts has not produced an overall solution to their texts. H. Cazelles followed up van den Branden's study by agreeing that some of the letters in this script were related to early Arabic forms, but he also noted that other letters resembled those in the Phoeni-

---

4 For his line drawings of all eleven tablets, see "Stratigraphic Context," p. 73, Fig. 1. A further line drawing, in larger size, of text I appears in "Clay Tablets," p. 380; and such a drawing of text III appears in the same article on p. 378. Photographs of six of the eight dotted texts appear in "Excavations," Plate Va. Franken has also published photographs of inscribed texts II and III in "Excavations," Plate Vb, and "Clay Tablets," Plate 1, respectively.


6 T. Dotan, The Philistines and Their Material Culture (Jerusalem, 1982), p. 84.

cian alphabet. He suggested that attention should be given to their relations in that direction.  

Almost a decade passed before the Deir cAlla tablets were treated again. Following up the idea that the script of these tablets might have come from the Aegean world, Z. Mayani attempted to decipher the tablets on the basis of Etruscan. His results are so exceptional that they are not dealt with further here.

The most recent study of one of these tablets was published more than a decade ago. In 1975, G. E. Mendenhall transcribed and translated one of the three written tablets, but this was only as a passing comment in a study on another subject. As a result, Mendenhall's cursory treatment provides no detailed interpretation of the palaeography or linguistics involved. Mendenhall sees the text as written in a script related to hieroglyphic Luwian but conveying a message in a Semitic language. The message is the record of a delivery of some donkeys. Because of its linguistic consistency, Mendenhall's is probably the best of the previous studies of these tablets.

My own interest in these tablets dates to a seminar I taught at Andrews University in the Spring term of 1985. A graduate student in that seminar, Aecio Cairus from Argentina, undertook a study of the Deir cAlla tablets for his research project. I did not encourage him in this undertaking because at the time I considered the tablets undecipherable. Cairus persevered, however, and eventually convinced me that he had indeed identified seven more letters of this script beyond those identified by earlier researchers (see Section 3 below). Because of the difficulty of the script, this was a remarkable achievement.

On various occasions during the course of that seminar, Cairus and I discussed the identification of individual signs, the meaning of, different words, and the overall significance of the texts. In spite of the progress made, the texts remained difficult. In the final written report of his research, Cairus presented three different ways in which the two tablets with which he dealt (texts I and III) could

---

be translated. He has subsequently presented the results of his work on this subject to the Midwestern sectional meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature that met at Andrews University in February 1986.

While I am deeply indebted to Cairus for his identification of the letters which I accepted from him, plus some of the words in my translations which were first proposed by him, other lexical items and the overall translation and interpretation of the tablets proposed below are my own responsibility and the result of my continuing work on this subject. I have also added here my translation of the third and more badly damaged tablet (text II) and my interpretation of the dotted tablets with which Cairns did not deal.

2. The Archaeological Context

These tablets were found on the floors of two storerooms that were located immediately adjacent to the sanctuary at the site. Since the pottery in the final phase of the sanctuary and in the storerooms was essentially the same, it is evident that all of the buildings in the complex were destroyed at approximately the same time. A faience vase bearing the cartouche of Queen Taousert, who reigned in Egypt at the beginning of the twelfth century, was found in the final destruction level of the sanctuary; hence a date for this destruction just after 1200 B.C. is appropriate from the archaeological evidence.

This date of just after 1200 B.C. for the final destruction of the sanctuary complex, however, does not necessarily provide a specific date for the writing of the tablets. The archaeological evidence indicates only that they could not have been written any later than ca. 1200; it does not tell us how long before that final destruction they were written. Several objects found in the sanctuary complex antedated its final phase by rather long periods of time; A Hyksos scarab was found in the storerooms with the tablets, and it must have been more than three centuries old by the time of that destruction.11 Two large painted LB-I vessels were found in the cella of the temple, and they came from an earlier phase of that structure.12 It is possible, therefore, that these tablets could have originated from a time considerably earlier than the destruction of the final

11 Franken, "Excavations," Plate VIII, no. 3.
12 Ibid., Plate I.
phase of the sanctuary. The archaic nature of their script suggests that they probably did.

3. Analysis and Decipherment of the Script

The process of deciphering the script used on these tablets has been a slow one, to which each of the studies cited above has made a contribution. For reasons of space, identifications for signs in previous studies which have been rejected are not here discussed.

The first of the letters in this script, which van den Branden correctly identified, was the \textit{gimmel}. It consists of a vertical stroke which curves to the right at its head. The form is similar in later West-Semitic scripts, but the head became more angular.

Van den Branden's second correct letter was the \textit{pe}. This he identified on the basis of parallels with the bow-shaped \textit{pe} of Thamudic and Safaitic scripts. In Canaanite writing the \textit{pe} was written with more of a curve, and it does not straighten out as much at the ends of the stroke.

Van den Branden was also the first to identify the \textit{samek} in these texts. It is a typical West-Semitic \textit{samek}, which consists of three horizontal strokes on a vertical stem.

The final letter, utilizable from van den Branden's identifications, is the taw. It, too, is typical of West-Semitic taws in that it was written with two crossed strokes.

The \textit{kaph}, which was first identified by Cazelles, has a trefoil head and a vertical tail like the later forms of the West-Semitic \textit{kaph}. The use and length of the tail of the \textit{kaph} seem to vary among the Deir ʕAlla tablets.

The \textit{yod}, which Gazelles identified, lacks the forked head of the later West-Semitic \textit{yods}. It was written here with just a dot, or not even that, at the head of the vertical stroke.

The \textit{res} that Mendenhall recognized has a direct parallel with the head-shaped sign with which the \textit{res} was written in the Proto-Sinaitic script.

The first of the letters which Cairus identified is the \textit{beth}. Later West-Semitic \textit{beths} have triangular heads and angular tails. What Cairus noted here was that there is a letter with a triangular head, but it is represented only by three corner dots. The tail of this letter consists only of a straight downstroke without any bend in it.

The circular infolded \textit{lamed}, which Cairus recognized, comes fairly close to the \textit{lamed} in the abcedary of the ʕIzbat Sartah Ostracon.\footnote{The \textit{lamed} occurs as the 10th letter in the second line; the 12th, 26th, and 29th letters of the fourth line; and the 12th letter of the fifth or alphabetic line of the ʕIzbat Sartah Ostracon. See M. Kochavi, "An Ostracon of the Period of the Judges from ʕIzbat Sartah," \textit{Tel Aviv} 4 (1977): 1-13.}
Figure 1. Table of Letters of the Script of Deir 'Alla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Text I</th>
<th>Text II</th>
<th>Text III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Aleph</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gimel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waw</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>כ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yod</td>
<td>יד</td>
<td>יד</td>
<td>ג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaph</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamed</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mem</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samek</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayin</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pe</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sade</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qoph</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resh</td>
<td>ר</td>
<td>ר</td>
<td>ס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>ס</td>
<td>ס</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taw</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cairus's distinction between the *mem* and the *nun* is especially important for understanding these Deir ʿAlla texts. In later scripts, both of these letters had wavy-lined heads extending to the left from the head of their downstrokes. The *mem*, however, has multiple notches, while the nun has only one. In these texts Cairus has identified the wavy vertical line as the nun and the broad vertical V as the *mem*. This seems to run in the opposite direction from the parallels. Cairus adopted this position on the basis of the sense that they brought to their respective words. When he showed me these identifications, I checked some of the early alphabets for parallels and found one for the *mem* in the abcedary of the ʿIzbet Sartah Ostracon.14 Thus the *mem* that we find here has a parallel in at least one other early alphabet. That leaves the alternate letter as a *nun*.

*Ayin* was originally written in the form of a horizontal oval or circle with a dot in it, representing the eye with a pupil. What Cairus recognized here is that we have half of this sign—one curved line with a dot in it, but lacking the lower curved line and being turned 90° to stand vertically.

Cairus's bow-shaped *sin* is relatively close in form to the later West-Semitic *sins*, except that it has been rotated 90° to stand vertically like the *cayin*.

The vertical box-shaped sign at the beginning of the one word on the side of text III has been difficult to identify. It looks most like *heth*, but it does not function like *heth* because it is followed by a clear example of an *cayin*. The combination of *heth* followed by *cayin* does not occur in West-Semitic languages. In his search for another letter with which to identify this sign, Cairus settled upon the *zayin*. If this sign is rotated 90°, like the two previous letters discussed, and its excess of crossbars is removed, this sign would resemble the later *zayin*. The key to this identification may lie in the fact that the letter's top horizontal crossbar extends between the two vertical strokes at an angle, as does the vertical connector between the horizontal strokes of the later *zayin*.

There are some additional signs which should now be added to the foregoing list. The first of these proposed here is *he*. One example of a vertical box-shaped sign with one central crossbar appears in text II, and

---

14 The alphabet of the ʿIzbet Sartah Ostracon has been misinterpreted with regard to *mem* and *nun*. It has been thought that the last letter in the alphabet before the break in the middle of the sherd was the *nun* and that the *mem* was missing. Actually, the last letter before the break is the *mem* and the *nun* was written back in the sixth position of the letters in the alphabet. It is the standard notched form of the nun that was written there in error, and to compensate for this error the scribe wrote the *waw*, the correct letter of that position, underneath the nun. That makes the broad letter like the v-shaped letter of the Tell Deir ʿAlla tablets' *mem*. For details, see the line drawing of the ostracon which accompanies Kochavi's article referred to in n. 13.
another occurs in text I. While this sign looks something like heth, heth does not make sense in these contexts while he does, and he is the letter that looks most like heth. The clue to identifying he here may lie in the facts that only one central crossbar extends between the vertical strokes and that the vertical stroke on the left appears to be less deeply incised than the one on the right.

Both Cazelles and Cairus considered identifying the letter with the semicircle atop the vertical stroke as a waw, but in the end they rejected that identification. That original identification is retained here. This letter looks very much like the waws in other West-Semitic alphabets, and it functions well in these texts as a waw.

The triangular letter which consists of only three dots has a head which is similar to the head of the beth, but it does not have a tail, as does the beth. The letter in later alphabets which has a triangular head but only a rudimentary tail is the dalet; hence this letter has been identified as a dalet here.

There appears to be another example of the zayin present here, this one in text II. It is also a vertical box-shaped sign, but it has no central crossbar, only top and bottom crossbars, and the top crossbar is incised at an angle like that of the zayin on the side of text III. If this sign is rotated 90° and its bottom crossbar is removed, it also looks like the later zayin.

Together, these letter identifications yield the alphabet that is outlined in Figure 1. While the forms of some of these letters are unusual and quite archaic, most of them can still be related to forms known from other early West-Semitic alphabets. From the standpoint of these relations, there is no need to identify this script as non-Canaanite. It should rather be thought of as compatible with other early Canaanite scripts.

Before proceeding to the transliteration and a translation of the texts of the three tablets, the long slash marks inscribed in these texts should be mentioned. The slash marks are clearly word dividers. They make, in fact, much better word dividers than the short vertical strokes or dots that were used in later texts.

4. Text I: Pethor Smitten
   (Deir ʿAlla No. 1449)

General Introduction

In connection with text I and also the further two written tablets, the pattern of treatment is as follows (indicated by side subheads): First the transliteration and translation are given; next
my line drawing of the particular tablet is presented (as given in
line drawing below); then general introductory comments are made
(whenever there are such); following those comes the analysis of
the text upon which my transliteration and translation are based;
and finally, attention is given to the historical and geographical
implications of the information elicited from the text. In tablet I,
which is inscribed with only one line, the final two items require
but one side heading each, whereas in tablets II and III, each of
which contains more than one line, the headings for these two final
areas of treatment will be on a line-by-line basis.

Transliteration and Translation of Text I:

\[ lkm \quad mk. \quad wtm.y \quad whm \quad mk. \quad ptr \]

(la) "To you (have come) a smiter and a finisher,
(lb) and they (are) the smiters of Pethor."

The Line Drawing:

![Line Drawing of Tablet]

Analysis of the Text

This text was written all on one line located along the edge of the
tablet, and all six boxes for the words of this text were marked off on this
line. The superior and inferior flat surfaces of the tablet were not incised.
The first letter of the first word can be identified as a circular infolded
lamed, comparable to that of the ʻIzbet Sartah Ostracon. This is followed
by a standard form of the kaph with a trefoil head and vertical tail. The
large V of the mem concludes this word. Lkm divides nicely into the
prefixed preposition l and the suffixed pronoun km, second person plural.
It translates as, "To you. . . ." The position of this prepositional phrase
suggests that a form of the verb "to be" should be understood with it, here
translated freely as "have come."

The first noun which tells what came to the people was written with a
large notched mem, a trefoil kaph, and a dot following the kaph. This fits
either one of two words in Biblical Hebrew-makka as the noun for
"blow, stroke, wound, defeat"; or the Hiphil participle makke from the
derivative root nkh, "to beat, strike, smite, defeat." Either the noun or the
verb would bring satisfactory meaning to this passage, but the verbal form has been preferred for its emphasis on agency over result: thus, "smiter."

No indicator of the final vowel was written, but a dot does follow the kaph both here and in the same word in the fifth box. In Biblical Hebrew the kaph in these forms was doubled by using a dagesh forte. It looks very much as if that was the scribe's intent here by use of this dot.

The third word is introduced by a waw with a forked head, which should serve as a conjunction. Therefore a form and a function similar to those of the preceding word are thus expected. The taw and mem from this word's root occur next, and they are clear. They are followed by a dot and a plain vertical stroke of the yod. The most direct relationship is to the root tmm, "to finish, complete." If the dot doubles the letter that it follows, as it appears to do elsewhere in this text, the yod following could provide the reason why it should function in this way. When endings were added to this Hebrew verb, its doubled forms appeared. This final yod probably is not a pronominal suffix. More likely, it represents the i-vowel of the old genitive case ending, a case ending which would be appropriate here with a word that ends a prepositional phrase. My translation of this word is "finisher."

The next word begins with a standard form of the waw with a forked head. This should serve as a conjunction that introduces the other major statement of the text. This is followed by the vertical box-shaped sign, which has been identified as the he rather than heth. He also makes better sense here. The last sign of this word is the large V-shaped mem that has already been seen three times in this text. The word present here is $w + \text{hm}$, or the conjunction followed by the third person masculine plural independent pronoun, "they." The natural plural antecedent of this pronoun should be the two objects mentioned together immediately before it, the "smiter" and the "finisher."

The fifth word in this line is the same as the second. It consists of a mem followed by a kaph and a dot. As in the previous case, this should be taken as a Hiphil participle from nkh, "to smite." For the third time in this line a dot appears to function as doubling the consonant that it follows. Since the subject of this participle is in the plural, the participle should be plural too. But it lacks the mem of the plural ending, so it probably should be taken as in construct with the following word. The final vowel of the plural construct was not written out here. With the verb "to be" understood, this second statement should thus far be translated as, "and they (are) the smiters of . . . ."

The object which was smitten by these two "smiters" (i.e., by the "smiter" and "finisher" in the first statement) was named at the end of the line, and that name reads quite clearly. Its first two letters are the pe and taw, which van den Branden identified, and its final sign is the head-shaped letter, which Mendenhall recognized as the res. The name of the
object which received these two blows or attacks is, therefore, ptr. These consonants can be vocalized quite readily to yield the name "Pethor."

**Historical and Geographical Implications**

Pethor is identified in Num 22:5 as the home of Balaam the prophet. This text thus provides us with an identification for that site, which previously was in dispute. Both the location of Pethor and the ancient name of Tell Deir cAlla have been uncertain, but thanks to this text, those two puzzle pieces can now be put together by identifying Tell Deir cAlla as Pethor. Further discussion of this identification follows later in this study, in Part II of this article. The translation developed here for this six-word line thus not only identifies as Pethor the site at which the tablet was found, but also indicates that Pethor had been attacked by two successive waves of attackers. Although this text does not identify those attackers, it appears that the related tablet written in the same scribal hand (II) does do so.

5. **Text II: Pethor's Smiters (Deir cAlla No. 1441)**

**Transliteration and Translation:**

(1) $\text{czw}^\text{t} \ pthm \ m[k.]$

(2) $[w^\text{dr}]^\text{y} \ wyw^\text{g} / m[k.]$

(1) "The mighty ones of Pithom (are) a sm[iter],

(2) [and Edre]$^\text{i}$ and Yog (are) a smiter."

The Line Drawing:
Introduction

Text II was inscribed upon the top surface of its tablet in a boustrophedon order, as Franken originally noted. This is clear from the fact that the letters face in one direction in one line and in the other direction in the other line. Both lines read from right to left, as the preceding text did, but the lines are upside down in relation to each other. Some of the letters of the text have been broken away at its right end. The written surface of the tablet has been damaged and contains many horizontal cracks. These make the text difficult to read.

Since the script of this tablet especially resembles that of tablet I, it is reasonable to suggest that it was written by the same scribe and at the same time as that tablet. If this was the case, then it is natural to anticipate that the contents of this text may be related to the contents of text I. Tablet I left off with the two attackers who smote Pethor still unidentified. It appears that this text provides those identifications.

Analysis of the Text of Line 1:

The first word of this text begins with a clear-cut case of the vertical half-eye sign of an /ayin/. This is followed by a vertical box with its upper horizontal bar crossing at an angle. Rotating this sign 90° suggests its similarity to the later /zayin/, with which it should be identified. Next comes a /waw/, with the forked head that is common to these two texts. The last letter of this word is a /taw/, written here with its customarily crossed strokes.

Between the /waw/ and /taw/ of this word there is a vertical stroke that would ordinarily be identified as a /yod/. Here, however, I would suggest a different function for that stroke. The first two letters of /cwv't/ make up the word /czwvt/, which is used in Biblical Hebrew either as a noun or as an adjective meaning "strong, mighty, powerful." To this the feminine plural ending -/ot/ has been added, but that ending contains this intrusive /yod/. Rather than serving as a true /yod/ here, this stroke appears to have been used as a vowel marker for the /waw/ which precedes it, indicating that it should be taken as vocalic a rather than as consonantal /w/. The /waw/ conjunctions of these texts are not followed by such a marker. I have indicated this proposed function with a /v/ above the line after the /waw/ with which it was used. The identity of the /czwv't/ or "mighty ones" mentioned here is addressed further below.

The first two signs of the next word were accurately copied by Cazelles from Franken's photograph, and they can be identified with the /pe/ and /taw/ that van den Branden recognized. The /pe/ is more damaged than the
taw. The next letter begins with a vertical stroke, as Cazelles copied. A short horizontal stroke extends to the left from the middle of this stroke as Cazelles also copied. While they are more difficult to see in the photograph, two other horizontal strokes appear to project to the left from the top and bottom of the vertical stroke. There may possibly be another vertical stroke on the left, but this is uncertain. This box-shaped sign matches the form of the he that is found in the fourth word of the preceding inscription. The final sign of this word is located in the left upper corner of the word-box. It has been obscured in part by abrasion to the tablet, but it can still be read. It consists of a large V with a dot between the heads of its limbs. This is the form consistently used by these texts for mem.

On the basis of the foregoing identification of the letters in this word, the word can now be read as pthm. This word occurs as a place name, Pithom (consonantal ptm), in Exod 1:11. It was one of the two major store cities that the Israelites built for Pharaoh in Egypt. These two names, Deir cAlla pthm and biblical ptm, are essentially the same except for the way in which they treat the spirantization of the taw. In Biblical Hebrew this was accomplished by the absence of a dagesh lene. Lacking such an indicator, the Deir cAlla scribe appears to have compensated by following the taw with he. Because of their close written and phonological relationships, the two names can be taken as referring to one and the same place, the significance of whose presence in this text is discussed further below and in Part II of this article.

The last word in this first line is badly damaged and difficult to read. It can be reconstructed, however, from the traces that remain and by parallelism with other parts of this text and with text I. Three dots cross the right upper part of this box in a horizontal line. These remain from the first letter of this word, and the traces of a large V extend down from the outer two of them. This is sufficient evidence upon which to reconstruct another mem here. Only faint traces of the next letter are still present. To anticipate a reading from the next line of this text, we may note that the word in the parallel position there, in the third box, reads more clearly as mk. The same word occurs twice in text I. On the basis of these parallels and the faint traces present, it seems reasonable to reconstruct a kaph here. In its preceding occurrences, mk has been treated as a Hiphil participle from the verb nkh, "to smite," and so it should be treated here too: thus, "a smiter."

Historical and Geographical Implications of Line 1

With these three words read and reconstructed, the larger significance of this line can be considered. cUzot refers to the "mighty," with a plural ending. Pthm is the name of the place Pithom in Egypt. These two words can be taken as related to each other in a
construct chain. The verb "to be" is understood here again, just as it was in the two statements of text I. The last word of this line indicates that the "mighty ones of Pithom" were identified as a "smiter" or attacker. If this text is to be connected with the previous one, as seems reasonable, the place smitten or attacked was Pethor. Thus, one of the two groups that attacked Pethor was some of the "mighty ones" from Pithom in Egypt.

While one might think at first of Pharaoh and his army in this connection, there was a more direct way in which Canaanites could have referred to him in person at the head of his forces. Therefore another, more homogenous, group appears to be in view here. Since the Israelites built Pithom during their stay in Egypt and left it when they exited from Egypt, they make good candidates for this description. The proposal here, then, is that the "mighty ones" from Pithom in Egypt were none other than the Biblical Israelites, and that at some time during their travels in Transjordan they attacked Pethor. The feminine ending on the word for "mighty" is curious. Perhaps it is modeled upon the feminine plural ending that accompanies *saba* (*seba'ot*), "hosts, army, warriors."

Since the name for the other store city built by the Israelites in Egypt was Ramesses (Exod 1:11), the question arises why Pithom was referred to here instead of Ramesses. The availability of the latter name for inclusion here depends upon when this text was written. If it was written before the accession of Ramesses II, ca. 1290, it could not have mentioned the city of Ramesses, because that city was only renamed for him after he came to the throne. This text could still have referred to Pithom earlier than 1300, however, for the name of that city was not coupled chronologically to a particular Pharaoh's name. Although a precise date for these texts has not been established as yet, several of their linguistic and palaeographic features point to a rather lengthy interval between their writing and the ca. 1200 destruction of the temple complex in which they were found.

*Analysis of the Text of Line 2*

Most of the first word in the second line of this text has been broken away. Traces of the vertical half-eye sign identify an *'ayin* as the first legible letter after the break. A vertical stroke, possibly a *yod*, follows this, and there may be a dot between them. There is a longer stroke to the left of the first vertical stroke. Even though it is damaged, it probably should be taken as the line which delimits the end of this word box. It is difficult to
reconstruct a word here on the basis of just two letters. By parallel with the presence of a place name in the first line, a place name might also be expected here. Connecting that expectation with what follows suggests the name of the Bashanite city Edre'î for restoration here (consonantal ‘dr’î, Num 21:33-35). This proposal is, of course, quite tentative.

The word in the next box begins with a standard form of the waw with a forked head. This should serve as a conjunction to connect this word with the preceding one. The vertical stroke of a yod then follows, and its head has been dotted. Another good example of the waw comes after this yod. A vertical stroke without a dotted head follows this second waw. The difference between the dotted stroke which follows the first waw and the plain stroke which follows the second may be functional. It was suggested above that in the preceding line of this text the vertical stroke which follows the waw of the plural ending on ‘uzot (cuzw’t) may have acted as a marker for the vocalic function of the waw which it followed. The same suggestion may be offered here. In this case, the dotted stroke before the second waw should be taken as a consonantal yod, and the stroke after it should be taken as a vocalic indicator for it. A vertical stroke with a head that curves to the right comes next and is readily identifiable as a gimmel. The final letter in this word-box is difficult, but I take it to be another example of the gimmel which has been turned upside down. The rotation of the second letter in a pair can also be seen in the case of mkk in text III.

The word in this box should thus be read as wyw‘gg. The first waw has been taken as a conjunction and the second as a vowel letter accompanied by its marker, i.e., w + yogg. Yogg is not analyzed well either as a verb or as a noun, and parallelism with the first line suggests taking it as a personal or place name. While yogg does not correspond to the name of any place known in this region of Transjordan, it does bear a certain resemblance to the personal name of Og. Og was the king of Bashan when the Israelites arrived in Transjordan after the Exodus (Num 21:33). The central portions of these two names, consisting of a vocalic waw followed by a gimmel, correspond directly. The additional gimmel at the end of the inscriptional name is not an important difference, as it may not have been doubled by the biblical writer. Only the initial letters, ‘ayin and yod, respectively, differ significantly between these two names. This difference is not due to a known phonetic shift. It could have resulted from a scribal error during the course of the transmission of the biblical text. On the other hand, it could also have come about through different ways in which the original scribes heard this man's name, inasmuch as it probably came to them through oral rather than written communication. Since the similarities between these two names still appear to outweigh this one main difference, it is proposed here to identify Deir ‘Alla’s (y)og(g) with the biblical (c)og.
The two letters of the word in the next box are partially damaged but still legible. Both of them consist of large V-shaped signs. The point of the first is missing, and the left limb of the second is faint. They both appear to have dots between the heads of their upper limbs. By parallelism with the word used twice in the first text, a stroke rather than a dot can be reconstructed between the limbs of the second sign. That makes the first letter a *mem* and the second a *kaph*. Thus we have here another occurrence of the Hiphil participle *mk* from *nkh* (referring to a "smiter") that we have already seen three times previously in these texts. A form of the verb "to be" can also be understood here, between the word pair earlier in this line and *mk*.

**Historical and Geographical Implications of Line 2**

The three words in this line transcribe [‘dr]cy / wywgg / mk, and they translate as "[Edre]i and Yogg (are) a smiter." This line of text identifies another party that attacked Pethor--Og and his forces from Bashan. Og had two main residences in his territory, one at Ashtaroth and the other at Edre'i (Deut 1:4, Josh 12:4, 13:12). It would have been more logical for him to launch a campaign into the Jordan Valley from the latter (at Derca), because it was farther south than the former (at Tell cAshtarah). Thus, if Edre'i is the name that was broken away in part from the beginning of the second line, there would have been good reason to mention it here. The Song of Heshbon (Num 21:26-30) describes Og's fellow Transjordanian king Sihon as an aggressor who campaigned victoriously into Moabite territory to the south. It would have been natural for Og to act in a similar fashion, but he was not able to campaign very far to the south because by crossing the Jabbok River he would have penetrated into Sihon's territory and come into conflict with him. The best direction for Og to expand his territory was to the west, down to the river in the Jordan Valley. Located just north of the confluence between the Jabbok and the Jordan, Pethor at Tell Deir cAlla probably was one of the last sites that Og conquered in filling out the territory of his kingdom.

The presence of the memory of Sihon's attack upon Moab in the Biblical text suggests that it was a relatively recent occurrence when the Israelites arrived in the area. Mention in this inscription of Og's attack upon Pethor, along with reference to the subsequent Israelite attack upon the same site, suggests that it too was a relatively recent event by the time the Israelites arrived there.
The Chronology of Events and the Textual Order in Tablet II

A question of chronology and textual order arises from the identification of both the Israelites and Bashanites as conquerors of Pethor. Which came first? Num 21:33-35 tells of the Israelite defeat of Og, the conquest of Bashan, and the annihilation of Og's forces and families. Historically, therefore, the Bashanite conquest of Pethor had to occur before the Israelite conquest of the same site, for the Bashanites were not around any longer after the Israelites came through this area. The translation of this text, as given above, presents the Israelites as a smiter of Pethor in the first line and Og and his forces as a smiter in the second line. Because this text was written boustrophedon, however, this order could just as well have been reversed. I have translated the text in this order because it seemed easier to go from one to the other linguistically and epigraphically, and I have also retained it for reasons of literary relations that are described later, in the forthcoming Part II.

(To be continued)
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THE POSSIBLE INFLUENCE OF LXX EXODUS 20:11 ON ACTS 14:15

THOMAS B. SLATER
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

A number of recent commentators have noted that in Acts 14:15, Luke does not mention Jesus as the content of the gospel, but instead mentions God the Creator as that content.¹ Some interpreters, such as E. Haenchen, have also observed that Acts 14:15b contains a quotation from LXX Exod 20:11.² However, no one, so far as I can tell, has investigated the theological affinity between the two verses. To do so is the purpose of this brief study.

In short, my suggestion is that Acts 14:15 quotes LXX 20:11 as a validation of the Gentile mission. This mission as a fulfillment of the divine plan is, of course, a major theme of Luke Acts (cf. e.g., Acts 13:44-52 and 28:28).

Exod 20:11, like Acts 14, refers to God as the Creator of the world. In fact, it contains the only reference to an act of God within the context of the Decalogue. As such, it could have been considered an ideal text for first-century Gentile Christians to use in demonstrating that the Creator God included all humanity when he gave the Torah to Moses on Mt. Sinai. Although God first revealed himself to the Jews, He did so with an understanding that ultimately the entire human race would obey the Torah. Both Rev 7:4-9 and Rom 9-11 appear to convey expectation.

Acts 14:15b is almost a verbatim quotation of the corresponding line in LXX Exod 20:11. The only difference is that hos in Acts

² Haenchen, 428; cf. Bruce, 276.
replaces *kurios* in Exodus. This change could result from the grammatical syntax and/or from the writing style of the author. The author has "God" in the main clause as the antecedent and therefore the subordinate clause reads better with the relative pronoun.

There is a similar passage in LXX Ps 145:6, but there the verb is an aorist active participle, whereas the verb in both LXX Exod 20:11 and Acts 14:15 is an aorist active indicative. Thus on purely literary grounds, the quotation in Acts 14:15 appears more closely related to the Decalogue passage than to LXX Ps 145:6.

Acts 14:15b tends to support M. Dibelius' contention that the speeches in Acts are for the reader rather than for the participants in the story? They do not, for example, contain a quotation formula by the speaker (cf. Acts 2:16 and 23:5b). The use of Exod 20:11 in Acts 14:15 would have had the intent of conveying to the reader the immutable plan of God. Specifically, by quoting the Decalogue, the text in Acts 14 associates the giving of the Torah with the mission to the Gentiles. The intent of the author might well have been to convey to the reader the concept that the same God who gave Moses the Ten Commandments and established a covenant with Israel had now established, through the Gentile mission, a new people of God, the Church, as part of the divine plan (see 15:7-11 and 15:13-21). Indeed, Luke-Acts concludes with God's calling a new people from among the Gentiles because the Jews had rejected the Christian gospel (28:26-29; cf. 14:19).

Acts 14:15b is an integral part of the agenda of Acts 13-15, the narrative of the first missionary journey and of its acceptance by the Jerusalem Church. These chapters indicate that the first missionary journey of Paul was ordained by God, and that the results of the mission--the persecution from the Jews (e.g., 13:32-41, 46, 50; 14:1, 19; cf. 14:22) and the positive reception by the Gentiles (13:44-47; 14:8-18, 21-28; 15:7-11, 13-21; cf. 14:21 and 15:3)--also were ordained by God. Thus, the quotation from LXX Exod 20:11 tells the reader that the Creator God, who gave the Torah at Mt. Sinai and chose a select people to Himself, now has chosen a new people, the Christians, from among the Gentiles (cf. 28:26-29).
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THE INTERPRETATION OF EXODUS 21:22-25 
(LEX TALIONIS) AND ABORTION*

JOE M. SPRINKLE

I. Introduction

W.C. Kaiser, in defending the use of OT law for formulating Christian ethics, argues that many ethical questions of interest to the modern Christian are not addressed in the NT, but only in the Old. "Where," he asks, "will we obtain authoritative materials on the abortion question if the OT is not consulted?"1

The passage most directly relevant to the abortion question according to Kaiser is Exod 21:22-25, the case of a pregnant woman struck during a brawl.2 Key to finding direct relevance in this passage to the abortion question is the interpretation that, contrary to the view exemplified by most commentators and translators,3 premature birth rather than miscarriage is involved in the first half of this passage where there is no serious injury (Ƞירשת). Only in the second case with serious injury is the death of the fetus and/or mother contemplated, and there the lex talionis, the "law of retaliation," is applied 'life for life," implying that the killing of the fetus was regarded as taking a human "life" (נפש). This interpretation, which is reflected in the NIV translation, implies that deliberate induced abortion of a human fetus is murder.

Many anti-abortion Christian theologians and ethicists adopt this interpretation to bolster their case against abortion.4 However, this line of interpretation is subject to criticism on exegetical grounds. It will be my

*An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Kansas City, November 1991. I appreciate the following for reading the paper and making helpful suggestions: Daniel Evearitt and Donald Williams of Toccoa Falls College, and Michael A. Grisanti of Central Baptist Seminary. I also appreciate the fine editorial work of Moises Silva.

1 W. C. Kaiser, Jr., Toward Old Testament Ethics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) 34.
2 Kaiser, Ethics, 168-72.
3 Kaiser (Ethics, 170) lists the RSV, Berkeley Version, NAB, JB, Amplified Bible, Douay-Rheims, Moffatt, and Goodspeed, which take the miscarriage view. Tanakh, NEB, REB, and Today's English Version can be added to the list.
purpose to reexamine the interpretation of this passage and reassess its relevance to the issue of abortion.

II. Exegetical Problems in Exod 21:22-25

Any interpreter of Exod 21:22-25 should begin by confessing that this passage is extremely difficult due to the large number of exegetical cruxes it contains. The variety of ways in which scholars have resolved these cruxes has resulted in a multitude of specific interpretations of the pericope as a whole. The following is an interpretive translation of Exod 21:22-25 which will facilitate a discussion of its exegetical difficulties.

(22) If men are in struggle with one another and butt a pregnant woman so that the product of her womb [יְלֵ器件] comes forth in fatal miscarriage, but there is no further serious injury [ חוֹז] to the woman, then someone (the guilty party or a representative of the guilty parties) will be charged tort in accordance with what the woman's husband requires of him, paying the amount for which he is culpable (?) [םְפֵלִים]. (23) But if there is further serious injury [ חוֹז] to the woman, then you Israelite will payout [_CHIP] as the guilty party according to the formula: "the monetary value of life in exchange for the life lost [מלשנתה], (24) value of an eye in exchange for the eye lost, the value of a tooth in exchange for a tooth lost, value of a hand in exchange for the hand lost, the value of a foot in exchange for the foot lost, (25) the value of injury caused by burning in exchange for burning inflicted, the value of a wound in exchange for a wound inflicted, the value of a stripe in exchange for stripe inflicted."

