

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the problem and hypothesis

The concept of ‘aniconism’ holds an important position not only in the legal codes of the Pentateuch (Cf. Ex 20:4; 20:23; 34:17; Lv 19:4; 26:1; Dt 5:8; 27:15), but also in the rest of Old Testament (Cf. Schmidt 1983:78).¹ According to the biblical evidence, the aniconic tradition can be considered as one of many distinctive features of Israel’s religion. This feature distinguishes Israelite religion from the religions of her neighbours (Cf. Oswalt 1998:63). The legal, historical and prophetic writings of Israel in the present text, all display a markedly negative attitude towards making any image of God and worshipping God through these images.²

Scholars have no unanimity on the possible provenance of the aniconic attitude in the Old Testament, although they have suggested some postulates (Carroll 1977:64).³ It is

¹ The concept of aniconism as term itself and its definition are directly borrowed from Mettinger (1997:174). The term ‘aniconism’ will be used to refer to cults having no iconic representation of their deity, neither anthropomorphic nor theriomorphic. Mettinger used it as reference to the relation between the symbol (the theophoric object) and its referent (the worshipper’s notion of God). He distinguished between two forms of aniconism: the mere absence of images, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the programmatic demand for a cult without any images, that is, the repudiation of iconic objects. He called the first type “*de facto* aniconism”, and the other one, “programmatic aniconism”. Mettinger’s (1977) conception of “programmatic aniconism” will be used in the inquiry of the prohibition of making any image of God in the second commandment of the Decalogue in this study. In this study, the term ‘aniconism’ itself is used to designate the prohibition of the representation of God in any form of any image.

² God’s image is something different from an image of God. The first says that there exists an image of God, that is, God has an image which can be represented. But God is spirit and can’t be pictured. The second idea therefore says that an effort is made to create an image of God. The intention in the Bible is rather that no effort should be made at all to try and represent God in the form somebody chooses. Man is made in a God’s image and was created by God himself (Cf. Gn 1:3). Man, however, has tried to create an image of God instead of being God’s image himself.

³ Nonetheless, certain theories are widely held. According to Hendel (1988:368), these can be generally grouped according to four possible motives for the aniconic tradition: (1) Yahweh is a god of history (Zimmerli 1963:246); (2) Yahweh cannot be magically manipulated (Zimmerli 1963:248); (3) Yahweh is transcendent (Von Rad 1962:218);

difficult to date the provenance of aniconism as found in the Old Testament. Nevertheless, it is not totally impossible to find some trace of the provenance of aniconism in the witness of the Bible itself.⁴ According to the biblical narrative in Exodus, the second commandment of the Decalogue not only refers to the phenomenon of aniconism, but also explicitly indicates the provenance of aniconism.⁵ This study starts from the hypothesis that the second commandment of the Decalogue is not only referring to some kind of “programmatically aniconism” but also the explicit provenance of the prohibition of making any image of God in the rest of the Old Testament. The aniconic tradition, which was transmitted as one of the distinctive features of Israel’s religion and distinguished the Israelite religion from the religions of her neighbours

(4) Yahweh is Israel’s God in contrast to the gods of Canaan (Keel 1972:37-45). However, criticism was given to each view. These views are formed in contrast with ancient Near Eastern religions. However, it was raised that the argument is not satisfactory, because the characteristics of Israelite religion are also shared with other ancient Near Eastern religions (Cf. Hendel 1988:368-372).

⁴ It is necessary to indicate specifically what is meant by the expression ‘the witness of the Bible’. An argument about what the status of the biblical text is, can be outlined in terms of questions such as: is it the precipitation of centuries of tradition?, or is it a factual report of different phenomena?, or is it a historical document?, or can it be seen as an interpretation of ideologies?, or as a religious witness? etc. (Cf. Frei 1974; Sailhamer 1995:37). Basically, the position that the character of the narrative of witness of the Bible can be said as a factual report, rather a theological presentation of history is taken in this study. However, this factual report is also presented as a form of narrative with the sequence by author. This is, as Sailhamer (1992:128) suggests, the view on the witness of the text that the order of the biblical text is the true representation of the order of historical events. This study regards the witness of the Bible as “a ‘literary coherence’ of a ‘written configuration’ about *real events*” (Lee 2004:202). Vasholz (1990:2) shows how it can be supported from the concept or theory of canonicity of the ancient Near Eastern convention that “a deity communicated a message in some form with man and that he in turn accurately recorded it” that the writer of the Bible “preserved for future generations for they are the words God had spoken and man wrote it down” (Cf. Graham 1987:49-50). See 1.3.1.1 Text as divine narrative below for the detail.

⁵ Some attempts were made to represent the prohibition of making any image of God of the Decalogue as a marked phenomenon of aniconism in the Old Testament (Cf. Zimmerli 1974:247-260; Mettinger 1979:18-29; Dohmen 1995:236-277; Dick 1999:7ff.). Mettinger (Cf. 1995: 18-27, 174-175) states that at the very least, the prohibition of making any image of God in the Decalogue presents “programmatically aniconism” in its uncompromising form. Dick (1999:2), who follows the hypothesis of Dohmen (1985:38), points out the second commandment of the Decalogue as a phenomenon of aniconism in the Old Testament, saying “the legal commandments prohibiting cult images include the Decalogue in its various versions.” Moreover, they have a different view that the prohibition of making any image of God was originated in the early period of Israelite history or religion. Rather, they suggest that the prohibition was originated in the later period, that is, in late exilic or in early post-exilic period of Israelite history. See 2.3 A provenance for the second commandment of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:4-6 for detail.

(Oswalt 1998:63) can be traced to the first and second commandments of the Decalogue.

As Sarna (1986:144-145) says:

This strict and comprehensive formulation, as we can see in the first and second commandments of the Decalogue, demands the exclusive recognition of and allegiance to one God, the One who showed Himself to be active in history and who is known to Israel by the name of that is consonantly written in Hebrew YHVH.

This study will evince this hypothesis, arguing that the proclamation of God's incomparability requires the prohibition of making any image of God, shared with some passages in the Pentateuch and Isaiah of the Prophets.

The prohibition in the second commandment can only be understood against the background of Yahweh's incomparability stated in the introduction of the Decalogue as well as the prohibition of making and paying homage to other gods including their images in the first commandment of the Decalogue. The prohibition in the second commandment is sometimes backed up by only the first commandment of the Decalogue and sometimes by both the introduction and the first commandment of the Decalogue. Both verses reflect God's uniqueness, but it is stated totally different in them. Therefore, this thesis postulates the hypothesis that the proclamation of God's incomparability demanded the prohibition of worshipping God through images. God's incomparability doesn't allow making any image of God. This construct can be depicted into the following table:

The introduction of the Decalogue	God's incomparability (v. 2)
The first commandment of the Decalogue	The prohibition of other gods including their images (v. 3)
The second commandment of the Decalogue	The prohibition of making any image of God (vv. 4-6)

In-textuality of Exodus 20:2-6 confirms that God's incomparability requires the prohibition of making any image of God. In the present text God's self-predication that is used in verse 2 representing God's incomparability, is represented as the ground for the prohibition of making any image of God in verse 5.

Exodus 32:1-6 is another example that interprets the second commandment as interwoven with the idea of God's incomparability, first in the introduction proclaiming God delivered Israel from the bondage of Egypt and secondly in the first commandment commanding the exclusion of worship of other gods and their images. This link can be seen behind the condemnation of "the golden calf" in Exodus 32:1-6 (Cf. Patrick 1985:45; 1995:117). The creation and worship of the golden calf under the leadership of Aaron reported in Exodus 32:1-6 is the first instance of idolatry by the Israelites narrated in the Bible in sequence to the promulgation of the Decalogue at Mount Sinai.⁶

⁶ According to the Bible's view of history - although a certain construction of history, which is not necessarily the order of history as we would have constructed it, is provided by the Bible-, the first violation of the second commandment occurred when Israel manufactured and worshipped a "golden calf" directly after the Decalogue was promulgated (Ex 32). It is not self evident that Exodus 32 is dependent upon Exodus 20 just because it follows upon the Decalogue passage. In the reading process Exodus 32 does follow upon Exodus 20, but it still has to be examined whether the events also historically followed upon each other in the same order as the text because the Bible is not a diary which represents exactly the sequence of events. This study is of view that the Bible's witness of the golden calf episode as an event after promulgation of the Decalogue at Mt. Sinai is chronologically correct, while in many other cases, it is not.

This study suggests that Moses wrote the law connected with narrative surrounding it from Exodus 20 onward to Deuteronomy (Cf. Dt 31:24) "during the wilderness years after the exodus from Egypt for the

According to the biblical narrative, the first instance of idolatry by the Israelites after the promulgation of the Decalogue at Mount Sinai, the story of the golden calf in Exodus 32:1-6 explicates that the promulgation of the second commandment at Mount Sinai prohibiting the making of image implies the prohibition of making image of God. This event illustrates that by making a golden calf, Israel has transgressed not only the first commandment but also the second commandment. It was a sin that violated the second commandment in creating an image of God in the form of something from his creation, namely, fashioning a calf as an image of Yahweh and declaring that this created thing is the god who brought them out of Egypt (Cf. Enns 2000:415). The calf is thus not only the equation of an idol with God, but also a pagan representation of the true God (Cf. Enns 2000:415). This passage can be used to explicate and confirm the meaning of the second commandment of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:4-6 being the prohibition of making any image of God.

