

objections vanish which the centralization theory once raised to the early origin of Dt. xii-xxvi. Its primitive character is confirmed by the absence of the words Ba'al and *bāmôth*, and by the indefiniteness about the allusions to the 'place' which Yahweh would choose to put His name there.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IX

THE DIFFERENT MEANINGS OF *BAMOTH*

Insufficient attention has been given to the fact that the word *bāmôth* has different meanings in different contexts.

The Briggs-Driver-Brown Lexicon distinguishes four meanings:¹ (1) 'Mountains' (Mi. iii. 12; Ezk. xxxvi. 2); (2) 'Battle-fields' (Dt. xxxii. 13; 2 Sa. i. 19, 25); (3) 'Places of worship', of different kinds; and (4) 'Funereal mounds' (?) (Ezk. xliii. 7).

The translators of the LXX also distinguish some from others by translating differently.² In Dt. xxxii. 13 the LXX translates *ισχύον*, 'stronghold', and in xxxiii. 29 *τράχηλον*, 'neck'; both paraphrases. In 2 Sa. i. 19, 25 the word used is *τὰ ὑψηλά*, 'heights'; in 1 Ki. iii. 2, 3 we have *ὑψηλοῖς*, and in 1 Ki. iii. 4 Gibeon is described as *ὑψηλοτάτη καὶ μεγάλη*, 'the highest and great'.

In Lv. xxvi. 30; Nu. xxi. 28, xxii. 41, xxxiii. 52 the word is *στῆλη*, 'monument', possibly indicating a knowledge of a standing stone on the Amorite *bāmôth*.

In 1 Sa. ix, x the word is uniformly transliterated *βέμου* as if the word had once been a place-name there.

In the book of Kings the standard word is *ὑψηλον* even when the idea of height had quite disappeared. But in 2 Ki. xxiii. 13 the word is *οἶκον*, 'house'. The context, which states that this high place was only 'defiled' while others were 'destroyed', also indicates a substantial building.

In Is. xiv. 14 the RV, in spite of its regard for uniformity, translates 'heights', which is evidently correct.

It appears, therefore, that there is an original connotation of actual height, which in the later usage disappears.

¹ See also G. B. Gray, *ICC: Numbers*, article on Nu. xxxiii. 52.

² This might in part be due to different translators.

CHAPTER X

DEUTERONOMY AND THE PROPHETS

THE silence of the eighth-century prophets is still often urged as a reason for believing that Deuteronomy was not in existence when they wrote. The argument was stated by S. R. Driver with his usual lucidity: 'the early prophets . . . shew no certain traces of (its) influence; Jeremiah exhibits marks of it on nearly every page.'¹

The argument *ex silentio* is always precarious even when the silence is complete; for instance, Samuel is never mentioned by the prophets till we come to Je. xv. 1; but this does not prove that he was unknown. We are on safer ground when we study what the prophets do say, than when we lay stress upon what they do not; and the present chapter will be devoted to this end.

In the first instance we propose to examine what they have to say concerning the law. Following upon this, a comparison between the teaching of Isaiah and Deuteronomy will be instituted with a view to discovering which of them appears to be the earlier. Finally, beginning with Amos, certain trends in the prophetic outlook will be observed to see how that of Deuteronomy stands in regard to them.

THE PROPHETS AND THE LAW

When the history of Joshua and Kings was compiled, the author or authors had certainly heard of a book of the law which was ascribed to Moses (Jos. i. 8, viii. 34; 1 Ki. ii. 3, 4), which they believed to have been in the hands of Joshua, and commended by David to Solomon his son. We know that they had access to earlier sources, and it is reasonable to believe that their statements were based upon them.

If the history of 2 Sa. ix-xx and 1 Ki. i, ii is rightly taken to be derived from the Court History of David, and if, shortly after

¹ *ICC*, p. xlvi.

the events, this already existed in a written form,¹ we should have an early authority for the existence of the law.

The Deuteronomic law describes itself as 'statutes and judgments', and the same collocation of words is found in Ps. xviii. 22, the early origin of which is generally conceded, where David claims to have not departed from them. It is found again in the saying of Ahijah the prophet to Jeroboam when he charges the people with forsaking these,² which David kept (1 Ki. xi. 33, 34).