Here are the main exegetical issues in this passage: Did the men strike the woman intentionally or unintentionally, or does intention make a difference in this case? Was the husband involved in the brawl? Was the woman actively involved, or merely an innocent bystander? Why is the plural ילד מ rather than the singular ילד, used for the fetus? Must the woman's ילד מ that "come forth" have been born dead or does the regulation contemplate also the possibility of their being born alive? Related to this, what is the meaning of חוֹז: death? serious injury? disaster for which no one can be blamed? What accounts for the change in person and number in this passage in which "men" struggle, but only one man (the verb is 3d masc. sing.) pays a tort to the woman's husband in the case without חוֹז, but if there is חוֹז


not "he" but "you" pay "life for life"? Why does only one person pay a
tort if more than one man were fighting? Who is the "you" who renders
"life for life": the same man who paid the fine in the case without בְּמֶּ֣לֶל יִתְנָ֣א or
Israel? What is the meaning of בָּטָלָתָם: by judges? by arbitrators? by as-
essment? alone? as the culpable party? Can some of the problems be best
explained on the assumption that there are textual corruptions, or that two
originally unrelated laws have been awkwardly thrown together? How does
the so-called Law of Retaliation relate to the situation described? Was the
application of "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth" applied literally in
the sense of capital punishment ("life for life") and physical mutilations of
the offenders, or does this formulation imply monetary composition ("the
value of a life for the life taken," etc.)? If the latter, how would such pe-
cuniary values be determined? How does this regulation relate to the reg-
ulations which precede it and follow it which concern slaves? Why is this
example addressed at all? What principle(s) does it seek to convey?
The analysis will be simplified a bit by eliminating all views--and these
are not uncommon--which suppose that the text is so corrupt as to require
radical surgery to make sense of it.6 I operate on the assumption that the
text as it stands makes sense if rightly interpreted, an assumption vindicated
through exegesis. The key issue for the remaining interpretations of the text
as it stands pertains to the question of whether or not the text implies the death
of the baby (or babies) both in the case with and the case without בְּמֶּ֣לֶל יִתְנָ֣א, or
whether the case without בָּטָלָתָם allows for the possibility of the child surviving.
The majority view, both in ancient times among rabbinical interpreters
and among modern exegetes, is that the death of the child is assumed
throughout this case.7 On the other hand, the view that the death of the

6 E.g., A S. Diamond ("An Eye for an Eye," Iraq 19 [1957] 153) calls the lex talionis "one
of the plainest interpolations in the Pentateuch, being inconsistent with its immediate con-
text." S. E. Loewenstamm ("Exod XXI 22-25," VT 27 [1977] 357) thinks that "the text of
a law dealing with a blow given to a pregnant woman has become mixed up with the text of
another law providing for the consequences of blows which men dealt upon one another in a
brawl." Jackson (Essays, 105) claims that Exod 21:24-25 (the lex talionis) is a later interpolation
inserted on the basis of the similar language of the slave law of vv. 26-27. H. Cazelles (Etudes
sur le code de l'alliance [Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1946] 56) thinks vv. 24-25 belong after vv. 18-19
rather than in their present position. Similarly, A. H. McNeile (The Book of Exodus [3d ed.;
London: Methuen, 1931] liii and 129) comments that vv. 23b-25 are irrelevant in their present
context. L. Schwienhorst-Schonberger (Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20, 22-23, 33) [BZAW 188; Berlin:
Walter de Gruyter, 1990] 81-83) concludes a more complete survey of critical scholarship
with the remark that only a few exegetes (R. Westbrook is the only one footnoted) regard
Exod 21:22-25 as a unity in the strict sense.

7 This category of interpretation is the most common among commentators. Along the
lines of this interpretation are the standard commentaries on Exodus by S. R. Driver, M. Noth,
B. Childs, and J. P. Hyatt, as well as S. M. Paul (Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light
of Cuneiform and Biblical Law [VTSup 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970] 70-77), and R. Westbrook, ("Lex
that the majority ancient Jewish tradition followed this interpretation: Josephus, Ant. 4.8.33
§278; Tg. Ṣnq.; Mek.; m. Ketub. 3:2; m. B. Qam. 5:4.
fetus is not assumed has existed from ancient times, going back at least to Philo of Alexandria, and continues to be defended today. 8 According to this interpretation, the focus of the passage is not on the woman's life, but on the child's, or at least a combination of both woman and child. The death of the child is not assumed in the expression "her children [יִלְדָּה] come forth," since premature labor induced by the trauma of the blow could result in a healthy birth and no permanent injury to the mother. Moreover, the verb "come forth" (走出来) can be used of ordinary birth rather than miscarriage. 9 Hence the expression "there is no נִסְתָּא" could mean that there is not "serious mishap" to either the mother or the child. If there is no deadly and/or serious injury (נִסְתָּא may not always imply death), the offender is still guilty of exposing a pregnant woman and her fetus to unnecessary life-threatening danger, an offense deserving monetary penalty. On the other hand, if the child (or the mother) dies or is seriously injured so that there is נִסְתָּא, then the so-called talionic formula "life for life" (נָכָשׁ נוך נָכָשׁ) applies, sometimes taken in the sense of capital punishment for murder. The fetus, according to this view, is in any case a human "life" (ライフ).

III. A Proposed Interpretation

What I would like to do is examine the cruxes of interpretation in this passage and offer an analysis of the passage based on solutions to these cruxes.

1. An Intentional Blow to the Woman?

To begin, was the blow to the pregnant woman intentional or unintentional? A few interpreters have argued that the attack on the pregnant woman was intentional. 10 It is true that the verb נָכָשׁ, "butt, push, gore,"


9 Cf. "and the first one was born [נָכָשׁ] red" (Gen 25:25); "this one was born [נָכָשׁ] first" (Gen 38:28).

10 D. Daube, Studies in Biblical Law (London: Cambridge, 1947) 108, for example, argues from Deut 25:11f. (where wife grabs the genitals of a man lighting her husband), that the blow in Exodus "must be regarded as a deliberate, malicious attack." But, unlike Deut 25:11f., the text's silence concerning the relationship between the woman and the men lighting more likely indicates that whether or not her husband was involved is of no relevance to this case.
usually refers to intentional acts. But in this case, given the plural, that "men. . . butt a pregnant woman," it seems more likely that the men, while intentionally fighting each other, have flown out of control and unintentionally hit the woman as an innocent bystander.

2. The lex talionis: Literal or Figurative?

Next, is the punishment in the so-called lex talionis formula literal or figurative? According to the figurative view, the lex talionis has to do with "composition" in the legal sense of the satisfaction of a wrong or injury by money payment, this being an old rabbinic interpretation. Modern scholars, however, frequently understand it to refer solely to literal retaliation involving execution and maiming. In the discussion which follows, the figurative interpretation will be defended.

There are a number of arguments favoring the figurative interpretation. First, the literal application of the so-called lex talionis is inconsistent with the principles and legal outcomes of other laws elsewhere in the literary unit of Exod 20:22-23:33. Exod 21:18-19, for example, presents a more serious case, a case of deliberate injury as opposed to the accidental nature of the injury of the pregnant woman described here in Exod 21:22-25. The penalty there, however, is not to strike the offender and injure him in exactly the same way in which he injured the other man as one would expect on a literal understanding of lex talionis--which, by the way, would be absurdly impractical--but for the offender to pay money, i.e., to pay for the medical costs and for the lost time of the man he injured. In Exod 21:26-27, the penalty for striking out the eye or tooth of a bondsman likewise does not result in a talion against the owner's eye or tooth, but a release of the bondsman, equivalent to forgiveness of the bondsman's debt. Moreover, the literal talion of "life for life" in the case of accidental killing of a pregnant woman would be in contradiction with the principle expressed in Exod 21:13-14, which says that accidental manslaughter is not a capital offense.

Deut 25:11ff. is a substantially different case of little relevance for comparison. Accordingly, Kaiser's statement (Ethics, 102) that this "pregnant woman intervened" in the fight--as if a pregnant woman were likely to jump into the middle of the brawl!--and was "perhaps the concerned wife of one of them" is needless speculation. Surely the active "intervening" of the woman would affect the legal outcome inasmuch as the one striking her could with justification plea "self-defense."

11 Cf. b. Sanh. 79a; b. B. Qam. 83b; b. Ketub. 33b; Rashi on Exod 21:24; m. B. Qam. 8:1.
13 Paul (Studies in the Book of the Covenant, 67-68) argues that the reason the talionic punishment ("eye for eye, tooth for tooth," understood literally) is not invoked in this case is that there was no original intent to cause injury. But whether or not there was "original intent," the use of a stone shows that there was certainly "subsequent intent," and this would have been sufficient, had the man died, to make it a translated offense.
It is a general hermeneutical principle that one should assume that an author or editor of a literary unit can be expected to be self-consistent; hence, one regulation of our unit of Exod 20:22-23:19 ought not be interpreted in ways contradictory to another regulation so long as there are other possibilities which are not in conflict. This principle leads to the rejection of a literal talion.

Second, Exod 21:29-30 shows that ransom could serve as a substitute for literal talion. A man who does not constrain an ox with a known tendency to gore, so that as a result it gores someone to death, is liable on the principle of "life for life" to give up his own life. Hence, the text says, "also its owner is to be put to death" (Exod 21:29b). But the text immediately allows the possibility of ransom: "If a ransom is laid upon him, he will pay the price of redemption for his life [rather than the life of the owner] whatever is laid on him." In other words, v. 29 applies the principle of life for life to a man whose negligence has caused the loss of a life forfeits his own life. But v. 30 goes on to show that this operates within a system that permits a payment of money to take the place of the actual execution of the offender. Though in principle such a man forfeits his life, it was possible (and in practice probable)\(^{14}\) for him to redeem his life by paying the offended party a ransom. A similar principle seems to be implicit elsewhere in this collection. For example, if someone injures another person, as in the case in Exod 21:18-19, the offender on the principle of "wound for wound" deserves to be injured in the same way. But rather than actually injuring him, which does nothing for the original victim, the man normally pays a ransom, consisting in the case of Exod 21:18-19 of payment for the inactivity and medical expenses of the man he injured. By paying this "ransom," the culprit thereby avoids having the same injury imposed on him.

\(^{14}\) Acceptance of ransom is the probable resolution to the situation described here. (1) The death of the negligent owner would give no tangible benefit to the victim's family, whereas ransom would both punish the culprit and benefit the family. Family self-interest dictates the ransom opinion. (2) Other forms of negligent but unintentional homicide are not capital offenses—cf. Exod 21:12-15; Num 35:9-15; Deut 19:1-13. To make negligence with an ox a capital offense, but negligence with a stone, ax head, or some other inanimate object not a capital offense seems inconsistent. (3) As I read the OT, it seems clear to me that the moral sensitivities of the ancient Israelites were not radically different from those of modern people. Modern people would see capital punishment for unintentional manslaughter as excessive, and hence morally objectionable as compared with accepting a ransom. So also did the ancient rabbis of the Talmudic period who therefore concluded that ransom must always be accepted in such cases—cf. J. J. Finkelstein, The Ox that Gored (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1981) 31; b. B. Qam. 40b-c; m. B. Qam. 4:5. It seems to me probable that Israelites of the biblical period would also be sensitive to the injustice of making unintentional manslaughter a capital offense, and would ordinarily on that basis be persuaded to accept a ransom. In sum, there is good reason to suppose that the death sentence of v. 29 is mostly hyperbole to underscore the seriousness of negligence which threatens the life of another human being.
Additional evidence that 'life for life' can be related to ransom is provided by 1 Kgs 20:39: "Guard this man! If he is missing it will be your life for his life [Nearstitial] or [IA] you must weigh out silver." Here "life for life" in the sense of capital punishment has an explicit alternative of monetary substitution, which obviously would be the option chosen by anyone who could afford to pay. There is reason to suppose that this option was available even where not explicitly stated. The availability of ransom seems to have been so prevalent that when biblical law wants to exclude it, as in the case of intentional murder, it must specifically prohibit it (Num 35:31). The system of ransom means that though the lex talionis could in principle be applied literally, normally it was not. Rather, monetary composition substituted for literal talion.

Third, the use of the verb [Ntn], "you will give life for life" suggests monetary exchange. The "you" here most plausibly refers to the nation Israel personified as an individual (cf. the same usage in Exod 21:2, 14; 22:17, 20, 22, 24-25, 27-29; 23:1-19). [Ntn] is used here in the sense of making monetary payment: "you, 0 Israelite, must pay money [as the guilty party]." The sense "pay money" is well attested for [Ntn] in the immediate context. [Ntn] is used in the sense of monetary payment immediately before the so-called lex talionis when Exod 21:22b states, "and he will pay [Ntn] by Myllp." A few verses earlier in Exod 21:19b, [Ntn] is used to describe payment for an injured man's time of convalescence (Ntnv vtw--"he will pay for his inactivity"). A few verses later, three other examples occur: Exod 21:30, "And he will pay/give [Ntnv] the ransom for his life"; Exod 21:32, "He will give..."  

---

15 Num 18: 15-17 gives further illustration of the ransom principle. This text specifies that the firstborn son who was in principle to be sacrificed to God must in practice be redeemed for live shekels, the "sacrifice" in effect being a legal fiction. The broad availability of "ransom" is also illustrated here, for the text is compelled to prohibit the redemption of firstborn sheep and goats precisely because otherwise its availability would be assumed.

16 Josephus (Ant. 4.8.35 §280) seems to suppose that the lex talionis was applied literally "unless indeed the maimed man be willing to accept money." Hence he sees the possibility of either literal application or the substitution of a ransom.

17 Another sense of [Ntn] is just possible: "You, 0 Israel, are to impose (monetary) penalty" (insofar as you act as a judge in such a case). For the sense "impose penalty" for [Ntn], see 2 Kgs 18: 14 and 23:33, where the verb is used of Sennacherib's "imposing" tribute and of Neco's imposing a "fine" (Ntnv, a word cognate with the verb used in Exod 21:22, which refers to a case without Nvsx, and which requires the offender to give monetary payment to the father). Cf. Lev 17:11; Deut 26:6. This usage of [Ntn] is infrequent, however, and the examples listed differ from our text in that there [Ntn] is used in conjunction with [vtn], which designates the one on whom the penalty is imposed; therefore, whereas the sense "impose penalty" is possible, the other sense, "to pay money," seems the more likely. Cf. U. Cassuto (A Commentary on the Book of Exodus [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967] 275), who renders "You 0 judge (or you, 0 Israel, through the judge who represents you) shall adopt the principle of 'life for life'"; "Schwienhorst-Schonberger (Das Bundesbuch, 126) who renders "you are to utilize [the principle]"; and TWAT 5.696 which shows that [Ntn] can take the sense of [vtn] and [vtn].
thirty shekels of silver to his master”; and in the context of bailments Exod 22:6, "If a man gives [נְתַנָּה] his fellow silver." Hence, the general employment of נְתַנָּה in the verses surrounding Exod 21:23-25 suggests the giving of money is a probable meaning in v. 23 as well.\(^{18}\)

Fourth, the usage of the word translated “for” (תָּתַנָּה) is consistent with the monetary interpretation. The meaning here can be taken as "instead of, in place of," that is, substitutionary compensation--"eye in compensation for an eye." This usage is illustrated in Exod 21:26b, 27b where a bondsman whose master has struck out his eye or tooth is freed in compensation for/in place of the eye or tooth he lost. Likewise, in Exod 21:36, if an ox was known to be a gorer and yet it was permitted to gore to death another man's ox, the owner is negligent and must make restitution "ox for נְתַנָּה ox," that is, he must provide compensation either by giving the monetary value of an ox, or by providing the live animal itself as a substitute for the dead one. In Exod 21:37 a thief makes restitution "five members of the herd in place of נְתַנָּה the ox" he stole, and "four members of the flock in place of נְתַנָּה the sheep." That is, he compensates for his stealing by restoring not only a replacement for the sheep or ox he stole, but also by providing additional sheep (or their monetary value) as a penalty for the act. This monetary understanding of נְתַנָּה is further supported by the parallel in Deut 19:21 where the נְתַנָּה is replaced by בּ, the beth preti, "of price."

Some arguments can be raised in support of taking the lex talionis as literal retaliation, but they are not conclusive. The usual understanding of the Ancient Near Eastern laws takes the references to talion there quite literally. A. S. Diamond,\(^{19}\) for example, supports this view by citing LH (Laws of Hammurapi) §§229-30:

If a builder has constructed a house for a seignior but did not make his work strong, with the result that the house which he built collapsed and so has caused the death of the owner of the house, that builder shall be put to death. If it has caused the death of a son of the owner of the house, they shall put the son of that builder to death.\(^{20}\)

Diamond also cites LH §§196-97: "If a seignior has destroyed the eye of a member of the aristocracy, they shall destroy his eye. If he has broken a(nother) seignior's bone, they shall break his bone." Diamond draws further support from the "sympathetic" sanction of MAL (Middle Assyrian Laws) §9, which decrees the cutting of man's lower lip for kissing a married woman.

\(^{18}\) Compare the frequent employment of the Akkadian cognate nadanu in economic texts for the payment of money (C4D N 1.45-46). Schwienhorst-Schonberger (Das Bundesbuch, 102) thinks the Akkadian expression "X kima X nadanu" corresponds to the Hebrew expression "X נְתַנָּה X נְתַנָּה," both meaning "to pay a sum corresponding to the value of X."

\(^{19}\) Diamond, "Eye for an Eye," 151-55.

\(^{20}\) My translations of cuneiform laws are from ANET.
R. Westbrook, however, argues that even in Ancient Near Eastern laws that appear to demand a literal talion there is an unstated assumption that a ransom of money could be substituted for literal talion. Scholars have noted the contrast between the LH §196 (above), where literal talion seems to be specified, and LE (Laws of Eshnunna) §42, where it is not: "If a man bites the nose of another man and severs it, he shall pay 1 mina of silver. (For) an eye, (he shall pay) one mina of silver, (for) a tooth, 1/2 mina; (for) an ear, 1/2 mina; (for) a slap in the face 10 shekels of silver." Such differences have often been explained on the basis of supposed progress from a "primitive" society where literal talionic maiming was applied, to the more advanced society where payment of money substituted for literal talion.

However, the contrast between LH §§229-30, 196-97 and LE §42 just cited contradicts this theory in that the latter with its pecuniary penalty preceeds by a few years those of Hammurapi with its literal talion. The contrast, moreover, is unexpected, since the two collections are from societies that are closely related chronologically, geographically, and culturally. Westbrook argues that this difference is more apparent than real. The solution to this discrepancy, according to Westbrook, is that the "ransom" principle operated in Mesopotamia as it did in Israel, so that the statement in the Laws of Hammurapi requiring talion also assumes the possibility of ransom. The LE §42 simply specifies the ransom price appropriate to various injuries. Among other examples Westbrook uses to support his thesis is MAL B §2, where in the case of murder the "owner of the life" can either execute the murderer or receive compensation from him.

J. J. Finkelstein has pointed out the absurdity of taking some of the Mesopotamian laws literally. He notes that LH §230 (cited above) could not be applied literally in the case of a builder who had no son. Even more absurd if applied literally is LH §218 which states that a physician whose patient dies in surgery or is blinded by surgery is to have his hand cut off. Finkelstein remarks that "it is inconceivable that any sane person in ancient Mesopotamia would have been willing to enter the surgeon's profession" if such a law were literally enforced. Finkelstein concludes that such laws were never meant to be complied with literally even when they were first drawn up, but that they were from the beginning hyperbolic, having more of an admonitory than a legal function, saying in effect, "Woe to contractors and physicians who because of negligence, greed, laziness, or any other reason endanger the life and limb of others." It can be added, however, that if a system of ransom were assumed where the life of the builder or his son could be redeemed and the hand of the physician could

21 This theory is also contradicted by the early Sumerian collection of laws, the Laws of Ur-Nammu, where pecuniary penalties occur rather than talion.
23 Finkelstein, Ox that Gored, 34-35.
be redeemed by pecuniary ransom, these laws would not only have an admonitory function (for which the more graphic statement of the penalty-execution or mutilation—is more effective), but would also be practical as law. Such observations support Westbrook's view.

It has also been argued that literal talion was practiced in the Bible. One passage cited in this regard is Judg 1:6-7, which records the cutting off of thumbs and big toes of king Adoni-Bezek, who himself had previously done the same to seventy kings. Although this is often taken as a literal application of the principle of *lex talionis*, it may be more "poetic justice" than an application of the original, intended meaning of this law.\footnote{So also similar statements of "poetic justice" in the prophets who predict that crimes committed by people against others will, as punishment, be inflicted on the offenders need not be considered direct application of this law.}

Lev 24:19-20 also sounds like a literal application of talion: "If anyone maims his fellow, as he has done, so shall it be done to him: fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth. The injury which he inflicted on another shall be inflicted on him." This prima facie seems to imply literal talion, but such language does not do so necessarily. Lev 24:17-18 applies the principle of "life for life" to cover not only homicide, but also the destruction of a beast. In the case of an animal monetary substitution surely would have been acceptable. In addition, literal sounding language is not always literal. As Ibn Ezra pointed out, Samson in Judg 15:11 says, "as they have done to me, so I did to them," yet he had not done exactly what the Philistines had done to him, for they had burned to death his wife and father-in-law (Judg 15:6), but he simply slaughtered a great many of them (Judg 15:8).\footnote{Cited by Doron, "A New Look at an Old Lex," 25-26.}

In a similar way, in Lev 24:20, the "injury which he inflicted upon another" could be "inflicted on him" not by exact reduplication of the injury, but figuratively through a ransom which served as a substitute for that injury. Moreover, in Deut 19:15-21, the so-called lex talionis--is applied to the case of a false witness, with the judgment that whatever verdict would have been carried out against the falsely accused should be carried out against the false witness. Here the so-called talionic formula "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot" is not applied literally, but merely means that the punishment varies with the severity of the accusation. On the basis of these arguments, a strong case can be made that the *lex talionis* did not have to be carried out literally, but could have been applied figuratively through payment of ransom in order to achieve composition.

The purpose of the *lex talionis* is to express the principle that the (monetary) penalty one can demand for an injury must be proportional to the degree of injury involved so that the less the injury, the less should be the penalty. Moreover, it limits the penalty to the monetary equivalent of the injury caused, excluding punitive damages (e.g., "two eyes for an eye").
As for the formulation "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth," which has a poetic ring to it, there is clear organization in three sections: (1) "life for life" representing the most serious, i.e., deadly injury; (2) "eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot" representing various parts of the body injured, working progressively from the head down to the foot; (3) "burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" representing various types of injuries. In this regard, categories (2) and (3) overlap—one can have a "wound" to a "foot" or "hand." It can also be noted that at least one element of this formula, e.g., "burning for burning," is an unlikely injury in the context of a blow to a pregnant woman. This confirms the conclusion that this formula is broader than the present context, expressing a general principle in a poetic/proverbial manner, a conclusion supported by the partial repeating of the formulation in Lev 24:18b, 20 (where "breaking for breaking" is added before "eye for eye" and the formula ends with "tooth for tooth"), and Deut 19:21 (where only "life for life" through "foot for foot" is quoted, and the preposition Perspectives replaces הָז, for"). In this context, the **lex talionis** is saying that if there is any further injury, no set rule can be given, but the extent of the (monetary) penalties paid to the aggrieved family should correspond to the extent of the injuries. As for the specific amount of payment for a specific injury, Exod 21:22 and 21:30 suggest that this was a matter of tort between the family and the offender. As a practical matter, judges could well become involved should the parties fail to agree on a price (cf. Deut 21:18-21 where the elders confirn that a son is incorrigible before allowing the parents to have him executed), though not necessarily otherwise. If judges became involved, guidelines such as those at Eshnunna (cr. LE §42 above) could well have been utilized, though presumably with enough flexibility to allow the judge to take into account individual circumstances.

The conclusion that the **lex talionis** has to do with composition is important since it undermines one line of argument that draws a distinction between the death of the fetus, in which money is paid, and the death of the mother, which is said to be a capital offense where "life for life" is exacted in terms of literal execution. On the contrary, the above argumentation has attempted to show that "life for life" in the present context probably does not imply capital punishment, but rather alludes to a system where composition is achieved through a ransom which substitutes for talion. If so, there is no distinction in the quality or kind of punishment between the death of the mother and the death of the child whether or not one sees miscarriage in the case without מְשֹׁר.

3. **What is the Meaning of מְשֹׁר?**

The key term מְשֹׁר is a rare one used but five times in the OT (twice in Exod 21:22-25 and three more times in the Joseph Story, Oen 42:4,38 and

---

It is also used in Sir 34:22; 38:18; 41:9 in the Apocrypha. Most interpreters have felt the general meaning offered by BDB, "mischiefs, evil, harm," to be more or less correct. A few interpreters assert that this word more specifically implies "deadly calamity" or the like, support for which can be derived from the occurrences in Genesis in which יָסָר is used of Joseph's alleged death by the attack of a wild animal.

A quite different view of יָסָר has been offered by R. Westbrook. He claims יָסָר does not mean "deadly calamity," but refers to "cases where responsibility cannot be located." This new meaning radically affects the overall interpretation. The woman, according to Westbrook, has a miscarriage after being struck in a brawl, but in the first instance there is not יָסָר that is, there is not a case of "perpetrator unknown," but rather the culprit is known. In that case the culprit pays the fine "alone" (וֹלֵך לָהוֹ). But if there is a case of יָסָר, so that responsibility among the men (more than two being involved) cannot be established, then "you" pay "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth," the "you" referring to Israel as a whole as elsewhere in the Book of the Covenant. The second half of this regulation is thus an example of a humanitarian principle that the Israelite community as a whole (through its representative) should compensate persons who suffer a loss where individual responsibility cannot be established.

Westbrook claims to find this meaning of יָסָר in Gen 42:4, 38; 44:29, the only other OT occurrences of this word. Westbrook adopts a suggestion of D. Daube that Jacob did not believe that Joseph was killed by a wild beast, but said so in Gen 37:31-33 because he was legally bound to acknowledge the evidence of Joseph's coat covered with blood and declare his sons innocent of negligence (cf. the analogous regulation in Exod 22:10-12, where bringing the carcass of a sheep torn to pieces removes from the shepherd the responsibility of making restitution). Later, then, when Jacob expresses fear that יָסָר would befall Benjamin as it did Joseph, he feared, says Westbrook, not just "calamity" but "a disaster for which no one can be blamed."

Westbrook's interpretation in Genesis is highly suspect, however. It is doubtful that Jacob would follow legal formalities privately with his own sons; such is more appropriate in a courtroom setting with persons outside of one's own immediate family. Moreover, it is far from clear that Jacob at first disbelieved the story of Joseph's demise, as the view adopted by Westbrook implies. Indeed, it is Jacob who, upon looking at Joseph's bloody garment, jumps to the conclusion that a wild beast had devoured him (Gen 37:33). His sons do not have to lie directly about the matter; they

27 Among the Rabbis, the Mek. states, "יתר יָסָר here only means death" (cited by Paul, Studies in the Book of the Covenant, 72 n. 3). KB ("todlicher Unfall") agrees.
28 Westbrook, "Lex Talionis," 52-69. j,
29 Ibid., 58-61.
simply do not contradict Jacob's false deduction. When he fears lest יָדוֹא befall Benjamin in Gen 42:4, he does not yet suspect the brothers of anything, so that a legally loaded meaning "disaster for which no one can be blamed" is inappropriate. It is only later in this chapter, when the brothers arrive back from Egypt with the grain and their money but without their brother Simeon, that Jacob begins to suspect the brothers of treachery, just as Joseph had planned for him to do by withholding Simeon and returning the money, making it appear as if they bought the grain by selling their brother.31 יָדוֹא in Gen 42:38 cannot refer to a "case where responsibility cannot be located" because Reuben in v. 37 specifically volunteers to take responsibility for the safety of Benjamin, and yet Jacob refuses to let him go lest יָדוֹא befall him.32 Moreover, in Gen 44:28-29 the brothers, who know Joseph only as an Egyptian official, repeat to Joseph Jacob's words to the effect that Jacob believed Joseph to have been torn by a beast, and fears יָדוֹא for his brother Benjamin as well. If יָדוֹא contained an obvious, implied suspicion of the brothers, they would not have incriminated themselves by repeating the accusation to an Egyptian official. In sum, יָדוֹא in Genesis need mean no more than "(deadly) disaster" from which Jacob wanted to protect Benjamin, the last remaining child of his favorite wife Rachel. Westbrook ignores the usage in Sirach, perhaps because he considers the meaning of יָדוֹא there to be a late development. It suffices to say that the meaning "a disaster for which no one can be blamed" does not fit the usage there.

Westbrook's meaning for יָדוֹא in Exod 21:22-25 does not fit the particulars of that case either. Westbrook supposes that the text contemplates a circumstance where the blame for striking the pregnant woman cannot be placed on any particular individuals. However, a case of striking a pregnant woman during a brawl seems an unlikely one for having a "perpetrator unknown." It is unlikely that a pregnant woman would be alone with strangers during a brawl. On the contrary, one would expect there to be plenty of witnesses: the woman, other brawlers, and gawking bystanders. Moreover, anonymity in the close-knit society of ancient Israel would be uncommon. The introduction of a "perpetrator unknown" prima facie seems farfetched.

The etymology of the word יָדוֹא perhaps speaks against Westbrook's "legal" interpretation of this term. יָדוֹא could well be derived from נָדוֹא meaning "to heal" (KB; contra BDB which takes it from נָדַּשׁ II "be sorrowful" based on an Arabic root). If so, יָדוֹא would be related to the noun נָדוֹא, which means "physician" in Talmudic Aramaic and in Syriac. This

32 Schwienhorst-Schonberger, Das Bundesbuch, 91.
term in turn is derived from Akkadian *asu*, itself a loanword from Sumerian A.ZU (traditionally "knower of the waters"). Denominative verbs have been derived secondarily from this non-Semitic noun in Aramaic (Aphel "to cure," Ithpaal "be cured, recover"). A reasonable interpretation is that the noun נַזְק in Biblical Hebrew is also a secondary development from this word, in which case נזק would be expected to be a medical, not a legal term, meaning something like "injury requiring attention of a physician, serious injury," from which a secondary sense such as "deadly injury" might have developed (cf. KB, "[healing, euphemism for] deathly accident"). In the context of Exod 21:22-25, נזק is not limited to "deadly injury"--even though that is the sense in Genesis--but "serious injury/medical calamity," including injuries up to and including death. This seems clear from the talionic formula after the case with נזק which does not end with "life for life," but contemplates various lesser injuries as well.

4. **What Is the Meaning of בהמַלֵּל?**

The philologically difficult term בהמַלֵּל cannot be pinned down with certainty. Traditionally it has been understood to mean "by judges/arbitrators" (to keep the husband from demanding too much, so Tg. Onq.), but this meaning is doubtful. Although the verb of this root does seem to have the meaning "to judge," the lexical meaning "judge" for מָלֵל is not well established from its only other occurrences in Deut 32:31 and Job 31:11. Moreover, the context of Exod 20:22-23:33 makes the interpretation "judges" doubtful. If one excludes the philologically and contextually far-fetched view that בהמַלֵּל in Exod 21:6 and/or 22:7-9 means "judges," we find that (excluding Exod 21:22) there is no direct reference to judges in the entire legal unit of Exod 20:22-23:33. Indeed, it seems that even among those regulations in the Book of the Covenant which might not appropriately be called "laws," those laws regularly lack administrative details such as who decides a case, who carries out a sentence, and how a sentence is to be carried out, all of which suggests that these so-called laws might be better characterized as moral comments on legal matters than as a complete law-code. This context casts further doubt on the traditional rendering.

---

33 S. A. Kaufman (*The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* [Assyriological Studies 19; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974] 37) provides some of this information, though he in fact rejects association of *asu* with נזק. CAD A II.347 rejects that A.ZU means "knower of the waters."

34 Interestingly, the Hebrew term for "to pray" (הלַמֵּל) can be understood as a HtD stem of this root meaning "to seek a judgment for oneself." Cf. M. Greenberg, *Biblical Prose Prayer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983) 21-22.

If מָלַל לִבְנָה does not refer to judges, then to what does it refer? There has long been a conjectural emendation that replaces this term with מִלְלַל לִבְנָה, meaning “the price of the miscarriage.”36 I am normally reluctant to accept conjectural emendation, but this reading cannot be altogether ruled out.

Another interpretation of מָלַל לִבְנָה was defended by E. Speiser.37 He argues that the root has to do with “reckoning, assessing” and that מָלַל לִבְנָה means "by assessment/reckoning." Hence, the penalty paid is assessed on the basis of the stage of the development of the dead fetus. The rationale for this view is that the later the stage of pregnancy, the more time has been lost to the woman, the greater the grief for the loss of a child, and the more difficult the miscarriage. This may have been the view of the LXX, which paraphrases מָלַל לִבְנָה as "imperfectly formed child" and translates מָלַל לִבְנָה "with valuation."38 Furthermore, Speiser's view gains credibility in that penalties for miscarriage actually do vary with the age of the dead fetus in the parallel ancient Hittite Law § 17, which states, "If anyone causes a free woman to miscarry-if (it is) the 10th month, he shall give ten shekels of silver, if (it is) the 5th month, he shall give five shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security."39

Speiser makes a good case for his interpretation of מָלַל לִבְנָה. Those who oppose abortion are understandably uncomfortable with this view because the life of a young fetus being worth less than that of an older one might be used to justify first trimester abortions when the fetus is less valuable. This conclusion is not a necessary deduction from Speiser's interpretation, however. Lev 27:1-8 gives monetary values for redeeming persons who have been given as a votive offering to the sanctuary. It is interesting to note that the monetary value assigned to people varies according to age and sex, from a low of three shekels for a girl between one month and five years, to a high of fifty shekels for a male aged twenty to sixty. Yet despite these differing monetary valuations, probably reflecting the market value of slaves, the intentional killing of anyone of them would be considered murder. The same could be true of the fetus, having a lower economic value for the family early in pregnancy, and a higher economic value later on, but perhaps being considered equally human throughout. Note also Exod 21:32 where a monetary value of thirty shekels is assigned to a male or female slave gored to death by an ox, but the transcendent life value of the slave

36 S. R. Driver (The Book of Exodus [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911] 219) attributed this view to Budde. It is mentioned by BDB.
38 μὴ ἐξεικουσθήμενον and μετὰ ἀξιωματος. The LXX seems to imply the view that an imperfectly formed child who is not yet viable independently of the mother is not yet fully human; consequently, there can be no case ἁμαρτα ("deadly injury") in the case of the death of the fetus. Weingreen, "The Concepts of Retaliation and Compensation in Biblical Law," 9-10, argues that the LXX's rendering was influenced by the debate among Greek thinkers as to whether or not the embryo is to be considered a living entity.
39 A later version of this law increases the penalties.
is nonetheless affirmed by the execution of the ox as a murderer for taking a human life in violation of Gen 9:5. This stoning of the ox is in contrast with the case where an ox gores an ox to death in which the goring ox need not be dispatched because human life is not involved.

