

Themelios

An International Journal for Pastors and Students of
Theological and Religious Studies

Volume 10

Issue 3

April, 1985



Contents

Editorial: Gospel studies from Tübingen

Ordination

David F. Wright

Recent trends in Roman Catholicism

Carl F. Wisløff

The date of Deuteronomy: linch-pin of Old Testament criticism Part One

Gordon Wenham

Index to Themelios Volumes 1–10

Book Reviews

David Wenham, "Editorial: Gospel Studies from Tübingen," *Themelios: Volume 10, No. 3, April 1985* (1985): 3–4.

Editorial: Gospel Studies from Tübingen

Exciting things have been happening in Tübingen. Last year in *Themelios* I reviewed and warmly commended a book on Jesus as teacher, written by Rainer Riesner, a lecturer in Tübingen University.¹ Now a further book on the gospels, which is also of considerable significance, has come from the same Tübingen publisher. This time it is a symposium edited by Professor Peter Stuhlmacher, and it contains the papers presented at an international conference held in Tübingen in 1982. The book is entitled *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien (The Gospel and the Gospels)*,² and its sixteen essays—written by an international team of authors in German and English—look at a wide range of subjects.

The exciting thing about the symposium is that it shows that the radically sceptical approach to the gospels, represented by Rudolf Bultmann and other form and redaction critics, has by no means won the day in New Testament scholarship inside or outside Germany. Indeed some of the most important New Testament scholars of our day have contributed to this symposium, and almost with one accord they believe that the evangelists were concerned to preserve a reliable account of Jesus' life and teaching.

Perhaps the most fascinating article is one in German by the famous Swedish scholar Birger Gerhardsson on 'The Way of the Gospel Tradition'. He starts with the observation that the gospel stories of Jesus are used very little in the New Testament outside the gospels. This cannot be because they were unknown or not widely known (despite some critics' views); it must be because the stories of Jesus were passed on from the very beginning as a distinct and special tradition. Gerhardsson suggests that this tradition was transmitted in three contexts: at the church's celebrations of the Lord's Supper, in the catechesis of church members, and also in the context of what we would call Bible study. Gerhardsson believes that the earliest Christians, who saw Jesus as supremely great and who knew that he was a teacher, will certainly have been concerned to study his teaching and to pass it on; the twelve had a special role in this process. (He defends the thesis of his book *Memory and Manuscript* against its critics, explaining that he never intended to suggest that Jesus operated just like the Jewish rabbis.) Gerhardsson criticizes the form critical approach to the gospels on many counts, as do other contributors to the volume. For example, he is doubtful about how much one can deduce about the history of traditions from their form: the form of the gospel stories may tell us as much about the literary influences on the evangelists—they used familiar forms from the Old Testament

¹ *Jesus als Lehrer* (Tübingen: J.C. B. Mohr, 1981), now in its second edition, reviewed in *Themelios* 9:3 (1984).

² Published by J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1983, viii + 455pp., DM 178.

and elsewhere—as about the situation and needs of the evangelists' churches. And the idea that 'pure' forms are older than 'mixed' forms is unpersuasive.

Another particularly interesting article is by Rudolf Pesch on Mark 14:12–26. Pesch is the author of a massive two-volume commentary in German on Mark's gospel (in the Meyer series), and is one of the leading Catholic New Testament scholars in Germany. In his article he defends his controversial thesis that behind Mark chapters 8–16 there is a substantial pre-Markan passion narrative that was formulated in the Jerusalem church as early as AD 37. He takes Mark 14:12–26 as a test case: he argues that the Markan Last Supper narrative is the oldest form we have (older than Paul's form in 1 Cor. 11), that the institution narrative is not separable from its context in Mark, and that the context (including Jesus' secretive instructions to the disciples about finding the upper room) is historical reminiscence, not theological construction. Other scholars have found Pesch's relatively conservative views incredible; he argues vigorously that his case has not been answered and suggests that his critics are too much in the grip of the radical form critical consensus.

Martin Hengel's article on problems in Mark begins by describing Mark as a gospel in conflict, and he reminds us that Pesch's view of Mark is not the only scholarly view on offer: at the other end of the German scholarly spectrum W. Schmithals sees Mark as little more than a historical novel with a minimal basis in tradition. The fact that scholarly opinion can diverge so widely is a reminder to treat the overconfident assertions of many scholars with caution. Hengel goes on to look at form and redaction criticism, noting how the new critical orthodoxy sees the gospels, including Mark, as theology rather than history, and how the critics look for subtle theological meanings in the same sort of way as the ancient allegorists looked for deeper meanings in Scripture. Hengel objects to this trend, and asserts that Mark's readers would (rightly) have seen Mark's gospel as historical biography, a category of literature with which they were familiar. Mark was indeed a dramatist and a theologian—bringing out, for example, the reality of sin and the centrality of the cross—but he was also a respectable historian by ancient standards. Mark did not need to dehistoricize the tradition in order to address people: the good news is precisely that history and address come together. Hengel has a useful consideration of the Messianic secret motif in Mark, siding with those who believe that the different ingredients that make up the so-called Messianic secret in Mark are to be differently explained and that they are not a theological construct: thus the demons must be silenced as Jesus' enemies; Jesus does not wish to be a popular wonder-worker, and so seeks to keep his miracles quiet; Mark's portrayal of the disciples' failure to understand Jesus is a reflection of the evangelist's honest anthropology. Hengel believes that Jesus did see himself as Messiah, but that he chose to present his claims indirectly. Hengel argues in favour of the early church tradition that the gospel was written by Mark, who was associated with Peter.

The articles so far described are all in German. The article on Luke in the volume is by Howard Marshall and is in English. In it he considers the purpose of Luke-Acts, helpfully alerting us to the fact that an author may have a variety of aims: a main conscious aim, subsidiary aims and even unconscious aims. He insists that in identifying Luke's aims we must take Luke-Acts together; he argues that, when Luke in his prologue speaks of others having written an account and then of his own decision to write, he does not mean to imply that the other accounts are unreliable, but only that he intends to write

a fuller account, including the story of the church, which he has ‘followed closely’, indeed participated in. Marshall reviews various concerns of Luke—for example, his Jew-Gentile interest, his interest in showing how the story of Jesus led into and was continued in the church, etc.—but he finally sums up Luke’s overall aim thus: ‘It is to show “how we got here” in the sense of giving an account of Christian origins which will demonstrate how salvation was brought to the world by Jesus and the apostolic witnesses who testified to Jesus. The effect of reading this account will be to give assurance to people such as Theophilus that what they had been taught catechetically was sound and reliable.’ As for Luke’s motivation in writing, this may have been quite simply to document and fill out Theophilus’ knowledge of the gospel which he had heard and learned. Luke is indeed concerned with theology, and he has shaped his gospel accordingly; but this point should not be exaggerated: Luke is concerned to express his theology through an accurate historical account of what happened. Marshall comments that ‘In general a writer whose declared aim is reliability is more likely to achieve it than one who has no concern for it, or is deliberately writing a fictitious or semi-fictitious narrative.’

Other essays in English in the volume include a useful survey of gospel criticism by Earle Ellis, in which he brings together many significant observations, noting for example, about source criticism, the fragility of the ‘Q’ hypothesis, and about form and redaction criticism, the anti-supernatural prejudice of the Bultmannian school and the dubious usefulness of the criteria of authenticity. He, like other contributors to the volume, considers that the burden of proof is on those who deny the authenticity of the gospel traditions rather than on those who affirm it. He has less support from other contributors in arguing that the words of Christian prophets, speaking in the name of Jesus, have sometimes been incorporated in the gospels. Robert Guelich’s article is a look at ‘The Gospel Genre’, and usefully summarizes attempts to find analogies to the gospels in Jewish and Hellenistic literature. Guelich finds no close analogies, and believes that it was Mark who developed the gospel genre out of the sort of preaching ‘form’ that we find in Acts 10:34–43. Graham Stanton, writing on ‘Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus’, argues that Matthew did ‘create’ gospel material, but only to elucidate and apply the traditions he received. I suspect that Matthew is even more conservative than Stanton suggests. James Dunn invites us to ‘Let John be John’, arguing that the author of John’s gospel had access to and an interest in tradition, but that he developed that tradition in his own way to express his particular ascending-descending Christology and in interaction with late first Judaism. He rejects the more conservative views of John of scholars such as John Robinson and D. A. Carson.

In addition to the articles already mentioned, there are essays in German by O. Betz on Jesus’ gospel of the kingdom, in which he finds significant theological unity in Matthew, Mark and Luke; by Athanasius Polag on the theology of Q; by R. Feldmeier on the portrayal of Peter in the synoptic gospels; by L. Abramowski on Justin’s ‘reminiscences of the apostles’; by Otfried Hofius on ‘Unknown Words of Jesus’ (he finds very few dominical words outside the gospels); and by A. Dihle on Greek biography. Finally, there are two significant essays by the editor, Peter Stuhlmacher: in his article on ‘The Pauline Gospel’ he argues that there was a split between Paul and the Jerusalem church after Paul’s clash with Peter at Antioch (Gal. 2:11–14), which explains Paul’s resolutely independent stance. This controversial view may perhaps seem

reminiscent of old-style Tübingen views, but Stuhlmacher goes on to argue that Paul was very much at one with the Jerusalem church in his theology and that various aspects of his teaching, for example on the atonement, were derived from the tradition of the Jerusalem church. In his essay introducing the whole volume Stuhlmacher ranges over a great many issues: like others of the authors he rejects the sceptical form critical view of the synoptic gospels, and argues that we should approach the gospels with critical sympathy, not mistrust: the gospel tradition was under the control of eye-witnesses, and the church was conscious of the need to resist false prophets. He sees John's gospel as a much more theological and less historical gospel, though he admits that the Johannine question is one needing more study. (We may look forward to the publication of John Robinson's 1984 Bampton Lectures for further light on John.) Stuhlmacher also looks at Paul's evidence and at the question of the origin of the 'gospel' form, a question addressed by several authors.

Enough has been said to show the interest of this new book and to justify devoting much of this editorial to it, though that may also be justified by the likely inaccessibility of the book to many people because of its price—let us hope for a paperback edition!—and because of its use of two languages. The articles are not the last word on the subjects they discuss: that is made clear by the useful discussion-summaries that follow the articles and explain how the conference reacted to the arguments presented; conservative readers will feel that the authors have not gone far enough in questioning common critical views. But, if the book does reflect a new trend in gospel studies in Germany and around the world—if it reflects a return among critical scholars to an appreciation of the gospels as records of Jesus' life (not primarily as reflections of church theology) and a return to an appreciation of the evangelists as historians concerned to preserve, not to create, tradition—then it is much more significant than the average symposium. If gospel scholars can escape the domination of sceptical approaches and rationalistic doubt, then they will still have many questions to answer and wrestle with but they are more likely to understand the gospels correctly and so to enable the church to proclaim the good news of Jesus effectively.

Another significant study of the gospels coming from Tübingen is Seyoon Kim's "*The Son of Man*" 'as the Son of God'.³ Dr Kim is a Korean scholar who has already put students of the New Testament greatly in his debt by his stimulating book on *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*,⁴ in which he shows the decisive importance of Paul's Damascus Road experience for his theological thinking. In this new book Kim turns to Christology, summarizing research done by him at Tübingen. Studies of New Testament Christology very often examine the different titles ascribed to Jesus in the gospels, such as 'Son of man', 'Messiah', *etc.*, without offering a coherent explanation of how the different titles and other aspects of Jesus' person and work relate to each other (if they do at all). Kim, however, proposes an integrated approach to gospel Christology. His thesis is summed up in his conclusion: 'With "the 'Son of Man' ", Jesus intended discreetly to reveal himself as the Son of God who creates the new people of God (the children of God) at the eschaton, so that they may call God the Creator "our Father" and live in his love and

³ Published by J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, x + 118pp., DM43.

⁴ Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1981; also published by Eerdmans/Paternoster and reviewed in *Themelios* 9:3 (1984).

wealth' (p. 99).

The key text for his study is Daniel 7. He argues that at the time of Jesus it was quite possible to interpret the 'one like a son of man' in Daniel 7:13 as the Son of God (a divine, more than human, figure, *cf.* Ezk. 1:26), as the Messiah and as the embodiment of God's people (the saints of the most high), and to take the vision of Daniel 7:13ff. as descriptive of the elevation of God's people as embodied in their head, the Son of man, to divine sonship and kingly rule. He believes that this is how Jesus saw his ministry. And Jesus linked the representative Son of man figure of Daniel 7 with the representative Servant figure of Isaiah 40–55, seeing himself as bringing God's people to 'sonship'—or, to put it differently, as bringing God's new covenant and kingdom—through his death as suffering servant on their behalf.