In 2 Ki. xiv. 6 'the book of the law of Moses' is quoted as Amaziah's authority for sparing the children of the murderers, the reference being to Dt. xxiv. 16.

It appears, therefore, that when the historical books were written, it was believed that a book of the law of Moses existed which had been a guide to Joshua, to David and to Amaziah, and that 'the book of the law', having been lost, was rediscovered by Hilkiyah. How much of this information was contained in the original sources may be open to question; but to assign all of it, as a matter of course, to the historians is really a *petitio principii*.

These scattered indications of the early existence of a written law prepare us to find something similar in the prophetic writings. Now the eighth-century prophets knew of the existence of a 'law' (Torah), for the word is used by Hosea (iv. 6, viii. 1, 12), Amos (ii. 4), Micah (iv. 2), Zephaniah (iii. 4) and Isaiah (i. 10, ii. 3, v. 24, viii. 16, 20). What can we rightly infer from this?

The word *Tôrāh* is of wide meaning (see above, p. 67), and care is needed to see that it is rightly understood in each case.

In some places (e.g. Is. i. 10) it can be translated either 'law' (RV) or 'teaching' (RV mg.), and may refer to the prophet's own words. But elsewhere the context assumes the existence of a definite law of Yahweh, which it was the duty of the priests to teach (Ho. iv. 6; Zp. iii. 4; cf. Dt. xxiv. 8), and of the people to observe (Is. v. 23f.; cf. Dt. xvi. 19). The prophets declare that this law was 'trespassed against' (Ho. viii. 1), 'forgotten' (Ho. iv. 6) or 'rejected' (Is. v. 24), all of which implies something statutory and concrete. It is therefore reasonable to infer that 'when Amos

¹ A. Bentzen, *Introduction*, II, p. 94. Cf. S. H. Hooke, *In the Beginning*, Oxford, 1947, p. 9.

² Robertson ascribes the neglect of the law in the later monarchy to the disruption of the kingdom, and no doubt this was a contributory cause.

chides Judah for rejecting the Torah of Yahweh, he has clearly a well-known body of law in mind'.¹ The prophets, moreover, were conscious that they stood in a line of tradition which went back to Moses and the exodus (Ho. xii. 13; Je. vii. 25).²

If no more than the Decalogue and the laws of Ex. xxi-xxiii were already in writing in their day, it would follow that a law existed which was not entirely oral.

When Hosea declares in the name of Yahweh, 'Though I write (mg. I wrote) my law in ten thousand precepts' (viii. 12, RV), whilst there is some obscurity as to what is meant, there is no ambiguity about the word 'write'. There is also an obscure passage in Isaiah (viii. 16-20) where the words 'bind up' and 'seal' are such as are used in reference to a document.³

Besides these explicit references to a *Tôrāh* there are signs that certain particular injunctions of the Deuteronomic law were known. These include the law of the landmark (Ho. v. 10; Dt. xix. 14), the authority of the priest (Ho. iv. 4; Dt. xvii. 12) and that it was his duty to teach the law (Ho. iv. 6; Zp. iii. 4; Dt. xxiv. 6), the need for a standard measure (Am. viii. 5; Mi. vi. 10, 11; Dt. xxv. 13-18) and the triennial payment of tithe (Am. iv. 4; Dt. xiv. 28).⁴

It can be freely admitted that these facts do not prove the acquaintance of the prophets of the eighth century with the book of Deuteronomy;⁵ on the other hand they are consistent with the existence of a written law at that time, though one that was certainly neglected. It is easily possible that a prophet like Amos may never actually have read the law, and improbable that he would possess his own copy. Those were not the days of the printing press; and even if the modern view that the prophets were attached to local sanctuaries⁶ becomes firmly established, it does not follow that each sanctuary would have its library.

How open to subjective influence is an argument of this sort

¹ Robertson, *OTP*, p. 51.

² See N. W. Porteous, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 150.

³ See E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, Dublin, 1941, *in loc.*

⁴ The reference to Admah and Zeboim might be added (Ho. xi. 8; elsewhere only Dt. xxix. 23 and Gn. xiv. 2).

⁵ It would be no less difficult to prove their acquaintance with J or E, which are generally assumed to be earlier.