There is another view of the meaning of למלס which is neutral on the question of whether or not the fetus dies. Westbrook, as we have seen, understands this root to imply the sense of "sole responsibility" and that למלס means "[he pays] alone." He argues that למלס in the G stem means "take sole responsibility" and in the D stem means "shift responsibility (to )L subject or object of verb "). ⁴⁰ A. Berlin, however, has rightly criticized Westbrook's emphasis on "sole/alone" in his view that למלס means "sole responsibility." Instead, she has made a good case that this root has to do simply with "responsibility, accountability." According to her, למלס means "as the culpable party." ⁴¹

Berlin's view could be slightly modified, however, by taking the ב as a "beth of price," and the plural as that of abstraction, and read the text, "he pays/gives the amount for which he is culpable" (lit. "amount of [ב] culpable ones/culpability"). If taken this way, the expression could refer to some customary set amount (perhaps varying according to the development of the fetus as in the Hittite Laws), or an amount which takes into account any extenuating circumstances. My translation above tentatively adopts this modification.

In summing, there are too many uncertainties to make any firm conclusions based on למלס.

5. Is There a Miscarriage in the Case without נבשא?

Does the case without נבשא imply the death of the fetus? My answer is yes, and several lines of argument support this conclusion: there are medical

⁴⁰ Westbrook ("Lex Talionis," 58-61) applies this view to various passages. Deut 32:31 reads, "For their rock is not as our rock; our enemies are alone" (למלס responsible for themselves). Job 31:11 & 28 takes מלח as "a sin for which I alone am responsible." 1 Sam 2:25, "If a man does wrong against a man, God may take the blame for him [למלס אלוהים], but if a man does wrong against the LORD, who will bear responsibility for him [למלס אלוהים]?" Ps 106:30, "Pinhas stood and took upon himself responsibility [למלס] and the plague was halted" (cf. Num 25:7-8, where what מלח refers to is taking bold initiative against the source of divine curse [Israel's sin] by killing an Israelite man in the act of immorality). Ezek 16:52, "You have taken responsibility [for the sins, מלח] of your sisters," i.e., Jerusalem, by being so much worse than her sister Samaria, has taken over responsibility for the sins of the latter. Gen 48:11, "And Israel said to Joseph, 'I did not take upon myself the responsibility [for holding out the hope] to see your face.'"

⁴¹ A. Berlin, "On the Meaning of מלח in the Bible," RB 96 (1989) 345-51. Kline ("Lex Talionis and the Human Fetus," 195-96) earlier came to a similar view that מלח has to do with incurring guilt, though he exceeds the evidence by claiming that it could mean "liability to death." I doubt Kline's view that the final mem is an emphatic enclitic since this is both rare and mainly limited to archaizing texts.
reasons for thinking this view likely; the use of the plural נָדַלְיָה gives support to it; and comparison with similar ANE laws suggest this line of interpretation.

First, the medical reasons. In the days before modern medical science, most premature births under these circumstances would result in the death of the fetus. R. N. Congdon, writing as a physician, remarks on this passage by reviewing modern medical statistics concerning premature births following physical trauma (usually automobile related) to a pregnant mother. He points out that only in the last six weeks (of a normal forty weeks) of pregnancy would an infant’s lungs be sufficiently developed for it to survive outside the womb. Apart from modern medical technology, any premature births before that time would result in fetal death. But not even premature birth in the last six weeks would necessarily result in a live birth. A blunt blow severe enough to induce premature labor frequently causes such damage as fetal skull fracture, disruption of the oxygen supply through the umbilical cord, uterine rupture, and overt disruption of connection between the placenta and the uterus, each of which is fatal for the fetus. Even less severe disruptions of the placenta creating an impaired oxygen supply, if not repaired, typically result in labor or in fetal death within forty-eight hours. Congdon concludes: "There are only a few instances, in a nontechnological era, in which blunt trauma serious enough to cause abortion of the fetus would result in a viable birth. If medical data has anything to say about Exodus 21:22, it indicates that the overwhelming probability for such a situation is an outcome of trauma-induced abortion with fetal demise."43

Another argument in favor of assuming the death of the fetus comes from the use of the plural נָדַלְיָה. One of the arguments used by W. Kaiser against assuming the death of the child is that if the author wanted to denote a miscarriage, he should have used the root חָשַׁל (a verb used of miscarriages, cf. Exod 23:26) along with דַלְיָה. This argument from silence is not particularly strong, however. It could be turned on its head by posing an equally weak argument from silence: why did the author not use the ordinary word for a live birth דַלְיָה, if he had that in mind, rather than the more ambiguous חָשַׁל ("came out")? The better answer to Kaiser, however, is to observe that the author does not need to use the term for miscarriage because the plural form נָדַלְיָה is a plural of abstraction with the sense "the product of her womb," an apt term for an inadequately developed baby.45

Other explanations for this plural are unconvincing. C. E Keil argued that the plural נָדַלְיָה occurs "because there might possibly be more than

44 Kaiser, Ethics, 170 n. 22.
45 The recent monograph by Schwienhorst-Schonberger (Das Bundesbuch, 97-98) has come independently to similar conclusions.
one child in the womb."\textsuperscript{46} This seems farfetched, however, since the possibility of twins introduces an unneeded complication to the point being made by this case. Kaiser adds that the plural "allows for... either sex,"\textsuperscript{47} but this suggestion too is an irrelevant complication; moreover, such a plural is not the way in which the Book of the Covenant expresses the idea that a regulation applies regardless of sex (for that we expect something like נולדה יא; cf. Exod 21:15, 17, 28, 31, 32).

More plausible is the view that the plural refers to a not fully developed fetus that is nonviable when born, and that the plural of abstraction "the product of her womb" is used proleptically in anticipation of, or foreshadowing, the fatal outcome (note that the situation described would usually result in stillbirth). This interpretation, by the way, need not imply that a live, unaborted fetus is subhuman. It merely implies that a corpse is sub-human.

Finally, the comparison with ANE laws confirms the view that the fetus is assumed to have died. When the case laws in the Bible are compared with those of the Ancient Near East, it is clear that in broad terms they come out of the cultural milieu. Indeed, the fact that in one case a biblical law is identical in wording with a known, earlier Mesopotamian one (cf. Exod 21:35 and LE §53) suggests some literary dependence. I argue (in general agreement with Cassuto)\textsuperscript{48} that biblical laws are essentially making [moral comments on legal matters, but that their wording draws upon legal traditions that would have been known to the Israelites, though modifying those laws to express a uniquely Israelite ideology. But since Mesopotamian legal traditions (probably via the Canaanites) are being drawn upon, it is not irrelevant to make comparisons (and contrasts) with cuneiform laws that deal with similar subject matters, as has been the universal practice of modern scholars of biblical law.

When this is done, it is discovered that not only Hittite Laws §17, but also Sumerian Laws §§1-2, what has been provisionally taken as part of the Laws of Lipit Ishtar,\textsuperscript{49} LH §§209-14, and MAL §§A 21,50-52 all refer to causing a miscarriage by striking a woman (sometimes discussing the penalties for killing her in the process), but none of them contemplates the possibility of a birth of a viable baby. Surely this evidence suggests that our case, where the language is a bit ambiguous and is set in a corpus of laws that is drawing upon contemporary legal traditions influenced by Mesopotamia, probably does not contemplate a viable birth either.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{47} Kaiser, \textit{Ethics}, 103.
\textsuperscript{48} Cassuto, \textit{Exodus}, 262.
\textsuperscript{49} Translated in M. Civil, "New Sumerian Law Fragments," in \textit{Studies Landsberger} (Assyriological Studies 16; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965) 4-6. The other texts are translated in ANET.
\textsuperscript{50} Paul (\textit{Studies in the Book of the Covenant}, 71 n. 1) correctly observes, "The fact that so many of the legal corpora specifically refer to [causing a miscarriage], which apparently was not too
We conclude that the death of the fetus is to be assumed so that the question of Ⱨ xe ("serious injury") applies solely to the mother.

6. How are the Changes in Person and Number in Exod 21:22-25 to be Explained?

We may now review our conclusions, paying particular attention to the changes in person and number in this passage. If there is no Ⱨ xe after the miscarriage, that is, no serious injury to the woman, then someone ought to pay the father for the economic loss to the family of the child. The purpose of the plurals (men brawl, men strike a pregnant woman) is to point out the accidental nature of the injury--they are fighting each other, not the woman, and are out of control.\(^{51}\) The switch to singular, "he pays," reflects an indefinite use of the singular.\(^{52}\) That is, "someone" pays, whether the most negligent party in the brawl (Berlin's view that בַּרְלָם means "as the culpable party" would go along with this view), or a representative of the men who brawled. The point is that the accidental, negligent taking of the life of an embryo has resulted in a great loss for the woman's family, and someone should compensate monetarily for the damage done by paying the father as the head of the family.

As for the other half of the regulation, if there is serious injury (Ⱨ xe) to the woman up to and including death, then the so-called lex talionis applies which states that the penalty, in this case monetary, should vary according to the degree of injury caused. The "you" (sing.) who pays according to this principle is Israel represented by an individual. Westbrook, as seen above, also argues that the "you" is Israel, but in his view Israel pays only if the guilty party cannot be determined. In my view, in contrast, the "you" is Israel personified as the guilty party and is not a different entity from the one who pays the fine בַּרְלָם to the husband.\(^{53}\) This usage of the second common, may be due to the literary dependence of one corpus upon another. That the Bible refers to it suggests some literary dependence. Kaiser (Ethics, 103) states, "We cannot agree that these laws are the proper background for [Exod 21:22-25]." To this I can only ask, why not?

\(^{51}\) Kline ("Lex talionis and the Human Fetus," 198) suggests this plural may be "the indefinite plural active used as a passive, signifying 'a pregnant woman is struck.' " But the ready antecedent בַּרְלָם ("men") speaks against this.


\(^{53}\) The singular "you" in biblical law flows easily between Israel as a whole personified as the original patriarch and a particular Israelite within Israel. Compare the use of second person singular elsewhere: the "you" in Exod 21:2 ("If you acquire a 'Hebrew' slave") is Israel represented by a an individual Israelite who happens to be a slaveholder; the "you" of Exod 21:14 ("from my altar you may take him") is Israel as represented through those responsible for executing murderers; the "you" of the Decalogue is Israel, and hence individual Israelites; "your poor" in Exod 23:6 is Israel's poor. For a complete discussion, see Dale Patrick, "I and Thou in the Covenant Code," SBLSP (1978) 1.71-86.
IV. Exod 21:22-25 and the Surrounding Context

The case of the pregnant woman struck during a brawl breaks a sequence between the two bondsman laws, Exod 21:20-21 having to do with striking a bondsman to death, and 21:26-27 having to do with injuring a bondsman. Why the case of the pregnant woman should come between these two has puzzled commentators.

According to D. Patrick, Exod 21:22-25's link with Exod 21:26-27 is only superficial. The case of the injured bondsman came to the lawgiver's mind because, like the lex talionis, it deals with "eye" and "tooth" and uses the term הָאָרֶץ. Others, less graciously, suggest scribal misadventure.

My own view, suggested to me by H. C. Brichto, is that Exod 21:20-27 as a group is fundamentally about injuries to bondsmen, specifically debt slaves as in Exod 21:2-5, which is a natural sequel to the discussion of injury to the full citizen in Exod 21:18-19. Exod 21:22-25 on the pregnant woman is parenthetical, though necessary to further the author's discussion of bondsmen.

What the case of the pregnant woman introduces is the principle that one should as a rule pay the exact monetary equivalent for mayhem that one caused even if the mayhem was unintentional, as the striking of the pregnant woman in a brawl among men would be. This principle was introduced, however, to form a contrast with the case of injury to a bondsman that follows. The case of injury to a bondsman by using similar language but drawing a quite different conclusion indicates that this principle does not apply in the case of a beating of a bondsman in which the beating is intentional (this is the master's right if for the purpose of making him work), but the maiming was (in all likelihood) unintentional. In this case, and unlike the talionic formula, the penalty does not vary according to the degree of injury, but maiming of any sort, as great as the loss of an eye, as little as the loss of a tooth, results in the bondsman's freedom and the loss of the master's investment, i.e., the master loses the time owed by the bondsman in lieu of the bondman's unpaid debt.

The reason why the talionic formula does not apply, but that any maiming results in the slave's freedom, is that this bondsman (being actually a "distrainee" or an "indentured servant" rather than a "slave"—cf. Exod 21:2-4) must be treated as a human being despite his reduced social status. The master has the right to the bondsman's time and to a limited extent can use force to make him work, but the master has no right to his bondsman's person. If he murders the bondsman, he is subject to "vengeance"
(Exod 21:20-21) as with the murder of any other human being; if he maims him, he loses all rights as master (Exod 21:26-27) since he has no right to treat another human being in that way. Hence the biblical author has artfully expressed a philosophical concept concerning the humanity of a bondsman by this juxtaposition of the case of the pregnant woman and the case of the maiming of a bondsman.

If this view is correct, the lex talionis was introduced not to prove the humanity of the fetus--it is quite ambiguous on that point--but rather to prove the humanity of slaves.

Conclusion

Although one might like to find definitive answers to the abortion question from Exod 21:22-25, it is not possible to do so. The detailed exegetical analysis of Exod 21:22-25 (lex talionis) given above shows the passage to be ill suited for establishing a biblical ethic concerning abortion.

On the one hand, the case of the pregnant woman does not disprove the humanity of the fetus. The killing of the fetus and the killing of the mother are treated alike: in both cases composition is achieved through payment of money. The text talks only about accidental killing, and exegetically from this passage alone we have no way of knowing whether the intentional killing of the fetus by its mother would have been considered murder. What is clear here is that the accidental killing of the unborn is punished. What about the intentional killing of the unborn? Would it go unpunished? Exod 21:22-25 does not exclude the possibility that the intentional killing of the mother and the intentional killing of the fetus would also be treated alike, that is, as murder.

On the other hand, the case of the pregnant woman cannot be used to prove the humanity of the fetus either. Contrary to the exegesis common among certain anti-abortion Christian theologians, the most likely view is that the death of the fetus is to be assumed throughout the entire case. It cannot be proven whether the formula “life for life” applies to the fetus since it occurs in the instance with ἄνυξις ("serious injury"), which deals exclusively with injuries to the mother. The wording of the case does not rule out the possibility that the fetus was considered subhuman. Rather than proving the humanity of the unborn, the passage instead serves (by its contrast with the subsequent case) to demonstrate the humanity of slaves.
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Palestinian Artifactual Evidence Supporting the Early Date of the Exodus

Bruce K. Waltke

THE ISSUE AND ITS IMPORTANCE

Assuming that Solomon built the temple ca. 970-960 B.C., the biblical numerical notices pertaining to the date of the Exodus in 1 Kings 6:1 and Judges 11:26 yield a mid-fifteenth century B.C. date for the Exodus.¹ But, in spite of these specific statements by the ancient historians, most contemporary Syro-Palestinian archaeologists and Old Testament historians date the Exodus about one hundred and fifty years later.²

Now the issue whether the Exodus occurred at ca. 1440 B.C. or ca. 1290 B.C. merits the attention being given to it by serious scholars of the Old Testament for at least two reasons. (1) Either the biblical prophet-historians have committed a historical blunder, and therefore the Bible is less than a completely trustworthy historical document on which man can rest his faith,³ or the numbers in the Bible must


be interpreted as meaning something other than their face value.\textsuperscript{4} If one opts for the second hypothesis he raises the question whether or not the Bible can be interpreted literally in other areas as well. (2) In addition to this theological and hermeneutical consideration, the question is also vital for historical reasons. All biblical chronology, the backbone of history, down to the Kingdom Period depends on this date.\textsuperscript{5} Furthermore, those who accept the grammatico-historical method of interpreting the Bible, which is by far the most commonly accepted method, must interpret all passages affected by this issue according to the appropriate historical background.

THE METHOD OF DECIDING THE ISSUE

Now while the writer has implicit faith in the Scriptures apart from man's verification of them, he has chosen in this article for its apologetic value to appraise some of the archaeological evidence related to the problem. In the article he hopes to make a modest contribution toward deciding the date of the Exodus by setting the date of the Conquest which occurred approximately forty years later. But by what accredited method can one decide the date of the Conquest? Here the writer proposes to compare the pertinent Palestinian artifactual evidence with the pertinent Old Testament textual evidence without consciously suppressing evidence. If these two lines of evidence regarding the Conquest coincide, and if the artifactual evidence can be dated, it seems reasonable to think that the date of the Conquest can be established.

Now according to the textual evidence the Israelites took the Canaanite cities in two different ways: most of them they occupied without first destroying them; but they burned three, Jericho (Josh. 6:24), Ai (Josh. 8:28), and Hazor (Josh. 11:13). The writer will consider first the cities they occupied without burning, and then he will consider the three cities they burned.

With regard to the cities occupied by the Israelites without burning, the adherents to the theory of the late date of the Exodus commit two fundamental errors. First, they set aside the textual evidence that these cities were not burned before the Israelites occupied them, and instead they presume that the Israelite capture of a

\textsuperscript{4} Harrison, p. 317.
\textsuperscript{5} J. Barton Payne, \textit{An Outline of Hebrew History} (Grand Rapids, 1954), pp.34-36.
town is likely to be marked by destruction. But the biblical historian's account of the Conquest recorded in Joshua flatly contradicts this presumption. He recorded: "Israel did not burn any city which stood on its tell, except Hazor only, that did Joshua burn" (Josh. 11:13). Now admittedly he referred in this statement to the "tells of Northern Palestine, but his account of the capture of the tells in Southern Palestine states only that Joshua "took" (laqad) them. By contrast in the case of Ai and Jericho he stated that Joshua "burned" (saraph) them. By taking most of the Canaanite cities without first destroying them, Joshua would have fulfilled Yahweh's promise to Israel: "to give you great and splendid cities which you did not build; houses filled with all kinds of goods which you did not put there" (Deut. 6:10-11). Cities burned to the ground do not yield to their captors houses filled with all kinds of goods.

Secondly, having set aside the biblical textual evidence, the late date critic now commits the logical error of circular reasoning. Confident from the Egyptian artifactual evidence that the Conquest occurred at ca. 1250 B.C., he interprets the destruction layers dated in the second half of the thirteenth century B.C., and attested at a number of hill country sites (Tell Beit Mirsim C², Beth-Shemesh IVb?, Hazor Lower Canaanite City I, Lachish Temple III, Bethel L.B.), as the result of the Israelite invasion. Having interpreted these mute layers of destruction by his assumption, he now uses this evidence to support his thesis that the Israelites brought the Canaanite Bronze Age to an end in the mid-thirteenth century B.C. The argument is obviously circular and not convincing. Critics of the late date theory have long pointed out that other historical events could account for these layers of destruction; viz., the raids into Palestine carried out by Merneptah of Egypt ca. 1230 B.C., or the raids of

9 G. Ernst Wright, "The Archaeology of Palestine," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, ed. by G. Ernst Wright (Garden City, New York, 1961), p. 94.
the People of the Sea at ca. 1200 B.C., or by the Israelites in their continuing seesaw struggle with the Canaanites during the time of the Judges.

Now the writer proposes that in order not to commit the first error of disregarding the textual evidence one should examine the material culture and the pottery during the period 1400 B.C. to 1200 B.C. instead of the destruction levels at these hill country sites. Now it is a fact that wherever within this period one puts the arrival of the Israelites, there is no complete break in the culture within the period. This should come as no surprise for migratory tribes such as the Israelites had been would not be expected to carry large equipment or durable material objects. Their containers may well have been made mainly of skin, and their place of worship was portable and temporary, a tent. Kenyon wrote: "History and archaeology show again and again how such bands, coming amongst a settled population, tend to adopt the material culture (which alone is reflected archaeologically) of that population." On the other hand, while it is a fact that there is no complete break in the material culture, it is also a fact that the sharpest change in the culture occurs at the transition from Late Bronze I to Late Bronze IIA (ca. 1400 B.C.). Concerning this fact Kenyon wrote: "... at the beginning ... the biggest change occurs, with the transition from L.B.I to II, when the culture does seem to show a marked deterioration. In the pottery, for instance, there is the introduction of a class of saucer bowls of a very plain and undeveloped form, which form one of the least attractive series in the whole of Palestinian pottery. The archaeological remains are undistinguished and the objects found suggest a low level of artistic ability." The crude art of the period is well represented by a stone libation tray from Tell Beit Mirsim. Kenyon noted: "Such a situation would well reflect the state of affairs during the acclimatisation to settled life of wanderers such as the Habiru bands of the Amarna Letters and the Israelites of the Old Testament." In a word, the material culture suggests the date

15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
1400 B.C. as the most likely time for the Israelite occupation of these cities.

Moreover, it must not be assumed that the Israelites could not have been responsible for the Canaanite temples19 and the crude Astarte plaques which are the most common cult object on almost all the sites of this period,20 for the historian who wrote the book of Judges bitterly recalls Israel's continual practice of adopting the Canaanite religion in preference to the more austere religion of Yahweh.21 Even during the prophetic period abundant artifactual evidence has been unearthed attesting the prophetic denunciations that the Israelites adopted the Canaanite cult.22

Now if the Israelites were responsible for this marked deterioration in the material cultures in the cities of the hill country at the beginning of Late Bronze (ca. 1400 B.C.) it follows that the same situation ought not to prevail in the great cities in the north, Beth-shan and Megiddo on the borders of the Plain of Esdraelon, since they did not fall into Israelite hands until comparatively late.23 Now remarkably, this is precisely the situation. With regard to Megiddo Kenyon noted: "Megiddo presents a contrast to the other sites for which we have evidence, for the level of culture here does not seem to reach such a low ebb. The buildings, as far as they have been excavated, have indications of architectural pretensions. The pottery is not so exceedingly uninteresting, for the crude saucer forms found on other sites are hardly present here, and the pottery decoration

21 Judges 2:11 fl.
22 For example, the little model sanctuary found at Tell el-Far‘ah dated in the 10th or 9th century B.C., and similar to several other pious household objects found in Cyprus, at Megiddo, and in Transjordan. See R. de Vaux, "The Excavations at Tell el-Far‘ah and the Site of Ancient Tirzah," Palestine Exploration Quarterly [hereafter PEQ], 1956, p. 132. Gowan goes so far as to say: "The phenomenon of syncretism scarcely needs extensive discussion in this paper. One need only read the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings to be convinced that Israelite worship from the Conquest on was thoroughly mingled with aspects of the Canaanite fertility religion, and that this was not, for the majority of Israelites, considered apostasy, but was the commonly accepted thing" (Donald E. Gowan, "The Syncretistic Cult in Israel," Transitions in Biblical Scholarship, ed. by J. Coert Rylaarsdam [Chicago, 1968], pp. 96-97).
23 Judges 1:19.
found during L.B. I has its continuation, though it is less elaborate. Most striking of all is the collection of ivories found in the ruins of the palace in the second phase of VII, which provide an indication of the cultural tastes at least of the ruling classes."\(^{24}\) She concluded: "Megiddo, therefore, though it may have had a share in political disturbances, was not submerged in the increasing tide of barbarism."\(^{25}\) Beth-shan likewise exhibits a high degree of civilization.\(^{26}\) Now to be sure, this archaeological evidence does not conclusively prove that the presence of Israelites occasioned the cultural decline in many strong cities and their absence explains the greater degree of civilization in those cities along the great land route controlled by the Egyptians. But it must be agreed that the literary evidence of Joshua-Judges comports favorably with the only valid archaeological evidence, and that this evidence points to an invasion of migratory bands such as the Israelites would have been at about 1400 B.C.

**THE CITIES BURNED ON THEIR TELLS**

The writer now turns his attention to the cities burned on their tells: Ai, Jericho, and Hazor respectively.

**AI**

Most recently David Livingston in a superb article on the identification of biblical Bethel and Ai, has brought together strong objections to the common identification of historical Ai with Et-Tell. Rather, he argues in detail that Bireh is to be identified with Bethel. If this identification should prove to be right some small unnamed ruin one and a half miles to the southeast, and on the other side of a high hill (Et-Tawil) may be biblical Ai.\(^{27}\) Regarding this new suggestion D. J. Wiseman, professor of Assyriology at the University of London, writes:

> It must be emphasized that this new suggestion of Mr. Livingston must remain an unproven theory until checked by archaeological soundings at both places for the evidence for the identification and location of Bethel and Ai is interrelated. By noting this new theory here, the reader is reminded that the validity of the biblical text and history will remain unchanged despite often changing interpretations and hypotheses concerning it. Much archaeological work and interpretation falls far short of positive and conclusive evidence.


\(^{25}\) Ibid., p. 218.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., pp. 218-19.

This is especially the case in identifying places from which no epigraphic evidence has been produced. . . . Pending sure identification the student of the Bible has every right to hold to the explicit statement of Scripture rather than to any passing idea even though the latter may seem to support him.  

Until the site of ancient Ai is located this enigmatic city must continue to remain without consideration in deciding the issue.

JERICHO

The writer now turns to the most disputed site, Jericho (Tell es-Sultan). The biblical historians give these three statements about Jericho during this disputed period that are subject to archaeological research: (1) when the Israelites conquered the city the walls collapsed (Josh. 6:20), (2) the Israelites burned the city (Josh. 6:24), and (3) the city was probably reoccupied shortly after the Conquest, first by the Benjamites, and then by Eglon (ca. 1320 B.C. according to the chronology of Judges) (Josh. 18:21, Judg. 3:12-14). Now even though little remains on the tell from the Late Bronze Age probably because of its long exposure between the Israelite invasion and the time of Ahab, the writer will consider these features respectively.

The walls. Everyone but the most naive tourist knows now that Garstang's "Late Bronze Age" walls which he associated with the Israelite invasion actually date from the Early Bronze Age, over five hundred years before Joshua, because Miss Kenyon subsequently identified both Early Bronze Age remains with these walls, and Middle Bronze Age material overlaying them. She wrote: "It is a sad fact that of the town walls of the Late Bronze Age, within which period the attack of the Israelites must fall by any dating, not a trace remains." 

The burnt debris. But in the upper levels of the store rooms joining the palace on the knoll, located on the slope, and first built in the Middle Bronze Age, there is debris accumulation merging with the overlying "Streak," the term the original excavators used to describe a well-defined stratigraphical feature which is "clearly burnt material washed down the hill" [italics mine]. Now both the upper debris in the store rooms and the "Streak" contained a con-

29 Kathleen M. Kenyon, Digging Up Jericho (New York, 1957) [hereafter DUJ], p. 263.
30 Ibid., p. 170.
31 Ibid., pp. 261-62.
sizable quantity of pottery from the first half of the fourteenth century. Having analyzed the pottery "from the upper level above the ruins of the store rooms" and "from the 'Streak' of debris above the store rooms," Kenyon concluded: "As a group, the pottery has connections with Megiddo Level VIII (1479 B.C.-1350 B.C.), but also definite links with VII. The closest Beth-shan parallels are to Stratum IX (first half fourteenth century)." Miss Kenyon rejected the analysis of Albright and Garstang that it can be related to forms from the second half of the thirteenth century. She wrote: "The closeness of the material to Beth-shan IX is generally admitted, and both Professor Garstang and Professor Albright also link it with Stratum VIII (second half of fourteenth century B.C.). On the published evidence, it does not, however, seem to be very close to that from the later level, and the Jericho group can at most just overlap, but not equate with it." In a word, according to Kenyon, the latest burnt debris from the Late Bronze Age city cannot be dated later than mid-fourteenth century B.C., and probably belongs to the L.B. IIA period (1410 B.C.-1340 B.C.). Now admittedly she formed this conclusion about the pottery about twenty years ago, but in the 1970 edition of her work, *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, she still refers her readers to this article written in 1951, and she does not modify her statements in the appendix.

Now can the fall of the city be dated more precisely during the Late Bronze IIA period? Garstang argued convincingly that the Conquest must have occurred before the reign of Akhenaten, who began to reign ca. 1375 B.C., because: (1) not one of the distinctive, plentiful, and well-established archaeological criteria characteristic of Akhenaten's reign has been found in either the city or the tombs; (2) there is no reference to Jericho in the Amarna letters dated to Akhenaten's reign, though numerous cities of Canaan are mentioned frequently; (3) there is no scarab after Amenhotep III (1412 B.C.-1375 B.C.) though there survived an abundant and continuous series of scarabs of the Egyptian kings from the Middle Bronze Age right on down through the reign of Hatshepsut, Thutmose III, and

32 Kathleen M. Kenyon, "Some Notes on the History of Jericho," *PEQ*, 1951, p. 120.
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Amenhotep III of the Late Bronze I period. Confessedly these are all negative evidences and may be subject to other explanations than that the Canaanite city ceased to exist before 1375 B.C., but together they lead to the plausible suggestion that the destruction of the city previously established by the ceramic evidence between 1410 B.C. and 1340 B.C. occurred before 1375 B.C.

The evidence of occupation after the destruction of Late Bronze Age II A. Now the latest pottery from tombs 4, 5, and 13 is best dated to the second-half of the fourteenth century. Garstang related this pottery to the later, unimportant, sporadic habitation suggested in the Old Testament, and expected because of the advantageous situation of the site. Kenyon, on the other hand, held that this pottery (exhibits Canaanite occupation until about 1325 B.C. at which time the Canaanites abandoned the tell.

In order to clarify this evidence from the tombs appeal is now made to the "Middle Building" found on the tell. Was it built during the fourteenth century Canaanite occupation? or was it built after the destruction attested in Late Bronze IIA?

Garstang originally ascribed the Middle Building to the city conquered by Joshua. But with the generally accepted revision of the dating of the pottery from Beth-shan downward he revised the date of the building down to the second half of the Late Bronze Age. On this erroneous basis, as it appears to the writer, he suggested that the building was intrusive and possibly to be attributed to Eglon, King of Moab, at the end of the century.

Kenyon, however, noted that no ceramic dating evidence is published from the Middle Building itself. But even though the building could not be dated by ceramic evidence, she attempted to date it by stratigraphic evidence. On this basis she originally con-

---

39 Ibid., pp. 115-18, 126-27.
40 For example, Kenyon explains the scarabs of Hatshepsut, Thutmose III, and Amenhotep III as heirlooms to fit her theory that the tell was abandoned during L.B. I (see Kenyon, PEQ, p. 117). While this is a possible explanation it is also a possibility that their names were engraved on the scarabs after their death because scarabs were believed to possess protective powers. The names of well-known and popular rulers recur very frequently on these mantic objects (Palestine Museum, Gallery Book No.1, Nos. 1417-1441, unpublished).
41 Kenyon, PEQ, p. 138.
43 Kenyon, DUIJ, p. 261.
44 Called the "Middle Building" because it was found between the block building of Ahab's time and the storerooms of the Bronze Age.
45 Garstang, p. 177.
46 Ibid., pp. 171-80.
47 Kenyon, AHL, p. 210; PEQ, p. 121.
cluded that Garstang's interpretation of the building after all was clear. In her original article she wrote: "It is clear from photographs and from published section. . . that most of what survived was foundational, and therefore was dug into the surrounding layers. These layers consisted of the upper debris in the store rooms and the 'Streak'. . . . From the startification it is quite clear that these have nothing to do with the Middle Building, but represent the pre-existing accumulation." Now if the "Streak" can be dated by its pottery between 1400 B.C. and 1350 B.C., and if the Middle Building was dug into the surrounding layers, then the building must be later than the destruction represented by these layers and must be dated after 1340 B.C. In her later writings, however, Miss Kenyon reversed herself, and without producing any new evidence, she erroneously dated the building by the debris beneath it.

If then a substantial building such as the Middle Building was secondarily introduced on the tell after the destruction represented by the "Streak," one has good reason to think that the few recognizably late pottery examples from the tombs belong to this occupation and cannot be used to date the Conquest.

Finally, in connection with the subsequent occupation of the tell after its destruction, there is no evidence of any occupation after 1325 B.C. Kenyon insisted: "There is no evidence at all of it in stray finds or in tombs." Conclusion. Although meager, yet the textual and the archaeological evidence regarding Jericho in Late Bronze IIA and B remarkably coincide, and once again the archaeological evidence suggests a conquest during the first quarter of the fourteenth century. Even more conclusive, however, is the evidence that the city was not occupied during the mid-thirteenth century B.C., thereby precluding the option of the commonly accepted late date for the Exodus.

HAZOR

The writer now considers Hazor, the third city burned on its tell. The site of Hazar (Tell el-Qedah/Tell Waqqas) comprises two distinct areas: the Tell proper, covering less than twenty-five acres, and a large rectangular plateau covering more than one hundred and seventy-five acres, called by the most recent excavators "the Lower Canaanite City." Yigael Yadin, et al. have reached the

49 Kenyon, *PEQ*, p. 120.
50 Kenyon, *DUJ*, pp. 262-63.
51 Ibid.
Solomonic period but have not as yet reached the Bronze Age strata I on the Tell proper.\textsuperscript{52} On the other hand they have disclosed on the Lower Canaanite City the earliest stratum dated at the second part of the Middle Bronze Age [ca. 1750 B.C.] while the latest belongs to the end of the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{53} Professor Aharoni, one of the team that excavated the Tell, however, assured his readers that this violent and long lasting end of the Late Bronze Age marked the end of Canaanite occupation on the high tell as well.\textsuperscript{54} Likewise in their principal publications on the excavations the teams asserted that they think they know the synchronization between the strata of the Lower Canaanite City and the strata of the Upper City.\textsuperscript{55} Presumably they are the same.

