

EXODUS - EXILE

CITATION COLLECTION

2007

BIBLICAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

J. ROBERT VANNOY

FOR CLASSROOM USE ONLY

NOT TO BE REPRINTED OR DISTRIBUTED

- I.B. Archer, G. L. A Survey of Old Testament Introduction. Chicago:Moody Press, 1964, 212-223.

"No other known Pharaoh fulfills all the specifications besides Thutmose III. He alone, besides Rameses II, was on the throne long enough (fifty-four years, including the twenty-one years of Hatshepsut's regency) to have been reigning at the time of Moses' flight from Egypt, and to pass away not long before Moses' call by the burning bush, thirty or forty years later." (217)

_____. "An 18th Dynasty Rameses." JETS 17 (1974) 49-50.

"For many years it has been the contention of the advocates of the "Late Date" Theory of the Exodus (ca. 1290 B.C.) that a Nineteenth Dynasty situation for the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt was demanded by the mention of the city of "Raamses" in Ex. 1:11. On the assumption that this reference was not an anachronism for the period of the oppression, but the name actually current for Tanis or Avaris (referred to in Dyn. XIX as Pi-Ramesses), it is urged that an early 13th century date for the Exodus is absolutely required. This deduction has long been open to question, however, in view of the apparent connection between the 19th Dynasty and the Hyksos royal line. As W. F. Albright asserted (From Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd ed., 1957, p. 232). "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 residency 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)." This being the case, the proposition that the actual name "Rameses" itself was used no earlier than Dyn. XIX seemed more than doubtful, even though it might be true that Rameses I (1303-1302, according to IDB, iv, 10) was the first pharaoh to bear that name.

"It was therefore of considerable interest to this writer to discover purely by chance, as he was looking through "Views of the Biblical World" (Jerusalem, 1960, vol. iii, p. 118), a wall painting of a prominent noble-man who served in the reign of Amenhotep III (1412-1376) and who was named Ramose, or Rameses. The accompanying inscription caught my eye, because it contained the characters so familiar in the cartouche of Rameses the Great. The scene depicts a procession of trusted servants who had devotedly followed "Ramose" during his lifetime, and who are now carrying to his tomb the choice objects which were to be interred with him: his sandals, his jars of ointment and beer, his chair and bed, and what seem to be four caskets containing smaller precious objects or mummified portions of his body. The first eleven columns seem to read: 'His people of his estate say: O guardians, the faithful attendant upon his call says, O mountain of the west, open up (for) Ramose; mayest thou shelter him within thee. The attendant of the lauded vizier who served him; the attendant of Ramoses the justified, the good vizier.' . . .

"It would be interesting to speculate about the failure of this connection to be made in print--so far as this writer is aware, at least--up until the present time. It is just possible that evidence unfavorable to the generally favored Late Date theory fails to excite sufficient interest in those who are acquainted with the data to move them to publish this discovery for the enlightenment of the world at large. But whatever the motives for ignoring this inscription up until now, at any rate the information is hereby made available to the public. The name Rameses, in its non-geminating form at least, was already known and used in noble circles during the reign of Amenhotep III, if not before. It would therefore have been no surprise for a fifteenth century Moses to have been well acquainted with it."

Finegan, J. Light From the Ancient Past. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959, second edition, 108, 109, 113, 116, 153.

- (a) "The state of affairs abroad is very evident in the Tell el-Amarna letters, a group of clay tablets found accidentally by an Egyptian peasant woman at Tell el-Amarna. Written in cuneiform, they represent correspondence from vassal princes and governors in Syria and Palestine with Amenhotep III and with Akhenaton. Although many of the details of the letters remain obscure, it is clear that Syria and Palestine were seething with intrigue within and were under attack from without, while adequate help to maintain Egyptian sovereignty was not forthcoming. Rib-Addi, governor at Gubla or Byblus, twenty miles north of Beirut, wrote more than fifty times to Amenhotep III and Akhenaton, the following letter (Fig. 46) probably having been addressed to Amenhotep III:

"Rib-Addi to the king. . . .
 At the feet of my lord, my sun,
 seven times and seven times I fall down. . . .
 The king has let his faithful city
 go out of his hand. . . .
 They have formed a conspiracy with one another,
 and thus have I great fear that there is no man to rescue me
 out of their hand. Like birds that
 lie in a net
 so am I in
 Gubla. Why dost thou hold thyself back in respect to thy land?
 Behold, thus have I written to the palace,
 but thou hast paid no attention to my word. . . .
 May the king care for his land. . . .
 What shall I do in
 my solitude? Behold, thus I ask day
 and night." (p. 108-109)

In Jerusalem, Abdi-Hiba (sometimes Abdi-Heba) was governor, and he wrote repeatedly to Akhenaton, asking for Egyptian troops and stating that unless they were sent the entire country would be lost to Egypt. His letters customarily begin with some salutation of the greatest deference like this:

To the king, my lord, say.
 Thus saith Abdi-Hiba, thy servant:
 At the feet of the king, my lord,
 seven times and seven times I fall down . . .

Then he proceeds, as in the following letter, to protest vehemently his own loyalty and to beg urgently for help:

What have I done to the king, my lord?
 They slander me
 to the king, the lord: "Abdi-Heba
 has become faithless to the king, his lord."
 Behold, neither my father
 nor my mother has put me
 in this place.
 The mighty hand of the king
 has led me into the house of my father.
 Why should I practice
 mischief against the king, the lord?
 As long as the king, my lord, lives
 I will say to the deputy of the king, my lord:
 "Why do you love
 the Habiru, and hate
 the regents?" But therefore
 am I slandered before the king, my lord.
 Because I say: "The lands of the king,
 my lord, are lost," therefore
 am I slandered to the king, my lord
 So let the king, the lord, care for his land
 Let the king turn his attention to the archers
 so that archers of the king,
 my lord, will go forth. No lands of the king remain.
 The Habiru plunder all lands of the king.
 If archers are here
 this year, then the lands of the king,
 the lord, will remain; but if archers are not here,
 then the lands of the king, my lord, are lost.
 To the scribe of the king, my lord, thus saith Abdi-Heba,
 thy servant: Bring words,

plainly, before the king, my lord: All the lands
of the king, my lord, are going to ruin" (pp. 110-111).

-
- (b) "Henceforth the inscriptions of Seti I speak of campaigns in Palestine and Syria, Pekanan ("the Canaan"), Retenu, and Kadesh being among the places mentioned. One inscription said of his return to Egypt, "His majesty arrived from the countries . . . when he had desolated Retenu and slain their chiefs, causing the Asiatics to say: 'See this! He is like a flame when it goes forth and no water is brought.'"

RAMSES II

"Actually "the Asiatics" were not as fearful of Egyptian power as Seti I likes to believe, and his successor, Ramses II (c. 1290-c. 1224), had to battle throughout the sixty-seven years of his reign against them. Although his only victory in the famous Kadesh-on-the-Orontes battle with the Hittites was that of escaping complete destruction, the personal heroism of Ramses II was depicted proudly in numerous Egyptian scenes." (p. 113)

-
- (c) "But the Early Bronze Age civilization of Transjordan disappeared about 1900 B.C. (p. 147) and from then until upon the eve of the Iron Age there is a gap in the history of permanent sedentary occupation in that land. Not until the beginning of the thirteenth century did a new agricultural civilization appear belonging to the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, and Amorites. Therefore the situation presupposed in Numbers 20:14-17 did not exist before the thirteenth century B.C. but did prevail from that time on exactly as reflected in the Bible. If the Israelites had come through southern Transjordan at any time within the preceding 600 years they would have found neither the Edomite nor the Moabite kingdoms in existence and only scattered nomads would have disputed their passage. But coming sometime in the thirteenth century as we have reason for believing they did, they found their way blocked at the outset by the well organized and well fortified kingdom of Edom." (p. 153)

Harrison, R. K. Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969, 175, 176, 315-327.

- (a) "The question cannot be settled simply by an appeal to the book of Kings in the light of an arbitrary dating for the fall of Jericho. More recent excavations have cast considerable doubt upon the methods and conclusions of Garstang at Jericho, and the entire question of the date when Jericho fell has been shown to be in fact far from settled. Even Garstang modified his original date to one occurring between 1400 B.C. and the accession of Akhenaton (ca. 1370-1353 B.C.), which Albright subsequently lowered to between 1360 and 1320 B.C., and later to about 1300 B.C., finally concluding that the Exodus occurred in the latter part of the fourteenth century or the early years of the thirteenth century B.C.

"The diversity of opinion on this matter is further illustrated by Vincent, who proposed a date of between 1250 and 1200 B.C. for the fall of Jericho. Although Schaeffer and de Vaux tended to agree with Vincent, this date has been rejected by Wright as being too low. Bearing in mind the conclusions of Kathleen Kenyon that it is at present impossible to state with certainty the date when Jericho fell, it would seem from the available evidence that a date in middle of the thirteenth century B.C. is required for the crossing of the Jordan." (p. 175-176)

- (b) "The tradition preserved in Exodus that government store-cities were erected by the use of forced Israelite labor has been largely confirmed independently by excavations in Egypt. An ancient site in the Wadi Tumilat, Tell el-Retabeh, supposed to have been Raamses by Petrie who excavated it originally, is now known to have been Pithom. Work at the site has uncovered some of the massive brickwork erected in the time of Rameses II, and since no traces of Eighteenth Dynasty construction or expansion were evident, it would appear that the Exodus tradition of forced labor referred to the days of Rameses II." (p. 322)

*But 1990
discovery
has found
18th Dy (C)
evidence.*

"Thus if a clear view of the conquest period is to be obtained, it is important to distinguish between the events that characterized it and those that occurred after the death of Joshua, when a resurgence of the native Canaanite population took place. The conquest can be illustrated by the facts of archaeological exploration at sites such as Bethel, Lachish, Debir, Hebron, Gibeah, and Hazor, which show clearly that these places were occupied or destroyed in the latter part of the Late Bronze Age. If this destructive activity is to be correlated with the campaigns of Joshua as outlined in the Biblical sources (Josh. 11:16ff.), it would appear that the land as a whole was occupied with comparative rapidity by the Israelite invaders, although not all of the fortified strongholds, including a belt of Canaanite resistance separating the northern and southern tribes, were reduced at that time (cf. Josh. 13:1)." (p. 327)

Kitchen, K. A. Ancient Orient and Old Testament. London: Tyndale Press, 1966, 57-75.

- (a) "First, Exodus 1:11 links the oppression of the Israelites with the building of the store-cities of Pithom and Ra'amses, giving thereby an indication of date for the end of the oppression and for the Exodus.³ Ra'amses is most probably the Pi-Ramesse of Egyptian texts, founded by Sethos I and mainly built (and named) by Ramesses II. The Exodus, therefore, is best dated after the accession of Ramesses II (1304 or 1290 BC). There is no reason to doubt the Hebrew text at this point, and the possible sites of Pi-Ramesse - Tanis or Qantir, or both - were original foundations by Sethos I and Ramesses II, so that the Exodus can hardly be dated in the preceding Eighteenth Dynasty as was once thought by some scholars."
- (a.1) ft. nt.3. "Giving no hint as to how long the oppression lasted, Ex. 1:7-14 describes the oppression very briefly in general terms, esp. verse 14, a general summary of building and other field-work. The failure of this oppression to reduce the Hebrews led to the edict of Ex.

1:16 and the Hebrew evasion of it that sets the stage for the birth of Moses in Ex. 2. The narrator gives just one concrete example of the work done by the Hebrews, 'and they built for Pharaoh store-cities, Pithom and Ra'amses', 1:11b. We have no warrant to assume either that the Hebrews were employed exclusively on Pithom and Ra'amses (note 1:14, 'and in all manner of service...'), or that the oppression began only with this project. In fact, it is much more likely that Pithom and Ra'amses were their last major taskwork before the Exodus itself, because (i) they actually set off from the vicinity of Ra'amses (cf. Ex. 12:37; Nu. 33:3, 5), and (ii) they would retain most vividly in memory and record the names and scenes of their last labours before leaving Egypt, not those of a generation earlier. In other words, it should not be lightly assumed that Moses' birth was later than the start of Hebrew labours on Pithom and Ra'amses (as did Rowley, *Expository Times* 73 (1962), pp. 366-367, thereby imposing artificial problems on Ex. 1, and *NBD*, pp. 214-216)." (p. 57-58)

- (b) "The Amarna Habiru, therefore, have no direct bearing on the date of the Exodus or conquest (except indirectly to precede them) and so cannot support a date for these events in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries BC as was once held. As has been said long ago, the Hebrews may have been Habiru -- but not all Habiru are biblical Hebrews, nor can any particular group in the external data be yet identified as corresponding to the Hebrews." (p. 70)
- (c) "2. From the Exodus to Solomon. Here, the evidence is rather more complicated. The primary evidence and biblical data used so far would indicate an interval of roughly 300 years from the Exodus to the early years of Solomon (c. 971/970 BC). For the same interval, 1 Kings 6:1 gives 480 years, while addition of all the individual figures in the books from Exodus to 1 Kings gives a total of some 553 years plus three unknown amounts which will here be called 'x'. Furthermore, David's genealogy of five generations in Ruth 4:18-22 can hardly easily extend over the 260 years or so between him and the Exodus, and so it is probably a selective one; but that of the priest Zadok (1 Ch. 6:3-8) of ten generations would about cover the 300 years. The genealogies need be no problem; but what shall we make of the 480 and 553-plus-x years, as compared with the roughly 300 years' interval required by our primary evidence?

"In principle, this problem is not quite so contradictory as it may appear, if we remember that the Old Testament is also a part of the Ancient Near East, and therefore that Ancient Oriental principles must be applied. Thus, in ordinary king lists and historical narratives, ancient scribes and writers did not usually include synchronistic tables and cross-references as we do today. Synchronisms were the subject of special and separate historiographic works. In biblical terms, Judges as a narrative with a historico-religious purpose does not deal with synchronisms (except with oppressors as part of its story), while Kings is a synchronous history of Israel and Judah (while also a selective religious writing) in some degree comparable with the so-called 'synchronous histories' of Assyria and Babylonia. Here, an Egyptian example will be instructive as a parallel problem. For the five Dynasties Thirteen to Seventeen (the so-called Second Intermediate Period in Egyptian history), the Turin Papyrus of Kings records -- or did when it was complete -- some 170 kings who

reigned at least 520 years altogether. Now we also know that they all belong inside the period 1786 to c. 1550 BC, a maximum period of only about 240 years at most -- a hopeless contradiction? No. We know, too, that these dynasties were all partly contemporary: the 520 or so years are genuine enough, but were partly concurrent, not all consecutive. This may prove equally true of some of the Judges in early Israel, so that the 553-plus-x years would then fit into the roughly 300 years, just like the 520 or so into the roughly 240 in Egypt. Now in the Ancient Orient, chroniclers and other writers often used excerpts from fuller records, and this might explain the 480 years -- a total of selected figures (details now unknown) taken from the larger total. The various figures are therefore not so refractory in principle, when relevant principles are applied. To work this out in practice within the book of Judges is not easy, simply because we need more detailed information on the period than is available there or from elsewhere. But neither is it beyond possibility (as is evident from an unpublished preliminary study). The problem of the book of Judges is chronologically rather less complicated than other celebrated problems of Near Eastern chronology -- such as the Second Intermediate Period in Egypt, or the date of Hammurapi of Babylon, where a similar situation obtains." (p. 72-74)

MacRae, A. A. Biblical Archaeology. 46, 47.

"However, the date of the conquest still remains a question. This is, of course, closely connected with the question of the date of the Exodus from Egypt (cf. II.E.5). The figure given in 1 Kings 6:1 seems to many to decide the matter conclusively in favor of an Exodus during the 18th dynasty in Egypt, and therefore a Conquest about 40 years later. Some students would even feel that Biblical integrity was dependent upon the acceptance of this particular date for the Exodus and the Conquest.

"The present writer does not feel this way. Systems of chronology such as we have today, of numbering centuries one after the other, were hardly in existence until well along in the Christian era. The Bible does not tell us the month in which Abraham left Ur, nor the month in which David died. God could have caused this information and thousands of similar facts to be included in the Bible if He had chosen. The Bible does not tell us in what century the Exodus occurred. If we can determine these matters from other evidence, they are interesting to know, but they should never be considered as articles of faith.

"For many years there have been those who would place the Exodus from Egypt about two centuries later. This has usually been based upon the mention of the city of Ramses in Ex. 1:11. This name came into prominence in the 19th dynasty, and it is unlikely that it would have been made the name of an important city previous to that time. For many years it was considered almost a settled matter that Ramses II was the pharaoh of the oppression, and Merneptah the pharaoh of the Exodus. Again it must be said that we cannot be certain. The Bible has simply not given us the data on which to be sure of the date of the Exodus.

"When we look at the evidence from Palestine, it again is inconclusive. While the book of

Joshua tell us of a thorough-going conquest with most of the cities completely overcome, there are statements in Joshua and a still greater number in Judges which suggest that after the first great conquest there was still much land to be taken. In the case of many cities whose armies had been defeated and their king destroyed, people might have been able to return to the city and to re-establish themselves so well that considerable time elapsed before they were again conquered. This is very definitely true of Jerusalem, whose king was overcome by Joshua (Josh. 10:1-27; 12:7, 10) but which was a pagan city in the midst of the land (cf. Judges 19:10-12) until its final conquest by David (II Sam. 5:6,7).