⁶ Cf. A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, 1944.

is seen when we come to consider the book of Jeremiah. S. R. Driver thought that marks of the influence of Deuteronomy could be seen on 'nearly every page';¹ and gave a list of passages by way of proof.²

On the other side J. N. Schofield³ denies that Jeremiah ever knew the book, which in his view was of later origin, the similarities being due to the influence of Jeremiah upon Deuteronomy; a view to which a reply has been given by H. H. Rowley.⁴

For our purpose it is sufficient to note that the traces of Deuteronomic influence in Jeremiah are similar to those observable in the earlier prophets, although in some cases (e.g. xi. 1-5) more precise, owing, perhaps, to its recent rediscovery in the temple. If indeed he was cognizant of the contents of the newly discovered book of the law, he shows no awareness that its purpose was to limit the offering of sacrifices to Jerusalem. Je. vii. 12 recognizes that once a legitimate altar of Yahweh existed at Shiloh. Jeremiah does not reject the sacred ritual, but insists upon its purity and sets the moral law above it; the sins he denounces are the corruption of the temple worship and the introduction of heathen practices (vii. 22f., 30f.).⁵

DEUTERONOMY AND ISAIAH

The comparison of Deuteronomy with the work of Isaiah affords one means of testing the thesis that the former was compiled soon after the death of Hezekiah and derived its provenance from the circle of earnest servants of Yahweh who had shared in his reforming zeal and had embodied in this book their hopes for the future.⁶ Were that so, the author would be a younger contemporary of Isaiah, and the influence of the great prophet might be expected to show itself in the work of his successor.

¹ See p. 137.

² p. xciii. Many of these are from Dt. xxviii; but these can be matched by others from Hosea, e.g. verse 33, Ho. v. 11; 49, viii. 1; 64, ix. 17; 68, viii. 13.

³ 'The Significance of the Prophets for dating Deuteronomy', *Studies in History and Religion Presented to H. W. Robinson*, ed. E. A. Payne, London, 1937.

⁴ 'The Prophet Jeremiah and the book of Deuteronomy', in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to T. M. Robinson*, ed. H. H. Rowley, Edinburgh, 1946.

⁵ See W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, Tübingen, 1947, p. 99.

⁶ See p. 126.

In *Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium*, G. von Rad has made such a comparison.¹ It is possible to see certain ideas which are held in common, but, even so, he observes that such ideas are so deeply set in Deuteronomy, that it is impossible that they should be derived from a prophet 'so alien in thought as Isaiah'.

Deuteronomy sees Israel newly chosen as the 'people of God' (*Gottesvolk*), brought into a land extending to Lebanon and the Euphrates (i. 6), where a happy future, with material blessings, awaits them. Isaiah begins with a lament over the sins of the people, who have forsaken the LORD and revolted from Him. His hope is centred in the few, an inner kernel, a true, spiritual Israel who shall be established in Zion (x. 24, xiv. 32).²

Deuteronomy bids the people rejoice in their sacrifices and offerings; Isaiah rebukes the people for keeping the outward observance of the law, whilst their heart is far from their God (i. 11-14, xxix. 13), and this is a sin which Yahweh, who searches the heart, cannot tolerate.

Isaiah's doctrine of the remnant is in the 'sharpest opposition' to Deuteronomy;³ Isaiah looks for a spiritual blessing upon the 'poor' (xiv. 32), but Deuteronomy for material blessings upon the whole people; Zion in Isaiah is not 'the place' to which sacrifices are to be brought, but a symbol of God's faithful people.

Deuteronomy sees God's blessing connected with entry into the land, here and now, but Isaiah knows nothing like this. Indeed, so far is Deuteronomy from showing any connection with Isaiah that it might almost be regarded as 'a protest against the outlook of Isaiah and Zephaniah'.⁴

Other contrasts may be added. Isaiah never quotes Moses as an authority, nor the oath to the fathers, but he founds his hopes for the future of Israel on the Davidic covenant. Zion is his constant theme;⁵ here the throne of David shall be established, and here a true spiritual worship shall be offered. Surely this would have provided an ideal starting-point for a follower of his, whose aim was to centralize worship in Jerusalem. But Deuteronomy knows nothing of Zion or David.