Now the Lower Canaanite City in the Late Bronze Age has three main strata, each of which ends with a destruction layer.\textsuperscript{56} Of interest here are these destruction layers for they belong to the disputed period between ca. 1400 B.C. and 1200 B.C. The earliest destruction layer related to our discussion terminated Stratum III, dated Late Bronze I, and belongs to the Pre-Amarna Age, viz., about 1400 B.C. The recent excavators recorded: "Stratum 1B [=General Stratum II] was built after stratum 2 [=General Stratum III] had been completely destroyed."\textsuperscript{57} In an earlier report regarding the destruction of the gate built on the gate of Middle Bronze II and before the final destruction of Hazor, so presumably belonging to the destruction of about 1400 B.C., Yadin wrote: "This gate must have been destroyed in a violent conflagration, traces of burnt bricks of its inner walls and the ashes of the burnt beams still cover the floors in thick heaps."\textsuperscript{58}

General Stratum II (=Late Bronze IIA) likewise ends with a destruction level at the end of ca. 1300 B.C. The final report reads: "It can be determined. . . that Stratum 1B [=General Stratum II] is the stratum of El-Amarna age at Hazor . . . The end of Stratum 1B may also perhaps be fixed with the help of the tomb-finds and the finds on the floors of the buildings. As stated, the imported finds

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{55} Yigael Yadin, \textit{et al.}, \textit{Hazor II} (Jerusalem, 1960); p. 165.
\textsuperscript{56} See the synchronization table of the strata in the Lower Canaanite City in Yadin, \textit{Hazor II}, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 92.
in the Tombs have nothing later than the end of the 14th century."\(^59\) A paragraph later they spoke of the end of Stratum 1B in terms of "its destruction."\(^60\)

General Stratum I (=Late Bronze IIB, ca. 1300-1260/30) likewise ends in destruction. They concluded: "This enables us to state that City 1A [=General Stratum I] began at the opening of the 13th century. . . . The few Mycenaean wares belonging to type IIIB enable the end of the stratum to be dated not later than the last third of the 13th century. . . . It may be concluded that City 1A was destroyed in the second third of the 13th century."\(^61\)

There are then from the Late Bronze Age Canaanite city, layers of destruction at ca. 1400 B.C., ca. +1300 B.C. and ca. +1230 B.C. Moreover, there is no occupation after 1230 B.C. on the Lower Canaanite City and a probable gap on the Tell between 1230 B.C. and the era of Solomon. The interpretive problem then is: "With which of these three strata shall one associate Joshua?" Most probably Yadin is correct in his suggestion that the destruction level at ca. +1300 B.C. should be associated with the burning of the city by Seti I (ca. 1318 B.C.).\(^62\) So then one is left with the destruction levels at 1400 B.C. and 1230 B.C. Yadin opted for the 1230 B.C. level. The report concluded: "This destruction should be related (according to Yadin) to the Israelite Conquest."\(^63\)

But the reference in Judges 4:2 to Hazor as a Canaanite City in opposition to Israel still in the time of Barak at least three or four generations after Joshua precludes this possibility. If the city ceased to exist after 1230 B.C., and if it is still in existence at least three or four generations after Joshua, then Joshua's destruction cannot be attributed to the destruction level dated at 1230 B.C. but must be related to the destruction level dated at ca. 1400 B.C. To the writer's knowledge M. B. Rowton, assistant professor at the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, was the first to note this decisive evidence for the early date of the Conquest.\(^64\) This battle between Jabin, king

---

59 Yadin, *Hazor II*, p. 159.
61 *Ibid*.
64 M. B. Rowton, "Ancient Western Asia," *The Cambridge Ancient History*, ed. by I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd, and N. G. L. Hammond (2nd ed.; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970), I, pt. 1,237-39. In fairness to Rowton's position it should be noted that he is of the opinion that it is premature to attempt a date for the Exodus because he believes that more evidence is needed to indicate whether one has to reckon with one Exodus or two Exoduses.
of Hazar, and Barak, he further argued, presumably was fought during a period when Egyptian control had broken down. Moreover, because of the presence of Mycenaean IIIB pottery in the last stratum, he reasoned that the exact period of Egyptian weakness was in the second half of the thirteenth century. So then, the battle can be dated to this period. If this line of reasoning is valid, the chronological notices in Judges taken in conjunction with the anchor date of ca. 1230 B.C. would yield a date for Joshua's conquest during the first quarter of the fourteenth century.

Now the adherents to the late date of Exodus have reacted to Rowton's apparently decisive evidence for an early Conquest in two ways: K. A. Kitchen, on one hand, suggests that either the location of Hazor at the time of Barak differed from its location in the time of Joshua, or that the city of Barak's time has escaped the excavators. On the other hand, Aharoni, although not directly addressing himself to Rowton's thesis, vitiated Rowton's argument by his acceptance of Mazar's theory that the two accounts in Joshua 1 and Judges 4 are reversed. According to this theory the two wars do not belong to the first stage of penetration but to a later period, and the battle of Merom (Joshua 11:1-9) was eventually associated with Joshua. He supports his position by these three arguments: (1) in both accounts Jabin is king, (2) according to the account in Joshua Hazor was totally destroyed, and (3) the results of a Galilee survey show a stage of occupation that preceded the Conquest of the Canaanite district.

Against Kitchen's argument that the name became associated with a new site the writer makes these two points: First, his argument is \textit{ad hoc} and has no convincing textual support. Second, although in the judgment of the writer Kitchen has no convincing textual support, Kitchen does correctly note that Jabin II's main strength is "curiously" not in Hazor but with Sisera in Harosheth. Now the apparent weakness of Hazor at the time of Barak finds archaeological support in the final Canaanite stratum at \textit{Tell el-Qedah/Tel Waqqas}. Before the city's final destruction a sharp decline took place. This is especially noticeable in the Lower City which evidently ceased to be fortified in Stratum I. Its temples were aban-

66 Aharoni, p.203.
67 \textit{Ibid.}, p. 201.
68 Kitchen, p. 68.
doned and apparently plundered, being rebuilt afterwards in a very poor and temporary form. According to Aharoni the last town was concentrated mainly on the high Tell.\textsuperscript{69} Here then the artifactual evidence further confirms the association of Barak with Stratum I of \textit{Tell el-Qedah/Tell Waqqas}. Finally, it seems unlikely that the excavators missed the site in all seven squares excavated.

Against Aharoni's desperate argument, the writer makes these points: (1) it should come as no surprise that at this time Hazor had more than one king named Jabin for as Kitchen has illustrated there are many parallel examples of this situation from the period in question;\textsuperscript{70} (2) it is astonishing that a Palestinian archaeologist should suppose that a tell would not be reoccupied after its total destruction for this very situation is attested over and over again in Palestinian archaeology; (3) Aharoni has committed the logical error of positing an unnecessary, novel hypothesis in place of an ancient, reliable, consistent account; (4) he handles a text verified over and over again as creditable by archaeological research in a most radical fashion; (5) finally, he commits the logical error of arguing in a circle when he says that the clear data attesting Israelite occupation during the late fourteenth century, such as the mention of (i-s-r [Asher]),\textsuperscript{71} in a fragment of a stele from Seti I, "show a stage of occupation that preceded the conquest of the Canaanite districts."

Aharoni in this discussion presumed the settlement occurred before the decisive battles in the North. Having posited this conclusion he interpreted the data according to his presupposition rather than according to the biblical statement. Finally, as incredible as it may seem, he appealed to this data to support his conclusion. A better method of procedure would have been to interpret the data according to the historical narrative rather than according to the conclusion he is seeking to establish.

**CONCLUSION**

On the basis of the evidence mentioned above and without consciously suppressing other evidence two conclusions impose themselves: (1) there is no convincing support from the Palestinian artifactual evidence for a Conquest in the mid-thirteenth century. On the contrary, the artifactual evidence from Jericho and Hazor decisively

\textsuperscript{69} Aharoni, p. 207.
\textsuperscript{70} Kitchen, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{71} Aharoni, p. 168.
refutes the theory; (2) in every way studied in which the textual tradition regarding the Conquest and the Settlement can be tested by archaeology, the two lines of evidence coincide. Furthermore, all the accredited Palestinian artifactual evidence supports the literary account that the Conquest occurred at the time specifically dated by the biblical historians. Therefore, from this data one has no reason either to question the trustworthiness of the Bible regarding the date of the Exodus, or to use another method of interpretation for these numbers than the normal literary approach.
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TOWARD A LITERARY UNDERSTANDING OF
MOSES AND THE LORD "FACE TO FACE"
(פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים) IN EXODUS 33:7-11

MARK D. WESSNER
Prince George, B.C.

I. Background
Throughout the narratives of the Hebrew Bible, perhaps no other biblical character is portrayed as being more intimate with God than Moses, the unequaled leader of the ancient Israelites. Not only is Moses well known for the mighty deeds he did on behalf of the Lord, he is also renowned for the profound nature of his relationship with the Lord of Israel. Within the framework of their personal relationship, the brief story of Exod 33:7-11 explicitly claims that the Lord spoke פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים (פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים) with Moses, as a man speaks with his friend. It is the theological, literary and historical nature of this unique face-to-face communication that is explored in this brief essay.

2. Text, Genre and Form
Within the book of Exodus, defining the textual limits of this particular passage does not pose a significant problem, given the distinctive nature of the material itself. For example, John Durham writes that "verses [7-11] are... strikingly different in both content and style from the dramatically arranged narrative composite that precedes and follows them." Umberto Cassuto separates these verses from the rest of chapter 33 due to the use of the imperfect rather than the perfect verb form found in the surrounding text. Finally, the MT indicates that verse 7 is the start of an "open" paragraph and that verse 12 is the start of a "closed" paragraph (indicated by a ס).

1 Within the OT, פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים occurs five times: Gen 32:31; Exod 33:11; Deut 34:10; Judg 6:22; Ezek 20:35. The passage in Genesis has previously been explored in Mark D. Wessner, "Toward a Literary Understanding of 'Face to Face' (פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים) in Genesis 32:23-32," ResQ (2000/42:3): 169-77.

Although verses 7-11 function primarily as a theophany, the passage appears to have no particular cultic and/or religious significance in the life of ancient Israel. For example, the tent of meeting, as presented in Exod 33:7-11, "had no connections with the Ark or with any other palpable symbol of Yahweh's Presence, or with any rituals of sacrifice or blessing. It was exclusively and solely a place where Yahweh's Presence could be met... a kind of post-Sinai point of theophany." However, it is not only 33:7-11 that is seen as a theophany; Frank Polak indicates that, in fact, "the theophany theme dominates the entire book of Exodus... [and] stands at the center of the book as a whole, and permeates all traditions, sources and redaction layers." Verses 7-11, however, do more than just present a one-time theophanic event between the Lord and his servant Moses. The pericope's use of the imperfect verb forms causes Fretheim to conclude that verses 7-11 function as "a retrospective: this is how things have been in the recent past." Walter Moberly concurs that "there is a sense in which the tradition of Exodus 32-34 as a Sinai tradition, functions aetiology." It seems therefore, that Exod 33:7-11 has a twofold form and purpose within the literature of ancient Israel: it functions as a theophany (due to the appearance of the LORD) and also as an etiology (due to the habitual nature of the events).

3 Durham, Exodus, 440. Nahum Sarna is in agreement with the non-cultic nature of the text when he states that in this passage "there is no priesthood, cult, or ritual of any sort (Nahum Sarna, Exodus; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 211.
6 Fretheim, Exodus, 295.
7 R. W. L. Moberly, At the Mountain of God (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 150.
8 Cassuto, Exodus, 407; Durham, Exodus, 415; Fretheim, Exodus, 279; Noth, Exodus, 241; Sarna, "Book of Exodus" ABD 2.693.
9 Moberly, At the Mountain of God, 63.
The simple fact that 33:7-11 is within the larger literary section of chapters 32-34 does not answer the question of why it is there. In his commentary, Durham writes that "there remains the need to consider the text of each pericope of the biblical text as a whole and in the light of the theological purpose binding the pericopae into larger sequences, entire books, and even whole sections of the Bible," and "these three chapters constitute a marvelous literary unity." However, he later acknowledges the difficulty of understanding why 33:7-11 is where it is and concludes "the five verses of Exod 33:7-11, therefore, as important as they are, are nonetheless completely out of place in the taut narrative of Exod 32:1-34:9."

Perhaps the best way to make sense of the placement of Exod 33:7-11 is to understand that it is central, not peripheral, to the larger unit of chapters 32-34. Clearly, Moberly's notion that this pericope is the turning point of the unit must be correct. It is the reality of the presence of God with his people that ties the larger literary unit together, in which the encounter of 33:7-11 plays a crucial role.

An analysis of the Hebrew text reveals that the small pericope of 33:7-11 contains a chiastic structure that suggests the central focus of the narrative itself:

11 Ibid., 418.
12 Ibid., 443.
13 The repetitive structure of Exod 33:1-23 indicates that 7-11 are semantically distinct from their surroundings. Throughout the larger section of 1-23, the continuing presence of הוהי (the LORD), דבר (speaking), משה (Moses), and עם (people) occur repeatedly and serve to hold the chapter together as a unit. However, 33:7-11 is clearly marked by the exclusive use of 넓 (tent), מחנה (camp) and, מתי (door), Hebrew roots that occur neither before nor after the pericope. Only the face/presence motif ( ENC ) carries on after vv. 7-11. The unique element that is being presented in this pericope is Moses' Tent of Meeting and it is within this context that must be considered. (A review of chapters 32-34 reveals that after each private encounter with the LORD (32:1-18, 34:1-28), the LORD proceeds to speak to Moses in view of the Israelites (33:7-11, 34:29-35).)
A Moses pitched the tent outside the camp (7a)

B those who sought the Lord (7b)

C all the people/every man arose and stood at the entrance of his tent (8)

D' pillar of cloud at the entrance of the tent (9a)

E and he spoke with Moses (9b)

D' pillar of cloud at the entrance of the tent (10a)

C' all the people/every man arose and worshipped at the entrance of his tent (10b)

B' the Lord spoke to Moses (11a)

A' Moses returned to the camp (11b)

A clear structure such as this likely indicates that the passage is primarily concerned with the Lord's speaking to Moses--the central point of the chiasm. The other elements (outside the camp, the pillar of cloud, etc.) serve to highlight both the subtle nuances and the overall significance of the entire pericope. This also helps to explain how verse 11, "the Lord spoke to Moses פִּנִים אֵל פִּנִים" relates to the corresponding chiastic point of "those who sought the LORD." Either the Lord spoke to those who truly sought Him, or because Moses sought the Lord, the Lord in turn spoke to him face to face.

Finally, the narrative setting of the entire book indicates that the forty-year wandering of the Israelites took place immediately after the exodus from the pagan land of Egypt. In Egypt, the Lord had presented himself in dramatic, powerful and national ways (i.e., the ten plagues, the parting of the sea), and now in the latter part of Exodus, he presents himself in a personal way, sometimes to individuals and sometimes for the benefit of the people as a whole. It is within

14 The verb-form of 'spoke' is piel, from הבָּרָד, meaning "to speak" with the primary subject (the Lord) being active, and the under-subject (Moses) being passive. The significance of the verb forms is fully explained in Bruce Waltke and Michael O'Connor, Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 358.
this larger context of the Lord's personal presentation of himself (to both individuals and to the people) that 33:7-11 takes place.

4. Historical Context

If the events of Exod 33:7-11 are to be understood as both theophany and etiology, then it would be expected that the narrative itself serves a cultic function for the people. However, the tent of meeting in 7-11 is not the Tabernacle -- which has not yet been constructed -- but a private tent where he [Moses] might commune with God." With regard to this pericope, Durham says "about the significance of the Tent of Appointed Meeting however there can be little question. ..this Tent was a primary symbol of Yahweh's Presence, and especially of the accessibility of the Presence to those in need of guidance, represented primarily by Moses."16

5. Biblical Context

Within the canon of OT literature, the unique phrase "pillar of cloud" is used only thirteen times, with all but two of the occurrences appearing in the Torah. Rather than for the guidance and protection of Israel, it seems to be used primarily in connection with either the Lord's leading of his people (Exod 13:21, 22, 14:19; Num 14:14; Neh 9:12, 19) or the Lord's speaking with his people (Exod 33:9, 10; Num 12:5; Deut 31:15; Ps 99:7). The pillar of cloud is reserved for God himself as he makes his presence known among his people, often as a means of divinely legitimizing the recipient, or "seer" of the cloud. That is, one of the primary functions of the pillar of cloud is to portray the presence of the Lord visually.

Also of significance is the term "tent of meeting," with ninety-nine occurrences in the Torah and only nine occurring elsewhere in the entire OT. When the use of this phrase is further restricted to referring exclusively to the tent

15 Sarna, Exodus, 211.
16 Durham, Exodus, 441. The primary evidence that the tent of 33:7-11 is not the formal Israelite Tabernacle is the fact that the Lord visits this tent only occasionally; he does not "dwell" there, as he does in the Tabernacle. Also, there is no Ark, and the tent is outside of the camp (in contrast to the Tabernacle), which is an area of impurity (cf. Lev 9:11, 10:4-5, 13:46, 16:27; Num 5:2-4).
17 Exod 13:22, 14:19, 33:9, 10; Deut 31:15, Neh 9:19 (םלכוהו הַגּוֹיֶם), Exod 13:21,
Num 12:5, Deut 31:15, Ps 99:7, Neh 9:12 (םלכוהו הַגּוֹיֶם) and Num 14:14 (םלכוהו הַגּוֹיֶם). In the New Testament, a cloud is often mentioned with regard to both the presence of God (cf. Matt 17:5, Mark 9:7; Luke 9:34 and the coming or going of Christ to the heavens (cf. Matt 24:30, 26:64; Mark 13:26, 14:62; Luke 21:27; Acts 1:9; I Thess 4:17; Rev 1:7). The cloud motif, as representative of the presence of the Lord, is presented throughout the entire Bible.
described in Exod 33:11 (i.e., not the "official" tent of meeting), it occurs in just three other passages: Num 11:16-17, 12:4-10, and Deut 31:14-15. All three instances portray the Lord's initiation of communication with his servant Moses; and interestingly, in all three cases, the Lord desired to communicate with someone other than Moses, but insisted on having Moses there in his presence instead. Within the context of the exodus and the wandering, Moses was the only person with whom the Lord spoke in private.

Perhaps there is no other passage in the OT that is more apt to cause difficulty in understanding how the Lord spoke to Moses than Exod 33:17-23:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{20} \text{And he said, "You are not able to see my face, אֲנָשׁ אֱלֹהֵי אֲדֹנָי;} \\
&\text{For no one can see me and live;} \\
&\text{23} \text{"Then I will take away my hand } \text{אָזַן} \\
&\text{and you will see } \text{my back } \text{אָזַן} \\
&\text{but my face will not been seen by you" (niphal)}.
\end{align*}
\]

The difficulty, however, quickly becomes the solution if Waltke's linguistic lens (see n. 15) is used to view the text. When one considers the verb forms, it becomes apparent that Moses could be the active agent (qal) in seeing the Lord's back, but he could not be the active agent (qal) in seeing the Lord's face. The Lord would not let His face be the passive object of someone else's seeing. As the concepts of the Lord's actively speaking (דבר) to Moses face to face and the Lord's face being passively seen (ראה) deal with different issues, they are not in contradiction; rather, they expand and clarify the nature of the Lord's revealing of himself, both verbally and physically. As a result of this verbal nuance, verses 17-23 help the reader attain a more complete understanding of verses 7-11. As in the other OT uses of פָּנֵים אֵל פָּנֵים, humankind does not actively initiate face-to-face interaction (ראה, דבר, etc.) with the Lord. Instead, the Lord is active initiator, and the people are the passive receptors of his intimate presentation of himself.

20 The seventy elders (Num 11: 16-17), Miriam and Aaron (Num 12:4-10), and Joshua (Deut 31: 14-15).
21 See Wessner, Face to Face: Panim 'el-Panim in Old Testament Literature (Theological Research Exchange Network, #048-0211, 1998), 103-4.
22 Num 12:8 ("with him I speak mouth to mouth") is possibly a reference to the events of Exod 33: 11, although this passage uses פָּנֵים אֵל פָּנֵים as the description of the Lord's communication with Moses. דבר (to speak) occurs in the Piel form, in which the subject (the Lord) is active and the undersubject (Moses) is passive.
6. Other Ancient Literature

Due to the anthropomorphic nature of Exod 33:7-11, the transcendentalization of God might be expected in the Samaritan text of this passage in order to "adjust" the theology.\(^{23}\) It is significant to note that the only difference between the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch is in verse 11, where the MT has שֹׁמַר, while the Samaritan Pentateuch instead has שָׁמַר, likely a scribal variance. The Samaritans did not transcendentalize this passage, as they may have understood that the Lord was in the pillar of cloud and therefore not personally present, although it is more likely that, in fact, the Lord's פָּנֶיהוֹנָא-פָּנֶיהוֹנָא encounter with Moses was not theologically upsetting.

As is often the case, the textual witness of the Septuagint is an aid in determining the ancient Jewish understanding of Exod 33:11. With regard to our immediate concerns, the only significant textual feature of this passage is its use of ἐνωπιον ἐνωπιω rather than πρόσωπον πρός/κατά πρόσωπον, which is used in each of the four other OT uses of "face to face." This Greek phrase is used nowhere else in the Septuagint and seems to present a more abstract (therefore, less physical) notion than πρόσωπον πρός πρόσωπον.

Targum Onqelos is also helpful in seeking to uncover the way this passage may have been understood by the ancient readers due to its combination of both translation and interpretive commentary:

<7> Now Moses took the tent and pitched it outside the camp far from the camp and called it the Tent of the Place of Instruction. Now anyone seeking instruction from before the Lord would go out to the Tent of the Place of Instruction which is outside the camp. <11> Now the Lord would speak with Moses literally just as one would speak with his fellow man, and he would return to the camp, while his attendant, Joshua son of Nun, the youth, would not depart from the tent.

In the same manner as both the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint, Targum Onqelos leaves the MT essentially unmodified in verse 11, except to add the word "literally" in order to remove any doubt as to the "real" nature (i.e., it was not a vision, dream) of the face-to-face communication between the Lord and Moses, again initiated by the Lord and received by Moses. Targum Neofiti also varies from the traditional Hebrew in verse 11 by using "speech to speech" the nature of the communication.

7. Conclusion

There is essentially no uncertainty that the text says that the Lord spoke to Moses "face to face" due to the witness of the MT, the Septuagint, and even the Samaritan Pentateuch. In addition, the chiastic structure of the text, the recurring theophany motif throughout the book of Exodus, as well as the numerous OT

\(^{23}\) See Bruce Waltke, "Textual Criticism of the Old Testament and Its Relation to Exegesis and Theology" NIDOTE 1.59.
and NT allusions to the passage, indicate that it was indeed the Lord who descended within the supernatural pillar of cloud. However, the fact that the event itself is presented and understood as fact does not answer our questions about the theological/spiritual nature of God's communication with Moses.

As indicated in the text of Exod 33:7-11 (and also Num 12:8), the Lord spoke to Moses face to face, as a man speaks with his friend--clearly and not in riddles. In fact, the Lord considered Moses to be such a friend that not only did he speak to him יְנִיְקָא בָּאֶל יְנִיְקָא but he also required Moses to be present in the tent when he wished to speak to others. Clearly, face-to-face communication with the Lord was not possible for every one of his people, at least not at the same level of *intimacy* that Moses personally and privately experienced throughout his time as leader of God's people.24

In addition, it is the Hebrew morphology that brings to light a secondary component of the unique nature of face-to-face communication with the Lord—the Lord is the active and initiating participant in interacting יְנִיְקָא אֵל יְנִיְקָא while his partner is passive. The face-to-face communication in Exod 33:7-11, as presented in the biblical text (Exodus, Numbers) and further confirmed by the earliest readers (Septuagint, Samaritan Pentateuch, and Targums), is a picture of immediate and profound intimacy that reflects both God's initiative25 and Moses' fulfilled desire to seek his Lord within an ongoing relationship. As in the other biblical יְנִיְקָא encounters, verses 7-11 reflect the four common characteristics of divine initiation, profound intimacy, intentional solitude, and supernatural verification.

24 In fact, there were occasions when the people were saved from divine destruction due solely to the close relationship between Moses and God (e.g. Exodus 32, Numbers 14).

25 Interestingly, in Genesis 32 Jacob thought he had actively encountered God face to face, and he expected to lose his life as a result. Moses however, was the recipient of the Lord's active encounter, and he went back again and again and never seemed to become tired or fearful of spending time with his God.
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In criticising a document there are at least three fundamental principles upon which we should proceed: First, the document must be supposed to be in harmony with itself and interpreted accordingly. Secondly, it must be presumed to be in harmony with its sources of information. Thirdly, it should be in accordance with its supposed time, place, and circumstances.¹

I. The Critical Theory is Inconsistent

I. The critics hold that Exodus vi. 3, which the RV renders, "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as God Almighty (El Shaddai); but by my name Jehovah I was not known unto them," belongs to P and that P means to say that El Shaddai and not Jehovah was the name of God known to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Therefore they assign four passages, Gen. xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, and xlviii. 3 to P, since El Shaddai is found in them. It is to be observed, however, regarding these passages that, in xvii 1, it is said that Jehovah appeared to Abram, saying, I am El Shaddai; and in xxxv. 11 that Elohim appeared to Jacob saying, I am El Shaddai. In xxviii. 3 Isaac says to Jacob, El Shaddai bless thee; and in xlviii. 3 Jacob says in the presence of Joseph and his two sons, El Shaddai appeared unto me. In a fifth passage, Gen. xliii. 14, Jacob uses this appellation in his prayer for his sons who are starting for Egypt. But this verse is assigned to E or J by the critics and the El Shaddai attributed to the Redactor. Is it not singular that if P thought El Shaddai was a proper name for God he should have used Elohim about seventy times before Ex. vi. 3 and El Shaddai only four-times? Is it not extraordinary that, if the writer of Ex. vi. 3 meant that God "appeared" to the patriarchs under the name of El Shaddai, only once in P should it be said that El Shaddai "appeared," just the same number of times that P says that Jehovah "appeared" and that Elohim "appeared"? Jehovah alone (or Jehovah Elohim) is alleged to have occurred in J, and Elohim alone in E; but El Shaddai is found but four times in P and Elohim seventy times.

¹ Briggs, The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, p. 4.
If P alone thought that El Shaddai was the only name of God known in the time of the patriarchs, how about Gen. xliii. 14, which the critics assign to E or J? We have seen that they escape the consequences of this assignment simply by asserting that El Shaddai is an interpolation of the Redactor. But did the Redactor also think that the patriarchs used El Shaddai rather than Jehovah? Why, then did he not cut out Jehovah and put El Shaddai into the text of J? Besides, if P alone thought that Shaddai was a specifically patriarchal designation, how about its use in Gen. xlix. 25 and Num. xxiv. 4, 16, which are assigned to J or JE? All of these questions will be appropriately answered if we take Shaddai and El Shaddai as appellations, "the Almighty" or "a mighty God," and not as proper names.

2. A historical or ostensibly historical document should, if possible, be interpreted in harmony with its sources and with earlier histories supposedly known to the author. What then were the sources of P? According to datings advocated by the critics they could have been only J, E, D, H, and Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, and parts of other books. Now the only one of these sources or earlier works in which El Shaddai occurs is Ezek. x. 5, "And the sound of the cherubim's wings was heard unto the outer court as the voice of Almighty God (El Shaddai) when he speaketh." Shaddai alone occurs in the Pentateuch only in Gen. xlix. 25 (J) and in Numbers xxiv. 4, 16 (JE). In Gen. xlix. 24, 25, we read in the Blessing of Joseph that "the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the Almighty One ( médico ) of Jacob (from thence is the Shepherd, the stone of Israel) even by the God of thy fathers, who shall help thee, and by the Almighty (Shaddai) who shall bless thee." The Samaritan Hebrew text and version of this verse both read El Shaddai instead of Shaddai, a reading supported by the Syriac and apparently by the Septuagint. If we take the latter reading we would find God Almighty to be parallel with the Almighty One of Jacob who is also called the God of thy fathers (i.e., of Jacob). This psalm of Jacob refers in verse 18 to Jehovah in the words, "I have waited for Thee, O Jehovah"; so that if P got his information about El Shaddai in this psalm he would have known that Jehovah was
used by the Patriarch Jacob at least. Nothing is said in this
psalm about either Jehovah or El Shaddai having appeared.
In Num. xxiv. 4, 16 Balaam uses the phrase: "which saw the
vision of the Almighty (Shaddai)."2 Since this chapter is as-
signed to JE, P must have known, if he got his information
here, that Shaddai was supposed by his sources to have been,
used after the declaration made in Exodus vi. 3; for JE certain-
ly places the episode of Balaam about forty years after the
event recorded in Exodus vi. 3.
These being the only places in the old Testament where Shad-
dai occurs in the portions assigned by the critics to a date be-
fore 550 B.C., it follows that the critics' interpretation of Ex.
vi. 3 makes P to be out of harmony with all its known sources.
3. In documents which in their opinion were written after
550 B.C. we never find El Shaddai; but Shaddai alone occurs
thirty times in Job, and in Ruth, i, 20, 21; Isa. xiii. 14; Joel i. 15;
Ps. lxviii. 15, xci. 1. Not one of these passages refers to the
patriarchs or to God as "appearing" to them or to anyone else.
In twenty-seven of them Shaddai is used as parallel to other
names of God, to wit: nine times to הלאא, thirteen times to
לאא, once to י litres, and four times to א. There is no in-
timation that Shaddai was a more ancient designation than these
other terms. It follows, therefore, that, as interpreted by the
critics, P in its use of El Shaddai is not congruous with the
usage of these other books which the critics allege to have been
written in post-captivity times. To be sure, if Job was written
in the time of the patriarchs we can see where the author of P
got his idea that they had used Shaddai as a name for God.
Or even if some of the other passages came from the time to
which they have been assigned by tradition we might see how he
got the idea; even though they say nothing of revelation or the
patriarchs. But as the case stands for the critics we find that
the author of P must have invented the whole conception. For
neither Ezekiel, Job, J, E, H, D, Joel, Jonah, Deutero-Isaiah,
Ruth, nor the Psalms, furnish any ground for supposing that the
patriarchs used this appellation for God; and the certainly late
writings such as Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Esther,

2 Shaddai is rendered in Greek and Syriac by "God," in Arabic by
"the sufficient one"; and in the Samaritan version by "field," they hav-
ing read sadai for shaddai.
Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, never mention the name at all. Whether we take the traditional view of the post-captivity literature, or the radical, there would therefore be no contemporary evidence to show that the hypothetical writer of P, provided that he lived in post-captivity times, was in his use of Shadai in harmony with contemporaneous usage and ideas.

II. Correct Exegesis Supports Unity of Pentateuch

Having shown that the interpretation of Exodus vi. 3 a advanced by the critics is out of harmony with the rest of P, that it does not agree with the rest of the Pentateuch, and that it does not fit into the time at which P is alleged to have been written it remains to see whether this passage can be so interpreted as to be brought into agreement with the traditional view of the Pentateuch as the work of Moses. This we shall attempt to show by an examination of the text, grammar, and vocabulary of the verse, under the following heads: 1) "appeared," 2) "as" (ב), 3) "God" (El), 4) "Almighty (Shaddai), 5) but" (ו), 6) "name," 7) "known," 8) the form of the last sentence,--can it be interrogative?

I. The "appearing" of God to men is described in several different ways in the Old Testament.
a. The most usual expression is that found here in Ex. vi. 3, where the Niphal of the verb "to see" (נָכָה) is used. With the Deity as subject this verb occurs forty-three times as follows:
   (a). Jehovah, Gen. xii. 7 bis (J), xviii.1 (J), xxii. 14 0), xxvi. 2, 24 (J), Ex. iiii.4 (E), iv. 1, 5 (J), vi. 3 (P) Lev. ix. 4 (P), xvi. 2 (P), Num. xiv.14 (JE), Deut. xxxi. 15 (JE), I Kings iii. 5, ix. 2, I Chron. i. 7, iii. I, vii. 12, Jer. iii.13, Zech. ix. 14
   (b). The glory of Jehovah, Ex. xvi. 10 (P), Lev. ix. 6, 23 (P), Num. xiv. 10 , xvi.19 (P), xvii. 7, xx. 6 (P)
   Isa. lx. 2, Ps xc. 16
   (c). The angel of Jehovah, Ex. iii. 2 (J), Jud. iii. 21 bis, vi.12, xiii. 3, 21.
   (d). Jehovah of Hosts, Mal. iii. 2.
   (e) Jehovah, God of Israel, 1 Kings xi. 2.
   (f) Elohim, Gen. xxxv. 9 (P).
   (g) The man (i.e., the angel of Jehovah), Jud. xiii. 10.
   (h) El, Gen. xxxv. 1
   (i). El Shaddai, Gen. xlviii. 3 (P).
b. Other expressions are the following:
   (I) In the following cases it is said that man "saw" the Deity, the Kal of the verb \( \text{אָנָּתָן} \) being used:
   (a). Jehovah, I Kings xxii. 19, 2 Chron. xviii. 18.
   (b). The glory of Jehovah, Ex. xvi. 7 (P), Isa. xxxv. 2.
   (c). The angel of Jehovah, Num. xxii. 31 (E), I Chron. xxi. 16, 20.
   (d). The majesty of Jehovah, Isa. xxvi. 10.
   (e). \( 
   \text{וָּדַם} \), Isa. xxxviii. 11.
   (f). The King, Jehovah of Hosts, Isa. vi. 5.
   (g). Lord (Adonai), Isa. vi. 1, Am. ix. 1.
   (h). The Holy One of Israel, Isa. xvii. 7.
   (i). Elohim, Gen. xxxii. 30 (J), xxxiii. 10 (J), Jud. xiii. 32, I Sam. xxviii. 13.

   (2) The Hiphil of \( \text{אָנָּתָן} \), with the Deity as subject, occurs in the Old Testament twenty-two times: Gen. 1, Ex. 2, Deut. 3, Judg. 1, 2 Kgs. 1, Pss. 4, Jer. 3, Ezek. 1, Nahum 1, Hab. 1, Zech. 2. In the Pentateuch it is found in J in Ex. ix. 16, in E in Gen. xlviii. 11; in P in Ex. xxv. 9, Num. viii. 4; in D in Deut. iii. 24, iv. 36, and v. 21,

   (3) The verb \( \text{נָא} \) "to see" is used in Ex. xxiv. 11 (J) with Elohim as object, in Job xix. 26 with Eloah as object, and in Num. xxiv. 4, 16 (JE) with Shaddai as object.

   (4) Of the words for "vision" \( 
   \text{מָרֶה} \) is used in Gen. xv. 1 (E), in connection with Jehovah and \( 
   \text{מַחַזֶה} \) in Num. xxiv. 4, 16, with Shaddai.

   (5) The verb "to reveal" (\( 
   \text{רָאָה} \) is found in the Pentateuch only in Genesis xxxv. 7 (E). Isaiah employs it in xl. 5, liii. 1, lvi. 1. It is found also in I Samuel in ii. 27, iii. 7, 21.

   It is clear from the above evidence that the Deity is said in all the documents J, E, D, H, and P to have "appeared" and that the Niphal of \( 
   \text{אָנָּתָן} \), "to see," the most common expression used to describe it, is found in all of them.

2. The preposition \( 
   \text{ב} \) which occurs in Ex. vi. 3 before Shaddai is the so-called \( 
   \text{בֵּית} \) and is to be ordinarily by "as," or "as being," or "in the character of." It found in Gen. xxi. 12 (P), in Ex. xviii. 4, xxxii. 22, (both and in Deut. xxvi. 5, xxviii. 62, xxxiii. 26, and in Lev. xvii. 11 (H). It occurs also in Jud. xi. 35, Pss. xxxv. 2, xxxvii. 20,
xxxix. 7, liv. 6, Iv. 19, lxviii. 5, 33, cxviii. 7, cxlvi. 5, Prov. iii. 26, Ecc. vii. 14, Job xxiii. 13, Isa. xxvi. 4, xl. 10, xlviii. 10, Ho. xiii 9.

