

11-1-1969

The Influence of Zion Theology on the Centralization of the Cult

Kurt Hendel

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, khendel@lstc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv>

 Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hendel, Kurt, "The Influence of Zion Theology on the Centralization of the Cult" (1969). *Master of Divinity Thesis*. 63.
<http://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv/63>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Divinity Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE INFLUENCE OF ZION THEOLOGY ON THE
CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULT

A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for elective
E-199

by

Kurt Hendel

November 1969

73597

Holland Jones
Advisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION OF THE TOPIC	1
II. ZION THEOLOGY.	4
Historical Development	4
Main Concepts.	10
III. THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULT	22
The Time of the Centralization	22
The Historical Situation	28
The Reform of Josiah	34
IV. DEUTERONOMY AND THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULT.	41
Deuteronomy and the "book of the law".	41
Authorship	49
Date	61
Place of Composition	66
Centralization in Deuteronomy.	69
Deuteronomy and Josiah	78
V. INFLUENCES ON THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULT	88
The Historical Situation	88
Nationalism.	89
The Reform of Hezekiah	91
The Deuteronomic Code.	92
VI. ZION THEOLOGY AND THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULT.	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	100

OUTLINE

- I. Introduction of the Topic
- II. Zion theology
 - A. The development of Zion theology
 - B. The main features of Zion theology
- III. The centralization of the cult
 - A. The time when the centralization occurred
 - B. The historical situation
 - C. The reform of Josiah
- IV. Deuteronomy and the centralization
 - A. The origins of Deuteronomy
 - B. The demand for centralization
 - C. Deuteronomy's relationship to Josiah
- V. Influences on the centralization
 - A. The historical situation
 - B. Nationalism
 - C. The reform of Hezekiah
 - D. Deuteronomic law
- VI. Zion theology and the centralization of the cult

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION OF THE TOPIC

When the people of Israel first entered the land of Palestine, the land which Yahweh had promised to their fathers, they worshipped their God in many different places. The main sanctuaries were those where at one time or another the Ark of the Covenant, the symbol of Yahweh's presence among His people, was kept. Thus Shechem, Shiloh, and Gibeon became important sanctuaries during the amphictyonic times. In addition to these major sanctuaries, however, there were also an abundant number of local sanctuaries where the people worshipped Yahweh their God. All of these places were considered to be legitimate sanctuaries of the Yahweh cult. Between the time of the amphictyonic league and the reign of Josiah, however, a startling change of attitude developed, for II Kings 22-23 and II Chronicles 34-35 give an account of how all of these local cult places were abolished and the Jerusalem Temple became the central sanctuary of Israel. Since Jerusalem was chosen as the only legitimate center of the cult, the question immediately comes to one's mind what role Zion theology played in the centralization of the cult.

This particular study of the relationship of Zion theology to the centralization of the cult arose out of a general interest in the influence of the various Israelite traditions

particularly on the prophets. I developed this interest while studying the use of traditions by the prophet Hosea. I chose to study Zion theology, because it seems to be a living tradition among the faithful Jews even today. Since Zion theology is so intimately connected with Jerusalem, I felt that it would be interesting to examine the particular role which Zion theology played in the centralization of the cult at Jerusalem. It is the purpose of this paper to determine whether Zion theology influenced the centralization of the cult, and if it did, in what way it did.

In order to be able to do this, it is necessary to become acquainted with the growth of Zion theology and its major features up to the time of Josiah. Furthermore, we must discuss the centralization itself and determine when it took place. The relationship of Deuteronomy to the centralization of the cult must also be dealt with. Having laid the basis in these discussions, it will then be necessary to determine what the possible influences on the centralization of the cult might have been. Only then will it be possible to determine whether Zion theology influenced the centralization, and if it did, in what way it influenced it.

As the last chapter particularly will show, my investigation has led me to conclude that although Zion theology was not the immediate impetus of the centralization of the cult it certainly was a very basic and underlying influence.

As a matter of fact, Zion theology seems to be the very cradle out of which the Deuteronomic doctrine of centralization arose. In the following chapters I will attempt to show how I arrived at this conclusion.

CHAPTER II

ZION THEOLOGY

Israel's creed was a creed which was deeply rooted in history, for Yahweh, the God of Israel, revealed Himself to His people in the events of history. Therefore, the traditions which commemorate and preserve these historical acts of Yahweh on behalf of His people form an integral part of the creed of Israel. The major traditions of Israel are the tradition of the Patriarchs, the Exodus tradition, the Sinai tradition, the Wilderness tradition, the Conquest tradition, and the Zion tradition. Zion theology developed last chronologically, but it became an extremely important tradition in the classical prophets, the post-exilic prophets, and in intertestamental literature. Zion theology stressed the election of the Davidic line as God's adopted sons and the choice of Zion as God's dwelling place here on earth. I will, first of all, trace the historical development of Zion theology and then enumerate some of its major thrusts.

Historical development:

During the whole amphictyonic history of Israel Jerusalem really was of no importance except in the fact that it was one of the cities which the Israelites were unable to conquer. For the religious and daily lives of the people, however, Jerusalem meant absolutely nothing.

Martin Noth makes this very clear:

Jerusalem hatte keine Beziehungen zu den fundamentalen Ueberlieferungen des israelitischen Staemmeverbandes, auf denen seine Existenz, sein Selbstverstaendnis und sein Glaube ruhten....Bis zum Ende der vorstaatlichen Zeit bedeutete Jerusalem fuer die israelitischen Staemme, fuer ihren Glauben und ihr Leben schlechterdings nichts.¹

David, however, changed all of this. He, first of all, made Jerusalem his capital. When David became king of Judah, Hebron was his seat of government. It became obvious, however, that he would need another capital when the northern states also wanted to make him their king. David felt that it would be best to choose a neutral city with neither northern nor southern orientation. Jerusalem seemed to be the ideal choice, for it had never come under Israelite control. David's men conquered Jerusalem, and thus it became David's own city.² The choice of Jerusalem was a wise one for its neutrality did facilitate the unification of the kingdom.

David not only made Jerusalem the political capital of the nation, but he also made it the religious center by bringing the ark to Jerusalem.³ Through this important act David connected Jerusalem with the traditions of the past which were dear to the hearts of all Israelites.⁴

Thus the history of Zion theology really begins with David, but some of the conceptions of Zion theology go back to pre-Israelite times and belong to the traditions of Canaanite Jerusalem. These were modified and then incorporated into Israelite Zion theology. It is necessary

to discuss several of these mythological, pre-Israelite concepts in order to be able to understand some of the major thrusts of Zion theology.

Although we know little of pre-Israelite Jerusalem, it seems that the inhabitants of the city before the time of David worshipped the gods Zedek, Shalem, and El Elyon. It is also possible that only El Elyon was worshipped and that the other two names refer to the same god.⁵ Genesis 14:18-24 sheds some light on this question, for the pericope states that Melchizedek was the priest of El Elyon and the king of Jerusalem. Thus the king of the city was also the chief priest of the cult. In some ways the Davidic kings patterned themselves after Melchizedek and the other city kings of Jerusalem, for priestly functions were also ascribed to the Davidic kings. (II Sam. 8:18).

A common idea in exilic and post-exilic eschatology is the concept that water of life and blessing flows out of Zion (Ez. 47:1-12; Joel 3:18; Zech. 14:8; Ps. 46:5). This idea no doubt had its roots in Canaanite myth which also speaks of streams of blessing proceeding out of the mountain of the gods.⁶

The whole concept of Zion as the mountain of God also seems to be rooted in Canaanite myth. Canaanite mythology teaches that Baal dwelt on Mt. Zaphon, which Eissfeldt has identified as Jebel-el-Aqra, the highest mountain of Syria. Baal supposedly also owned this mountain. It may be that the mountain also represented the

land, as Mt. Zion came to do, for the god is also the "lord" or "owner" of the land surrounding the mountain.⁷

In addition to Baal, El also dwelt on a mountain which held earth, sky, and underworld together.⁸

It seems probable that the city of Jerusalem had a body of tradition even before David conquered it, and that some of these traditions were revised and incorporated into Zion theology, which developed after David's conquest of Jerusalem.

We have already discussed what David did to give an impetus to the rise of the importance of Jerusalem and thus to the development of Zion theology. A few words, however, must be said concerning the importance of the ark. The ark had been a symbol of God's presence already in amphictyonic times (I Sam. 4; II Sam. 6), and its importance in the holy war is quite clear. When the ark was brought to Jerusalem, Yahweh's presence among His people became identified with the city (Jer. 3:16-17).⁹

During the time of David some aspects of the worship of Elyon were, no doubt, adapted to and incorporated into Yahweh worship. Thus Yahweh was now referred to as Elyon. This assertion is further substantiated by the fact that Zadok, the chief priest of El Elyon also became Yahweh's high priest.¹⁰

There is one major project which David wanted to undertake but was unable to do so. This was, of course, the building of the Temple. The Nathan oracle recorded in

II Samuel 7 is the Biblical explanation why the Temple was not built by David. Nathan says that Yahweh does not want David to build a house for Him, because He has dwelt in a tent ever since the wilderness wanderings. Nevertheless, Yahweh does promise that David's offspring will build a house for Yahweh. The Chronicler (I Chr. 28:3), on the other hand, claims that David was not allowed to build the temple, because he had shed too much blood.

Various reasons have been postulated by scholars for the rejection of David's request to build a temple. Those important for our topic are: that Israel's nomadic ideal led to disapproval of a permanent shrine; reverence for the amphictyony with its tent shrine led to opposition of a temple which was fundamentally Canaanite in origin; or that political tensions in the kingdom made it impossible for David to build the temple.¹¹

Ahlstrøm posits an interesting theory. He believes that Nathan was not a reactionary Yahwist or a defender of the nomadic tabernacle tradition, but a spokesman of the native Jebusite party which did not want their conqueror to build a temple in the city. They were also afraid that the Jebusite cult would be completely suppressed if David built a temple. This party, therefore, opposed the building of a temple and began to support Solomon as the successor of David in opposition to the Davidic people who supported Adonijah. When Solomon was crowned the Jebusite party had won, and there was, therefore, no more reason to oppose the building of the Temple.¹²

Although these theories propose to explain why David could not build the Temple, there is really not enough evidence to be able to posit an explanation which is absolutely positive. It seems that all or many of these factors worked together, thus preventing David from building the Temple.

Jerusalem's influence was extended and Zion theology's growth was fostered by the activity of Solomon. Solomon, of course, built the Temple. Since the Temple was erected on palace property by the king, it was not only the Temple of the whole nation, but also the private sanctuary of the king, the royal chapel, so to speak. Solomon deposited the ark in the Temple, and because of this important act the Temple came to be thought of as Yahweh's house. Thus the writer of Kings tells us that Yahweh's presence could be seen in the Temple as soon as the ark was deposited there, for a cloud filled the Temple (I Ki. 8:10). The cloud, of course, was one of the accompanying features of a theophany and became a sign of Yahweh's presence. Solomon also proclaimed that he had built Yahweh a dwelling place in the dedication prayer (I Ki. 8:13).¹³

The next historical event which is extremely important for the development of Zion theology is Sennacherib's invasion in or around 701 B.C. During that year Sennacherib was again subjugating the rebellious vassal states, one of which was Judah. Sennacherib besieged the city (II Ki. 18f)

but then had to leave suddenly. We are not sure why he left, but whatever the reason was, this event greatly enhanced the prestige of Jerusalem. Although all of the other cities had fallen, before it the mighty Assyrian army was scattered and had to flee. This important historical event greatly strengthened the concept of Jerusalem's inviolability.

This brings us to the event about which this paper is concerned, namely, the centralization of the cult. The centralization also strengthened Zion theology. Jerusalem was made the cultic center and thus the most important city for every Yahwist.¹⁵

Main concepts:

Having discussed the historical development of Zion theology, it is now necessary to describe the major concepts of Zion theology. Some of these have already been mentioned or hinted at.

Certainly one of the basic doctrines of Zion theology is the election of David. The Davidic dynasty came into being in the clear light of history. There was nothing supernatural about its advent, and I Sam. 16:14-II Sam. 5:12 is a clear historical account. The concept of David's special election by Yahweh soon arose, however. Already the account of David's anointing (I Sam. 16) points to the fact that David was especially chosen by Yahweh. Nathan's

oracle, however, is really the basis for the conception of Davidic election. Yahweh's special election of David was then developed by the prophetic, cultic, and apocalyptic literature of the Old Testament. In the oracle Nathan informs David that he will not be able to build a house for Yahweh, but that Yahweh will build a house for him (I Sam. 7:11,13). This house will not be temporary, but it will be an everlasting house (II Sam. 7:16).¹⁶ Thus the king became the adopted son of Yahweh (Ps. 2:7) in later literature. The concept that the king was the son of god was a common idea in the Near East, and almost all of the Near Eastern dynasties claimed to be divine. It is most likely, therefore, that Israel adopted this idea from her neighbors.¹⁷ It must be noted, however, that Israel did not equate the king with Yahweh. Israel's king was not divine, but Yahweh's adopted son. As the adopted son of Yahweh the Davidic king could pray to God (I Ki. 3:5ff.; Pss. 2:8; 20:5; 21:3,5); rule in God's stead (Ps. 2:7,8); and even sit upon the throne of Yahweh (Ps. 110).¹⁸

Closely connected with the election of David stands the concept of the election of Mt. Zion. Just like the Canaanite god dwelt on a mountain and owned that mountain, so Yahweh now dwelt on His Mt. Zion which He had chosen for Himself. Hayes thinks that,

it can be shown that the special tradition concerning Zion's election, which was originally based on Yahweh's presence in Zion symbolized by ark and temple, incorporated pre-Israelite traditional thought concerning

Zion as a holy place protected by the divine. This is apparent in certain of the Zion Psalms (46, 48, and 76) and is witnessed to by some of the Zion speeches in Isaiah.¹⁹

The election of Zion was also a natural outgrowth of Yahweh's election of David (Pss. 2:6; 78:67ff.; 132:11-14; I Ki. 8:25f.). It is easy to reason that since Yahweh chose David, and David chose Zion, Yahweh also chose Zion as His dwelling place.

Finally, we also dare not forget the influence of the ark in connection with the concept of the election of Zion. Since the ark was the symbol of God's presence among His people and was now being kept in Zion, it was only natural to assume that Yahweh had chosen Zion. Thus Yahweh's choice of Zion is clearly delineated in the Psalms (46, 48, 68, 76, 78, 81, 84, 87, 122, 132).