Inner-textuality between Exodus 20:2-6 and Exodus 32:1-6 shows that the latter is alluding to the former. What is more, the golden calf episode in Exodus 32:1-6 is an evidence showing that the second commandment of the Decalogue is as old as it is regarded as the provenance of the ban in the Old Testament because the golden calf episode tradition in Exodus 32:1-6 is regarded as earlier in Israelite history.⁷

What is stated in the introduction and first two commandments of the Decalogue construct (Ex 20:2-6) and explicated in the golden calf episode (Ex 32) is also used in

benefit of all Israelites who needed to know the full story of their national history-especially the new generation born in the wilderness as well as those from other ethnic groups (Ex 12:38)” (Stuart 2006:33-34).

⁷ See 3.3.1 The golden calf episode (Ex 32:1-6) in the literary context of the Exodus 32-34 for the discussion on the formation of this tradition in Exodus 32:1-6.

the prophecy of Isaiah 40:18-20. Many studies tried to explain the meaning of the idolatry or of the denouncing of idolatry in Isaiah 40:18-20. These studies concentrated on the prophet's critique on serving other gods and making their images, but not, to my knowledge, on the prohibition of serving God through images, as it is forbidden by the second commandment. This study tries to read it in the point of view that it can also be the prohibition of making any image of God in relation with God's incomparability.

The expression of God's self-predication in the form of "I am Yahweh, your God" as expression of God's incomparability, is not directly found in Isaiah 40:18-20. The assertion of God's incomparability can, however, be inferred from the allusion of these expressions in the rhetorical question: "To whom will you compare God and to what image will you compare him?" (Is 40:18). This rhetorical question asks the audience to answer if God can be compared with any other being whoever or whatsoever he/she/it is. Its unexpressed but explicitly expected answer is to "none!" Therefore, this rhetorical question prohibits not only serving other gods and their images but also even try to make any image of God. Verses 19-20 in Isaiah 40 duplicates and confirm an unexpressed but explicitly expected theological reply to the rhetorical question stated in verse 18. In reply to the rhetorical question in verses 19-20, which is a rather "neutral" description of idol-fabrication, no direct theological polemic against idolatry as such is found (Holter 1995:77-78). But in its function this description fortifies the statement that not only serving other gods and their image but also creating an image of God cannot compared with God himself (v. 18). It is structured according to the scheme of God's incomparability and the prohibition of making other gods' images, even making an image of God as follows:

	Isaiah 40:18-20
<i>God's incomparability</i>	-Rhetorical <i>וְיִשְׁאַל</i> -question (v. 18): "To Whom will you compare God...?"
<i>The prohibition of not only other gods and their image and even making any image of God (1)</i>	-Self-evident answer: [unexpressed but explicitly expected, "None!"]
<i>The prohibition of not only other gods and their image and even making any image of God (2)</i>	-Indirect reply followed by a idol-fabrication passage (vv. 19-20): "A craftsman casts the image..."

The aniconism as expressed in the second commandment forbidding the making of any image of God functions within the context of God's incomparability and his demand for the exclusive worship for him. God's incomparability requires not only the prohibition of worshipping other gods and their images, but also the prohibition of making any image of God himself. The prohibition of making any image of God as stated in the second commandment of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:4-6, is important not only as a phenomenon of the prohibition of making image of God itself, but also as the provenance enabling us to trace the history of aniconism in the rest of the Old Testament. The construct of the introduction and the first two commandments in the Decalogue provides a framework within which the meaning of the prohibition of making any image of God can be understood in the rest of the Old Testament.

The present research deals with the phenomenon of aniconism in Exodus and in Isaiah, presupposing that the Prophets used the prohibition on making an image of God as it was found in the Decalogue. They used the Decalogue in the form it was known during their lifetime.⁸ The prophetic use of the prohibition on an image of God continues the

⁸ This, of course, supposes that the Pentateuch was already finished in its present form by the time of the major prophets. As this is against the present theory that the Decalogue in its present form underwent a

same fundamental objection to images, which Israel has learned from the beginning (Cf. Childs 1974:409).

A preliminary conclusion can, therefore, be drawn from this idol-fabrication passage in Isaiah 40:18-20 as an indirect answer to the question. The prohibition on making any image of God in Isaiah 40:18-20 is to be read in the context of God's incomparability implied in Isaiah 40:18. Isaiah 40:18-20 read in the context of its macro-unit confirms the thesis of this study. Considering compositional strategy in Isaiah 40-55 as part of Isaiah's prophetic covenant disputation, especially in Isaiah 41:1-7; 44:6-20; 46:5-7, it can be seen more explicitly that Isaiah 40:18-20 reuses the introduction and the first two commandments of the Decalogue construct in Exodus 20:2-6.

This study argues that God's incomparability implies the prohibition of making any image of God. The argument of this study goes as follows: Firstly, the construct of the prohibition on making any image of God, stated in the second commandment, is interwoven with the idea of Yahweh's incomparability in the introduction of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:2 and the prohibition of serving any other god as stated in the first commandment in Exodus 20:3. Secondly, this study argues that the explicitly traceable provenance of aniconism shown in the legal and prophetic writings of the Old

growing process from an original and shortest version whether it could have been written or oral and the Pentateuch was only finished much later after the exile. Durham (1987:278) suggests that at least five aspects of the form the Decalogue has to be considered: "(1) the ANE covenantal / legal form to which the commandments are obviously related; (2) the "original" form of the commandments in relation to the "expanded" form that some of them now have; (3) the connection between the commandments and other OT covenantal/legal collections, in particular the Book of the Covenant in Exodus 20:22-23:33; (4) the arrangement of commandments into a sequence coincident with the sequence of the larger narrative of which they are a part; and (5) the "age" of the commandments and the hand by which they have been brought into Exodus." On these aspects this study takes a different position believing that the form in which we have received the Ten Commandments comes directly from the hand of Moses. See 2.3.2 The arrangement of the Decalogue in the Sinai pericope (Ex 19:1-24:11) for detail.

Testament can be traced back to the second commandment of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:4-6. The provenance or reason for aniconism, that is, the prohibition of making an image of God in the Law and the Prophets reflects God's incomparability as found in God's self-prediction in the introduction of the Decalogue (Ex 20:2) and the exclusive worship of God in the first commandment (Ex 20:3). This study will seek to evince the thesis that the second commandment is the provenance of aniconism (the prohibition on making any image of God) as found *inter alia* in Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20. For this purpose a comparison will be made between the prohibition of making any image of God in Exodus 20:2-6 and 32:1-6, and Isaiah 40:18-20.

1.2 Research Methodology

This section presents an outline of the methodology used in this study to analyze the texts in Exodus 20:2-6, Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20. All of them deal with the prohibition of making any image of God in his worship in related with God's incomparability and the exclusive loyalty of God.

The aniconism expressed in the second commandment in Exodus 20:4-6 explicates the prohibition of making any image of God from the Sinai event onwards. It is necessary to study the relevant passages exegetically and theologically to confirm this hypothesis. Therefore, this study will firstly do exegesis of the separate passages in Exodus and Isaiah and after that compare Exodus 20:2-6 with Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20.⁹ This process of exegetical and theological consideration can be summarized as follows:

⁹ We do stand by the Sola Scriptura principle of the Reformers. Although 4 centuries passed in which development took place, the principle of the Reformers that Scripture interprets Scripture is can be applied here. This study done from Reformed point of view follows the tradition of the Reformers,

- (i) Exegesis of each passage
- (ii) Inner-biblical interpretation of the texts.
- (iii) Thematic-theological consideration of each passage
- (iv) Coming to a conclusion regarding aniconism in these passages

1.2.1 Exegesis of each passage

1.2.1.1 Exegesis of Exodus 20:2-6

The key question related with the thesis of this study is whether the second commandment (Ex 20:4-6) is a separate commandment or only an elaboration of Exodus 20:3. The position taken up here is that Exodus 20:4-6 is a separate commandment. As a result of this exegesis, this study will represent that the second commandment is the prohibition on making any image of God.

1.2.1.2 Exegesis of Exodus 32:1-6

The exegetical issue raised in Exodus 32:1-6 is that an indication of what the golden calf represents is polytheism or idolatry? This study will argue that the identity of the golden calf is regarded as an image of God, not a foreign god or foreign gods.

1.2.1.3 Exegesis of Isaiah 40:18-20

because it witnesses to the authority of Scripture (Old 2002:170). As this study accepts the Reformers as important constituents of Reformed tradition, this study is interested in them because they point out to us what Scripture is about (Old 2002:171).