"The arguments as to an early or late date of the Exodus often seem to be given in the manner of a lawyer determined to prove a particular point, rather than of a researcher seeking for light in order to determine something that is not yet known. Some new discovery may make the matter absolutely final, but up to the present it must be considered a question on which we do not yet have sufficient light."

Unger, M. C. Archaeology and the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1954, 140-152.

"Archaeology has located Pithom at Tell el-Retabeh and Raamses at Tanis and indicated that these cities were (allegedly at least) built by Raamses II (c. 1290-1224 B.C.). But in the light of Raamses II's notorious practice of taking credit for achievements accomplished by his predecessors, these sites were most certainly merely rebuilt or enlarged by him. Moreover, since it is true that Tanis was called Per-Re'emase (the House of Raamses) for only a couple of centuries (c. 1300-1100 B.C.), the reference in Exodus 1:11 must be to the older city, Zoan-Avaris, where the oppressed Israelites labored centuries earlier. Accordingly, the name Raamses is to be construed as a modernization of an archaic place name like Dan (for Laish in Genesis 14:14)." (p. 149)

I.C. MacRae, A. A. "The Relation of Archaeology to the Bible." In Modern Science and Christian Faith. Wheaton: Van Kampen Press, 1950, 215-219.

"Another striking incident, somewhat similar in nature, is connected with the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt. In Exodus 1:11 it is stated that the Israelites "built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses." In Chapter 5 it is related that after Moses' request for alleviation of the oppression Pharaoh gave orders that it be made still worse. He declared that straw would no longer be given them; they must gather it for themselves and yet be held responsible for the same number of bricks as before (vss. 7-11). "So the people were scattered abroad throughout all the land of Egypt to gather stubble instead of straw" (vs. 12). Naturally they complained at this increase in their labors, but Pharaoh refused to listen to them, and declared his intention to treat them severely, saying, "There shall no straw be given you, yet shall ye deliver the tale of bricks" (vs. 18).

"Over sixty years ago a bit of evidence came to light which seemed at first to give a remarkable special corroboration to the account. Professor E. Naville conducted excavations in 1883 at Tell el-Maskhutah in the Wadi Tumilat in northeastern Egypt. It was his opinion that this was the ancient Pithom, which the oppressed Israelites had built.

"His publication of the results quotes the following statement from Mr. Villiers Stuart, who had visited the site during the excavation: "I carefully examined round the chamber walls, and I noticed that some of the corners of the brickwork throughout were built of bricks without straw. I do not remember to have met anywhere in Egypt bricks so made." Evidently he felt that these were the very bricks which the Hebrews had been compelled to make without straw.

"However, we must always be cautious, for the cause of Biblical knowledge is never advanced by hasty conclusions. The statement in Exodus 1:11 that the Israelites were forced to build the city of Pithom does not by any means prove that they were still working there when the incident recorded in Chapter 5 occurred many years later. Moreover, there has been grave question as to the correctness of Naville's identification of Tell el-Maskhutah, and most Egyptologists incline now to the opinion that Pithom was at Tell Retabeh, eight and a half miles further west. Thus it is by no means certain that the bricks which Mr. Stuart observed to be partly made with straw and partly without are actually bricks from a city built by the Israelites, and the validity of the incident as a case of special corroboration becomes highly doubtful.

"There remains, however, the possibility that it is a case of general corroboration, giving evidence that such incidents occurred in Egypt as Exodus 5 describes, though leaving the particular instance without any specific evidence bearing upon it. Even this was strongly questioned by the late Professor T. Eric Peet of Liverpool University, who commented on Mr. Stuart's statement as follows:

"It is almost inconceivable that any traveller in Egypt should make this statement with regard to the use of straw in bricks, for though straw has been used both in ancient and modern times, its use is somewhat rare, more particularly in ancient times. What is more, the writer of this passage in the narrative is certainly under some strange delusion as to the function of the straw when used. Its purpose is to bind the mud more tightly together, though as a matter of fact the Nile mud coheres so well of itself that no binding material is really necessary. Consequently the refusal of the taskmasters to provide the Israelites with straw would not in the slightest degree increase the difficulty of their labours. As a piece of local colour the whole incident is unsatisfactory, and goes to prove the writer's ignorance of Egyptian customs rather than his close acquaintance with them, as is so often averred.

"When a noted Egyptologist thus believes the Biblical statements to be out of touch with reality, what is the correct attitude to take? Certainly the proper response is not one of two extremes. One should not proceed to vilify him or to question his motives. That is between him and God, who alone knows the inner motives and thoughts. An argument should not be

constructed from motives except when the evidence for such a conclusion is complete and unanswerable. The cause of Christianity advances by careful consideration of facts and evidence, not by superficial conclusions or by substitution of name calling for patient research.

"On the other hand, one must not be too hasty about deciding that Professor Peet's conclusions on this particular point are right. Jesus Christ rested weighty matters upon quotations from the books of Moses, and always referred to them as authoritative and true. If His attitude was wrong, then all belief in His deity must be given up, and the very foundation of Christianity discarded.

"The attitude of one who truly believes in Christ as Saviour and Lord must be that of suspended judgment on the particular point involved, while seeking for more evidence. If there is no question of error in copying or translation of the documents, two considerations still remain: first, that Christians may have been in error in their interpretation of the meaning of the Biblical statement, and second, that further scientific evidence may come to light, either from archaeology, or from some other source. In this particular matter the writer was unable to answer Professor Peet's allegations. Consequently, he suspended judgment until 1946, feeling confident that when all the evidence was in, it would show that God's Word was dependable.

"Strangely, the answer to the problem has come from modern chemistry. Dr. Irving A. Cowperthwaite, a Boston industrial engineer, formerly a member of the department of chemistry at Columbia University, gave a paper at the 1946 meeting of the American Scientific Affiliation which called attention to the probable solution to the difficulty. Edward G. Acheson, noted American chemist and inventor early in this century, after his invention of "Carborundum," and his discovery that graphite could be produced artificially, became interested in the fact that American clays were considered far inferior to those imported from Germany, which possessed a far higher degree of plasticity and greater tensile strength, despite the fact that often their chemical composition was similar to that of the American clays. This problem aroused the inventor's curiosity.

"Discovering that the best foreign clays generally came from a secondary source, to which they had been carried by a stream of water, he thought of the possibility that small amounts of organic matter suspended in the water might have profoundly altered the workability of the clay, even though so slight as to be extremely difficult to detect by chemical analysis. Testing this possibility by taking types of clay that were difficult to work and adding to them small amounts of various types of organic matter, he finally discovered a tremendous improvement when gallotannic acid was used. After describing these experiments in an article in the Transactions of the American Ceramic Society, Vol. 6, p. 31 (1904), he added the following remarks:

I made an effort to find in the history of clay-working some record of the addition of vegetable or organic matter to clay. Only one instance could I find, that of the

Egyptians as recorded in Exodus 5. The accepted theory of using the straw fiber as a binding agent for the clay never had appealed to me, and it now seemed likely those ancient people were familiar with the effect I had discovered. I procured some oat straw, boiled it in water, decanted the resultant reddish-brown liquid and mixed it with clay. The result was like that produced with gallotannic acid, and equal to the best I had obtained. This explained why the straw was used, and why the children of Israel were successful in substituting stubble for straw, a course that would hardly be possible were the fiber of the straw depended upon as a bond for the clay, but quite feasible where the extract of the plant was used.

"As a result of this Acheson concluded that 'Egyptianized Clay' would be a fitting name for straw-treated earths.

"The great increase in plasticity and workability which the straw produced in the clay makes it easy to see why taking away the straw from the Israelites was, indeed, a means of greatly increasing the difficulty of their work. It also shows how even stubble could be useful to them. Moreover, it indicates clearly that the absence of visible marks of straw in an ancient brick is no proof that the brick was made without its help. An incident in the Bible which was difficult to understand becomes crystal clear on the reasonable assumption that the ancient Egyptians were already familiar with a practical scientific procedure which was completely forgotten until its rediscovery within the present century. Such an instance should also lead to caution about assuming that there is a mistake in the sacred narrative, simply because we may not yet be in a position to understand it fully."

Motyer, J. A. Old Testament Covenant Theology. Unpublished lectures. London: Theological Students Fellowship, 1973, 9.

"Even more significant than the actual occurrence of the word 'covenant' is the situation in which the book of Exodus is set. I have already mentioned the genocidal impulses of Pharaoh. This is the content of chapter 1: the king of the world, Pharaoh, had determined on the utter destruction of this people. Little did he know that he was in this way challenging the promise that God had made to Abraham, in other words the most fundamental reality about the people of Israel. For at the beginning of God's dealings with Abram as he then was in chapter 12, there was the promise of the preservation of Abram and his descendents. God said 'I will bless those who bless you, and him who curses you I will curse.' Pharaoh, therefore, all unwitting was setting himself up to challenge the covenant. When his covenant was challenged God rose to defend it. Therefore both its vocabulary and also its own chosen setting proclaim to us that the book of Exodus is the continuation of the covenant narrative."

- I.D. Albright, W. F. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel. Anchor Books. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1969, 94.

"The Mosaic tradition is so consistent, so well attested by different pentateuchal documents, and so congruent with our independent knowledge of the religious development of the Near East in the late second millennium B. C., that only hypercritical pseudo-rationalism can reject its essential historicity."

- Bright, J. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981 (third edition), 127.

"Though we know nothing of his career save what the Bible tells us, the details of which we have no means of testing, there can be no doubt that he was, as the Bible portrays him, the great founder of Israel's faith. Attempts to reduce him are extremely unconvincing. The events of exodus and Sinai require a great personality behind them. And a faith as unique as Israel's demands a founder as surely as does Christianity--or Islam, for that matter. To deny that role to Moses would force us to posit another person of the same name!"

- Vos, G. Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948, reset ninth printing, 1975, 103, 104.

"For one thing he was, retrospectively considered, instrumental in bringing the great patriarchal promises to an incipient fulfilment, at least in their external, provisional embodiment. Israel became in truth a great nation, and this was due not exclusively to their rapid increase; the organization received through Moses enabled them to attain national coherence. Moses likewise led them to the border of the promised land. . . .

"Prospectively considered Moses also occupies a dominant place in the religious development of the Old Testament. He is placed not merely at the head of the succession of prophets, but placed over them in advance. His authority extends over subsequent ages. The later prophets do not create anything new; they only predict something new. It is true, Moses can be co-ordinated with the prophets: [Deut. 18.18; 'a prophet like unto thee']. Nevertheless the prophets themselves are clearly conscious of the unique position of Moses. They put his work not so much on a line with their own, as with the stupendous eschatological work of Jehovah for his people expected in the latter days [cp. Isa. 10.26; 11.11; 63.11, 12; Jer. 23.5-8; Mic. 7.15]. According to Num. 12.7, Moses was set over all God's house. It is entirely in keeping with this prospective import of Moses and his work, that his figure acquires typical proportions to an unusual degree. He may be fitly called the redeemer of the Old Testament. Nearly all the terms in use for the redemption of the New Testament can be traced back to his time."

I.E. Block, J. "Ten Plagues of Egypt," *RelEd* 71 (1976) 519-526

Approximately 1500-1200 BC the Santorin volcano erupted sending pyroclastics downwind toward Egypt. The pinkish-red ash fell into the Nile suggesting blood. This alkaline ash contaminated the river forcing the frogs to flee. Contaminated frogs died attracting gnats and flies. Disease microbes brought murrain to the animals and boils to man. Increased atmospheric vapor produced thunderstorms containing lightening, thunder, and hail. Additional rains increased vegetation: the scent prompted the migration of locusts. Ash, khamsin and/or locusts blocked the sun for three days. The weight of the ash caused roofs to collapse killing many Egyptians including firstborn. The Santorian eruption is responsible for the 10 plagues.

Gottwald, N. *A Light to the Nations*. New York, 1959, 121.

"The plagues in their cumulative power can hardly be explained as merely natural phenomena, although most of them are identifiable as recurrent or occasional blights in Egypt. To rationalize them grossly is to cut out the heart of the story: the power of Yahweh. . . . The attempt to treat the plagues as causatively related to one another (e.g., the organic discoloration of the Nile attracting frogs which bred flies and led to plague, etc.) is intriguing but ill-advised."

Calvin, J. *Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses Arranged in the Form of A Harmony*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Baker 1979 (reprint), 102, 141, 210.

(On Exod 4:21) "Since the expression seems harsh to delicate ears, many soften it away, by turning the act into mere permission; as if there were no difference between doing and permitting to be done; or as if God would commend his passivity, and not rather his power. As to myself, I am certainly not ashamed of speaking as the Holy Spirit speaks, nor do I hesitate to believe what so often occurs in Scripture, that God gives the wicked over to a reprobate mind, gives them up to vile affections, blinds their minds and hardens their hearts. But they object, that in this way God would be made the author of sin; which would be a detestable impiety. I reply, that God is very far from the reach of blame, when he is said to exercise his judgments: wherefore, if blindness be a judgment of God, it ought not to be brought in accusation against him, that he inflicts punishment. But if the cause be often concealed from us, we should remember that God's judgments are not without reason called a 'great deep,' and, therefore, let us regard them with admiration and not with railing. But those who substitute his permission in place of his act, not only deprive him of his authority as a judge, but in their repining, subject him to a weighty reproach, since they grant him no more of justice than their sense can understand." (p. 102)

(On Exodus 7:3) "There is, however, no need of discussing at length the manner in which God hardens reprobates, as often as this expression occurs. Let us hold fast to what I have already observed, that they are but poor speculators who refer it to a mere bare permission;

because if God, by blinding their minds, or hardening their hearts, inflicts deserved punishment upon the reprobate, He not only permits them to do what they themselves please, but actually executes a judgment which He knows to be just. Whence also it follows, that he not only withdraws the grace of His Spirit, but delivers to Satan those whom he knows to be deserving of blindness of mind and obstinacy of heart. Meanwhile, I admit that the blame of either evil rests with the men themselves, who wilfully blind themselves, and with a wilfulness which is like madness, are driven, or rather rush, into sin. I have also briefly shewn what foul calumniators are they, who for the sake of awakening ill-will against us, pretend that God is thus made to be the author of sin; since it would be an act of too great absurdity to estimate His secret and incomprehensible judgments by the little measure of our own apprehension. The opponents of this doctrine foolishly and inconsiderately mix together two different things, since the hardness of heart is the sin of man, but the hardening of the heart is the judgment of God. He again propounds in this place His great judgments, in order that the Israelites may expect with anxious and attentive minds His magnificent and wonderful mode of operation." (p. 141).

(On Exodus 10:27) "Here, also, according to his custom, Moses asserts that God was the author of his obduracy; not because He inspired with obstinacy a heart otherwise disposed to docility and obedience, but because He gave over as a slave to Satan a reprobate who was wilfully devoted to his own destruction, that he might rush forward with still increasing pertinacity in his impiety. But, since Moses has so often used this word, I am astonished at the boldness of certain sophists who, by the substitution of the word permission, allow themselves by this frivolous evasion to escape so plain a statement." (p. 210)

Helfmeyer, F.J. "oth." TDOT, Vol. I. G. J. Botterweck, J. Ringgren, editors. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, 170.

"oth, 'sign' is an object, an occurrence, an event through which a person is to recognize, learn, remember, or perceive the credibility of something."

Pfeiffer, C. F. Egypt and the Exodus. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1964, 47-49.

"When Pharaoh refused to acknowledge the claims of the God of Israel, he and the entire land of Egypt suffered a series of ten plagues. Except for the last -- the death of the first born -- none of the plagues was completely strange to Egypt. The timing of the plagues -- at the word of Moses -- and their intensity constituted the miraculous element. The Bible consistently presents Yahweh as sovereign over all creation. The forces of nature are always subject to his control. . . .

"When Moses, at the command of God, stretched his rod over the Nile waters they became red and putrid (Exod. 7:14-25). This plague reflects conditions brought about by an unusually high Nile, which normally reaches flood stage in August. The waters are then

saturated with finely powdered red earth from basins of the Blue Nile and Atbara, and they carry along minute organisms which help to color the water and create conditions so unfavorable for the fish that they die in large numbers. It may be that the extreme intensification of this phenomenon as described in Exodus 7:21, occurring at the word of Moses, produced the first plague which lasted seven days. Pharaoh, however, was unmoved by the scourge which should have convinced him of Yahweh's power.

"When Moses again approached Pharaoh and he refused to let Israel go, God told Moses to stretch forth his rod over the waters, and there came forth from the water, an army of frogs which invaded the land in such numbers that they became a national catastrophe (Exod. 8:1-15). Frogs are not unusual in the Nile Valley. The plague of frogs, however, came at the word of Moses and was of such intensity the Pharaoh should have recognized the power of Yahweh. When the frogs died in large numbers the land again was filled with the odor of decaying flesh. But Pharaoh remained unmoved and refused to let Israel go as Moses had requested.

"Heaps of decaying frogs and fish provide an ideal breeding ground for insect pests. At the word of the Lord, Moses stretched forth his rod and smote the dust, and there came forth a large number of insects variously described as gnats, lice or mosquitoes (Exod. 8:16-19). This was, as the third plague, God's third warning to Pharaoh and challenge to Egypt's gods.