Again, Isaiah was deeply concerned over the great political events and changes of those stirring times; but the author of

¹ *Gottesvolk*, pp. 83-90. ² *ibid.*, p. 89. ³ *ibid.*, p. 87. ⁴ *ibid.*, p. 89.

⁵ Is. ix. 7, xi. 1, 10, 13, xii. 6, xxiv. 23, xxv. 6, xxvii. 13, xxviii. 16, xxix. 19.

Deuteronomy, if living then, completely ignores them. Would this have been the case had he belonged to the time when Samaria had fallen, and Jerusalem had narrowly escaped?

The endeavour to picture the author living in those days meets on every side with baffling paradoxes. The book is one of great individuality and distinctive style which is said to have founded a 'Deuteronomic' school of writers, but not a trace of the author's name or person remains, although amidst the degenerate priests and prophets described by Isaiah (xxviii. 7) he must have been an outstanding figure. The book contains evidence of preaching of oratorical and spiritual power; but the preacher made no mark on his own generation. He is said to be an ardent reformer, but the only sins he denounces are those of his ancestors.

He constructs a series of rules intended to revoke an old Mosaic law, and then ascribes them to Moses himself. His purpose is to proclaim the *bāmôth* illegal, but he never names them; and to centralize worship in Jerusalem, though there is nothing to show that he even knew of its existence. When the sins of Manasseh call for stern rebuke, he composes a quite inappropriate passage about a future king (xvii. 14-20). He is bold enough to expect success where Hezekiah's zeal and Isaiah's preaching have failed, then hides his book in the temple.

Whether this author was a prophet (Kautzsch) or a priest (Kuenen) has been from the earliest days a point of controversy; in later years S. R. Driver found him among the prophets,¹ whilst R. H. Pfeiffer is equally sure that he was 'a priest in Jerusalem'.² G. von Rad³ sees objection to both, and takes refuge in the belief that the book arose among the country Levites, co-operating with the landowners, the 'people of the land' (2 Ki. xxi. 24, xxiii. 30). He thinks that the Levites might have preserved the Mosaic traditions, and that the landowners would be interested in the laws of warfare, which might account for the 'Janus-like' character of the book, with its combination of civil, military and religious laws.

But he candidly confesses difficulty here also, for if the abolition

¹ *ICC*, pp. liif. See also von Rad, *Gottesvolk*, p. 73.

² *Introduction*, pp. 179f. Engnell says that Deuteronomy is more priestly than the P work, *OTMS*, p. 70.

³ *Studies*, pp. 60-69.

of the local sanctuaries were the aim of the law, 'the country Levites would have been the last persons to compose Deuteronomy, for in so doing they would have been sawing off the branch upon which they sat'.

What he adds is significant. 'But it is being increasingly recognized that the demand for centralization in Deuteronomy rests upon a very narrow basis only, and is, from the point of view of literary criticism, comparatively easy to remove as a late and final adaptation of many layers of material.'¹ So easily could Wellhausen's well-planned fabric fall to pieces!

HOSEA AND DEUTERONOMY

By general consent Deuteronomy has more in common with Hosea than with Isaiah. Like Deuteronomy, Hosea writes of Yahweh's adoption of Israel for His people, and connects it with their deliverance from Egypt (xi. 1, xiii. 4); he calls attention to Yahweh's gift of corn, wine and oil (ii. 8; cf. Dt. viii. 13); he lays emphasis upon God's love (*'ahabhâ*) for Israel, and threatens judgment sometimes in similar terms. From these similarities some have inferred that Hosea was acquainted with Deuteronomy, whilst others have seen in Deuteronomy the spiritual heir of Hosea.

A closer examination shows how difficult it is to establish either inference. Sometimes the parallelism is superficial only, and there are strong contrasts which mark their independence. There are nevertheless some indications that Deuteronomy is the earlier.

Whilst both books treat of the love of God for Israel, the treatment is different. In Hosea the dominant idea is that of marital love, and is strongly coloured by his own experience, 'Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend and an adulteress . . .' (iii. 1, RV).

It is used indeed of God's love for His people,² but more frequently of their illicit love for false gods,³ and five times for the love of earthly objects.⁴

¹ *Studies*, p. 67.

² iii. 1a, ix. 15, xi. 1, 4, xiv. 4.