Clements makes an interesting and seemingly reasonable comment concerning this whole concept of the election of David and of Zion. He says that these concepts developed in a kind of etiological context. He believes that Davidic election was a piece of political theology intended to insure the Davidic throne in Jerusalem and to serve as divine authority for the Davidic kings. In a similar way, the doctrine of Yahweh's election of Zion sanctioned the installation of the ark in the new cult center of Jerusalem and also upheld Israel's adoption of features borrowed from the El Elyon cult. Since in Canaanite mythology the mountain of the god could also represent the land surrounding it,

the concept of the election of Mt. Zion finally became a divine sanction for the whole Davidic empire.²⁰

The election of David and of Zion was in time also transferred to the people, and in Deuteronomy 14:2 we find the first explicit claim in the Old Testament that Israel is a chosen nation. It is true, of course, that the earlier belief in the covenant of Yahweh with Israel already implied the election of the people.²¹ It should be pointed out in this connection, however, that Deuteronomy connects the election of all of the people with the Covenant at Horeb. Neither the Davidic dynasty nor the Temple are regarded as guarantees of Israel's election, although a legitimate place is given to each in the nation's religious life. "The divine word, rather than the sacred king and temple, is the witness to Israel that it is the chosen people of God."²²

Hand in hand with Yahweh's election of Zion goes the concept that Zion and the Temple are Yahweh's residence. From the time of the dedication of the Temple, the concept grew that the Temple, then Mt. Zion, and finally the whole city were God's place of residence. Thus Jerusalem became the city of Yahweh the King, for the Temple was His earthly palace (Jer. 8:14; 14:19). Yahweh was enthroned on Zion (Ps. 9:12), and Yahweh made Himself an eternal home in Jerusalem (Ex. 15:17f.). Even Amos who prophesied in the North spoke about Yahweh roaring from Zion (Amos 1:2). The so-called "Songs of Zion" (Pss. 46, 48, 76) proclaim a

message of assurance, because Yahweh dwells in Zion. Thus Yahweh will also bless His people from Zion (Pss. 128:5; 134:3). Isaiah, whose sayings are permeated with Zion theology, assures the people that Zion is the place which Yahweh has founded and where His afflicted people will find refuge (Is. 14:28-32). Yahweh will send forth both salvation and judgment from Zion (Pss. 50:2; 76; Joel 3:16). Since Yahweh dwells in Zion, it also becomes the place of theophany (Ps. 97:1-5). Lindblom points out that the assertions that Yahweh dwells on Zion and that the Temple is Yahweh's house "depend on the fact that Jerusalem with its Temple was the principal seat of the Yahweh cult and the place of His appearance in a visionary or cultic sense."²³ Deuteronomy, of course, polemicizes against the idea that Yahweh dwells in Zion by stressing that only Yahweh's name dwells there (Deut. 12:5,11,21).²⁴

The idea that Yahweh dwells in Zion became so embedded in the faith of the people that it continued even after the Temple was destroyed in 586 B.C. Jeremiah records that the people from the North made pilgrimages to Jerusalem even after the fall of Jerusalem (Jer. 41:5). This report by Jeremiah illustrates the fact that Jerusalem was important also to the people of the North, and that the city itself had become the symbol of God's presence, for the Temple and the ark no longer existed. Noth comments on these developments:

Dadurch wurde es moeglich, dass nach der Katastrophe von 587 v. Chr., nach dem Ende der Rolle von Jerusa-

lem als Koenigsstadt der Davididen, nach der Zerstörung des salomonischen Tempels, ja sogar nach dem Verlust der Lade, did doch am wahrscheinlichsten der Einaescherung der ganzen Salomostadt (Jer. 39,8) mit zum Opfer gefallen ist, Jerusalem mit seinem "heiligen Berg" der Mittelpunkt der an den alten Traditionen festhalten- den Israeliten im Lande und in der Zerstreung bleiben konnte.²⁵

Closely related to the idea that Yahweh dwells in Zion is the concept that the city of God is holy. As a matter of fact, the holiness of Zion is derived from the fact that Yahweh dwells there. Ps. 87:1 points out that Yahweh loves Zion, and that He has established it on the holy mountain. Since Jerusalem is the city of God (Ps. 46:5) and the city of the great King (Ps. 48:2f.), therefore, it is also the holy city (Is. 48:2; 51:1; Neh. 11:1). Even though Micah sees no future for Jerusalem as the center of the cult (Mic. 3:12), and although Jeremiah speaks a clear word of warning against the Temple and against the city (Jer. 26:6-12), nevertheless, the belief that Zion is holy and Yahweh's own possession because He created it continued (Is. 14:32; Pss. 125:1; 132:13f.).²⁶ The concept that the place where Yahweh is is holy is not new, for already Moses was warned to take off his shoes for the place where he was standing was holy ground (Ex. 3). The holiness of Zion is a quite natural development in Zion theology.

Another important concept of Zion theology is the belief of Zion's inviolability. The beginnings of this concept can be traced back to pre-Israelite traditions.

In Psalms 46, 48, and 76 the city is presented as divinely protected and unconquerable by the enemy. In these Psalms phrases of non-Israelite background can be easily detected. In Psalm 46:4 a "river" is mentioned, but there is no such river in Jerusalem, although the spring Gihon could possibly be meant. Nevertheless, it seems that this concept goes back to Canaanite mythology in which a river flowed out of the mountain of the god. In this Psalm the city is also described as the dwelling of Elyon, who was, of course, the god of the Jebusite cult in Jerusalem. In Psalm 48:2 Mount Zion is described as being in the north, and the Canaanite gods supposedly dwelt on Mt. Zaphon in the North. Psalm 76:2 says that Yahweh's "abode has been established in Salem," which is the pre-Israelite name for Jerusalem. Hayes suggests that these hymns may have been part of the Jebusite cult, but even if they were not, it is obvious that pre-Israelite material has been interwoven with Yahweh faith to express Zion's inviolability.²⁷ Isaiah certainly helped to develop the idea of Zion's inviolability (Is. 10:27b-34; 14:24-27; 28-32; 17:12-13; 28:14-22; 29:1-8; 30:27-33; 31:1-8; 33:20-24). The prophet assured the people that Yahweh Himself would fight for Israel from Mt. Zion (Is. 8:9; 14:32; 17:12-14; 28:14-18; 29:5-8), and he promised them that Yahweh's presence was their guarantee of safety before the onslaughts of Sennacherib (Is. 36; 37). The events surrounding the siege of Sennacherib certainly

seemed to prove Zion's inviolability. Although Isaiah does not seem to speak of a total destruction of Jerusalem anywhere in his book,²⁸ he does alter the inviolability tradition in two ways. He, first of all, makes faith in Yahweh the condition for salvation and protection (Is. 7:9; 31:4-9), and, secondly, he not only preaches that God protects the city, but he also warns that God causes the attacks of enemies upon Zion (Is. 10:5-6; 29:1-8).²⁹ Isaiah's message is summarized well by Volz who describes it in this way:

Gott ist Geist und er braucht Jerusalem nicht um zu leben. Er wird sich wohl weiterhin auf den Zion bezeugen, aber nicht weil er an ihn gebunden waere, sondern weil seine schaffende Gnade es will.³⁰

Micah, a contemporary of Isaiah, opposed the whole idea of Jerusalem's inviolability. He felt that this concept was the result of a false faith which had forgotten that certain moral obligations were part of Israel's covenant with Yahweh. The inviolability of Zion made Yahweh's covenant unconditional, and Micah believed that this was not so. He, therefore, warned that Jerusalem would be destroyed (Mic. 3:9-12). Clements points out that this prophecy,

was a warning that Yahweh was about to end his particular relationship with his people, since it meant an end to the election of Mount Zion, on which the whole religious basis of the State of Judah rested.³¹

Jeremiah, too, spoke against the inviolability of the Temple and of Zion. He still highly respected the

Temple (Jer. 3:17; 14:21; 17:12), but he was also sure that the Temple would be destroyed because of the sins of the people who by profaning Yahweh had profaned the Temple (Jer. 23:11).

Although the idea of Zion's inviolability vanished, the importance of Zion for the people of God certainly did not diminish. It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss all of the eschatological hopes of the exilic and post-exilic prophets, nevertheless, one other important aspect of Zion theology should be mentioned. This is the concept that Zion will be the spiritual center of the whole universe. The two passages which describe this idea clearly are Isaiah 2:2-4 and Micah 4:1-4. Both of these passages speak of Zion as the highest mountain to which all the nations of the earth shall flock. There Yahweh will teach them His holy will, and there they shall live together in peace and harmony. This same theme is also taken up and developed by Deutero-Isaiah and other post-exilic prophets. Thus Zion theology remained and still is an important aspect of the Jewish faith.

Although Zion theology developed comparatively late among the traditions of Israel's creed, it certainly became one of the most important and most influential of these traditions. It arose in Jerusalem and was interested in describing Yahweh's dealings with David and the city of David. There are, of course, many facets of Zion theology

which I have not discussed in this chapter. It would have been an unrealistic and impossible task to exhaust the study of Zion theology in this short chapter, for books have been written on the subject. It was necessary, however, to become acquainted with at least some of the main concepts of Zion theology as they had been developed by the time of Jeremiah, in order to be able to go on with the study of the influence of Zion theology on the centralization of the cult. Furthermore, I believe the discussion in this chapter has also shown that the question which is being discussed in this paper is a natural one, since Zion theology with its concern for Jerusalem would seem to be involved in every event which is related to Jerusalem. Let us, therefore, now turn to the discussion of the centralization of the cult.

FOOTNOTES

¹Martin Noth, Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966), pp. 173-174.

²Albrecht Alt, "Jerusalem Aufstieg," Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft, LXXIX (1925), p.14.

³M. Burrows, "Jerusalem," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), II, 848.

⁴Noth, p. 175.

⁵Ronald E. Clements, God and Temple (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), p. 44.

⁶Georg Fohrer and Eduard Lohse, ΣΙΩΝ ΚΤΛ, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964), VII, 316.

⁷Clements, God and Temple, pp. 5-6.

⁸Ibid., p. 10.

⁹Ibid., p. 29.

¹⁰Fohrer, p. 301.

¹¹Clements, God and Temple, p. 58.

¹²G.W. Ahlstrøm, "Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau," Vetus Testamentum, XI (1961), pp. 124-127.

¹³Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel, translated from the French by John McHugh (New York: McGraw and Hill, 1961), p. 326.

¹⁴Fohrer, p. 303.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, translated from the German by D.M.G. Stalker (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), I, 310.

¹⁷Klaus Koch, "Zur Geschichte der Erwaehlungsvorstellung in Israel," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXVII (1955), p. 224.

¹⁸von Rad, Old Testament Theology, p. 320.

- ¹⁹John Hayes, "The Tradition of Zion's Inviolability," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII (1963), p. 421.
- ²⁰Clements, God and Temple, p. 50.
- ²¹Ronald E. Clements, God's Chosen People (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968), p. 45.
- ²²Ibid., p. 41.
- ²³F. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962), p. 234.
- ²⁴Leo Krinetzki, Der Bund Gottes mit den Menschen nach dem Alten und Neuen Testament (Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963), p. 64.
- ²⁵Noth, p. 185.
- ²⁶Fohrer, p. 308.
- ²⁷Hayes, p. 424.
- ²⁸Josef Scharbert, Die Propheten Israels bis 700 vor Chr. (Koeln: Verlag J.P. Bachem, 1965), p. 338.
- ²⁹Ibid., p. 426.
- ³⁰Paul Volz, Prophetengestalten des Alten Testaments (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1949), p. 200.
- ³¹Ronald E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1965), p. 50.

CHAPTER III

THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULT

The centralization of the cult was one of the most important events in the history of the Yahwist faith. Its effects were far-reaching and of extreme importance. Not only did it change the very nature of the religious practices of the people, but it also immensely effected the whole priesthood. Before we can really discuss or describe the centralization of the cult, we must, first of all, determine just when this centralization took place.

The time of the centralization:

At first glance this may seem to be a rather foolish undertaking, for the Biblical records point out very clearly when this important event took place. Both II Kings 22-23 and II Chronicles 34:1-35:19 ascribe the centralization of the cult to the reform program of Josiah which culminated in the year 621 B.C. Although the two records differ in their chronological description of the reform of Josiah, they both ascribe the centralization to him.

As may be expected, however, there has been disagreement among the Biblical scholars concerning the historicity of the records. It is, therefore, necessary to determine whether the accounts of II Kings and II Chronicles should be considered to be historically accurate, or whether another

date for the centralization should be accepted. Since the Biblical texts themselves are rather clear and need no further explication, our discussion must revolve particularly around the arguments of the various scholars.

Friedrich Horst probably presents the most radical view among the scholars, for he claims that the centralization of the cult did not take place under Josiah. As a matter of fact, he doubts whether Josiah carried out any kind of reform at all. Horst bases his position on a critical study of II Kings 22-23. He claims that two sources make up these chapters. Source A, which is the original account of the life of Josiah, implies no reform at all, except possibly the burning of the cult instruments of the Baal and Astarte cults in the Temple and the celebration of a covenant renewal ceremony. Furthermore, the book which was found in the temple was not a law book, but a collection of oracles of doom against the people and the land. Therefore, Horst thinks that it must have been a prophetic book, although he does not venture to say which prophetic book it was. Horst points to the consternation which the reading of the book worked in Josiah as support of his claim that it was a collection of doom oracles.¹

Horst does admit that Source B definitely implies a Josianic reform on the basis of Deuteronomy. Source B, however, is based on Source A and was compiled about 500 B.C. It is really a revision of Source A in the light

of Deuteronomy.² On the basis of this interpretation of the text, Horst feels that it is safe to claim that the centralization of the cult did not take place at the time of Josiah.

Welch approaches the subject from a different point of view, but he, too, does not believe that the centralization of Israel's worship should be dated in the seventh century B.C. Welch claims that the phrase $\overline{\text{י}} \overline{\text{י}} \overline{\text{ו}} \overline{\text{ב}} \overline{\text{ש}} \overline{\text{ב}} \overline{\text{ט}} \overline{\text{ר}} \overline{\text{ב}} \overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ר}} \overline{\text{ב}}$ (Deut. 12:14) can be translated "in any of your tribes,"³ therefore, the reform which Deuteronomy demanded and which Josiah carried out was not a reform for Kulteinheit but for Kultreinheit.⁴ Welch's further arguments will also be examined in the next chapter.

Although he does not say it in so many words, Hoelscher, too, seems to imply that the centralization of the cult did not take place at the time of Josiah. Hoelscher points out that the whole idea of centralization and all that it implies as described in Deuteronomy is much too idealistic for the time of Josiah. Therefore, he comes to the conclusion that the whole idea of centralization had to be the dream of the Jerusalem priests in exile.⁵ His exact arguments will be discussed in the next chapter. Thus, although he does not definitely state that centralization did not take place at the time of Josiah, he certainly implies that this is his position.

Kennett⁶ and Berry⁷ also imply that the idea of centralization developed in exilic or post-exilic times, but it

was not clear from their writings whether they thought that this was a novel idea at that time or whether the centralization had taken place at the time of Josiah and was merely revived again after the exile.

Although these and other scholars argue that the centralization of the cult did not take place at the time of Josiah, by far the majority of the scholars⁸ think that the centralization was part of the reform of Josiah. These scholars will be discussed more thoroughly in the next chapter, therefore, in order to avoid repetition I do not feel that it is necessary to cite them and their arguments here. However, I have chosen to present the arguments of Roland de Vaux in this chapter, for he traces the development of the idea of centralization and represents the majority of the scholars in his position.