...

"The plagues represent God's judgment on the gods of Egypt (cf. Exod. 12:12). Haepi, the Nile god had brought stench and ruin instead of blessing. Frogs, associated with the gods of fruitfulness, brought disease instead of life. The light of the sun (Re) was blotted out during the plague of darkness. Yahweh desired Egypt as well as Israel to know His power."

- I.F. Motyer, J. A. Old Testament Covenant Theology. Unpublished lectures. London: Theological Students Fellowship, 1973, 13-15.

"So far so good. But if in fact it is the last judgment, the contest of the firstborn, that is going to bring the people of God out from the land of Egypt, why the Passover? If this tenth plague is the plague which settles the issue, why the Passover? And the answer to that question is this: because when the wrath of God is applied in its essential reality, no one is safe. There were two nations in the land of Egypt, but they were both resistant to the word of God; and if God comes in judgment none will escape, unless God makes some prior decision which will guarantee the safety of those whom he has chosen to save. And therefore, it is in the mercy of the covenant-keeping God that he says, 'These are the people to whom I have made promises. Now if my promises are real I must make provision for them which will guarantee that they will inherit promises and not inherit judgment.' And the provision which God made was the Passover lamb and its blood, and the smearing of the blood, and the safe sheltering of the people in the place where the blood has been shed.

"Don't you see that this is the same God who dealt in a parallel way with Noah? 'Here', said God, 'is a man to whom I have made promises of mercy. Therefore I will wrap him round with a circumstance, which will guarantee that, when the blow falls, it will fall upon him unto salvation.' So he wraps his people round with the blood of the lamb. Now how did that work out in the land of Egypt?"

"The theology of the Passover

"I want to set before you the five key words in which the theology of the story of the Passover may be expressed, for remember that we are trying to trace the theological grain in the narrative.

"(a) Propitiation. The chosen setting for the Passover is a setting of divine judgment, a setting of the wrath of God. This is a true covenant setting, for this was the setting of God's dealings with Noah. God purposes to come wrathfully into the land of Egypt. He says so in chapter 12 verse 12: 'For I will pass through the land of Egypt on that night, and I will smite...' God is coming in in judgment. And any Israelite who was abroad that night, having failed to heed the Passover regulations, is implicated; the fact that he is an Israelite does not exempt him. The teaching of verse 23 makes that clear: 'For the LORD will pass through to smite the Egyptians; and when he sees the blood upon the lintel and on the two side posts the LORD will pass over the door, and will not allow the destroyer to come into your houses.' So apart from the Passover blood, the destroyer would enter. All alike are under the wrath of God that night. Nevertheless it says in that key verse 13, 'The blood shall be to you a token upon the houses where you are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over'. Not 'when I see you', but 'when I see the blood, I will pass over'. The blood is a token to me that you are there; but it is 'when I see the blood that I will pass over'. Putting the matter bluntly, there is something about the blood which changes God. The God who comes in in wrath looks upon that household with absolute satisfaction. There is nothing there to move him to wrath any more, and he passes by. That is the truth which is safeguarded by the word 'propitiation', that which appeases divine wrath. There is something about that blood which appeases the wrath of God, so that wrath is no longer operative against that household. No other word but 'propitiation' will do. There is no reference in this narrative to any subjective state of the people of God, and therefore words like 'expiation', which signify the wiping away of sin in the heart of man, will not suffice. For the narrative takes no notice of subjective factors in the people of God. It simply says, 'God is coming in his wrath; when he sees the blood he passes by in peace.' It is therefore the blood of propitiation.

"(b) Security or salvation. As long as the people remain where the blood has been shed, they are secure. Verse 22 reads, 'Ye shall take a bunch of hyssop and dip it in the blood that is in the bason, and strike the lintel and the two side posts with the blood in the bason; and none of you shall go out of the door of this house.' There is no safety except there; there, there is safety (v.23). When he sees the blood the Lord will passover and will not suffer the destroyer to enter. The people of God are secure from destruction while they shelter in the place where the blood has been shed. So the blood has a manward movement. God-ward it

works propitiation, manward security.

"(c) Substitution. Is there any clue in the narrative as to why the blood has such amazing efficacy that it can propitiate a wrathful God and that it can secure a people who well merit that wrath? What is the inner secret of the efficaciousness of the blood of the lamb? We can see the answer to this most clearly if we remind ourselves that the judgment of God was in terms of death. He came in to slay, and the judgment of God was going to take a token but dreadful form in the death of the firstborn of the family. The judgment of God was in terms of death; but a death had taken place in every Israelite's house already. The narrative is perhaps more truthful than the narrator intended when he says in verse 30: 'There was not a house where there was not one dead' -- in every Egyptian household the death of a firstborn, in every Israelite household the death of a lamb. In every house there was a corpse - in the Egyptian house the corpse of the firstborn, in the Israelite house the corpse of the lamb which had been reverently carried into the house. We cannot resist the word substitution; for there was a death in every house, and in the houses of Israel it was the lamb that had died. The narrative rubs our noses in the exact equivalence of that lamb to the people of God. See verse 3; 'In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to their fathers' houses, a lamb for a household: and if the household be too little for a lamb, then shall he and his neighbour next unto his house take one according to the number of the souls; according to every man's appetite ye shall make your count for the lamb.' This is not just a broad equivalence - a lamb for a household; no, they must count heads and then stomachs. Count the number of people and then say how much they will eat, so that the lamb represents exactly the number and the needs of the people of God. And the narrative caters for human fallibility in this matter, in case they may over-estimate; it says, 'If anything remains till the morning, burn it with fire, for there is to be no other use or significance for this lamb than that it has represented the number and needs of the people of God. That was the lamb that died; that was the precious blood under which they had sheltered, the lamb that was exact in its measurement to the measurement of the number and needs of the people of God. If that's not substitution, then you must be very hard to please! But you may be mathematically inclined, and you may say, 'Ah, but in the houses of Egypt none died but the firstborn son; and therefore if the lamb had not been offered, none would have died but the firstborn son in the houses of Israel; therefore at most the lamb substituted for the firstborn sons. But have you forgotten that when God committed himself to propositional revelation to Moses, he said, 'Thus shall thou say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD, Israel is my son, my firstborn'? The lamb is equivalent to the firstborn of God.

"We have two more words in the Passover narrative, which I would like to share with you.

"(d) Deliverance, or accomplished redemption. The death of the lamb did not make redemption possible for the people of God; it made redemption actual and inevitable. Redemption was accomplished by the death of the lamb. You may put the matter this way without any shaping of the narrative: before the lamb died they could not go; after the lamb died they could not stay. We read that the Egyptians were urgent upon them to make them leave. The death of the lamb effected redemption. That is why, incidentally, through the

remainder of the Old Testament the focus of attention is often on the Red Sea and what happened there rather than upon the Passover lamb in Egypt, because it was the event of the Red Sea that sealed finally that which God had done in the land of Egypt. God manoeuvred his people into a corner, the sea on one side and the Egyptians on the other, and there was that great word which Holy Scripture always speaks to people who have not yet entered into the fulness of redemption: 'Stand still and see the salvation of God.' And the waters opened before them and they went through; the Egyptians trying to follow were drowned; and they saw the Egyptians dead on the sea shore. 'Then they believed God' (Exodus 14). Then they knew for certain that they were redeemed from the land of Egypt and that their bondage was finished and done with; the redemption had been accomplished and applied.

"(e) Pilgrimage. The Passover was the supper to be eaten as a breakfast. Exodus 12:11 reads: 'Thus shall ye eat it; with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand; and ye shall eat it in haste; it is the LORD'S Passover.' Why do we eat it in haste? Because it is the Lord's Passover, because there is that about it which demands that you eat it as those who are already committed to pilgrimage. You can't eat the Lord's Passover and live in Egypt. You can only eat the Lord's Passover if you have made a free commitment to go walking with God in pilgrimage out of this place wherever he shall lead you. So the Passover begins to be the fulfillment of the word which God spoke to Abraham, 'Walk before me and be thou perfect'. There has to be the walk with God. The people who went into safety through that door plastered with the blood of the lamb came out through the same bloodstained door into pilgrimage. The blood which ushered them into safety ushered them out to walk with God, and they had to eat it as those who were committed to that pilgrimage endeavor.

Payne, J. B. The Theology of the Older Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962, 404, 405.

"In the fulness of time came 5) the fulfillment of the passover in the person of the Messiah; "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" (I Cor. 5:7). On the very afternoon that the paschal lambs were being prepared (cf. John 13:1; 18:28), Jesus Christ gave His life on the cross in order that redemption might be accomplished once and for all. In His own person, He constitutes the final Lamb of God who was for sinners slain. The Savior, moreover, offered Himself without spot or blemish (I Pet. 1:18, 19; cf. Ex. 12:5), and not a bone of His body was ever broken (John 19:36). In such a way was the Mosaic system of anticipatory sacrifice terminated that day on Calvary.

"Yet on the evening previous to the regular celebration of the paschal ceremony, Jesus Christ observed the ancient passover feast with His disciples in the upper room (Matt. 26:17). This meal thereby became, at the same time, history's last, valid Mosaic passover and also the first Lord's Supper; for the one was transformed into the other. The redemption that had been anticipated in the passover is now commemorated in the supper. Moreover, even as the

passover constituted a sacramental seal, both of Israel's gracious adoption by God, so that He should be their Father (Ex. 4:22), and of their resultant, communal brotherhood under the national testament; so the supper has become the sacramental seal of our union with Christ (I Cor. 10:16) and of our union with one another in the new testament of His blood (v. 17, 11:25). The truth of Exodus 12:13 is eternally valid:

"The blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and there shall be no plague upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land (of Egypt)."

Vos, G. Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948 (reset ninth printing, 1975) 120.

"Wherever there is slaying and manipulation of blood there is expiation, and both these were present in the Passover."

II.C.1 Keil, C. F. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Vol. 2. The Pentateuch. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959, 67.

"כִּי for כִּי belongs to the popular phraseology, and has been retained in the Chaldee and Ethiopic, so that it is undoubtedly to be regarded as early Semitic."

II.D.1.a. Kaiser, W. Toward Old Testament Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, 110ff.

Was this covenant a deliberate change from the promissory covenant of the patriarchs to a conditional covenant in which 'obedience was the absolute condition of blessing'? Could this be interpreted as a 'step downward' and a 'mistake' tantamount to 'rejecting God's gracious dealings with them'? What was the relationship of the 'if' statements (Exod. 19:5; Lev. 26:3ff.; Deut. 11:13ff.; 28:1) and the command 'You shall walk in the way which the Lord your God has commanded you that (l'ma'an) you may live and that (w') it may go well with you and that (w') you may live long in the land which you shall possess (Deut. 5:33)?

The contrast implied in these questions was too sharp for the text. If the alleged obligatory nature of this covenant should prove to be the new grounds for establishing a relationship with the covenantal God, then it should prove possible to demonstrate that the same logic can be applied to the conditional statements noticed in the chapter on patriarchal theology.

The 'if' is admittedly conditional. But conditional to what? "It was a condition, in this context, to Israel's distinctive position among all the peoples of the earth, to her mediatorial

role and her status as a holy nation. In short, it could qualify, hamper, or negate Israel's experience of sanctification and ministry to others; but it hardly could effect her election, salvation, or present and future inheritance of the ancient promise. She must obey God's voice and heed His covenant, not 'in order to' (l^ema'an - purpose clause) live and have things go well for her, but 'with the result that' (l^ema'an -result clause) she will experience authentic living and things going well for her (Deut. 5:33).

Motyer, J. A. Old Testament Covenant Theology. Unpublished lectures. London: Theological Students Fellowship, 1973, 19.

"(i) The nature of Old Testament religion. Old Testament religion is a complex of grace, law and grace. Let your mind go back over what we have seen together in Exodus; we have seen the grace that brought them out of the land of Egypt, the law that was spoken to them because they were redeemed people and the grace that was made available for them as they committed themselves to a life of obedience. Notice how this solves thorny problems which have been raised by Old Testament specialists, e.g., the supposition that there was a battle in Israel between those who thought that religion was purely a matter of the cult and the sacrifices and those who thought that religion was purely a matter of ethical observance. It cannot be so because the Sinaitic Mosaic ground work of Old Testament religion is the binding together of grace, law and grace, the binding together of the commitment to obedience and the blood of sacrifice. Naturally when the prophets found that sacrifices were getting out of place, they countered that by reasserting the priorities for the people of God. The prior call was to holiness and within that context the blood of sacrifice makes provision for the lapses of the people. It is round this point that the totality of Old Testament religion finds its unity.

(ii) The unity of the Old Testament and the New Testament. 1 John 2:1,2 reads 'My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not.' People of God under the new covenant have no permission to sin; they are summoned to a life of holiness; 'All that the LORD has said we will do and be obedient.' 'But if any man sin we have an advocate with the father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins'; God has made a provision whereby those who are committed to obedience may, in spite of their disobedience, still be kept at peace with God and maintained in the covenant relationship. Is it not so that the whole of the Bible speaks with one voice?"

II.D.1.c Kaiser, W. Toward Old Testament Ethics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, 76, 77.

"The most common misconception of the purpose of the law is that Old Testament men and women were brought into a redeemed relationship with God by doing good works, that is, by obeying the commands of the law, not through the grace of God. The truth of the matter is that this reading of the text will not fit the biblical evidence.

"The history of the Old Testament revolves, for the most part, around three covenants: the

Abrahamic, the Sinaitic, and the Davidic covenants. The substance of these three covenants occupy a great deal of the Old Testament writer's attention and exhibits common material and concerns. However, most Old Testament scholars link the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants with royal grant types of treaties. Moshe Weinfeld demonstrated that the "royal [or divine] grants" made to Abraham and David with their promise of "land" and "house" (dynasty) were unconditional gifts that were protected and assured even if subsequent sins intervened. The gift might then be delayed or individually forfeited, but it had to be passed on to the next person in line. Thus for Abraham and David, God's covenant was an "everlasting covenant" even though there might arise some undeserving rascals who would not be able to participate in the benefits of that covenant though they were obligated to transmit those same gifts on to their children.

"But the Sinaitic covenant is placed on a different footing even though it shares much of the same substance with the Abrahamic and Davidic promises. It is not modeled on royal grant treaties, but on a vassal treaty form. To be sure, the vassal's obligations to obey in order to enjoy the benefits of this covenant are much more prominent.

"Several cautions must be raised at this point. First, both the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants also required obedience: obedience was no spiritual luxury which the grace and goodness of the one bequeathing the grant had removed. While the recipients did not earn these benefits, neither did they participate in them if they sinned and fell out of favor with the grantor. The best they could do in that sad event was to pass on these gifts to their children. They would participate in them if they walked in truth, otherwise it would skip their generation also. Second, "obedience to the law is not the source of blessing, but it augments a blessing already given." "Only after the historical preface to the covenant document has affirmed that Yahweh's grace came first, does the list of Yahweh's demands upon Israel begin." The grace of God is the atmosphere and context into which the Decalogue is cast, for its prologue states: "I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery" (Exod. 20:1). Likewise, before the specifications and stipulations of Deuteronomy 12-26 begin, Deuteronomy 1-11 lays the groundwork for such obedience by recording Moses' sermons on the great redemptive actions of God in history that brought this covenant into existence. Blessing would indeed come after obedience, but not as a "merited legal reward for the achievement of obedience to the law." The pattern in the Sinaitic covenant was, as Gordon Wenham has observed, " . . . God's choice (1) precedes man's obedience (2), but man's obedience is a prerequisite of knowing the full benefits of election (3)." Each of these three steps can be illustrated, as Wenham has, with a text like Exodus 19:4-5: "You yourselves have seen what I did to Egypt, and how I . . . brought you to myself" [(1) what God has done so far]. "Now if you obey me fully and keep my covenant" [(2) Israel's obligation], "you will be my treasured possession" [(3) a promise of fuller benefits is added for obedience, but in the context of a grace already received and begun].

"Accordingly, "the priority and absoluteness of God's grace are constantly reiterated." The law, then, must not be viewed as an abstract, impersonal tractate that stands inertly over the heads of men and women. It was, first of all, intensely personal. God spoke from heaven so

all the people could hear his voice (Deut. 4:32-34: "Has any other people heard the voice of God speaking out of fire, as you have, and lived?"). The ultimate motivation for doing the law was to be like the Lord--in holiness (Lev. 20:26) and action (Deut. 10:17-19; 14:1-2; 16:18-20). The covenant aims to establish a personal relationship, not a code of conduct in the abstract."

Kline, M. G. Treaty of the Great King. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963, 24.

"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."

Motyer, J. A. Old Testament Covenant Theology. Unpublished lectures. London: Theological Students Fellowship, 1973, 17.