³ ii. 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, iii. 1, viii. 9, ix. 10; cf. Je. iii. 1, 2.

⁴ iii. 1b, iv. 18, ix. 1, x. 11, xii. 7.

In Deuteronomy the word is free from lower associations: it is purer and more primitive.

Because Yahweh 'loved thy fathers' (iv. 37) He chose them, and because of His oath to the fathers, He loved Israel and guarantees His love for the future (vii. 8, 13). To the ancient law of Dt. xxiii. 3¹ is attached the comment that Yahweh turned Balaam's curse into a blessing 'because the LORD thy God loved thee' (5).

In many places² Deuteronomy proclaims the duty of man to love God, concerning which Hosea is silent, as he is regarding love of the stranger (Dt. x. 18, 19).

There are other indications that Hosea belongs to a later time than Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy sees Canaan as a 'good land' which Yahweh 'is giving' to His people; Hosea sees it as 'polluted' with idolatry, and the earlier promise revoked (ix. 3). Deuteronomy holds up the priests to honour (xvii. 12, xxiv. 8); in Hosea's day they are degenerate, a 'snare' and threatened with judgment (v. 1).

Hosea rebukes the people for syncretism, and issues his polemic against Bethel and Ba'al, names which are foreign to Deuteronomy. He deals with the schism between Israel and Judah as a sin (iii. 4, 5), and blames the people for placing their reliance on foreign aid (v. 13, vii. 11). These are sins which in Deuteronomy are neither rebuked nor foretold.

Deuteronomy looks forward from a clear sky for God's future blessing on the land, and rest from their enemies (xii. 7); for Hosea the blessing belongs to the past (ix. 10, xi. 1-4). God has a quarrel with His people and has become their judge (v. 2, x. 9).³

The facts brought out in this comparison are harder to explain if the writing of Deuteronomy followed on that of Hosea, than if the reverse were the case. It can, of course, be said that the Deuteronomist turned back the clock of history to give his book a primitive appearance. If this be the case, his skill demands our wondering admiration.

There is another way in which the book of Deuteronomy may be compared with the prophetic writings. When we consider the latter in their historical order, from Hosea to Jeremiah, we are

¹ See p. 111.

² v. 8, vii. 9, x. 12, xi. 1, 13, 22, xiii. 3, xix. 9, xxx. 6. Cf. also xv. 16.

³ See von Rad, *Gottesvolk*, p. 82.

conscious that their teaching on certain matters exhibits a progressive change; and we may inquire how that of Deuteronomy is related to these several trends of thought.

TRENDS TRACEABLE IN THE PROPHETS

In the prophetic writings, from Amos to Jeremiah, there are certain trends which correspond to the national development as it is shown to us in the historical books, and in this the prophets and the books of Kings and Chronicles confirm one another. There is a gradual change (*a*) in the outlook on the surrounding nations, (*b*) in the religious declension, (*c*) in the nearing of God's threatened judgment, and (*d*) in the transference of the hope for the nation as a whole to that of the salvation of the chosen few. In each of these matters there is a slowly changing emphasis with which the outlook of Deuteronomy may be compared.

a. The surrounding nations

After the happy days of David's victories and Solomon's rise to power, we find ourselves with the books of Amos and Hosea in the days of Uzziah king of Judah, and Jeroboam II, king of Israel. It was a time of general prosperity, the most powerful neighbour being Syria to the north-east.

In Amos ii, iii the prophet announces punishment on the nations for their sins, Damascus (Syria), the Philistines, Tyre, Edom, Moab and Ammon; finally Judah and Israel also. The house of Israel is to 'go into captivity beyond Damascus' (v. 27). Egypt is mentioned only incidentally (iii. 9, iv. 10, ix. 5), or looking back to the exodus (ii. 10, iii. 1, ix. 7), not as a potential friend or enemy; Assyria is not mentioned at all.

In Hosea both Egypt and Assyria enter into the foreground of the picture and we see the rulers of Israel looking for help to these powerful neighbours, instead of to their God (v. 13, vii. 11, viii. 9, 10, xii. 1, xiv. 3); renewed captivity in Egypt is threatened (viii. 13), or in Assyria (x. 6).