In Ex. vi. 3 we should translate "as being El Shaddai," and "as being Shemijahweh" or "in the character of a mighty God" and "in the character of my name Jehovah," the force of the proposition being regarded as carried over to the second phrase.

3. El occurs about two hundred and twenty times in the Old Testament, in Gen. 9, Ex. 4, Num. 11, Deut. 10, Josh. 3 (or 35 times in the Hexateuch, J 2, E 5, D 10, P 5³), I Sam. 1, 2 Sam. 2, Isa. 25, Jer. 2, Ezek 7, Dan. 4, Hos. 3, Jonah 1, Micah 2, Nahum 1, Zech. 2, Mal. 2, Pss. 71, Job 55, Prov. 1. It frequently takes after it an attributive adjective, or a noun in construction. Thus E represents El as jealous, D as great and terrible and merciful, JE as jealous, merciful, gracious and living; and J speaks of a seeing God (El Ro'i) an eternal God (El 'Olam), Deut. xxxii, of a God of a stranger (or a strange God), of trustworthiness, and a God who begat us, I Sam. ii. 3 a God of knowledge. Gen. xiv. four times calls El the Most High ('Elyon), and Deut. xxxii. 8 names him simply 'Elyon. From this evidence it seems clear, that El was in use in all periods of Hebrew literature and also that the limiting adjectives and genitives did not denote names of different gods, but were generally at least nothing but appellations of attributes or characteristics.

4. As to the word Shaddai, there is uncertainty as to its root, form, and meaning. If it were from a root נדש it would be of the same form as sadai which is sometimes read in the Hebrew text instead of sade "field." In Babylonian the root means "to be high," and derivatives mean "mountain." and "the summit of a mountain" and perhaps "majesty." In case, we might take shaddai as a synonym of 'elyon "Most High" as used in Gen. xiv.

A second derivation is from the root shadad "to be strong." The ending ai is found also in נדש (Isa. xix. 9) and in נדש (Am. vii. 1, Neh. iii. 17) and perhaps in נדש (Isa. xxxii. 5;

³ It is not found in H
⁴ In fact, the Samaritan version reads Shaddai as sadai in Num. xxiv. 4, 16.
Olshausen, *Lehrbuch* p. 216). This ending is found also in Arabic and Ethiopic (Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, I. p. 220; Dillmann, *Aethiopische Grammatik*, p. 204). If from this root the word *shaddai* would mean "might, strength." The Greek translator of Job apparently had this derivation before him when he rendered *shaddai* by παντοκράτωρ, "Almighty"—a translation which has been generally followed in the English version. In the Syriac an equivalent word *hassino* "strong" is found in Job vi. 4, viii. 3, 5, xi. 7, xiii. 3, xv. 25, xxvii. 2, 13, xxix. 5, xxxvii. 23.

A third derivation is from the relative pronoun (ו) and the word "sufficiency" (ד). The Greek Ἰκανος found in Job xxi. 15, xxxi. 2, xxxix. 32, Ruth i. 20, 21, Ezek. i. 24, comes from this interpretation. It also accounts for the usual rendering of Shaddai in the Samaritan version and in the Arabic version of Saadya. The Arabic always renders it Alkafi, "the sufficient," and the Samaritan always safuka, except in Num. xxiv. 4, 16, where it had read sadai (field).

Our ignorance of the real meaning of the word is further illustrated by the fact that the Greek translators of the Pentateuch invariably render both Shaddai and El Shaddai by Θεός, that the translation of Job renders it eight times by Κύριος, that the Syriac version renders it twenty-two times by *Aloho* (God), and in the Pentateuch usually transliterates it.

In conclusion, the evidence clearly shows that the Hebrews who translated the Old Testament, or part of it, into Samaritan, Syriac, Greek, and Arabic, knew nothing of a god called Shaddai or of Shaddai as a name for God. Only in the Greek of Ezek. i. 24 and in the Syriac of Gen. xvii. 1, xxxv. 11, and Ex. vi. 3 is there any indication that either El Shaddai or Shaddai was ever considered to be a proper name like Jehovah.

5. The particle *Wau* usually means "and." The meaning "but" is comparatively seldom the correct one.

6. *Shemi* has been taken by most interpreters and translators as meaning "my name." The Syriac, however, renders "the name of," taking the final *i* as the old nominal ending, as (Gen. xlix. 11), (Gen. xlix. 12), (Gen. xlix 11), (Deut. xxxiii. 16),

5 Fifteen times in all. to wit: v. 17. viii. 5, xi. 7. xv. 25, xxii.17, 25, xxiii 16, xxvii. 2, 11, 13, xxxii. 8, xxxiii. 4, xxxiv. 10, xxxv. 13, xxxvii. 22.
Lev. xxvi. 42), or else having read but one Yodh where the Hebrew text now gives two.

As to the syntactical relation of the phrase "my name Jehovah" the ancient and modern versions vary. Some take it as the preposed object "my name Jehovah did I not make known" (so the Septuagint, Latin Vulgate, Syriac, and the Targum of Onkelos) and seem to have read the Niphal as a Hiphil. The Samaritan Targum gives a literal rendering. The AV puts "by" before "my name" and inserts "the name of" before El Shaddai. The RV puts "as" before El Shaddai and "by" before "my name." The RV margin suggests "as to" before "my name" and omits "the name of" before "El Shaddai." The Targum of Jonathan renders literally except that it explains "and my name Jehovah" as meaning "but as the face (or presence) of my Shekina." By this simple interpretation the Targum of Jonathan, without any change of text, brings the verse into agreement with the preceding history of the Pentateuch.

As to the meaning of "name" it can scarcely be held that any post-captivity writer really thought that the mere sound of the name itself had never been heard before the time of Moses. But the writer of P did think so, it is preposterous to suppose that the Redactor who put J and P together should have accepted P's opinion and then allowed the Jehovah of J to remain

6 See other examples in Ex. xv. 6, Isa. i. 21, xxii. 16, Ho. x. 11, Ob. 3, Jer. x. 17, xii. 23, xxxii. 20, bis, 25, xlvi. 16, bis, li.13, Zech. xi.17, Lam. i. 1, iv. 21, Ezek. xxvii. 3, Mi. vii. 14, Pss. cl. 5, ex. 4, cxxxii. 5-9, cxiv. 8, cxvi. 1. See Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, §90 l, m, Olshausen, Lehrbuch, and Ewald Ausfuhrliches Lehrbuch.

7 That is the original text may have read הוהי where we now have יהוה Jehovah was possibly written יהוה here, as in Isa. xxvi.4, Ps. lxviii.5, Ex. xv.2 and other places, and the Yodh was read twice. This monographic writing where the letter is to be doubled in reading is to be found on the inscriptions as well as in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. It is familiar to all Semitic scholars in the so-called intensive stems where the second radical is written once and read twice. E.g ktl may be read kittel. So in the Panammu inscription (1.19) is to be read Bar-rekab; in Clay's Aramaic Indorsements. אב is to be read Bar-neshaya. So, also, in the Spicilegium Syriacum (p. 21), is to be read Kokab-Bel, and in Jud. vi.25, יר is Yerub-Baal. Massoretic notes also give an example in Lam. iv.16, suggesting that u should be read twice. The ancient versions, especially the Septuagint, afford many cases of this doubling of the letters of the Hebrew text, e.g., Hos. vii. 3, 2 Chron. xii. 2, Neh. x. 7.
in Genesis as the ordinary name of God. The Redactor at least, and the people who accepted his composite work as the work of Moses, must have interpreted this verse in a sense agreeing with what had gone before. Now such sentences as "my name is in him" (Ex. xxiii. 21), "to put his name there" (Deut. xii. 5), "for his name's sake" (Ps. lxxi .9), "according to thy name so is thy praise" (Ps. xlviii. 11), show that the name meant the power, visible presence, honor, or repute, of the person named. The Targum of Jonathan explains "my name Jehovah" as "the face (or presence) of my Shekinah."

7. That "knowing" the name of Jehovah means more than merely knowing the word itself, is apparent from Is. xix. 21, where we read: And Jehovah shall be known to Egypt and Egypt shall know Jehovah in that day.

The form used here in Ex. vi. 3 may mean: I was known, I was made known, or I allowed myself to be known.

8. Questions in Hebrew and other Semitic languages may be asked either with or without an interrogative particle. The following evidence goes to show that the last clause of Ex. vi. 3 might be read "was I not made known to them?" This interpretation would remove at one blow the whole foundation of the critical position, so far as it is based on this verse.

In Arabic "a question is sometimes indicated by the tone of the voice" (Wright, Arabic Grammar, II, 165); Potest quidem interrogatio solo tono notari (Ewald, Grammatica Critica Linguae Arabicae, §703).

In Syriac there is no special syntactical or formal method of indicating direct questions. Such interrogative sentences can only be distinguished from sentences of affirmation by the emphasis. Thus נָּהֲרֵךְ יְהֹוָה, may mean "God is great," or "Is God great?" (Noldeke, Syriac Grammar, §331). "Il n'existe de particule Syriaque pour l'interrogation; le phrase interrogative ne se distingue donc que par la sense general" (Duval, Grammaire Syriaque, §382). "Generally, he interrogative is denoted by the inflection or connection without any particle" (Wilson, Elements of Syriac Grammar, §132. 2. ).

In Ethiopic, the question be denoted by the arrangement of the words or by the tone; though ordinarily a particle of interrogation is used (Dillmann, Aethiopische Grammatik, §198).
In Hebrew "frequently the natural emphasis upon the words (especially when the most emphatic word is placed at the begin-
ing of the sentence) is of itself sufficient to indicate an inter-
rogative sentence" (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, § I 50). "Ist der Satz im ganzen fragend, so stellt sich das Wort welches die Kraft der Frage vorzugslich trifft in seiner Reihe voran; und die 'kraftliche Voranstaltung dieses Wortes kann allerdings in Verbindung mit dem fragenden Tone ohne jedes Fragwortchen genügen" (Ewald, Ausführliches Lehrbuch, §324).

As examples of this type of interrogative sentence, the lowing may be cited: Gen. xviii. 12, After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also? Gen. xxvii. 24, Thou art my son Esau? Ex. viii. 22, Should we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptian's before them, would they not stone us? Ex. ix. 11, As yet exaltest thou thyself against my people, that thou wilt not let them go? Ex. xxxiii. 14, Shall my presence go, then I shall give thee rest? (So Ewald, Gram. §324, and Gesenius, Gram. §150). Jud. xi. 23, And shouldest thou possess it? xiv. 16, Behold I have not told it my father nor my mother, and shall I tell it thee? I Sam. xi. 12, Shall Saul reign over us? xx. 9, If I knew certainly that evil was determined by my father to come upon thee, then would not I tell it thee? xxii. 7, Will the son of Jesse give every one of you fields and vineyards? xxii. 15, Did I then begin to inquire of God for him? xxiv. 14, If a man find his enemy, will he let him go well away? xxv. 11, Shall I then take my bread and my water? xxx. 8, Shall I pursue after this troop? 2 Sam. xi. 11, Shall I then go into my horse? xvi. 17, Is this thy kindness to thy friends? xviii. 29, Is the young man Absalom safe? xix. 23, Shall there any man be put this day in Israel? xxiii. 5, Verily will he not make it to grow? 1 Kings, i. 24, Hast thou said Adonijah shall reign after me? xxi. 7, Dost thou govern the kingdom of Israel? 2 Kings v. 26, Went not mine heart with thee? Hos. x. 9, Shall not the the against the unjust overtake them in Gibeah? (Ewald, en-
et al.). Is. xxxvii. 11, And shalt thou be delivered? Jer. xxv. 29, Like a hammer which breaketh the rock in pieces? xlv. 5, And seekest thou great things for thyself? xliv. 12, And art thou he that shall go altogether unpunished? Ezek. xi. 3, Is not the building of houses near? (Ewald). xi. 13. Wilt thou make
a full end of the remnant of Israel? (Ewald). xxix. 13, And shall I be inquired of by you? xxxii. 2, Art thou like a young lion of the nations? (Ewald). Jon. iv. 11, Should I not spare Nineveh? Hab. ii. 19, Shall it teach? Zech. viii. 6, Should it also be marvelous in my eyes? Mal. ii. 15, And did not he make one?
Job ii. 9, Dost thou still retain thy integrity? ii. 10, Shall we receive good? x. 9, And wilt thou bring me into dust again? xiv. 3, Dost thou open thy eyes? xxxvii. 18, Hast thou with him spread out the sky? xxxvii. 18, Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth? xxxix. 2, canst thou number the months? xli. 1, Canst thou draw out Nathan? Lam. 1. 12, Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? iii. 38, Out of the mouth of the most high proceedeth not evil and good? Neh. v. 7, Do ye exact usury everyone of his brother?

In view of the exegetical problems which are involved in the interpretation of this verse, the Versions, both ancient and modern are of unusual interest. The following may be cited

I. The Greek Septuagint: And God (ὁ θεός) spake to Moses and said to him: I am (the) Lord (κύριος) and he appeared to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, being their God, and my name κύριος I manifested not to them.

2. The Latin Vulgate: And spake the Lord (Dominus) to Moses, saying: I am the Lord who appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as (in) omnipotent God, and my name Adonai I did not show (indicavi) to them.

3. The Targum of Onkelos: And spake Jehovah with Moses and said to him: I am Jehovah, and I was revealed to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as God Almighty (בָּלַל שְׁדֵי) and my name Jehovah I did not make known (הדוֹדֵי אָנָא) to them.

4. The Targum of Pseudo- Jonathan: And Jehovah spake with Moses and said to him: "I am Jehovah who revealed himself unto thee in the midst of the bush and said to thee, I am Jehovah, and I revealed myself to Abraham, to Isaac, and Jacob as an Almighty God. (בָּלַל שְׁדֵי) and my name Jehovah, but as the face of my Shekina (בָּלַל שְׁדֵי שְׁחֵינַת) I was not made known to them.

5. The Peshito: And spake the Lord (Moryo) with Moses and said to him: I am the Lord and I appeared to Abraham and to Isaac and to Jacob as the God El Shaddai (בָּלַל שְׁדֵי אלוהים) and the name of the Lord I did not show to them.
6. The Samaritan Hebrew text agrees with the Hebrew, except that it has Jehovah instead of God in verse 2, reads " hvor" instead of " qov" in verse 3, and adds Wau (and) after Abraham.

7. The Samaritan Targum is a literal rendering of the Hebrew.

8. The Arabic of Saadya: Then spake God to Moses and said to him: I am God who named myself to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as the Mighty, the Sufficient, and my name is God.

9. The English version: And God spake unto Moses and said unto him: I am the Lord (RV, Jehovah) and I appeared unto Abraham and unto Isaac and unto Jacob by the name of (RV, as) God Almighty; but by (RV, or "as to") my name Jehovah was I (RV I was) not known (RV or made known) unto them.

10. The Dutch translation: Then spake God unto Moses and said unto him: I am the Lord and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as God the Almighty; but by my name Lord I was not known to them.

11. Luther's German version: And God spake with Moses and said unto him: I am the Lord and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob that I would be their Almighty God but my name Lord was not revealed to them.

On the basis of the investigation of the verse given above the writer would suggest the following renderings: And God spake unto Moses and said unto him; I am Jehovah and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob in the character of the God of Might (or, mighty God) and in the character of my name Jehovah I did not make myself known unto them. Or, if the last part of the verse is to be regarded as a question, the rendering should be: And in the character of my name Jehovah did I not make myself known unto them? Either of these suggested translations will bring this verse into entire harmony with the rest of the Pentateuch. Consequently, it is unfair and illogical to use a forced translation of Exodus vi. 3 in support of a theory that would destroy the unity of authorship and the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch.
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The past fifty years have witnessed the discovery of a wealth of material from the ancient Near East which has illuminated many of the customs of the Old Testament. Of particular interest to this study is the large amount of material which has shed light on our understanding of law and covenant in the Old Testament. The need has arisen to revise many earlier conclusions. The purpose of this study is to take another look at the ten commandments. Within this century alone, a large corpus of material has been written on the Decalogues in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5. In view of the new insights, an attempt will be made to exegete Exodus 20:1-17. In the process of evaluating the role of the ten commandments in today's world, the first step must be to understand the demands of the Decalogue in the original historical context. This paper is limited to the first step.

The general context in which the events of chapter 20 had their roots must first be reviewed. Having crossed the Red Sea, the Israelites entered the wilderness of Shur (Exodus 15:22). The story of God's people during the wilderness period was one of discontent, murmuring, strife, rebellion, and a general lack of faith. Throughout the difficult journey, however, God continued to care for the people, providing them with manna and quail (16:1-36) and deliverance from the Amalekites (17:13). On the third new moon after the people had escaped Egypt, they came into the

wilderness of Sinai (19:1). In Sinai, God extended His great promise to the people. "If you will obey my voice and keep my covenant you shall be my own possession among all peoples" (19:5). The people affirmed their decision to follow the LORD's word. In preparation for the great theophany, they consecrated themselves and washed their garments (19:14). The descension of God upon Sinai was to allow the people to hear God's speech with Moses and to instill in them a trust in Moses (19:9).

On the morning of the third day, the great cosmic scene evolved. Thundering, lightning, and a thick cloud surrounding the mountain provided the backdrop for the presence of Yahweh. The people were not permitted to ascend or to touch the border of the mountain. All the camp trembled (19:16). After Moses received further instructions from the LORD and returned to the people, God began to speak. After identifying Himself as the God who delivered them from Egypt, He proceeded to relate the commands which Israel was to follow (20:1-17). Having witnessed the awesome Sinai scene, the people requested that Moses speak to them, not God (20:19). Moses again drew near to the thick cloud where God was (20:22). The LORD gave Moses ordinances to communicate to the people (20:21-23:33), which he laid before them, with all the words of the LORD. Again the people spoke, "We will do [all the words]" (24:3). Moses wrote all the words and the next morning built an altar to the LORD. Ratification of the covenant occurred soon (24:8).

The immediate context for chapter 20 is set in 19:16ff. with the beginning of the theophany. On this day of cosmic eruption the three blocks of material in chapter 20 find their setting (*Sitz im Leben*). The presence of the LORD saturated Mount Sinai. The people viewing the smoking mountain and hearing the sound of the trumpet stood at the foot of the mountain trembling. After Moses returned to the people and reiterated to them the consequences of approaching too close to God's majesty, God spoke the words which form the unit of material to be considered in this study (20:1-17).

The commandments found in 20:1-17 are said to be
spoken by God at Sinai. The audience is not mentioned in the opening statement (20:1). Throughout the commandments the pronoun "you" is singular. This would, perhaps, suggest that Moses was the immediate listener.\(^2\) However, it appears from other passages that the people heard God speak. For instance, before the theophany, the LORD revealed to Moses that the people would hear His communication with Moses (19:9). Also later the LORD stated that He had talked with the people from heaven (20:22). After God had spoken, the people requested that Moses be the mediator (20:19): the people did not want God to speak to them, lest they die (20:19).\(^3\) If (as it seems) Israel was the audience, the singular, second person pronoun emphasizes the message addressed to the individuals within the community and the requirement of individual observance.\(^4\)

Much of the new information concerning the ten commandments\(^5\) has come from an analysis of the form of the "ten words" and a comparison of the form with others in the ancient Near East. By simple observation one recognizes

\(^2\) Since the pronoun "you" is singular throughout 20:1-17, it might appear that God was addressing Himself to Moses alone. Of course Moses would then be expected to relate the message to the Israelites.

\(^3\) It could be argued that the people had not yet heard the voice of God. By observing the activities of nature around Sinai, they might feel that if God spoke to them, surely they would die. Though this passage is somewhat ambiguous, the other passages seem to indicate that the people indeed heard God's voice.


\(^5\) The introductory remark (20:1) does not mention "ten words" but simply states "these words." Other passages, however, give precedence for coining the term "ten commandments" or "ten words" (Ex. 34:28; Dt. 4:13; 10:4). There is no complete agreement on a
that all of the commandments are in the negative except for those relating to the Sabbath and the honoring of parents (20:8,12). Further analysis indicates that the laws of Israel were of two types. Albrecht Alt has identified two forms of law.\(^7\) One type of law (casuistic law) is to be found in the "if" clauses of the Book of Covenant (20:22-23:19) and also in the Holiness Code (Lev. 17-26).\(^8\) This conditional law consisted of the characteristic formula: If this happens, then that will be the consequence. This type of law was common in the ancient Near East as is evident from legal documents

division of the commandments into their separate entities. The RSV follows Josephus, Philo, the Greek fathers, and the Reformed Church in dividing 20:2-3 for the first, 20:4-6 for second, 20:7 for the third, 20:8-11 for the fourth, and 20:12-17 for the remaining six. Modern Jews tend to separate 20:2 for the first, 20:3-6 for the second, and 20:7-17 for the remainder. The Latin fathers, the Roman Catholics, and the Lutherans see 20:2-6 as the first, 20:7 as the second, 20:8-11 as the third, 20:12-16 as the fourth through eighth, 20:17a as the ninth and 20:17b as the tenth. Each of these different divisions reflects not only different emphases, but also an approach toward handling critical exegetical problems; cf. J. E. Huesman, "Exodus," *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968).


\(^7\) J. J. Stamm with M. E. Andrew, *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research* (Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1967), p. 31. Stamm and Andrews' book is an excellent compendium of the more important explanations of various portions of the decalogue. It provided a major source for this study.

\(^8\) At this point it may be helpful to identify the legal material designated by various terms by scholars. Hyatt quotes Pfeiffer's list: (cf. Hyatt, op. cit., 200.)

2. Ritual Decalogue--Ex. 34:10-26 and 22:29b-30; 23:12,15-19
3. Twelve (originally ten) Curses--Dt. 27:14-26
4. Ten Commandments--Dt. 5:6-21 and Ex. 20:1-12
5. Deuteronomic Code--Dt. 12-26
6. Holiness Code--Lev. 17-26
from Sumeria and the laws in the Code of Hammurabi. On the other hand, Alt felt that the short command or prohibition, characteristic of the ten commandments, was without parallel in ancient oriental law. Alt concluded that this form of legal material was unique to Israel and a unique expression of her religion.\(^9\) In the course of time, an interesting discovery was made: There were extra-Israelite parallels to apodictic law. George Mendenhall found parallels between the Decalogue and vassal treaties of Hittite kings who reigned in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C.\(^10\) Of course such a date indicates that the treaties were written around the time of the Exodus. Evidently the Hittite covenant form circulated in the same area where the Israelites had wandered, i.e., from Northern Syria to Egypt. It is very possible that Israel became familiar with this form during this period. One type of Hittite treaty was the suzerainty treaty,\(^11\) in which the suzerain extended his terms to the vassal king. In a similar manner, God extended the terms of His love to Israel. In the Hittite documents great attention was given to the benevolence of the king. In fact, the vassal's motive for obligation was gratitude for what had been done for him by the suzerain.\(^12\) The ten commandments are prefaced by a reminder to Israel of God's care.

\(^9\) Alt sees the connection of apodictic law with Moses and Sinai as grounded in the cultic practices of Israel, i.e., in the recitation of the law at the Feast of Tabernacles; cf. Stamm, op. cit., p. 35.


\(^11\) Another type of treaty has been discovered, viz., the parity treaty, in which both partners in the treaty had equal status; cf. G. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *Biblical Archaeologist Reader* III (New York: Anchor Books, 1970), 25-53.

\(^12\) D. Hillers has written an excellent book on the covenant idea. One chapter deals with Sinai (and Shechem) and the parallels to the Hittite treaties; D. Hillers, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969), pp. 46-71.
Beyerlin has written an interesting study of the parallels, and he notes particularly those parallel to Exodus 20 which aid in the text's interpretation. The Hittite treaties had preambles in which the originator of the covenant presented himself (cf. 20:2). A historical prologue gave the great deeds of the Lord (cf. 20:2). The dependence on the founder of the covenant excluded any concurrent dependence (cf. 20:3). The covenant was not valid unless it existed in written form. Moses, too, wrote the "words of the covenant, the ten words" (34:28). The Hittite documents had to be kept in appropriate places (cf. Deuteronomy 31:9-26), and the documents were to be read regularly to the people. These examples of Hittite treaties provide many parallels with the legal material at Sinai. The question is how one should


14 A covenant tablet for Rimisarma, king of the Halap country. My father Mursiks made it for him, but the tablet was robbed. I, the Great king, made a new tablet for him, with my seal I sealed it and gave it to him. In all future nobody must change the words of this tablet." Cf. A. S. Kapelrud, "Some Recent Points of View on the Time and Origin of the Decalogue," *Studia Theologica* XVIII (1964), 87.

15 Although there is no regulation in the text of Exodus 20 concerning the reading of the words, "there can be no doubt that the Decalogue was proclaimed at more or less regular intervals in Israel's cult in some form or other;" cf. Beyerlin, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

16 Beyerlin feels the logical conclusion is that the decalogue was modeled after the well-established treaty form found in the Hittite treaties (cf. *Ibid.*, p. 43). M. Andrew has a valuable discussion on the caution which should be taken in making assertions as to the dependence or origin of treaties or apodictic laws. He mentions, in particular, the work of Dennis McCarthy in evaluating the covenant, treaty idea; cf. Stamm, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-74.
interpret these data.\textsuperscript{17} For the purpose of this study, these observations can be made. The genre of legal material represented by Exodus 20:1-17 is not unique in the ancient Near East. It is true that much of the content and intent is different; however, the basic forms of expression and terminology used in formulating the covenant has parallels in the thirteenth century B.C. Therefore, the form of literature confirms a date of origin which is compatible with the time period expressed in the Biblical material, i.e., about the thirteenth century B.C.

Most scholars feel that originally all the commandments were a brief single clause.\textsuperscript{18} Also some think that the commandments on the Sabbath and on reverence toward parents were originally in prohibitive form. Thus the sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments (20:13-15) have been understood as normative. The differences between the Deuteronomic statement of the ten words and the Exodus account have been adduced as proof that the original list of

\textsuperscript{17} D. McCarthy is "wary of using literary forms to argue to historical dates since literary forms can and do have a complex and variable history...." In other words, he is hesitant to use similar literary forms (i.e., Hittite treaties) in dating the Decalogue. In fact, McCarthy feels that "the Decalogue itself is really something different from the apodictic stipulations of the treaties and can hardly be deduced from the treaty form." D. J. McCarthy, "Covenant in the Old Testament: The Recent State of Inquiry," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXVII (1965), 229f.

\textsuperscript{18} A typical reconstruction is suggested by R. Kittel: (cf. Stamm, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 18f.).

I. I, Yahweh, am your God: you shall have no other gods before me.
II. Do not make yourself a divine image.
III. Do not utter the name of your God Yahweh for empty purposes.
IV. Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.
V. Honor father and mother.
VI. Do not murder.
VII. Do not commit adultery.
VIII. Do not steal.
IX. Do not speak lying witness against your neighbor.
X. Do not covet the house of your neighbor.
the commandments was briefer. For instance, in Exodus the reason for "remembering" the Sabbath is that God rested on the seventh day; in Deuteronomy the reason given is that the people of Israel were once slaves in Egypt. Deuteronomy gives a reason for honoring parents not mentioned in Exodus, viz., "that it may go well with you" (Deuteronomy 5:16). Different words also occur in these two passages. The variations in the two accounts must be explained somehow. Scholars feel the accounts represent two traditions of the Decalogue, expanded as they were transmitted. Thus, scholars say, originally both were briefer.

Quest for the original Decalogue leads one to look for the origin of the commandments. Mention has been made of attempts to parallel the literary form with existing forms in the ancient Near East. Some of the major theories which have been proposed for the origin of the commandments are now to be noted. Many scholars are rather vague as to the origin of the Decalogue. They speak of the Sinai tradition. Von Rad thinks the Sinai tradition grew out of the Shechemite shrine's festival legend and that its basic structure reflected the pattern of the cult there. Noth also connects the revelation on Sinai with a cult and its creed; he thinks various traditions (e.g., Egypt, Sinai, Conquest) were brought together as a result of the tribal confederacy or amphictyony. To Noth, Moses had no historical connection with the event which

19 In Ex. 20:16, the expression 'ed saqer occurs; in Dt. 5:20, the same commandment has 'ed saw. In Ex. 20:17, lo tahimod is found; the similar commandment in Dt. 5:21 has lo tih'auel.

20 Von Rad also finds an Exodus-Settlement tradition which was independent of the Sinai tradition. The former tradition was associated with the Feast of Weeks at Gilgal. After both traditions had been severed from this cultic background, the Yahwist incorporated the two traditions into his work; cf. G. von Rad, The Problem of the Hexateuch and other essays, trans. E.W.T. Dicken (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966), pp. 48-50.

21 Beyerlin, op. cit., xvi.
occurred on Sinai.²² For both of these scholars, participation by all Israel in the Sinai events as recorded in Exodus 19ff. is "out of the question." Both Kapelrud and Beyerlin locate the origin of the Decalogue at Kadesh. The tribes gathered there and summed up what had happened to them. Evidently Sinai was not far from Kadesh (Deuteronomy 1:2). It was at Kadesh that the great historical events received a cultic expression.²³ Beyerlin suggests that the part played by the cult in developing the Sinaitic tradition should not cause one to overlook the impulse which proceeded from historical circumstances. "It was God's activity in history that gave the impulse to the formation of this tradition and had a decisive influence on its contents and character."²⁴ He holds that the Decalogue was recited in the cult for the renewal of the covenant for many years and that through its long and active use, explanatory clauses were added to the original, briefer Decalogue for the people's benefit.²⁵ Noth feels the original Decalogue was expanded by explanations, reasons, and recommendations.²⁶ The theories of the traditions as proposed by these scholars by no means exhaust all the theories.²⁷

²² Hyatt, op. cit., 220.
²³ Kapelrud, op. cit., 89.
²⁴ Beyerlin, op. cit., p. 169.
²⁵ Ibid., p. 50.
²⁶ Noth, op. cit., p. 161. "When a piece which, like the Decalogue, represents a catechism-like collection of the fundamental requirements of God, has been handed down over a long period and has been repeated, the secondary appearance of expansions and alterations is not to be wondered at."
²⁷ See Eduard Nielsen, The Ten Commandments in New Perspective (Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc.; 1968). Nielsen's study attempts to present a history of the traditions of the Decalogue, after first dealing with literary and form-critical problems (thus the reason for his subtitle "A traditio-historical approach"). Another approach is
Among the benefits from the various explanations given for the origin and subsequent history of the Decalogue is that the evidence affirms the importance of Moses in Israelite history.\textsuperscript{28} The tradition concerning the writing of the "words of the LORD" (Exodus 24:3, 13) appears to be reliable. Thus the origin at Sinai through the mediatorship of Moses seems probable. That the Decalogue had a "historical development" after Moses seems to be supported by the Bible itself. The differences between the accounts of the "ten words" in Exodus and Deuteronomy lend validity to the supposition that some additions were made in the transmission, which seemed appropriate to those who handled the text.\textsuperscript{29} The efforts to arrive at the original Decalogue by making the other commandments conform to the structure of the sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments do not appear convincing.

Concerning the growth of the material and its com-

\textsuperscript{28} Harrelson states that the Old Testament is implicit about the importance of Moses: "no more appropriate author could be suggested;" cf. W. J. Harrelson, "Ten Commandments," \textit{Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible} IV (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), 573.

\textsuperscript{29} It is even possible that Moses altered the account when he related it to Israel in Dt. 5.
pilation, it appears from the text that the Decalogue (20:1-17) and the Covenant Code (20:22-23:33) were recorded soon after they were spoken (24:12 and 24:3). Later some individual wrote the material of 20:18-21, giving an account of the incidents which preceded Moses receiving additional instructions from the LORD (20:22-26).  

The same author probably also composed the material in 10:16ff., for many descriptions of the cosmos are the same in both accounts.  

The narrative in 20:18-21 is important, both because it relates the reaction of God's people to this momentous event and because it emphasizes the important place Moses had in the eyes of the people.

**Analysis and Interpretation**

Upon an understanding of the general structure and context of the "ten words" in chapter 20, the remainder of the study will be concerned with an analysis and interpretation of the individual passages and their relationship to the whole (i.e., to the pericope and the entire chapter). Unless a grammatical construction bears particular significance to the interpretation of a passage, the notation will be reserved for the footnote.

The words of God in 20:1-17 form the pericope to be

---

30 Beyerlin feels 20:1-17 stood between 20:18-21 and 24:1ff. before the insertion of the Book of the Covenant. Therefore the Decalogue was inserted into its context before the insertion of the Book of the Covenant which displaced the Decalogue in its role as the Book of the Covenant; Beyerlin, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

31 Beyerlin attributes this material to E; cf. *Ibid*. This writer feels the account was written nearer to the period when the theophany occurred. If the laws could be written, then surely narratives which accounted for the origin of the laws and the circumstances could also be written.

32 Beyerlin feels this section was written to answer the question why the voice of God was no longer heard by the cultic community at the cultic recapitulation of the Sinai-theophany; cf. *Ibid.*, p. 139.
interpreted. The tone for the entire section is set by verse 2: "I am the LORD, your [sing.] God\textsuperscript{33} who brought you [sing.]\textsuperscript{34} out of the land of Egypt from the house of slaves." The LORD can call on His people because he has delivered them;\textsuperscript{35} the Israelites have changed masters. The Israelite was to view the commandments through a heart which had been touched by the loving action of the LORD. The commandments were an expression of God's concern for Israel; God's grace was manifest in the demands of the law. One must determine whether the first commandment intends to advocate monotheism or monolatry. "There shall not be to you [sing.] other gods before me\textsuperscript{36} (20:3). The verse claims that Yahweh tolerates no rivals to his authority. If other gods confront you now or in the future, he would warn, immediately consider them as nothing. None should be in your presence, for Yahweh is among His people. The force of \textit{lo '} with the imperfect stresses permanent prohibition.\textsuperscript{37}

The second "word" draws on the implications of the first: "You shall not make for yourself an idol or any form

\textsuperscript{33}The phrase \textit{`anoki yehah `eloheyka} can be interpreted in two ways: "I am Yahweh, your God" or "I, Yahweh, am your God." The former interpretation is followed by the LXX and Vulgate and is herein advocated. The phrase "Yahweh, your God" is found in 20:5, 7, 10, 12.

\textsuperscript{34} The second person singular is used throughout the 17 verses. As has been suggested, it emphasizes the necessity of individual response.

\textsuperscript{35} Again the relation is to be viewed in light of the benefits that were extolled in the vassal treaties of the Hittites, as an incentive to obedience by the vassal.