De Vaux points out that in the period of the Judges and during the early monarchy there were numerous sanctuaries in Palestine, although not all of them had equal importance. The central and most important sanctuaries in the amphictyonic times were those where the ark was kept at various times, namely Shechem, Shiloh, and Gibeon.⁹ Nevertheless, it must always be remembered that the central sanctuary of the amphictyonic league was not the only sanctuary. The Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20:24-26) permits several sanctuaries, and this was the common practice of this time in Israel's history.¹⁰ When David brought the

ark, which was the sacred cultic object of all of the tribes, to Jerusalem, he meant Jerusalem to succeed Shiloh as the central sanctuary of Israel. However, during David's life Gibeon remained of utmost importance (cf. I Ki. 3:4-15).¹¹ Only when Solomon built the Temple for the ark did Jerusalem become the center of the nation's public worship. After the dedication of the Temple, Jerusalem became the most important sanctuary of Israel, but still not the only sanctuary. The pre-eminence which Jerusalem attained, however, meant that there was some practice of centralization. Even though the local sanctuaries remained, the people did acknowledge Jerusalem's importance and regarded the Temple as the most important sanctuary in Israel.¹²

When the kingdom was divided after Solomon, there was not only a political split, but also a religious one. Jeroboam felt that he could not allow the people to continue their pilgrimages to Jerusalem, for if their religious loyalty remained tied to Jerusalem, they might not remain loyal to him (I Ki. 12:27-30). Jeroboam did not introduce a new religion, however. He did want the people to worship Yahweh, and the statues of the young bulls which he erected were not supposed to be representations of Yahweh or another god. They were supposed to represent the throne of Yahweh and thus replace the ark which was in the Temple at Jerusalem. To prove this one need only read a prophet like Amos, who condemns the moral faults of Israel but says

nothing concerning the bull figures which were in the sanctuary from which he preached. It would seem that he would condemn them if they had some idolatrous meaning. Nevertheless, the bull was a dangerous figure to choose, for it also symbolized the Canaanite god Baal. The bull of Yahweh was, no doubt, easily confused with the bull of Baal, and some of the people, no doubt, thought of the bull figures as representations of Yahweh.¹³

Although the Temple at Jerusalem never replaced the local cult places, it did retain a place of pre-eminence even while the kingdom was divided. Furthermore, there were also two kings in the history of Judah who made attempts to make Jerusalem the only sanctuary. The first one was Hezekiah (II Chr. 29-31) who had seen the destruction of the Northern Kingdom and therefore wanted to strengthen both the political and the religious bases of his kingdom. Hezekiah was not very successful, however, because his son Manasseh again capitulated to Assyria and introduced much religious syncretism (II Ki. 21:3).¹⁴

The second king was Josiah who centralized the cult about a century after Hezekiah. It is this centralization of the cult with which we are concerned. De Vaux points out that Josiah's reform did not last long after his death either, for syncretism in the Temple, foreign cults, and local sanctuaries rose again (Jer. 7:1-20; 13:27). Yet in the end, Josiah's idea triumphed, for after

the exile there really was a central and sole sanctuary, namely, the Temple at Jerusalem. The reason for this ultimate success of Josiah's reform was "that the reform was based on a written law which survived longer than the men who opposed it: it was the Book of Deuteronomy."¹⁵ This last insight of de Vaux also justifies our discussion in chapter IV.

It seems, therefore, that we can confidently date the centralization of the cult around the year 621 B.C. during the reign of Josiah. There is really no reason to doubt the historicity of the Biblical record, and the majority of the scholars have seen this.

The historical situation:

Having established the date for the centralization of the cult, we must now discuss the historical situation surrounding this event. This is necessary in order to be able to consider all possible factors which may have had an impact on the centralization.

In order to understand the historical situation and the political tensions at the time of Josiah, one must study the historical developments in Palestine for at least a century preceding the centralization. When Tiglath-Pileser III came to the throne in 745 B.C. the rise of Assyrian power began, and Assyria remained the great world power until the time of Josiah. Tiglath-Pileser moved

quickly once he had ascended the throne, and by 734 B.C. he controlled almost all of Palestine. In that year Ahaz, who was then king of Judah, capitulated to the Assyrians and payed tribute to them. He had refused to ally himself with Rezin of Damascus and Pekah of Israel against the Assyrians, and when these two kings marched against him (II Ki. 15:37; Is. 7:1ff.), he turned to Assyria for help. Isaiah had warned Ahaz to trust in Yahweh and not to seek help from Assyria (Is. 7), but Ahaz did not listen to him.¹⁶ In 732 B.C. Damascus also fell, and Assyria controlled all of Palestine.

The vassal states of Assyria, of course, made numerous attempts to free themselves from her rule, but they were generally unsuccessful. This fact is illustrated in what happened to Northern Israel. Hoshea of Israel stopped paying tribute to Shalmaneser V, who had succeeded Tiglath-Pileser in 727 B.C., and sought an alliance with Egypt (II Ki. 17:4). The Assyrians, therefore, invaded Israel in 724 B.C., and only Samaria was able to hold out another three years. In 721 B.C. Sargon II (722-705) destroyed Samaria, and this meant the end of the Northern Kingdom.¹⁷

Even though the people in Judah had seen what had happened to their Northern brothers when they rebelled against Assyria, there were, nevertheless, a good number of patriots who vehemently opposed Ahaz's policy of submission. Hezekiah (715 B.C.- 687/6 B.C.) seems to have been in sympathy

with this patriotic party, and he began to take steps to cast off the Assyrian yoke in the last years of the eighth century B.C. It is likely that Hezekiah was also influenced by religious forces. No doubt the faithful Yahwists opposed the paganism which was rampant in Judah. The warnings of the prophets, who gave apostasy as the reason for Israel's downfall and warned that Yahweh would similarly punish Judah, must also have been ringing in the ears of Hezekiah.¹⁸ Furthermore, the historical situation was favorable, for Sargon was having problems with Babylon, with the Medes, and with the Egyptians.¹⁹

Hezekiah, therefore, began to show his independence by instituting a reform. He removed the foreign cult practices introduced by Ahaz. He did not stop with this, however, but also removed foreign accretions from the Yahwist cult. Thus we are told that Hezekiah destroyed the bronze serpent which had become an object of veneration (II Ki. 18:4). Like Josiah later on, Hezekiah also wanted to abolish the local shrines, but he seemingly was not too successful.²⁰

It seems most probable that Hezekiah's reform occurred somewhere around the year 705 B.C., for it was at this time that Sargon II died and was succeeded by Sennacherib. By 701 B.C., however, Sennacherib had again regained power and had conquered the cities of Judah. Hezekiah had to submit to his power and pay a heavy tribute (II Ki. 18:13-16).²¹

Either in this campaign or in a campaign a few years later Sennacherib also besieged the city of Jerusalem. Hezekiah would not surrender and turned to Isaiah for advice. The Prophet was convinced that Sennacherib had tried God's patience long enough and promised that Jerusalem would not fall (II Ki. 19:29-34; Is. 14:24-27; 17:12-14). Isaiah was right, and the city did not fall. This event, of course, greatly supported the belief in Zion's inviolability.²²

Bright points out that during the time of Isaiah and Hezekiah Zion theology played both a positive and a negative role in Judah. Positively, Zion theology continued to stress the worship of Yahweh and encouraged the people to continue to trust in Him. Furthermore, it also opposed foreign alliances and the influence of foreign cults. Isaiah, of course, personified the good message of Zion theology. Unfortunately, it seems that Zion theology was more influential in its negative role. The people began to use the teachings and beliefs of Zion theology as an assurance of Yahweh's protection, no matter how much they disobeyed Him. The Temple, the ark, and Zion itself became like charms, which kept all harm away. Thus the whole concept of Zion's inviolability arose, as we have seen in the previous chapter. The people used the teachings of Zion theology as an assurance of Yahweh's covenant with them, but they made it a covenant without stipulations. For this reason Micah rejected the idea of Zion's inviolability and warned

that the Temple would be destroyed (Mic. 3:12), although he did retain the hope and promise of the true Davidic covenant (Mic. 5:2-6).²³

When Manasseh (687 B.C. - 642 B.C.) came to the throne, he reversed Hezekiah's policy and again became the vassal of Assyria. It may very likely have been that he did not have much choice. Judah was simply too weak to oppose Assyria which reached the zenith of its power during the reign of Manasseh. In 663 B.C. Thebes was even captured and sacked, and thus Egypt was also under Assyria's control.²⁴

During Manasseh's long reign much syncretism was introduced into Judah. Although Hezekiah had removed the Assyrian gods, Manasseh again introduced them into the Temple as a sign of vassalage to Assyria. The local shrines were restored. Pagan rites were common, and temple prostitution was even allowed (II Ki. 23:4-7; Zeph. 1:4ff.). Human sacrifice was practiced at Jerusalem (II Ki. 21:6), and covenant law was completely disregarded so that there was much violence and injustice (Zeph. 1:9; 3:1-7). The reign of Manasseh was truly a difficult time for true Yahwism, and it was in great danger of becoming polytheistic. The period was a time of religious decay, and it is really no wonder that the author of Kings brands Manasseh as Judah's worst king (II Ki. 21).²⁵

As soon as Assyria reached the peak of its power, it began to collapse, and its end came with surprizing speed.

In 669 B.C. Assurbanipal succeeded Assarhaddon, and under his rule the power of the Assyrian Empire steadily declined. Unlike his predecessors, Assurbanipal was not interested in conquest and power and, therefore, devoted his time more to the arts. He is particularly remembered for the famous library of cuneiform texts which he assembled at Nineveh.²⁶

Egypt again became strong enough to cast off Assyrian control under Psammetichus I (664 B.C. - 610 B.C.), who started Egypt's twenty-sixth dynasty.²⁷

Around 650 B.C. Babylon, too, began to make trouble for Assurbanipal under the leadership of his brother Shamash-shum-ukin, who was the viceroy in Babylon. Assurbanipal was able to suppress this revolt, but the Empire was severely shaken.²⁸

It is impossible to determine exactly when Assurbanipal died, but it must have been sometime between 633 B.C. and 627 B.C.²⁹ His death touched off a series of rebellions which culminated in the end of the Assyrian Empire. In 626 B.C. Nabopolassar (626 B.C. - 605 B.C.) defeated the Assyrians and established the neo-Babylonian Empire. In 612 B.C. the Medes and the Persians destroyed Nineveh, and the fall of Haran in 610 B.C. meant the end of the Assyrian Empire.³⁰

Meanwhile some very important events had also occurred in Judah. The long reign of Manasseh had finally come to an end around 642 B.C., and he was succeeded by his son

Amon. It seems that Amon continued the policy of his father, but his reign only lasted about two years, for he was killed around 640 B.C. It seems possible that Amon was assassinated by members of a radical anti-Assyrian party.³¹ Whoever the assassins were, however, they were executed, and Josiah, the eight-year old son of Amon, was placed on the throne.

Because he was only a boy, Josiah did very little during the first years of his reign. As soon as he was old enough to act, however, he showed that he would not follow in the footsteps of his grandfather and father, for he initiated a reform program which culminated in the centralization of the cult. Let us now turn to a discussion of Josiah's reform.

The reform of Josiah:

As the Assyrian Empire crumbled, her vassal states saw an opportunity to free themselves from her control. Judah, of course, was no exception. No doubt a good portion of the population deeply resented Assyria's suppression, if not for religious, then for nationalistic reasons. Certainly the dreams of Hezekiah had not been forgotten, and an anti-Assyrian party must have existed even during the reign of Manasseh. This assumption is given some validity by the assassination of Amon, for the assassins were most probably radical patriots. By the year 630 B.C. Assyria was weak enough so that rebellion

against her was possible. It was also around that year that Josiah began his reform.

The Old Testament Scriptures give two accounts of the reform of Josiah, II Ki. 22-23 and II Chr. 34-35. The II Kings account implies that the whole reform took place in one year, and that it was the result of the discovery of the "book of the law" while the Temple was repaired. II Chronicles, on the other hand, reports several stages in the reform of Josiah, and the discovery of the law book in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign marked the third stage. Although both accounts probably are a systematization of the reform, II Chronicles seems to be the most plausible of the two accounts, for the finding of the book while the Temple was being repaired already implies that the reform was on its way. Furthermore, it would have been extremely difficult to complete such a vast reform in just one year. On the basis of the evidence which is available, however, we cannot really be sure how the reform was carried out chronologically.³²

This, then is the description of the reform by the Chronicler. In the eighth year of his reign (ca. 632 B.C.) Josiah began "to seek the God of David his father" (II Chronicles 34:3a). This, no doubt, means that Josiah rejected the Assyrian gods. In the twelfth year of his reign (ca. 628 B.C.) he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem (II Chr. 34:3b-5) and then Manasseh, Ephraim, Simeon, and

Naphtali (II Chr. 34:6-7). Josiah's action described here either means that he was already free of Assyria's control, since he ventured even into the North with his purge, or, more likely, that Assyrian power was so weak that Josiah felt it safe to try to reestablish the old Davidic kingdom and begin religious reform. In the eighteenth year of his reign (ca. 622 B.C.) the "book of the law" was found in the temple, and this book really gave an impetus to Josiah's reform.³³

The account in Kings records basically the same reform measures, but it implies that the whole reform was carried out in the year that the "book of the law" was found. These are the reform measures ascribed to Josiah in Kings. He broke down and burned the Canaanite objects of worship and altars (II Ki. 23:6,12,14). He forbade the worship of the hosts of heaven (II Ki. 23:4,5,11) and the offering of human beings to Molech (II Ki. 23:10). The sorcerers (II Ki. 23:24a) and the religious prostitutes (II Ki. 23:7) were no longer allowed. Possibly the most important part of Josiah's reform was the abolishing of all of the high places and the local sanctuaries (II Ki. 23:5,8,13). Not only did he abolish the high places of Judah, but he also broke down the altar at Bethel (II Ki. 23:15) and the shrines and high places of other cities of Samaria (II Ki. 23:19). Finally, Josiah also celebrated the Passover in the Temple (II Ki. 23:21-23).³⁴

Although all of Josiah's reforms have a religious character to them, it seems that the reform has both political and religious overtones.³⁵ The rejection of the Assyrian gods really meant the rejection of the Assyrians as the political masters. The purge of the Northern Territories fits very neatly into Josiah's desire to resurrect the Davidic Empire. II Ki. 23:29 implies that he was able to incorporate the territory as far north as Galilee into the kingdom. The Biblical record, however, is not interested in distinguishing between political and religious aspects of the reform and pictures Josiah only as a great religious reformer. It is, therefore, difficult to determine which of the reform measures were carried out as a result of political desires and which were a result of Josiah's desire to restore pure Yahwism. Nevertheless, it is rather clear that both religious and political interests motivated Josiah.

In the second chapter we became acquainted with Zion theology. The purpose of this chapter has been to become acquainted with the centralization of the cult. Therefore, we, first of all, established when the centralization took place. Having determined the time of the centralization, we then studied the historical developments of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. in order to become acquainted with the events leading up to and surrounding the centralization. Finally, we described the actual

reform of Josiah which culminated in the centralization of the cult. In the next chapter we shall discuss the "book of the law" which seems to have played such an important role in the reform of Josiah.

FOOTNOTES

¹Friedrich Horst, "Die Kultusreform des Koenigs Josia," Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LXXVII (1923), pp. 234-236.

²Ibid., p. 225.

³Adam C. Welch, "The Problem of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII (1929), p. 295.

⁴Ibid., p. 302.

⁵Gustav Hoelscher, "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, XL (1922), p. 229.

⁶R.H. Kennett, "The Code of Deuteronomy," Journal of Theological Studies, VII (1906), p. 490.

⁷George R. Berry, "The Date of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (1940), p. 135.

⁸Among them are Nicholson, Driver, Wright, Rowley, Procksch, and Bewer.

⁹Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel, translated from the French by John McHugh (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), p. 331.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 332.