"What does that mean for us as we seek to study these narratives as a covenant document? It means this: that the Word of God to a redeemed people is a word of law. We are enabled by this simple observation of a sequence of events to get in biblical perspective the place of law in the life of the people of God. God brought them to Mount Sinai that he might declare his law to them. In the Old Testament, therefore, the law is not a ladder whereby the unsaved seek in vain to climb into the presence of God. The law is a divinely given pattern of life for those who have been redeemed by the blood of the lamb. These folk, who had rested underneath the sheltering blood and who were committed thereby to pilgrimage, discovered that the immediate objective of their pilgrimage was the place where they might hear God speak his word of law and of commandment. The law is a pattern of life which God sets before and upon a redeemed people. This is the place of law in the Old Testament. Is it not the place of law in the New Testament? Ought we not therefore as believers increasingly to forget the blank page between Malachi and Matthew and to read the Bible as one book proclaiming one message?"

Vos, G. Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948 (resent ninth printing, 1975) 126, 127.

"This Pharisaic philosophy asserted that the law was intended, on the principle of merit, to enable Israel to earn the blessedness of the world to come. . . . It is true, certain of the statements of the Pentateuch and of the Old Testament in general may on the surface seem to

favour the Judaistic position. That the law cannot be kept is nowhere stated in so many words. And not only this, that the keeping of the law will be rewarded is stated once and again. Israel's retention of the privileges of the berith is made dependent on obedience. It is promised that he who shall do the commandments shall find life through them. Consequently writers have not been lacking who declared that, from a historical point of view, their sympathies went with the Judaizers, and not with Paul.

Only a moment's reflection is necessary to prove that this is untenable, and that precisely from a broad historical standpoint Paul had far more accurately grasped the purport of the law than his opponents. The law was given after the redemption from Egypt had been accomplished, and the people had already entered upon the enjoyment of many of the blessings of the berith. Particularly their taking possession of the promised land could not have been made dependent on previous observance of the law, for during their journey in the wilderness many of its precepts could not be observed. It is plain, then, that law-keeping did not figure at that juncture as the meritorious ground of life-inheritance. The latter is based on grace alone, no less emphatically than Paul himself places salvation on that ground. *But while this is so, it might still be objected, that law-observance, if not the ground for receiving, is yet made the ground for retention of the privileges inherited.* Here it can not, of course, be denied that a real connection exists. But the Judaizers went wrong in *inferring* that the connection must be meritorious, that, if Israel keeps the cherished gifts of Jehovah through observance of His law, this must be so, because in strict justice they had earned them. The connection is of a totally different kind. It belongs not to the legal sphere of merit, but to the symbolico-typical sphere of appropriateness of expression.

As stated above, the abode of Israel in Canaan typified the heavenly, perfected state of God's people. Under these circumstances the ideal of absolute conformity to God's law of legal holiness had to be upheld. Even though they were not able to keep this law in the Pauline, spiritual sense, yea, even though they were unable to keep it externally and ritually, the requirement could not be lowered. When apostasy on a general scale took place, they could not remain in the promised land. When they disqualified themselves for typifying the state of holiness, they ipso facto disqualified themselves for typifying that of blessedness, and had to go into captivity. . . ."

Wenham, G. "Grace and Law in the Old Testament." In Law, Morality and the Bible.
B. Kaye, G. Wenham, Editors. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1978, 3-23.

"Throughout the Old Testament, then, law is consistently set in the context of covenant. This means that law both presupposes grace and is a means of grace. Law presupposes grace because law is only revealed to those God has called to himself. Law is a means of grace because through obedience to it the redeemed enter into a closer relationship to their divine king and enjoy more of the blessings inherent within the state of salvation." (p. 17)

II.D.1.e. Dyrness, W. Themes in Old Testament Theology. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1979, 133, 134.

"The superficial resemblance of OT law to other law codes is undeniable, and it is instructive to ask what might be the relationship between them. We have already seen that in Israel it was God rather than the king who served as lawgiver. This put the idea of law in a unique perspective. In one sense all of OT law was religious. Israel had a keen sense of this difference: Moses asks, "What great nation is there, that has statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this law?" (Deut. 4:8). They knew that God "has not dealt thus with any other nation" (Ps. 147:20). But at the same time the similarities with neighboring law codes are also striking. These reflect not a wholesale borrowing, but "the influence of a single widespread customary law" (de Vaux, I, 146). Let us examine the relationship in more detail.

"In the first place, because the law is to safeguard the covenant relationship, idolatry is severely condemned (Ex. 20:23; 22:20 et al.). Moreover, life is seen to belong to God (Gen. 9:5), so that when an ox kills a man, its flesh may not be eaten (Ex. 21:28, 32). As a result capital punishment is not nearly so common as it is in the case of the law code of Hammurabi (ca. 1800 B.C.). There a wife that does not guard her property is cast into the river (DOTT, 31); robbery is punishable by death (DOTT, 30) as is bearing false witness in a trial (DOTT, 29). Indeed, in general, the punishment stipulated in the OT shows a restraint of gross brutality.

*may he life itself
is the pure ser
code of
God?*

"The fact that all stood in the presence of God equally in the covenant relationship made it impossible for them to recognize a class distinction in their law. There is not one law for the free and another for slaves. Indeed, slaves come in for particular protection in the law against cruel and demanding masters (Ex. 21:2-6, 26, 27). By contrast, most of the Near Eastern law codes stipulate different punishments for a person dependent upon his station in life:

"HC [Hammurabi Code] 203 If one of citizen status has struck the cheek of his equal, he shall pay one mina of silver.

HC 2045 If the serf of a citizen has struck the cheek of one of citizen status, they shall cut off his ear. (DOTT, 34)

"Because marriage is particularly important in God's sight and instituted by him, any infraction against chastity is severely punished. While promiscuity is punished in many ancient law codes, outside the OT there are exceptions that are authorized by the law. But in the OT if a slave is treated improperly, she is to be treated just as if she were a wife (Ex. 21:7-11). If a man seduces a virgin, she shall become his wife (Ex. 22:16). Otherwise, adultery and fornication are punishable by death (Deut. 22:22-24). The careful instructions in Leviticus about proper relations between a man and a woman are preceded by the warning that they are not to do as was done in Egypt where they had been, nor as is done in Canaan

where they were going (Lev. 18:3-4). And the instructions close with the plea not to defile themselves by these practices for "I am the LORD your God" (Lev. 18:30). Ultimately, then, even human relationships were to reflect God's character and therefore were never to be understood only in terms of expediency. Unfaithfulness throughout the OT was such an awful sin that God used it to illustrate the depths of Israel's unfaithfulness with him (Hosea).

"Specifically unique in the OT law are the numerous provisions for the stranger or alien, and for those who are handicapped in one way or another. There were instructions for the blind and deaf (Lev. 19:14), for widows and the fatherless (Ex. 22:21-22), and for the poor (Deut. 15:7-11). Strangers were singled out for protection from oppression (Ex. 23:9), for, it is explained, you should understand the heart of a stranger since you were strangers in Egypt. God was especially concerned with the disadvantaged, of whom he says: "If . . . they cry to me, I will surely hear their cry" (Ex. 22:23). One can almost hear Christ's words: "Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of God" (Lk. 6:20). Poverty is not considered a virtue in the OT, but it is recognized there how unjust the fallen order is, and those who are special victims of its injustice provide God's people with a heaven-sent opportunity to express the mercy of God himself (see Kidner 1972, 26-27)."

Hillers, D. R. Covenant. The History of a Biblical Idea. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969, 89-93.

Honor your father and your mother, so that your days may be long in the land Yahweh your God is going to give you.

Exodus 21:15, 17

He who strikes his father or mother shall surely be put to death.

He who reviles his father or mother shall surely be put to death.

"You shall not commit murder.

Exodus 21:12-14

He who strikes a man a fatal blow shall surely be put to death. But he who did not act deliberately, it being an act of God -- I will designate a place for you whither he may flee. But if a man maliciously plotted against his neighbor to slay him by a trick, you shall take him to be executed, even from my altar.

Exodus 21:18-25

If men are quarreling, and one man strikes the other with a stone or a hoe, not fatally, but so that he is confined to bed, if he gets up and can walk about outside with a cane, he who smote him shall be free of blame, only he shall pay for his support meanwhile and the medical costs. If a man strikes his slave, male or female, and it dies by his blow, he shall be liable to requital. But if he

survives a day or two, he shall not be liable to requital, for the slave is his property.

If men are struggling, and they strike a pregnant woman, and she has a miscarriage, with no further injury to herself, a fine shall be imposed as the husband of the woman shall determine, the amount being fixed by estimate (of the age of the fetus). If there is further misfortune, you shall require a life for a life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise.

Exodus 21:28-32

If an ox gores a man or woman to death, the ox shall be stoned, and its flesh shall not be eaten, but the owner of the ox is free from blame. But if the ox had a fixed habit of goring, and sworn testimony to that effect was given to its owner and yet he did not watch it (or, perhaps, dehorn it), and it kills a man or woman, then the ox shall be stoned and also its owner shall be put to death. If a compensation in money is imposed on him, he shall pay the ransom for his life exactly as it is imposed on him. If it gores a minor, boy or girl, the same principle applies. If it gores a slave, male or female, he shall give thirty shekels of silver to the slave's owner, and the ox shall be stoned.

Exodus 22:1-2

If a thief is caught breaking in and is struck and dies, there is no blood-guilt for killing him. But if it happens in broad daylight, there is blood-guilt for him.

"You shall not commit adultery.

Exodus 22:15-16

If a man seduces a virgin, who was not betrothed, and lies with her, he shall make her his wife by paying the bride-price. But if her father refuses to give her to him, he shall pay money equal to the bride-price for virgins.

Compare Deuteronomy 22:22-27

If a man is caught lying with a married woman, both of them shall die, the man who lay with the woman, and the woman. So you shall remove the evil from Israel. If it was a girl, a virgin, who was betrothed to a man, and a man comes upon her in the city and lies with her, you shall take both of them out to the city gate and stone them to death with stones -- the girl because she did not cry out in the city, and the man because he violated the wife of another man. So you shall remove the evil from your midst. But if a man came on a betrothed girl in the country and seized her and lay with her, only the man who lay with her shall die. You shall do nothing to the girl. She has done no wrong deserving death, for this case is like that of a man who attacks a another man and kills him, for he caught her in the country. The betrothed girl may have cried, but there was no

one to rescue her.

"You shall not steal.

Exodus 21:37-22:3

If a man steals an ox or a sheep and slaughters it or sells it, he shall restore five head for an ox, or four head for a sheep. . . . He shall make restitution. If he has nothing, he shall be sold for his theft. If what was stolen is found in his possession, alive, whether ox or donkey or sheep, he shall restore double.

Exodus 21:16

He who steals a man, whether he has sold him or is caught with the man in his possession, shall be put to death.

"You shall not swear falsely by the name of Yahweh your God, for Yahweh will not acquit anyone who swears falsely by his Name.

You shall not give false testimony against your neighbor.

Exodus 23:1-2

You shall not spread a false report. You shall not make common cause with a man who is in the wrong, to give false testimony (for him). You shall not go along with the majority in doing wrong, or testify in a lawsuit so as to fall in with the majority and pervert justice.

Compare Deuteronomy 19:16-21

If an unscrupulous witness attacks a man by testifying that he committed a serious crime, the two men who figure in the suit shall stand before Yahweh, before the priests and the judges of that time, and the judges shall make a thorough inquiry. If the witness is a perjurer, one who gave false testimony against his brother, you shall do to him as he plotted to do to his brother, and remove the evil from among you. Those who are left will hear and be afraid; they will not do an evil thing like that at another time in your midst. And you shall not spare him--life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot."

II.D.1.f Motyer, J. A. Old Testament Covenant Theology. Unpublished lectures. London: Theological Students Fellowship, 1973, 19.

"The blood moves first Godward in propitiation, but then, secondly, manward. 'And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the hearing of the people: and they said, 'All that the LORD has spoken will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it

on the people' (vs. 7 & 8). On what people did he sprinkle it? At what precise moment did that sprinkling of blood occur? At the moment when they committed themselves to a life of obedience. First comes the commitment to obedience according to the Lord God, 'All that the LORD has said we will do, and we will be obedient', then the sprinkling of the blood manward. And what does that mean? It means that just as the blood of the covenant on the one hand establishes the relationship of peace with God by propitiation, so on the other hand the blood of the covenant maintains the relationship of peace with God for a people who are committed to walk in obedience. God knows that the people are professing beyond their strength: 'They have well said in what they have said. O that there were such an heart in them, that they would...keep all my commandments always.' (Deut. 5:28ff) But they are professing beyond their ability. 'Very well', says God, 'I will make a provision for them.' The same blood which has made peace with God will keep peace with God. As they walk in the way of obedience, the blood is available for a people committed to obey. As they stumble and fall, so the covenant blood will be available for them."

II.D.2

Meredith
Kline, M. G. Treaty of the Great King. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963, 28, 41, 42, 43, 44.

do I have? → A) "The position to be advocated here is that Deuteronomy is a covenant renewal document which in its total structure exhibits the classic legal form of the suzerainty treaties of the Mosaic age." (p. 28)

"In the light of the evidence now surveyed, it would seem indisputable that the Book of Deuteronomy, not in the form of some imaginary original core but precisely in the integrity of its present form, the only one for which there is any objective evidence, exhibits the structure of the ancient suzerainty treaties in the unity and completeness of their classic pattern. That there should be a measure of oratorical and literary enrichment of the traditional legal form is natural, considering the caliber of the author and the grandeur of the occasion. And, of course, there is the conceptual adaptation inevitable in the adoption of common formal media for the expression of the unique revelation of God in the Scriptures. What is remarkable is the detailed extent to which God has utilized this legal instrument of human kingdoms for the definition and administration of his own redemptive reign over his people.

B) "The implication of the new evidence for the questions of the antiquity and authenticity of Deuteronomy must not be suppressed. The kind of document with which Deuteronomy has been identified did not originate in some recurring ritual situation. These treaties were of course prepared for particular historical occasions. It is necessary, therefore, to seek for an appropriate historical episode in the national life of Israel in order to account satisfactorily for the origin of the Deuteronomistic treaty. Without now rehearsing all the data that make it perfectly apparent that the addressees were the recently founded theocratic nation, we would press only one question: Where, either in monarchic or pre-monarchic times, except in the very occasion to which Deuteronomy traces itself can an historical situation be found in

which the twelve tribes would have been summoned to a covenantal engagement whose peculiar purpose was, as to the purpose of the Deuteronomic treaty demonstrably was, to guarantee the continuance of a (non-Davidic) dynasty over Israel?

"Another index of the time of Deuteronomy's composition is provided by the evolution of the documentary form of suzerainty treaties. Admittedly the available evidence is still quite limited and the differences among the extant treaties are not to be exaggerated. It is indeed one species that we meet throughout Old Testament times. Nevertheless, there is a discernible evolution. For example, where the beginning is preserved in the first millennium B.C. treaties of Sefireh and Nimrud, it is not the opening *umma* of the second millennium B.C. Hittite treaties, or its equivalent. Also, in the Sefireh treaties only a trace remains of the blessing sanctions which are prominent in the earlier treaties, and the sanctions in Esarhaddon's treaties consist exclusively of curses. The most remarkable difference is that the historical prologue, the distinctive second section of the second millennium treaties, is no longer found in the later texts.

"Accordingly, while it is necessary to recognize a substantial continuity in pattern between the earlier and later treaties, it is proper to distinguish the Hittite treaties of the second millennium B.C. as the "classic" form. And without any doubt the Book of Deuteronomy belongs to the classic stage in this documentary evolution. Here then is significant confirmation of the *prima facie* case for the Mosaic origin of the Deuteronomic treaty of the great King.

C) "The literary genre of Deuteronomy also has important implications for the way in which, having once been produced, this document would have been transmitted to subsequent generations. By their very nature treaties like Deuteronomy were inviolable. They were sealed legal contracts. Indeed, as has already been observed, it was standard practice to deposit such treaties in sanctuaries under the eye of the oath deities." (p. 41-43)

D) "These facts stand in diametrical opposition to the whole modern approach to the Book of Deuteronomy. According to the current speculations Deuteronomy was produced by an extended process of modification and enlargement of a pliable tradition. The most relevant evidence, however, indicates that once they had been prepared for a particular historical occasion, documents like Deuteronomy would not be susceptible to ready modification. They were in fact protected from all alteration, erasure, and expansion by the most specific, solemn, and severe sanctions. And the force of these facts is intensified in the case of the Deuteronomic treaty by the reverence which the Israelites will have had for it not simply as a sealed and sanctioned covenant but as in truth the very word of God revealed to them from heaven.

"Now that the form critical data compel the recognition of the antiquity not merely of this or that element within Deuteronomy but of the Deuteronomic treaty in its integrity, any persistent insistence on a final edition of the book around the seventh century B.C. can be nothing more than a vestigial hypothesis, no longer performing a significant function in Old

Testament criticism. Is it too much to hope that modern higher criticism's notorious traditionalism will no longer prove inertial enough to prevent the Deuteronomic bark from setting sail once more for its native port?" (p. 44)

Thompson, J. A. The Ancient Near Eastern Treaties and the Old Testament. London: The Tyndale Press, 1964.

"The best preserved of all the suzerain treaties from the ancient Near East are the Hittite treaties. There is enough comparative evidence to indicate that the pattern of the Hittite treaties was a fairly standard one all over the Near East. Hence, it is reasonable to take this as representing the standard literary structure of the normal suzerainty treaty in these lands. Since there are many resemblances between this literary pattern and the literary structure of a number of important passages in the Old Testament which deal with the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, it is important to understand the structure of the normal Near Eastern vassal treaty document.