The exegetical issue raised in Isaiah 40:18 is that the word, דְּמוּת in verse 18 being used with תַּעֲרֹכוּ can be rendered as an abstract, “likeness” or can mean the image of God. Whatsoever דְּמוּת means, concrete image or abstract sense of likeness, it can include the image of God in that God is compared with something in this context. Thus, this study will argue that verse 18 clearly says that God is not comparable with other gods who can be replaced by images and making of any image of God is prohibited because God himself cannot be compared with an image, even the image of God.

The exegesis of Isaiah 40:19-20 explaining the process of how an image was made is to be answered by the result of exegesis of verses 19-20. There is a consensus that this passage deals with the description of the technical process of idol-fabrication. Nevertheless, there are problems in translating and substantiating the thesis: firstly, whether it describes the manufacture of one or two idols; secondly, it evokes in us the question whether this idol in verse 19 consists of a wooden core, or a metal core; thirdly, the obscure phrase הַמִּסְכָּן הַתְּרוּמָה poses a problem for interpretation. This study will represent how verses 19-20 function as a prohibition of making any image of God in the context of God’s incomparability expressed in the rhetorical question of verse 18.

1.2.2 The inner-biblical interpretations of Exodus 20:2-6 in the Old Testament: Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20

Which approach will serve as useful model for the study of the relations between passages such as Exodus 20:3-6, Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20 dealing with the

prohibition of making any image of God in the Old Testament? This study mainly seeks for the provenance of the prohibition of making any image of God in the Old Testament. The relation between the two passages of Exodus 20:3-6 and Exodus 32:1-6 will be studied, and then the relation between Exodus 20:3-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20. The method of inner-biblical interpretation can be employed as a means of exploring the correlation between the passage dealing with the introduction and first two commandments of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:2-6 and the passages dealing with God's incomparability and the prohibition of making any image of God in Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20.¹⁰

A compositional strategy of a biblical text consists of some sub-units. Saillhamer (1995:207) says that "the compositional strategy of a biblical text can be traced at various levels." Saillhamer (Cf. 1995:207-215) divides this category into four levels: "In-textuality, Inner-textuality, Inter-textuality and Con-textuality." Saillhamer (1995:207) defines it as follows: "The cohesive nature of the strategy of the smallest literary unit is called in-textuality...is the inner coherence of the smallest units of text"; Inner-textuality can be defined as "inner-linkage binding narratives into a larger whole" (Saillhamer 1995:209). By means of such links the biblical authors can thematize their basic message" (Saillhamer 1995:210); According to Saillhamer (1995:212), "while inner-textuality is the study of links within a text, inter-textuality is the study of links between and among texts"; Con-textuality "is the notion of the effect on meaning of the relative position of a biblical book within a prescribed order of reading" (Saillhamer

¹⁰ Biblical scholarship, however, shows little unanimity when using a term designating intertextuality (Cf. Holter 2003:14). Not only the details of the terms, but even the term "intertextuality" itself, is used differently by different scholars. Many scholars share more or less the same definition of this concept. See Fishbane 1972:349-352; Sommer 1996:479-489; Nielsen 2000:17-18; Chandler 1982:464; Alter [1989] 1996: 112-113; Garner 1990:228 n.24; Ben-Porat 1985:170; Guillory 1983:74; Bloom [1973] 1974; Culler 1981:107-111; Hays 1989:14-15; cf. Kronfeld 1996:121-123, 125, 129-130; Van Peer 1987:20; Van Wolde 1997:430; Rashkow 1992:57-73; Hollander 1989:14-21; Becker 1993:64-69.

1995:213) and “does not necessitate an intentional linkage of books within the structure of the OT canon... [It] merely recognizes the obvious fact that context influences meaning” (Sailhamer 1995:214). Thus study will borrow and use Sailhamer’s (1995:207) concept of in-textuality for the analysis of a smallest literary unity, for example, Exodus 20:2-6, Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20.

Though Sailhamer’s (1995:207-215) division of the compositional level into four sub-division is very useful for posing how a biblical text consists of some sub-units, it is limited in dealing with the relation between two texts. Rather, it is helpful to use Sommer’s (1998:6; cf. Clayton & Eric 1991:3-4, 21) approach to define the relationship between texts: “influence” and “allusion”, and “intertextuality”. According to Sommer (1998:7f.), the term used in this field can be formulated as follows: Intertextuality “encompasses manifold connections between a text being studied and other texts, or between a text being studied and commonplace phrases or figures from the linguistic or cultural systems that do not arise exclusively from an intentional and signaled use of a earlier text, such as citation (which might be studied under the rubrics of influence or allusion).” In distinction to intertextuality, “influence” and “allusion” distinguish between the earlier text (the source or the influence) and the later one (the alluding text or the influenced) and focus attention on the author as well as on the text itself (Sommer 1998:7, 8). The distinction between the two approaches can be evinced: while the former encompasses manifold connections between a text being studied and other texts, or common place phrases and figures from the linguistic or cultural systems whether they come from an earlier or later stage than the text being studied, but doesn’t concern whether the links is known to the author of the text being studied and focuses not on the author of a text but either on the text itself or on the reader: the latter as diachronic

approach distinguishes between the earlier text (the source or the influence) and the later one (the alluding text or the influenced) and focuses attention on the author as well as on the text itself. According to Sommer (1998:10-18), however, ““allusion” and “influence” are not a subdivision of intertextuality, but a different category of relation between two texts at the same level, and are not identical. Both concepts, along with some related notions, need to be described on their own. They can, however, be grouped under inner biblical allusion and exegesis.”

This study will focus on the distinction between allusion and influence, and intertextuality on relations between texts. More specifically, this study will use the inner-biblical allusion and exegesis to decide the one text’s dependence to another. This study prefers to use ‘allusion’ or ‘influence’ rather than ‘intertextuality’. This distinction is very useful to study the relations of literary texts including biblical texts because while the former concerns the one text’s dependence to another between two texts, the latter doesn’t (Sommer 1998:7f.). According to Sommer (1998:10-18), echo and exegesis can be added to its rubric. It is not easy to discern the boundary between them. Thus, this study will utilize the model of inner biblical allusion and exegesis in wider meaning including the other rubric: allusion, influence, echo, and exegesis. Sommer (Cf. 1998:20-31) classifies the nature of the relationship along two axes. “One is concerned with form or rhetoric:....explicit citation, implicit reference and inclusion. The other with meaning, interpretation or strategy:....exegesis, influence, revision, polemic, allusion and echo.”

The necessity and advantage of using “allusion” and “influence” rather than “intertextuality” for the study of the relation between biblical texts dealing with the

provenance of an idea and its reflection can be evinced. Comparing Exodus 20:3-6 with Exodus 32:1-6 and Exodus 20:3-6 with Isaiah 40:18-20 respectively, calls for enquiring into the methods used by the authors of Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20 respectively. Whereas this study will borrow and use Sailhamer's (1995:207) concept of in-textuality for the analysis of a smallest literary unity, for example, Exodus 20:2-6, Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20 and call the term *in-textuality* to designate a textual composition of the smallest unity, this study will borrow and use Sommer's (1998) concept for comparing between Exodus 20:2-6 and Exodus 32:1-6 and between Exodus 20:2-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20: exegesis, influence, revision, polemic, allusion and echo and call the term *inner-biblical interpretation* to designate a discipline dealing with the relation between two texts. This enquiry calls for attention to the allusivity found in Exodus 20:3-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20. Both seem to use earlier texts. Considered the aim of this study, it would be preferable to use the term "allusion" and "influence" rather than "intertextuality" as will be shown later on.¹¹

1.2.3 Thematic - theological consideration

Exodus 20:1-17 can be analyzed according to ancient Near Eastern Treaties having a similar pattern: 1. Preamble (Ex 20:1), 2. Historical prologue (Ex 20:2) and 3. Stipulation (Ex 20:3-17). The Decalogue of Exodus 20:3-17 functions as a Stipulation of the Sinai Covenant (Cf. Kitchen 2003:284). It plays the role of constituting the laws that follow (Ex 20:22-26; 21-23; 25-31; Lv 11-20; 27).¹² Comparing Exodus 20:2 to

¹¹ See 3.4 Inner-biblical interpretation of Exodus 20:2-6 in Exodus 32:1-6 and 4.3.1.1 Inner-biblical interpretation between Exodus 20:2-3 in Isaiah 40:18-20 for a thorough discussion.

¹² The first two commandments of the Decalogue out of the larger context cannot be studied. See 2.1.1 The unity of the Sinai pericope in the present text as the final form for detail on the larger context of them.

the Hittite suzerainty treaties, we can see that it functions as a historical prologue. The name of Yahweh as a suzerain is found here, although in a reduced form. It also refers to the exodus event, which Israel experienced as Yahweh's redemptive grace in the past. The structure of this clause, which has the name of God in the form of Yahweh and his redemption in verse 2, elucidates the Decalogue as it was given by Yahweh with Israel's redemption from Egypt. The historical prologue of Exodus 20:2 stands in relation to the stipulations that follow it, which Israel as the covenantal partner had to obey (Cf. Kitchen 2003:284).