¹¹Ibid., p. 333.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid., pp. 333-334.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 336.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 337.

¹⁶Martin Noth, The History of Israel, translated from the German by Stanley Godman (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958), pp. 259-260.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 262.

¹⁸John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 262.

- ¹⁹Ibid., p. 263.
- ²⁰Ibid., p. 265.
- ²¹Noth, p. 268.
- ²²Bright, History, pp. 270-271.
- ²³Ibid., p. 277.
- ²⁴John Bright, Jeremiah, The Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday and Company Inc., 1965), p. XXXII.
- ²⁵Ibid., p. XXXIII.
- ²⁶Noth, p. 269.
- ²⁷Bright, Jeremiah, p. XXXV.
- ²⁸Noth, p. 269.
- ²⁹F.M. Cross and D.M. Freedman, "Josiah's Revolt Against Assyria," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XII (1953), p. 56.
- ³⁰Bright, History, p. 294.
- ³¹Cross and Freedman, p. 56.
- ³²Bright, History, p. 296.
- ³³H.B. MacLean, "Josiah," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), II, 997.
- ³⁴A.H. McNeile, Deuteronomy, Its Place in Revelation (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912), p. 34.
- ³⁵Cross and Freedman, p. 58.

CHAPTER IV

DEUTERONOMY AND THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULT

As the multitudinous amount of literature on the subject already points out, it is impossible to discuss the topic of the centralization of the cult without studying the relationship of Deuteronomy to the centralization. Such a study is particularly important when one is concerned with the possible influences on the centralization of the cult. For this reason the relationship of Deuteronomy to the centralization must be discussed. It will be my task in this chapter to determine whether Deuteronomy can be equated with Josiah's book of the law; whether Deuteronomy really does stress the centralization of the cult; what may have influenced such a stress; and what the relationship of Deuteronomy to Josiah's reform was. All of these questions have demanded the attention of the scholars, and all of them shed light on the various influences on the centralization of the cult, particularly what the influence of Zion theology on the centralization may have been.

Deuteronomy and the "book of the law":

In II Ki. 22:8 and in II Chr. 34:15 we read that during the repair of the Temple under Josiah a "book of the law" was found, which, according to the authors of

Kings and Chronicles, influenced Josiah a great deal. What book was this "book of the law"? We must try to answer this question before we begin our study of Deuteronomy, because if it was not Deuteronomy then a study of this Book would be foolish, and we would be wiser to attempt to find another book which might be the "book of the law." Scholars have asked this question for a long time, and some of the Church Fathers already suggested some answers to it. Athanasius, Chrysostom and Jerome all assumed that the book of the law was Deuteronomy or at least some part of it.¹

I think, however, that it would be well for us to consider the arguments of those scholars first who propound the theory that Deuteronomy should not be equated with Josiah's law book. Kennett claims that it is simply impossible to say what the book of the law in II Kings 22 was.² Certainly the account of Kings would imply that Deuteronomy was that book, but this is probably due to the fact that the author or editor who compiled the present record of Josiah's reform identified it with Deuteronomy. Rather than Deuteronomy having influenced Josiah, it is more likely that the denunciations of the prophets Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah caused Josiah to attempt a reform. The word "torah," after all, could have referred to prophetic teachings, for it was used in this sense at least until the time of Josiah.³

Hoelscher arrives at the same conclusion as Kennett through somewhat different argumentation. By analyzing some of the centralization passages in Deuteronomy (Dt. 12:13-28; 15:19ff.; 13:1-19) Hoelscher comes to the conclusion that these centralization demands are just too idealistic to be able to refer to the eighth or seventh century B.C. He, therefore, makes this statement:

Dann ist aber auch der Schluss unvermeidlich: das Gesetz, welches Koenig Josia im Einvernehmen mit der gesamten Aeltestenschaft von Juda zum Staatsgesetz erhoben hat, kann nicht das Deuteronomium sein.⁴

Hoelscher's position will be further explained in a later section of this chapter.

Friedrich Horst's position and argumentation has already been discussed in the previous chapter, therefore, it need only be alluded to here. Horst thinks that the present account of the centralization in II Kings is the work of two editors. The later of these worked around 500 B.C., and he is the one who implies that Josiah centralized the cult. This editor was influenced by Deuteronomy, which was also written after the exile. Thus it can be said that Deuteronomy had nothing to do with Josiah and the book of the law.⁵

George Berry thinks that Josiah's reform is based on a law code, but he does not think that it is the Deuteronomic Code. Berry's main concern is to compare the Deuteronomic Code and the Holiness Code and to show that D is later

than H. Although there is much resemblance in the subject matter of D and H, the language used when dealing with similar subjects varies greatly within the two codes. It seems likely, therefore, that the later writer was not familiar with the earlier code, but must have been quite familiar with the source of the earlier code.⁶ Having made this observation, Berry then goes on to show that in similar passages D expands H and, therefore, must be the later of the two codes. Berry lists the following parallel passages to illustrate his point:⁷

Deuteronomy 21:18-21	-	Leviticus 20:9
Deuteronomy 22:9-11	-	Leviticus 19:19
Deuteronomy 22:22-27	-	Leviticus 18:20; 20:10
Deuteronomy 23:19-20	-	Leviticus 25:35-37
Deuteronomy 24:14-15	-	Leviticus 19:13
Deuteronomy 24:19-22	-	Leviticus 19:9-10
Deuteronomy 25:13-16	-	Leviticus 19:35-36
Deuteronomy 10:18-19	-	Leviticus 19:34
Deuteronomy 28:22	-	Leviticus 26:16
Deuteronomy 28:33	-	Leviticus 26:16
Deuteronomy 28:59	-	Leviticus 26:21
Deuteronomy 28:64	-	Leviticus 26:33

D's supposed later origin is illustrated further by Berry in a comparison of the attitude toward slaughter in the two codes. Leviticus 17:1-7 still stresses that all slaughter is sacrifice. Deuteronomy 12:15, on the other hand, permits non-sacrificial slaughter. H, therefore, disregards all practicality in the light of the centralization of the cult and demands the older regulation. D, on the other hand, is quite practical and allows non-sacrificial slaughter. Because of its consideration of the practical aspects involved in the centralization, Berry

claims that D is the later code.⁸ It would seem, however, that this very stipulation of D would support its identification with the book of the law.

Berry does not only limit himself to a comparison of D and H, but he also uses related passages in Jeremiah and Deuteronomy as evidence for the late date of Deuteronomy. Berry thinks that Deuteronomy borrowed the concept of a place where Yahweh would cause His name to dwell from Jeremiah instead of vice versa, simply because Jeremiah is a more original thinker than the writer of Deuteronomy in Berry's opinion.⁹ By making this claim, however, Berry ignores the name theology which Deuteronomy develops and does not even deal with the possibility that Jeremiah might have been influenced by Deuteronomy. His arguments thus seem very subjective.

Berry also finds internal evidence which he uses to support a late date for Deuteronomy. Thus the regulation concerning the king in Deuteronomy 17:15 does not fit the time of the Davidic dynasty and must reflect a later period.¹⁰ Of course, if Deuteronomy had been written in the North such a concern would be very understandable. Berry does not mention this possibility.

Finally, Berry cites the judicial activity ascribed to priests (Deut. 17:8-13; 19:17; 20:2; 21:5) which also does not coincide with the activity of the pre-exilic priesthood.¹¹

The theory which Berry presents, then, is that Deuteronomy is too late to have influenced Josiah, and that the book of the law found in the Temple must be the Holiness Code which also stipulates some of the measures of Josiah's reform (Lev. 26:31-32; 17:7; 19:4; 26:1,30).¹²

Welch, who also will be discussed later, claims that the demand for centralization was a later addition to Deuteronomy and that Josiah did not even centralize the cult.¹³ It seems, therefore, that Welch might grant that Deuteronomy could be the book of the law found by Josiah, but that it had nothing to do with centralization.

Although the arguments of the scholars who would not identify Deuteronomy with Josiah's law book are interesting and even plausible at times, for the most part they are based on rather tenuous evidence and argumentation. Furthermore, these scholars are a minority.

By far the greatest number of exegetes support the view which some of the Church Fathers already expressed, namely, that Deuteronomy should be identified with the book of the law found in the Temple during the reign of Josiah. Very often these scholars will not even defend their position but merely state it as a seemingly obvious and accepted fact. Although they may disagree concerning other problems with regard to Deuteronomy, they identify it, or at least a part of it, with Josiah's law book. Some of these scholars are Nicholson, Baechli, Driver, von Rad,

de Vaux, Rowley and others. Many of these men will be discussed later on in the chapter in other contexts. Their position concerning this question will become very clear there. In order to avoid repetition, therefore, I will now only discuss a few men who identify Deuteronomy with the book of the law of II Ki. 22:8 and II Chr. 34:15.

Although neither Kings nor Chronicles says in so many words that Deuteronomy was this law book, it seems rather obvious to most scholars that at least a part of Deuteronomy must have been this law code, because the reform measures which Josiah carried out correspond so closely with the demands of the Deuteronomic Law. I think it would be profitable to list some of the reform measures which correspond to specific demands of Deuteronomy:

1. The destruction of Canaanite objects of worship and altars - II Ki. 23:6,12,14 - Deut. 4:16-18, 23; 7:5,25; 12:3.
2. The removal of the abominations of Canaanite worship - II Ki. 23:13 - Deut. 12:29-31a.
3. The prohibition of the worship of the astral deities - II Ki. 23:4,5,11 - Deut. 4:19; 17:2-7.
4. The cessation of Molech worship - II Ki. 23:10 - Deut. 12:31b; 18:10a.
5. The outlawing of sorcery - II Ki. 23:24a - Deut. 18:10b-11.
6. The removal of religious prostitution - II Ki. 23:7 - Deut. 23:17.
7. The destruction of the high places and local sanctuaries - II Ki. 23:5,8,13,19 - Deut. 12:2.

There is really only one discrepancy between Deuteronomy and Kings. The priests of the local sanctuaries who were supposed to have the same rights as the Jerusalem priests (Deut. 18:6-7) were given a subordinate place (II Ki. 23:8-9).

This was probably the result of the opposition by the Jerusalem priesthood.¹⁴ "These facts have led to the reasonable conjecture that the book which Hilkiyah discovered was Deuteronomy, or some portion of it."¹⁵

While McNeile supports his assertion by comparing the reform measures with the stipulations of Deuteronomy, most of the scholars merely make the statement that Deuteronomy must have been the law book of Josiah. Thus Sigrid Loersch asserts that Deuteronomy definitely was the book of the law of Josiah, although the book which was found in the Temple was, no doubt, only a part of the present Deuteronomy.¹⁶ Martin Noth makes the point that the law book found in the Temple was Deuteronomy.¹⁷ Lewis Paton, too, believes that Deuteronomy was Josiah's book of the law. He says:

From the time of Josiah onward the Old Testament writers unanimously assert that Josiah's book was Deuteronomy, and not a trace of any other book that will explain Josiah's reformation is found either in tradition or in the extant literature of the Old Testament.¹⁸

G.E. Wright thinks that it is rather clear that Josiah's reform was based on at least part of Deuteronomy, for the reform follows Deuteronomy's provisions very closely.¹⁹

Francisco Clyde suggests that Deuteronomy 12-26 was probably the book found by Hilkiyah, and that the basic material in these chapters is quite ancient. It is possible a portion of the material goes back as far as Moses.²⁰

Finally, Norbert Lohfink gives two main reasons for identifying Deuteronomy with the book of the law of Kings and Chronicles. First of all, the paraenetic sections of Deuteronomy could have moved Josiah to rend his clothes, and, secondly, the reform of Josiah follows the stipulations of Deuteronomy very closely.²¹

The close textual relationship between the accounts of Josiah's reform in the historical books and the stipulations of Deuteronomy is so obvious and the support of the majority of the great Biblical scholars is so overwhelming that the identification of at least part of Deuteronomy as the book of the law found in the Temple should be accepted.

Having established that Deuteronomy was Josiah's law book, let us now begin a study of Deuteronomy, its origins and its demands, for only then will we be able to understand and judge its relationship to the centralization of the cult. Only then will we be able to judge whether Zion theology had any relationship to Deuteronomy and thus also to the centralization of the cult.

Authorship:

The great amount of material written on the subject already indicates that there is much disagreement among scholars as to the origins, the demands, and the influences of Deuteronomy. I will, first of all, deal with the various

theories concerning the authorship of Deuteronomy. The scholars who discuss authorship can be divided roughly into three groups: those who support Mosaic authorship; those who point to the Levites as authors; and those who believe that Deuteronomy was a product of the prophetic circles. These are the basic theories of authorship mentioned, although, as we will see, there are also men who suggest other possibilities.

I found relatively few modern scholars who still support the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. Nevertheless, there are some. Troelstra points to the commands to exterminate the Canaanites in Deuteronomy (7:16; 20:16) and the provisions concerning the holy war in chapters nine and twenty-one and claims that they would have had no significance around the middle of the seventh century B.C. They would, of course, fit in very well if Moses were really speaking the Words of Deuteronomy.²² As we will see such scholars as von Rad attributed this war-like spirit to the theology of the Levites. Furthermore, the close connection with Josiah's reform does not prove that the book had to be written around his time. Earlier kings followed some of the provisions of Deuteronomy. Thus, for example, Saul removed the witches from the land (I Sam. 28:3). Asa and Jehoshaphat tore down the houses of the sodomites, and Hezekiah removed the high places (II Ki. 18:4). Of course, Troelstra does not take

into consideration that these were isolated acts and cannot be compared to Josiah's comprehensive reform. Nevertheless, Troelstra claims that there is not enough evidence that Deuteronomy was written around the time of Josiah and, therefore, supports Mosaic authorship.²³

Meredith Kline analyzes the literary form of Deuteronomy and believes that it is set up in the form of a covenant treaty agreement: preamble (1:1-5); historical prologue (1:6-4:49); stipulations (5-26); curses and blessings, or covenant ratification (27-30); succession arrangements, or covenant continuity (31-34).²⁴ Kline also says that the centralization passages go back to Mosaic times. In them Moses tells the Israelites what Yahweh's will for them was once they had settled the land. The stress, however, is not on centralization, but on purity.²⁵ Kline thus comes to the conclusion that the covenant treaty form of Deuteronomy and its style point to Mosaic authorship.²⁶ Although I do not remember finding a scholar who supports this view, it would seem to me that the covenant treaty form of Deuteronomy could also serve as support for an argument that Deuteronomy was the result of Josiah's reform, not the cause of it, for we are told in II Ki. 23 and II Chr. 35 that Josiah did celebrate a covenant renewal ceremony in connection with the reform.