Kim reaches his conclusion through a highly compressed and often technical study of New Testament texts and of relevant Jewish texts (a study sprinkled with quotations in Hebrew, Greek and German). Some of his argument is, confessedly, rather speculative, but much of it is valuable. For example, he effectively criticizes H. E. Tödt's view that only the future Son of man sayings go back to Jesus. He agrees with C. F. D. Moule that the article in the expression '*the* Son of man' is significant, being intended to allude to Daniel 7. The title expressed what Jesus wanted to say of himself; it also had a measure of ambiguity about it, and no misleading messianic overtones. Kim has a useful discussion of Mark 10:45, seeing it as a genuine saying of Jesus (and as expressing ideas taken from Is. 43:3f. and Is. 53), and argues rather controversially that it originally belonged in the context of the Last Supper (*cf.* Lk. 22:27ff). He links John 13 and the 'new commandment' with the synoptic account of the Last Supper and the 'new covenant'.

Kim's book is only a brief interim research report; and the author plans a major study of Jesus as Son of man. No doubt this will deal with other recent discussions of the Son of man usage (such as that of B. Lindars, which differs radically from Kim's). If this present book is anything to go by, we have something very good and important to look forward to.

Ordination

David F. Wright

The author is Senior Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History at Edinburgh University, and is an Associate Editor of Themelios. We are grateful for this study of a topic that is of great importance to many readers.

A recent study of 'Ministry and Ordination in Early Christianity against a Jewish Background' by E. J. Kilmartin declared that 'almost every issue related to the subject [of ordination] remains unsolved'.¹ No consensus has been reached about Jewish practice in the first century, and, partly for this reason, uncertainty shrouds also what was done, and why, in the primitive Christian congregations. Most of the limited New Testament texts relevant to the question are susceptible of divergent interpretations, and second-century sources such as the Apostolic Fathers have surprisingly little to say about the manner of appointment to ecclesiastical responsibilities. It is not until Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* early in the third century that we encounter our first extended evidence on early church ordination.

This lack of historical clarity about its origins is not the main reason why ordination is a talking-point in contemporary theology. After all, the limitations of the primitive sources have long been recognized, even if the relevance of later rabbinic traditions to first-century Judaism has only latterly become subject to more stringent scrutiny. Far more influential have been the modern recovery of a more corporate understanding of the church as the people of God in Christ and the accompanying widespread disaffection with restrictive notions of ministry. In these developments the 'Biblical Theology' movement and the charismatic renewal have played a significant role, and the impact has been felt in the Roman Catholic Church of the Vatican II era as strongly as anywhere. If all church members have gifts (charismata) for service (ministry) within the body of Christ, why are only a select few, normally one per congregation, 'ordained' or in any way publicly commissioned to that service?

At the same time the laying on of hands, which has traditionally been the ritual core of ordination, has come to be more widely used. This has happened particularly in connection with the revival of interest in the Christian ministry of healing, which itself, to a considerable measure, has been promoted by the Pentecostal and charismatic upsurge, though it has not been confined to these circles. Laying on of hands is not the only tactual gesture to be enjoying something of a vogue among Christians. In this particular case, its reactivation has focused attention on its varied uses and meanings in the New Testament, with concomitant questioning of its allegedly distinctive significance in ordination.

For all these and other reasons, including the increasingly ecumenical context of ecclesiastical and theological life and, not least, the current fashionable distaste for the merely

traditional, many churches have been taking a critical look at their practice of ordination. What happens in the author's own church, the Church of Scotland, for example, may seem to those of other traditions to be fraught with intolerable inconsistency. Ordination is given not only to clergy-ministers but also for life to elders, who would be regarded in most other denominations as laity. Moreover, elders are ordained without laying on of hands. At the same time the Church commissions or sets apart rather than ordains deaconesses and full-time lay agents (lay missionaries), as well as readers who like elders are only spare-time Christian ministers (if you get my meaning). The illogicalities are compounded when you learn that the ordination service for elders is to be found not in the *Ordinal and Service Book for use in Courts of the Church* but in the *Book of Common Order*, which does not contain the order for ordination of clerical ministers, whereas the orders for the setting apart of missionaries and deaconesses are printed in neither book but 'will be supplied on application to the Secretary of the Committee concerned'. The discipline at work here, one is sure, is not that of secrecy but of (financial) economy or (administrative) convenience.

Ordination is a difficult subject to discuss in isolation from church and ministry with their multiple ramifications. All that this brief article can hope to do is to attempt a somewhat selective survey of some areas of recent discussion.

Jewish Antecedents

Lawrence Hoffman's recent study of 'Jewish Ordination on the Eve of Christianity'² argues that in rabbinic Judaism of the tannaitic period, *i.e.* the first two centuries, there is no evidence of a rite of ordination by laying on of hands. The use of laying on of hands in Moses' commissioning of Joshua (Nu. 27:22-23; Dt. 34:9) with the verb *sāmak*, 'to lean, lay, rest', does not, in Hoffman's view, establish a parallel rabbinic custom when the same verb *sāmak* is used. Only about half-a-dozen rabbinic texts are at issue, whereas in about 150 occurrences of *semikāh* the reference is unambiguously to laying hands *on sacrificers*. Hoffman concludes that in the handful of uncertain instances *semikāh* denotes not ordination but sacrificial imposition of hands.

He proceeds to claim that such evidence as is available from the post-tannaitic era suggests that prior to *c.* 200 rabbis were appointed 'by mouth', 'by naming', explicitly not 'with hands'. Furthermore, the normal verb of appointment is not *sāmak* but *mānāh*, 'to assign, appoint'. The ordination of a rabbi would thus have been effected by a formulaary announcement, but the dominant use of *mānāh* shows that 'no specific term arose to define rabbinic appointment. Strange as it may seem to us, who single out clerical appointment from all others, ordination in Palestine was subsumed, terminologically at least, along with other civil

designations. Rabbis were "ordained" in that they were appointed to specific functions as communal workers; they were part of the civil service of their day.³

Such radical conclusions are by no means shared by all scholars. Although it is widely recognized that rabbinic ordination by laying on of hands prior to AD 70 is at best unproven, it is widely held that the example of Moses in Numbers 27:15-23 and Deuteronomy 34:9 became the basis of rabbinic practice, understood as the teacher's handing on to his pupil the very spirit of Moses. Whereas Hoffman confined his enquiry entirely to Jewish evidence, other writers have explicitly taken cognizance of Christian sources, notably 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6, in concluding that the rabbinic rite must have antedated AD 70. That is to say, the Christian ordination of the Pastorals is close enough to the post-AD 70 model of the ordination of the Jewish teacher by *semikâh* of hands as to overcome any serious doubts about the pre-70 currency of the Jewish rite. This is broadly the opinion of Kilmartin, Eduard Lohse⁴ and Georg Kretschmar.⁵

On the other hand, Arnold Ehrhardt, in a much-noticed article, discounted the dubious evidence for Jewish *semikâh* ordination before AD 70 and argued that the Pauline rite of laying on of hands derived from the *direct* influence of the Mosaic commissioning of Joshua.⁶ Primitive Jewish Christianity, on the other hand, adopted a different practice, appointment by solemn seating, literally installation, which is attested for the elders of the Sanhedrin.

Yet other scholars deny any significant influence upon early Christian ordination from the Old Testament or Judaism, other than perhaps from laying on hands in blessing, as in Genesis 48:14ff. According to Everett Ferguson, 'the employment of the imposition of hands in the early church derives from the example of Jesus', both in more obvious blessings like Mark 10:16 and in the more frequent healings which were blessings of a particular kind.⁷ Ferguson cites a wide range of patristic material to show that the idea of blessing or benediction continued after the apostolic era to unify diverse occasions when the imposition of hands was used. It signified the bestowal of blessing and a petition for divine favour, and not the creation of a substitute or the transfer of authority.

New Testament

Everett Ferguson's interpretation has the obvious merit of attempting to hold together the different uses of laying on of hands in the New Testament documents. It enables him also to infer its use in the appointment of elders in Acts 14:23 from the apostles' 'committing them to the Lord' with prayer and fasting, even though there is no explicit reference to it. His approach also suggests one way of making consistent sense of 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6, which are the two least controverted mentions of ordination by laying on hands in the New Testament. In his *Institutes* Calvin harmonized these two texts by referring them to a single occasion when Paul laid hands on Timothy to commission him to 'the office of presbyter' (4:3:16), for this was how he interpreted the genitive *tu presbyteriou*. In his commentary on 1 Timothy 4:14, however, he allows as equally acceptable the more natural sense 'of the body of the presbyters', 'of the presby-

tery', to which few scholars today would take exception. Should we then conflate the two verses and conclude that Paul presided in the presbytery in the ordination of Timothy? And what was the role of the prophetic utterance, through (*dia*) which the *charisma* was given to Timothy?

The question of the relation of these two Timothy texts has wider implications. If the assumed model is the rabbinical teacher's ordination of his pupil, this fits well with the preceding mention in 1 Timothy 4:13 of Timothy's ministry of teaching, but more suitably with Paul's personal commissioning of him in 2 Timothy 1:6 than with the presbytery's laying on of hands in 1 Timothy 4:14. The issue at stake is how Timothy's ordination, particularly when ascribed to Paul's action, is related to the church order evident elsewhere in the Pastoral Epistles. Many would see in 1 Timothy 5:22, 'Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands', an obvious allusion to the ordination of the presbyter-bishops (? and deacons) spoken of throughout the Pastorals. Others, however, attending to the mention of Timothy's grandmother and mother in 2 Timothy 1:5, with explicit reference to *the faith* Timothy shares with them rather than to any distinctive ministry of his, treat 2 Timothy 1:6 as an initiatory (baptismal or post-baptismal) laying on of hands, somewhat akin perhaps to the incidents in Acts in which the Spirit was received through the laying on of apostolic hands. An interpretation along Ferguson's lines, whether or not it adopts the initiatory reading of 2 Timothy 1:6, is at any rate less bothered by the similarities between such a verse and the happenings in Acts.

Scholars for whom the Pastorals are indubitably deutero-Pauline often direct attention to elements in these ordination texts which seem to cohere better with a Pauline than a deutero-Pauline context. Chief among these are the references to prophecy and twice to the *charisma* imparted by imposition of hands. At the same time it is pointed out that Paul's theology of *charisma* in 1 Corinthians and Romans contains no allusion to a rite of designation or appointment,⁸ and furthermore, that the only New Testament writings to mention such ritual acts belong to the Pauline school, *i.e.*, Acts 6:6, 13:3 and perhaps 14:23, and the Pastorals. This has led to the supposition that in non-Pauline churches commissioning by word alone may have been the norm, which could claim support from the remarkable silence in second-century sources about ordination by imposition of hands. Marcion, after all, judged the second-century churches to be suffering from Pauline malnutrition. Not even Irenaeus, with his profound concern for apostolic continuity of teaching leadership by presbyter/bishops, refers to such a use of laying on of hands.⁹

The tracing of lines of connection between the Pastorals and the events of Acts 6 and 13 is likely to interest evangelical students committed to the coherence of Scripture. While prophecy may provide such a link between 1 Timothy 4:14 and Acts 13, various scholars have hesitated to align the two actions too closely. The commissioning of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch has parallels with the Jewish institution of the *šāliah*, the plenipotentiary representative of religious authority, although the evidence for the Jewish use of imposition of hands is lacking.¹⁰ The considerable differences between the ministry to which Paul and Barnabas were commissioned and the service of presbyter-bishops in the local congregation need no highlighting, but the regional role

of Timothy, which is presumably in view at least in 1 Timothy 4:14, may occupy a position somewhat midway between these two poles. Evangelical missiologists have in recent years repeatedly appealed to Acts 13 in encouraging greater commitment by the congregation to mission further afield, but except in independent churches no scope exists for the use of laying on of hands in the congregation itself, whether for missionaries or ordinands.

The most obvious difference between Acts 6 and the Pastorals lies in the participation of the whole body of believers in the appointment of the Seven. The identity of the subject of 'laid their hands on them' in Acts 6:6 can perhaps not be decided with absolute certainty, but a natural exegesis would surely assign the action to the community as a whole. An analogy in Numbers 8:10 immediately suggests itself: 'When you present the Levites before the Lord, the people of Israel shall lay their hands upon the Levites.' T. F. Torrance has tied the two arrangements together in an article on 'Consecration and Ordination',¹¹ emphasizing that both Levites and the 'elder-deacons' of Acts 6 received a lay ordination. Yet there are differences even on Torrance's reading of the two incidents. The Levites' ordination by the whole people, albeit 'presumably through their elders', inducted them 'into responsible representation of the people, appointed to stand for the first-born of the people in their ministry at the Tabernacle', to which nothing comparable is asserted of the Jerusalem Seven,¹² while the apostles are explicitly excluded from the laying of hands on the Seven in order to show, in Torrance's view, that 'they were not being appointed as [the apostles'] deputies, but only as their assistants, *i.e.*, Levites!'