"The following elements were regularly present in a Hittite treaty text: (a) the preamble, which identifies the author of the treaty and gives his titles and attributes; (b) the historical prologue of the treaty, in which the benevolent deeds of the Hittite king on behalf of the vassal are recounted, and made the ground of the suzerain's appeal to the vassal to render future obedience in gratitude for past benefits; (c) the treaty stipulations -- (i) general clauses, which were the principles on which future relations were to be based, and (ii) specific stipulations; (d) the divine witnesses and guarantors of the treaty; (e) the maledictions or curses, and the benedictions or blessings. In addition to these standard elements, there was normally some provision for depositing the treaty documents in the sanctuary, for a periodic public reading of the treaty document, for an oath of acceptance of the treaty by the vassal, and for a religious ceremony, often with blood sacrifices, in which the treaty was ratified." (p. 13-14)

"In all these passages, and in others besides, Yahweh, the covenant God of Israel, was given a position which, on the formal and legal level, is reminiscent of the position of the Near Eastern suzerain. He was Israel's sovereign who had performed saving acts on her behalf in times past, and had appealed to her on the basis of these to enter into covenant with Him and to render Him undivided allegiance and loyal service. He too had His covenant stipulations. In obedience to these Israel would find blessing, but in rejection of them or in disobedience to them lay evil consequences and maledictions. Israel too was bound by an oath of which Yahweh himself was the witness and guarantor. There was also a covenant document which was to be lodged in the sanctuary and which was to be read to succeeding generations. Israel was bound to renew her covenant oath from time to time, especially on the occasion of a change of leadership in the nation, or of national renewal after a period of neglect.

"It seems clear that the Near Eastern covenant idea provided Israel with a significant metaphor for the exposition of the relationship which existed between Yahweh and herself. Not that the idea as it existed in the secular environment of the day was completely adequate

to expound the many-sided aspects of the divine covenant between Yahweh and His people. But this concept borrowed from the realm of international law, and given special theological application, gave concrete expression to the deeper concept of divine election. The Near Eastern treaties, and in particular the Hittite suzerainty treaty, in their literary structure, in their vocabulary, in their historical setting and, in some measure, in their general spirit, have considerable significance, therefore, for Old Testament studies." (p. 23)

Wellhausen, J. Prolegomena to History of Ancient Israel.

"Nor did the theocracy exist from the time of Moses in the form of the covenant, though that was afterwards a favourite mode of regarding it. The relation of Jehovah to Israel was in its nature and origin a natural one; there was no interval between Him and His people to call for thought or question. Only when the existence of Israel had come to be threatened by the Syrians and Assyrians, did such prophets as Elijah and Amos raise the Deity high above the people, sever the natural bond between them, and put in its place a relation depending on conditions, conditions of a moral character." (p. 417)

Wenham, G. "Grace and Law in the Old Testament." In Law, Morality and the Bible. B. Kaye, G. Wenham, Editors. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1978, 3-23.

"The Sinaitic covenant is not modelled on a royal grant but on a vassal treaty, a legal form in which the vassal's obligations are much more prominent. But even here the laws are set in a context of a gracious, divine initiative. Obedience to the law is not the source of blessing, but it augments a blessing already given." (p. 5)

"...the covenant setting of the law emphasizes that salvation is not based on works. The covenant was made with those who had already been saved from Egypt: 'You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings and brought you to myself' (Ex. 19:4). The Decalogue itself is preceded by a reminder about the exodus: 'I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage' (Ex. 20:2). The structure of the covenant form, with the historical prologue preceding the stipulations section, makes it clear that the laws are based on grace. In Deuteronomy the saving acts of God (Dt. 1-3) are related before the stipulations are imposed on Israel (Dt. 4ff.). Israel is expected to obey because God has brought the people out of Egypt and preserved them in the desert. The priority and absoluteness of God's grace are constantly reiterated: 'The Lord your God is not giving you this good land to possess because of your righteousness; for you are a stubborn people Even at Horeb you provoked the Lord to wrath' (Dt. 9:6, 8). God's grace in history is always the primary motive for obedience to the demands of the covenant. Deuteronomy 4-11 is a passionate plea to love God with all the heart, soul and mind. This demand is constantly being reinforced by appeals to the past history of Israel." (p. 10-11)

- II.D.3.a. Motyer, J. A. Old Testament Covenant Theology. Unpublished lectures. London: Theological Students Fellowship, 1973, 20.

"Now we move on to take up the thought of the efficacy of the blood. I would like you to notice first of all the sequence of events which binds the book of Exodus and the book of Leviticus together. The second half of the book of Exodus is concerned with the plans for the tabernacle and the setting up of the tabernacle. Let us look first of all at chapter 29:44, 'I will sanctify the tent of meeting, and the altar: Aaron also and his sons will I sanctify, to minister to me in the priest's office. And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and I will be their God.' The tabernacle is central to God's covenant dealings with his people. This is the covenant promise - that 'they should be my people and I will be their God' - and the tabernacle is the visible focus of the covenant - 'I will dwell among the children of Israel, and be their God. They shall know that I am the LORD their God, that brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, in order that I might dwell among them.' God's tabernacle is the climax of redemption; he brought them out of Egypt for this very purpose that he might dwell among them. Don't weary over all those tedious details to do with the tabernacle; they are describing to you the climax of God's redemptive covenant programme for his people. The second half of the book of Exodus is integral to the Exodus story and must not be separated from it.

"Well then, with what anticipation the people must have looked forward to the setting up of the tabernacle! This was the climax, this was the covenant in operation, God's coming to live at no. 10 - his tent amongst all the other tents, God in the midst of his people. Consider the situation at the end of Exodus: 'Then the cloud covered the tents of meeting and the glory of the LORD filled the tabernacle' (40:34). God had taken up residence in the midst of his people. But in v. 35 we read: 'And Moses was not able to enter...' So here again is the same tension; God is present but not available; he is next door but not a neighbour. Moses was not able to enter.

"How is this situation resolved? Look at Leviticus 1:1 'The LORD called unto Moses, and spoke unto him out of the tent of meeting, saying 'Speak unto the children of Israel and say 'When any man offers an oblation unto the LORD...' Now let me put that literally for you: 'Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, when any man brings near that which is brought near'. The glory banishes, but the sacrifices unite; the people cannot enter, but they can come near. This is the place of the sacrificial code in the life of the people of God; the sacrifices are designed to maintain a redeemed people in closeknit fellowship with their God."

- II.D.4.a. Hodge, C. Systematic Theology. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952 (reprint of 1872), 290-293.

"When the Hebrews in the wilderness said to Aaron, 'Make us gods which shall go before us,' neither they nor Aaron intended to renounce Jehovah as their God; but they desired a

visible symbol of God, as the heathen had of their gods. This is plain, because Aaron, when he fashioned the golden calf and built an altar before it, made proclamation, and said, "Tomorrow is a feast to Jehovah." "Their sin then lay, not in their adopting another god, but in their pretending to worship a visible symbol of Him whom no symbol could represent." (p. 293)

II.D.4.b. Wilson, M. R. "נָחַם." In TWOT. Vol. 2. R. L. Harris, G. Archer, B. Waltke, editors. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980, 570-571.

36/38
"The KJV translates the Niphal of nhm "repent" thirty-eight times. The majority of these instances refer to God's repentance, not man's. The word most frequently employed to indicate man's repentance is shub (q.v.), meaning "to turn" (from sin to God). Unlike man, who under the conviction of sin feels genuine remorse and sorrow, God is free from sin. Yet the Scriptures inform us that God repents (Gen 6:6-7; Ex 32:14; Jud 2:18; 1 Sam 15:11 et al.). i.e. he relents or changes his dealings with men according to his sovereign purposes. On the surface, such language seems inconsistent, if not contradictory, with certain passages which affirm God's immutability: "God is not a man ... that he should repent" (1 Sam 15:29 contra v. 11); "The LORD has sworn and will not change his mind" (Ps 110:4). When naham is used of God, however, the expression is anthropopathic and there is not ultimate tension. From man's limited, earthly, finite perspective it only appears that God's purposes have changed. Thus the OT states that God "repented" of the judgments or "evil" which he had planned to carry out (1 Chr 21:15; Jer 18:8; 26:3, 19; Amos 7:3, 6; Jon 3:10). Certainly Jer 18:7-10 is a striking reminder that from God's perspective, most prophecy (excluding messianic predictions) is conditional upon the response of men. In this regard, A. J. Heschel (The Prophets, p. 194) has said, "No word is God's final word. Judgment, far from being absolute, is conditional. A change in man's conduct brings about a change in God's judgment.""

emotion

Calvin, J. Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses Arranged in the Form of a Harmony. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Baker, reprint, 1979, 340, 343.

"For, since faith is founded on the Word, when that Word appears to be at issue with itself, how in such conflicting circumstances could pious minds be sustained unless they were supported by the incomparable power of the Spirit? Still in the mind of Abraham there was such strength of faith, that he came forth as a conqueror from this kind of temptation. He had heard from God's own mouth, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called;" he is afterwards commanded to slay him, and reduce his body to ashes; yet, because he is persuaded that God was able to raise him up seed even from the dead, he obeys the command. (Heb. xi. 17-19.) The same thing is here recorded of Moses, before whom God sets a kind of contradiction in His Word, when He declares that He has the intention of destroying that people, to which He had promised the land of Canaan. . . . Meanwhile, it is certain that, whilst God is trying the faith of Moses, He quickens his mind to be more earnest in prayer, even as Moses himself

"repent" initiates a new scheme of things

was led in that direction by the secret influence of the Spirit. Nor is there any reason why slanderous tongues should here impugn God, as if He pretended before men what He had not decreed in Himself; for it is no proof that He is variable or deceitful if, when speaking of men's sins, and pointing out what they deserve, He does not lay open His incomprehensible counsel. He here presents Himself in the character of Judge; He pronounces sentence of condemnation against the criminals; He postpones their pardon to a fitting season. Hence we gather that His secret judgments are a great deep; whilst, at the same time, His will is declared to us in His word as far as suffices for our edification in faith and piety. And this is more clearly expressed by the context; for He asks of Moses to let Him alone[vs 10]. Now, what does this mean? Is it not that, unless He should obtain a truce from a human being, He will not be able freely to execute His vengeance?-- adopting, that is to say, by this mode of expression, the character of another, He declares His high estimation of His servant, to whose prayers He pays such deference as to say that they are a hindrance to Him. Thus it is said in Psalm cvi. 23, that Moses "stood in the breach, to turn away the wrath" of God, who not only hears the prayers of His people when they humbly call upon Him, but suffers them to be in a manner intercessors with Him."

- II.D.4.c. Gispen, W. H. Exodus. Bible Students Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982 (Dutch original, 1964), 297.

"Verses 15b-16 are parenthetical and draw attention to the great value of the two tablets: they were completely covered with writing, inscribed by God Himself (cf. 24:12, 31:18), and given by Him to Moses in their final form. This parenthetical statement indicates that Moses' subsequent breaking of the tablets was wrong: even he, the interceding mediator (cf. vv. 7-14), fell into sin. Verse 16, cf. Deuteronomy 9:10. It would have been much more impressive and would have placed the focus much more on God if Moses had presented the two tablets to the people side by side with the golden calf; that would have been a lesson in comparative religion! Moses had violated "the work of God," where He only had a right to destroy the work of sinful people!"

- II.D.4.e. Berkouwer, G. C. Divine Election. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960, 110-114.

"In the Formula of Concord we find the expression liber vitae in the chapter on election. There, too, we find an aversion similar to Calvin's against an illegitimate penetration into the secrets of God's will. Of predestination it is said: "It cannot be searched and found in the secret counsel of God, but it must be sought in the Word in which it has been revealed"; and this Word of God "leads us to Christ, who is the Book of Life, in which are contained all the names of those who shall have life eternal, as it is written: 'He has elected us in Christ before the foundation of the world'." Further, it is emphasized that, if one wants to consider predestination correctly and fruitfully, "one must cultivate the habit not to speculate about the unsearchable and hidden predestination of God, but think and reflect how the counsel and ordinance of God in Jesus

Christ -- who is the true Book of Life -- is revealed to us in His Word."

"Thus Calvin, by pointing to Christ as the mirror of election, and Luther, by referring to Christ as the Book of Life, have shown us in similar manner the same pastoral and theological thesis regarding the knowability, the revelation, of election." (p. 110)

"If we think that the Book of Life is a mysterious entity, a hiddenness, and that the names written therein are unknown to us and must remain unknown -- perhaps for reasons which Trent calls our humility -- then we are struck by Paul's testimony when he writes clearly of Clemens and his fellow workers that their names are written in the Book of Life (*Phil. 4:3*). It seems that the Book of Life to Paul is not a mysterious entity: he speaks freely of it and "reads" in it, with the result that he mentions names that are written in it.

"It is also striking, however, that such passages are nevertheless infrequent in Scripture and that the Book of Life is mentioned in certain other connections, especially the dynamic connection: "He that overcometh shall thus be arrayed in white garments; and I will in no wise blot his name out of the book of life" (*Rev. 3:5*). The Book of Life appears here in the context of admonishment and perseverance. It lacks the traits which it often displays in dogmatic theology and in the consciousness of many believers. In the terminology of the latter one would hesitate to speak so emphatically of the possibility of "blotting out," and one would perhaps see in it a weakening of the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. But Scripture speaks thus freely, the more so, since we already hear of the Book of Life in the Old Testament. Moses prays for forgiveness for the people and says "if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book that thou hast written" (*Ex. 32:32*).

"And not only in the consideration of Moses, who supposes that he is written in the Book of Life, but also in the divine answer this "blotting out" is mentioned: "Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book" (*Ex. 32:33*). Blotting out is correlated with guilt, and the question may therefore be asked -- in the exegesis -- whether Gispén is correct when he writes: "The Lord does not say whether He always does that, or ever does that." That probably is related to the fact that Gispén continues: "Later on more about this book is revealed, about the electing counsel of God. This verse must be understood in the light of Scripture."" (p. 112-113)

"Passages about the Book of Life are abundant in Revelation, the book in which safety and solace are promised in the face of all apocalyptic dangers and threats. But these passages do not imply passivity (*Rev. 3:5*); they convey, instead, a word of promise to those who persevere in the way of faith. That is the reason why in really Scriptural thought no correlation can be maintained between the Book of Life and a hidden threat to the certainty of salvation. The Book of Life does not stand as a hidden thing over against the revelation of God in the world. He who believes that it does interprets the Book of Life out of its Biblical context. It becomes the "unknown" and as such it can no longer bring joy. But in the Bible it is not something far distant, not a vague, threatening reality, but the foundation of salvation, which is understood and experienced in the way of faith. He who refers to the

Book of Life to "prove" the hiddenness of election has not understood the joy which Scripture clearly associates with it. It is the Book of Life and of the Lamb.

"The Book of Life is connected with deep joy (Luke 10:20), with service of the gospel (Phil. 4:3), and with solace amidst great terror. "In the New Testament the Book of Life becomes free of fatalism, it becomes the expression of the certainty of salvation for God's children who know themselves chosen for eternity because they have their eternal foundation in God's counsel of grace."" (p. 113-114)

Calvin, J. Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses Arranged in the Form of a Harmony. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Baker, reprint, 1979, 361, 362.

"By "the book," in which God is said to have written His elect, must be understood, metaphorically, His decree. But the expression which Moses uses, asking to be blotted out of the number of the pious, is an incorrect one, since it cannot be that one who has been once elected should be ever reprobated; and those lunatics who, on this ground, overturn, as far as they can, that prime article of our faith concerning God's eternal predestination, thereby demonstrate their malice no less than their ignorance. David uses two expressions in the same sense, "blotted out," and "not written." "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous." (Ps. lxxix. 28.) We cannot hence infer any change in the counsel of God; but this phrase is merely manifest that the reprobate, who for a season are counted amongst the number of the elect, in no respect belong to the body of the Church. Thus the secret catalogue, in which the elect are written, is contrasted by Ezekiel (xiii. 9) with that external profession, which is often deceitful. Justly, therefore, does Christ bid His disciples rejoice, "because their names are written in heaven," (Luke x. 20;) for, albeit the counsel of God, whereby we are predestinated to salvation, is incomprehensible to us, "nevertheless (as Paul testifies) this seal standeth sure, The Lord knoweth them that are his." (2 Tim. ii. 19.)

"33. Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out. In these words God adapts Himself to the comprehension of the human mind, when He says, "Him will I blot out;" for hypocrites make such false profession of His name, that they are not accounted aliens, until God openly renounces them: and hence their manifest rejection is called erasure. Moreover, God reproves the preposterous request of Moses, inasmuch as it does not consist with His justice to reject the innocent; whence it follows, that Moses had prayed inconsiderately. The sum is, that God, whenever He punishes the ungodly and iniquitous, pays them the wages which they have earned; whereas He never punishes the just. Yet it is to be observed, that when God declares that He will be the avenger of sins, His mercy is not excluded, whereby He buries the transgressions of His people, so that they come not into mind. Thus, when Paul says, "Neither fornicators, nor adulterers, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor murderers, nor revilers, shall possess the kingdom of God," (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10;) it would be incorrect to conclude that they were all shut out from the hope of salvation; since he only speaks of the reprobate, who never repent, so that being converted they may obtain grace."..