\textsuperscript{36} The phrase \textit{`al panay} is rendered in various ways: RSV: "before me" or "beside me"; NEB: "against me" or Koehler: "in defiance of me;" LXX, \textit{plen emou}. All the interpretations would indicate the same general meaning for the verse.

which is ... (anywhere)" (20:4). To the ancient Near Eastern mind, the idol was the place of residence of the god.\(^{38}\) The deity was not considered the material of the image; the deity simply resided in the form. The question has arisen whether the images prohibited were those of foreign gods or of Yahweh. Perhaps with a view toward the situation, the Israelites were commanded not to cleave to any forms of wood, stone, or metal; the images of the Canaanite gods were abundant in the land. Not only were the Israelites not to offer religious worship to foreign deities\(^{39}\) "residing in images," but they, no doubt, were not to construct a form of Yahweh.\(^{40}\) They were to remember, "I am the LORD, your God, a jealous God\(^{41}\) visiting upon the iniquities of fathers to sons upon those of the third and fourth generations to those who hate me" (20:15). The phraseology is reminiscent of the opening acclamation (20:2): "Remember, Israel, I the LORD your God was the one who brought you out of slavery; I am zealous for your welfare. Do not be led to serve

\(^{38}\) As early as the First Dynasty of Egypt it was stated in the "Theology of Memphis" that gods entered into images of wood, stone; cf. Hyatt, *op. cit.*, 203.

\(^{39}\) Stamm states that the phrase *tistahweh ta‘ab dem* in 20:5, means in essence "to offer religious worship" and is only used in connection with divinities which are foreign to Israel and forbidden to her, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

\(^{40}\) No figures of Yahweh have been found in excavations, though many Canaanite figurines in Israelite houses have been found; cf. D.M.G. Stalker, "Exodus," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* (Great Britain: Nelson, 1962), p. 228.

other gods. Yes, I punish those who hate me, but view my stedfast love which extends to thousands, to those who love me and keep my commands (20:6).

A name was a precious thing to ancient man; it reflected his being, his personality. Accordingly, God's name was representative of His nature, His Holiness. "You shall not take the name of the LORD your God in vain, for the LORD will not leave unpunished the one who takes His name in vain" (20:7). The use of God's name for no purposeful intent included at least two activities. The Israelite was not to swear by God's name falsely (Leviticus 19:12). There was, however, a legitimate, meaningful way of swearing by His

42 BDB thinks ta 'ab'dem means to "be led or enticed to serve." F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and A. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Great Britain: Oxford, 1959). The NEB gives "be led to worship them" as a possibility. Also, Zimmerli thinks the lahem refers back to "other gods"; cf. Stamm, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

43 Possibly such a judgment is placed on the sons because they too hate the LORD (20:5).

44 *Hesed* is hard to express in English: RSV, "stedfast love"; ASV, "loving kindness"; BDB, "kindness"; NEB, "(keep) faith"; KJV, "mercy"; (LXX, *Eleos*).

45 It appears that a parallelism is indicated; those who love me are those who keep my commands (Dt. 6:5ff.).

46 Stalker, *loc. cit.*

47 Andrew sees *nasa* in the sense of lifting up one's voice. He further states that *sawi* "is used in many sections of the Old Testament for what is false (just made up) [Dt. 5:20], empty (having no point or purpose, hopeless) [Isa. 1:13], and for what even has a light-minded but nevertheless mischievous wantonness in it [Ex. 23:11]." M. Andrew, "Using God," *Expository Times* LXXIV (1963), 305.

48 No doubt, another way of using God's name for no meaningful reason was in cursing God (Lev. 24:13ff.).
Another way of dishonoring God's name was using it in magic formulas. The names of divinities were prominent in incantations in the ancient Near East. The use of the name of a deity was important in affecting curses or bringing misfortune upon a person. The sorcerer who invoked a deity's name was actually attempting to gain control of a deity and his power. Yahweh made it clear to Israel that such pronouncement of His name was prohibited and was punishable. Yahweh's name was to be protected from unlawful use in oath, curse, or sorcery. Control could not be gained over Yahweh either by making an image or invoking His name.

The Israelite was to "remember the day of the Sabbath to observe it as holy" (20:8) for the LORD "rested on the seventh day (and) . . . blessed the day of Sabbath and observed it as holy" (20:11). Man was asked by God to share in the observance of the Sabbath. Not only was the man not to work, but also those under his care were to cease from labor (20:10).

The origin of the Sabbath

49 Jeremiah speaks of swearing by the phrase "as the LORD lives" as being expressive of God's people (Jer. 12:16).
50 Stamm, op. cit., p. 89.
51 Deuteronomy has the motivation of remembrance of the slavery in Egypt (5:15).
52 It is commonly alleged that this commandment cannot be from Moses because those tending the flocks could not rest even one day. Hyatt comments that one does not know how Israel defined work. Hyatt, op. cit., 204.
53 Both the LXX and Dt. add two animals to the list in Exodus 20:10 (ox and ass).
outside the institution of Yahweh is obscure.54

The next commandment, like the Sabbath statement, is positive, rather than negative in form:55 "Honor56 your father and mother in order that your days will continue long upon the land57 which the LORD your God gives you" (20:12). It appears that this is the only commandment which is intended for children, rather than for the paterfamilias. However, in light of the family situation in Israel the relationship between adults and their aged parents lies within the scope of the commandment also. The normal family unit was the clan which dwelt together on inherited property.58 Aged parents lived with their adult children. In those years when the parents would be unable to care for their own needs, it was the adult child's responsibility to provide for their welfare.59

54 Stamm posits three possible origins: (1) sapattu in Babylon, which was the 15th day of the month, (2) Kenites, a tribe of smiths, had a Sabbath day of rest, which Moses appropriated (Koehler, Budde, Rowley), and (3) the market day which developed into a festival day (E. Jenni); cf. Stamm, op. cit., pp. 90-92. Stalker states that the Babylonian sapattu was quite different from Jewish Sabbath (e.g., there is nothing about ceasing work in connection with it); Stalker, loc. cit.

55 Many scholars feel that the commandment was originally negative (e.g., "You shall not curse your father or mother."). Nielsen suggests that the affirmative form was a transformation which occurred under the influence of the Wisdom literature; cf. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 117.

56 Kabed was the opposite of despise (Dt. 21:18-21). In Num. 22:17, to do a person honor is to obey a person. In Mal. 1:6, honor is associated with fear. Upon the death of Nahash, David sent comforters to Hanun. Such an action by David was considered as a means of honoring Nahash (II Sam. 10:3ff.).

57 Both the LXX and Dt. add "and that it may go well with you."

58 Stamm, op. cit., p. 95.

59 G. Beer states, "The aged parents, those over 60 years, whose capacity for work and whose valuation has diminished are not to be treated harshly by the Israelite; he is not to begrudge them the bread of charity, or force them to leave the house or take the way of voluntary death, or even to kill them himself." Ibid.
children is seen in Deuteronomy 21:18-21. The book of Proverbs contains much material on the child-parent relationship (e.g., 19:26; 20:20). The fifth commandment concludes with the promise that one's life upon the land will be lengthy. This promise should be seen in view of Yahweh's promise concerning the gift of the land. The commandment is indicative of the fact that a woman as mother was equal to the man as father. Proverbs insists on the respect due to one's mother (e.g., 23:22; 30:17). Though a woman's position was often limited, her role as mother and wife was an honored one.

An understanding of the sixth commandment, "You shall not kill," centers on the meaning of rasah. Three words are used in the Old Testament to designate "killing:" hemit (201 times), harag (165 times), and rasah (46 times). Some would confine the meaning of rasah in Exodus 20:13 to "murder" (i.e., premeditated killing). However, other passages indicate that rasah is used for accidental (i.e., unintentional) killing as well as for deliberate killing.

A stubborn and rebellious son was to be taken by his parents to the elders of the city. All the men of the city would then stone him to death.

As Nielsen states, "The basic idea is, of course, not that obedience to parents leads automatically to the attainment of a long life, but that those who show respect to and care for their parents are rewarded by Yahweh with length of life on the plot of land which he has bestowed upon them," Nielsen, op. cit., p. 103.


Hemit and harag are "used for killing one's personal enemy, for murdering him, for killing a political enemy in battle, for killing one who was punishable according to the law, and for death as a judgement of God." Stamm, op. cit., p. 99.

The NEB has translated rasah "murder."

Nielson is justified in saying that "it is no part of the purpose of this commandment to rule out the death penalty or the waging of war." Though rasah is used in one instance of capital punishment (Numbers 35:30), it is clear that such punishment when commanded by God is not prohibited by the sixth "word." Also the wars sanctioned by Yahweh in the Old Testament and the accompanying killing of enemies in battle (cf. Deuteronomy 20:1ff) are outside the meaning of 20:13. In fact, rasah is never used for the killing of the enemy in battle. That premeditated murder is prohibited is unquestionable; that accidental killing is prohibited also may be surprising. However, in a society where capital punishment and wars were permitted and commanded, the sanctity of human life had to be preserved. It was God's prerogative, and His alone, to give and take life.

The seventh commandment, "You shall not commit adultery," is directed toward unfaithfulness in the marriage relationship. In fact, Rylaarsdam states that naap is used exclusively in the Old Testament concerning marital infidelity. Leviticus 20:10 and Jeremiah 29:23 define naap as a man with the wife of his neighbor. Adultery constitutes a denial of the unity of the relationship between

---

66 Nielson, op. cit., p. 108.
67 Cf. Stamm, loc. cit.
69 Hauck comments, "Adultery is the violation of the marriage of another, Gn. 39:10ff. Hence a man is not under obligation to avoid all non-marital intercourse. Unconditional fidelity is demanded only of the woman, who in marriage becomes the possession of her husband." D. F. Hauck, "Moicheuo" Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1967), p. 730. De Vaux states, "The husband is exhorted to be faithful to his wife in Pr. 5:15-19, but his infidelity is punished only if he violates the rights of another man by taking a married woman as his accomplice." De Vaux, op. cit., p. 37.
man and woman, a unity offered by Yahweh.\textsuperscript{70}

The eighth “word” prohibits stealing.\textsuperscript{71} Harrelson thinks the Old Testament conceives of property as a kind of extension of the "self" of its owner (Joshua 7:24).\textsuperscript{72} He concludes that acts of theft are violations of the person. Alt asserts that the commandment did not mean theft in general, but refers rather to the kidnapping of the free Israelite man. The kidnapping of dependent persons or those not free was covered by 20:17. Because Exodus 21:16 was from an apodictic series, Alt concluded that it would be placed into the Decalogue (i.e., defining 20:15).\textsuperscript{73} However, as Anderson has stated, simply because one meaning can be found in one apodictic series does not mean that another apodictic series has the same meaning.\textsuperscript{74} It seems best to preserve the general meaning of "steal."

The next commandment does not deal primarily with gossip, but with the lying witness who jeopardizes the welfare of another. "You shall not testify (as) a witness of false hood\textsuperscript{75} against your neighbor (20:16). The setting for this commandment is in the court.\textsuperscript{76} "He who showed himself to be truthful here would not have wanted to give way to falsehood elsewhere.”\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{70} Harrelson, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{72} Harrelson, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{73} Cf. Stamm, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 104
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{75} BDB (p. 729) reads ‘\textit{ed} as a person; RSV and NEB have translated it as objective evidence.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Anah} has a special meaning for the reciprocal answering of the parties in law.
\textsuperscript{77} Stamm, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 109.
The last "word" of the ten centers around the meaning of *hamad*. "You shall not desire the house of your neighbor; you shall not desire the wife of your neighbor or his slave or his maidservant or his herd of cattle or his ass or anything which is to your neighbor." The question has arisen as to whether the Decalogue really prohibited a covetous impulse of the heart. Herrmann showed that *hamad* was repeatedly followed in the Old Testament by verbs meaning "to take" or "to rob" (Deuteronomy 7:25; Joshua 7:21). He concluded that the Hebrew understood the verb to mean an emotion which led to corresponding actions. Herrmann's attempts to validate his point have not been accepted by all scholars. Hyatt takes a different view. A person in a place of authority or serving as a judge should not be covetous and thus allow himself to be bribed. Since the courts of justice were administered by laymen, bribery was a common temptation. Hyatt feels an injunction against it was necessary. Concerning whether covetousness would have been forbidden in Moses' time, Hyatt cites an early document which forbids covetousness. This writer favors the view that the commandment is directed toward the impulse of the heart.

Of necessity, this exegesis has limited itself to Old

---

78 Both the LXX andDt. reverse house and wife.
79 He used Ex. 34:24, where *hamad* is not followed by a verb to show that desire was closely related to action.
80 H. J. Stoebe is somewhat doubtful as to the meaning of *hamad*; cf. Stamm, *loc. cit*.
81 Hyatt, *op. cit.*, 205. He feels this would follow the court motif for 20:16.
82 "The Instruction of the Vizier Ptahhotep" relates, "Do not be covetous against thy (own) kindred .... It is (only) a little of that for which one is covetous that turns a calm man into a contentious man"; cf. *Ibid*. 
Testament material. An attempt has been made to express the meaning of the Decalogue in its original historical context. The task remains of evaluating later references and interpretations of the "ten words" found in the New Testament and in Rabbinic literature in light of the Decalogue's original meaning. No doubt, reinterpretations were made in changing circumstances. Perhaps this study has acquainted the reader with a new perspective in which to view the commandments. The words were given in a less-than-passive setting; though the cosmic eruptions invoked fear in the people, they were to remember that the God of the Exodus was in control. The commandments He gave them were expressive of His gracious love and, in fact, were designed for their welfare.
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OF ALL countries upon the face of the earth Palestine seems one of the least likely to have produced anything striking or world shaking. Nevertheless, in Palestine there appeared a phenomenon the like of which the world has never seen elsewhere.\(^1\) The present day Bedouin of Palestine can hardly be regarded as the bearers of advanced thought and culture and there is not much reason to believe that they differ markedly from some of Palestine's earlier inhabitants.\(^2\) Yet in Palestine the most sublime ideas of God and, his love to mankind appeared, and in Palestine alone did the truth concerning man and his plight make itself known. What is the explanation of these facts? How are we to account for the large body of prophets, with their teleological message, their declaration of a Redeemer to come, forming a mighty, evergrowing stream that culminated in the person and work of Jesus Christ?

If we accept the Scriptures at face value we find that they are filled with references to Moses whom they regard as the human founder of the theocracy. It was Moses whom God used to bring his people out of Egyptian bondage and to give to them his unchanging law. "He made known his ways unto Moses", we read in Psalm 103, and this is only one of the testimonies that attributes to Moses the claim that Moses received his commission by divine revelation. Can we today, however, simply accept the plain testimony of the Scriptures as they stand?\(^3\) Modern scholarship very largely denies that we can, and we must give some attention to its claims.

---

\(^1\) Cf. "But when we take it all together, from Abraham and/or Moses to Jesus and the apostolic Church, it does cohere together; there is a consistency about it, and as history--not simply some imaginary salvation history--it is without parallel anywhere or at any time in the history of this planet". Christopher R. North: *The Second Isaiah*, Oxford, 1964, p. 27.

\(^2\) If some modern reconstructions of Israel's history are correct, the Israelites on the whole were little more advanced than some of the present day Bedouin.

\(^3\) "Von diesem Bild (i. e., the picture which the Old Testament gives of Israel's beginnings) hat die einsetzende Bibelkritik manches Element
The Sinai "Tradition"

In the discussion of these questions Professor Gerhard von Rad of Heidelberg University has taken a prominent part. The last one hundred and fifty years of critical historical scholarship, he tells us, have destroyed the picture of Israel's history which the church had derived from its acceptance of the Old Testament. According to critical historical scholarship we can no longer regard it possible that all of Israel was present at Sinai or that as a unit the whole nation crossed the Red Sea or achieved the conquest of Palestine. The picture given to us in Exodus, to be frank, is unhistorical.4

The account of Israel's origin given in the Old Testament, we are told, is extremely complicated, being based upon a few old motifs around which a number of freely circulating traditions have clustered. Both these ancient motifs and the separate traditions were pronouncedly confessionalistic in character.5 We thus have two pictures of Israel's history, that which the faith of Israel has reconstructed and that which modern historical scholarship has reconstructed. It is this latter which tells of "the history as it really was in Israel", for this latter method is rational and "objective" in that it employs historical method and presupposes the similarity of all historical occurrence.6


4Op. cit., p. 113 (E. T., pp. 106, 107). "Die historisch-kritische Wissenschaft halt es fur unmoglich, dass ganz Israel am Sinai war, dass Israel en bloc das Schilfmeer durchschritten und die Landnahme vollzogen hat, sie halt das Bild, das die Uberlieferungen des Buches Exodus von Mose und seinem Fuhreramt zeichnen, fur ebenso ungeschichtlich wie die Funktion, die das deuteronomistische Richterbuch den Richtern' zuschreibt".


6Op. cit., pp. 113 f. (E. T., p. 107), "Die eine ist rational und objektiv', d. h. sie baut mit Hilfe der historischen Methode' und unter der Voraussetzung der Gleichartigkeit alles historischen Geschehens an einem kritischen Bild der Geschichte, so wie es in Israel wirklich gewesen ist". With-
Yet historical investigation has its limits; it cannot explain
the phenomenon of Israel's faith, and the manner in which
Israel's faith presented history is still far from being adequately
elucidated. It is this question with which the work of theo-
logical investigation is primarily to be concerned.

In the second volume of--his work, as a result of criticism,
von Rad somewhat dulled the alternatives. In the English
translation this particular section is omitted, but it might be
well to call attention to the most significant sentence. "The
historical method opens for us only one aspect of the many
layered phenomenon of history (Geschichte). This is a layer
which is not able to say anything about the relationship of
the history to God. Even the best attested event of the
'actual history' remains dumb with respect to the divine
control of history. Its relevance for faith can in no wise be
objectively verified."

It is upon this foundation that von Rad proceeds to con-
sider the early history of Israel. In his penetrating work
The Problem of the Hexateuch von Rad had already directed
attention to what he called the "Sinai tradition". In this
treatise he made a study of Deuteronomy 26:5b-9 which he
regarded as a liturgical formula, the earliest recognizable
example of a creed. This summary of the facts of redemption,
he held, could not have been a freely devised meditation
founded upon historical events. Rather, it reflected the
traditional form in which the faith is presented. Of particular

out attempting any complete evaluation of this statement we would
challenge anyone's right to assume the "similarity of all historical oc-
currence". This rules out miracles and special divine revelation. The historical
occurrences in ancient Israel were not similar to those of other nations,
for God "made known. . . his acts unto the children of Israel" (Psalm
103:7b). To assume otherwise is to adopt an unwarranted presupposition,
as Dr. von Rad does, it is to write an apologetic. That the so-called his-
torical method is genuinely objective is an illusion, and hence any picture
of ancient Israel which this method creates will naturally share in the
weaknesses inherent in the method which produced it.

the influence of Kant's distinction between the phenomenal and noumenal.
For a thorough discussion see Cornelius Van Til: Christianity and Bar-

8 "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch" in Gesammelte
interest is the fact that in this "credo" there is no mention of the events which occurred at Mount Sinai.9

Likewise, in Deuteronomy 6:20-24, which, according to von Rad, is also written after the style of a confession of faith, there is no mention of Mount Sinai, and here the omission is said to be more striking inasmuch as in this passage there is express concern about the divine commandments and statutes. Again, in the historical summary Joshua 24:2b-13 ("shot through", says von Rad, "with all kinds of accretions and embellishments which are immediately recognisable as deriving from the hexateuchal presentation of history") the events of Sinai are said to be completely overlooked.10 All three texts follow a canonical pattern of redemption; indeed, the passage from Joshua is said to be a Hexateuch in miniature. The canonical pattern is clear, for in each instance it omits reference to what occurred at Sinai. The Sinai tradition is independent, and only at a very late date did it become combined with the canonical pattern. There were two originally independent traditions.

The Sinai tradition has been secondarily inserted into that of the wilderness wanderings. Wellhausen had asserted that

9 Von Rad's work has not been without influence. Martin Noth (Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, Damstadt, 1960, pp. 43, 63-67) finds the Sinai traditions already present in the material available to J. "Erst recht gehört der Einbau der Sinaitradition' zu den von J in G schon vorgefundenen Gegebenheiten" (p. 43). Mention may also be made of H. J. Kraus (Gottesdienst in Israel, 2. Aufl., Munchen, 1962, pp. 189-193) who thinks that in the removal of the Shechem cult to Gilgal the fusion of the divergent traditions may have occurred. Cf., also, Leonhard Rost: Das kleine Credo finden andere Studien zum Alten Testament, Heidelberg, 1965.

10 "Auch hier ist der Text mit allerlei Floskeln und Zutaten durchsetzt, deren Herkunft aus der heutatischen Geschichtsdarstellung sofort erkenntlich ist", Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, p. 14. The English translation given above is taken from the English translation of this work, p. 7. It may be remarked in passing that von Rad's constant use of the term Hexateuch is thoroughly unbiblical. The classification of the books into a threefold division is due to the position of their author in the Old Testament economy. For this reason, the five books of which Moses was the author stand apart, the base and foundation (despite Wellhausen) upon which the remainder of the Old Testament builds. It is biblical to speak of a Pentateuch, but not of a Tetrateuch (Noth, Engnell) nor of a Hexateuch (Wellhausen, von Rad).
after the crossing of the Red Sea the Israelites marched on to Kadesh, which is really reached when the people come to Massah and Meribah in the vicinity of Kadesh.\textsuperscript{11} Hence, the places in the events before Sinai and those in the narratives after Sinai are about the same and the expedition to Sinai is to be regarded as secondary. There is, as von Rad puts it, a break in the Kadesh tradition, which tradition alone is closely interwoven with the exodus story proper.\textsuperscript{12}

In the Sinai tradition the predominating elements are the theophany and the making of the covenant, and with these there are bound up less important traditional elements of an aetiological nature which bore no historical relationship to the account of the theophany and the covenant. What part in the life of ancient Israel did this Sinai tradition play? We may best understand the tradition as a cultic ceremony which was itself prior to the cultus and normative for it. It is the cult legend for a particular cult occasion. The Sinai experience is not something in the past but is a present reality, for "within the framework of the cultus, where past, present, and future acts of God coalesce in the one tremendous actuality of the faith, such a treatment is altogether possible and indeed essential".\textsuperscript{13} Thus, the events of Sinai were actualized in the cult. Later Israel could easily identify itself with the Israel of Horeb.\textsuperscript{14} It was the material of the ancient Shechem covenant-festival, celebrated at the renewal of the covenants of the Feast of Booths, and incorporated by the "Yahwist" into the Settlement tradition. Only about the time of the exile did the fusion of the two find popular acceptance.\textsuperscript{15}

With respect to von Rad's presentation we would remark that the entire Pentateuch does not at all look like a develop-

\textsuperscript{11} At this point von Rad appeals to Wellhausen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 21 (E. T., pp. 13, 14).
\textsuperscript{12} "Nur der erstere (i. e., the Kadesh tradition) ist aufs engste mit der eigentlichen Auszugsgeschichte verwoben; der andere (i. e., the Sinai tradition) nicht, wie das ja auch der Sprung zwischen Ex. 34 und Num. 10, 29 ff. zeigt" (\textit{op. cit.}, pp. 21 f., E. T., p. 14).
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 36 (E. T., p. 29).
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 61, "erst urn die zeit des Exils ist diese Verbinduhg popular geworden" (E. T., p. 54).
ment or overworking of the cultic credo supposedly found in Deuteronomy 26:5b-9.16

With respect to Deuteronomy 26:5b-9 there is no evidence that it was ever recited at the Gilgal sanctuary at the time of the Feast of Weeks. The action described in this passage is to be performed when the nation enters the land which God will give it. The singular has individualizing force. "Yahweh, who is thy God", we may paraphrase, "will give the land to thee". Emphasis falls upon divine grace. The land is not taken by Israel's power but is a gift of her God. Indeed, the word נָּתַן implies that Israel knew why she was receiving the land. It seems to reflect upon preceding events.

The purpose of the confession is to show that from a small people which entered Egypt and were evilly entreated by the Egyptians the nation became great and powerful. Hence, they cried unto the Lord, and the Lord by mighty wonders brought them out of Egypt unto the place where they now are.17

Is not the reason for the omission of reference to events at Sinai clear? Moses wishes to stress the great contrast between the nation's present position of safety and blessing and its former state of servitude and to bring into prominence the fact that God has brought this change about by means of a mighty act of deliverance. To have introduced at this point the events of Sinai would simply obscure this contrast.18

16 The more one considers von Rad's position, the more apparent does it become that one cannot begin with Deuteronomy 26:5b-9 and from there work as he does to the completed Pentateuch. The whole procedure is based upon fantasy, not fact, and upon acceptance of an unnatural, unrealistic, humorless documentary analysis which does not begin to do justice to the true nature of the Pentateuch. Cf. Oswald T. Allis: *The Fille Books of Moses*, Philadelphia, 1949. There is a unity in the Pentateuch which is best explained as the work of one mind.

17 Artur Weiser (The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development, New York, 1961, p. 85) points out that the Pentateuch is essentially different from an expanded hymn-like prayer or creed.

18 Weiser (op. cit., p. 86) holds that the subject matter of the "Sinai
Von Rad's argument actually proves too much. If absence of the Sinai episode really shows that the Sinai "tradition" was not an integral, original, part of the Exodus "tradition" then the same conclusion follows with respect to the events at Kadesh. Deuteronomy 26:5b-9 says not a word about Kadesh. Are we therefore to conclude that the events at Kadesh were not an original element in the Exodus "traditions"? For that matter the entire fact of the wilderness wanderings is passed over in silence in the Deuteronomy passage, and we are simply told that the Lord "brought us unto this place". Is the entire wilderness episode therefore a separate tradition? If we grant von Rad's premises, we may consistently exclude the whole time of the wilderness journey from the original "tradition" and not merely the events at Mount Sinai.

Von Rad's appeal to Deuteronomy 6 is singularly unfortunate, for this passage does contain an express reference to the events at Sinai. It is intended to answer the question posed in verse 20, "what are the testimonies, and the statutes and the judgments which the Lord our God commanded you?" In answer Moses contrasts the period of Egyptian servitude and the present condition brought about by means of the mighty deliverance of the Lord. This time, however, it is expressly stated that "the Lord commanded us to do these statutes". When did the Lord give such a command

tradition is not a historical event in the same sense as the historical events of the exodus and entry; it is on the contrary an encounter with God which leads up to the acceptance by the people of the will of God proclaimed in the commandments; and in its cultic setting it represents a particular action in the course of the festival. Consequently it is not mentioned in the same breath with God's acts of salvation in those texts which are concerned only with the latter. . . . it (i. e., no mention of Sinai) is due to the fact that they (i. e., certain texts) restrict themselves to the recital of the saving acts in history on grounds which make it clear that their silence concerning the Sinai tradition cannot be used an argumentum e silentio for the reconstruction of the whole contents of the festival cult, as is done by von Rad."

19 ליברמן אל תמקום לה. 20 נזון יהוה לאששא וא '../../מקים נזון. The verb need not be understood as denoting action subsequent to that expressed by אַל מַצְוַה in verse 23; it may merely set forth a concomitant thought --God brought us out and he also laid upon us commands --irrespective of the chronological relationship of the two actions.
if it was not at Sinai? This very statement is a reflection upon the events at Sinai. True enough, the word Sinai is not mentioned, but is it necessary? The disjunction between the Sinai and Conquest traditions, which von Rad thinks is supported by this passage, therefore, is illusory.

Unfortunate also is the appeal to Joshua 24, for this passage reflects both upon the Sinai "traditions" and also upon the so-called "Conquest traditions". This fact has been clearly demonstrated by Artur Weiser who finds that the two sets of tradition are here already combined and "are clearly regarded as belonging essentially together because they supplement each other".21 Verses 2-13 are a recital of God's historical dealings with his people, pointing out how God had been with them since the time of the patriarchs and had brought them unto the present. In verses 14-26, however, we have the response of the nation to the plea to obey the covenant. These latter verses presuppose that God has given his commandments to the nation. Weiser goes so far as to say that this manner of speech (i.e., God speaking in the first person singular) shows "the original connexion between God's revelation of his nature in his saving acts in history and his revelation of his will leading up to the pledge of the congregation".22 In this passage history and law are bound up together as they are in the Pentateuch generally.23

22 Op. cit., p. 88. :
23 In a recent article, "The Exodus, Sinai and the Credo" (Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Vol. XXVII, 1965, pp. 101-113) Herbert B. Huffmon, appealing to the Hittite vassal treaties, points out that the Credo of Joshua 24:2b-13 is the historical prologue of the covenant whose conclusion the remainder of the chapter describes. In the more than thirty international treaties recovered from Boghazkoy, Alalakh and Ras Shamra the place where the treaty was concluded is never mentioned. Nor do the prologues (with two exceptions which Huffmon notes) mention documents of investiture, i.e., which specify the granting of a treaty. The granting of a treaty was not considered one of the gracious acts of a suzerain. For this reason, argues Huffmon (p. 108), Sinai, which represents the reception of the Law, is not part of the Credo.

For an introduction to the subject of the relationship of Scripture to the Hittite suzerainty treaties cf. Meredith G. Kline: Treaty of the Great King, Grand Rapids, 1963. It must also remembered that the complete form of a treaty may not necessarily have been recorded upon one document but upon several, cf. Donald J. Wiseman: The Alalakh Tablets, 1953, nos. 1-3, 126,456. Exodus 20 itself is largely in the form of covenant
What, however, can be said about von Rad's attempt to separate the Sinai sections from the main body of the narrative? Is there a break in the Kadesh tradition between Exodus 18 and Numbers 10 as Wellhausen maintained? Von Rad holds that there was a cycle Kadesh narratives (Exodus 17-18; Numbers 10-14) and a Sinai cycle (Exodus 19-24; 32-34).

If one examine Exodus 19 as it stands, without the presupposition that documentary analysis must be engaged in, he will note that it very naturally continues the preceding narrative (cf. especially 17:1). In 19:1 there is a direct reference to the exodus from Egypt and a time reference in connection therewith. Unless we assume then that a redactor has worked over this verse, we must conclude that it constitutes an integral part of the narrative of the Exodus. The mention of Rephidim in 19:2 refers expressly to the previous mention of Rephidim in 17:1, 8 and continues the journey of the Israelites from that point.

In verse two there seems to be obvious reflection upon Exodus three. The word רָסִיר calls to mind the same word in Exodus 3:1, as does also רֹאשׁ. This word is introduced without any explanation, for the reader is supposedly acquainted with it. In the light of Exodus 3:1 it is perfectly understandable; otherwise it is almost without meaning. If there be no preceding narrative, we are without a word of explanation. What mountain is intended? The same is true of רָסִיר. In the light of Exodus 3 we are prepared for this directly between God and the individual, a form not attested outside the Old Testament. Whereas in the revelation of his will, God did to some extent make use of covenant-forms extant in the world, his revelation was not bound by these forms. To a certain extent these covenant types may be an aid in understanding the form of certain Scriptures, nevertheless, there is danger in pressing this method too far. It still remains true that the best interpreter of Scripture is the Scripture itself. In refuting von Rad's thesis Walter Beyerlin has quite effectively used the covenant pattern (Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, tr. by S. Rudman, Oxford, Blackwell, 1965).

Huffmon (op. cit., p. 111) suggests that the people may have proceeded to Kadesh and then made a pilgrimage to Sinai. But it is also possible, as Huffmon points out, that there may have been two Meribahs, one near Sinai and one near Kadesh. In his masterful study From Joseph to Joshua, London, 1952, pp. 105 ff., H. H. Rowley maintains that two accounts of what took place after the exodus from Egypt may have been combined.
word, but if Exodus 19 is to be divorced from what precedes we are left without explanation. Likewise, the phrase, and God called to him from the mountain brings to mind and God called to him from the midst of the bush in Exodus 3:4. A similarity exists also between thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob and thus shalt thou say to the sons of Israel of Exodus 3:14.

When one examines Numbers 10, he notes that here, too, there is reference to what has preceded. In verse 11 there, is a date and an express mention of the cloud being taken up from the tent of testimony. Verse 12 speaks of the wilderness of Sinai, which clearly reflects upon the similar language used in Exodus 19. Unless we engage in drastic excisions we must accept the narrative as it stands, and then it is clear that the break which Wellhausen, von Rad and others thought that they found here is non-existent.

It has been necessary to consider von Rad's assertion that the narratives which recount the events at Mount Sinai are not an original part of the Exodus account, for if he is correct, then it follows that Exodus 3, which narrates the call of Moses, must be abandoned as unworthy of historical consideration. The reason for this is that Exodus 3 is a preparation for the meeting of Moses with God upon the holy mount of Sinai and the revelation of the law. If God did not meet Moses and the law was not revealed, then obviously, the third chapter with its prediction, "ye shall serve God upon this mountain" is not historical fact.

The Unity of Exodus Three

It is now necessary to examine more closely the question of the unity of the third chapter of Exodus. Is this chapter a unified whole or does it consist of a compilation of fragments of various documents, pieced together by a redactor? Modern scholarship is almost unanimous in asserting the latter. Perhaps the latest documentary analysis is that given by Georg Fohrer,'s who partitions the chapter as follows:

25 Georg Fohrer: Uberlieferung una Geschichte des Exodus, Berlin, 1964, p. 124. Gressmann (Mose und seine Zeit, Gottingen, 1913, p. 21) holds that the chapter is a compilation of JE. "3:1, Horeb E; 2-4a Sinai, bush, Yahweh J; 5 J // 4b. 6 God E; 7,8 Yahweh J // 9-12 E; 13-15 God E, but vs. 15 is of later origin" because in E the name of Yahweh is partly
Fohrer candidly acknowledges that the presence of the divine names largely guides him in this analysis, although he recognizes that there may be deviations from this analysis. There are, asserts Fohrer, differences in the various documents. According to J Moses comes to the mountain of Yahweh, according to E to the mountain of God. J says that first Moses approached a burning bush, and God spoke to him, whereas E maintains that God spoke to him immediately. From J we learn that Yahweh himself will bring the Israelites out of Egypt; whereas E holds that Yahweh entrusts this task to Moses. Furthermore the deity declares twice that he has seen the affliction of his people. Likewise there are two occurrences of and he spoke (vv. 5, 6) and and now go (vv. 9a+16, 10). If this minute analysis strikes the unprejudiced reader as somewhat overrefined and possibly lacking in a sense of humor, we can only say that this is what we are asked to accept in place of the narrative as it stands. Refined as such analysis may be, we must nevertheless evaluate it.

According to Fohrer, the words of 3:1, and he came unto the mountain of God, belong to E and not to J. It would seem that a redactor has cut these words out of the E document and inserted them in J (which comprises the earlier part of verse one and continues with verse two), apparently for the purpose of making it appear that Sinai was the mountain of Elohim. That such a procedure is unnatural (great books are not made this way, to say nothing of the question of the avoided. Vv. 16 ff. probably belong to E; Gressmann regards vv. 18-22 as a later element. Carpenter and Harford (The Composition of the Hexateuch, 1902, p. 515) attribute 3:2-4a, 5, 7-9a, 14, 16-18 to J and 3:1, 4b, 6, 9b-13, 15, 19, 21 to E. It should be noted particularly with respect to Gressmann, how determinative a role the divine names play in the documentary analysis.