The setting apart of the Seven may well have been a one-off emergency arrangement. The rabbinic *semikah* rite, even if presumed to be current as early as this, provides no parallel to this offloading of some of the apostles' responsibilities onto the Seven, and the fact that the activities of two of their number, when observed later in Acts, bear no relation to the task allotted them here, tends to confirm the temporary *ad hoc* character of their appointment. The suggestion¹³ that their 'serving tables' had a eucharistic dimension to them should be resisted.

If such a selective survey may be validly said to have an outcome, it must be to stress the uncertainties attending much of the New Testament material supposedly germane to ordination. Only one text, 1 Timothy 4:14, can with firm confidence be regarded as attesting an observance recognizable in subsequent church history as ordination to 'the ministry'. Rabbinic *semikah* ordination remains the most plausible antecedent to this rite, but when we look for subsequent developments, a yawning gulf is exposed between the Pastorals and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus over a century later.¹⁴ In this work not only is a clear-cut clergy-laity distinction already operative but also a sharp differentiation obtains between bishop, of whom high-priestly language is now employed, and presbyter, and between both and deacon. The extent of the development since the first century is starkly revealed in comments appended to the prescriptions for appointing deacons:

The bishop alone shall lay on hands at the ordaining of a deacon for this reason, that he is not ordained for a priesthood but for the service of the bishop. . . . [The deacon] does not receive the Spirit

[? spirit] which is common to [all] the presbyterate . . . but that which is entrusted to him under the bishop's authority. . . . But upon the presbyters the [other] presbyters also lay their hands because of the similar Spirit [? spirit] [which is] common to [all] the clergy. For the presbyter has authority only for this one thing, to receive. But he has no authority to give holy orders. Wherefore he does not ordain [a man] to orders but [by laying on hands] at the ordination of a presbyter he [only] blesses while the bishop ordains.¹⁵

The intrusion of the language of priesthood strains almost to breaking point any continuity that is discernible with the New Testament, which must seem to centuries of Catholic tradition unconsciously deliberate in its avoidance of priestly categories for Christian ministers. This is no less true of manner of appointment than of ministerial function.

Congregation and Ordination

A notable absentee from the rites of ordination prescribed by Hippolytus is the congregation. It is present, and it has been involved in the election of the bishop, but that is all. So Hippolytus has no guidance to offer on what is arguably the most critical contemporary question about ordination. If, on ministry in general, we have to resolve the issue of the relationship between the special ministry of the full-time, professionally-trained, stipendiary ordained person and other ministries in the congregation or even the ministry of the whole congregation, so too we must face it at the point of ordination. Indeed, this is perhaps the most crucial pressure-point of all, for ordination has traditionally been the locus at which the ordinand has been decisively set apart from the church membership at large, in an act in which the congregation has played in the main the part of spectators. Neither has it had much to do beyond respond and receive, and that verbally rather than by any visible and tangible action and movement, nor has the ordination service provided a clear focus for the (re)ordination or (re)commissioning of the whole congregation to its ministry. That is to say, ordination has been anything but an occasion when the congregation reaffirms its own ultimate responsibility under God 'for the work of ministry' (Eph. 4:12), within which context alone can sound, biblically theological sense be made of what is being done to the ordinand.

It is disappointing to find the widely read Lima report *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM)* so limited on this question:

Ordination is an acknowledgment by the Church of the gifts of the Spirit in the one ordained, and a commitment by both the Church and the ordinand to the new relationship. By receiving the new minister in the act of ordination, the congregation acknowledges the minister's gifts and commits itself to be open towards these gifts.¹⁶

The import of even this minimal statement is diminished further by the uncertain reference to 'the Church'; its first use in the quotation must encompass more than the local congregation.

One looks in vain in *BEM* for acknowledgment of the widespread contemporary theologoumenon that baptism constitutes the commissioning or consecration of God's people to its royal priesthood. In baptism all Christians are ordained to the service of the gospel. (It is an emphasis that suggests fruitful speculation on the significance of that laying on of hands which was an element of primitive Christian

baptism, not merely in the somewhat exceptional incidents recorded in Acts.) This theology found breathtaking expression in Luther's early Reformation treatises:

Whatever issues from baptism may boast that it has been consecrated priest, bishop and pope, although it does not beseech everyone to exercise these offices. For, since we are all priests alike, no man may put himself forward or take upon himself, without our consent and election, to do that which we have all alike power to do. For, if a thing is common to all, no man may take it to himself without the wish and command of the community. . . . Therefore a priest should be nothing in Christendom but a functionary; as long as he holds his office, he has precedence of others; if he is deprived of it, he is a peasant or a citizen like the rest. . . . Between laymen and priests, princes and bishops, or, as they call it, between spiritual and temporal persons, the only real difference is one of office and function, and not of estate.¹⁷ Of this sacrament [of orders] the church of Christ knows nothing: it was invented by the church of the pope. It not only has no promise of grace, anywhere declared, but not a word is said about it in the whole of the New Testament. . . . Let every man then who has learnt that he is a Christian recognize what he is, and be certain that we are all equally priests, that is, that we have the same power in the word, and in any sacrament whatever, although it is not lawful for any one to use this power, except with the consent of the community.¹⁸

Such healthy radicalism was destined to undergo major qualification as the Lutheran protest settled into the mould of reformed churches. What did survive unscathed was a dominant emphasis on the congregational call and election of ministers. 'The principal criterion of the validity of an ordination in the Reformation churches was whether or not the essential elements of the call had been observed.'¹⁹ Procedures of selection, examination, presentation and approbation were paramount, and the solemn setting apart could itself be described as the 'election' in Calvinist churches anxious to avoid the distasteful medieval implications of 'ordination'. The Reformers also insisted that no ordination was to take place except to a specific ministerial charge. None was to be ordained without reference to an allotted congregational context. This meant in particular that ordination conferred no permanently indelible 'character'. It was absurd to suppose that after deposition or deprivation a priest or minister could not become a mere layman.²⁰ The overriding concern to mark a complete break with the medieval system of hierarchical priestcraft even went as far as dispensing with the laying on of hands in Geneva and, more decisively, in Scotland, although in time all Calvinist churches joined Lutherans and Anglicans in retaining this action.

The congregation's role in ordination is always likely to be restricted where what is imparted is viewed as coming from above or from without. The dominant values to be safeguarded will be the orderly transmission of ministerial authority in continuity with the apostolic tradition, even if not articulated in so many words as 'apostolic succession', the expression of the church's catholicity actualized in ordination by bishops or the ministers of the district or region, and what *BEM* calls 'the otherness of God's initiative, of which the ordained ministry is a sign' (p. 30). Concepts like these abound in recent ecumenical reports. When reinforced by common features in training and appointment procedures, they make it almost inevitable that ordination and induction will be seen as the injection from outside of an element essential to the validation of the congregation as a church of Christ, rather than as a significant stage in the congregation's

own assumption of responsibility for its mission and service.²¹

One of the most stimulating recent contributors to the debate about the relation between church and ministry has been E. Schillebeeckx, whose writings in this field must appear more revolutionary than any of his essays into Christology.²² Much of what he has to say is not directly related to ordination, but we may note his general observation that all the different patterns of New Testament church order developed *from below* but were experienced as coming *from above* because the whole life of the community was of God by Christ's gift of the Spirit.²³ Schillebeeckx enunciates 'an essentially ecclesial view of the ministry'.²⁴ In the later Pauline writings he finds that 'the church's ministry was in no way detached from the community or so to speak set above it; ministry is clearly incorporated into the totality of all kinds of services which are necessary for the community'.²⁵ Like other recent Catholic scholars,²⁶ he argues that 'The essence, and indeed the force of the [early church] concept of *ordinatio* [or *cheirotonia*] comprises the calling, the mandate of the sending of someone by a particular Christian community (the people and its leaders).... *Ordinatio* is an appointment or "incorporation" as minister to a community which calls a particular fellow-Christian and indicates him as its leader (or, above all in the earlier period, which accepts the actual charismatic emergence of one of its members and gives it official confirmation).'²⁷ That it is the ecclesiastical mandate and not the laying on of hands that constitutes ordination is confirmed by a canon of the Council of Chalcedon which declared null and void any *ordinatio* not to a specific congregation. There is here a remarkable joining of hands with some of the central principles of the Reformers. In particular Schillebeeckx explodes the misconception that the emergence of ministers from within the congregation *from below* is incompatible with their being appointed by Christ and given by the Spirit *from above*.

Ordination in Ecumenical Perspective

The papal bull of 1896, *Apostolicae Curae*, declaring Anglican orders invalid, is still the official verdict of Rome. In 1973 the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) issued an agreed statement on 'Ministry and Ordination'. Although it is not unpromising in its brief comments on ministry in general, it insists that the ordained ministry is 'not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit'. Not surprisingly, its account of ordination to this ministry which is of another order altogether to that of other members of the church, moves almost entirely in a supra-congregational stratosphere; the only nod in the direction of the congregation is the requirement that ordination takes place in the context of the eucharist.²⁸ It is a remarkably traditionalist statement, reflecting a complacent clericalism.

Note has already been taken of *BEM*, which represents the fruit of discussions among a very wide range of churchmen. Although it commends episcopacy, and hence invariable episcopal ordination, to non-episcopal churches, it betrays no hint that the latter lack an authentic apostolic ministry or require episcopal re-ordination. Its paragraphs on ordination are not couched in terms of an episcopal polity. Although it is far more cognizant than ARCIC of the new relation established between the minister and the local Christian community, it fails to reflect the Reformers' central emphasis

on what Schillebeeckx and others call 'the ecclesiastical mandate' as the heart of ordination. To this extent its section on ordination is insufficiently ecclesial, remaining too narrowly concerned with the divine gift of ordained ministry.

Most recently of all, an Anglican-Reformed International Commission has issued the result of four years of consultations in *God's Reign and Our Unity*.²⁹ We may pass over the report's interest in the Reformed churches' recovery of 'the historic continuity of ordinations'. It cites and endorses *BEM's* three pivotal paragraphs on ordination, and emphasizes in particular the focal and representative role of the minister in relation to the congregation and church as a whole. Ministers are presented as 'leaders, examples and enablers for the priestly ministry of the whole body in virtue of the special calling and equipment given to them in ordination. The one so ordained is called to be a focus of unity for the whole body. Ordination is the act which constitutes and acknowledges this special ministry of representation and leadership within the life of the Church both locally and universally.'³⁰ This reflects an advance on *BEM* which is grounded partly in the report's holding together ordained 'priesthood' (one is bound to ask how much longer this usage can survive exposure to the damning silence of the New Testament) and the priesthood of the whole body of the faithful. The crucial question remains what happens at the ordination service itself. More still needs to be said, both theologically and liturgically, about the commissioning of the congregation in relation to the ordination of the individual.

It has recently been suggested that in the evolution of ordination, both action and interpretation, two constants are operative: the action assigning office or ministry changes to express the community's understanding of that office or ministry, and the assignment ritual becomes more formal as the charismatic nature of the community yields to more formal structuring.³¹ What should we expect today as the community's renewed understanding of church and ministry shifts the centre of gravity in the reverse direction, from formalized structures towards a charismatic functionalism? There are grounds for thinking that the far-reaching modern recasting of theologies of church and ministry has yet to be worked through into not only the theory but more particularly the practice of ordination. One powerful factor that may well retard such revision is the appeal of ecumenical rapprochement with Catholics and Orthodox. Yet perhaps more potent still is the force of inertia in all our traditions. In ordination the professional interests of the clergy find privileged expression. It remains to be seen how long they will be able to resist the rightful claims of the whole congregation of God's people for a place, or better a hand, in their ordination. A recent article on Anglican practice by Michael Sansom of Ridley Hall, Cambridge,³² suggests that the laity should be involved in the laying on of hands. If the Anglicans will lead the way, who dare not follow?