Furthermore, Kitchen (2003:288) pointed out the similarity of form between Exodus-Leviticus and Deuteronomy as well as Joshua 24 concerning the Sinai Covenant and its renewals, and ancient Near Eastern treaties, including the Hittite suzerainty treaties, indicating both of them have the same elements of a treaty.¹³ The Hittite suzerainty

¹³ In contrast to this traditional view that the Ten Commandments had been handed down to us from Moses himself stands the view that it can never be traced to the times of Moses (Cf. Nielsen 1982:88; Alt 1934; von Rad 1938; Noth 1948). On the one hand, it is maintained that the tradition of Moses as the promulgator of the law stands in relation to the Hittite vassal contracts from the middle and latter half of the second millennium B.C.E. (Cf. Nielsen 1982:90). In these vassal contracts or covenants the Great King would remind his vassals or partners of the benefits he and his predecessors has bestowed upon them, and he would issue the basic demand for loyalty. Thereafter would follow a number of separate regulations such as the invocation of the deities of the parties, curses against a possible violator of the contract, and regulations on how to preserve the document (Cf. Nielsen 1982:90). Mendenhall (1955) contends that the tradition of the Ten Commandments fitted into this pattern and that these Hittite analogies supported the tradition of Moses as law-giver. Mendenhall (Cf. 1954:50-76; 1955:5-41) and Baltzer (1971:9-93) says that the covenantal law of the Old Testament copied the form of the Hittite suzerain treaties. Mendenhall (1954; 1955) compared the form of the treaties between ancient Near Eastern nations. He insists on the close similarity between the form of the apodictic law of Israel and of Hittite suzerainty treaties, and indicates the commonality between the ancient Near Eastern treaties and the treaty in the Bible. Mendenhall (1954:58ff.; cf. Kitchen 2003:290) points out the clear congruence between the format of the Hittite corpus of treaties and part of Exodus plus Joshua 24, suggesting that the Sinai covenant might well have had thirteenth-century roots. Other biblical scholars, on the other hand, "have challenged the idea that the Exodus-Liviticus and/or Deuteronomic covenants reflects the structure of the second-millennium treaty covenants of the ANE, a connection that had been convincingly presented by G. E. Mendenhall (1954:26-46, 49-76; 1955) (Stuart 2006:440)" and also insist that the Bible treaty documents, including the Decalogue corresponds with ancient Near Eastern treaties of the seventh to sixth centuries B.C.E. (MaCarthy 1963; 1973; 1978) because they contain the elements of ancient Near Eastern treaties of 7th and 6th centuries B.C.E.. Kitchen (2003:290; cf. 289-294), however, says "there were clear distinctions between the late-second-millennium treaties and the first millennium group. The "formulation of the Hittite treaties" is unique to the period between 1400 and 1200 (more exactly, ca. 1380-1180

treaties are composed of the following elements: 1. Title, 2. Historical prologue, 3. Stipulation, 4. Depositing and Reading of text, 5. Witnesses (the list of gods), 6b. Blessings and 6c. curses. The Assyrian treaty is composed of the following elements: 1. Title, 5. Witness, 3. Stipulation, 6c. Curses (Mendenhall 1954:58ff; cf. Kitchen 2003:288). The corpus of Exodus-Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and Joshua24 are composed of the following elements: 1. Title, 2. Historical prologue, 3. Stipulation, 4. Depositing and Reading of text, 5. Witnesses, 6b. Blessings and 6c. Curses. The biblical covenant seems to be more similar to the Hittite suzerainty treaties than the Assyrian treaty in the comprising elements (Mendenhall1954; 1955; cf. Kitchen 2003:288). According to Kitchen (2003:284), Exodus-Leviticus, which deals with the Sinai covenant, can be analyzed according to the form of the ancient Near Eastern treaties as follows:

1. Title and preamble: Now God spoke all these words, saying...(Ex 20:1)
2. Historical Prologue: I am Yahweh your God who brought you out of Egypt...(Ex 20:2)
3. Stipulation: a. Basic / 10 words (Ex 20:3-17)
 - b1. Details (Ex 20:22-26; 21-23; 25-31)
 - b2. Details (Lv 11-20; 27)
- 4a. Depositing Text (Ex 25:6 / Book by Ark)
- 4b. Reading Out (Ex 24:7)
5. Witness (Ex 24:4 / 12 stelae)
6. Blessing (Lv 26:3-13 / If you follow My word, I send...peace)
7. Curses (Lv 26:14-43)

B.C.E.)” Stuart (2006:440; cf. Miller 2001:146-166) maintains that “the elements thought to be neo-Assyrian (i.e., not exactly typical of second-millennium treaties) are simply the specific Israelite adaptations made by Yahweh through Moses, rather than having late extrabiblical origins at all.”

The account of the covenant that God made with Israel at Mount Sinai is found in chapters 19-24 of Exodus. The rest of the Old Testament contains the story of how Israel responded to the demands of the covenant relationship. Israel has the responsibility to live according to the law under the terms of the Sinai covenant. God expects his people to fulfill their obligations under the covenant.

The abundant accusations, judgments, and sermons or instructions of the people, however, do not refer unambiguously to the Mosaic Law as if they lived their lives under the impact of the Mosaic Law whatsoever (Cf. Nielsen 1982:88). Although Clements (1975:23) argues that “we can see that the traditions which the prophets inherited and used had a place in the emergence of a distinctive covenant ideology in Israel”, he attributes the concept of the prophet as a covenant mediator to the product of later theology.”¹⁴ Mayes (1979:60-71) agrees with Clement, saying “Deuteronomic covenant theology is not in itself to be understood as an innovation, but as the end of a

¹⁴ Regarding the office of prophets Clements (1965:127; cf. 23f, 123) states that “the distinctiveness of the canonical prophets...lays in their particular relationship to, and concern with, the covenant between Yahweh and Israel.” Prophets were the ones who “actualized covenant tradition in a situation of crisis, in which the older had fallen into decay” (Clements 1965:123). Clements (1965:23f.) presents this thesis in connection with the more general acknowledgement that “the controlling factor” in the development of the several literary traditions in the Old Testament was Israel’s knowledge of their covenant relationship with Yahweh. Clements (1965:54) says that the actual term ‘covenant’ was only found twice in the eighth-century B.C.E. prophets, i.e. in Hosea 6:7 and 8:1. He argues that to elect someone leads to some kind of special relationship between the one who elects and the one who is being elected. Within this framework the obligations of the latter are set out. The use of the term ‘covenant’ to describe such a relationship was ‘only of secondary importance’. Clements (1965:126) holds that the prophets’ unique contribution was to reactivate the idea of the covenant, which had fallen into neglect. He goes as far as to assert that, without the prior fact of the covenant, the prophets would be unintelligible to us. In general, scholars see the prophets as drawing on the various ways in which disaster could occur in the ancient Near East employing the legal metaphor of a court action (Cf. Phillips 2002:164-165). These scholars attempt to explain many concepts within the prophetic corpus as deriving from the political suzerain treaties. According to them, there was a strange lack of theological creativeness on Israel’s part when confronted with radically changed circumstances. One could have expected them to develop new theological insights (Cf. Phillips 2002:165). Clements (1965:126) abandoned the attempt to see the prophet as fulfilling the office of covenant-mediator based on Deuteronomy 18:15-22. He considered the Deuteronomist as interpreter of the prophets who were both preachers of *tōrâ* and a spokesman of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel.

In this, Clements relied on Mendenhall’s (1954a: 26-46; 1954b:50-76) thesis that related the covenant to the Hittite suzerainty treaties, which were reflected in the prophetic curse and lawsuit oracles.

process, which is finally assimilated into a system, as set out in the Deuteronomic history work. The law and the prophets are thus very early seen in conjunction, which explains the almost total absence of the canonical prophets from the Deuteronomistic History.” Barr (1977:23-28), however, says “whether the covenant of Yahweh with Israel became significant so late” is suspicious. Barr (1977:23-28; cf. Martin-Achard 1978:299-306) suggests “that syntactical and linguistic, rather than ideological and theological restrictions might explain its use in one kind of linguistic context and not in another.” Muilenburg (1965:97) maintains that the prophets were “like Moses, Yahweh’s messengers, his covenantal mediators...[were] sent from the divine King, the suzerain of the treaties.” Muilenburg (1966:466) points out that there is a close connection in respect of the continuing influence of the Sinai covenant on the commission that Israel received: “covenant (בְּרִית) and teaching (תּוֹרָה) belong together; the covenant people have been entrusted with teaching or law (Cf. Ex 19-24).” Kitchen (2003:377) indicates the prophets’ main theme as follows:

[T]heir main themes involve warnings of punishment for wrong-doing, whether “religious” (cultic) or moral/ethical, against both foreign nations and Israel/Judah, and (often) promises of restoration and blessing if the admonitions be heeded and Israel/Judah return to a “clean” and exclusive worship of YHWH.

The Sinai covenant, with repeated blessing/curses for obedience/disobedience, was a basis for all that followed it, especially for the prophets as plenipotentiaries of the covenant (Cf. Kitchen 2003:397). They were all basing their polemic on the old Sinai covenant: the worship of YHWH versus other deities and images plus their rites (Cf.