After Uzziah's death (Is. vi. 1) Isaiah prophesies and the scene is changed again. In the days of Ahaz, Syria joins with Israel to make war on Judah, but Isaiah prophesies their downfall at the hands of Assyria (chapter vii).

In Is. xv-xix dooms are pronounced upon Moab, Damascus, Ethiopia and Egypt; in chapter xx Assyria is seen as the conquering power. Babylon, 'the glory of kingdoms', comes into view, and Media on the widening horizon (xiii. 1, 17).

His contemporary Micah foresees the captivity in Babylon (iv. 10). Zephaniah foretells the utter destruction of Nineveh (ii. 13).

By Jeremiah the downfall of Assyria, the rise of Nebuchadnezzar, the fall of Jerusalem and the Babylonian captivity are all vividly portrayed.

Where in this series can a place be found for Deuteronomy? The great warring powers of Assyria and Babylon seem to be unknown.

Syria is known only as the place where Jacob once dwelt (xxvi. 5). The only wars known are those against the kings of the Amorites and those soon to be waged against the early inhabitants of Canaan.

Egypt and Moab are seen as lands which have been recently passed through and whose nationals may be seeking entry into the community of Israel (xxiii. 3, 7). The Philistines are known by their ancient name of Caphtorim (ii. 23; cf. Gn. x. 14).

The only place for this outlook in the prophetic series is at the very beginning.

b. Religious declension

As we pass from the early prophets to their successors we see tokens of a religious decline.

Hosea and Amos lived in days of material prosperity and moral corruption. These two well deserve the title of 'reform' prophets; they call on the people to amend their ways and 'return' to Yahweh. Hosea reminds them of the covenant which they have transgressed (vi. 7, viii. 1), recalls them to a law which they have 'forgotten' (iv. 6), and to 'return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king' (iii. 5). He wages his polemic against the calf worship at Bethel,¹ and mourns over them as having fallen away from a better past (xiii. 4-6). Israel is far gone, Judah following (i. 6, 7, iv. 15, xi. 12).

¹ iv. 14-17, viii. 5, 6, x. 5-7.

Amos tells a similar tale. He also looks back on 'the days of old' (ix. 11), but now the people have 'despised the law of the LORD' (ii. 4). The forms of religion are kept up (v. 21-24), but mixed with idolatry (iii. 14, vii. 13); the poor are oppressed, luxury and dishonesty are rife.

Isaiah's picture is darker. Worship is no longer acceptable, their hands are stained with blood (i. 10-15). They have 'rejected the law of Yahweh' (v. 24), and 'broken the everlasting covenant' (xxiv. 5), the evil is nation-wide (i. 5, 6) and judgment is at the door (x. 4-6).

Jeremiah continues the sad lament. The people go 'backward and not forward'. They are 'worse than their fathers' (vii. 26). Early in his ministry, in words reminiscent of Deuteronomy,¹ he bids them remember the covenant in Horeb, and obey, in order that Yahweh 'may perform the oath which I have sworn unto your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey' (xi. 3-5).

But it is useless; the people 'harden their necks' (xix. 15) and will follow the imagination of their evil hearts (xviii. 12). The king casts the written word into the fire (Je. xxxvi. 23). Jeremiah's appeals are all in vain. The covenant in Horeb is gone beyond recall (xxxii. 32), nevertheless in the future a new covenant (xxxii. 33, xxxii. 40) is seen in vision.

In this sad story of downward progress there is no place for the happy optimism of Deuteronomy except at the beginning; the covenant in Deuteronomy is still unbroken² (v. 2, xxix. 1).

c. Impending judgment

In Hosea and Amos the words of judgment are like approaching thunder, and there is yet hope that the storm may be averted (Ho. xiv. 2-5; Am. v. 15).

Amos proclaims 'the day of the Lord' as being 'darkness and not light' (v. 18-20), but it is undated.

In Hosea threats of judgment (ii. 10-13, v. 14, 15) alternate with

¹ The whole passage (xi. 1-10) implies Jeremiah's knowledge of Josiah's covenant (2 Ki. xxiii. 3). On its relation to Deuteronomy see Rudolph, *Jeremia*, p. 67.