Credo

Yes, the early Luther was right! Ordination must be viewed not simply in relation to the wider church extended in time or space, nor, as Michael Sansom points out, as the point of entry into a lifelong career as a member of the professional body ambiguously related to the church. Ordination is an act in which the local congregation says to a person:

You are the one we have chosen [and presumably therefore examined!] to lead us in our life of worship/discipleship/evangelism/service etc. [delete as required!] as a congregation. We gladly acknowledge the gifts God has given you for this role, we believe that God has appointed you for it and we pray in this service for the power of God's Spirit to enable you to fulfil it. Together with representatives of the wider church [surely including local representatives of other denominations], we set you apart to this ministry of leadership among us, and in so doing we consecrate ourselves afresh to our continuing ministry as God's people in this place.

There will follow the laying on of hands, in which some members of the congregation, including some 'ordinary' members, will take part. This act will be seen as both authorization (hence congregational involvement is essential) and prayer-blessing for God's grace and power. Then must follow some ceremony with appropriate action (and why not imposition of hands representatively on some members?) in which the congregation is recommissioned as, by baptism, the priestly people of God charged with declaring the wonderful deeds of the one who calls us out of darkness into light.

Such an approach would mean that each new induction to a fresh charge must not be too different from initial ordination. *There is no reason whatsoever why ordination along these lines should not be seen as an act of God as well as an act of the congregation and church.* The belief that only the ordained can ordain derives ultimately not from the conviction that only thus can ordination be an act of God (although it is frequently justified in these terms today), but from the mistaken notion that you can give only what you already have — whether charisma, character or authority. A New Testament doctrine of ministry has no room for such a presumption, and ordination is the place to say so.

¹In *Studia Liturgica* 13 (1979), pp. 42-69, at p. 45.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 11-41.

³*Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁴*Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen and Berlin, 1951).

⁵'Die Ordination im frühen Christentum', *Freiburger Zeits. für Philos. und Theolog.* 22 (1975), pp. 35-69. A similar line is followed in the more popular recent work by Marjorie Warkentin, *Ordination. A Biblical-Historical View* (Grand Rapids, 1962), pp. 16-25, although she states (p. 17 n. 1) that 'until such time as ordination in early Judaism can be dated more exactly the question must remain open'.

⁶'Jewish and Christian Ordination', *JEH* 5 (1954), pp. 125-138.

⁷'Laying On of Hands: Its Significance in Ordination', *JTS* n.s. 26 (1975), pp. 1-12, at p. 4. Cf. also his 'Jewish and Christian Ordination', *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 56 (1963), pp. 13-19.

⁸The use of *cheirotoneītheis* in 2 Cor. 8:19 is not an exception to this (cf. its use in Acts 14:23), although appointment by a ritual act cannot be excluded, any more than it can in other instances where verbs denoting election or appointment (e.g. *kathistanai*) are employed. It was only in ecclesiastical Greek that *cheirotoneō* later became the technical term for 'ordain', parallel to the Latin *ordinare*.

⁹Cf. Kilmartin, *art. cit.*, pp. 45-50, 54, 58, 63-64.

¹⁰Cf. Kretschmar, *art. cit.*, pp. 56-57, with further references.

¹¹*SJT* 11 (1958), pp. 225-253, at pp. 227, 236-237.

¹²Elsewhere, however, e.g. in his recent pamphlet *The Eldership in the Reformed Church* (Edinburgh, 1984), Torrance distinguishes the ministry of Presbyterian elders from that of clerical ministers of Word and sacraments as a responsive and representative ministry, leading the people to God in response to the ministry of Word and sacrament.

¹³Cf. Torrance, in the pamphlet noted in n. 12.

¹⁴Cf. Kretschmar, *art. cit.*, pp. 65-66. Hippolytus's work is accessible with least inconvenience in the translations by G. Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, ed. H.

Chadwick (London, 1968), and G. J. Cuming, *Hippolytus: A Text for Students* (Grove Liturgical Study, 8; Bramcote, 1976). For an index of the influence exerted by this work, especially in circles caught up in both liturgical renewal and ecumenical dialogue, cf. G. Wainwright, 'Some Theological Aspects of Ordination', *Studia Liturgica* 13 (1979), pp. 125-152.

¹⁵Dix, pp. 15-17; cf. Cuming, p. 13, for a version differing at several points.

¹⁶*Faith and Order Paper* no. 111 (Geneva, 1982), pp. 30-31.

¹⁷*Appeal to the German Nobility* (1520), cited from E. G. Rupp and B. Drewery, *Martin Luther* (London, 1970), pp. 43-44.

¹⁸*The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520), from Rupp and Drewery, p. 50.

¹⁹P. F. Bradshaw, 'The Reformers and the Ordination Rites', *Studia Liturgica* 13 (1979), pp. 94-107, at p. 101. Cf. Luther's short treatise of 1523, *That a Christian Assembly or Congregation Has the Right and Power to Judge All Teaching and to Call, Appoint, and Dismiss Teachers, Established and Proven by Scripture*, tr. E. W. & R. C. Grötsch in *Luther's Works*, ed. H. T. Lehmann, vol. 39 (Philadelphia, 1970), pp. 305-314.

²⁰Cf. Rupp & Drewery, p. 44, for Luther on this point.

²¹Cf. the comments in my essay 'Training the Whole Church for Ministry', in Jock Stein (ed.), *Ministers for the 1980s* (Edinburgh, 1979), pp. 42-53, at pp. 47-48.

²²*Ministry. A Case for Change* (London, 1981), and his essay in L. Grollenberg et al., *Minister? Pastor? Prophet? Grass-roots Leadership in the Churches* (London, 1980).

²³*Ministry*, p. 5; *Minister? . . .*, p. 63.

²⁴*Ministry*, p. 39.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 13. Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, *Christian Priesthood Re-examined* (Guildford, 1979), p. 23: official ministries 'are not offices instituted independently of the rest of the church by Christ or his apostles, offices whose holders bear rule over the church by an independent line of authority deriving from Christ'.

²⁶Cf. Kilmartin, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-62, referring to the work of P. van Beneden, *Aux origines d'une terminologie sacramentelle: Ordo, ordinare, ordinatio dans la littérature chrétienne avant 313* (Louvain, 1974).

²⁷*Ministry*, pp. 38ff.

²⁸ARCIC. *The Final Report* (London, 1982), pp. 36-38.

²⁹London and Edinburgh, 1984; pp. 52-57 deal with 'Ordination, Authority, Continuity'.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 51.

³¹P. E. Fink in *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology*, ed. A. Richardson and J. Bowden (London, 1983), pp. 418-420.

³²'The Doctrine of Ordination and the Ordained Ministry', *Churchman* 96 (1982), pp. 9-22, at p. 20.

Recent trends in Roman Catholicism

Carl F. Wisløff

The author is Professor of Church History at the Free Faculty of Theology in Oslo, Norway. We are grateful for this survey article.

At the beginning of the twentieth century Roman Catholicism was considered — by friends and foes alike — to be 'semper eadem' (forever the same): the Roman Catholic church had never changed and could never change. This, of course, was a simplification: the Roman Catholic church has been undergoing development throughout the centuries of its existence, and some of its greatest thinkers have endeavoured to explain how 'the development of Christian doctrine' (cf. the title of J. H. Newman's book, 1845) has taken place, and how the church in its changing historic appearances has always been 'the continuing incarnation of Christ' (J. A. Moehler, 1835), and so has been able to keep its identity intact.¹

By the year 1900 the Roman Catholic church was strong and powerful. How different from the situation at the time of the French Revolution, when the pope had to undergo great humiliation and the very existence of the Roman see seemed jeopardized! The strength of the Roman church was a result of a concentration on its own intrinsic nature. The great Pope Pius IX called the attention of the faithful to the typically Roman dogmas: the immaculate conception of Mary (dogmatized 1854) and the infallibility of the pope *ex cathedra* (1870). The pope solemnly condemned modern ideas such as democracy, liberalism and modern civilization (1864). Pope Pius X crushed theological modernism in the Roman church (encyclicals *Lamentabili* and *Pascendi domini gregis*, 1907). All priests and teachers had to swear 'the anti-modernist oath' (1910). A monolithic orthodoxy seemed to reign in the church.

This, however, was not the case. The modernist tendency was still there. Theologians like Henri de Lubac and Henri

Bouillard in their interpretation of scholastic theology actually criticized the traditional understanding of the dogmas. A new evaluation of Martin Luther and the Reformation and a new willingness to acknowledge the historic guilt of the Roman church paved the way for ecumenical openness. Pius XII seems to have been disturbed by these new tendencies. On 20 December 1949, he warned against continually drawing attention to the sins of the church while presenting analyses of the background to the Reformation.²

Pius XII felt that he had to stop the development that in his eyes constituted a threat to the church. In 1950 came his famous encyclical *Humani generis*. The pope warned against 'certain false opinions' which are 'disseminated not only among members of the clergy and in seminaries and religious institutions but also among the laity, and especially among those who are engaged in teaching youth'. Existentialism, a current philosophical way of thinking, threatened to lure people into a subversion of what is essentially Catholic, said the pope. Like his predecessor Pius IX, Pius XII wanted to mobilize the faithful to a wholehearted devotion to the Holy Virgin. On 1 November 1950, the dogma of Mary's assumption to heaven was promulgated, and in 1953-54 the Roman Catholic church celebrated a Marian year.³

A Catholic Bible movement has grown up in our century. While not absolutely a new phenomenon — contrary to a certain Protestant misconception there has never been a categorical prohibition against Bible reading in the Roman church — the modern Bible movement represents a new tendency. Bible societies have come into being and in some countries there is a constant and growing co-operation between Catholic and Protestant societies for Bible translation and Bible reading.

On an academic level Catholics seem to have accepted — without much reserve — the historical critical method of Protestant Bible research. Catholic exegesis has walked a long way since the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (1893) where Leo XIII clearly stated the church's belief in biblical inerrancy. In his *Divino afflante Spiritu* (1943) Pius XII opened the door for the study of the Bible as a revelation in history. Today the methods and results of Catholic Bible research seldom differ from those found in books written by liberal Protestant scholars; it is only from the 'imprimatur' in the Catholic dissertation that one can tell that it is not Protestant.

Vatican II

During the 1950s, it was felt by observers, great tensions existed inside the Roman church. The old monolithic orthodoxy seemed to prevail, but new tendencies, such as those which Pius XII had warned against, were still there. These tendencies came to the fore during the Second Vatican Council (1962-65). This Council — the most spectacular event in Christendom during the 1960s — has been discussed in countless books, and evaluations differ greatly. The only way to some understanding of the Roman church today is through an analysis of what happened during the Second Vatican Council.⁵

In his opening speech John XXIII emphasized two things especially. First: the salient point of the council was not to be a discussion of one article or another of the fundamental doctrine of the church; this was presumed to be well known and familiar to all. Second: the deposit of faith was one thing, the way in which it is presented was another. The pope explained that it was the latter which was now to be taken into consideration by the Council. And this is exactly what happened. The dogma of the church was not discussed, only confirmed, very often by direct quotation from the First Vatican Council (1869-70), for example concerning the Holy Virgin (*The Church*, 59) and the infallibility of the pope (*ibid.*, 25). The authority and position of the bishops was accentuated: just as Peter and the rest of the apostles were one 'college', so the pope (the successor of Peter) and the bishops (the successors of the apostles) form a college, the head of which is the pope. The college of bishops has no authority unless in unity with the pope. A selected group of bishops form the Synod of Bishops, which meets at specified times (see canons 330 and 342 in *The Code of Canon Law* (1983)).

The first work of Vatican II to be completed was the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. The liturgy of the Roman church was thoroughly reformed. This great work is a result of a development which had been on its way since the beginning of our century. The so-called 'Liturgical Movement' in France and Germany had called the church to a new understanding of its liturgical life. Men like Odo Casel and Johan L. Mayer criticized the traditional celebration of mass for concentrating too much on the performance of the priest. The service of the church, they felt, was too pompous, too individualistic — lay people saying their prayers instead of really participating in the common action of the eucharist. The congregation should engage in a joint action together with the priest, who — of course — is the one to perform the sacramental act of transubstantiation. The ideas of the Liturgical Movement were to a great extent accepted by the Council. Catholic congregations will now endeavour to

follow the advice of Pius X: You shall not pray *in* the mass — you shall pray *the* mass! The faithful are taught not only to 'hear mass', saying their own prayers while the priest ministers at the altar, but to follow the words of the liturgy, which are said in the vernacular. The huge Gothic or Baroque altars, before which the priest used to stand with his back to the congregation while saying the prayers, are still there, but the priest has taken his position *versus populum* (facing the congregation) behind a small table placed in the chancel. There is a new emphasis on preaching.⁶

This liturgical attempt to mobilize the laity is only one aspect of the new vision of the responsibility of the lay people. The new approach can be studied in the *Constitution on the Church* (1964). According to the traditional understanding the church is first of all the hierarchy. Now, however, the church is the people of God: following Vatican II lay people are called upon to share responsibility in the church. It is the decree on the *Apostolate of the laity* (1965) that laid the basis for a reconsideration of the position and importance of lay people.