Kitchen 2003:401). The prophets sought to call both rulers and people back to the Sinai covenant, and invoke its curses, while looking also for the future blessing after the punishment was over (Kitchen 2003:401). They in effect tried to call Israel and Judah back to their ancestral covenant made at Sinai, which made them subjects of the sole sovereign, their god YHWH (Kitchen 2003:420). Like other kings, he required their exclusive allegiance, not shared with other deities, hence a basic monotheism (Kitchen 2003:420).¹⁵

Broadly, the prophet's main themes involve warnings of punishment for wrong-doing and promises of restoration and blessing if the admonitions be heeded and Israel/Judah return to a "clean" and exclusive worship of Yahweh (Kitchen 2003:377). The conjunction of curse/blessing proceeded from the terms of the long-standing covenant first established at Sinai following the exodus from Egypt, and renewed by Jordan, as can still be seen in Leviticus 26 as well as Deuteronomy 28 (Kitchen 2003:377). That covenant underlays the prophetic call to the people and kings urging them to follow the traditional covenant and its exclusivity in the worship of YHWH, providing practical application in right living, treating one's fellows justly and kindly (Kitchen 2003:377). The main theme of the Prophets is Israel's disloyalty to her ancient covenant with YHWH as their sole and sovereign god, by adding other cults to his, or even going over to other cults in his stead, and indulging in forbidden practices (Kitchen 2003:395).¹⁶

¹⁵ 'Monotheism' differs from 'henotheism' and 'monolatry' (Kitchen 2003:330-333). Monotheism can be found as early as the fourteen/thirteenth centuries B. C. E.. None of the commonplace objections to a "Mosaic monotheism" made by Biblicists have any actual validity (Cf. Stager 1998:148-149; Propp 1999/2000:537-575)

¹⁶ Kitchen (2003:395; cf. 330-333) points out that the monotheism of Israel is as prominent as other nations, stressing some three point: "First, YHWH's role as *sovereign* in a treatylike covenant meant that he stood over Israel as their ultimate-and *sole*-king, even though that terminology (Hebr. *Melek*) was scrupulously avoided...Second, monotheism was *not* invented among uprooted Jews during the Babylonian exile in the sixth century B.C.E....Third...a belief in, and loyalty to, just one deity *does* naturally tend to lead to the exclusion of all other deities, regardless of whether they are thought to exist

The demands for righteousness (and against non-YHWH cults) throughout some prophets presuppose the socio-religious requirements of Exodus and Deuteronomy, which are much more pervasive (Kitchen 2003:377). With this go the prophetic condemnations of social injustice in the Israel/Judean conduct of daily life, which also constituted of the breach of the social justice dimension of the basic covenant, held since Sinai (Kitchen 2003:395). Thus, the Sinai covenant, with repeated blessings/curses for obedience/disobedience, was a basis for all that followed it, especially in the prophets (Kitchen 2003:397). The prophets were all basing their polemic on the Sinai covenant, along two lines: (1) the worship of YHWH versus other deities and images plus their rites, and (2) social justices that equally broke with the letter and/or spirit of the social injunctions of the Sinai covenant in Exodus and Leviticus and allied items in Numbers and in Deuteronomy (Kitchen 2003:401). The prophets sought to recall both rulers and people to the ancient covenant, and invoked its curses, while looking also for future blessing when the discipline of punishment was over (Kitchen 2003:401). Classic Israelite prophets of the early first millennium did not start from nowhere. They in effect recalled Israel and Judah to their ancestral covenant from Sinai, which made them the subjects of a sole sovereign, their god, YHWH (Kitchen 2003:420). Like other kings, he required their exclusive allegiance, not shared with other deities, hence a basic monotheism-something already “in the air” in the fourteenth centuries B.C., with older roots (Kitchen 2003:420). During the settlement period the Hebrews compromised in practice, then in concept, by admitting other deities also, in breach of covenant (Kitchen 2003:420). Thus the prophets recalled Israel to an *existing*, former covenant; they were not imposing something *new*, or nobody would have listened (Kitchen 2003:420).

also well (henotheism, monolatry) or are deemed to be nonexistent (strict monotheism).”

Labuschagne (1969:133-134; cf. Sellin 1933:12) points to the relation between “this experience of Israel at the beginning of its history, that Yahweh by virtue of His act of salvation is the incomparable One” and its maintenance by prophetic voices (Cf. Dt 26:5ff.; Jos 24:5ff.; Jdg 6:13; Am 2:10; Hs 11:1; 13:4; Mi 6:4; Jer. 2:6).”¹⁷ Prophetic appeal to the covenant is explicit in the Prophets.¹⁸ The correspondence between Pentateuchal law and prophetic covenant lawsuit in this case, however, has to be substantiated. How did the prophets as plenipotentiaries of Yahweh in the administration of his covenant with Israel recall Israel to the old covenant and apply the law?

The Pentateuchal laws are depicted as part of the covenant between God and Israel. The laws are made special to Israel, the covenant partner of God. Bergen (1974:211-212) indicates how this was recognized by the prophets. He says:

¹⁷ An investigation into the question of the place of the concept of Yahweh’s incomparability in the cult world” (Labuschagne 1969:134) requires to be mentioned separately. But “the concept was not linked with one particular cultic act or festival, but that it had its place in the whole of the cycle of annual festivals and in individual religious life, even as it has its place to this day in the Jewish divine service.” (Labuschagne 1969:134)

¹⁸ This is found in the three of the “great” prophets, and in four of the Twelve (Kitchen 2003:377). Bergen (1974:221) says that “a look at the contents of the accusation portion (which stipulates what the “accused” has done wrong) of the prophetic judgment-speeches of Amos, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah reveals a correspondence in content to certain Pentateuchal laws” Bergen concentrates on the offences actually cited by the prophets in their indictment. His argument rests not only on Mendenhall’s thesis about the covenant origins of Israel, but also on Alt’s distinction between apodictic law and casuistic law. Bergen contends that, whenever the prophets used law as basis of their condemnation of Israel, their accusation was grounded solely on the breach of apodictic law, because nowhere is there any appeal to casuistic law. Bergens’s view is that the prophets understood that God had made a covenant with Israel, conceived of as a treaty, by which it was committed to a certain standard of behaviour as set out in the apodictic law, and which God himself would enforce. For Bergen, it is in the prophetic judgment speech that the law and prophets come together. He relies on Westermann’s (1967) analysis of the forms of prophetic speech. Thus Bergen maintains that a comparison of Alt’s apodictic law and the content of the accusation sections of the prophetic judgment speeches indicates that the latter was entirely dependent on the former (Blenkinsopp 1977).

For the criticism of Bergen’s thesis see Schottroff 1977:3-29; cf. Mendenhall 1954:29-30; Gevirtz 1961:137-158; Kilian 1963:185-202.

The Prophets establish that a law must be part of the covenant in three ways: 1) by the language they use... the language of a number of the disasters, which are announced as consequences of this behavior, is paralleled in the treaty-curses....2) by the use of form. Isaiah institutes a covenant lawsuit indicting the people for behavior contrary to apodictic law...3) by establishing what it is about the accused that makes him indictable. The accused is... 'Israel,' the covenant community. If the covenant people or its representatives behave contrary to apodictic law, it is ground for a covenant lawsuit, amounts to "rebellion" against, and not recognizing the authority of this covenant sovereign. It results in the activation of the covenant-curses (Bergen 1974:221-222).

There are a considerable number of instances where a prophet makes explicit reference to earlier laws (Fishbane 1985:293; cf. Kitchen 2003:401). In addition to explicit prophetic references to Pentateuch laws, there are many other cases where the relationship is implicit and much less precise (Fishbane 1985:295). The references to Pentateuchal laws are oblique and indirect and has almost no firm lexical basis. But even this lack of explicit references is not sufficient to gainsay the strong impression made by the sources that a prophet was aware of ancient Israelite legal traditions, and that he made use of them in the course of his covenantal lawsuit (Fishbane 1985:295).

According to Fishbane (1985:296), we can conclude from the antiquity of apodictic formulations of law in ancient Israel that the Prophets made considerable use of ancient Israelite legal traditions. It can be inferred that the older Israelite legal stratum, whether it may be official or local, ethnic or civic, oral or written, was recognized and utilized by the prophets in their covenant disputations (Fishbane 1985:296).

The ideological background of a prophetic passage may be deduced from the basis of known Pentateuchal sources and ideas (Fishbane 1985:299). That the prophets utilized the old legal notions aggadically - although just how, and in what state these were known to them, is uncertain (Fishbane 1985:299). In this manner, the prophets exegetically reinterpreted the old law. The textual transformation is aggadic: while the aggadic rhetoric does not exist for the sake of the old tradition, that is, for the sake of its *legal* exegesis. Rather, the aggadic exegesis existed solely for its own rhetorical sake, and the law functions as the particular occasion for the rhetorical-exegetical enterprise which results, not more (Fishbane 1985:300).