Harold Wiener agrees with Troelstra and does not think that enough evidence has been found to disprove Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy.²⁷

A much greater number of scholars support the position that the Levites are the authors of Deuteronomy. Von Rad is a foremost exponent of this view, and he develops his theory quite extensively. He, first of all, discusses the style of Deuteronomy and points out that the paraenetic style is quite prevalent. The writer seems to be a preacher exhorting his hearers or readers to obey certain commandments. He, therefore, generally states the commandment, often in apodictic form, then he explains it, and finally he exhorts his listeners to obey the commandment.²⁸ Nehemiah 8:1ff. records the reading of the law of God which Ezra arranged after the return from exile. In this chapter we are told that the Levites instructed the people by interpreting what they read. Thus it seems possible, yes, even probable, that the book of Deuteronomy arose from the priestly-Levitical circles.²⁹

From the style of Deuteronomy von Rad turns to its contents. He finds that the writer or writers are concerned about kingship, the support of priests, holy war, and laws concerning marriage and family, among others. This wide scope of interest and the acquaintance with so many traditions seems to imply a relatively advanced period of Israel's history. The old patriarchal and amphictyonic traditions which pervade Deuteronomy remained alive among the free peasant population, the עַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ . Deuteronomy's origin from among the country peasants would

also explain the war-like spirit of Deuteronomy, for the peasants had made up the militia before the kings began to use a mercenary army. The spokesmen of these people and this faith were the country Levites, and it is among them that the authors of Deuteronomy must be sought.³⁰ The Levites, of course, were closely connected with the whole concept of the holy war, for they were the bearers of the ark, which was such an important part of the holy war.³¹

Von Rad admits that the question could be asked why the Levites would close down their own local shrines and thus put themselves out of a job. He answers this objection to his view by claiming that the demand for centralization rests on a narrow basis and could easily be removed from Deuteronomy as later material.³² Furthermore, such a demand could possibly be attributed to the Levites, for by the time of Josiah they seem to have forsaken the cultic sphere proper and were busy with scholarly preservation and transmission of old traditions.³³ This is basically von Rad's argumentation in support of Levitic authorship of Deuteronomy.

Clements supports von Rad's theory. He comments that because of Deuteronomy's moral earnestness and deeply spiritual tone some scholars have identified the prophets as the authors of Deuteronomy.³⁴ However, because of its great interest in the cult and its various regulations,

it seems more likely that Deuteronomy is a product of the priestly-Levitical circles.³⁵ Clements also agrees with von Rad by claiming that by the time of Josiah the Levites seem to have regarded their task primarily that of teaching, and their priestly functions became secondary.³⁶

Bentzen, too, is certain that the origin of Deuteronomy is to be found among the Levites, for no Jerusalem priest could have written the provisions for the Levites (Deut. 18:6ff.), as is illustrated by II Ki. 23:9.³⁷ He makes his position quite clear in these words:

Der Kreis, in welchen das deuteronomische Reformprogramm entwickelt worden ist, kann weder als prophetisch noch als prophetisch-priesterlich, sondern nur als priesterlich, d.h. levitisch, bezeichnet werden. Und er ist nicht in Jerusalem, in der "hohen Geistlichkeit," sondern in dem priesterlichen Proletariat in den Provinzstaedten Palaestinas zu suchen.³⁸

Victor Maag also points to the לְיִשְׂרָאֵל as the source of Deuteronomy. He believes that the country Levites collected most of the Deuteronomic laws, except those stressing centralization. Maag feels that the Levites would not have wanted to give up their cult places which were also their source of income. Thus it seems that Maag would still ascribe a strictly priestly function to the Levites.³⁹

Roland de Vaux agrees with the position that Deuteronomy is a collection of Levitical traditions, but he does not think that all of the material necessarily comes from these circles.⁴⁰

Another scholar who supports the Levitical origin of Deuteronomy is Eichrodt, but he comes to this conclusion in a somewhat different way. Eichrodt believes that the Levites did not stand in antithesis to Jerusalem and its traditions, but that the Levites really guided the rise in importance of the Jerusalem sanctuary. He writes:

The influential royal sanctuary in Jerusalem took shape under Levitical direction, and became the stronghold of Levitical ideals; and to this the intrusion of the Zadokites made little difference. ...In the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah recognition was given to the best traditions of the Levitical priesthood.⁴¹

This observation by Eichrodt differs radically from the position of most of the scholars.

Friedrich Horst also supports the idea that Deuteronomy is a product of the Levites. However, he adds an interesting twist to the theory by claiming that Deuteronomy was probably revised by the Wisdom School in Jerusalem.⁴² It is interesting to note that in this particular source, he also seems to change his position from the one I have already described, for he states that Deuteronomy clearly influenced Josiah, although it was not the cause of Josiah's reform.⁴³

Hoelscher does not identify the authors particularly as Levites, but he does think that they were Jerusalem priests who lived in exile, far away from the realities of the Jerusalem situation.⁴⁴

Baechli presents an interesting discussion concerning the possible authors of Deuteronomy. He points out that

Deuteronomy is the product of people who are aware that Israel is in danger of destruction, and who, therefore, want to rescue Israel by purging her of all foreign influences. The specific knowledge of the Law and the various cult traditions shows that Deuteronomy is the work of people who are well acquainted with these traditions. It is also clear that the writers are concerned with politics. Furthermore, they are at home in both Northern and Southern traditions and can speak to the people concerning all areas of life. Thus they must also be figures of authority.⁴⁵ Having given this general description of the authors, he then discusses several possibilities. First of all, he mentions the Rechabites, but they are not mentioned in Deuteronomy and their wilderness idealism is totally foreign to Deuteronomy. Thus they must be rejected.⁴⁶ Secondly, Baechli treats the Levites. They certainly would hold a position of authority equal to that described above, but it is difficult to think that the Levites who came from all areas of Palestine would have such a conformity of message. Furthermore, they are also described as people without inheritance in Deuteronomy (12:12; 14:29; 16:11,14).⁴⁷ It seems most likely to Baechli that the writers of Deuteronomy identify themselves with and have the same responsibilities as Moses who is the supposed speaker of Deuteronomy.⁴⁸ Baechli finally decides that the authors are to be found among the prophetic

and priestly circles, who were the king's functionaries and advisors.⁴⁹

The discussion of Baechli has already introduced us to another possibility suggested by scholars, namely, that Deuteronomy is the product of the prophets. There are a good number of scholars who support this particular position.

One of the modern scholars who is well-acquainted with von Rad but disagrees with him is Ernest Nicholson. Nicholson says that the Levites could not possibly have been the authors of Deuteronomy, because they play such an insignificant role in the content of the book. Thus the book must have risen out of the prophetic circles for the prophets were the preservers of tradition in the Old Testament, and Moses is pictured as a prophet, not as a priest, in Deuteronomy.⁵⁰ Nicholson also analyzes the Deuteronomistic history and decides that it comes out of prophetic circles. Thus Deuteronomy, which is certainly related to the Deuteronomists and probably is the theological basis of this historical work, must also belong to the same tradition.⁵¹

Edmond Jacob summarized his view in the following quote:

The theology of Deuteronomy is in the line of the preaching of the prophets, who admitted a particular association of Yahweh with the Temple, not in the sense of the deity's dwelling-place, but in that of God's particular property. However, Deuteronomy makes a concession to popular religion since it retains the view of the Temple as a dwelling-place, but spiritualizes it through the concept of the name.⁵²

The prophetic authorship of Deuteronomy is also defended by pointing out the similarity of its message to that of the great social prophets of the eighth century B.C., namely, to the social passion of Amos, to the national devotion of Isaiah, and particularly to Hosea's stress on love.⁵³

Even though Welch denies that centralization is part of the stress of Deuteronomy, nevertheless, he feels that the "Code of Deuteronomy is the enduring monument to the effect produced by the prophets of Northern Israel."⁵⁴

S.R. Driver thinks that the basis of Deuteronomic legislation is quite old, but that Deuteronomy is a "prophetic reformulation, and adaptation to new needs, of an older legislation."⁵⁵

Although most of the scholars are content with placing the authors of Deuteronomy either within the priestly-Levitical or the prophetic circles, there are some who feel that they can be more specific in their findings. Thus Procksch suggests that the authors of Deuteronomy may have belonged to the school of Isaiah or Hosea. He attacks the problem historically and points out that the first attempt at centralization was made by Hezekiah. Hezekiah seems to have been greatly influenced by Isaiah, and Isaiah firmly believed that the Temple was Yahweh's house (8:18), for he had seen his glory there (6:1ff.). Thus it is very possible that Deuteronomy arose out of

the school of Isaiah.⁵⁶ In addition to this proposition, Procksch suggests that the school of Hosea may also have been the source of Deuteronomy. He points particularly to Hosea's stress on love (Hos. 3:1; 14:5; 2:25; 11:8) which seems to have influenced Deuteronomy (4:37; 10:15).⁵⁷

Phythian-Adams even points to a specific man as the author of Deuteronomy. Primarily on the basis of the law concerning the king (Deut. 17:14-20), Phythian-Adams claims that the priest who is responsible for the original Deuteronomy is Jehoiada (II Ki. 11-12). Jehoiada's descendants kept the book and finally hid it in the Temple during the reign of Manasseh.⁵⁸ Phythian-Adams' theory might be interesting, but his argumentation was based on very limited evidence, and no other scholars support his assertion.

While most scholars can be placed into the two traditions which we have discussed, Moshe Weinfeld makes a new suggestion as to the possible authors of Deuteronomy. He approaches the problem from a sociological point of view and also suggests that the literary form of Deuteronomy which follows the pattern of a covenant treaty, is a clue to its authorship. It would be rather natural to assume that the book was written by authors who were well acquainted with writing covenant treaties. Thus it seems most likely that the court scribes who were familiar with treaty writing composed Deuteronomy.⁵⁹ Weinfeld thinks that his position would also explain the seeming influence

of the Wisdom School on Deuteronomy, as the use of such verbs as $\Pi\Delta\eta$, $\Gamma\sigma$, and $\tau\lambda\acute{\iota}$ seems to indicate, for the scribes and the wise men seem to have been closely related during the time of Josiah (Jer. 8:8).⁶⁰ Weinfeld summarizes his position in these words:

In sum it may be said that the scribes of the courts of Hezekiah and Josiah achieved a religio-national ideology which was inspired by the sapiential-didactic school.⁶¹

Weinfeld's theory seems possible, however, before it can be seriously considered it must be studied further and examined by more scholars.

The discussion concerning the authorship of Deuteronomy has certainly shown that there is no agreement among the scholars concerning this question. It is possible, however, to point to two main circles out of which Deuteronomy probably arose, namely, the priestly-Levitical and the prophetic circles. Although it is not possible to say definitely who the author or authors of Deuteronomy were, nevertheless, since both prophetic and priestly elements are present in the book, it seems best to somewhat beg the question with Baechli and say that the book arose out of prophetic-priestly circles. The amount of evidence which we have simply does not allow us to be any more specific. It would seem, however, that Zion theology probably would have influenced the prophetic circles more readily than the priestly-Levitical circles, for Zion theology is certainly developed by some of the prophets, particularly Isaiah.

Date:

We must now turn our attention to the date of the Book of Deuteronomy, for we must determine whether it appeared before the centralization of the cult. Only then, of course, could it possibly have influenced the centralization. We can point to four possible eras during which Deuteronomy could have been composed, namely, the time of Moses, a time later than Moses but before the fall of Samaria, a time between the fall of Samaria and Josiah's reform, and a time after Josiah. Before I begin with a discussion of the various eras, let me point out that most of the scholars support the third of these time periods. Since I do not think that it is necessary to cite the arguments of each scholar, I will only discuss a number of representative scholars under each period.

Obviously all of the men who hold to the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy also support the theory that Deuteronomy was written at the time of Moses. The arguments of these men have already been discussed, therefore, I need only mention Troelstra⁶² and Wiener⁶³ as two of the proponents of a Mosaic date.

The men who support a date after Moses but before the fall of Samaria generally believe that much of the material in Deuteronomy goes back to the time of Moses or shortly thereafter. So, for example, Norbert Lohfink thinks that the heart of Deuteronomy was used in the temple long before

the time of Josiah. As a matter of fact, he proposes that the Code was brought to Jerusalem with the ark. When the ark was deposited in the Temple, the Deuteronomic Code was also kept there.⁶⁴

Kuyper, too, believes that much of the Deuteronomic material goes back to Moses, but that additions were made during the time of the Judges, particularly the time of Samuel, and during the time of the early monarchy. During this latter period the "Mosaic tradition took its Deuteronomic form."⁶⁵

Welch dates Deuteronomy by tracing the development of the Old Testament literature. He claim that Deuteronomy is an outgrowth of the Book of the Covenant and was compiled as a result of the division of the kingdom after Solomon. D was the law book of the North and H the law book of the South. Thus the original Deuteronomy should be dated shortly after the division of the Davidic kingdom.⁶⁶

Ever since W.M.L. de Wette identified Deuteronomy as the book of the law found under Josiah⁶⁷ and postulated that it was compiled shortly before the reform, there have been a multitude of scholars who simply point to the century between the fall of Samaria and Josiah's reform as the time during which Deuteronomy was compiled. Among these scholars are von Rad,⁶⁸ Noth,⁶⁹ Driver,⁷⁰ Dahl,⁷¹ Graham,⁷² and Ryle.⁷³

There are some who point to a more specific time within that century. One of these scholars is Procksch who sets the date of Deuteronomy around 700 B.C.⁷⁴

The supposed relationship between Hezekiah's reform and Deuteronomy has also been used to date Deuteronomy. Poulssen is positive that such a relationship does exist, but he does not believe that it is possible to establish whether Deuteronomy caused or was a result of the reform. Whatever the case may be, Poulssen does date Deuteronomy around the time of Hezekiah.⁷⁵

Rowley postulates that Deuteronomy was written early in the reign of Manasseh by a small group of reformers who wished to embody the lessons of Hezekiah's reform in a plan which would be useful when the next opportunity for reform came.⁷⁶

Irwin takes a novel approach to the dating of Deuteronomy. He examines Deut. 28:45-68 and comes up with the conclusion that the description of the siege is so vivid that it must have been written only a few years after the siege actually took place. He summarizes his position in these words: "The verses were written 'soon' after 586 as a commentary on the epilogue of the Deuteronomic code. Then the code must obviously have been in existence before that time."⁷⁷ How long before 586 B.C. Deuteronomy existed he does not say.