All these efforts represent a trend towards a certain 'secularization' of the church. That expression could perhaps be misleading, but will easily be understood by anyone who has witnessed the spectacular change in the outward appearance of the Roman Catholic church. During the years of the Council the church was repeatedly criticized by its own members, for its alleged 'triumphalism' and for its pompousness, this being — it was claimed — a survival from the age of the Baroque. Let the church, it was said, be a home for men and women of today! So off went the clerical garb and the garb of nuns and sisters of mercy, with the result that anyone who saw ecclesiastical Rome thirty years ago might wonder today what has happened to all those people he used to see in the streets. The same thing seems to have happened in most countries. There is a story about an American nun who was asked, sometime in the uproarious 1960s, if she never used her old garb any more. Answer: well, only for picketing!

During the years of Vatican II an optimistic mood seemed to prevail. The church, it was felt, was on the offensive. Pope John XXIII's great word was 'aggiornamento', i.e. 'bringing up to date', which everyone seemed to think could only be a good thing. Pope John, so the anecdote goes, was asked by journalists why he had convoked the Council. In answer Pope John simply went and opened a window. One is tempted to say more things entered through that window than the pope could have anticipated. New winds have caused a great deal of antagonism within the church. The great, seemingly monolithic structure of the Roman Catholic church now seems to be split into various factions.⁷

Factions

Many Catholic priests and laymen are involved in *radical political parties*, sometimes even in revolutionary activity. These men and women — nuns are often active — protest against the social injustice, economic exploitation and political oppression they find in their societies. At the same time their protest is also directed against the traditional position of the church, which they accuse of being too lenient towards the established society. As one of the leaders, Leonardo Boff, puts it: 'the theology of liberation attempts to elaborate the total content of Christianity starting from the demands of social liberation, which anticipates and mediates final liberation in the kingdom'. Behind this thinking lies a

new eschatology: the kingdom of God will be brought about by a revolution, which is God's way of making all things new, radical Christians being the instrument in his hands.⁸

John Paul II has felt it necessary to deal with the radical priests and theologians in Latin America. In September 1984 a document was published in which the Vatican issued a challenge to that movement. The document takes a balanced position in so far as it strongly condemns dictatorship, corruption, economic exploitation, etc.; here the pope follows in the steps of the great social encyclicals of Leo XIII (*Rerum novarum*, 1891), Pius IX (*Quadragesimo anno*, 1931), John XXIII (*Mater et magistra*, 1961) and Paul VI (*Populorum progressio*, 1967). In all these documents economic liberalism is condemned as well as all kinds of exploitation of the poor. But most of all the document warns against a theology of liberation which uncritically borrows Marxist ideas. A revolutionary society will only create new forms of oppression and so the liberation theologians betray the poor they mean to help.⁹

Radical theologians, like Hans Küng and Edvard Schillebeeckx, have attracted much attention. Küng's book *Infallible? an Inquiry* (English ed. 1971) questions the cornerstone of Roman Catholicism, namely the infallibility of the pope when speaking *ex cathedra* on matters of faith and morals. Only God is infallible, says Küng, arguing from his philosophical supposition that no human statements, not even those of the Bible, are free of error. In a new book (*On being a Christian*, 1974) Küng questions the historicity of the virgin birth, the miracles of Christ, Christ's ascension to heaven, etc. His position is very similar to that of contemporary Protestant theologians of liberal persuasion such as Bultmann and Käsemann. He teaches a kind of modernistic theology which makes itself felt in almost every Christian church today. Küng has been repeatedly warned by Vatican authorities and was finally stripped of his post: the Congregation of the Faith issued a declaration to the effect that Küng could no longer teach as a Catholic theologian (December 1979). Schillebeeckx also has been summoned to Rome for questioning. His book *Jesus, An Experiment in Christology* (1974) is quite modernistic in its discussion of the deity of Christ. The French theologian and scientist P. Teilhard de Chardin (d. 1955) may be mentioned here; his posthumously published books present his controversial ideas about the universe as being in a process that will finally gather all things up in God.

These cases are not exceptional. On the contrary, one could say, with the words of a close observer of contemporary theology: 'The Catholic church is now becoming like the Protestant church: a mixture of everything. You have traditional Catholics who accept all dogmas in typical nineteenth-century form including a distinctive Roman Catholic ethic. At the opposite end, you have liberals who are uneasy about believing in God, let alone in a divine Christ.'¹⁰

The Dutch branch of Roman Catholicism used to be fervently traditionalistic. Not any longer. Since Vatican II Dutch Catholicism has moved in a markedly radical direction. A *Catechism for adults* (1967) caused a great deal of controversy because of its liberal tendency. A rather tolerant line has been taken on abortion and homosexuality. Lay men and women have been allowed to carry out tasks formerly

reserved for priests. To keep the priests of Holland in line, John Paul II chose a conservative archbishop of Rotterdam (1970), and ten years later called a number of Dutch bishops to the Vatican for an extraordinary synod. The bishops seem to have bowed to the Pope's insistence on questions of celibacy, liturgical liberties and on individual confession, which is said to be nearly extinct in Holland and in Germany. There should, it was said, be an end to common communion for Catholics and Protestants. In fact, the most progressive branch of the Roman Catholic church was disciplined by the pope and his advisers, primarily Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger.¹¹

The Jesuit order, traditionally considered to be the watchdog of Catholic tradition, formed by its founder Ignatius Loyola (1534) to be absolutely obedient to the pope, has been under severe criticism from the pope. In the USA and in Holland Jesuits have been in the forefront of the battle for social activism, birth control and ordination of women, and also on the matter of celibacy (which by many liberals is considered unsuitable outside of monasteries). In their concern for social justice many Jesuits have adopted Marxist ideas. Gustavo Gutierrez, one of the leading Latin American theologians of liberation, is a Jesuit. In April 1982 Pope John Paul appointed his own delegate as interim head of the Jesuit order. The pope has criticized their 'secularistic tendencies', and in 1982 he summoned Jesuit leaders from all parts of the world to a meeting in Rome, where he made it clear to them that they had to remember their oath of obedience to the supreme head of the church.¹²

An ultra-conservative group stands as the opposite extreme. At the close of Vatican II the French archbishop Marcel Lefebvre was convinced that the Council had acted under influence of neo-modernism. In 1969 he protested against Paul VI's new Mass Ordinal, which is a result of decisions made by Vatican II. In 1974 the archbishop launched severe attacks on the established church, declaring Vatican II false and the pope's mass illegal. From his base in Encone in Switzerland the archbishop criticized the pope for allowing the most severe aberrations in doctrine and deviation from traditional forms of devotion. Being a rightly ordained archbishop he insists that the ordinations given by him are valid; but because the archbishop has been suspended by the pope, his ordinations are considered invalid by the established church. The Priestly Fraternity of Pius X (Priesterbruderschaft St. Pius X), which is the name the followers of Lefebvre have given their organization, have two theological institutions and several centres for celebration of mass in the old form (the so-called Mass of Pius V (1570) which was used before Vatican II).¹³

The charismatic movement has invaded all of Christendom, and the Roman Catholic church is no exception. Charismatics are found in most Catholic churches in America and Europe. Some high officials, like Cardinal Suenens, are sympathetic towards them. One could, of course, wonder how this movement, with its emphasis on a certain experience of 'baptism in the Spirit', could be compatible with the Catholic doctrine on baptismal regeneration. Obviously this is a difficult point. Catholic charismatics endeavour 'to integrate the saving efficacy of the sacrament with the experienced effects of the baptism'. A person who was born again in infant baptism will understand the experience of 'baptism in the Spirit' as 'the coming to fruition

of what is already there'. Evangelical Christians sometimes feel concern because Catholic charismatics give witness to a new devotion to the holy virgin. On the other hand orthodox Catholics feel that the authority and power of the hierarchy is bypassed by the special experience of the charismatics.¹⁴

The tendencies mentioned so far no doubt represent real difficulties for the pope. And yet he may be able to turn the tide. The man who presently occupies the see of Rome is a person of extraordinary ability. He has come to Rome from the Polish Catholic church, which is conservative in its liturgy as well as in its forms of popular devotion. The Catholic church in Poland has been equal to the most trying political situations.¹⁵ The mighty force of Roman Catholic tradition is on the pope's side.

An organization called *Opus Dei* (*God's work*) was founded in 1928 by the Spanish monsignore Josemaria Escriva. Today this movement has about 75,000 lay members and 1,200 priests in forty countries. This rich and mighty organization is decidedly conservative and very loyal to the pope. They have members working in numerous universities and schools all over the world. The *Opus Dei* run almost 700 newspapers and periodicals together with fifty-two TV or radio stations. Because of its orthodox position the *Opus Dei* attracts many Catholic believers, but on the other hand it is attacked by progressive priests. There seem to be differences of opinion concerning this movement in the Vatican, but John Paul II apparently thinks very highly of it. Some observers think the *Opus Dei* may fill the traditional role of the Jesuits, who in many cases have taken unorthodox and unusual positions.¹⁶

Ministerial recruitment and celibacy

Expectations were running high during Vatican II. The future of the Roman Catholic church seemed to be a brilliant one; a new spirit penetrated the old structure of the church, and a new vigour was to be expected. The developments in the years after Vatican II must have been a disappointment. The church is facing difficulties at the point where it used to have its greatest asset, namely in recruiting of candidates for ordination and for convents. There is an acute shortage of priests. Since 1962, when Vatican II opened, more than 30,000 priests have left their pastoral work, 12,000 of these in the USA alone. Twenty years ago the American Catholic church had 48,000 seminarians; in April 1983 there were 12,000, and only about 60% of them were expected to take the final vow.¹⁷

Why this 'flight from the yoke of Christ'? the German periodical *Der Spiegel* asked (October 1971). The answer was apparently not difficult to find: most of these priests wanted to marry. Celibacy has been under dispute for some time. The Bishops' Synod in 1967 discussed the problem. Two things are to be considered: (1) ordination of mature married men (which is practised in the Greek Orthodox Church), and (2) permission for ordained men to marry (which the Greek Orthodox Church does not allow). There seems to be a distant possibility that married men might be permitted to take the priest's vow under very special conditions. Celibacy is too deeply rooted in the Roman Catholic church to be lightly given up. Illegal tendencies in that direction (in the Dutch church) have been curbed, as we have seen.

There are other conflicting loyalties to be mentioned. The pope's ban on 'the pill' (1968), in which he condemned all methods of contraception except the rhythm method, has been interpreted as leniently as possible by some bishops. No-one, they say, can be forced to act contrary to their conscience; the pope's word of course carries authority, and yet the conscience of the individual must not be violated.¹⁹ There is a moral crisis in all of Christendom, and the Roman Catholic church has its share.

Progressive theologians maintain that the development following Vatican II has not gone far enough. Traditionalists, however, contend that it has gone too far. The 'aggiornamento' has falsely opened a door for all kinds of error. In many seminaries Christianity is being interpreted in terms of secular philosophy which contradicts the Word of God. The result of all this can only be confusion.²⁰ There may be some reason to think that the traditionalists are right. The Roman Catholic church is in danger of ending up in the same kind of relativism which has deprived most Protestant churches of their spiritual conviction and vigour.

Dialogue and ecumenism

The most conspicuous result of Vatican II is the new attitude towards non-catholics. Some readers will recall the bewilderment caused in 1953 by an American priest who defended the traditional belief that there is no salvation outside of the Roman Catholic church. That was too much — even Pius IX dared to hope for the salvation of those who lived outside of the Roman church because of ignorance — and the priest was disciplined. Today, however, not only individual non-catholics but even 'separated churches and communities' are considered to be used as 'means of salvation' by the Spirit of God (*Decree on ecumenism*, 1964). As a result of this new attitude a long series of dialogues has been arranged between Roman Catholic theologians and their Protestant colleagues.

The statements issued as a result of these dialogues usually follow a certain pattern. First of all they express willingness to acknowledge each other as Christians, and then strong words are used to condemn separations in Christendom and to recommend attempts at unity. Usually the Protestants have a tendency to go further than the Catholics. In matters of dogma the statements often say more than the Protestant creeds and markedly less than what Vatican II demands.

The final report from the Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission (1981) is one example. The report says that 'a substantial agreement' has been reached. For instance, Anglicans are willing to accept the institution of a single head of the church as a practical necessity. 'In any future union a universal primacy should be held' by the bishop of Rome. This, of course, is a major concession by the Anglicans, but it is very much less than Vatican II and John Paul can accept.