Wright (1962) proposed that the form of the covenant lawsuit was as follows:

1. Call to the witnesses to give ear to the proceedings.
2. Introductory statement of the case at issue by the Divine Judge and Prosecutor or by his earthly official.
3. Recital of the benevolent acts of the Suzerain.
4. The indictment.
5. The sentence.

Harvey (1967) suggested a more elaborated scheme, distinguishing between five 'stable elements' in the form as follows:

1. Preparation for the trial, including the summoning of heaven and earth as witnesses, declaration of the judge's right to act, and the accusation.

2. Cross-examination by the judge, who is also the plaintiff; no response is ever expected or given.
3. The persecutor's accusatory address, usually recalling the plaintiff's past benefits and the accused's infidelity.
4. Official declaration of the accused's guilt.
5. Type A: Condemnation expressed in threats, but not in judgments.
Type B: Positive instruction as to how the accused should respond.

Nielsen (1978) also suggested an outline of the lawsuit in the simplest possible form as follows:

1. Depiction of the scene of the trial
2. Accusation
3. Defense
4. Judgment.

Under the continuing influence of the Sinai covenant, Isaiah follows the contents of certain Pentateuchal laws. The laws found in the Pentateuch are part of the covenant between God and Israel. The prophetic use of the second commandment represents basically the same fundamental objection to images which Israel has learned before.

The prophet Isaiah's prohibition of God's image on account of the incomparability of God, is in line with the prohibition of God's image in the Sinai covenant in Exodus. The Sinai covenant, with its repeated blessing/curses for obedience/disobedience, formed the basis for all that followed it, especially for the prophets as plenipotentiaries of the

covenant. As Kitchen (2003:420) says, they based their polemic on the old Sinai covenant: “The prophets sought to call both rulers and people back to the Sinai covenant, and invoke its curses, while looking also for the future blessing after the punishment was past. They in effect tried to call Israel and Judah back to their ancestral covenant made at Sinai, which made them subjects of the sole sovereign, their god YHWH. Like other kings, he required their exclusive allegiance, not shared with other deities, hence a basic monotheism.”

Isaiah poses the covenant disputation of deviation on the prohibition of making any image of God to the covenant people, introducing God’s incomparability with a formula of God’s self-predication, which is seen in structure of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:2-6. Thus, this study presents that Isaiah’s covenant disputation of Isaiah 40:18-20 is based on the Decalogue in Exodus 20:2-6.

The prophet Isaiah acts as plenipotentiary of the covenant who accuses the people of the covenant according to this covenantal law. He uses of the first two commandments to show to Israel, the covenant community of Yahweh, that the incomparability of God requires the prohibition to represent Yahweh in any way, whether cultic or not.

According to Williamson (2003:393), “many scholars have suggested that either the whole or part of the opening chapter of the Book of Isaiah is in itself a part of a ‘covenant lawsuit’.” The term ‘covenant lawsuit’ can be replaced by ‘prophetic lawsuit’ or ‘prophetic/covenant *rîb*’.¹⁹ This genre was considered as a genre for representing God

¹⁹ For a general discussion of the covenantal lawsuit see Daniel 1987:339-60; Huffmon 1959:285-95; Roche 1983:563-574; Wright 1962:26-67.

as formally accusing his people and finding them guilty, although its specific background should be in the particular indictment of covenant infringement associated with secular ancient Near Eastern treaties. (Cf. Nielsen 1978:5-26; Houtmann 1993:117-22)

The rhetoric of the book of Isaiah, of which the formal structure comprises of several major sections, and presents a complex frameworking of patterns and repetitions among its subunits, is closest to that of the prophetic covenant disputation (O'Connell 1994:19-20). It may be inferred that the book of Isaiah best manifests its structural unity, thematic coherence and rhetorical emphasis when read as an exemplar of the prophetic covenant disputation genre (O'Connell 1994:20). Arrangement of materials in the book was understood to cohere under the rhetoric of prophetic covenant disputation (O'Connell 1994:21). It seems reasonable to infer that overall rhetoric of the book is that of a prophetic covenant disputation, that it is the covenant disputation that forms the basis of the book's rhetorical strategy (O'Connell 1994:21). Isaiah's exordium (1:1-2:5) appears to be a truncated version of the biblical covenant disputation form and an aggregate of rhetorical elements typical of ancient Near Eastern and biblical covenant disputation forms, aligning with the rhetorical strategy of the book of Isaiah as a whole (O'Connell 1994:21).²⁰

²⁰ These explicit examples of a strategy such as disputation against the people (3:13-14a; cf. 27:8; 45:9; 57:16), vindication of his servant before the people in 49:25 and 50:8, and vindication of his people before the nations (51:22; cf. 2:4; 41:11) in Isaiah to portray YHWH in covenant disputation may lend further support that it is the genre of covenant disputation that best defines the controlling rhetoric strategy of the book, even though the book contains a variety of speech forms, which would not normally be associated with a covenant disputation form (O'Connell 1994:21).

Similarity is found in both legal and prophetic parts in forbidding images in worship showing a negative attitude towards idolatry, i.e. worship of God through images.²¹ It results from the office of the prophet as a plenipotentiary of the covenant having the authority to accuse the people according to the covenantal law. This can be seen in the prophetic curses and lawsuit oracles, which was inherited from a distinctive covenant ideology in Israel. One of the main themes found in the “written prophets” is Israel’s disloyalty to the ancient covenant with YHWH being their sole God and sovereign. The prophet Isaiah as a plenipotentiary of the covenant stresses the idea of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel.

Isaiah’s references to the covenant responsibility in connection with the one of divine self-predication have to be attended to:

[A] basic formula such as “I am Yahweh” has specific connotations [in this case, the incomparability of God as the motif for the prohibition of images of God] and retains these through changing historical circumstances ([in this case, not the fall of Jerusalem, the loss of the liturgical context of the temple worship, and the exile to Babylon in general, as scholars assume, but a warning about disobedience, the proclamation about the fall of Jerusalem, and of Yahweh’s judgment on their sin of worshipping other gods and of God through images]) (Harner 1988:159).

²¹ Many passages on idol-critique can also be conceptualized according to the form below. Schematically, they can be represented according to Bergen’s (1974:183) thesis, which is presented in a tabular form as follows:

1) A summary of the contents of the prophets’ accusations, the contents of which corresponds to that of certain Pentateuchal laws;
2) The prophetic passages where each accusation is found;
3) The corresponding Pentateuchal legislation.

<i>Accusation</i>	<i>Prophetic Passage</i>	<i>Pentateuchal Legislation</i>
Images	Mi 1:7; 5:12; Is 10:10; Jr 8:19	Ex 20:4; Lv 26:1; Dt 27:15
Idolatry	Is 2:8, 18, 20; Jr 1:16	Lv 19:4; 26:1

Harner's (1988) insight on divine self-predication in the Old Testament supplies a vehicle for a thematic approach in this thesis.

Isaiah thought of Israel as the covenant community that had the obligation to follow the religious and ethical tenets of the Sinai covenant and in very careful, and tactful ways-such as the use of the formula "I am Yahweh"-reminded his audience that they were called to live responsibly as the community of the covenant. When Isaiah connects the self-predication "I am Yahweh" with a reminder to Israel of their covenant responsibility, he is employing this self-predication in a way that he had evidently become familiar with from existing Old Testament traditions.

Kitchen (2003:396) points out that one of the main strands which can be seen in the Sinai covenant is its monotheistic and exclusive basis. It can be seen in the "Ten Words" (Ex 20:1-17): no deity alongside/instead of YHWH, and no material images for worship (Ex 20:3-4). Under the continuing influence of the Sinai covenant (Ex 19:5), the Prophets share with the Pentateuch the accentuation of God's word against images. According to Childs (1974:409), the prophetic use of the second commandment continues basically the same fundamental objection to images which Israel has learned from the beginning (Cf. Phillips 2002:178).²² The prophetic use of the second commandment by the prophet being a plenipotentiary of the covenant accusing the people of the covenant according to this covenantal law, shows that at least to Israel, the

²² See Phillips (2007:178) for the explanation of the prophetic silence about the Decalogue and its provisions. Phillips's comment is helpful to understand the prophetic silence about the law of the Pentateuch. Phillips (2002:178) mentions that the prophetic silence can be due to other reasons than the ignorance of its existence.

covenant community of Yahweh, the incomparability of God requires the prohibition to represent Yahweh in any way, whether cultic or not.

Isaiah met with pagan cultures because pagan religion was already present and pervasive. In chapters 40-55, the idols were taken into account, for they were real to some Israelites (Cf. Labuschagne 1966:144). As in the rest of the Bible, Isaiah insists that the Supreme Power ruling the universe is totally different from his creation. God cannot be represented by any form in the universe, and cannot be manipulated by any of those forms. The inevitable result of such a belief is monotheism, as represented in the Scriptures (Oswalt 1998:175). As Sarna (1991:144-145) observes, “the essence of monotheism is that God is absolutely sovereign precisely because He is wholly independent of the world He created...to present an invisible God in any material and tangible form whatsoever is by definition to distort the divine reality.” (Cf. Enns 2000:569).