Finally, we must examine the position of some of the men who claim that Deuteronomy was written after the time

of Josiah. The primary exponent of this position is Gustav Hoelscher. Hoelscher's main argument is that the demands of Deuteronomy are simply too idealistic and do not at all fit into the time of Josiah. Hoelscher sees a problem particularly with the demand that the people come to Jerusalem to celebrate the major festivals. He feels that it would be impossible for the people who lived far away from Jerusalem to come to the Temple for all these festivals.⁷⁸ He disregards the fact that the faithful Jews did do this after the exile and that the distances in Palestine are relatively small. However, Hoelscher sees other problems also. For example, he feels that the stress on the Levites would be difficult to imagine in Zadokite Jerusalem.⁷⁹ He again does not at all consider the possibility that Deuteronomy might have been composed elsewhere. Hoelscher further cites the problem of the number of people which would be in Jerusalem during the major festivals, the amount of cattle which would have to be slaughtered, and the lack of a definite date for the Passover as other evidence that Deuteronomy is an ideal code.⁸⁰ Hoelscher concludes, therefore, that,

Der ideologische Charakter der deuteronomischen Gesetzgebung zeigt, dass sie nicht im vorexilischen Juda entstanden sind, sondern in der Zeit nach dem Falle Jerusalems gehoert.⁸¹

Kennett points to seeming internal problems as evidence for a later date. First of all, he compares Deuteronomy with Jeremiah and makes the point that there is at

least the possibility that Deuteronomy could have been influenced by Jeremiah. Since this possibility must be granted, so must the possibility that Deuteronomy might have come after Josiah.⁸² Furthermore, the lack of concern with the cult of the "queen of heaven," the denunciation of Ammon and Moab (Deut. 23:4ff.), and the favorable attitude toward Egypt (Deut. 23:7) all point to a date later than Josiah.⁸³ This and other evidence causes Kennett to postulate that Deuteronomy could possibly have been the product of a reform party in Palestine after the destruction of Jerusalem.⁸⁴

A third scholar who supports a late date for Deuteronomy is George Berry. He comes to this conclusion by examining both external and internal evidence. Berry points out that during the exile the religious life in Palestine went on. The priests from Bethel came to Jerusalem, and it became the only legitimate sanctuary, even though the Temple was destroyed.⁸⁵ Around 520 B.C., with the return of some of the exiles, national life was reawakened, and the people needed a law code. Thus Deuteronomy was prepared. Berry writes: "My position is that the code D was written at this time, that is, about 520, or, more probably, a few years later, as a result of the new movement in the national life."⁸⁶ Berry gives the following data in support of his view: the seeming cooperation between prophets and priests in the production

of Deuteronomy, which would fit the time of Haggai and Zechariah; the contradiction of Deut. 18:6,7 and II Ki. 23:9; the stipulations concerning the king (Deut. 17:14-17) which would not fit at the time of Josiah; and the use of Horeb for Sinai.⁸⁷

The textual evidence in Deuteronomy and II Kings cited by the scholars who support the proposition that Deuteronomy was written some time in the century before 621 B.C., the very weight of the number of the scholars who support this position, and the character of the historical situation which seemed ideal for the writing of such a law code all would argue for acceptance of this particular position. On the basis of the evidence which I have found and which the scholars cite, I do not think, however, that it is possible to point to some particular year within that era. It does seem probable, however, that the fall of the Northern Kingdom and the extreme syncretism of Manasseh pointed out the necessity of the compilation of such a book as Deuteronomy, and thus it seems very plausible to me that the code was compiled in the earlier years of Manasseh's reign. Even such narrowing of the date of compilation stands on shaky ground.

Place:

The last question of origin which we must answer is the place where Deuteronomy originated. This, too, is

important for it can shed much light on the traditions used in Deuteronomy and on the particular thought world of the authors of Deuteronomy. Thus it can help us understand Deuteronomy itself and its various relationships to the centralization. There are basically only two areas to be considered, namely, Northern Israel and Judah. It will become apparent that many scholars would rather accept both than exclude one in favor of the other. Hoelscher does suggest the exile,⁸⁸ but since we have already rejected his late date for Deuteronomy it is no longer necessary to discuss this option in length.

Let us, then, first of all consider the arguments for the Northern origin of Deuteronomy. Dumermuth feels that it is very probable that Deuteronomy was written with Bethel in mind, for Bethel was certainly the most important Northern sanctuary during the divided kingdom. Therefore, Dumermuth claims "dass das Deuteronomium von nordisraelitischer Hand zur Zeit des Reiches Israel abgefasst worden ist."⁸⁹

Other arguments for the Northern origin of Deuteronomy are its struggle against religious syncretism, which, however, would fit Judah just as well; the fact that it is addressed to "all of Israel"; that it speaks about a free choice of kings which would have been impossible in dynastic Judah; its close relationship to Elijah, Amos, and Hosea;⁹⁰ and the prevalence of the Egypt-Exodus-Wilderness traditions.⁹¹

Although there are scholars who would point explicitly to Judah as the source of Deuteronomy, the majority and most convincing suggest that both North and South influenced the production of Deuteronomy. The former group of men argue that Deuteronomy emerges from the prophetic sources of Judah;⁹² or that "...it was the principal product, and inspiring force, or a religious movement which flourished in Judah at the end of the seventh and the beginning of the sixth century B.C.";⁹³ or even that it was the result of a party in Judah which disapproved of high places (Amos 4:4; 5:4-5; 8:14).⁹⁴

A good number of scholars, and these men are in my opinion most convincing in their argumentation, agree in their theory that the traditions found in Deuteronomy dictate the assumption that much of the material originated in the North, but was brought South after the fall of Samaria, where it was edited and Southern traditions were added. The clearest proponents of this theory are Clements,⁹⁵ Nicholson,⁹⁶ and Poulssen.⁹⁷

Having discussed as precisely as possible the vast amount of material written concerning the origins of Deuteronomy, what seems to be the most feasible explanation of Deuteronomy's origin? On the basis of the evidence within Deuteronomy which clearly represents Northern and Southern traditions, and on the basis of the argumentation of the scholars I have come to agree with the position explicated

by Nicholson:

The thesis we wish to advance here is that Deuteronomy originated among a northern circle who fled South to Judah after the destruction of the northern kingdom in 721 B.C. and there formulated their old traditions into a programme of reform and revival which they intended to be carried out by the Judean authorities with whom they believed the future of Israel to lie. In composing their work the authors had in mind Jerusalem as the cultic and political centre of the reformation movement and made certain concessions to the Jerusalem cult tradition. Such a view would obviously present a plausible solution to the problem for it would account for Deuteronomy's North Israelite background as well as its presence in Jerusalem in Josiah's reign.⁹⁸

Centralization in Deuteronomy:

These preliminary studies which we have just completed were definitely necessary in order to gain an understanding of Deuteronomy and to determine whether it could be related to the centralization historically and chronologically. The crucial question which must be asked and which we shall discuss now is the question whether Deuteronomy demanded centralization or not. We have already concluded that the centralization did take place under Josiah; that Deuteronomy was the book of the law found in the Temple during Josiah's reign; and that it was thus chronologically possible for Deuteronomy to have influenced the centralization. However, all of these findings will be useless for our discussion if we discover that Deuteronomy did not demand centralization, for then it would have had nothing to do with the actual centralization of the cult.

There are only two scholars who definitely deny that Deuteronomy demanded centralization. The first of these is Theodor Oestreicher. Oestreicher differentiates between הַיְכָל and בְּמָקוֹם and claims that these two existed side by side in Judah until after the exile. He points out, however, that in a sense a central sanctuary existed ever since the building of the Temple, for it always stood in pre-eminence. Therefore, Josiah did not have to centralize the cult and did not do so. This explains the fact that Jeremiah and Ezekiel never mention the centralization which certainly would have been a topic worthy of their concern had it really occurred.⁹⁹ Instead of being a centralization, then, Josiah's reform was really a purification.¹⁰⁰

The second scholar is Adam Welch. Welch is primarily concerned with the phrase $\text{בְּאַחַד שְׁבֵטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ (Deut. 12:14), which is generally translated "in one of your tribes." Welch, however, wants to prove that in the Code of Deuteronomy a noun with an article and a following relative clause does not imply one and only one. He, therefore, cites examples of this construction in Deuteronomy 14:21; 18:6; and 20:20 among others, and points out that הַזָּרָאבֵן , הַזָּרָאבֵן , and הַזָּרָאבֵן do not mean one particular stranger, or one particular Levite, or one particular town, but any stranger, any Levite, and any town.¹⁰¹ Following this line of reasoning, then, Welch points out that $\text{בְּאַחַד שְׁבֵטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ can also mean "in any of your tribes." He proposes, therefore, that

the aim of the Deuteronomic code was Kultreinheit, not Kulteinheit. Deuteronomy was polemicizing primarily against Baal worship instead of for centralization. Welch stresses:

To recognize that the main aim of the Code is to keep Israel away from all heathen worship in loyalty to its ancestral cult is to gain strong support for the view that this was the sense in which the writer used the language he used about the sanctuary.¹⁰²

Certainly Welch's position on Deuteronomy's stress of Kultreinheit must be accepted, but one cannot agree that the stress on Kultreinheit excludes the stress on Kulteinheit. The more probable position is that Kultreinheit and Kulteinheit go hand-in-hand and that Kulteinheit is really a means of producing Kultreinheit.

Bach addresses himself exactly to this problem in the following quote:

Nach dem Reformbericht sorgte Josia durch die Beseitigung der nichtjahwistischen Kulte (II Koenige 23:8,10,13ff.) fuer die Reinheit und durch die Aufhebung aller jahwistischen Kultstaette ausserhalb Jerusalems (23:8) fuer die Einheit des Jahwekultes. Mit diesem tiefen Eingriff kam er der Grundforderung der Dtn. nach, den einen Jahwe nur an einen Heiligtum zu verehren (Dtn. 12:13f.).¹⁰³

Baechli also supports the view of both Kultuseinheit and Kultusreinheit.¹⁰⁴

It is this position which most of the scholars take, thus there is overwhelming support for the proposition that Deuteronomy does demand the centralization of the cult. As one reads Deuteronomy one sees that the book is so permeated with the idea of centralization that any

other opinion requires an extremely tenuous position with regard to the text. The centralization passages are the following: the altar law (ch. 12); the law of tithing (14:22-29); the law of the first-born (15:19-23); the law of feasts (ch. 16); the law of the court (17:8-13); the law of the priests (18:1-8); the law of asylum (19:1-13); and the law of first fruits (26:1-15).

Let us now discuss what some of the scholars who believe that Deuteronomy demands centralization have to say on the subject. As I worked through the material of these men, it became apparent that almost all of them do support this position, although at times from different points of view.

One position taken is that centralization was not part of the original demands of Deuteronomy, but was added later although before the time of Josiah. One supporter of this view is Victor Maag. The primary reason why he thinks that centralization was a later addition to Deuteronomy is because he believes that the Levites were the authors of Deuteronomy and centralization would be a demand which could not possibly come out of Levitic circles.¹⁰⁵ It seems, therefore, that a non-priestly group in Jerusalem was also involved in the composition of Deuteronomy, and they are the ones who added the centralization passages before the time of Josiah.¹⁰⁶ Lohfink dates the addition of centralization more specifically

by claiming that it occurred at the time of Hezekiah when Deuteronomy was also supposedly revised.¹⁰⁷

The most prevalent view among the scholars is, however, that centralization was one of the original demands of Deuteronomy. It occurs again and again throughout the book, and there are even provisions in Deuteronomy which are a direct result of the abolition of all local shrines. Thus slaughtering was now allowed for domestic purposes (Deut. 12:20-25). Priests from the local shrines were allowed to come to the central shrine (Deut. 18:6-8), and priests were given juridicial rights (Deut. 17:8f.). Thus centralization must be regarded as an integral part of Deuteronomy.¹⁰⁸ Kline believes that the idea of centralization goes back all the way to Moses. Of course, he supports Mosaic authorship.¹⁰⁹

Driver ascribes epoch-making importance to Deuteronomy because of its stress on centralization:

The law of Deuteronomy marks an epoch in the history of Israelitish religion: it springs from an age when the old law (Ex. 20:24), sanctioning an indefinite number of local sanctuaries, had been proved to be incompatible with purity of worship; it marks the final, and most systematic, effort made by the prophets to free the public worship of Jehovah from heathen accretions.¹¹⁰

Weinfeld not only believes that Deuteronomy stressed centralization, but he also thinks that the centralization of the cult may have saved the monotheistic religions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. If all of the cult

places had been continued there simply might not be any monotheistic faith today.¹¹¹

There are some scholars who not only accept the fact that Deuteronomy stressed centralization, but who even point to a specific place which Deuteronomy might have had in mind for the central cult. Since the particular place where Yahweh will cause His name to dwell is never mentioned specifically in Deuteronomy, the scholars, of course, have an open field for speculation. Rowley, therefore, ventures to posit that Shechem might have been in the Deuteronomic's writer's mind when he wrote the centralization passages.¹¹² Other possibilities could have been Bethel, Gibeon, or even Shiloh which Jeremiah calls the place where Yahweh caused His name to dwell (Jer. 7:12). De Vaux does not attempt to guess what the writer's original position might have been, but he does point out that by the time of Josiah and in later Deuteronomistic literature the place which Yahweh had chosen was definitely identified with Jerusalem.¹¹³ While Rowley placed his suggestion in the realm of possibility, Procksch is absolutely positive that Deuteronomy referred to Jerusalem:

Das Heiligtum mit der Lade, das allein Jahvehs Wohnung auf Erden bezeichnet, deutet unfehlbar auf den Tempel in Jerusalem; ihn allein zum sakralen Mittelpunkt des Volkstums zu machen, ist das kultische Hauptanliegen des Deuteronomiums.¹¹⁴

Finally, Dumermuth's position must be mentioned. He points out that Deuteronomy's demand for centralization

is not so radical, for there had been a central sanctuary ever since the time of the judges. It is true, there were still local cult places, but one was always superior to the rest.¹¹⁵

One must agree with the scholars who believe that centralization was a definite part of the Deuteronomic code, for the demand for centralization pervades the whole book. What could have influenced the Deuteronomic writer to make centralization such an important part of his code? I believe that this is also a pertinent question for our study.

Basically, there seem to be two impetuses which caused the writer of Deuteronomy to stress centralization. The first is a desire to purge the cult of all syncretism, and the second is Zion theology. In order to support this assertion I must again turn to the work of the Old Testament scholars. Baechli, for one, believes that the desire to purge the cult caused the Deuteronomic writer to demand centralization:

Nach Ansicht des Dts. kann der Synkretismus nur gewehrt werden, indem Israel wieder wie in der amphiktyonischen Zeit nur ein Zentrum hat fuer seinen Kult und fuer sein Reich.¹¹⁶

There are a good number of scholars who clearly point to Zion theology as the impetus for the stress on centralization in Deuteronomy. Since our interest lies particularly in this area, let us review some of their suggestions. In our discussion of Zion theology it was pointed out that one of the main features of this theology

is the concept that Zion is Yahweh's chosen dwelling place. It is probable that this particular stress of Zion theology caused the Deuteronomist to stress centralization and possibly even to think of Jerusalem as the central sanctuary. Noth expresses this view when he says that the whole idea of Yahweh "dwelling" (יָשַׁב) somewhere and "choosing" (בָּחַר) a specific place seems to have been at home in the Jerusalem tradition.¹¹⁷

It is really not surprising that even a Northern author would stress centralization and mean the Temple. After all, the Temple had risen to pre-eminence among the sanctuaries of all of Palestine and was held in high esteem by both Northern and Southern believers. Furthermore, the ark, which was housed in the Temple, retained its importance for the people of Israel. Thus the whole concept of centralization seems to have its historical roots in the prestige of the Temple.¹¹⁸

Even though the Deuteronomic writer was influenced by Zion theology, it should not be assumed that he did not change it. Clements points out that even though "...the Deuteronomists were conceding, and even extending, the old claim of Jerusalem to a position of primacy"¹¹⁹ in their law concerning the sanctuary, nevertheless, they also changed the Jerusalem cult tradition. The most important change is expressed in Deuteronomy's name theology. In this theology Yahweh no longer dwells in the sanctuary, but in heaven

(Deut. 26:15). Only His name dwells in the sanctuary (Deut. 12:5).¹²⁰ Thus the ark is no longer the symbol of God's presence, but merely the container of the tables of the Law (Deut. 10:1-5; 31:9,25f.). Finally, Deuteronomy does not claim that God will set His name in Jerusalem forever. Deuteronomy makes the covenant conditional on the obedience of the Law. This is, of course, different from Zion theology which stressed an eternal covenant (I Ki. 8:12-13; Pss. 68:16; 78:69; 132:14).¹²¹

It should be noted that Zion theology and the desire to purge the cult probably worked together as impetuses of the centralization of the cult. History had shown that the local sanctuaries were extremely vulnerable to syncretism, and it became obvious that a central sanctuary could be guarded much more easily against syncretism. Since the Jerusalem Temple had risen to pre-eminence among the local sanctuaries, and since Zion theology claimed that Yahweh dwelt in Zion, it must have seemed only natural to choose the Temple as the central sanctuary.¹²²

It has become apparent, then, and it is important for us to note, that Zion theology did influence Deuteronomy's stress on the centralization of the cult. As a matter of fact, the whole idea of centralization seems to have arisen out of Zion theology's stress of Yahweh choosing Zion to be His special dwelling place.