Gispen, W. H. Exodus. Bible Students Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982 (Dutch original, 1964), 302.

"In verse 33, the Lord says that it was impossible for Him to accept the offer Moses made in verse 32. Being blotted out of His book does not depend on anyone's will, but solely on Him. And He punishes only those who have sinned against Him, without respect of persons. "Sin," see commentary on verse 31. Verse 33, cf. Ezekiel 18:4. The Lord did not say that He always did this; He merely cut off Moses in his attempt to move the Lord to blot him out of the book. Moses also sinned against the Lord, and the Lord did not destroy him (cf. 3.g., Num. 20). We must see this verse in the context of the whole Bible, which later reveals more about this book and about the Lord's elective decree. Yet Moses' offer did have an effect, as verse 34 shows. He was told to go and lead the people (cf. 13:17; 15:13) to Canaan (cf. 3:8)."

Hengstenberg, E. W. Christology of the Old Testament. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publication, 1956 (reproduction of British edition of 1872-1878), 127, 128.

"On account of the sincere repentance of the people, and the intercession of Moses, the Lord revokes the threatening, and says in xxxiii. 14, "My face shall go." But Moses said unto Him, "If Thy face go not, carry us not up hence."

"That פָּנִים, face, signifies here the person, is granted by Gesenius: "The face of some one means often his personal presence,--himself in his own person." A similar use of the word occurs in 2 Sam. xvii. 11: "Thy fact go to battle" (Michaelis: "Thou thyself be present, not some commander only"); and in Deut. iv. 37, where בְּפָנָיו means in, or with, his personal presence: "He brought them out with His face, with His mighty power out of Egypt." . . .

"The connection between the face of the Lord in xxxiii. 14, 15, and the Angel in whom is the name of the Lord, in xxiii., becomes still more evident by Is. lxiii. 8, 9: "And He (Jehovah) became their Saviour. In all their affliction (they were) not afflicted, and the Angel of His face saved them; in His love and in His pity He redeemed them, and He bore and carried them all the days of old." The Angel of the face, in this text, is an expression which, by its very darkness, points back to some fundamental passage--a passage, too, in the Pentateuch--as facts are alluded to, of which the authentic report is given in that book. The expression, "Angel of the face," arose from a combination of Exod. xxxiii. 14, whence he took the "face." To explain "Angel of the face" by "the angel who sees His face," as several have done, would give an inadequate meaning; for by the whole context, an expression is demanded which would elevate the angel to the height of God. Now, as in Exod. xxxiii. 14, "the face of Jehovah" is tantamount to "Jehovah in His own person," the Angel of the face can be none other than He in whom Jehovah appears personally, in contrast with inferior created angels. The Angel of the face is the Angel in whom is the name of the Lord."

Keil, C. F. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Vol. 2. The Pentateuch. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959 (reprint), 234.

"Out of this cloud Jehovah talked with Moses (vers. 7-10) "face to face, as a man talks with his friend" (ver. 11); that is to say, not from the distance of heaven, through any kind of medium whatever, but "mouth to mouth," as it is called in Num. xii. 8, as closely and directly as friends talk to one another. "These words indicate, therefore, a familiar conversation, just as much as if it had been said, that God appeared to Moses in some peculiar form of manifestation. If any one objects to this, that it is at variance with the assertion which we shall come to presently, 'Thou canst not see My face,' the answer is a very simple one. Although Jehovah showed Himself to Moses in some peculiar form of manifestation, He never appeared in His own essential glory, but only in such a mode as human weakness could bear. This solution contains a tacit comparison, viz. that there never was any one equal to Moses, or who had attained to the same dignity as he" (Calvin)."

Vos, G. Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948, reset ninth printing, 1975, 107.

"It derives its most general name from this, namely, mishkan, 'dwelling-place'. The English versions render this too specifically, in dependence on the Septuagint and the Vulgate, by 'tabernacle'. But 'tabernacle' signifies 'tent'; every tent is a mishkan, but not every mishkan a tent. For 'tent' there is another Hebrew word, 'ohel."

II.D.5. Fairbairn, P. The Typology of Scripture. Two Volumes in One, Complete and Unabridged. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, no date, 201-223.

"In regard to the other articles used, it does not appear that any higher reason can be assigned for their selection, than that they were the best and fittest of their several kinds. They consisted of the most precious metals, of the finest stuffs in linen manufacture, with embroidered workmanship, the richest and most gorgeous colors, and the most beautiful and costly gems. It was absolutely necessary, by means of some external apparatus, to bring out the idea of the surpassing glory and magnificence of Jehovah as the King of Israel, and of the singular honor which was enjoyed by those who were admitted to minister and serve before Him. But this could only be done by the rich and costly nature of the materials which were employed in the construction of the tabernacle, and of the official garments of those who were appointed to serve in its courts. It is expressly said of the high priest's garments, that they were to be made "for glory (or ornament) and for beauty"; for which purpose they were to consist of the fine byss or linen cloth of Egypt, embroidered with needle work done in blue, purple, and scarlet, the most brilliant colors. And if means were thus taken for producing effect in respect to the garments of those who ministered in the tabernacle, it is but reasonable to infer that the same would be done in regard to the tabernacle itself. Hence we read of the temple, the more perfect form of the habitation, that it was to be made "so exceeding magnificent as to be of fame and glory throughout all countries"; and that among

other things employed by Solomon for this purpose, "the house was garnished with precious stones for beauty." Such materials, therefore, were used in the construction of the tabernacle, as were best fitted for conveying suitable impressions of the greatness and glory of the Being for whose peculiar habitation it was erected. And as in this we are furnished with a sufficient reason for their employment, to search for others were only to wander into the regions of uncertainty and conjecture.

"We therefore discard (with Hengstenberg, Baumgarten, and others) the meanings derived by Bahr, as well as those of the elder theologians, from the intrinsic qualities of the metals, and the distinctive colors employed in the several fabrics. They are here out of place. The question is not, whether such things might not have been used so as to convey certain ideas of a moral and religious nature, but whether they actually were so employed here; and neither the occasion of their employment, nor the manner in which this was done, in our opinion, gives the least warrant for the supposition. So far as the metals were concerned, we see no ground in Scripture for any symbolical meaning being attached to them, separate from that suggested by their costliness and ordinary uses. That brass should have been the prevailing metal in the fittings and furniture of the outer court, where the people at large could come with their offerings, and in the sanctuary itself silver and gold, might undoubtedly be regarded as imaging the advance that is made in the discovery of the divine excellence and glory, the more one gets into the secret of His presence and is prepared for beholding His beauty. A symbolical use of certain colors we undoubtedly find, such as of white, in expressing the idea of purity, or of red, in expressing that of guilt; but when so used, the particular color must be rendered prominent, and connected also with an occasion plainly calling for such a symbol. This was not the case in either respect with the colors in the tabernacle. The colors there, for the most part, appeared in a combined form; and if it had been possible to single them out, and give to each a distinctive value, there was nothing to indicate how the ideas symbolized were to be viewed, whether in reference to God or to His worshippers. Indeed the very search would necessarily have led to endless subtleties, and prevented the mind from receiving the one direct and palpable impression which we have seen was intended to be conveyed. As examples of the arbitrariness necessarily connected with such meanings, Bahr makes the red significant, in its purple shade, of the majesty, in its scarlet, of the life-giving property of God; while Neumann, after fresh investigations into the properties of light and color, sees in the red the expression of God's love, inclining as purple to the mercy of grace, as scarlet to the jealousy of judgment. With Bahr, the blue is the symbol of the skyey majesty whence God manifests His glory; with Neumann, it points to the depth of ocean, and is the symbol of God's substance, which dwells in light inaccessible, and lays in the stability of the Creator the foundation of the covenant. Such diverse and arbitrary meanings, rivalling the caprice of the elder typologists, show the fancifulness of the ground on which they are raised. And interwoven as the colors were in works of embroidery, not standing each apart in some place of its own, we have no reason to imagine they had any other purpose to serve than similar works of art in the high priest's dress, viz., for ornament and beauty."

Vos, G. Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948, reset ninth printing, 1975, 145-148, 154-155.

"A symbol is in its religious significance something that profoundly portrays a certain fact or principle or relationship of a spiritual nature in a visible form. The things it pictures are of present existence and present application. They are in force at the time in which the symbol operates.

"With the same thing, regarded as a type, it is different. A typical thing is prospective; it relates to what will become real or applicable in the future."

"The main problem to understand is, how the same system of portrayals can have served at one and the same time in a symbolical and a typical capacity. Obviously this would have been impossible if the things portrayed had been in each case different or diverse, unrelated to each other. If something is an accurate picture of a certain reality, then it would seem disqualified by this very fact for pointing to another future reality of a quite different nature. The solution of the problem lies in this, that the things symbolized and the things typified are not different sets of things. They are in reality the same things, only different in this respect that they come first on a lower stage of development in redemption, and then again, in a later period, on a higher stage. Thus what is symbolical with regard to the already existing edition of the fact or truth becomes typical, prophetic, of the later, final edition of the same fact or truth. From this it will be perceived that a type can never be a type independently of its being first a symbol. The gateway to the house of typology is at the farther end of the house of symbolism.

"This is the fundamental rule to be observed in ascertaining what elements in the Old Testament are typical, and wherein the things corresponding to them as antitypes consist. Only after having discovered what a thing symbolizes, can we legitimately proceed to put the question what it typifies, for the latter can never be aught else than the former lifted to a higher plane. The bond that holds type and antitype together must be a bond of vital continuity in the progress of redemption. Where this is ignored, and in the place of this bond are put accidental resemblances, void of inherent spiritual significance, all sorts of absurdities will result, such as must bring the whole subject of typology into disrepute. Examples of this are: the scarlet cord of Rahab prefigures the blood of Christ; the four lepers at Samaria, the four Evangelists."

"The tabernacle affords a clear instance of the coexistence of the symbolical and the typical in one of the principle institutions of the Old Testament religion. It embodies the eminently religious idea of the dwelling of God with His people."

"The typical significance of the tabernacle should be sought in close dependence upon its symbolic significance. We must ask: where do these religious principles and realities, which the tabernacle served to teach and communicate, reappear in the subsequent history of redemption, lifted to their consummate stage? First we discover them in the glorified Christ.

Tabernacle Type: God dwelling in the midst of his people
 ↳ appears: Christ on Earth ↳ Church ↳ New Jerusalem

Of this speaks the Evangelist [John 1:14]. The Word become flesh is the One in whom God came to tabernacle among men, in order to reveal to them His grace and glory. In John 2:19-22 Jesus Himself predicts that the Old Testament temple, which His enemies by their attitude towards Him are virtually destroying, He will build up again in three days, i.e., through the resurrection. This affirms the continuity between the Old Testament sanctuary and His glorified Person. In Him will be for ever perpetuated all that tabernacle and temple stood for. The structure of stone may disappear; the essence proves itself eternal. In Col. 2:9, Paul teaches that in Him the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily. With these passages should be compared the saying of Jesus to Nathanael [John 1:51] where He finds in Himself the fulfilment of what Jacob had called the house of God, the gate of heaven. In all these cases the indwelling of God in Christ serves the same ends which the Mosaic tabernacle provisionally served. He as the antitypical tabernacle is revelatory and sacramental in the highest degree.

"THE TABERNACLE ALSO A TYPE OF THE CHURCH

"But what is true of the Christ is likewise true of the Church. Of that also the tabernacle was a type. This could not be otherwise, because the Church is the body of the risen Christ. For this reason the Church is called 'the house of God' [Eph. 2.21, 22; 1 Tim. 3.15; Heb. 3.6; 10.21; 1 Pet. 2.5]. An individual turn is given to the thought where the Christian is called a temple of God [1 Cor. 6.19]. It ought to be noticed that 'house of God' is not in the New Testament a mere figure of the fellowship between God and the Church, but always refers specifically to the Old Testament dwelling of Jehovah. The highest realization of the tabernacle idea is ascribed to the eschatological stage of the history of redemption. This is depicted by the Apocalypse [21.3]."

II.D.12.b. Harrison, R. K. Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969, 633.

"None of these attempts to scale down the Old Testament numbers is able to account satisfactorily for all the data involved, and hence the suggestions made cannot be taken as uniformly valid for purposes of interpretation. If other evidence from Near Eastern sources concerning numbers generally is of any value in this connection, it would imply that the Old Testament numerical computations rest upon some basis of reality which was quite familiar to the ancients, but which is unknown to modern scholars."

MacRae, A. A. "Numbers." In The New Bible Commentary. F. Davidson, Editor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953, 165.

"The large numbers in this census have created a difficulty for some readers, who find it hard to believe that the nation of Israel was so numerous during its march through the wilderness. Yet when we consider the large families that were customary and the length of time that was spent in Egypt before the beginning of the oppression, the amount of increase is seen to be

not at all unreasonable. Passage of so large a group through the wilderness transcends ordinary history. Were it not for the constant divine provision it would have been impossible (cf. Dt. xxix. 5). Some have tried to escape the difficulty by assuming that the word thousand is to be taken as meaning family or clan rather than being an exact number. This interpretation overlooks the fact that most of the numbers include hundreds as well as thousands, that the tribe of Gad numbered 45,650 (25), and that the total number of fighting men is given as 603,550 (46).

"It is difficult to preserve numbers accurately in ancient documents, which had to be copied and recopied. Various types of abbreviations may have occasionally been used and sometimes misunderstood. Actually, however, the number of figures in the Bible which occasion real difficulty is comparatively small."

DeVaux, R. Ancient Israel. Its Life and Institutions. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961, 65.

"The 'towns' of the Bible were not large. It is astonishing to see from excavations just how small they were. Most of them could easily be fitted into Trafalgar Square, and some would scarcely fill the courtyard of the National Gallery. The Annals of Tiglath-Pileser III give a list of the towns in Galilee conquered in 732; the number of captives varies between 400 and 650--and this king used to deport entire populations. They were, then, villages like those today, and no bigger. Certain centres were larger, of course. According to the estimate of its excavator, Tell Beit-Mirsim, the ancient Debir, contained two or three thousand inhabitants during the time of its greatest prosperity, and it was a relatively important city.

"For Samaria and Jerusalem other sources of information are available. Sargon II says that he carried off 27,290 persons from Samaria. This deportation affected mainly the capital, and was wholesale, but it must have included those who had taken refuge there during the siege. The archaeologists who have excavated it also assert that the town must have contained about thirty thousand inhabitants.

"For Jerusalem, the figures of Nabuchodonosor's deportations are difficult; they are difficult to establish, and difficult to interpret, ... At a reasonable estimate, in our Lord's time the city had about twenty-five or thirty thousand inhabitants. A few years ago this was just the population of the Old City within the walls, and in roughly the same space. The population cannot have been much bigger in Old Testament times."

Wenham, J. W. "Large Numbers in the Old Testament." TynBul 18 (1967) 19-53.

"There are various ways of taking אֶלֶף without involving impossibly large numbers. It could

be a social unit--family, clan, tent group--or such a group organized as a military unit. Or it could be an officer (as Clark maintained) or a specially trained warrior (as our study of Judges 20 suggested). There is much to be said for this last possibility." (p. 30)

"Let us assume that there were such specially qualified warriors and look at the census lists again. We know that Israel at various times went to war led by captains of thousands, captains of hundreds and captains of fifties. The 24 numbers in Numbers 1 and 26 can be split up so that the number of *אלופים* per *מאה* lies somewhere between 2 and 3. This would make one *אלוף* available to act as 'captain of a hundred' and one as 'captain of fifty' in every *מאה*, and there would be a few spare *אלופים* either as captains of thousands or as supernumerary captains of fifties. (For details see p. 35-38)

"On this reckoning we get a total of 580 *אלופים* and 235 1/2 *מאות* at the exodus and 579 *אלופים* and 226.3 *מאות* at the end of the wanderings.

"There are reasons for thinking (see p. 38) that the captains of thousands might normally have had 7 or 8 *מאות* under their command. Similarly the actual strength of an average *מאה* might have been about 75 men. 235 1/2 *מאות* of 75 men each would give 17,662 1/2 men in all. This, together with 580 *אלופים*, would give a total fighting force of a little over 18,000. The number of males under 20 would probably be a little smaller than the number of those over 20. But, with the addition of the Levites and of those who were too old to fight, we might expect the total number of males to be about double the number of fighting men: say, 36,000. If we double this again, in order to include women, we shall get a figure of about 72,000 for the whole migration." (p. 31)

"If we adopt the hypothesis that these figures are made up of a number of *אלופים* (who are 'captains of thousands', 'captains of hundreds' and 'captains of fifties') and of a number of military units (which are called *מאות*), we should expect a little over two or a little over three *אלופים* per *מאה*. (A *מאה* would have two officers, if there was one 'captain of hundred' and one 'captain of fifty' per unit; or three officers, if there was one 'captain of hundred' and two 'captains of fifty'. In addition each tribe would have two or three 'captains of thousands'.) In any given tribe the number of *מאות* would not normally be an exact multiple of ten, so that the military 'thousand' would consist of a group of *מאות*, usually less than ten in number. (Military units seem often to be smaller than their nominal strength, but seldom larger.) If we now break up the figures on these principles, we can get a quite detailed picture of the whole military organization. The figures below marked with an asterisk incorporate the emendations suggested above. No claim is made that these (and the other conjectures involved) are more than intelligent guesses, nor that it is possible to give any great weight to the individual reconstructed figures. But it does show that the Massoretic figures could have come from the census of a carefully planned military organization." (p. 36-37)

Young, E. J. An Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, revised edition, 1960, 85.