This is exactly what was said by the Holy Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in an important statement printed in the pope's official organ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (1 October 1982).²¹ This statement should be studied by all who are under the impression that all of Christendom is on its way to unity. The Holy Congregation of the Faith (voicing the opinion of the pope) is thankful for the report as an important ecumenical event. There are, however, many objections. There is a certain ambiguity, the Congregation says, in the

phrase 'substantial agreement'. The Holy Congregation says that expression leads one to read into it a fundamental agreement on essential points. But such an agreement has not been reached. When the members of ARCIC speak about 'the consensus we have reached', 'one does not always see clearly whether this means the faith already professed by the two Communions in dialogue, or a conviction which the members of the Commission have reached'. In other words: when members of a mixed commission agree, it does not necessarily follow that their communions have reached a consensus. And so the Holy Congregation goes on to demonstrate that transubstantiation, adoration of the sacrament, ministerial priesthood and supreme jurisdiction of the pope belong to the sphere of dogma which cannot be altered.

The Holy Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith also comments on the Anglican-Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist (1971). In this 'agreement' a solution was sought on the difficult question of the mass as a sacrifice for the living and the dead. A solution was found 'in the notion of *memorial* as understood in the passover celebration at the time of Christ — *i.e.* making effective in the present an event in the past'. This, the Anglican-Catholic commission felt, has opened the way to a clearer understanding of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the eucharist. But the Vatican is not at all content with that kind of solution. Most of all 'the propitiatory value' of the eucharist should not be forgotten, says the Congregation of the Faith. This is a very important point for the Roman church, because masses are still read for the living and the dead. The mass is a real sacrifice offered up to God; this is Roman dogma.

Let us take a look at one more 'agreement'. The Reformation preached justification by faith alone for Christ's sake alone. The Reformation fathers said that the Scripture alone shall constitute articles of faith. Here we have the three great 'alones' of evangelical Christians. But Vatican II says that 'both sacred Tradition and sacred Scripture are to be accepted and venerated with the same sense of devotion and reverence' (*Revelation 10*, quoting Vatican II). Efforts have been made to prove that Vatican II has moved away from the old theory of Scripture and tradition as two 'sources'. That may be true, but the fact remains that Vatican II says: 'it is not from sacred Scripture alone that the Church draws her certainty about everything which has been revealed' (*ibid.*). The infallibility of the pope and the veneration of Mary cannot be proven from the Bible. Rome takes her proof and certainty from tradition.

'By faith alone' is a fundamental concept in Protestant creeds. The Council of Trent condemned the belief that we are justified through faith alone solely by the favour of God. This has been discussed in dialogues between Protestants and Catholics, for instance in the USA, where six volumes have been published as a result of the consultations. The sixth volume deals with justification.²² The members of the Lutheran-Catholic commission agree that our entire hope of justification and salvation rests in Christ Jesus and the gospel whereby the good news of God's merciful action in Christ is made known: 'We do not place our ultimate trust in anything other than God's promise and saving work in Christ'. At first sight this seems conclusive. On closer observation, however, it is evident that they do not agree on the main question: what is justification? Is it a declaration in which God says that the

sinner is righteous by faith alone (Luther, Calvin), or is justification a healing process by which the sinner is made 'more and more justified' (Council of Trent)? This is the salient point. Here is no agreement. Indeed, can there ever be an agreement on these matters as long as the Roman Catholic church sticks to its concept of tradition as a source of revelation?

On 1 January 1983 a new edition of *Corpus Iuris Canonici* (the law of the Roman Catholic church) was published.²³ It clearly shows that nothing has changed in the field of dogma. Papal infallibility, the Catholic understanding of the relation between Scripture and tradition, indulgences and sacrificial mass, it is all there. This is only what could be expected, and it should not come as a surprise to anyone who has read the papal encyclicals *Mysterium fidei* (1965) and *Mysterium Ecclesiae* (1973). In its dogma the Roman Catholic church certainly is 'semper eadem'.

One wonders why so many leading churchmen from almost every church denomination speak so easily about approaching unity and the prospect of full communion. Answering this, we are struck by the fact that almost all churches of today are penetrated and filled with the same kinds of modern theological trends. The 'existential' way of thinking, the tendency to speak about the secular rather than the celestial city, the willingness to take a comprehensive position, all this is found everywhere. And so why shouldn't they come to an understanding with the same kind of people who happen to represent another church denomination? In the days of rationalism — c. 1800 — Lutheran pastors and Catholic priests sometimes changed pulpits on Sundays. The congregations heard the same kind of sermon anyway. Their ministers were neither Lutherans nor Catholics, they were neologians.

The theology of the Enlightenment blew over, and was followed by the Catholic restoration of Pius IX. The future is known by God alone. And yet there might be some reason to think that almost the same development could occur again.

¹K. S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age*, vol. 1 (N.Y., 1958), *passim*; Walther von Loewenich, *Der moderne Katholizismus* (2. Aufl., 1956), *passim*.

²G. C. Berkouwer, *Recent Developments in Roman Catholic Thought* (N.Y., 1958); Vittorio Subilia, *The Problem of Catholicism* (London, 1964).

³Encyclicals are quoted from *Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context*, ed. Anne Freemantle (N.Y., 1956).

⁴Pius Parsch, 'The Rediscovery of the Bible in the Roman Catholic Church' (*Bulletin of the United Bible Societies*, First Quarter 1951; cf. Second Quarter 1958).

⁵All quotations from Council documents are taken from Walter M. Abbott (ed.), *The Documents of Vatican II* (N.Y., 1966).

⁶E. B. Kvenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (Chicago, 1954); Odo Casel, *Das Christliche Kultmysterium* (Regensburg, 1948); Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945).

⁷G. C. Berkouwer, *The Second Vatican Council and the New Catholicism* (Eerdmans, 1965); David F. Wells, *Revolution in Rome* (London, 1973).

⁸J. Andrew Kirk, *Theology encounters Revolution* (IVP, 1980); Don Ford, 'Changes in Catholicism in Latin America' (*Themelios*, March 1974).

⁹*Time*, September 10, 1984: 'Berating Marxism's "False Hopes"' by Richard N. Ostling.

¹⁰Kenneth Kantzer in *Christianity Today*, November 26, 1982; Donald Dean Smeeton, 'Hans Küng: architect of radical Catholicism' (*Themelios*, January 1982); David F. Wells, *Revolution in Rome* (London, 1973).

¹¹*Time*, January 28, 1980; *Time*, February 11, 1984.

¹²*Christianity Today*, April 9, 1982: 'Reining in the Jesuits' by Harry Genet with Royal Peck.

¹³Malachi Martin, *The Final Conclave* (N.Y., 1978), pp. 36 ff.; *Mitteilungsblatt der Priesterbruderschaft St. Pius für den deutschen Sprachraum*, Nr. 70, October 1984.

¹⁴Quoting from Anne Mather, 'The Charismatic Movement' (*Themelios*, April 1984).

¹⁵Mary Craig, *Man from A Far Country* (London, 1979).

¹⁶Richard N. Ostling, 'Building God's Global Castle' (*Time*, June 11, 1982).

¹⁷Kenneth Woodward, 'An Acute Shortage of Priests' (*Newsweek*, April 11, 1981); Paul Hendrickson, *Seminary* (N.Y., 1983); *Der Spiegel*, 'Massenflucht aus dem Joch Christi' (October 18, 1971).

¹⁸*The Ministerial Priesthood. Statement from The Synod of Bishops*, November 30, 1967; *Vatican II. More Postconciliar Documents, Vol II* (Eerdmans, 1982).

¹⁹Pastoral Letter from the Nordic bishops (St. Olav 19/68).

²⁰Ralph Martin, *A Crisis of Truth* (Michigan, 1982).

²¹*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, October 1, 1982, pp. 1060 ff.

²²*Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue. Statement on Justification* (Minneapolis, 1983). See the assessment by Peter Toon in the *Church of England Newspaper*, December 2, 1982.

²³English translation, *The Code of Canon Law* (London, 1983).

The date of Deuteronomy: linch-pin of Old Testament criticism

Gordon Wenham

The author, who is an associate editor of Themelios, is lecturer at the College of St. Paul and St. Mary, Cheltenham. He is known for his commentaries on Leviticus and Numbers. In this article (to be published in two parts) he returns to the subject of his doctoral research, the book of Deuteronomy.

The last decade has been one of great turmoil in the field of documentary studies. Many of the most cherished ideas of the classic documentary theory have been put in serious question by mainline critical scholars. According to the classic theory popularized by Wellhausen in 1878 there are four main sources in the Pentateuch: J from the tenth century BC, E from the ninth, D(euteronomy) from the seventh and P from the late sixth century. But in recent years the very existence of an independent E document has been questioned,¹ and it has been forcefully argued that P, supposedly the latest source, is really an earlier source perhaps contemporary with J and certainly before D(euteronomy).² Pleading for a new look at the whole question of pentateuchal critical theory, Rendtorff, Professor of Old Testament at the University of Heidelberg, observed: 'We possess hardly any reliable criteria for dating pentateuchal literature. Every dating of the pentateuchal "sources" rests on purely hypothetical assumptions which only have any standing through the consensus of scholars.'³

But in the whirlpool of conflicting modern theories one point in the critical consensus has escaped serious challenge: namely, the date of Deuteronomy. It is well-nigh universally assumed by mainstream scholarship that Deuteronomy was written in the late seventh century and should be associated with Josiah's reform c. 622 BC. This assumption is obvious in the two of the most significant recent works on Deuteronomy published in English: M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (1972) and R. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist* (1980), and in A. D. H. Mayes' *New Century Bible* commentary on Deuteronomy (1979). One will read

these works in vain for a clear statement of why these scholars believe Deuteronomy was written in the seventh century: this dating is simply such a central element in critical tradition that it is not regarded as necessary to state the reasons for it, let alone defend them.

On the other hand conservatives have persistently tried to argue for a much earlier date for Deuteronomy, indeed often for a Mosaic origin of the book. Yet their arguments, even when cogently presented, have fallen on deaf ears: critical scholars may list conservative works in their bibliographies, but they rarely take the trouble to interact with them.

It is the purpose of this article to explore the basic arguments for and against a seventh-century date of Deuteronomy. To try to discover what are the reasons for the critical consensus on the one side and conservative opposition on the other. To ask whether there are any firm grounds for holding one position rather than another, or whether this is just another area where Rendtorff's dictum, 'every dating of pentateuchal sources rests on purely hypothetical assumptions', holds good.

Conservative presuppositions

Let us begin by outlining the basic assumptions that underlie conservative arguments for the antiquity of Deuteronomy. The first and obvious point is that Deuteronomy claims to be the last words of Moses. Deuteronomy consists of three sermons (chs. 1-4, 5-28, 29-30) and two poems (32, 33) ascribed to him. Not only is Moses said to have uttered most of Deuteronomy, he is also said to have written down 'this law'. 'Moses wrote this law, and gave it to the priests' (31:9; cf. 31:24). Admittedly it is not exactly clear what 'this law' consisted of, but the most obvious candidate is the oral exposition of the law given by Moses in Deuteronomy.

It is important to notice that the presentation of the law in Deuteronomy is different in character from that found in the earlier books of the Pentateuch. Most of the laws in Exodus to Numbers are represented as having been revealed to Moses: they are usually introduced by the remark 'the LORD said to Moses', but it is rare for it to be said that Moses wrote them down (Ex. 24:4; 34:28). It is never said of the great mass of laws mediated by Moses in Leviticus and Numbers that he wrote them down. But the law of Deuteronomy is presented differently: here Moses paraphrases the law in his own words: '[he] undertook to explain this law' (Dt. 1:5). He puts the legislation into his own words, he describes Israel's history from his personal perspective as leader, and he is expressly said to have written down 'this law'. In other words the claim to be of Mosaic, as opposed to just of divine, origin is much clearer in the book of Deuteronomy than in the preceding books.

In interpreting these exegetical facts about the book conservatives have generally been guided by another assumption. This is that 'all Scripture is inspired of God' (2 Tim. 3:16), or in the words of the Nicene creed that the Holy Spirit 'spoke through the prophets' and that it is hard to imagine the Spirit of truth to have inspired a pseudo-Moses to write Deuteronomy by pretending in a very thorough fashion to be Moses. The author professes to have been with Israel in the wilderness, to have received the law on Mount Sinai, to have interceded for Israel after they made the golden calf, to have led the conquest of Transjordan, and so on. The integrity at least of these statements seems to be thrown in question if Deuteronomy is in no sense a Mosaic work, but simply the creation of someone unknown living many centuries afterwards.