26 R. Smend (Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht, 1912) had suggested the presence of a fifth document in the entateuch (cf. Young: An Introduction to the Old Testament, 1958, p. 15). Fohrer adopts this position, labelling this fifth document N (op. cit., p. 8) because of its nomadic character.

Bible's inspiration) is evident, but more than that, the true significance of the names is ignored.28

We may note that in 4:27 and 18:5 (English 4:28 and 18:6) there is a similar usage of the word Elohim. In the earlier days of documentary analysis it was simply the presence of the divine name which led to these passages being assigned to what is today known as E. The reason for the usage of Elohim is to show that the mountain belongs to the true God and is thus to be distinguished from other mountains. Psalm 68:17 likewise uses the name (although without the definite article) to distinguish Sinai from ordinary mountains. It is for this reason also that, both in 4:20 and 17:9, the rod is designated the rod of God. This rod is thus set apart from all other rods, as that which belongs to God.

There is a reason for the prominence of Elohim in the early chapters of Exodus, but it is one which modern scholarship largely ignores. Modern scholarship would maintain that the name Yahweh was first made known to the Israelites at the time of the Exodus. In so maintaining, however, it overlooks the deep significance of the name. With the book of Exodus we are entering upon new epoch in the history of redemption. The patriarchal period is past, and the descendants of the patriarchs are now but a slave people in a foreign land. Will their God help them at this juncture of their history? They have known this God under various designations, Elohim, El Shaddai, and Yahweh, yet they have not known the full significance, nor have they experienced the full significance, of the name Yahweh. They must learn that Elohim, the powerful God of creation and providence is also Yahweh, the redeemer God of the covenant. Hence, the

28 The term is here used by way of anticipation. There is no evidence of any kind from any source to support the position that the mountain was regarded as sacred before Moses' calling. The designation Horeb apparently applied not merely to one mountain but to several. Cf. Hengstenberg (Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch, Vol. II, pp. 325-327) for one of the earliest presentations of this view. In this passage the term מִורְבּ is appropriate in order, to connect with what precedes (e. g., 2:25 where the word appears twice and to show that the true God is the One who appears to Moses. Cf. Gus Holscher: "Sinai und Choreb" in Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann, 1949, pp 127-132. The question of the significance of these two names we plan treat in greater detail in connection with the exposition.
frequent usage of Elohim in the early chapters of Exodus (cf., e.g., 1:17, 20, 21; 2:23, 25) prepares the way for the revelation of the name Yahweh. At the same time, although Elohim was regarded as the God of creation and providence, he was also the God to whom Israel cried in the time of her deep need. The usage of Elohim, then, is to call attention and to prepare the way for the approaching epoch of revelation and to indicate that before it the present epoch was about to pass away. Israel must learn the lesson that the God to whom she had turned in her times of need is the Yahweh of redemption who is about to enter into covenant with her.

With verse two the transition begins. Here the angel is designated the Angel of the Lord, which may have been somewhat of a stereotyped expression. The word Yahweh in verse 4, however, clearly points to the transition. We are to learn that he whom the people had worshipped and known as Elohim is truly Yahweh, their covenant God. The term Yahweh appears seven times and in verses 2, 4, and 7 the language is that of the writer of the account. The change, however, is not absolute, for the language reverts immediately to Elohim, and in verse four which contains the first usage of Yahweh as a subject, the word Elohim also occurs. This verse is one of the strongest stumblingblocks in the way of a documentary analysis. God is Yahweh, but he is also Elohim, and so we are still in the state of transition. Thus the way is prepared for the identification of God in verses 6 ff. as the God of the patriarchs.

From this point on to the close of the conversation respecting the significance of the covenant name, Elohim is exclusively employed (cf. vv. 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15). When Elohim has made it clear that he is Yahweh and will make himself known as Yahweh, the designation Yahweh alone is used until the end of the chapter. In fact, Moses is commanded to make known to the Israelites that Yahweh, the God of their fathers, has appeared unto him (v. 15 and cf. v. 18).

It is apparent, then, that there is a very definite reason for the distribution of the divine names in this chapter. Before the people know that Elohim is Yahweh, Moses himself must have that knowledge, and it is the purpose of this chapter to show that God did convey that information to him. As far as the usage of the divine names is concerned, we must
conclude that there is a genuine unity in the chapter, and as a unity, therefore, we shall proceed to study the content of the chapter. Other arguments advanced to demonstrate a lack of unity or the presence of duplicate accounts we shall consider as we turn to the exposition of the passage. As far as the presence of the divine names is concerned, instead of lending support to the documentary analysis, they are strongly opposed to it, and in one particular instance, namely, verse 4, where both Yahweh and Elohim occur, constitute a serious obstacle to documentary partition.

The Burning Bush

Before attempting an exposition of the passage we must give consideration to the question of the burning bush, for this question brings us face to face with the problem of the nature of Exodus 3. Martin Noth claims that it is a favorite explanation of exegetes that the burning bush is a manifestation similar to St. Elmo's fire, and he thinks that, although we cannot regard this as a certain explanation, we must imagine something of the sort.29 Such a phenomenon was regarded as something awesome, a sign of the divine presence. There was a local tradition of a holy place with a burning bush and this has now entered into Israelite tradition to provide a concrete background for the account of the first encounter of Moses with God.30

With this explanation we are in effect asked to regard the chapter as nothing more than an account of ancient traditions of the Hebrews. Nowhere does Noth make it clear that the true God did appear to Moses, as this chapter records. For our part we are compelled to consider the chapter as

29 Martin Noth: Exodus, E. T., Philadelphia, 1962, p. 39. During stormy weather discharges of atmospheric electricity give off a glow from the extremities of pointed objects such as ships' masts. The term St. Elmo is a corruption of St. Erasmus (or Ermo), the patron saint of Mediterranean sailors. Has anyone, however, ever mistaken St. Elmo's fire for a burning bush that burned yet was not consumed? Certainly the learned and wise Moses would not have done so.

30 This statement cannot be supported by any evidence. It fits in well with the prevailing naturalistic account of the origin of Israel's religion and hence is almost cavalierly adopted
sacred Scripture and so to interpret it. Without at this point endeavoring to give a defense of the position that the Scripture of the Old as well as the New is a special revelation from God, we shall nevertheless proceed upon that assumption and seek to point out the inadequacy inherent in alternate attempts to explain the miracle of the burning bush other than as a genuine miracle.  

Hugo Gressmann has perhaps collected the greatest number of supposedly similar phenomena, and it will be well briefly to consider these. He mentions that some appeal to the phenomenon of St. Elmo's fire, as well as to fire brands or reflexes of light, which must often have occurred in dry lands with an abundance of storms. Gressmann, however, thinks that this is a *contradictio in adiecto*, for where there are many storms, he says, there is fruitful land and much rain. Furthermore, he claims that underlying this theory is the false idea that Yahweh was originally a storm deity, whereas only later on the soil of Canaan did he become such. If Sinai were a volcano, one could he thinks, if he were proceeding upon rationalistic grounds, seek to explain the burning bush upon the basis of volcanic phenomena, or of subterranean fire, assuming that the bush stood near escaping gases from under the ground.

Gressmann tells us that there are accounts of burning bushes or holy trees which fell into flames and were not consumed. Thus Achilles Tatius relates concerning Tyre that fire enveloped the branches of a sacred olive tree but the soot of the fire nourished the tree. Thus it is claimed that there exists friendship between fire and tree. Nonnus tells of a burning tree upon a floating rock in the sea, and Georgius Syncellus relates that a tree by the grave of Abraham and Isaac seemed to burn but did not burn. Eustathius speaks of the same phenomenon however in different terms, asserting that when the tree had been lighted it was fully on fire, and when the fire burned out, the tree still stood sound. Gressmann further calls attention to the legend that a pious man once saw the holy walnut tree at Nebk in flames. Believing

---

31 In *Thy Word Is Truth*, Grand Rapids, 1957, we have ought to set forth the reasons why we believe the Bible to be the Word of God.
eyes have supposedly seen mysterious fires or lights in trees and pious ears have at the same time heard wondrous music. Gressmann believes that the luster as well as the music belong to the appearance of the holy, and just as the music is not to be explained upon the basis of some naturalistic phenomenon, neither is the light nor the fire.

How are these phenomena to be related to what is given in Exodus? If we assert that they are simply the characteristics of myth and saga then we have relegated the Exodus narrative to the same category as tales of myth and saga. We then have in the third chapter of Exodus an account which is not historically true, but is simply a story which the ancient Hebrews liked to tell. It is a part of their tradition and is probably aetiological in nature, designed to explain why certain things are as they are. Sinai was regarded as a holy mountain, and the saga or myth or call it what one will of the burning bush gives the explanation why this is so. The roots of this story are lost in hoary antiquity. Perhaps there may have been some basis of truth in it; perhaps not. If form criticism tells us that we have here an aetiological saga, then we cannot take the narrative seriously. It is merely an explanation, possibly containing some elements of truth, of the fact that in the day of the writer men regarded Mount Sinai as a holy mountain.

There are those, however, who seek to give a rationalistic explanation of the phenomenon, and Gressmann rightly criticizes them. It is rather difficult to explain a burning bush as the result of volcanic phenomena, for how could this explain the fact that the bush was burning and yet was not consumed? The same is true of subterranean fire. How does anyone know that the bush was close to seeping gases? Furthermore, both of these explanations leave too much unexplained. Moses knew the country intimately, and had Sinai been a volcano or had there been a place where subterranean gases issued forth, he would have known it well and probably often would have seen the appearances of such volcanic action or subterranean fire. Even assuming that he did not know the country, an assumption that no one who knows the desert would entertain for an instant, 33 when he

33 The present writer had the privilege of travelling in the Sinai peninsula
approached the bush he would have seen that there was nothing at all out of the ordinary. He would have realized that there was nothing more than volcanic action or seeping gases and he would have known the reason why the bush appeared to burn without being consumed. Furthermore, the discovery of the actual truth of the situation would have destroyed any psychological condition in which he might have thought that he heard a voice speaking to him. The naturalistic interpretations do not explain; they create more difficulties than they remove. As the exposition proceeds we shall seek to point out in greater detail what some of these difficulties are.

It remains to insist that the account of the burning bush is sui generis. The alleged parallels which Gressmann has adduced in his attempt to show that Exodus 3 belongs to a certain type of literature are really not parallels at all. For that matter there is no parallel to the account of the burning bush. We have but to examine the first of Gressmann’s alleged parallels, the account found in the Erotica. To be noted in the first place is the fact that the olive tree is found on sacred ground, i.e., ground which was commonly recognized as sacred. This was not the case with the burning bush. Moses did not know that the place was sacred and had no hesitation in approaching. Indeed, the reason why he approached was idle curiosity; he merely wanted to know what

in 1930. At one point the goat-skin sack which contained our entire water supply broke open and all the water poured out upon the ground. The Bedouin were not troubled. At a further point on the journey one of them took the sack and walked off into the desert. Five hours later he returned with the sack filled with water. He had remembered an underground spring. The Bedouin know the desert like a book. This is one reason why all naturalistic attempts to explain the burning bush are somewhat ridiculous.

Some of the naturalistic explanations are that a flake of gypsum blown against a twig may have set a bush alight. It is said that once a year the sunlight penetrates through a chink in the rocks on the summit of Jebel ed-Deir and falls upon a spot at the foot of Jebel Musa. Hence, it is hinted that this might in some way be connected with the vision perceived by Moses. Cf. the interesting discussion in Joan Meredyth Chichele Plowden: Once In Sinai, London, 1940, pp. 48, 147-150.

Op. cit., p. 26, τὸ δὲ Ἡσυρίον ἱερὸν. Thus the place is introduced as already sacred. It was merely a shrine; the ground mentioned in Exodus 3 only becomes sacred because God has appeared there. Once the theophany was concluded the place would no longer be sacred.
was happening. Only as he drew near did God tell him of the nature of the place. Furthermore, the leaves of the tree were known to be bright or sparkling; nothing similar is related in Exodus.\textsuperscript{36} Fire was planted with the tree and catches the branches with a mighty flame and the soot of the fire nourishes the tree. Thus, fire and tree are said to be friends.\textsuperscript{37}

A mere reading of this account will reveal the profound differences that exist between it and the narrative in Exodus. In Tatius' account the fire is said to be planted, for the purpose is to show that there is a friendship between what is planted and the fire. The precise sense of soot (\(\alpha\iota\theta\alpha\lambda\eta\)) is not as clear as might be desired but apparently the thought is that the fire somehow gives nourishment to the tree. What strikes one immediately is that in this narrative there is nothing approaching the seriousness of the Exodus account. The burning bush is not a wonder known far and wide, but an event which Moses alone was permitted to behold. Furthermore, it was filled with deep significance, for it revealed that the Holy God was present in the midst of his people and it prepared the way for the revelation of the covenant name of God. The wonder was not to show the friendship between fire and something planted, but to induce in the heart of Moses the proper reverence so that in humility he would be willing to go forth as a messenger of the Holy God who had appeared unto him.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{36} Op. cit., p. 26, \(\phi\alpha\iota\delta\rho\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) (bright, cheerful, beaming) \(\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\lambda\alpha\delta\omicron\iota\varsigma\).

\textsuperscript{37} Note the passive \(\pi\epsilon\phi\omicron\upsilon\upsigma\epsilon\tau\upomai\), \(\tau\omicron\) \(\varphi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\varsigma\). The meaning of the episode is \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \phi\omicron\omicron\iota\lambda\alpha\, \kappa\alpha\varsigma\, \varphi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\).

\textsuperscript{38} In the interpretation of Nonnus (see Gressmann, op. cit., p. 26 for references) we are really dealing with an event of magic. Two rocks swim (\(\pi\lambda\omicron\omega\sigma\omicron\sigma\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\)) in the sea (\(\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \alpha\lambda\iota\)) on which a pair of self-planted olive trees of the same age grow. From the burning tree (\(\alpha\pi\omicron\ \phi\omicron\omicron\gamma\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron\delta\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\nu\delta\rho\omicron\upsilon\)) sparks shoot forth, and enflame the unburned (\(\alpha\phi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\)) olive tree.

Another alleged parallel has to do with a "wonderful terebinth" (\(\tau\eta\nu\ \theta\alpha\upsigma\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\alpha\nu\ \tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\beta\iota\nu\theta\omicron\omicron\)) that grew where Jacob supposedly buried the gods which he had brought. Offerings were brought to an altar by the trunk of the tree, which seemed to be destroyed but was not burned up (\(\eta\ \delta\upsilon\ \o\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \delta\omicron\kappa\omicron\omicron\sigma\alpha\)).

Eustathius speaks of the same matter, stating that after the terebinth
This brings us to the heart of the problem. If we at all take the Bible seriously we are compelled to assert that there must have been some compelling reason which caused Moses to return to Egypt and to deliver the nation. All subsequent history is based upon the assumption that Moses did in fact bring forth the people from Egyptian bondage. Whence arose the conviction in Moses' heart that he was thus to deliver the people? The Bible gives a clear answer to that question; the Bible declares that God appeared to Moses and charged him with the task of deliverance.

The burning bush was a miracle performed by God himself. It introduced that great period of miracles in Biblical history when God must show his saving power to Pharaoh and perform signs and wonders upon him. Israel must know that the God whom Moses proclaims to them is the God whom their fathers worshipped, the God who is in sovereign control over all the elements of nature. Such a God they may follow and such a God they may worship. In the miracle of the burning bush then, we see no low display of magical power, but rather a manifestation of the holiness of him who was in truth the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

(to be concluded)

was set on fire (ὕφασκειται lit., lighted from beneath, by whom?) it becomes completely fire (酂ν φύρ γίνεται). When the fire is, out (κατασβεσθείσα) it is seen to be unharmed. How completely different from the miracle recorded in Exodus!
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THE CALL OF MOSES

Part II

EDWARD J. YOUNG

IF THE burning bush is to be understood as a genuine miracle, it is well to ask what its significance is. The miracles of the Bible were designed to be signs and attestations of God's plan of redemption. In what sense, then, did the burning bush point to God's redemptive activity?

According to Acts 7:30 the events described in Exodus 3 took place forty years after Moses' flight into the land of Midian. Emphasis falls immediately upon Moses and the fact that he was shepherding (the participle expresses continual occupation) the flock of Jethro. In the desert itself there was apparently not enough vegetation for the flock, so Moses led the flock beyond the desert. This would imply that when he had come to Horeb, he was no longer in the desert. Indeed, if we are to identify the mountain with Jebel el-Musa or Jebel es-Sufsafeh we can well understand why the plain Er-rahah would have been sought after by a shepherd. Even today there is considerable water in this location.1

To assume that the mountain was regarded as a sanctuary even before the revelation to Moses is unwarranted.2 The designation, "mountain of God", is merely used by anticipa-


2 Josephus, Antiquities, 2:12:1, strangely remarks, τούτο (i. e., Mt. Sinai) δ' ἐστὶν ψηφιλότατον τῶν ταύτη ὅρων καὶ πρὸς νομάς ἀρίστου, ἀγαθῆς φυσιμένης πόλεως καὶ διὰ τὸ δύος ἔχειν ἐνδιατρίβειν αὐτῷ τῶν θεῶν οὐ κατανεμηθείσης πρότερον, οὐ τολμώντων ἐμβατεύειν εἰς αὐτὸ τῶν ποιμένων.
tion, and there is no reason for supposing that Moses was expecting a revelation or that he came to seek such.\(^3\) The whole emphasis of verse one falls upon the ordinary, earthly task of Moses. He was a shepherd and he was concerned for the welfare of his sheep.\(^4\) Inasmuch as there was water near Horeb, that is where he brought his flock. The Rabbis may not have been wrong when they declared that God first tested Moses in small things so that he might later be suited to serve in greater tasks.\(^5\) He who could faithfully be a shepherd in Midian could serve in the exalted position which God was preparing for him in the divine economy.

Why, however, is the mountain here named Horeb and not Sinai? The most likely answer is that Horeb and Sinai are simply two different names of the same mountain, just as Hermon and Sirion both designate Mt. Hermon (cf. Deuteronomy 3:9; Psalm 29:6). Why this was so we do not know, nor do we know why Horeb is sometimes used and sometimes Sinai. Conceivably one might fit into the rhythm of a verse better than the other. That the difference is due to euphonic reasons, however, is merely conjecture. Certainly it is not due to the predilections of supposed authors of documents. Nor can the presence of these words serve as evidence of difference in document.

Exodus 3:1 is generally attributed to J, but inasmuch as its final clause contains the word Horeb, the "critics" would excise this clause and attribute it to E. Thus, 3:1 is a composite, 3:1a, b\(^b\) belonging to J and 3:1b\(^b\) to E. The last clause is essential, however, to the narrative for it gives the locale

\(^3\) George A. Barton: *Semitic and Hamitic Origins*, Philadelphia, 1934, pp. 334, 335 holds that Moses was psychologically prepared for a message from the god of the volcano.

\(^4\) Dillmann: *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*, Leipzig, 1880, p. 24, quotes Burckhardt to the effect that with the approach of summer the Bedouin of the peninsula leave the lower regions and move to the higher districts where the pasture remains fresh for a longer time.


\(^6\) Acts 7:30 speaks of ἔν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ ὄρους Σινα. Inasmuch as Sinai appears six times in Exodus 19 (generally attributed to E), Horeb can hardly be regarded as a characteristic of E.
where the revelation is to occur and it also points out the destination that Moses had in mind in leading his flock beyond the wilderness.

THE ANGEL OF THE LORD IN THE BUSH

Having given the locale for the revelation, the narrator now relates the fact of the revelation itself. This is mentioned before there is any hint of a burning bush, for what is essential for an understanding of all that follows is the fact that God has been seen by Moses. The One who appears to Moses is the "angel of the Lord". According to Jewish tradition this figure is to be distinguished from God Himself, for he is merely God's messenger and speaks in God's Name. The thought and will behind the words are God's, but the actual words and deeds are said to be those of the messenger himself.

As the text stands, however, it clearly identifies the Angel with God. The Angel appeared unto Moses in a flame of fire from the midst of the bush, and God called to Moses from the midst of the bush. Furthermore, the manner in which the LORD is introduced as one who sees that Moses had turned aside suggests that the LORD and the Angel are one. How is this to be explained?

Martin Noth apparently looks with favor upon the explanation given by Von Rad, who declares that the Angel is God in human form, a form in which Yahweh appears. This result, however, has been achieved by means of intensive inner revising of very old traditions. These traditions told about unique and spectacular divine appearances at definite shrines and sites. Later on men came to assume that it was an Angel of Yahweh that thus appeared, and in this way they broke down the naive immediate intimacy of God's relationship. They introduced this mediating figure, the Angel of the Lord, and yet at the same time preserved the directness of God's address to man and of His saving activity. Von Rad acknowledges that there are Christological "qualities" in this figure and that it is a type or "shadow" of Jesus Christ.

7 E. g., Soncino, p. 213.
8 Martin Noth: Exodus, Philadelphia, 1962. Van Rad writes (Das erste
Is the "Angel", however, to be accounted for as the product of theological reflection? What would have led men to introduce this mediating figure into old traditions which spoke of an immediate appearance of God? And what evidence is there for such an assumption? Is there really extant evidence to support the idea that we have here the product of revision of ancient traditions? And if the introduction of the Angel into the picture is merely the result of theological reflection, how, possibly, can the Angel be a type of Jesus Christ? If the Angel actually did appear to Moses, as Scripture says he did, then He can be a type of Christ; but if He is merely a shadowy figure, the product of the human imagination, how can he typify the Mediator par excellence?

In the exegetical sphere Von Rad is correct as far as his interpretation of the text is concerned, but he enters the realm of fancy when he speaks of revising ancient traditions. The Angel is a real Being, and He is to be identified with God. Inasmuch as He is sent from the Lord, He is not God the Father Himself but distinct from the Father. If we would do justice to the Scriptural data, we must insist therefore both upon the distinguishableness of the Angel from the Father and also upon the identity of essence with the Father. Christian theologians have rightly seen in this strange Figure a prein-

carnate appearance of the One who in the days of His flesh could say, "And the Father who sent me has himself borne witness of me" (John 5:37).  This One is indeed a messenger to bring to Moses the announcement of deliverance to come. Calvin may be mentioned as representative of a common interpretation of the significance of the miracle. In the bush, he holds, we see the humble and despised people surrounded by the flames of oppression; yet in the midst is God who prevents the flames from devouring the nation. Keil appeals to Judges 9:15 to support the position that in contrast to the more noble and lofty trees the thornbush aptly represents the people of God in their humiliation. On this particular point there seems to be fairly widespread agreement among interpreters.

Is it, however, correct to say that the fire stands for oppression? According to Keil, appealing to 1 Corinthians 3:11 ff., the fire, considered as burning and consuming, figuratively represents refining affliction and destroying punishment. It must be noted, however, that the Angel of the Lord is said to have appeared in a flame of fire. The fire, therefore, it would seem, is not the iron furnace of Egypt (Deuteronomy 4:20), but is rather to be understood as a symbol of the burning zeal of God. Inasmuch as this fire burns the bush, it signifies the pure holiness of God which comes in judgment and devours whatever is impure. Nevertheless, the fire, although it burns, does not consume. The sin of the people could call

---

10 Calvin: "... the ancient teachers of the Church have rightly understood that the Eternal Son of God is so called in respect to his office as Mediator, which he figuratively bore from the beginning, although he really took it upon him only at his Incarnation". Harmony of the Four Last Books of the Pentateuch, Grand Rapids, 1950, Vol. I, p. 61.
11 Keil and Delitzsch: Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, Grand Rapids, 1949, Vol. I, p. 438. It must be noted, however, that the word ἔσθήσεις is used, not ἔσθησις.
12 Th. Schmalenbach: Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg, Gutersloh, 1892, Vol. III, p. 374, "Das geringe, verachtete, unterdrückte Volk Gottes-das ist der Dornbusch. Sachlich sind, die zerschlagenen und niedrigen Geistes sind, das Thorichte und Unedle gemeint, Jes. 57, 15; I Cor. 1,26-29".
forth the punitive wrath of God; but the fire does not consume, for God has promised salvation to this very despised and lowly slave people. In the midst of the Israelites, the despised slaves of Egypt, dwells the holy LORD himself, whose zeal would consume whatever is not pure yet who does not devour, for His intentions are of grace toward His chosen people. Thus, as so often in the Old Testament, judgment and salvation are linked together and go hand in hand.

That the Lord dwells in the midst of His people is a thought which finds emphasis in the twice-mentioned phrase, "from the midst of the bush". It is this thought which prepares the way for the revelation of God as the God of the fathers. He who had appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was at this very moment, despite the lowly condition of the people, in their midst. Nor had He ever deserted them. God had taken up His abode in their midst and would never abandon them. Even when He must bring judgment, He is in their midst. They cannot find Him by turning to the gods of Egypt, but must look for His presence among themselves. Thus, the miracle of the burning bush, among other things, both strengthens Moses' faith in the presence of God with His people and prepares him to understand that this God, who is now in their midst, is the same God who spoke to the fathers.

THE RESPONSE OF MOSES

To this wondrous sight of the burning bush Moses responds. The words, "And Moses said", in verse three do not suggest that Moses spoke the following words aloud, but merely indicate that they were the thoughts which passed through his mind. Moses recognizes that what he sees is a "great sight", and hence something out of the ordinary. Had it been merely the glistening of the berries of a bush in the sun or the campfire of the shepherds, or anything of similar nature, Moses could hardly have considered it a "a great sight". It is noteworthy also that the only reason for Moses' turning aside is that he

14 Schmalenbach: op. cit., p. 374, "Das Gesicht von dem brennenden und doch nicht verbrennenden Busche (2 Mos. 3, 1-8) stellt die grosse Wahrheit der Unzerstörbarkeit der Gnade Gottes gegen seine Gemeine inmitten aller Trubsal dar".
is moved by curiosity. He sees something unusual, which he designates a "great sight", and he does not know what it is. He turns aside from his regular course simply to discover the explanation of the unusual phenomenon, the like of which he has never before seen at the base of the mountain. It is this fact of Moses' curiosity which rules out once and for all the idea that Moses, because of long meditation upon the suffering of his people in Egypt, is in a frame of mind or attitude in which he could readily believe that a voice was speaking to him. The late George A. Barton, for example, maintained that as Moses was alone with the flock in the desert he spent the time brooding upon the "acute problems of life as he had experienced it". Among these thoughts were considerations of the nature of the "desert god" that his father-in-law, Jethro, served. The mountain was volcanic, and its smoke and flames expressed the wrath of the desert god, Yahweh, whose presence was indicated by the smoke of the volcano. The Kenites, who worshipped Yahweh, were victorious in war, for they could make metal weapons, whereas their enemies had weapons of flint, arrows and stones. As Moses drew near the mountain to obtain a better view of the strange sight of a bush on fire, he seemed to hear a voice. "This was a religious experience as genuinely real as that which any prophet ever had, and its main elements shine out still through the phraseology of later tradition. That phraseology assumes the results of historical processes which we now know to have been later, but the religious emotional brooding over the problems of himself and his people, and the sudden conviction that this powerful god of the desert, in whose territory he had himself found asylum, had sent him to rescue his people, bears all the marks of psychological reality, and alone accounts for the subsequent career of Moses".

What took place, according to Barton, was the psychological experience known as an "audition". "In all parts of

---

16 Inasmuch as the Sinai peninsula is not volcanic, advocates of the theory that the theophany was related to volcanic action usually seek to locate the mountain in Midian, east of the peninsula.
the world and in all religions men of a certain type of psychic constitution, after seeking for the solution of a religious problem and brooding long over it, have found their problem solved in a flash of insight so sudden and clear that they have seemed to hear a voice uttering the words in which their thought took shape".¹⁸

One may well ask as he ponders Barton's explanation how it is possible to know what type of psychic constitution Moses possessed and what he was thinking as he tended his sheep in the desert. If we are to judge from some of the incidents recorded in the Pentateuch, Moses was a man of decisive action.¹⁹ What his particular "psychic" constitution was we simply do not know. Nor do we know what problems occupied his thoughts as he wandered alone in the desert.

Furthermore, there is not the slightest evidence that the mountain of God was a volcano. If, however, it had been a volcano, Moses would have been so familiar with flames shooting forth from it that he would not have supposed that one such flame was a bush burning yet not consumed. How conceivably could a shooting flame seem like a bush on fire? Possibly one who did not know the desert might come to such a conclusion, although it is a situation difficult to understand; but when a man had spent forty years in the desert, it is asking too much of one's credulity to expect him to believe that such a man might mistake a shooting flame of fire for a burning bush.²⁰

It must further be noted that, even if Moses had been pondering the sufferings of his people and even if he were in a psychological frame of mind to receive a revelation or an audition, that frame of mind would completely have been shattered when he discovered that, after all, there was nothing unusual with respect to the bush. Indeed, the very sight of the bush which seemed to be burning without being consumed might itself well have destroyed such a psychological frame or condition of mind. Instead, Moses' mind would have become filled with curiosity as to the explanation of the strange

¹⁹ Cf., e. g., Exodus 2:11 ff.
phenomenon before him, In place of being deeply moved by thoughts of the condition of the Israelites, his mind would have become filled with thoughts as to why the bush was burning and yet did not burn up. And, indeed, if we allow the Scripture any credence at all, it was precisely such thoughts which did occupy his mind. "I shall now turn aside, that I it may see this great sight, why the bush does not burn". Curiosity filled Moses' mind, not thoughts of his people's need. It was not exactly the frame of mind suitable for the reception of an "audition".

More important and significant than any of the considerations hitherto adduced is the fact that, if Dr. Barton's explanation of the events at the burning bush is correct, not only the work of Moses but the entire subsequent history of Israel are founded, not upon a genuine revelation from God, but upon Moses' mistaken conviction, that God had appeared to him and charged him to deliver the people from Egypt. If God actually did appear to Moses, as Exodus relates, that is one thing. The entire subsequent history of Israel is then filled with meaning and is capable of explanation. If, on the other hand, it is simply founded upon Moses' conviction that God appeared to him and upon nothing more than that, the picture is entirely different. It is one thing to say, to take another example, that the Christian Church is founded upon the belief of the apostles that Jesus Christ rose from the dead; it is something entirely different to assert that the Christian Church is founded upon the fact that Jesus Christ actually did rise from the dead.

This is the crux of the issue. No matter how compelling the conviction of Moses may have been, if it were not based upon fact, the subsequent events would remain without adequate explanation. If the foundation of all that follows is simply the conviction of Moses, then the history of Israel is founded upon man and upon man alone. Very different, however, is the case if God did appear to Moses and the burning bush was a miracle. Then, and then alone, we may say that the subsequent history of the nation of Israel is based upon a revelation of God. It is then the work of God and not of man.

There remains, however, another objection which men raise against accepting the text of Exodus as it stands. We are
told by recent writers that the ancient Israelites would not have asked whether the burning bush was miraculous or merely an unusual natural phenomenon. They had no basis, we are told, for making a distinction between what was wonderful and yet ordinary and what, on the other hand, was miraculous.21 All of God's works were wonderful, and the modern distinction between the miraculous and the non-miraculous was one which they did not make. This is so, we are told, even if the burning bush actually was a miracle. In answer to this contention we need not stress the distinctive vocabulary which has to do with signs and wonders and distinctive events. The Hebrew words do indeed point to certain events which were performed by God's power in the external world, which in their appearance22 were contrary to God's ordinary and even unusual providential working, and which were clearly designed as signs and attestations of the plan of redemption. The signs and wonders, for example, which God performed upon Pharaoh were miraculous events, and could easily have been distinguished from even extraordinary events of providence.

With respect to the burning bush, we must insist that the objection which we are now engaged in considering does not hold. At first, it is true, the bush probably appeared to Moses as a wonderful event of providence. Were that not so, he would not have turned aside to examine it. Even from the distance where he was he could discern that the bush was burning yet did not burn up, and to discover the reason for this was the cause of his turning aside. At the least, he would have considered this a wonderful event of providence. When the revelation was given to him, however, Moses would have realized that the Lord was performing in the burning bush a sign or wonder which was unique. Were he

21 This idea has recently appeared in the attractive study of James Plastaras: The God of Exodus, Milwaukee, 1966, pp. 65, 66.
22 I. e., as they appeared to man. What Moses saw as he beheld the burning bush, for example, was a phenomenon which appeared to be contrary to the other phenomena with which he had experience. In the light of the definition of miracle which we have just given in the body of the text, the reader will find it very profitable to make a careful study of the usage of such words as תּוּכְלָאָה, מַלֵּפָה, and נַכְלֶאָה. 
to ponder the nature of the event, he would have been compelled to conclude that God, the all powerful one, was causing the bush to burn and yet not permitting it to be consumed. And he would well have understood that this event was designed by God to be an attestation of His plan of salvation. For the Lord explicitly stated to Moses that He had remembered His people and the covenant made with the fathers and had come down to deliver them. Moses, therefore, irrespective of the terminology he might have employed, would have placed this event in an entirely different category from a manifestation of St. Elmo's fire or anything of similar import. A miracle is not merely an event that appears to be contrary to what one ordinarily meets in life, but it is also an act which Almighty God performs to attest His plan of redemption. It behooves us to be cautious about asserting that the Israelites would not have distinguished between the miraculous and the merely wonderful.

Not only does the miracle attest the present working of God but it also points to the continuity of His working in His determination to accomplish redemption. The revelation which accompanies the miracle first looks back to the promises made to the patriarchs, "I am the God of thy father" (Exodus 3:6a), and it also points to the future, "And I came down to deliver it from the hand of Egypt" (Exodus 3:8a). This particular miracle, therefore, was for the benefit of Moses primarily, that through it he might become convinced that the God who had spoken to his ancestors was in the midst of His people and would be faithful to His promise to redeem them.

THE GOD OF THY FATHER

In this narrative emphasis falls upon the initiative of God. Moses is not seeking a revelation, nor does he have any intention of drawing near to a "holy place" in the hope of meeting God. He is simply engaged in his ordinary daily business when God approaches him. This factor also is characteristic in the performance of a miracle. God comes to man to convince man that He is man's Redeemer. Hence, the address, "Moses, Moses". Perhaps there is some merit in the old
Jewish interpretation to the effect that the repetition of the name was for the sake of encouraging Moses and indicating affection toward him. Both Abraham and Jacob had been similarly addressed (cf. Genesis 22:11 and 46:2).