"The census recorded in 1:1-54 was taken exactly one month after the erection of the Tabernacle (Ex. 40:17). It included the sum of the congregation, according to their families, by the house of their fathers, and it included only those who could serve in military service, twenty years of age and upward (1:2,3). The total thus obtained was 603,550. (1:46). The census in chapter 2 gives the order of the tribes in their camps, each by its standard (degel) in relation to the Tent of Meeting. It is obvious that chapters 1-4 presuppose a condition when the people were not settled in the land.

"Three objections to these chapters have been made. (i) If the number of fighting men was about 600,000, the total population, it is claimed, would then be about 2 1/2 million, and it would have been impossible for the seventy families which came into Egypt to have multiplied thus rapidly during the time of their oppression. But while this rapid multiplication might be unusual, it certainly was not impossible, and we should note that the Bible stresses the extraordinary fruitfulness of the Hebrews (Ex. 1:7). (ii) The wilderness of Sinai, it is claimed, could not have sustained so great a group of people. But if the people were encamped in the plain of Er-Rahah before Jebel es-Safsaf, they were in a plain about four miles in length and quite wide, with which several wide, lateral valleys join. Further, the sustenance of the people was not the natural produce of Sinai but the miraculous gift of manna. (iii) The order of march is said to be impossible, as described in chapter 2 and 10:14-20. But if the account is so impossible, no writer would have devised such an impossible scheme. The very difficulty involved is but an indication of historicity. Since so little is said about the details of the march, we are in no position to question the historicity and accuracy of the statements made."

II.D.12.c. Davis, J. J. Biblical Numerology. Grand Rapid: Baker, 1968, 78.

"The firstborn among the tribes. One of the more perplexing problems encountered in the book of Numbers is the total of firstborn among the tribes. According to the census taken for the purpose of redemption, all the male firstborn of the twelve tribes totaled only 22,273. If the nation had a population of more than a million males, which would probably be the case if there were 603,550 men of twenty years old and upwards, then on the assumption that 22,273 represents the sum total of all first-born in the nation, there would only be one firstborn to forty or fifty males. This implies that every father of a family must have begotten, or still had, thirty-nine to forty-four sons. Generally, the proportion of firstborn to the whole male population is one to four.

"Keil and Delitzsch handle this problem by arguing that this number of firstborn only represents the number born in the space of thirteen months (or between the exodus and the time when the law was given). This would seem to indicate, on the basis of the above statistics, that there were about 19,000 firstborn in one year, and thus bring the numbers in conformity with the probabilities of the historical situation."

II.H.1. Schultz, S. J. Deuteronomy. The Gospel of Love. Chicago: Moody, 1971, 7, 47, 48.

- (a) "The book of Deuteronomy is the most important book in the Old Testament from the standpoint of God's revelation to man. For years in his teaching of Old Testament survey, the author made only brief references to Deuteronomy as a book which merely reviews or repeats what precedes in the Pentateuch. Such, however, is not the case. It is one of the books most frequently cited and referred to in the New Testament (nearly two hundred times, according to the Greek New Testament edited by Aland, Black, Metzger, and Wikgren)." (p. 7)
- (b) "The word love is at the heart of the message. Neither a list of dos or don'ts, nor law, nor legalism, nor rules for living, nor good works, nor even a high moral standard was primarily in focus. Basic to all of these was a vital relationship with God--a relationship of love. Out of this love relationship issued all other considerations that were important to man.

"Love for man was initiated by God and did not come in response to human action or activity. Although God's tender care had been bestowed upon all mankind, God's love for Israel began with His choice of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. God's love was manifested to the entire nation through their miraculous deliverance from Egypt.

"As a recipient of God's love, which was evident in His redemption and constant care, the Israelite was expected to respond with wholehearted love and devotion. This response tapped all the resources of his entire being--heart, soul, mind, and strength. This love and devotion was exclusive. No other gods could be allowed or tolerated in such a relationship.

- (c) "Out of the unique relationship with his God, the Israelite was to express his love horizontally to his neighbor. Only as he experienced being loved by God was he qualified to extend love to his neighbor. A keen realization of God's love provided the wellspring that enabled the Israelite to love his fellowman in the true sense.

"It is this vertical and horizontal love relationship that Jesus pointed out as the essence of all that God required of man to obtain eternal salvation (cf. Mt 22:35-40; Mk 12:28-34; Lk 10:25-28). The expert in Mosaic law representing the Pharisees concurred with Jesus that the law of love was more important than all other considerations.

"It was in the book of Deuteronomy that Jesus and the religious leaders found the core of God's revelation to man in written form. Jesus also pointed out that this represented the essence of all that is written in the law and the prophets (the Old Testament). Consequently, we do well to study this book which provides us insight and understanding of the context in which this divine concept of love was revealed through and stated by Moses." (p. 8-9)

- (d) "These two responsibilities, complete love for God and love for neighbor, constituted the essence of what God required of man. This was the core of God's message to man as

revealed through Moses at Horeb. Not legalism, not ritual, not external minutiae of religious observances, not a legalistic observance of the Decalogue, or a system of negatives and positive principles or creeds--none of these was basic. Rather, Moses emphasized a vital relationship with God as fundamental to all other issues in life. Second to this was a genuine love relationship with fellowman."

(p. 47-48)

*Deut 6:4
Deut 10:12-ff
Deut 30:11-20*

- III.B.3. Hodge, C. Systematic Theology. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952 (reprint of 1872), 440-443.

"Intention to deceive, therefore, is an element in the idea of falsehood. But even this is not always culpable. When Pharaoh commanded the Hebrew midwives to slay the male children of their countrywomen, they disobeyed him. And when called to account for their disobedience, they said, "The Hebrew women are not as the Egyptian women; for they are lively, and are delivered ere the midwives come in unto them. Therefore God dealt well with the midwives: and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty." (Ex. i. 19, 20.) In 1 Samuel xvi. 1, 2, we read that God said to Samuel, "I will send thee to Jesse the Bethlehemite: for I have provided me a king among his sons. And Samuel said, How can I go? if Saul hear it, he will kill me. And the Lord said, Take an heifer with thee, and say, I am come to sacrifice to the Lord." Here, it is said, is a case of intentional deception actually commanded. Saul was to be deceived as to the object of Samuel's journey to Bethlehem. Still more marked is the conduct of Elisha as recorded in 2 Kings vi. 14-20. The king of Syria sent soldiers to seize the prophet at Dothan. "And when they came down to him, Elisha prayed unto the LORD, and said, Smite this people I pray thee with blindness. And He smote them with blindness, according to the word of Elisha. And Elisha said unto them, This is not the way neither is this the city: follow me and I will bring you to the man whom ye seek. But he led them to Samaria. And it came to pass, when they were come into Samaria, that Elisha said, LORD, open the eyes of these men, that they may see. And the LORD opened their eyes, and they saw; and behold, they were in the midst of Samaria;" that is, in the hands of their enemies. The prophet, however, would not allow them to be injured; but commanded that they should be fed and sent back to their master. Examples of this kind of deception are numerous in the Old Testament. Some of them are simply recorded facts, without anything to indicate how they were regarded in the sight of God; but others, as in the cases above cited, received either directly or by implication the divine sanction."

"It is the general sentiment among moralists that stratagems in war are allowable; that it is lawful not only to conceal intended movements from an enemy, but also to mislead him as to your intentions. A great part of the skill of a military commander is evinced in detecting the intentions of his adversary, and in concealing his own. Few men would be so scrupulous as to refuse to keep a light in a room, when robbery was apprehended, with the purpose of producing the impression that the members of the household were on the alert.

"On these grounds it is generally admitted that in criminal falsehoods there must be not only the enunciation or signification of what is false, and an intention to deceive, but also a

violation of some obligation. If there may be any combination of circumstances under which a man is not bound to speak the truth, those to whom the declaration or signification is made have no right to expect him to do so. A general is under no obligation to reveal his intended movements to his adversary; and his adversary has no right to suppose that his apparent intention is his real purpose. Elisha was under no obligation to aid the Syrians in securing his person and taking his life; and they had no right to assume that he would thus assist them. And, therefore, he did no wrong in misleading them. There will always be cases in which the rule of duty is a matter of doubt. It is often said that the rule above stated applies when a robber demands your purse. It is said to be right to deny that you have anything of value about you. You are not bound to aid him in committing a crime; and he has no right to assume that you will facilitate the accomplishment of his object. This is not so clear. The obligation to speak the truth is a very solemn one; and when the choice is left a man to tell a lie or lose his money, he had better let his money go. On the other hand, if a mother sees a murderer in pursuit of her child, she has a perfect right to mislead him by any means in her power; because the general obligation to speak the truth is merged or lost, for the time being, in the higher obligation. This principle is not invalidated by its possible or actual abuse. It has been greatly abused. Jesuits taught that the obligations to promote the good of the Church absorbed or superseded every other obligation. And, therefore, in their system not only falsehood and mental reservation, but perjury, robbery, and assassination became lawful if committed with the design of promoting the interests of the Church. Notwithstanding this liability to abuse, the principle that a higher obligation absolves from a lower stands firm."

"The question now under consideration is not whether it is ever right to do wrong, which is a solecism; nor is the question whether it is ever right to lie; but rather what constitutes a lie. It is not simply an "enunciatio falsi," but there must be an intention to deceive when we are expected and bound to speak the truth. That is, there are circumstances in which a man is not bound to speak the truth, and therefore there are cases in which speaking or intimating what is not true is not a lie."

"It is far better that a man should die or permit a murder to be committed, than that he should sin against God. Nothing could tempt the Christian martyrs to save their own lives or the lives of their brethren by denying Christ, or by professing to believe in false gods; in these cases the obligation to speak the truth was in full force. But in the case of a commanding general in time of war, the obligation does not exist to intimate his true intentions to his adversary. Intentional deception in his case is not morally a falsehood."

Kaiser, W. Toward Old Testament Ethics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, 224-227, 271-272.

"But what constitutes a lie? Ezekiel Hopkins, following St. Augustine's definition says, "A lie . . . is a voluntary speaking of an intent to deceive.." He went on to explain that a lie must have, then, three ingredients:

"[a] There must be the speaking of an untruth; [b] It must be known to us to be an untruth; and [c] it must be with a will and intent to deceive him to whom we speak it, and to lead him into error.

"Asa Mahan's definition sharpens the focus even more: a lie is "the intentional deception of an individual who has a right to know the truth of us, and under circumstances in which he has a claim to such knowledge.

"Mahan commented on this definition in the following manner:

"The deception must be intentional, else guilt does not attach to the agent, or the crime falls under some other denomination than lying. The person or persons deceived, must have a claim to know the truth, if anything is communicated, else no obligations are violated in the act of deception. Lying, should be carefully distinguished from concealing. It is proper to conceal facts from individuals whom we have no right to deceive. Concealment is a sin when and only when, an obligation exists to reveal the fact which is concealed.

Thus lying is more than "a breach of promise" (for lying is a moral evil in that it violates an obligation that comes from the relations of the parties involved and which binds them independently of all pledges) and it is more than "intentional deception" (which may be a moral evil, but I cannot tell if it is such until I can determine if all men in all circumstances have a claim on me to know the truth if they receive anything from me).

"The importance of this definition can be seen in those instances where concealment was present without it being a moral evil. Thus Mahan teaches that concealment is proper, or even a duty, when it does not violate a moral obligation. Several instances will illustrate what types of situations these are."

"Concealment is also demanded when the person from whom the truth is withheld has forfeited his or her right or has no legitimate claim to that truth. That was Saul's position in 1 Samuel 16:1-3. Having been instructed by God to "Fill your horn with oil and go on your way; I am sending you to Jesse of Bethlehem. I have chosen one of his sons to be king" (v. 1). "But Samuel said, 'How can I go? Saul will hear about it and kill me.' The LORD said, 'Take a heifer with you and say, 'I have come to sacrifice to the LORD'" (v. 2).

"Without question," opined John Murray, "here is divine authorization for concealment by means of a statement other than that which would have disclosed the main purpose of Samuel's visit to Jesse." But it is just as important to note that Samuel had no special prerogative to speak a falsehood either. The only point that may legitimately be made is that concealment, in some situations, is not lying. Only what was true was presented to Saul. As for Samuel's ultimate intentions, nothing is affirmed or denied, and nothing incited Saul's mind to probe concerning what may have been Samuel's ultimate motives for coming to Bethlehem at this time. Had such questions been raised, an altogether different problem

would have confronted Samuel and he would have to avoid either affirming or denying what those purposes were or face the wrath of Saul in his disclosure."

"What then constitutes a "claim to knowledge"? Would Saul have had a right to know, had he asked, what Samuel was doing in Bethlehem beside offering a sacrifice (off his scheduled circuit) to the Lord? We believe he would have--had he asked. He was the king! Did Pharaoh have a right to know what the midwives were doing with regard to his edict even though they had rightfully refused to carry it out? We believe he did, in one way, have that claim even though the substance of that claim was wrong. These men were rightly opposed at the level of their error (e.g., the sanctity of life for the midwives) rather than at the level of their right to pose such questions. No one has a right to lie; but then, neither does everyone have the right to know all the facts in a case when their evil actions have forfeited that right. So we make a distinction between the right of the king, for example, to ask the question and the right to receive all the information he might hope to get." (224-227)

"In chapter 14, we have already discussed the problem of defining truth or truth telling over against the "concealment" practiced by Samuel (1 Sam. 16:1-3). But we do not agree that the Hebrew midwives in Egypt (Exod.1:17-21) or Rahab the harlot (Josh. 2:1-14; 6:25) qualify for this same exception as we defended in that chapter. (271)

"The issue at stake in the case of the midwives and Rahab is whether God recognizes and approves of otherwise dubious methods that are alien to the integrity of his character in fulfilling the purpose of his will. Can strong faith coexist and be actuated by the infirmities of unbelief? It is true that Hebrews 11:31 includes Rahab as a woman of faith: "By faith the prostitute Rahab, because she welcomed the spies, was not killed with those who were disobedient." Likewise James 2:25: "Was not even Rahab the prostitute considered righteous for what she did when she gave lodging to the spies and sent them off in a different direction?" (271-272)

"But the areas of Rahab's faith must be strictly observed. It was not her lying that won her divine recognition; rather it was her faith--she "believed in" the Lord God of the Hebrews and God's action in Israel's exodus more than she was "frightened" by the king of Jericho (Josh. 2:10-12). The evidence of her faith was seen in the works of receiving the spies and sending them out another way. Thus, she was well within the proprieties of biblical ethics, such as mirroring the holiness and character of God, when she hid the spies and took the legitimate precaution of sending them out another way. But her lying was an unnecessary accoutrement to both of the above approved responses." (272)

"While we agree that Pharaoh has given up his right to know all the facts and that this could be a case of legitimate concealment of facts, just as in the case of Saul and Samuel (1 Sam. 16:1-3), we cannot agree that the midwives had any right to lie. Pharaoh does not deserve to know all the truth, but the midwives owe it to God to speak only the truth. If they truly had not made even one Hebrew male delivery during the months of Pharaoh's new program then their response was laudable and justified by Old Testament ethics. However, if they were

partially true and partially telling a lie, they were just as blameworthy as Rahab, Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob were when they lied." (273)

Smith, B. L. "The Bible and Morality." *Themelios* 6 (1969) 44-52.

"First, then, we observe in passing from the Old to the New Testament there are several specific injunctions common to both Testaments. Such injunctions include the prohibitions against idolatry, blasphemy, various sexual offenses, stealing, lying, coveting, etc. These offences, which invite the wrath of God (Eph. 5:6) and exclude their practitioners from the Kingdom of God (Rev. 21:8; 22:15), may well stand as candidates for absolute status. They are certainly presented in this form.

"Second, although these commands are presented in an absolute form it is not difficult to conceive of exceptions to them and even within the Bible itself there are some examples of this. Thus Samuel, for instance, is told to tell Saul a half-truth (I Sam. 16:2) and Naaman is given permission to bow in the house of Rimmon (2 Kings 5:18). We may resolve this problem either by saying that the biblical imperatives are to be considered as norms and that exceptions may and do, of course, occur but that they will only do so under extreme duress--when, for instance, there is a clear conflict of obligations and not just a conflict between obligation and desire. On this understanding situations necessitating lying or theft or even adultery (e.g. under pressure of blackmail) will probably be far from common. Or, on the other hand, we may approach the problem differently and say that on closer examination these so-called "exceptions" do not qualify as contradictory examples at all but are overt actions which are definitionally of a different order. On this view lying, thieving, adultery, fornication, murder, etc. are only permitted because they are no longer these offenses (by definition).