Isaiah considered Israel to be a covenant community with the obligation to follow the religious and ethical tenets of the Sinai covenant. By using the rhetorical question followed by an idol-fabrication passage Isaiah reminded his audience that they were called to live responsibly as the community of the covenant (Harner 1988:152). Isaiah uses it in connection with a theme that was expressed in the Sinai covenant, even though he uses it with new emphasis on the meaning of it in Isaiah 40-55 (Harner 1988:159).

In sum, the close correlation between the first two commandments of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:2-6, and the passages in Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20 dealing with the

incomparability of God and the prohibition of making any image of God will be examined thematically. The passages of Exodus 20:3-6, Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20 share the same theological context, namely the prohibition on making any image of God on account of God's incomparability. The prophet Isaiah reuses the second commandment of the Decalogue, in which God prohibits the making of any image of God in the context of his incomparability. The request here is not to place God in line with other gods in the pantheistic shrine. This would degrade him to a mere god among other gods in the pantheon. This forms the basis of what follows. As a result of the exegesis of these two passages, it is clear that both express the same theme, which seems to be too consistent to be coincidental or simply attributable to a common tradition. The thematic continuity between the two passages can be inferred from their linguistic affinities. Thematically, this continuity comes from the office of the prophets as covenantal plenipotentiaries. The prophets condemn the human partner of the covenant in a covenantal lawsuit, using the law, which originated in the Sinai covenant. Thus, the Ten Commandments, as the law of the Sinai covenant were used by the prophets in their role as covenantal plenipotentiaries. The prohibition on any image of God, expressed explicitly in the structure and theme of the first two commandments in Exodus, explicates the provenance of the prohibition of images of God in the Old Testament. Therefore, the prohibition on any image of God in Isaiah shows the same theological thought as found in the Decalogue of Exodus. It is especially clear in the passages in Isaiah 40:18-20 dealing with a rhetorical question followed by an idol-fabrication.

<Excursus 1> The formation the Law and the Prophets of the Old Testament

The basic presupposition of this study on the canon formation is that the present form of the canon is, in reality, identical to the Pentateuch in the time of Moses. The argument of this study implies that the present form of the Pentateuch is not something, which grows and reaches a final form after a long history of tradition.

Childs (1979:56, 60-61) insists that the present form of the Hebrew canon as a product of a historical development has to be recognized, distinguishing between the history of the literature and the history of the canon. Childs (1979:62) maintains that, although “writing the word of God by Moses (Cf. Dt 31:24ff.) cannot be unequivocally fixed, nor can the scope of the law attributed to Moses be determined with certainty, many scholars agree that the age is pre-exilic and the scope is not to be identified with the whole Pentateuch.” In view of the identification of the literary and canonical history, Childs (1979:61) criticizes both Kline’s view and Freedman’s on the relation between the literary and canonical history as follows: “In the recent search for a new reconstruction of the history of Israel there have been several attempts to identify the two processes, whether by means of a new literary –critical hypothesis (Freedman) or by a return to an older conservative position (Kline). In my judgment, whether stemming from the left or right of the theological spectrum, is a step backward and cannot be sustained.” Childs (1979:61) indicates Kline’s basically dogmatic formulation of the history of the canon in terms of a divine inspiration which assured an inerrant transmission of the Word of God. In my judgment, as Kline (1981:40) points out, “the theories on canon formation are only hypotheses concerning the time of composition or redaction of the various books or parts of it, having dictated the shape of the canon formation.”²³ Kline’s (1981:25-61) theory does more justice to the biblical account with his view on the canon formation in the light of Ancient Near Eastern custom, namely that divine revelation is immediately recorded, and in the light of the internal example of the Bible of this custom. The identification of the literary and canonical history is considered as legitimate by

²³ Harrison (1969:284) correctly says that the fundamental issue is whether they consider divine inspiration as the principle of canon formation or not. Beckwith (2003:52) also states “what qualifies a book for a place in the canon of the Old Testament...is not just that it is ancient, informative and helpful, and has long been read and valued by God’s people, but that it has God’s authority for what it says....It is not just a record of revelation, but the permanent written form of revelation. This is what we mean when we say the Bible is inspired and it makes the books of the Bible in this respect different from all other books,” although “the issue of inspiration in biblical exegesis is [still] controversial...as far as it[s] meaning and applications are concerned” (Lee 2004:220; cf. Geisler 1980:227-264).

some scholars, on account of the many evidences both internal and external to the Bible. During the Mosaic age specific collections of laws were put into writing, as indicated by the formulation of the Book of the Covenant (Ex 24:4ff.) and the composition of the essentials of Deuteronomy (Harrison 1969:263). As scholars (Childs 1979:62; Harrison 1969:263; Vasholz 1990:2ff.) commonly observes, the book of Deuteronomy (Cf. Dt 31:24ff) records an act which clearly reflects an early stage in the growth of the canon. Moses wrote the words of the divine law in a book that was deposited at the side of the ark of the covenant for periodical reading before the entire assembly of Israel. Vasholz (1990:43) points to the internal evidence that the divine revelations were recognized as such by his people from the time when they first appeared and written and kept in God's shrine. The belief that God could reveal his will by means of a holy book was thus an early and indelible feature of Israelite religious life (Harrison 1969:264). The nature of the Old Testament itself argues strongly for its accurate preservation (Vasholz 1990:82).

This study would like to presume that on the canonization process of the Pentateuch. Van Zyl (1983:44-47) wants to determine the earliest period of canon formation, and views Moses as the departure point for such a canon history. Van Zyl (1983:50) assumes that Moses complied with his prerequisite; he recorded the authoritative words of Yahweh, and thus, the history of canon can start here and illustrate how things developed from this point.

As Beckwith (2003:53) says, the Pentateuch presents itself to us as basically the work of Moses, one of the earliest and certainly the greatest of the Old Testament Prophets (Nm 12:6-8; Dt 34:10-12). As Beckwith (2003:53) points out, God often spoke through Moses orally, as he did through later prophets, but Moses' activity as a writer is also frequently mentioned (Ex 17:14; 24:7; 34:27; Nm. 33:2; Dt 25:58, 61; 29:20-27; 30:10; 31:9-13,19, 22, 24-26). Van Zyl (1983:50-56, 59) says that "during the time of Moses a nucleus of the canon existed which comprised of the Decalogue and the book of the covenant and some other regulations, and historical references were also included. This nucleus was not only written down but also accepted as normative for the believing community." Thus, although it is difficult to say accurately how the Pentateuch was compiled in the formation of the canon, it can be possible to say as follows (Cf. Childs 1979:62): Moses' writing of Exodus 20-24 as the covenant law of the Sinai covenant (Ex 24:18) (Marshall 1993; cf. Song 1992:145-147)²⁴; Moses' writing of Exodus 25-Numbers 10 as the Levitic law (Nm 33:1-2) (Kaufmann 1974:24-57); Moses' writing of Deuteronomy 12-26 as

²⁴ Marshall (1993) maintains that so-called 'the Book of Covenant' (Cf. Ex 24:8), which is allotted to Exodus 21-23, includes Exodus 20, namely, the Decalogue, so that it can be identified as Exodus 20-24. He argues that the times of writing of the Book of Covenant can be traced to the times before the kingship of Israel emerges.

the Deuteronomic law (Dt 31:9-22) (Korosć 1931; Mendenhall 1955); Moses' writing of the narrative of the Pentateuch conjuncted with other laws (Ex 17:14; Nm 33:2) (Unger 1951:217). Although there is some exceptions (Gn 12:6; 13:7; 14:17; 36:9-43), which is not possible to be attributed to Moses, we believe that Moses is the fundamental and real author of the Pentateuch (Young 1964:45). Wilson (1929:11) says that "the Pentateuch as it stands is historical from the time of Moses, and Moses was its real author, though it may have been revised and edited by latter redactors, the additions being just as much as inspired and as true as the rest." This study would like to presume that on the canonization process of the Pentateuch. The written word became the norm and played an extremely important role in the religion of Israel (van Zyl 1983:80-85). For the Pentateuch, at least, it was recognized and accepted as canon by the community, although before the acceptance, the Pentateuch had acquired canonical status (Cf. Kline 1981:40). We can see the witness of the Old Testament itself to its inspiration by God and authority as the word of God, and the response of the people of God to acknowledge and accept it in the Law (Beckwith 2003:52-53). As House (1998:971-Korean Edition) says, "the text of the Bible itself insists that it is the word of God and thus the faith community has confessed and obeyed the text of the Bible itself as the word of God." From the witness of the Old Testament itself its inspiration by God can be seen, its authority as the word of God, and the response of the people of God to acknowledge and accept as the Law (Ex 24:7; 2 Ki 22-23; 1 Chr 34; Neh. 8:9, 14-17; 10:28-39; 13:1-3) (Vasholz 1990:82; cf. Beckwith 2003:52-53).