Deuteronomy's relationship to Josiah:

We have established that Deuteronomy definitely stressed centralization. However, this discovery in itself is of little use if Deuteronomy did not influence the actual historical centralization, for it is this event in which we are interested. Therefore, we must now determine the relationship of Deuteronomy to Josiah. II Kings 22-23 and II Chronicles 34-35 both state that the book of the law found in the Temple influenced Josiah greatly. The Kings account seems to imply that the whole reform is the result of the influence of this book. Since we have identified Deuteronomy as the law book found by Josiah, it would seem that we could say that Deuteronomy greatly influenced Josiah, particularly in his attempt to centralize the cult. That this is a safe assumption is attested to by the fact that almost all of the scholars except those who date Deuteronomy after the fall of Jerusalem believe that Deuteronomy was an important influence on Josiah. It would be too redundant to cite them all for their message is essentially the same.¹²³

As one considers the influence of Deuteronomy on Josiah, one must be careful not to give Deuteronomy all of the credit for Josiah's reform. It is safe to say, however, that Deuteronomy did support and influence Josiah in his attempts to centralize the cult:

Man wird sich die Sache so denken muessen, dass die Auffindung des Gesetzes im Tempel, an deren Geschicht-

lichkeit nicht zu zweifeln ist, da der Gesetzauf-
findungsbericht eine sehr zuverlaessige und noch zu
Lebzeiten Josias verfasste Quelle darstellt, waehrend
des Ganges des kultischen Reinigungswerkes sich er-
eignete und dass das Gesetz von da ab auf dessen
weiteren Verlauf Einfluss gewann, vor allem nun die
tief einschneidende Zentralisierung des gesamten
Kultes im Staate Juda auf den Tempel von Jerusalem
veranlasste.¹²⁴

Some specific steps taken as a result of the Deuteronomic
legislation were the attempt to gather the country Levites
into Jerusalem; the destruction of the sanctuary at Bethel
(II Ki. 23:15); and the celebration of the Passover (II Ki.
23:21-23).¹²⁵

John Bright reminds us that Deuteronomy not only
served as an impetus for Josiah's reform, but it also
served to remind Josiah and all the people that Yahweh's
covenant with them was not a covenant without stipulations:

The consternation that it worked is illustrated by
the behavior of Josiah, who (II Ki. 22:11) rent his
garment in dismay. It must have seemed to the godly
young king that, if this was truly Yahweh's law, the
nation was living in a fool's paradise in assuming
that Yahweh through His promises to David was irrev-
ocably committed to its defense. The reform called
the people back behind the official theology of the
Davidic covenant to an older notion of covenant, and
committed nation and people to obedience to its stip-
ulations.¹²⁶

Although Deuteronomy's influence on Josiah primarily
in his attempt to centralize the cult, Poulssen points
out that indirectly it may have also influenced him in his
attempts to incorporate Samaria into his kingdom and thus
restore the Davidic Kingdom, for it gave him such a zeal
for reform that he also purged the Northern territory.¹²⁷

Although many more scholars could be cited, I think the evidence of the Biblical text and the conviction of these scholars is sufficient to show that Deuteronomy influenced Josiah greatly, particularly in his attempts to centralize the cult at Jerusalem. It even seems to be safe to say that Deuteronomy was the immediate cause or impetus of this centralization.

During the course of the discussion in this chapter it has, no doubt, become quite evident why it is necessary to study the book of Deuteronomy in connection with the centralization of the cult. Such a study is particularly important when one deals with a possible influence on this centralization.

FOOTNOTES

¹G.E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), II, 320.

²R.H. Kennett, "The Date of Deuteronomy," Journal of Theological Studies, VII (1906), p. 492.

³Ibid.

⁴Gustav Hoelscher, "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, XL (1922), p. 187.

⁵Friedrich Horst, "Die Kultusreform des Koenigs Josia," Zeitschrift der Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft, LXXVII (1923), pp. 234-238.

⁶George R. Berry, "The Code Found in the Temple," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXIX (1920), p. 45.

⁷Ibid.,

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 46.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 48.

¹¹Ibid., p. 49.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Adam C. Welch, "When was the worship of Israel Centralized at the Temple," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, XLIII (1925), p. 253.

¹⁴Georg Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, translated from the German by David E. Green (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 168.

¹⁵A.H. McNeile, Deuteronomy. Its Place in Revelation (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912), p. 34.

¹⁶Sigrid Loersch, Das Deuteronomium und Seine Deutungen, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, edited by Herbert Haag (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967), XXII, 31.

¹⁷Martin Noth, Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Tuebingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957), p. 86.

¹⁸Lewis B. Paton, "The Case for the Post-exilic Origin of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVII (1948), p. 341.

¹⁹G.E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), II, 320.

²⁰Francisco Clyde, The Book of Deuteronomy (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966), p. 47.

²¹Norbert Lohfink, "Die Bundesurkunde des Koenigs Josias," Biblica, XLIV (1963), p. 480.

²²A. Troelstra, "Deuteronomy," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXXXI (1924), p. 405.

²³Ibid., p. 406.

²⁴Meredith Kline, Treaty of the Great King (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963), p. 28.

²⁵Ibid., p. 81.

²⁶Ibid., p. 43.

²⁷Harold Wiener, "The Main Problem of Deuteronomy," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXXVII (1920), p. 82.

²⁸Gerhard von Rad, "Deuteronomy," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), I, 835.

²⁹Ibid., p. 836.

³⁰Gerhard von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, translated from the German by David Stoelker (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1963), p. 66.

³¹Ibid., p. 67.

³²Ibid.

³³Ibid., p. 22.

³⁴Ronald E. Clements, God's Chosen People (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968), p. 22.

³⁵Ibid., p. 94.

³⁶Ibid., p. 22.

³⁷Aage Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad Publishers, 1959), p. 43.

³⁸Aage Bentzen, "Die Josianische Reform und Ihre Voraussetzungen" (Copenhagen: n.p., 1926), p. 71.

³⁹Victor Maag, "Erwaegungen zu Deuteronomischen Kult-zentralisation," Vetus Testamentum, VI (1956), p. 10.

⁴⁰Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel, translated from the French by John McHugh (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), p. 338.

⁴¹Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, translated from the German by J.A. Baker (London: SCM Press, 1961), I, 399.

⁴²Friedrich Horst, "Deuteronomy," Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, third edition, edited by Kurt Galling (Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1958), II, 102.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Gustav Hoelscher, "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," Zeitschrift Alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft, XL (1922), p. 229.

⁴⁵Otto Baechli, Israel und die Voelker, Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, edited by W. Eichrodt and Oscar Cullman (Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag Zuerich, 1962), XLI, 182.

⁴⁶Ibid., p.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 183.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 186.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 225.

⁵⁰Ernest W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 122.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 117.

⁵²Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, translated from the French by Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958), p. 83.

⁵³George Dahl, "The Case for the Currently Accepted Date of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVII (1948), p. 373.

⁵⁴Adam C. Welch, Deuteronomy. The Framework to the Code (London: Humphrey Milford, 1932), p. 201.

⁵⁵Samuel R. Driver, Deuteronomy, The International Critical Commentary, edited by S.R. Driver (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1965), p. LXI.

⁵⁶Otto Procksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), p. 228.

⁵⁷Ibid..

⁵⁸W.J. Phythian-Adams, "The Origin and Evolution of Deuteronomy," Church Quarterly Review, CXXIII (1937), p. 244.

⁵⁹Moshe Weinfeld, "Deuteronomy - The Present State of Inquiry," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVI (1967), p. 253.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 262.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Troelstra, p. 405.

⁶³Wiener, p. 82.

⁶⁴Norbert Lohfink, Hoera Israel (Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1965), p. 21.

⁶⁵Lester J. Kuyper, "The Book of Deuteronomy," Interpretation, VI (1952), p. 324.

⁶⁶Welch, Deuteronomy, p. 198.

⁶⁷Loersch, p. 18.

⁶⁸von Rad, "Deuteronomy," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, p. 836.

⁶⁹Martin Noth, The History of Israel, translated from the German by Stanley Godman (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958), p. 275.

⁷⁰Driver, Deuteronomy, p. XXVII.

⁷¹Dahl, p. 362.

⁷²William Graham, "The Modern Controversy about Deuteronomy," Journal of Religion, VII (1927), p. 402.

⁷³H.E. Ryle, "Deuteronomy," Dictionary of the Bible, edited by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1931), I, 602.

⁷⁴Procksch, p. 228.

⁷⁵Niek Poulssen, Koenig und Tempel im Glaubenszeugnis des Alten Testaments, Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien, edited by Josef Haspecker and Wilhelm Pesch (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967), p. 95.

⁷⁶H.H. Rowley, editor, Studies in Old Testament Prophecy (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1957), p. 164.

⁷⁷W.A. Irwin, "An Objective Criterion for the Dating of Deuteronomy," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, LVI (1939), p. 348.

⁷⁸Hoelscher, p. 182.

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 186-187.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 228.

⁸²Kennett, p. 486.

⁸³Ibid., p. 487.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 490.

⁸⁵George R. Berry, "The Date of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIX (1940), p. 134.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 135.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 137.

⁸⁸Hoelscher, p. 229.

⁸⁹Fritz Dumermuth, "Zur Deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und Ihre Voraussetzungen," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXX (1958), p. 95.

⁹⁰Welch, "Deuteronomy," p. 28.

⁹¹von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, p. 836.

⁹²Procksch, p. 222.

⁹³McNeile, p. 7.

⁹⁴Paton, p. 348.

⁹⁵Ronald E. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition," Vetus Testamentum, XV (1965), p. 312.

⁹⁶Nicholson, p. 94.

⁹⁷Poulssen, p. 91.

⁹⁸Nicholson, p. 94.

⁹⁹Theodor Oestreicher, Reichstempel und Ortsheiligtümer (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsman Verlag, 1930), pp. 38-39.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 38.

¹⁰¹Adam C. Welch, "The Problem of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII (1929), pp. 293-295.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 302.

¹⁰³R. Bach, "Josia," Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, third edition, edited by Kurt Galling (Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1959), p. 870.

¹⁰⁴Baechli, p. 83.

¹⁰⁵Victor Maag, p. 10.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁰⁷Lohfink, "Bundesurkunde," p. 484.

¹⁰⁸Nicholson, pp. 54-55.

¹⁰⁹Kline, p. 181.

¹¹⁰Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 138.

¹¹¹Weinfeld, p. 258.

¹¹²Rowley, p. 167.

¹¹³de Vaux, p. 338.

¹¹⁴Procksch, p. 113.

¹¹⁵Dumermuth, p. 61.

¹¹⁶Baechli, p. 84.

¹¹⁷Martin Noth, Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966), p. 187.

- 118 Procksch, p. 228.
- 119 Clements, Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition, p. 304.
- 120 Dumermuth, p. 69.
- 121 Clements, God's Chosen People, p. 81.
- 122 S.R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1965), p. 93.
- 123 Some of the scholars who claim that Deuteronomy influenced Josiah are: Wright, Duhm, Rowley, Dumermuth, Loersch, Procksch, Dawson, and de Vaux.
- 124 Noth, Gesammelte Studien, p. 60.
- 125 von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, p, 16.
- 126 John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 300.
- 127 Poulssen, p. 104.

CHAPTER V

INFLUENCES ON THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULT

In the last three chapters we have laid the bases for determining whether Zion theology influenced the centralization of the cult, and if it did, how it did. In these chapters it has also become quite apparent that there were several influences on the centralization of the cult. In this chapter, therefore, we must look back and determine what these influences were and how important they were. Only after we have done this can we evaluate the influence of Zion theology on the centralization of the cult.

Certainly the historical situation must be considered as one of the influences on the centralization of the cult under Josiah, although it is a passive influence. As we have shown in chapter III, a political power vacuum was developing in the Near East during the middle of the seventh century B.C. Assyria had been the dominant power since the time of Tiglath-Pileser (ca. 745 B.C.), but under Assurbanipal, who was more interested in the arts than in political conquest, Assyria's power began to wane, and its end came with surprising speed. By the time that Josiah was old enough to take an active role in leading his nation (ca. 630 B.C.) Assyria was simply too weak to prevent any of her vassal states from doing what they wanted. Certainly, we can say, therefore, that it was the historical situation

which served as a major impetus for the reform movement of Josiah.¹ In the Biblical records Josiah's religious zeal and faith in Yahweh are given the credit for causing him to carry out his reform. Certainly Josiah's faith must have been influential, but it is doubtful that he would have been able to carry out his reform, had not Assyria been too weak to do anything about it. The removal of the Assyrian cult from the Jerusalem Temple did not only signify the purification of the Temple, but it was also an overt sign of the rejection of Assyrian power, for the Assyrian cult in a subjugated country was the symbol of Assyria's control of that country.

Although it must be admitted that the historical situation was an immediate cause of the general reform of Josiah, it cannot be claimed that it was also an immediate cause of the centralization as such. Nevertheless, it must be cited as an indirect influence, for the centralization probably would never have occurred had not Josiah begun his reform during which the Deuteronomic Code was discovered. On the other hand, the reform of Josiah probably would never have been started had it not been for the historical situation. The historical situation, then, must be given credit as an indirect impetus of the centralization of the cult, for it was the favorable cradle in which the centralization could be carried out.

Nationalism must also be given credit as a primary influence on Josiah's reform, and thus as a secondary or

indirect influence on the centralization of the cult. It is difficult to determine exactly which reforms Josiah instituted before the finding of the book of the law in 621 B.C., and which he instituted after this important discovery. It seems, however, that a primary impetus for the reform before 621 B.C. was Josiah's desire to gain independence from Assyria, in other words, a growing nationalism.² This nationalism showed itself particularly in the annexation of the Northern territory. The move by Josiah toward political freedom naturally also involved changes in religious practices. All foreign influences, particularly Assyrian, were destroyed and Israelite religious practices stressed. The result, of course, was a return to Yahwism, for this was, after all, Israel's faith.³

Welch suggests that even the centralization was a result of nationalism. The unification of North and South, was, of course, one of Josiah's political dreams. He knew, however, that he could not do this unless Jerusalem was also the religious center for all of Israel, therefore, he centralized the cult in Jerusalem.⁴ It seems that in this particular article Welch at least admits that there was a centralization of the cult under Josiah, although he still does not give Deuteronomy any credit for it.

It seems possible that nationalism would inspire Josiah to centralize the cult in his capital, however, more specific study must be done in this area, before a

more definite stand can be taken. Nevertheless, there seems to be enough evidence for the assertion that nationalism is a primary influence on the reform in general and thus an indirect influence on centralization which became such an important part of the reform.