² 'Deuteronomy looks on the covenant as existing, the prophets look on it as destroyed', von Rad, *Gottesvolk*, p. 60.

promises of mercy (ii. 14-16, vi. 1, 2), but there is nothing definite in point of time.

Isaiah sees the hand of God 'stretched out' in judgment (x. 4); 'the day of the Lord is at hand' (xiii. 6); Jerusalem shall fall as Samaria has already fallen (x. 11); the people shall go into exile (v. 9-14, x. 4, xiii. 4-9, xxii. 1-14, xxiv). Zephaniah repeats the words 'the day of the Lord is at hand' and follows them with further threats of judgment (i. 7-18). In Jeremiah the final warnings are uttered, the enemy is at the gates, and Jerusalem falls.

Compared with this, in Dt. xii-xxvi the sun shines out of a cloudless sky.¹

d. The people of God

Von Rad has drawn attention to the outlook of Deuteronomy upon Israel as the people of God, and contrasted it with that of the prophets.² In this Hosea stands nearest to Deuteronomy; he sees the people as a whole and in isolation.

With the ethical prophets the tendency is to universalism on the one hand, and on the other, to distinguish sections, classes, a remnant, and at last individuals. This tendency begins with Hosea. Indeed, he sometimes treats Israel as a whole, whether in rebuke (iv. 1-3) or promise (xiv). Yet there is a sharp distinction between Ephraim and Judah;³ he marks a difference between them (i. 6, 7, iv. 15) and hopes for their reunion (i. 11, iii. 5). He selects the princes for special blame (v. 10, vii. 16, viii. 4, ix. 15); the priests also as little better, or even worse (v. 1, vi. 9, x. 5).

Amos speaks to 'the whole family' which came out of Egypt, and all Israel is involved in the common punishment (iii. 2, viii. 8). Yet he foresees that there is hope for 'the remnant of Joseph' (v. 15), and announces a sifting process between the good grain and the 'sinners of the people' (ix. 9, 10).

¹ Dt. xxviii threatens judgment on disobedience in terms of a siege. In consequence some scholars regard it as in whole or in part post-exilic. Yet it bears no trace of Babylonian influence, there is no hint of time, and the severity of the terms savour more of a deterrent than of a retrospect. Von Rad says that in Deuteronomy judgment falls on *some* people because of *possible* revolt. In the prophets it is inescapable (*ibid.*, p. 76).

² *Gottesvolk*, pp. 74-83.

³ Ephraim is named thirty-seven times and Judah fifteen times.

With Isaiah the ethnic character of the judgment gives way to the ethical; the distinction is drawn between those who are 'willing and obedient' and those who 'refuse and rebel' (i. 19, 20). There will be a refining process by which the pure metal is separated from the dross (i. 22-25, iv. 4); the sinners and the righteous shall not be treated alike (xxxiii. 14, 15). The thought of a faithful 'remnant' assumes greater prominence (i. 19, 20, x. 20-22, xi. 11, 16). The restoration of this remnant begins to take on the form of a Messianic kingdom (chapters vii, ix, xi).

By Jeremiah the particularizing process is carried still further. The fall of Jerusalem is now imminent and captivity certain, yet a remnant may be saved (xxxiii. 3, xxxi. 7). In the end the new covenant will be based upon the faith of the individual (xxxii-xxxiv).

In this matter also the stream flows steadily in one direction, and again Deuteronomy is seen at the fountain head; it is the people as a whole that are viewed as the people of God (Dt. xxvi. 17-19).

Here is a fourfold cord not easily broken. We may add two other considerations of a similar character. The names of God, as shown in Chapter III, which are used in Deuteronomy do not include several which were commonly employed by the prophets; and there is in Deuteronomy a noticeable absence of eschatology. Regarding the latter von Rad says, 'the book stands absolutely apart from all the broad eschatological conceptions which we find taken up by the prophets . . . in the period of the monarchy. When we read the prophets, Deuteronomy's proclamation of salvation as a present reality seems to come as if from another world.'¹ He speaks of this as a problem and a paradox, attributable to the Mosaic setting. The paradox vanishes and the problem is solved if the early date of Deuteronomy be granted. Viewed from all these aspects, the impression made is the same: the true order is the Law and the Prophets, not the Prophets and the Law.

¹ *Studies*, pp. 72, 73.