Given these pieces of evidence and their assumptions about the nature of inspiration, conservatives have tenaciously defended at least a Mosaic core to the book of Deuteronomy. This I believe is a perfectly legitimate way for theologians to proceed. 'I believe in order to understand', said Anselm. And in the realm of critical biblical study this approach to theology often takes the form of defending Scripture against the doubts of unbelievers. It is difficult very often to offer positive proof of biblical statements, so apologetics must needs take the form of a defensive operation in an attempt to show the doubts are ill-founded. For more than a century mainline biblical scholarship has judged conservative arguments in support of the Mosaicity of the Pentateuch to be unconvincing. And this is part of the reason why a seventh-century date has become a dogma in liberal critical scholarship, a tradition passed on from generation to generation without really reflecting on alternative possibilities.

Liberal presuppositions

Why then is the case for Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy ignored by mainline scholars? Not because they deny the exegetical facts just set out: they would freely admit that Deuteronomy professes to come from Moses. It is rather because they do not take a conservative view of inspiration and believe, because everybody else seems to say so, that there is an overwhelming case for Deuteronomy's seventh-century composition.

Some scholars simply do not believe in the divine inspiration of the Bible: certainly Wellhausen fell into this camp, so it was easy for him to accept that Deuteronomy was fictitious. However the majority of biblical critics do believe that the Bible is in some sense the word of God: in the case of Deuteronomy we have an example of the inspired imagination of a later writer addressing the problem of his own generation. In order to persuade his hearers he clothed his message in the dress of Israel's greatest lawgiver and prophet. This practice of pseudonymous writing was both widespread and respectable in ancient Israel, it is maintained. Therefore it is not difficult to envisage the Spirit of God using such devices to gain acceptance of this vital message.

Now though this view of inspiration cannot be ruled out as an impossibility, if it is indeed true that pseudonymity was an accepted convention in biblical times, there is little clear evidence within Scripture for it being so accepted. There are certainly plenty of works outside the biblical canon which are pseudonymous, and it might well be surmised that one reason they never received canonical status was their patent pseudonymity.

The postulate that pseudonymity was respectable in biblical times and that the Spirit might therefore have inspired some great unknown to pretend to be Moses or Isaiah or whoever, is not based on a large number of provenly pseudonymous works within the canon, rather it rests on the assumption that Deuteronomy and other books such as Daniel are clearly not from the time they pretend to portray. Because the canonizing authorities were prepared to accept books like Deuteronomy though they knew them to be fictitious, that shows they did not disapprove of such productions. In other words the liberal belief that pseudonymous authorship was respectable arises from the dating assigned to these books, not from evidence outside these works. It therefore becomes the more important to examine the nature of the arguments for the date of Deuteronomy. For not only is the history of Israel's religion seriously altered by these theories but also our whole view of inspiration. But to discover the reasons scholars hold a seventh-century date of Deuteronomy is more difficult than might be anticipated, for it is one of the most deeply rooted assumptions of critical scholarship.

The assumption of a seventh-century date

Reading many works on Deuteronomy one is frequently struck by the way a seventh-century date is presupposed rather than argued for. For example G. von Rad in his *Studies in Deuteronomy* (1948) and his commentary (1964) invokes the holy war ideology of the book in support of its late date. Deuteronomy pictures the conquest of Canaan as a holy war in which all Israel is mobilized and led by God in a great campaign to destroy all foreigners and their forms of worship. This, says von Rad, bespeaks a period when the nation could not afford a professional army because royal funds were low. What more likely time than the seventh century BC when Judah was impoverished by Assyrian imposts and Josiah was fighting to regain long-lost territory? Deuteronomy was a suitable book to stir up enthusiasm for such a cause.

But on further reflection this is a somewhat flimsy argument. There is little, if any, evidence in the book of Kings of a

radical reorganization of the army in Josiah's time. The undoubted holy war ideology of Deuteronomy could be held to reflect a much earlier period in Israelite history, e.g. the time of the judges, for Deborah and Samuel certainly believed in the holy war principle according to Judges 4-5 and 1 Samuel 15. It would therefore be possible to turn von Rad's observations on their head and say that they demonstrate the antiquity of the book. I think we really know too little about the history of these ideas and institutions to use them to date the literature of the Old Testament. But the fact that von Rad put forward these observations so confidently as confirmation of Deuteronomy's *late* date illustrates again how strongly he has been influenced by the consensus of scholarship.

Similarly Weinfeld's detailed work proceeds on the assumption of a seventh-century date and so he cites parallels between Assyrian treaty curses and those in Deuteronomy as confirmation of the latter's late date.⁴ The fact that such curses are well attested in Mesopotamian legal literature long before the seventh century receives scant attention,⁵ nor the fact that in over-all structure the book of Deuteronomy is much closer to a second-millennium treaty or collection of laws than to first-millennium texts.⁶ Like von Rad Weinfeld assumes a seventh-century dating of Deuteronomy and interprets the new data in the light of that assumption.

Again one should admit the legitimacy of this procedure. It is what we all do most of the time. We are constantly fitting new pieces of information into our existing preconceptions and world view. One person may listen to the news and have his basic pessimism about human nature confirmed, another may hear the same broadcast and have his optimism reinforced. One sees oppression, the other sees the compassion that moves men to help the oppressed.

But from time to time it is necessary to ask ultimate questions, and this is constantly being done in theology courses. Students are constantly being made to ask whether their assumptions about God, the world, and salvation are correct. Conservative students are frequently told that their assumptions about the inspiration and reliability of Scripture are certainly not correct. All sorts of critical theories are put forward and evaluated, yet though many aspects of pentateuchal criticism are currently under review, strangely the date of Deuteronomy is rarely debated. Yet according to Wellhausen, 'Deuteronomy is the starting point, not in the sense that without it it would be impossible to accomplish anything but only because, when its position has been historically ascertained, we cannot decline to go on, but must demand that the position of the Priestly Code should also be fixed by reference to history.'⁷ Put more simply: fix the date of Deuteronomy and then date the rest of the Pentateuch by comparison with it. J and E must be written before it and P after it. Today some deny that P was composed after Deuteronomy, but everyone would agree that the dating of Deuteronomy most profoundly affects our understanding of the history of Old Testament religion and literature. The influence of Deuteronomy's ideas and language is so pervasive in the Old Testament that it makes a tremendous difference to our evaluation of the development of Israelite theology⁸ whether we ascribe the book to the Mosaic or Josianic eras.

Arguments for a seventh-century date

So what are the real arguments for a seventh-century date that first led to the establishment of this critical consensus? To discover them one needs to return to the literature of the nineteenth century, especially the works of de Wette and Wellhausen⁹ in Germany and Driver¹⁰ in Britain. It comes as something of a surprise considering how much has been built on the seventh-century dating to find what a narrow basis it rests on.

There are essentially two key arguments: the language of Deuteronomy and its demand for the centralization of worship. The style of Deuteronomy, a rhetorical or preaching style with various characteristic words or phrases, markedly resembles other works which must date from the late seventh or early sixth centuries BC. The most obvious parallels are found in the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel and in 2 Kings. An elaboration of this theory is Noth's¹¹ theory of a Deuteronomistic history. This holds that Deuteronomy is not so much the last book of the Pentateuch, but the first volume in a history comprising Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. It is, I think, undeniable that the language and style of Deuteronomy have close affinities with some books undoubtedly written about 600 BC. Whether this is sufficient grounds for holding that Deuteronomy must also have been written then, we shall return to later.

The second and historically more important reason for holding that Deuteronomy is a seventh-century work is its attitude to the central sanctuary. Until the time of King Josiah people worshipped, whether legally or not is unclear, at the temple in Jerusalem and at high places, village shrines scattered up and down the land. But then Josiah, perhaps following the earlier attempt of Hezekiah, abolished all the local high places and insisted that sacrifice be offered only in the Jerusalem temple. An English equivalent would be the destruction of all the English parish churches and the limitation of worship to Westminster Abbey. Josiah's innovations are described in 2 Kings 23.

Now de Wette, Wellhausen and their successors associate this Josianic reformation with the book of Deuteronomy. This orders Israel to destroy all the Canaanite shrines when they enter the land. They must instead 'seek the place which the LORD your God will choose . . . to put his name and make his habitation there' (Dt. 12:5). This is where Israel must offer sacrifice and celebrate the national pilgrimage festivals of passover, pentecost and tabernacles (ch. 16). Evidently then 'the place which the LORD will choose' is Deuteronomy's term for the national central sanctuary. However Deuteronomy never names the chosen place or gives any indication that it should be identified with Jerusalem.

This, it is argued, is quite understandable: the author of Deuteronomy realized that it would be anachronistic to have Moses specify Jerusalem as the central shrine when it was not captured by Israel till the time of David. He preferred to use the discreet code name 'the place which the LORD will choose', which was perfectly clear to the men of Josiah's time and did not make it so obvious that Moses was not the real author of Deuteronomy. The book's insistence on limiting all worship to the one place shows that it was written either as the programme for, or in justification of, Josiah's reforms. In further support of this hypothesis it is pointed out that in the

course of the reform a book of the law was found in the temple. This again is customarily identified with some version of Deuteronomy, and it is implied that the book, recently written, had been deliberately planted in the temple to encourage or justify the reforms that had been undertaken.

Reopening the question

Language and centralization are thus the two key arguments for the late date of Deuteronomy. The other reasons often adduced for dating the book to the seventh century, *e.g.* holy war, treaty curses, relationship with the book of Proverbs, are equivocal: they are just as compatible with an earlier date. With the present openness in so many areas of pentateuchal criticism, it seems opportune to look again at this most central area of study. If we have not already irrevocably prejudged the issue of Deuteronomy's date of composition, what would we conclude on the basis of our present knowledge? Clearly in a brief article these issues cannot be dealt with with the thoroughness they deserve: it is written in the hope that it will help those trying to think through these issues from scratch and perhaps provoke some to further work in these areas.

Six areas need to be thoroughly re-examined in any reconsideration of the date of Deuteronomy: its language, its relationship to ancient oriental legal texts, its view of the central sanctuary, its religious ideology, its marriage laws, and its use in Jerusalem. Few of these areas have been thoroughly discussed in recent literature, at least in so far as their implications for the date of Deuteronomy are concerned, so my observations must necessarily be provisional rather than definitive, an agenda for further research rather than the last word on these issues.

Language

Does the language of Deuteronomy with its obvious affinities with Jeremiah and 2 Kings demand a seventh-century date? It must be admitted that such a date of composition could explain Deuteronomy's style, but it seems that this is rather too simple an explanation for a number of reasons.

First, it is characteristic of religious language to be conservative and to retain older forms of expression long after popular speech has changed. For 350 years the language of the Authorized Version and the prayer book has dominated religious usage in England: it is only in the last few years that it has been felt to be inappropriate to address God as 'thou', for example, and the traditional form of the Lord's Prayer is still the form most people use. It could be that a similar tendency is at work in the Old Testament: the prophets and religious leaders were consciously or unconsciously using a 'biblical' style of speech, because they were speaking on religious subjects and seeking to appeal to their hearers' respect for old tradition.

Second, it is characteristic of the literary languages of the ancient Near East to adopt the spoken dialect of a particular period and for this to remain unchanged for centuries, even though the spoken language alters. Old Babylonian was the form of Akkadian spoken in Babylon in the old Babylonian period 1900-1600 BC. In it the great classical texts such as the laws of Hammurapi or the epic of Atrahasis were composed. Subsequently, though the spoken language changed, later scribes tried to imitate the old Babylonian as best they could

(so-called standard Babylonian), so that a type of old Babylonian remained the standard written language of Mesopotamia for a millennium after the spoken language had changed.

There was evidently a similar development in Egypt. There were five Egyptian dialects and the second, Middle Egyptian, was adopted as the official written language. Kitchen writes, 'Middle Egyptian was perhaps the vernacular of dynasties 9-11 (2200-2000 BC) and was used universally for written records during the Middle Kingdom and Early New Kingdom periods (to *c.* 1300 BC) and continued in use in official texts in a slightly modified form as late as Graeco-Roman days.¹² In other words Middle Egyptian was the spoken language between 2200 and 2000 BC, the universal written language until 1300 and widely used until about 100 BC.