As one studies the Biblical and historical records, one cannot help but ask whether Hezekiah's reform influenced Josiah, and thus the centralization of the cult. The account of Hezekiah's reform in the Biblical record (II Ki. 18) describes it as being very similar to Josiah's reform. Hezekiah is also particularly given credit for removing the high places (II Ki. 18:4). It may, of course, be that the Deuteronomistic historian who records both reforms somewhat syncretized them. Nevertheless, it seems likely that there was a similarity between the two reforms even before the Deuteronomistic historian recorded them. Nicholson believes that the reform of Hezekiah might have been an example for Josiah, and that there had been a religious-political movement in Judah ever since the fall of Samaria which preached centralization and reform as a means of preventing what had happened to Israel.⁵ Although it seems probable that the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah were somehow related, I did not find enough evidence among the scholars concerning this relationship, and the Biblical record also does not say anything specific, except for the similar presentations of the reforms. Thus one cannot say much more concerning this topic.

The historical situation and nationalism certainly were primary impetuses of Josiah's general reform, and Hezekiah's reform may have served as an example to Josiah, however, none of these influences were the immediate impetus for the centralization of the cult under Josiah. The immediate and most important impetus of the centralization was the Deuteronomic Code. There is no need to defend this conclusion here, nor is it necessary to go into a detailed discussion of how Deuteronomy influenced centralization, for this has been done in the previous chapter. In the course of that discussion it became clear that Deuteronomy was the book of the law found by Hilkiah; that Deuteronomy does stress centralization; and that it did influence, yes, even cause, the centralization of the cult under Josiah.

I have obviously not yet discussed one further influence on the centralization of the cult, namely, Zion theology. This will be my task in the following and final chapter of this paper.

FOOTNOTES

¹Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, translated from the German by D.M.G. Stalker (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), I, 75.

²Ernest Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 12.

³John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 298.

⁴Adam C. Welch, "The death of Josiah," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, XLIII (1925), p. 258.

⁵Ernest Nicholson, "The Centralization of the Cult in Deuteronomy," Vetus Testamentum, XIII (1963), p. 384.

CHAPTER VI

ZION THEOLOGY AND THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULT

Our stated purpose in this paper has been to try to determine the influence of Zion theology on the centralization of the cult. In order to do this it has been necessary for us to treat many questions, particularly the relationship of Deuteronomy to the centralization. All of these steps were necessary, for in order to judge what influence Zion theology had on the centralization of the cult, it has been essential that we establish what the impetuses were which brought about the centralization. As we have seen, all of the factors which we have discussed were somehow related to the historical centralization. Thus, for example, it has become apparent that the historical milieu was just right for a reform movement such as Josiah's. Certainly the discussion of Deuteronomy need not be defended, for it proved to be absolutely essential for our topic.

In this last chapter, then, it is necessary for us to sum up the findings of the previous chapters and to formulate the influence of Zion theology on the centralization of the cult.

My study and research on the relationship between Zion theology and the centralization of the cult has shown that although Zion theology was not one of the immediate historical impetuses of the centralization of the cult

under Josiah, nevertheless, it was a very basic and important influence of this centralization. Zion theology influenced the centralization of the cult indirectly by being an influence on the more direct impetuses of the centralization under Josiah. One could even say that the very idea of the centralization of the cult arose out of Zion theology. Let me illustrate what I mean.

In the previous chapter I isolated the historical situation, nationalism, possibly Hezekiah's reform, and certainly Deuteronomy as secondary and primary impetuses of the centralization. I propose that Zion theology influenced the centralization of the cult through these impetuses.

Although we cannot claim that Zion theology influenced the historical situation during the seventh century B.C.,-- certainly it had nothing to do with the fall of the Assyrian Empire,--we can make the claim that Zion theology influenced the whole nationalistic fervor which characterized the reign of Josiah and which was an impetus for the reform. It is really impossible to separate Judaic nationalism and Zion theology, for politics and religion were so closely connected in Jerusalem.¹ Certainly Zion theology formed the religious traditions of Jerusalem, but these religious traditions were so closely tied up with the political traditions that they can only be separated with great difficulty. Let us just think back to the main thrusts of Zion theology, namely,

the eternal election of David and of Zion; the establishment of the Davidic Kingdom; the inviolability of Zion as Yahweh's dwelling place. Certainly such ideas would foster and support nationalistic zeal. It cannot be denied, therefore, that Zion theology and the nationalism of Josiah are intimately connected. Since Zion theology supported and probably even sparked this nationalism, and since nationalism was an impetus of Josiah's reform, therefore, it can be said that Zion theology influenced the centralization of the cult in this way.

Because of its similarity of purpose, the reform of Hezekiah should possibly also be considered as an influence on Josiah's attempt to centralize the cult. As I pointed out in the last chapter, however, more study of this subject is necessary in order to be able to make a more definite statement. Nevertheless, if Hezekiah's reform did influence the centralization under Josiah, and Nicholson claims that it did,² then this, too, was a medium through which Zion theology influenced the centralization of the cult. According to the Biblical record (II Ki. 19) it seems that Isaiah wielded great influence on Hezekiah, and Isaiah is, of course, the prophet whose message is permeated by Zion theology. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt that it was Zion theology which produced the religious and nationalistic zeal in Hezekiah which inspired his reform.

The most important and most immediate way in which Zion theology influenced the centralization of the cult,

however, is through its influence on the Deuteronomic Code. I have already shown in the previous chapter that Zion theology was, no doubt, the source of Deuteronomy's stress on centralization. The very idea of Yahweh choosing a special place and dwelling in it was at home in the Zion tradition (Pss. 68:16; 76:2; 78:68; 132:13).³ Furthermore, because of the prestige to which the Temple had risen by the time of Josiah, it seems very likely that the writers of Deuteronomy had Jerusalem in mind as they spoke of centralization.⁴ The historical choice of Jerusalem as the place where the cult was centralized was, of course, a triumph for Zion theology.

It has been shown in this paper that Deuteronomy was clearly the most immediate and most important impetus of the actual historical centralization of the cult under Josiah. Since Zion theology influenced Deuteronomy's stress on centralization, it becomes apparent what an important indirect influence Zion theology was on the centralization of the cult.

In summary, then, what was the influence of Zion theology on the centralization of the cult? On the basis of my study, I must say that Zion theology was really the basic influence of the centralization. Because Zion theology seems to be the source of the very concept of centralization, the Deuteronomic doctrine of centralization would appear to be Zion theology refined and revised by prophetic,

priestly, and possibly wisdom groups and addressed to a particular historical situation. The centralization of the cult under Josiah, then, was the political and the ecclesiastical "yes" to the claims of Zion theology. With the centralization of the cult at Jerusalem Zion theology reached the peak of its influence, for Yahweh's chosen Mt. Zion had in reality become the spiritual center of all believers in Yahweh.

FOOTNOTES

¹John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 298.

²Ernest Nicholson, "The Centralization of the Cult in Deuteronomy," Vetus Testamentum, XIII (1963), p. 383.

³Ronald Clements, God's Chosen People (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968), p. 77.

⁴Ernest Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 121.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahlström, G.W. "Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau," Vetus Testamentum, XI (1961), 124-127.
- Alt, Albrecht. "Jerusalem Aufstieg," Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft, LXXIX (1925), 1-19.
- Alves, Colin. The Covenant. Cambridge: The University Press, 1957.
- Bach, R. "Josia," Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Edited by Kurt Galling. Third Edition. Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1959.
- Baechli, Otto. Israel und die Voelker. Volume XLI of Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Edited by W. Eichrodt and O. Cullmann. Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag Zuerich, 1962.
- Beecher, Willis Judson. The Prophets and the Promise. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959.
- Bentzen, Aage. Introduction to the Old Testament. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad Publishers, 1959.
- . Die Josianische Reform und Ihre Voraussetzungen. Copenhagen: n.p., 1926.
- Berry, George R. "The Code Found in the Temple," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXIX (1920), 44-51.
- . "The Date of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIX (1940), 133-139.
- Bewer, Julius. "The Case for an Early Date of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVII (1948), 305-321.
- Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.
- . Jeremiah. Volume XXI of the Anchor Bible. Edited by W.F. Albright and D.N. Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965.
- Burrows, M. "Jerusalem," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. I. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 831-838.

- Clements, Ronald E. "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition," Vetus Testamentum, XV (1965), 300-312.
- God and Temple. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- God's Chosen People. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968.
- Prophecy and Covenant. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1965.
- Cross, F.M. and D.N. Freedman. "Josiah's Revolt Against Assyria," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XII (1953), 56-58.
- Dahl, George. "The Case for the Currently Accepted Date of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVII (1948), 358-379.
- Dawson, Levi. The History and Religion of Israel. London: Evans Brothers Limited, 1968.
- Driver, S.R. Deuteronomy. Volume V of The International Critical Commentary. Edited by Samuel R. Driver. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1965.
- An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1965.
- Duhm, Bernhard. Israels Propheten. Volume XXVI of Lebensfragen. Edited by Heinrich Weinel. Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1922.
- Dumermuth, Fritz. "Zur Deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und Ihre Voraussetzungen," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXX (1958), 59-98.
- Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. I. Translated from the German by J.A. Baker. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament. An Introduction. Translated from the German by P.R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.
- "Silo und Jerusalem," Supplements of Vetus Testamentum, IV (1957), 138-147.
- Flight, J.W. "The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLII (1923), 158-226.
- Fohrer, Georg. Introduction of the Old Testament. Translated from the German by David E. Green. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.

- Fohrer, Georg, and Eduard Lohse, Σίων κτλ. Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. VII. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964. Pp. 291-338.
- Francisco, Clyde T. The Book of Deuteronomy. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966.
- Graesser, Carl Jr. "The Message of the Deuteronomic Historian," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXIX (September, 1968), 542-551.
- Graham, W.C. "The Modern Controversy About Deuteronomy," Journal of Religion, VII (1927), 396-418.
- Hayes, John H. "The Tradition of Zion's Inviolability," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII (1963), 419-426.
- Henton, Davies G. "Worship in the Old Testament," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. IV. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 879-883.
- Hoelscher, Gustav. "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, XL (1922), 161-255.
- Horst, Friedrich. "Deuteronomy," Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Edited by Kurt Galling. Third Edition. Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1958.
- "Die Kultusreform des Königs Josias," Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft, LXXVII (1923), 220-238.
- Irwin, W.A. "An Objective Criterion for the Dating of Deuteronomy," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, LVI (1939), 337-349.
- Jones, Douglas. "The Tradition of the Oracle of Isaiah of Jerusalem," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXVII (1955), 226-246.
- Kennett, R.H. "The Date of Deuteronomy," Journal of Theological Studies, VII (1906), 481-500.
- Kline, Meredith. Treaty of the Great King. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963.
- Koch, Klaus. "Zur Geschichte der Erwaehlungsvorstellung in Israel," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXVII (1955), 205.

- Koehler, Ludwig. Theologie der Alten Testaments. Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. worship in Israel. Translated from the German by Geoffrey Buswell. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.
- Krinetzki, Leo. Der Bund Gottes mit den Menschen nach dem Alten und Neuen Testament. Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963.
- Kuyper, Lester. "The Book of Deuteronomy," Interpretation, VI (1952), 321-340.
- Lindblom, F. Prophecy in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962.
- Lörsch, Sigrid. Das Deuteronomium und Seine Deutungen. Volume XXII of Stuttgarter Bibelstudien. Edited by Herbert Haag. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Die Bundesurkunde des Koenigs Josias," Biblica, XLIV (1963), 261-288, 461-498.
- Hoere, Israel. Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1965.
- Maag, Victor. "Erwaegungen zur Deuteronomischen Kultzentralisation," Vetus Testamentum, VI (1956), 10-18.
- MacLean, H.B. "Josiah," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. II. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 996-999.
- McNeile, A.H. Deuteronomy. Its Place in Revelation. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912.
- Moehlenbrink, Kurt. "Die Levitischen Ueberlieferungen des Alten Testaments," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LII (1934), 184-231.
- Nestle, Eberhard. "Das Deuteronomium und II Koenige XXII," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, XXII (1902), 170-171, 312-313.
- Nicholson, Ernest W. Deuteronomy and Tradition. Philadelphia; Fortress Press, 1967.
- "The Centralisation of the Cult in Deuteronomy," Vetus Testamentum, XIII (1963), 380-389.
- Noth, Martin. Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament. Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966.

- . The History of Israel. Translated from the German by Stanley Godman. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958.
- . Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Tuebingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957.
- Oestreicher, Theodor. Reichstempel und Ortsheiligtuemer in Israel. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1930.
- Paton, Lewis. "The Case for the Post-exilic Origin of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVII (1948), 322-357.
- Payne, J. Barton. The Theology of the Older Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.
- Phytian-Adams, W.J. "The Origin and Evolution of Deuteronomy," Church Quarterly Review, CXXIII (1937), 215-247.
- Poulsen, Niek. Koenig und Tempel im Glaubenszeugnis des Alten Testamentes. Volume III of Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien. Edited by Josef Haspecker and Wilhelm Pesch. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967.
- Procksch, Otto. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950.
- Rad, Gerhard von. "Deuteronomy," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. I. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 831-838.
- . Deuteronomy. Translated from the German by Dorothea Barton. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966.
- . Old Testament Theology. I and II. Translated from the German by D.M.G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962.
- . Studies in Deuteronomy. Translated from the German by David Stalker. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1963.
- Rowley, Harold H., editor. Studies in Old Testament Prophecy. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1957.
- Ryle, H.E. "Deuteronomy," Dictionary of the Bible. I. Edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1931. Pp. 596-603.
- Scharbert, Josef. Die Propheten Israels bis 700 vor Chr. Koeln: Verlag J.P. Bachem, 1965.

- Schmid, H. "Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXVII (1955), 168-197.
- Schreiner, Josef. Sion-Jerusalem Jahwes Königssitz. Muenchen: Koesel-Verlag, 1963.
- Sellin, Ernst. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1933.
- Simpson, C.A. "A Study of Deuteronomy 12-18", Anglican Theological Review, (1952), 247-251.
- Stamm, Johann. "Zum Altargesetz des Bundesbuch," Theologische Zeitschrift Basel, I (1945), 304-306.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. Israel und das Gewalttame Geschick der Propheten. Volume XXIII of Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Edited by Guenther Bornkamm and Gerhard von Rad. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1967.
- Todd, E.W. "The Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah," Scottish Journal of Theology, IX (1956), 288-293.
- Troelstra, A. "Deuteronomy," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXXXI (1924), 393-409.
- Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel. Translated from the French by John McHugh. New York; McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Volz, Paul. Prophetengestalten des Alten Testaments. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1949.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "Deuteronomy - The Present State of Inquiry," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVI (1967), 249-263.
- Welch, Adam C. "The death of Josiah," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, XLIII (1925), 255-260.
- Deuteronomy. The Framework to the Code. London: Humphrey Milford, 1932.
- "The Problem of Deuteronomy," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII (1929), 291-306.
- The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1912.
- "When was the Worship of Israel Centralized at the Temple," Zeitschrift der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, XLIII (1925), 25-255.

- Wiener, H.M. "The Main Problem of Deuteronomy," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXXVII (1920), 46-82.
- Wright, G. Ernest. "The Levites in Deuteronomy," Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 325-330.
- . The Old Testament Against its Environment. Volume II of Studies in Biblical Theology. Edited by C.F.D. Moule. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968.
- Xavier, Leon-Dufour, editor. Dictionary of Biblical Theology. Translated from the French under the direction of P. Joseph Cahill, S.J. New York: Descler Company, 1967.