"This approach necessitates a recognition (a) of a vocabulary problem as well as (b) of various offenses being different in kind. (a) The vocabulary problem is illustrated in prescriptions against, for example, lying and killing. There are circumstances in which, it is generally admitted, the withholding of truth or deliberate misdirection is warranted (in hospitals, in times of war, etc.). We have, however, no way of distinguishing in our vocabulary between the culpable and the permitted lie. Both are "lies." We do, however, distinguish between "killing" and "manslaughter" and "murder." Not all "killings" are "murders." The vocabulary distinction is crucial. Similarly, we distinguish between "adultery" and "rape."

"(b) That offenses can have a profoundly different character is well illustrated in the offenses of idolatry, adultery (or fornication, etc.) and murder or theft. Idolatry is an offense in the mind alone and in 1Cor. 8 St. Paul argues that only if our example of apparent conformity contravenes a higher obligation (consideration of our neighbor) need we desist from conforming. Illicit sex is, however, always a sin against the body. The union of marriage, within which sexual consummation is intended (Heb. 13:4), is the created earthly symbol of that ultimate union between Christ and the church (Eph. 5:22-33) and, by inference, of

the inner relations within the Godhead itself (Jn. 17:21-22). Illicit sex in all its forms, adultery, fornication, homosexuality, and perversion, is a sin against the proper use of our bodies (I Cor. 6:18) which are intended to operate sexually in a divinely ordained bond which reflects a supernatural relationship and which in the Christian's experience has already been possessed by the Spirit in anticipation of this ideal (I Cor. 6:19f.). Sins such as murder, theft, lying, etc. are based on the denial of rights which arise out of human relationships. It is only when (and this is sometimes a very risky decision) a person has forfeited his right to know the truth or to possess certain property or as (in war) to live, that we may mislead as to the truth without lying, deprive of property without stealing, and kill without murdering. Only in the last of these three, however, do we avoid the vocabulary problem."

- III.C.1. Kelso, J. L. "Jericho." IDB, Vol. 2. G. A. Buttrick, Editor. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, 837.

"In 1952, Kathleen M. Kenyon began work on the mound. After five years of her work the archaeological picture is clearer, and the following conclusions now seem valid: Most of the mound is sixteenth century B.C. or earlier; indeed, the major depth of the mound is actually Neolithic. In other words, most of the mound belongs to prehistoric times, and the last big city was something like three hundred years earlier than Moses. Unfortunately she has found that the small amount of the upper levels which had escaped destruction by wind and rain were those areas already worked by the Germans and Garstang. Jericho was built of mud brick, and this is quickly disintegrated by both wind and rain. The same winds which furnished the forced draft for Solomon's smelters at EZION-GEGER (2) had already been blasting away at the mud bricks of Jericho. One year the English excavations here were flooded by heavy rains. Even in the Neolithic area, Miss Kenyon found, stream channels had cut into parts of the mound. It therefore seems unlikely that anything new can be learned of thirteenth-century Jericho from the mound itself, although nearby tombs may prove very helpful in the future. One of the major tragedies of Palestinian archaeology is that the Germans excavated Jericho when archaeology was still an infant science."

Kenyon, K. M. Digging Up Jericho. London: 1957.

"Occupation of the site started in the Mesolithic, c. 9000 B.C., and there was a continuous development from that stage into a town of the Pre-Pottery Neolithic period, c. 8000 B.C., successively occupied by two different groups of people. Thereafter there was a very much lesser occupation by Neolithic people with pottery, but it is not yet clear whether there was a gap before these arrived, and again before the arrival of the Proto-Urban groups. From that time, late in the fourth millennium, there was continuous occupation until the town was destroyed, c. 1580 B.C. It was probably reoccupied c. 1400 B.C., but of the town of this period almost nothing remains."

Schaeffer, F. A. Joshua and the Flow of Biblical History. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1975, 105, 106.

"The city shall be accursed," Joshua said (Josh. 6:17). "Accursed" represents only a part of what this word means. The Hebrew word means both "accursed" or "devoted," that is, "given to God." Here it clearly means the latter: "The city shall be devoted, even it, and all that are therein, to the LORD: only Rahab the harlot shall live, she and all that are with her in the house, because she hid the messengers that we sent." In this way, Joshua gave the command for her protection.

"Joshua's commands to the people make clear that the city was devoted: "But as for you, only keep yourselves from the devoted thing, lest when you have devoted it ye take of the devoted thing, so would ye make the camp of Israel accursed, and trouble it. But all the silver, and gold, and vessels of bronze and iron, are holy unto Jehovah; they shall come into the treasury of Jehovah" (Josh. 6:18-19, American Revised). The city of Jericho was a sign of the first fruits. In all things the first fruits belonged to God. Jericho was the first fruits of the land; therefore, everything in it was devoted to God."

III.C.2. Finegan, J. Light From the Ancient Past. Princeton: Princeton niversity Press, 1959, second edition, 160.

"The most probable explanation of the difficulty at this point lies in a confusion between Ai and Bethel. The site of the latter city is less than one and one-half miles distant from Ai, and is known now as Beitin. Excavations were conducted here by joint expeditions of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem and the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary under W. F. Albright in 1934 and under James L. Kelso in 1954 and following. Bethel was found to have been occupied first after the destruction of the Early Bronze Age city of Ai and to have existed as a well-built town in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. Sometime in the thirteenth century B.C., the city was consumed by a tremendous conflagration which left behind a solid mass of burned brick, ashes, and charred debris. There can be little doubt but that this destruction represents the conquest of the city by the children of Israel. In the Iron I period the town was rebuilt, presumably by the Israelites, and in a rude fashion as compared with the earlier city. In the sixth century B.C. Bethel was again destroyed by fire, probably by the Chaldeans, and afterward reoccupied in the Persian and Hellenistic periods.

"It may be noted that in the book of Joshua no account is given of the capture of Bethel while, on the other hand, in the probably older account of Judges 1 the taking of Bethel by the house of Joseph is narrated (vv. 22-25) but nothing is said of Ai. Therefore it may be supposed that at a later date the tradition of the sack of Bethel was attached, erroneously but naturally, to the nearby and impressive ruins of Ai."

Free, J. P. Archaeology and Bible History. Wheaton: Van Kampen Press, 1950, 134.

"A recent solution has been offered in the suggestion of J. Simons that Et-Tell is not to be identified with Biblical Ai. He offers four objections to this identification: (1) Et-Tell is not particularly near Beitin (Bethel), whereas Joshua 12:9 indicates that Ai is "beside Bethel." (2) Et-Tell is a large site, whereas Joshua 7:3 describes the people as "few." (3) Et-Tell was not a ruin in the post-conquest period, whereas Joshua indicates that Ai was (8:28). (4) There is no broad valley to the north of Et-Tell, whereas Joshua 8:11 indicates the existence of a valley near Ai.

"If Et-Tell is not to be identified with Ai, then the indication that Et-Tell was not in existence in 1400 B.C. has no bearing on the Biblical indication concerning Ai. Or if Pere Vincent's suggestion that Ai was a fortress, which would leave little or nothing in remains, is correct, again the Biblical narrative offers no difficulty. In view of such possible solutions, it is inadvisable to insist that the Bible must be wrong."

Halpern, B. "Biblical Exodus Redating Fatally Flawed." BAR 13/6 (1987) 56-61.

"The Biblical account of the conquest was written late in the seventh century B.C. and fails to link the conquest to any event that external sources permit us to date. So, by taking elementary precautions against skepticism about the Biblical text, by pressing one's eyelids down tightly on the cheekbone, one can pretend that the Book of Joshua is the unvarnished, untarnished truth, and that it all occurred in the 15th century B.C.: Israel conquered Canaan in a single decisive campaign. What B&L have done is to accord unquestioning credulity to their own--highly idiosyncratic--reading of the Biblical conquest accounts. B&L's smorgasbord approach is attractive because it masquerades as a defence of the Bible. But it is not. B&L dismiss as much Biblical evidence, in the end, as they embrace, picking and choosing. Their textually arbitrary, historically unconvincing, archaeologically improbable hypothesis hides its warts behind a veneer of benevolent piety. Piety has its place, no doubt, but it also has its price. And the going price for B&L's piety is about 200 years of Israelite history."

Kitchen, K. A. Ancient Orient and Old Testament. London: Tyndale Press, 1966, 63, 64.

"Excavations at Et-Tell have failed to produce any proper evidence of occupation there after the Early Bronze Age (c. 2400 BC), apart from a small Israelite settlement (Iron I) of c. 1200-1050 BC. Despite assertions sometimes made to the contrary, this situation suggests that Et-Tell is not Ai but another ancient site (Beth-Aven?), and that Ai must be looked for somewhere else in the area and not on Et-Tell. When mounds and literary records fail to agree in other cases, topographers and archaeologists do not panic but simply use their common sense, recognize that they were probably mistaken in their identification, and proceed to search elsewhere in the region. The problem of Ai should be regarded in exactly

the same way. Jericho and Ai are lessons in negative evidence: the absence of the expected body of remains of Late Bronze Age date does not automatically imply that the biblical narratives are inventions or aetiological tales. The circumstantial realism of the topographical allusions and of Joshua's leadership suggest otherwise, as does the analogy of archaeological failure to produce remains tallying with other --and indisputably original -- Ancient Oriental written documents."

- III.C.4. Blair, H. J. "Joshua." In The New Bible Commentary: Revised. D. Guthrie, J. A. Motyer, editors. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970, 244.

"A second question is, Did the sun stand still? One suggested explanation of the episode is that the narrator has taken what was merely a highly figurative poetical description of God's intervention on behalf of Israel as historical fact. But there is no reason to reject a more literal interpretation, though this passage has often been the butt of scientific scorn, much of which, it seems possible, may be based on a misunderstanding. It has usually been assumed that Joshua prayed for the day to be prolonged. But is it not possible that what Joshua needed even more, since, as is expressly stated in v. 9, he came upon the camp of the enemy by night, was that the darkness should continue and the night be prolonged for his surprise attack? That it was early morning when he made his request is evident from the position of the moon in the valley of Aijalon (to the west) and the position of the sun over Gibeon (to the east)(v. 12). The answer to his prayer came in a hailstorm which had the effect of prolonging the darkness. An investigation of the exact meaning of the Hebrew words used confirms this interpretation. The word translated stand still (Heb. dom) means literally 'be silent' and frequently has the sense 'cease' or 'leave off' (cf. Ps. 35:15; La. 2:18). Similarly the word translated stayed (Heb. 'amad), stood still in v. 13b, has the sense of 'cease' (cf. 2 Ki. 4:6; Jon. 1:15). The basic meaning of the word translated 'go down' (Heb. bo') in the phrase did not hasten to go down is 'come', or 'go'. It is true that throughout the OT this word, when applied to the sun, normally means 'set', or 'go down', e.g. in Gn. 15:12,17; 28:11; Ex. 17:12; 22:26; Jos. 8:29; 10:27, etc., and that the Hebrew words normally applied to sunrise are yasa, to go forth, or zarah, to arise. But there is one instance, again significantly in a verse that is set in poetical form, where the verb bo', 'to come', is parallel to zarah, 'to arise': Is. 60:1, 'Arise, shine; for your light is come, and the glory of the Lord has risen upon you.' 'Light' here admittedly is not the same as 'sun', but in Jb. 31:26 the word translated 'sun' is the word used here for 'light' (Heb. or). It is possible to argue, therefore, that the word bo' in a poetical setting, as here in Joshua, can apply to the coming of the light and the rising of the sun. The phrase for about a whole day can better be translated as 'when day is done' (Heb. keyom tamim; cf. K. A. Kitchen, op.cit., p. 64). So 13b can be translated, 'The sun ceased shining in the midst of the sky, and did not hasten to come, (so that it was) as when day is done.' And so in the darkness of the storm the defeat of the enemy was complete. It should be noted that one is not disparaging the miraculous nature of the occurrence by suggesting that there was a less spectacular divine intervention than is postulated by the more customary interpretation, which takes it that the day was lengthened. It was still God who lengthened the night by a miraculous intervention on behalf of His people."

Keil, C. F., Delitzsch, F. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: Joshua, Judges, Ruth. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, reprint, 1956, 110.

"At the same time, it must be borne in mind that it is not stated that God lengthened that day at the request of Joshua almost an entire day, or that He made the sun stand still almost a whole day, but simply that God hearkened to the voice of Joshua, i.e. did not permit the sun to go down till Israel had avenged itself upon its enemies. This distinction is not without importance: for a miraculous prolongation of the day would take place not only if the sun's course or sun's setting was delayed for several hours by the omnipotent power of God, and the day extended from twelve to eighteen or twenty hours, but also if the day seemed to Joshua and all Israel to be miraculously prolonged; because the work accomplished on that day was so great, that it would have required almost two days to accomplish it without supernatural aid. It is not easy to decide between these two opposite views; in fact, it is quite impossible if we go to the root of the matter. When we are not in circumstances to measure the length of the day by the clock, it is very easy to mistake its actual length, especially in the midst of the pressure of business or work. The Israelites at that time had neither sun-clocks nor any other kind of clock; and during the confusion of the battle it is hardly likely that Joshua, or any one else who was engaged in the conflict, would watch the shadow of the sun and its changes, either by a tree or any other object, so as to discover that the sun had actually stood still, from the fact that for hours the shadow had neither moved nor altered in length. Under such circumstances, therefore, it was quite impossible for the Israelites to decide whether it was in reality, or only in their own imagination, that the day was longer than others. To this there must be added the poetical character of the verses before us."

Newman, R. C. "The Longest Day." United Evangelical, (Aug. 23, 1974), 8-11.

See attachment.

- IV. Cundall, A. E., Morris, L. Judges, Ruth. TOTC. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1968.

"Attempts have been made to show that Jephthah had an animal sacrifice in mind and that he was taken by surprise when his daughter came to greet him; but these cannot be substantiated, since the designation whoever comes forth from the doors of my house (31, RSV) must refer to an intended human sacrifice. It is certain that this was intended as an act of devotion on Jephthah's part, a recompense for God's action through him; but had he been better versed in the traditions of Moses he would have known that God did not desire to be honoured in this way. The 'fruit of my body' (or anyone else's body) cannot be offered 'for the sin of my soul', or as a mark of devotion to the Lord (Mi. 6:6-8). The lives of others are sacred and are not to be terminated for the private end of an individual, however laudable that end may appear. As Bishop Hall observed, 'It was his zeale to vow, it was his sinne to vow rashly.' On a considerably lower level may be instanced the case of the Moabite king

who sacrificed his son in a desperate attempt to placate Chemosh and effect a deliverance from Israel, Judah and Edom (2 Ki. 3:27). Human sacrifice was practised amongst Israel's neighbours, although the custom was not so prevalent as is commonly supposed. But apart from this instance, which is clearly exceptional, there is little evidence of any widespread observance of this evil custom in Israel until the later period of the monarchy, notably in the reigns of Ahaz (2 Ki. 16:3) and Manasseh (2 Ki. 21:6)." (146,147)

"All the earlier commentators and historians accepted that Jephthah actually offered up his daughter as a burnt-offering. It was not until the Middle Ages that well-meaning but misguided attempts were made to soften down the plain meaning of the text. The susceptibilities of enlightened minds may well be shocked at such an action, particularly by one of Israel's judges; but the attempt to commute the sentence of death to one of perpetual virginity cannot be sustained. The final reference to the virginity of Jephthah's daughter is added to point the tragedy of the affair and the perfect tense is best read as a pluperfect, a use which it often has in Hebrew, 'she had known no man' (cf. RSV, She had never known a man). The plain statement, that he did with her according to his vow which he had vowed, must be allowed to stand. The desolation of Jephthah (35), the two-month reprieve (37, 38), and the institution of an annual four-day feast would hardly be likely if nothing more was involved than perpetual virginity. (148)

"The noble character of Jephthah's daughter has been the theme of poets down through the ages. Anticipating with feminine insight the content of her father's rash vow before he had divulged it openly, she nevertheless submitted herself immediately to what awaited her. The Lord had granted a great victory over the Ammonites and, if this involved a price, she was prepared to pay it. The pathos of such submissive nobility is enhanced for the modern reader by the realization that human sacrifice is repugnant to the Lord and a virtual contradiction of the love which is central in His character. With no hope of immortality to light the pathway to a childless death she lamented the impending tragedy, but made no attempt to avert it. The incident witnesses to the sacredness of a vow undertaken before the Lord (cf. Nu. 30:1ff.; Dt. 23:21, 23) and we must at least respect this man and his daughter who were loyal, at such a cost, to their limited beliefs. There comes the challenge to the modern reader, whose knowledge of God is much greater than that of Jephthah, to offer to Him a comparable but enlightened loyalty." (148,149)

VII.A.2. Archer, G. L. A Survey of Old Testament Introduction. Chicago: Moody Press, 1964, 275.

"The theme of these two books was to demonstrate on the basis of Israel's history that the welfare of the nation ultimately depended upon the sincerity of its faithfulness to the covenant with Jehovah, and that the success of any ruler was to be measured by the degree of his adherence to the Mosaic constitution and his maintenance of a pure and God-honoring testimony before the heathen. The purpose of this record was to set forth those events which were important from the standpoint of God and His program of redemption. The

author had no intention of glorifying Israel's heroes out of nationalistic motives; hence he omitted even those passing achievements which would have assumed great importance in the eyes of a secular historian. His prime concern was to show how each successive ruler dealt with God in his covenant responsibilities."