If in Babylon and Egypt the spoken language of one period survived for 1,000 years as the national written language, might not the same be true in Israel? The sparsity of Hebrew inscriptions from Old Testament times unfortunately makes this hypothesis impossible to demonstrate, but it is certainly no less likely than the theory that anything reminiscent of deuteronomistic style must have been written within fifty years of 600 BC. If one could affirm a Mosaic date for Deuteronomy, the fact that Jeremiah and 2 Kings continue to use deuteronomistic language would suggest that the history of Hebrew does indeed resemble that of Akkadian and Egyptian.

There is, of course, evidence within the Old Testament that deuteronomistic style survived long after the seventh century. Ezra's prayer (Ne. 9:6-37) is a good example of deuteronomistic style, as is Daniel's (9:4-19). Ezra's prayer dates from about 430 BC; Daniel's from about 520 on a conservative view (about 170 BC on a liberal view, which would be four centuries after Jeremiah). Now if it be admitted that deuteronomistic style may have persisted a few centuries after 600 BC, may it not be that it was invented some while before 600 BC?

In fact there is some long-neglected evidence which suggests that not simply deuteronomistic style, but some form of the book of Deuteronomy itself was known in the eighth century. It is well known that the earliest writing prophets, Hosea and Amos, show many traces of deuteronomistic style and apparent allusions to Deuteronomy. Modern commentators generally ascribe these deuteronomisms to the ubiquitous deuteronomist, an editor who rewrote everything in deuteronomistic style. Commentators like Wolff peel away the most obvious deuteronomisms and argue that what is left is the authentic voice of Amos and Hosea. However, these commentators do not do a thorough enough job. If every trace of Deuteronomy were eliminated from these early prophets, there would be hardly anything left. This has been recognized in the recent massive Hosea commentary by Andersen and Freedman. They recognize that the deuteronomistic elements of the book are integral to Hosea's message. They state: 'Hosea's discourses are threaded with Deuteronomistic ideas in a way that shows they were already authoritative in Israel.'¹³ And in the course of their commentary they show how at many points Hosea uses deuteronomistic ideas. However they do not exhaust the scope of this study. Had they consulted E. W. Hengstenberg's *Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch* (1831-39 ET 1847), they would

have found many more examples of where Hosea and Amos apparently quote or allude to Deuteronomy and indeed other books of the Pentateuch.¹⁴

Recently, too, the doyen of Hebrew philology, C. Rabin,¹⁵ has also pressed the case for Deuteronomy being composed before Hosea and Amos. On the grounds of discourse analysis Rabin argues that Deuteronomy has the form of a prophetic sermon, yet prophetic sermons from Amos onwards adopt a clearly poetic style. Deuteronomy's style is like that of earlier prophets such as Samuel and Elijah. Thus a late date for the book must be excluded. Rabin's article, though written with great authority, is tantalizingly brief and leaves many questions unanswered. It does though suggest new methods of approaching an old problem.

The same too could be said of Rendsburg's¹⁶ article in which he argues that the Hebrew of the Pentateuch is distinctively archaic in certain respects, e.g. its failure to distinguish the masculine and feminine in some words. 'The Pentateuch as a whole would by necessity be dated earlier than the composition of Joshua, Judges, etc.'¹⁶ Weippert's study of Jeremiah's sermons is also important in showing that his prose style cannot be simply identified with that of Deuteronomy or the deuteronomists.¹⁷

On balance then it seems likely that the deuteronomistic language was not a phenomenon restricted to the late seventh/early sixth centuries BC, but that it persisted much longer. It could indeed have been the preferred style of explicitly religious texts for a long while in Israel. Certainly the evidence of the prophets Amos and Hosea is most easily explained on the basis of at least some form of Deuteronomy antedating their preaching and being known to them.

Ancient legal texts paralleling Deuteronomy

Another indication of Deuteronomy's relative antiquity is provided by Near Eastern legal texts. In the 1960s a number of scholars pointed¹⁸ to the parallels between Deuteronomy and ancient oriental treaties, most notably those from the Hittite archives (sixteenth-thirteenth centuries BC) and Assyrian texts (eighth-seventh centuries). It was quickly observed that Deuteronomy markedly resembles a treaty text, especially the earlier Hittite treaty. This can be most easily seen in a table.

<i>Early (Hittite) treaty</i>	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	<i>Late (Assyrian) treaty</i>
Preamble	Preamble 1:1-4	Preamble
Historical introduction	History 1:5 - 3:29	God list
Stipulations	Stipulations chs: 4-26	Stipulations
Document clause	Document clause ch. 27	
God list		
Curses/blessings	Blessings/curses ch. 28	Curses (Blessings)

The most obvious difference between the second-millennium Hittite treaty and the first-millennium Assyrian treaty is the presence of a historical section and document clause in the former and their absence in the latter. In both these respects Deuteronomy resembles the earlier Hittite treaty rather than the later one, so quite naturally conservatives like Kline and Kitchen argued that this proved the Mosaic date of Deuteronomy, c. 1280 BC being the most widely accepted date of the Exodus.

However, those brought up in the tradition of a seventh-century date for Deuteronomy were unpersuaded. They pointed out that not all Hittite treaties had document clauses, and that possibly one Assyrian treaty had an historical prologue.¹⁹ On these grounds they held that one could not really postulate a marked change in the pattern of treaties between the second and first millennium, so the argument from treaty parallels proves little about the date of Deuteronomy.²⁰

In his book *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, Weinfeld underlined very thoroughly Deuteronomy's affinities with the treaties. He also observed that early second-millennium legal collections closely resembled the form of Deuteronomy,²¹ so that it seems likely that there was a standard pattern used for a variety of legal documents. Again one can best display the evidence diagrammatically.

<i>Early (Hittite) treaty</i>	<i>Law collection e.g. Laws of Hammurapi c. 1750 BC</i>	<i>Deuteronomy</i>
Preamble		
History	History	History 1-3
Stipulations	Laws	Laws 4-26
Document clause	Document clause	Document clause 27
God list		
Curses/blessings	Blessings/curses	Blessings/curses 28

If there is a close resemblance between Deuteronomy and Hittite treaties there is an even closer one between Deuteronomy and early second-millennium collections of law. Note the absence of a god list in both, and the order of blessings and curses. In both Deuteronomy and oriental legal collections blessings precede curses, whereas in treaties the order is reversed.

It is again striking how the arrangement of material in Deuteronomy resembles early collections of law rather than the later Middle Assyrian laws or neo-Babylonian laws, both admittedly incomplete. However this would again appear to point to the antiquity of Deuteronomy rather than its lateness.

Weinfeld however, assuming a seventh-century date for Deuteronomy, minimizes the force of these observations. The continuity of Near Eastern legal traditions means that very little should be built on the apparent changes of form: these changes may simply reflect the accidents of discovery. We have several collections of law from the early period, few from the late. Had we more information we could be more dogmatic. Furthermore the close parallels between some of the curses of Deuteronomy and some found in Esarhaddon's vassal treaties show that the authors of Deuteronomy were well aware of neo-Assyrian (i.e. seventh-century) treaty-drafting techniques. This confirms the usual dating of Deuteronomy.

But it must be said that this again suggests the data is being manipulated to fit in with an assumption of a seventh-century dating. If the continuity of Near Eastern legal tradition allows one to dismiss the resemblance between the laws of Hammurapi (1750 BC) and Deuteronomy as insignificant, it surely forbids one to make too much of the correspondences between some seventh-century treaty curses and Deuteronomy. Could these not reflect an old and long tradition too, as D. J. Wiseman maintained?²² Weinfeld certainly has not proved that the deuteronomistic curses could

have been derived only from a seventh-century Assyrian text. And even if that were demonstrated, it would merely show that Deuteronomy's curses had been expanded then, not necessarily that the whole book was composed then. On balance then it seems to me that the parallels between Deuteronomy and early treaties and legal collections suggest an early date for the book, though, as so often in biblical studies, this falls short of definite proof.

The parallels with treaties and law codes is important for another reason though: they show that chapter 27 is an integral part of the book. It corresponds to the document clause of the treaties and legal collections, because it insists that the laws be inscribed on stones at a sanctuary (vv. 3-8). That this chapter really belongs to the book and at this point in it is confirmed also by the many typically deuteronomistic phrases within it, and its place in the book's over-all structure. Lohfink²³ pointed out that material in chapters 12-28 inverts the order of material introducing the section in 11:26-32:

A 11:26-28	Blessing and curse
B 29-31	Mounts Ebal and Gerizim
C 32	'Statutes and ordinances'
C ¹ 12:1 - 26:19	'Statutes and ordinances'
B ¹ 27:1-26	Mounts Ebal and Gerizim
A ¹ 28:1-68	Blessing and curse

This mirror-image pattern ABCC¹B¹A¹ is typical of Hebrew literary techniques and indicates that chapter 27 is an indispensable element within the book. This is important to bear in mind as we consider the place of the central sanctuary in Deuteronomy. *(to be continued)*

¹E.g. J. van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1975); C. Westermann, *Genesis* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974-82); G. W. Coats, *Genesis with an Introduction to Narrative Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983); Y. T. Radday et al., 'Genesis, Wellhausen and the Computer', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982), pp. 467-481.

²E.g. A. Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* (Paris: Gabalda, 1982); Z. Zevit, 'Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982), pp. 481-511. For a summary of the main arguments see also G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), pp. 8-13, and also *Numbers* (Leicester: IVP, 1981), pp. 21-24.

³R. Rendtorff, *Das Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), p. 169. Surveys of Deuteronomy criticism: S. Loersch, *Das Deuteronomium und seine Deutungen* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967); H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982).

⁴M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), pp. 116-146; cf. his earlier article, 'Traces of Assyrian Treaty Formulae in Deuteronomy', *Biblica* 46 (1965), pp. 417-427; R. Frankena, 'The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy', *Oudtestamentische Studien* 14 (1965), pp. 122-154.

⁵For an exception, cf. D. R. Hillers, *Treaty Curses and the OT Prophets* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964): 'One cannot explain both the resemblances and differences by naively supposing that an Israelite writer got this curse from an Assyrian treaty' (p. 42); 'One could make out a better case for saying that the Bible preserves an older form of the curse' (p. 42 n. 21).

⁶Cf. M. G. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), pp. 27-44; K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and OT* (London: IVP, 1966), pp. 90-102.

⁷J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (1878 ET Cleveland: Meridian, 1961), p. 13.

⁸Cf. my forthcoming article 'Development within the OT Law'.

⁹In many respects Wellhausen's ideas in his *Prolegomena* were not new, especially with regard to the dating of Deuteronomy and the unreliability of Chronicles. W. M. L. de Wette, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament I-II* (Halle: 1806-7) first proposed many of the key arguments. Wellhausen simply ignored the very thorough replies given by conservative scholars to de Wette's views. However there is still much of great value in such early conservative works as: E. W. Hengstenberg, *Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch* (1831-39 ET Edinburgh, 1847), and C. F. Keil, *Apologetischer Versuch über die Bücher der Chronik und über die Integrität des Buches Ezra* (Berlin: Oehmigke, 1833).

¹⁰S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the OT* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1891); *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1895).

¹¹M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (1957 ET Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).

¹²K. A. Kitchen, *New Bible Dictionary* (London: IVP, 1962), p. 339.

¹³F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Hosea* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1980), p. 75.

¹⁴E. W. Hengstenberg, *Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch I* (Edinburgh: 1847), pp. 107 ff.; cf. E. W. Pusey, *The Minor Prophets with a Commentary* (London: Smith, 1883), p. 6, and D. K. Stuart, 'The OT Prophets' Self-Understanding of Their Prophecy', *Themelios* 6 (1980), pp. 9-14. On Hosea Stuart writes: 'There is no passage in the book that does not have the Mosaic Scripture as its basis' (p. 11).

¹⁵C. Rabin, 'Discourse Analysis and the Dating of Deuteronomy', in J. A. Emerton and S. C. Reif, *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: Essays in honour of E. I. J. Rosenthal* (Cambridge: UP, 1982), pp. 171-177.

¹⁶G. A. Rendsburg, 'A New Look at Pentateuchal HW', *Biblica* 63 (1982), pp. 351-369, quotation p. 366.

¹⁷H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiaebuches* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1973).

¹⁸M. G. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King*; K. Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960); D. J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963); K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and OT*.

¹⁹A. F. Campbell, 'An Historical Prologue in a Seventh-Century Treaty', *Biblica* 50 (1969), pp. 534-535.

²⁰The argument is addressed most fully by D. J. McCarthy in *Treaty and Covenant*, pp. 80-140.

²¹M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, pp. 146-151. I had earlier and more briefly made the same observation in my article 'Trends in Pentateuchal Criticism', *The Churchman* 84 (1970), p. 219.

²²D. J. Wiseman, 'The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon', *Iraq* 20 (1958), pp. 26-27.

²³N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), p. 234.