Some writers assume without argument that Moses came to a holy place. Thus, Noth remarks, "It is therefore probable that here too we are dealing with an original local tradition to which the 'holy ground' concerned was still known as such at a later period" (p. 39). Plastaras at least seeks to give some evidence for adopting this view. He appeals to the definiteness of the word "mountain" in the phrase "mountain of God" (verse one) and to the use of the technical word "holy place" (i.e., ma-qom) in verse five. This evidence, he thinks, suggests that the place was already a sanctuary, although Moses himself may not have been aware of that fact. With respect to the definiteness of the word "mountain" we would simply remark that the word is used to express the point of view of Moses, the writer of the Pentateuch. At the time when this passage was written down, the events herein described had already occurred. What would be more natural than to speak of the mountain where God had appeared to His people as "the mountain of God"?

To say the least it is questionable whether the word ma-qom is here employed in a technical sense. What other suitable word for "place" appears in biblical Hebrew? Whether it is used technically or in a specialized sense in a given context, only that context can decide. In the present passage there is nothing to indicate a specialized usage. Rather, the addition of the words "whereon thou standest" would seem to suggest that the reference is merely to a particular spot. If the word "ma-qom" in itself denotes a sacred place, is it not redundant to say, "the sacred place whereon thou standest is holy ground"? Would it not have been sufficient merely to tell Moses that he was standing upon a ma-qom? The mere men-

26 We have given evidence for holding that Moses was the writer of the Pentateuch in Introduction to the Old Testament, Grand Rapids, 1954, pp. 47-51.
tion of the word itself should in that case have been sufficient to have informed Moses that the place was sacred.

The view that the term *ma-qom* is here technically employed is based upon a particular understanding of the nature of the narrative, namely, that it is an aetiological saga. Originally, argues Plastaras, the narrative was intended for those who went to worship God at a particular sanctuary. But what evidence is there that such was the case? Rather than being a narrative intended for those who went to worship God at a particular sanctuary, the account as we have it in Exodus before the hand of the "critic" has mutilated it relates an event which happened once for all and which had reference to Moses alone. Its whole purpose was to reveal to Moses the fact that the God of his father had not forsaken His people, but dwelt in their midst, and that He would deliver them from the affliction in which they found themselves. This is the profound "theological" significance of the narrative.

There is not a word to indicate that this narrative seeks to explain why a particular spot was regarded as holy by the Israelites. Indeed, there is no evidence that they later did come to regard it as a sanctuary. They did not endeavor to preserve the sanctity of the spot by means of a shrine. They knew that God had appeared unto them upon the mountain, and they regarded the mountain as the mountain of God; but there is no warrant for saying that they considered the place where God appeared to Moses sacred. It is the presence

---


of God which renders the place holy, and the putting off of the shoes is intended as a recognition of that fact. Removing the sandals is a sign of reverence to God, whose presence sanctifies the place of His appearance to Moses.

According to modern negative criticism, verse 5 is attributed to J and verse 6 to E. Yet how needless such a partition is! Verse 5 follows naturally from verse 4b. Moses has responded to God's call, and now God warns him of the sacredness of the place, thus preparing him for the revelation of the identity of the One who speaks from the bush. Very striking and remarkable is the identification that God gives, "I am the god of thy father". It is the singular which stands out as unusual. Generally, this is interpreted in a collective sense, as referring to the patriarchs as a group. The Kittel Bible, with its customary disregard of the significance of Masoretic Hebrew, simply proposes an emendation to the plural. With such an expedient we cannot rest satisfied since it is too facile a solution of the difficulty. One possible explanation of the singular is that it was deliberately employed to call attention to the fact that God was the God of the patriarchs.

In patriarchal times this type of expression was employed fairly frequently. It was used, for example, in Genesis 31:5, 29, 42, 53, where we find such phrases as "the god of my father", "the god of your father", and "the god of their father". Cf. also Genesis 43:23; 50:17; 46:3. Recently Professor Haran has called attention to this expression. According to him it indicates the household god. We can agree to the extent that there was something very intimate about the phrase; it pointed to the god whom one's father worshipped, and it would seem that this was a patriarchal mode of designating God. When, therefore, the Lord made known to Moses that He was the God of Moses' father, He

---

29 I. e., יְהוָהַב.  
30 I have discussed the significance of these phrases in "The God of the Fathers", The Westminster Theological Journal, Vol. III, No. 1, 1940, pp. 25-40. This article seeks to evaluate the views of the late Albrecht Alt concerning patriarchal religion.  
immediately directed Moses' thought to the time of the ancestors. To rule out all question of doubt the Lord immediately adds, "the god of Abraham, the god of Isaac, and the god of Jacob". Thus Moses was reminded of the promises made to the patriarchs individually. The God of the patriarchs was alive in the midst of His people, mindful of His promises and ready to bring deliverance.

In the history of redemption a pivotal point has been reached. The God of patriarchal promises is a God who has the power to deliver His people from bondage. He has control over all of His creation, and this fact He manifests by His appearance in the burning bush. He is a God who can perform wonders, a God of the miraculous.

It would seem that God had appeared in some visible way to Moses, for Moses responds to the revelation by hiding his face, probably wrapping it in his mantle, as Elijah had done (1 Kings 19:13), for he fears to look upon God. In this action, Moses gives expression to his own unworthiness and sinfulness, for he realizes that he is in the presence of the holy God of his people. To look upon his God irreverently would result in death. He is convinced that the one who speaks from the bush had earlier made Himself known to the patriarchs. What, however, about the people who are now in bondage in Egypt?

THE NAME OF GOD

The narrative in Exodus is smooth and straightforward. God charges Moses to deliver the people; Moses complains of his unworthiness and receives the assurance that God will be with him. Yet, when Moses tells the people that the patriarchal God has appeared unto him and they ask His name, what shall he say unto them? As is well understood today, to the Semite the name had far deeper significance than is the case in our occidental world. With us the name is little more than a vocable; to the Semite, however, it either signified the character of a person or brought to mind something distinctive about him. To ask for the name of God was to desire to know the nature of God.

32 Thus, Moses himself received his name because he was drawn out of
When therefore the Israelites in Egypt should ask as to the name of the patriarchal God, they would want to know concerning His nature. A mere vocable would have been no sufficient answer. Was the God who made promises to the patriarchs still with His people and was he able to deliver them from their present bondage and to bring to fulfillment the ancient promises? We must keep these considerations in mind when we seek to ascertain the meaning of the name revealed to Moses.

Two basic questions call for consideration. In the first place there is the question of the philological significance of the word which we so often transliterate Yahweh. Were we able to ascertain this precise philological significance, it would doubtless be a great boon. That, however, is a goal which apparently has not yet been attained. Nor is it really essential for an understanding of the employment of the word in this context. We must then be guided primarily by usage, in particular by the appearance of the word in this context. In the second place we must seek to ascertain the theological significance of the Name. Why did God reveal this particular Name to Moses at just this time? How does this revelation fit into the plan of redemption?

There are of course a number of views to consider, and we shall briefly mention some of them before proceeding to a discussion of the matter. According to J. Stellingwerff, the late Professor B. Holwerda took the name as signifying "I am, the water ḫḥytwim;" in this particular instance the significance may simply appear in the assonance, there being no attempt made at etymology. The word may be Egyptian, but it may also be, as Kitchen suggests (The New Bible Dictionary, London, 1962, p. 843), that the word represents an assimilated Semitic word to the Egyptian.

Whatever may be said about the Tetragrammaton, I do not see how it can be construed as a Qal imperfect. If the a vowel is original, as it seems to be (cf. ʾd̂ḏḇē and Ṣ), and the form is verbal, it must be Hiph'īl.
I the God who appears in action".  
Rashi interpreted, "I will be what I will be", i. e., more and more God's unchanging mercy and faithfulness will manifest themselves to His people. Again, emphasis has fallen upon the thought expressed in Exodus 3:12, "Surely I shall be with thee", and the Name has been taken to indicate that God will be present with His people. It has also been held that the phrase expresses God's inscrutability. "I am what I am". Hence, it is concluded that God's being is inscrutable and man cannot penetrate it. Geerhardus Vos calls attention to what he calls the ontological view, which would render, "I, who am, (truly) am", thus expressing the fact that God is pure being. 

In his interesting discussion of the theology of Exodus, James Plastaras gives some consideration to the meaning of the Name. He feels that the translation I AM is likely to be misleading inasmuch as there is no copula verb in Hebrew. Hence, he maintains that the verb ha-yah was used in the sense of being or becoming in an active or dynamic sense. The word 'eh-yeh he would therefore translate "I am present and ready to act". This presence was an act of grace and not simply the immanent omnipresence of God. The Name designates God as present in power. Plastaras renders it, "I will be present (in a dynamic, active sense) wherever, whenever, and to whomever I will be present".

In similar vein Martin Noth asserts that the verb hyh does not denote pure being but an "active being" and in this instance an "active being" which makes its appearance in the history of Israel. At this point a word of caution is in order. We must remember that "activism" plays a great role in much of modern theology and philosophy. Karl Barth has given great impetus to this conception by identifying God's

---

34 J. Stellingwerff: Oorsprong en toekomst van de creatieve mens, Amsterdam, 1966, p. 122. Holwerda's words are "Ik ben, ik de handelend optredende God". The reference is from Dictaten, I, Aflevering 2, Kampen, & 1961, a work which I have not been able to obtain.
36 Vos, op. cit., pp. 132-134, gives a survey of some significant views.
being with his act. "God is who he is", says Barth, "in his act of revelation". This idea that God is to be identified with his act is very prevalent today.

Yet this activistic emphasis is certainly not biblical. The modern depreciation of metaphysics is not based upon Divine revelation. We cannot therefore be satisfied with the designation "active being" in distinction from "pure being". The God of whom Exodus speaks is not the god of modern theology with its Kantian foundation, but the ever living and true, Triune God of Holy Scripture.

Anyone who studies the revelation given to Moses must realize the difficulty involved in seeking to set forth the precise significance of the Name. At the same time there are certain indications in the Scriptures themselves which will help us arrive at an understanding. The ancient versions which rendered I am who I am have hit upon something significant in the revelation, namely, the fact that the Name does serve to express God's aseity.

With this conviction in mind we may again look at Exodus. If we take the text seriously we are compelled to recognize that the One to whom Moses speaks is a Being distinct from Moses. He is designated with the definite article, The God. He is, in other words, the true God, the only God, the God who exists. To this God Moses speaks. Emphasis is placed upon metaphysics. The God with whom Moses converses exists. He is. And what Moses would know is the Name of this God with whom he is speaking.

Verse thirteen prepares for the later revelation of chapter six, verse three, where God says to Moses that by His Name Yahweh He was not known to the patriarchs. What He means

40 Karl Barth: Kirchliche Dogmatik, 11:1, p. 293. "Darum muss das unsere erste und entscheidende Umschreibung des Satzes «Gott ist: sein: «Gott ist, der er ist, in der Tat seiner Offenbarung». And again: "Aber eben das Sein Gottes umschreiben wir, indem wir es als Gottes Wirklichkeit bezeichnen, als Gottes Sein in der Tat, nämlich in der Tat seiner Offenbarung, in welcher das Sein Gottes seine Realität bezeugt: nicht nur seine Realität für uns--das freilich auch!--sondern zugleich und eben so seine eigene, innere, eigentliche Realität, hinter der und fiber der es keine andere gibt". How different this is from the biblical doctrine of God!

41 Thus, the Vulgate, Dixit Deus ad Moysen: EGO SUM QUI SUM. Ait: Sic dices filiis Israel: QUI EST, misit me ad vos.
was that in the character of *yhw* He was not known to the fathers. Clearly the verse does not mean that the patriarchs had not heard the vocable YHWH. As Professor Kitchen rightly says, "This major prop of the documentary theorists is now definitely swept away, no matter how unwilling they may be to recognize the fact". 42 The purpose of the revelation now given is to make known the significance of the Name YHWH.

With these thoughts in mind we may look again at the third chapter of Exodus. In itself the phrase 'eh-yeh "ser 'eh-yeh may be translated, "I shall be who I shall be", as Aquila and Theodotion do render it. 43 From other considerations, however, it would seem that in this context the future is not intended, but rather the present. This is also the force of the word 'eh-yeh taken alone.

In itself the verb ha-yah may express pure existence. When it is followed by the preposition Lamed, it is best rendered into English, become. This distinction, it would seem, is rather consistently followed. Thus, in Genesis 1:2 "the earth WAS desolation and waste", does not refer to the earth becoming such but rather simply states a condition existing in past time. Here the idea of becoming is wholly missing. The same is true in the phrase, "And his wife looked from behind him, and she was a pillar of salt" (Genesis 19:26). The Hebrew with its expression of instantaneousness is far stronger of than the English. On the other hand, when the preposition is employed, the word is rightly translated "become". In Exodus 6:7, for example, we should render, "And I shall take you to me for a people, and I shall be to you for God (i. e., I shall become your God) and ye shall know that I am the LORD your God who brings you out from under the burdens as of Egypt". The idea of activism, therefore, is not necessarily inherent in the verb itself.


We may consequently render *I am who I am* as the Vulgate has done. The phrase expresses the aseity of God; it tells us what His true nature is. Despite the activism and dynamism of modern theology, there is good warrant and evidence for insisting that this concept I AM is present in the verbal form, "'eh-yeh." This is not to say that the form in itself might not be rendered I SHALL BE, but the interpretation which adhered to the word from the first is one which expresses God's aseity. Thus, the Greek has translated THE BEING ONE (ὁ ὄν). It is this concept which also underlies and forms the basis for such expressions as "I am the LORD". Indeed, the purpose of Moses' ministry is that both the Israelites and the Egyptians may know that "I am the LORD". We meet this emphasis again in the second part of Isaiah when the Lord says, for example, "For I the LORD am your God", or "I am the LORD thy God" (Isaiah 41:13). The frequent assertion in these chapters of Isaiah's prophecy that "I am the LORD" clearly harks back to the revelation of the NAME given at Sinai. When we come to the New Testament, we find that Jesus Christ went to the heart of the question with His assertion: "Before Abraham was I AM". Here the very essence of the NAME is expressed. "'Eh-yeh is the BEING ONE, He who IS. And now we can see the significance of the sentence, "I am who I am". God is the BEING ONE, and therefore He is ever the same; inasmuch as He alone is eternal, forever the same, He alone is the BEING ONE. Augustine has well brought out the thought: "Quid est ego sum qui sum, nisi aeternus sum. Quid est ego sum qui sum, nisi mutari non possum". Malachi evidently reflected upon this passage in Exodus when he wrote, "For I the LORD do not change; therefore you, a sons of Jacob, are not consumed".

To stress the fact that the aseity of God is present in this remarkable word has been necessary. It has particularly
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44 Codex B. ἡγω εἰμι ὁ ὄν.
45 In the Gospel of John particularly, our Lord seems to have dwelt upon this passage. Cf. John 6:48, 51; 8:58; 10:9, 11; 11:25, etc.
been necessary in the light of the terrific power that the
theology of dynamism and activism have exerted upon the
interpretation of the Bible in recent days. Against that
influence we do protest, for we feel that it is a baneful one.
Instead of allowing the Bible to speak for itself, it seeks to
compel the Bible to speak with its own voice.

At the same time we realize full well that what we have
hitherto said does not do full justice to the revelation of the
NAME. The whole context precludes the idea that the
'eh-yeh is an impersonal, hard, abstract substance, somewhat
like Aristotle's unmoved mover or the hard-rock Allah of the
Koran. The concern of the people in asking after the Name of
God was to discover what relation this God sustained to
themselves. Of what help would He be in this very present
time of trouble? Unless the revelation concerns itself with the
question of the people and offers them a satisfying answer--
that is, not necessarily an answer that will satisfy them, but
an answer which in itself is satisfactory--it becomes a
mockery. The people were not interested merely in a question
of metaphysics; they were interested above all in the practical
matter of how the One who claimed to be the God of the
Fathers could be of aid to them.

In the light of this fact we must note that the revelation
expressed in the word 'eh-yeh and also in yah-weh makes
clear that the idea of pure, unchangeable being is no mere
abstract concept but is something quite practical. In wondrous
grace God reveals His nature to man in so far as it determines
what God is for His people. Thus in the Name the people
would have a pledge and earnest of the gracious deliverance
which God alone could bring and would bring to them.
The very fact that God speaks makes clear that He is no
mere impersonal force. Rather, as this context compels one
to recognize, He is the living and true God. In contrast to the
idols which had no life and could not move, Yahweh is the
eternal, living One. He changes not, yet He is living and can
reveal Himself to His creation. He will make known to Moses
and to the children of Israel what kind of God He is by means
of the deeds which He will perform in their midst and by means
of the words which He will speak unto them. These words
and deeds are such that only one who in all His attributes and
perfections is infinite, eternal and unchangeable can perform them. In His revelation the I AM makes Himself known to His people. Thus, He declares to the Israelites, "Ye shall know that I am the Lord your God, who brought you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians" (Exodus 6:7b). As a result of the revelation of power—a revelation accompanied by words—God's people would know that the One who had delivered them was no mere idol, the creation of men's hands, but the eternal, ever living one, the true Creator of heaven and earth, who did with His creation according to His will. Such a God they would and should worship. Indeed, this was to be the result of the revelation, "Ye shall worship God upon this mountain" (Exodus 3:12).

A further point remains to be noted. God declares, "This is My Name for ever, and this is My memorial unto all generations". By the use of the word NAME reference is had to the objective revelation of the divine nature. When God wrought mighty wonders, there would be objectively displayed the divine majesty and glory of the ONE who IS. Likewise the word MEMORIAL referred to the subjective recognition of that divine nature upon the part of man. Thus, when God displayed His power in redemption the Israelites would recognize that the One whose glory was thus displayed was the LORD, the eternal one, "who changeth never".

At this point, however, a minor problem arises. That the Israelites would know that Yahweh had delivered them is easily understandable. He had revealed Himself to them, both in word and in deed, and we may not doubt that He Himself would have made them willing and able to believe in Him. What, however, shall we say about the Egyptians? The Israelites will know that Yahweh is their God, but the Egyptians are said merely to know that Yahweh has brought judgment upon them. The Egyptians would have known that the God of the Hebrews had brought judgment upon them and that He was far more powerful than their own gods. As to the rich meaning of the NAME which Israel could know, we may be sure that Egypt did not have such knowledge. At the same time they would know that the One who spoke to Moses was Yahweh. Judgment is not without meaning,
and when the final judgment falls, the wicked will acknowledge that God is just.

Thus at the burning bush God gave to Moses the revelation of His NAME. In His historical revelations He is absolutely independent of His creation, the self-existent one, who manifests in deeds of wonder the nature of His being expressed in His Name. Thus, in a certain sense, we may agree with Holwerda's translation, "I am, I the God who appears in action". Yet, as quoted by Stellingwerff, this does not go far enough. At the burning bush there appeared to Moses One who is eternal, who changeth not, who depends not upon His creation, but in sovereign and supreme majesty, exists independently of that creation. He, the BEING ONE, is unchangeable; yet He is the living and true God. In His revelation of deliverance He displays the glory of His majesty, the blessed truth that He alone is the I AM.
The Practice of Witchcraft in the Scriptures

Roy B. Zuck

WITCHCRAFT TODAY

In recent years, witchcraft—the alleged power to cast spells of influence on people or events—has become almost commonplace in America. The publishing of books on how to practice witchcraft; the offering of courses on witchcraft at the University of Alabama, New York University, and other schools; the scheduling of radio and television interviews with self-claimed witches; the publishing of articles in large circulation daily newspapers—all these offer tips on how to cast curses or spells.

Involvement in witchcraft used to be limited to the eccentric few, but is now the experience of many. For example, an article in The Wall Street Journal describes a thirty-four-year-old woman who cast a love spell on a friend she just started dating. In her New York apartment she drew around her a "magic circle" on a sheet on the floor with a stick of charcoal. Then as incense swirled around her and as candles flickered, she chanted, "By all the names of princes and by the ineffable name on which all things are created, I conjure you . . ." Louise Huebner, the so-called official witch of Los Angeles, explains in her book Power through Witchcraft how to cast spells of love to lure a person with whom one is having
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1 Books in Print 1970 (New York, 1970) II, 1757. Almost 100 titles of books on witchcraft are listed.
2 October 23, 1967.
3 Louise Huebner, Power through Witchcraft (Los Angeles, 1969).
romantic problems, spells of emotional bondage, money spells, and so forth.4

Some present-day witches meet monthly in covens, usually when the moon is full. A coven consists of six males called warlocks, six females, and a high priest or priestess. They also hold eight festivals a year, with the most significant one being on Halloween. In these meetings spells of influence are conjured either for the benefit of others (to heal physically or to help in numerous other ways), or for the harm (physical or otherwise) of others. The former is commonly known as white magic and the latter as black magic.

Dr. Kurt Koch, noted German theologian and pastor, has counseled thousands of persons entangled in various forms of occultism. He reports that through black magical powers, witches are able to bring upon others oppression, disease, harassment, and even death. Through white magic, persons have been healed, crops have improved, protection from harm has been maintained, and so forth.5

Many missionaries report having witnessed evidences of the supranatural power of witchcraft in foreign lands. But the American public at large has only recently been confronted directly with the open display of these powers on a wide scale.

What does the Bible say about witchcraft? Are instances of magic charming with incantations recorded in the Scriptures? How does God view this practice? Is it a harmless pastime or a dangerous engagement with demonic forces? An understanding of what the Bible teaches on this subject will better enable one to analyze and counteract the present-day growth of witchcraft.

WITCHCRAFT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Supranatural powers possessed by the "magicians" of Egypt and of Babylon were not unlike the powers and the chantings of some witches today.

4 In addition to this spell-casting power, there are at least three other kinds of occultic powers: (1) power to foretell the future, (2) power to communicate with the dead (spiritism) or with the living (telepathy) without the use of the physical senses, and (3) power to locate hidden objects or to cause objects to appear, move, or disappear without the physical senses. Persons possessing one of these kinds of ability may also have one or more of the others.

The morning after the Pharaoh (of Joseph's day) dreamed about seven fat cows devoured by seven thin ones and seven full ears of corn consumed by seven thin ones, he called in his magicians to interpret the dream (Gen. 41:1-8). The word translated "magicians" in the Authorized Version occurs twice in this chapter (41:8, 24). It is the word מָכָר קִרְדָּם, which comes from קִרְדָּם "stylus" and literally means "scribes" or "engravers." They were "men of the priestly caste, who occupied themselves with the sacred arts and sciences of the Egyptians, the hieroglyphic writings, astrology, the interpretation of dreams, the foretelling of events, magic, and conjuring, and who were regarded as the possessors of secret arts ..."6 Kidner suggests these magicians were "expert in handling the ritual books of priesthood and magic."7

In Moses' and Aaron's contest with Pharaoh the Egyptian magicians duplicated three of the miracles: rods were turned to snakes (Exod. 7:11), water was turned to blood (7:22), and frogs appeared (8:7). However, the magicians could not produce lice, as Aaron did (8:18). The three demonstrations of their magical powers were accompanied by "enchantments" or "incantations," a word from the verb לְכַת אֶת meaning "to wrap tightly or to envelop" and thus suggesting secret, mysterious ways. Jehovah's supremacy over these magicians is demonstrated in a threefold way: (1) their snakes were devoured by Aaron's (7:12), (2) Aaron's miracles did not require incantations, and (3) they were unable to duplicate the plague of lice.

The same word for "magicians" is listed along with names for other occultists in the book of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar called in magicians, sorcerers, Chaldeans (Dan. 2:2) and wise men (2:27) to interpret his image dream, but they were unable to do so. Also these occultists were unable to interpret Nebuchadnezzar's dream of a large tree (4:7).8

The word "witch" occurs twice in the Authorized Version—in Exodus 22:18 and Deuteronomy 18:10. In both occurrences the Hebrew word is a piel participle from בַּשֵּׁם, "to practice sorcery," and could be translated "sorcerer" or "sorceress." Unger explains that this Hebrew word denotes "one who practices magic by using

8 The "astrologers" in Daniel may better be translated "chanters" that is, persons with magical ability through incantations.
occult formulas, incantations, and mystic mutterings."9 J. S. Wright points out that this root verb "probably means ‘to cut,’ and could refer to herbs cut for charms and spells."10

God's attitude toward witchcraft is bluntly stated in Exodus 22:18, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch (הַמַּשֲׁפֵּט) to live." "There must not be found among you anyone who makes his son or daughter pass through the fire, anyone practicing divination or soothsaying, observing omens, applying sorcery (מִלָּחָם), a charmer, a medium, a wizard, or a necromancer. For all who do these things are offensive to the Lord" (Deut. 18:10-12, Berkeley). God gave these stringent orders in order to preserve the Israelites from spiritual contamination with the degraded occultic practice of Canaan.11

The profession of the sorcerers in both Egypt and Babylon along with the magicians and the enchanters in Babylon "is condemned through the O.T. as representing black magic."12

Jezebel, the wicked queen of the Northern Kingdom of Israel, was deeply involved in witchcraft ("her sorceries were many," 2 Kings 9:22). Therefore Joram asked how there could be any peace in Israel so long as Jezebel's magical practices prevailed. This "cursed woman" (9:34) died a violent death (9:33-35), which is typical of the fate of so many who are involved in this kind of evil practice.

King Manasseh of Judah practiced numerous kinds of occultism, including spiritism and magical sorcery (2 Chron. 33:6). God called these deeds "abominations" and stated that Manasseh had "done wickedly" (2 Kings 21:11). Therefore Manasseh and his kingdom suffered greatly (21:10-16). "The term ‘abomination’ has the clear connotation of outrageously affronting God by contaminating His holy worship with the adoration of finite, polluted, false deities."13 It is certainly shameful that the chief monarch of God's people fell to such low depths of sin.

In Jehoiakim's reign, just before the Babylonian Captivity of Judah, Jeremiah warned Judah that her occultic leaders were false in predicting that she would not become subservient to Babylon.

11 The Ras Shamra tablets indicate that the Canaanites practiced many magical arts. See Cyrus A. Gordon, Ugaritic Literature (Rome, 1949), p. 94.
(Jer. 27:9-10). This points up two things: (1) an entire nation can become susceptible to the influences of occultists, and (2) many of the seers' and sorcerers' predictions are not reliable.

God does not let sorcery go unpunished. Through Isaiah He informed Babylon that within one day she would lose her children and her husband, meaning that her people would be taken captive and her king killed (Isa. 47:9). This was fulfilled by the attack of Cyrus--in spite of her sorceries and incantations (47:9). "Babylon was famed for expiations or sacrifices, and other incantations, whereby they tried to avert evil and obtain good."14 In fact, "Babylonia was the birthplace of astrology from which sprung the twelve-fold division of the day, the horoscope and sun-dial (Herod. ii. 109); but it was also the home of magic, which pretended to bind the course of events, ..."15

The word "incantation" in Isaiah 47:9, 12 is בִּרְכַּ, which could be rendered "spell" or "charm." It comes from the root which means "to unite or bind."

Isaiah sarcastically challenged Babylon to continue on in her incantations and magical practices, in her effort to avert the invasions of the Medes and Persians (47:12-13). But the efforts of Babylon's magicians and astrologers to save their nation were doomed to failure (47:14-15). This poignantly illustrates that sorcery is incapable of exercising power over God's plans.

The ancient world was deeply entrenched in occultism. Not only were the nations Canaan, Israel, Judah, and Babylon engaged in witchcraft; Assyria too was an active participant in the black arts.16 The city of Ninevah, known for its bloody atrocities and torturous inhumane treatment of its prisoners, is called "the mistress of sorceries (םֶמְשִׁי תּ" (Nah. 3:4). Entire nations ("families") were subjugated by her witchcraft.

Witchcraft will not continue indefinitely. When the Messiah, Israel's Prince of Peace, returns (Mic. 5:2-5), He will deprive Israel of any possible reliance on material strength (5:10, 11). In addition, "all man-made religions--with their sorceries, diviners, idols,

16 For details on Assyro-Babylonian magic, see Wright and Kitchen, The New Bible Dictionary, pp. 770, 771, where numerous firsthand sources are cited.
shrines, and cities devoted to idolatry—by which Israel has been led astray, Jehovah will pluck up" (5:12-14).

Malachi also refers to the removal of witchcraft as part of the future judgment on the nation Israel at the Lord's return. The Lord will be "a swift witness against the sorcerers" (Mal. 3:5). This judgmental attitude of the Lord toward sorcery and its practitioners indicates that witchcraft has a defiling effect on Israel. Complete removal of every trace of this sin is necessary to prepare Israel for the millennium.

WITCHCRAFT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In the New Testament there are several striking examples of the clash of Christianity with demonic magic.

Simon, of Samaria, had gained a great following through his practicing of witchcraft (μαγευών, participle). People on all levels of society ("from the least to the greatest") followed him for some time (Acts 8:10, 12). They were amazed because of his magical arts (μαγείας, 8:12) and his claim that he was "some great one" (8:9). So overwhelmed and deceived were they by his power that they claimed, "This man is the great power of God" (8:10). However, on hearing the Gospel from Philip, Simon believed and was baptized. Interestingly, Simon himself was amazed as he saw that the miracles Philip performed were far greater than his own (8:13). This points to the superiority of God's power over that of sorcery.

The noun μάγοι, translated "wise men" in Matthew 2:1, 16, is related to the verb μαγεύω. However, men from the East (Persia or Arabia) were not sorcerers like Simon. They were experts in philosophy, religion, astronomy, and medicine. Barnes suggests that μάγοι "came afterwards to signify those who made use of the knowledge of those arts for the purpose of imposing on mankind—astrologers, soothsayers, necromancers, fortunetellers, etc. Such persons pretended to predict future events by the positions of the stars, and to cure diseases by incantations, etc." Delling states that the specific meaning of μάγος was "a member of the Persian priestly caste" and then came to mean more generally a possessor of super-

18 The Authorized Version has "bewitched" but the word is ἐξίστημι.
natural knowledge and ability, or one who practices magical arts, or figuratively, a deceiver.\footnote{G. Delling, "μάγος," \textit{Theological Dictionary of the New Testament}, ed. by Gerhard Kittel and trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, 1967), IV, 356-57.}

It is noteworthy that on each of Paul's missionary journeys he confronted some form of satanic occultic powers. On Paul's first journey, Bar-Jesus, a Jewish sorcerer (μάγος) who was also called Elymas, opposed Barnabas and Saul on the island of Cyprus. Bar-Jesus tried to prevent Sergius Paulus the governor from turning to the Lord (Acts 13:6-8). Perhaps Bar-Jesus sensed that if the governor accepted Christ, Bar-Jesus would be ousted as the governor's sorcerer. Saul denounced Bar-Jesus with strong words: "0 full of all deceit and all mischief,\footnote{The word rendered "mischief" (けばりνια) "denotes properly facility of acting, and then sleight of hand; sly, cunning arts, by which one imposes on another, and deceives him with a fraudulent intention" (Barnes, p. 457).} thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" (13:10) In this denunciation Paul indicates that witchcraft is deceiving, satanic, the opposite of righteousness, and a spiritual perversion.

At Ephesus many of the Christian converts confessed to having engaged in magical practices. Many of those burned their books (apparently volumes with instructions on the performance of magical arts). The words "magical arts" in the New Scofield Reference Bible are the translation of περίεργα, a word meaning irrelevant, trifling, or curious (Acts 19:19).

In Galatians 5:20 witchcraft is listed among the "works of the flesh." The word for witchcraft here is φαρμακεία (from which comes our word "pharmacy" from φαρμάκον, a medicine, poison, magic potion, or drug), which is the preparing and giving of medicine. From the primary notion of administering medicines and drugs, the word came to mean preparing and giving magical potions possibly with incantations.\footnote{Unger, \textit{Biblical Demonology}, p. 154.}

The practice of witchcraft will continue in the tribulation period. As Revelation 9:21 makes clear, the people not killed by God's trumpet judgments will not repent of their murders, sorceries (φαρμακείων), fornication, nor thievery. The gross sins listed along with φαρμακεία in Galatians 5:19-21 and Revelation 9:21 are clear
evidence that God considers this practice a serious judgment-deserving transgression.

In the latter half of the tribulation, one reason ecclesiastical Babylon will be destroyed is that she will have deceived many nations by her practices in witchcraft (φαρμακεία, Rev. 18:23). Sorcerers (φαρμακοίς\(^2\)) will have no part in the New Jerusalem (Rev. 22:15) for they will be cast into the lake of fire (21:8).

**CONCLUSION**

Several things become evident from this study of the practice of witchcraft as recorded in the Old and New Testaments.

First, witchcraft is *demonic*, opposing all that is godly. Egyptian and Babylonian magicians were in direct opposition to Jehovah and His followers; Manasseh's witchcraft was wicked and an abomination to the Lord; witchcraft will be cleansed from Israel before the millennium; Bar-Jesus, who withstood the ministry of Paul, was an enemy of righteousness; witchcraft is one of the works of the flesh; and sorcerers will be cast into the lake of fire.

Second, witchcraft is *deceitful*. At first glance the performances of the Egyptian magicians appeared identical with those of Aaron, but in actuality were less powerful. Simon, the Samaritan sorcerer, deceived many for a long time by means of his magical powers. Bar-Jesus was "full of all deceit." And ecclesiastical Babylon will deceive many nations. Obviously, then, satanic powers are noted for their blinding deception.\(^2\) Because Satan performs miracles "with limitless deceit" (2 Thess. 2:9-10, Berkley), masquerading as an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:14), many "yield to deluding spirits" (1 Tim. 4:1, Berkeley).

Third, witchcraft is *deteriorating and destructive*. God ordered the Israelites to put witches (sorcerers) to death lest His people become contaminated spiritually. Jezebel's involvement in this sin resulted in her own violent death, and Judah suffered greatly because of Manasseh's witchcraft. Koch cites numerous modern-day examples of persons who have suffered physical harm, mental depression, emotional upheaval, and spiritual defeat as a result of dabbling in black or white magic.\(^3\) Experimentation with any form of witchcraft is highly dangerous. Those who participate in witchcraft

\(^2\) The word is used by the Septuagint several times to translate מיספים.

\(^3\) See Koch, *Occult Bondage and Deliverance*, pp. 20-22.
do so to the serious detriment and endangerment of their own souls.

Fourth, witchcraft is doomed. Though sorcerers may have tremendous supranatural powers because of their subjugation to and alignment with demonic forces, God's power is superior. A person trapped by magical practices can experience deliverance from that bondage through faith in Christ (Heb. 2:14; Col. 1:13; 1 John 4:4). The wise believer refuses to toy with any form of sorcery or witchcraft. Instead he continually appropriates the whole armor of God, he claims the protective power of the blood of Jesus Christ, and steadfastly resists the devil. Only in this way can the power of witchcraft be broken and its growth be counteracted.

26 For more on how to obtain deliverance from witchcraft, see Roy B. Zuck, "The Occult Craze," Moody Monthly, April, 1971, pp. 28-29, 49-50; Koch, Occult Bondage and Deliverance, pp. 85-128.