The identification of the literary and canonical history is considered as legitimate by some scholars (Vasholz 1990), on account of the many external evidences to the Bible. Ancient Near Eastern religions also show that the divine revelation should be written down as soon as it was given to the people of the god by their god. What can be said, however, is that from the very beginning of its existence high authority was attached to its contents, and as a result it is little wonder that it became the first major section of the Hebrew Scriptures to be accorded unquestioned acceptance prior to subsequent formal canonicity (Harrison 1969:264).

It is impossible, in the light of present knowledge, to state with any degree of certainty exactly when the Pentateuch was finished in its present form. This study agrees with the view that the origin of the Old Testament canon coincided with the founding of the kingdom of Israel by the covenant at Sinai. Kline (1981:27-68) insists that the structure of biblical authority came from the ancient Near Eastern covenants, and insists on a tripartite theory similar to the standard theory of canon formation, with a suggestion on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Beckwith (2003:56) argues for the priority of the Pentateuch to the other parts of the canon. In reality, "the Law of Moses" was accepted as the only Law of Israel in History (Jos 1:7,8; 8:31, 32,

33; 11:15, 20; 14:2; 21:2; 23:6; Jdg 3:4; 1 Ki 2:3; 2 Ki 14:6; 21:8; 1 Chr 34:14; 23:18; 25:4; 35:12; Ezr 3:2; 6:8; Nh 8:1-8; 13:1). This is an evidence that the Pentateuch has been written already and predates the Prophets. In the Prophets, although only the expression 'the law' is seen, because only the Law of Moses was accepted as the law of Israel, the law can be identical with "the Law of Moses" in Prophets. Kline (1981:39) insists that on the concept of a canonical Scripture, the formative factor in Israel's literature in prophetic times is never compatible, because where there is a divine covenant of the classical Old Testament kind, there is a divine covenantal canonical document. What can be said convincingly is that from the very beginning of its existence high authority was attached to its contents, and as a result of it, that "it became the first major section of the Hebrew Scriptures to be accorded unquestioned acceptance prior to subsequent formal canonicity" is little wonder (Harrison 1969:264).

The distinguishing between the history of the literature and the history of the canon is rejected in this study, because it is impossible to separate canon, text and authority (House 1998:47; cf. Childs 1985:25). All individual book of the Bible has been written and accepted as a canon in a historical time. Thus the canon of the Old Testament is the collection of each book, which comprises the Bible (Cf. VanGemeren 1988). From this point of view, this study concerns, firstly, the time when the people of God has accepted an individual of the Bible as a canon. It can be said that for the Pentateuch, it has been accepted as a canon from the beginning of the writing. Secondly, the historical context of the being accepting of the Pentateuch as a canon is the making covenant between God and Israel in the times of Moses (Cf. VanGemeren 1988).

On the formation of the second subcollection of the canon, how can the relation of the literary and canonical history be regarded? Although the evidence from the Old Testament about how it was transmitted does appear meager-this is because transmission is assumed. An exploration of the Old Testament does provide some clues about its transmission (Cf. Vasholz 1990:83ff.). The external evidences are also opposed to the theory of the utterance of the Prophets might be handed down through time orally, before reaching written form, and of oral or written later additions to their oracles without knowledge or permission but still in their name (Kitchen 2003:389). According to Kitchen (2003:390), although "the first stage of almost every prophetic pronouncement was its oral declaration from the mouth of the prophet or prophetess....these messages were commonly of importance primarily to the king and thus officials invariably relayed them promptly back to the royal palace - *not* orally, but in *writing*, and sent on with the least possible delay." An official would send the written-down text of more than one oracle in one and the same letter-the beginning of a "collection" of prophecies, as was to be the case very much later in the Old Testament prophetic books (Kitchen 2003:391). A letter includes some prophecies from some prophets and has some messages with their local historical

context (Kitchen 2003:391). So to speak briefly, “the picture is of individual prophecies quite promptly written down, which subsequently can be brought together into collective tablets for future reference. A named prophetic speakers are in a massive majority over unnamed ones (Kitchen 2003:391).An accurate, independent, and permanent record of the prophecies was needed, to stand as lasting witness for when possible fulfillment might occur or be required to be checked. Late in a Hebrew prophet’s life, or after his death, his oracles may have been gathered in book (scroll) format...suggests very strongly that the record of a prophet’s oracles and deeds was built up as he went along, even if tidied up a little later by himself or others (Kitchen 2003:393).” According to van Zyl (1983:66-77), no essential difference existed between the words of Moses and the prophets. The prophets believed that they were the plenipotentiaries of Yahweh and that he was working with and through them. As Kline (1981:58) points out, it can be said that “the establishment of the prophetic office was itself a matter of treaty stipulation. In the Deuteronomistic treaty, Moses, the prophet-mediator of the old covenant, arranged for his covenantal task to be furthered by a succession of prophets like unto him (Dt 18:15ff.; cf. Ex 4:16; 7:1f.).” This study assumes there was a succession of prophets (Harrison 1969:286f; Beckwith 2003:55). The position of the Prophets of the Old Testament is that the prophets spoke the word of the Lord *ipsissima verba* (Vasholz 1990:83). This was the reason why the prophetic canon could be incorporated into the existing canon.

Is it stated with any degree of certainty exactly how the individual books were incorporated into the present form of subcollection of the canon? Beckwith (2003:54) suggests that it is guessed “for earlier sacred writings to be added to and edited in the manner of the Pentateuch.” Sailhamer (1995:238) guesses with more details how the second subcollection of the canon was redacted. Sailhamer (1995:240) infers from the “connecting links which give the TaNaK its present shape” that link of the first two segments, “the Law and the Prophets” can be found out. Although Sailhamer (1987:307-15; cf. 1995:253) supposes the canonizer, who redacts the final form of the present canon, he accepts the essential part of the Pentateuch was written by Moses. Sailhamer (1995:253; cf. Schmitt 1982:170-189) suggests “the Pentateuch represents an attempt to point to the same hope as the later prophets, namely, the New Covenant. From “the work of the composer or author of the Pentateuch” Sailhamer (1995:241) suggests that the prophets, namely, both former prophets and latter prophets is linked with the Pentateuch (Cf. Jos. 1:8). Sailhamer’s (1995:241) suggestion is very plausible. The identification of the literary and canonical history is, however, considered as legitimate for the second subcollection of the canon. Its formation has to be basically attributed to the individual authors and a individual collector or a group of collectors rather than the redactor of the final form of the present canon (Cf. VanGemeren 1988).

How can the relation between the two subcollection of the canon be established? Sailhamer (1995:238) never asks “whether the Pentateuch preceded or followed the prophets literature.” Nevertheless, from the “order of priority of existing texts” Sailhamer (1995:238) suggests that “the Pentateuch is the fundamental document to which the rest of the Hebrew Bible is related inter-textually...The evident reflection of these texts on the message of the Pentateuch shows that already within the Hebrew Canon, its first section is considered basic and essential.” Sailhamer (1995:239) says that “the Law (Pentateuch) is basic to the rest of the books, which they in turn assume and build inter-textually on the Pentateuch.” This relation between the subcollections of the canon comprises the foundation of intertextuality or inner-biblical interpretation between the Law and the Prophets as part of a connected, canonical and theological whole (Cf. House 2002:269). This study, thus, describes the covenantal thematic relation between the Law and the Prophets of the Old Testament canon as follows:

- (1) Genesis to Exodus 1-19 is the prolegomenon to the Sinai covenant (Cf. Kline 1981:53-57; Kitchen 2003:242),
- (2) Exodus 20-24 presents the explicit covenantal law (Cf. Kline 1981:47-53; Kitchen 2003:242-243; Marshall 1993),
- (3) Exodus 25-Deuteronomy is an extension of the covenant prologue (Cf. Kline 1981:53-57; Kitchen 2003:242-243),
- (4) The Prophets with their prophecies acted as plenipotentiaries of Yahweh in the administration of his covenant with Israel (Cf. Kline 1981; Kitchen 2003:295-397) and their prophecies which were written and kept in the archive of King were collected and comprised of the Prophets.

1.2.4 Coming to a conclusion regarding aniconism in these passages

The thesis presented here deals with aniconism. It states that the prohibition of making any image of God, that is, ‘programmatically aniconism’ is formulated in the first and second commandments of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:3-6. It furthermore proposes that the idea of Yahweh’s incomparability and the prohibition of making images of God are closely related to each other. This is explicated in the golden calf episode in Exodus 32:1-6. In the final instance this thesis indicates that the ‘first and second

commandments construct' found in the two sections of Exodus is also found in Isaiah 40:18-20.

To defend this thesis the following outline will be followed:

Having dealt with the purpose, methodology, and aims of this study in this first chapter, the next four chapters deal with different aspects of this thesis.

Chapter 2 presents an exegesis of the introduction and the first two commandments of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:2-6 and the probability that this is the provenance of the prohibition of making any images of God in the rest of the Old Testament.

Chapter 3 examines Exodus 32:1-6 as the explication of the meaning of the second commandment. Here the exegesis of Exodus 32:1-6, its in-textuality and its the inner-biblical interpretation with Exodus 20:2-6 are dealt with. The presence of 'the introduction and the first two commandments of the Decalogue construct' in Exodus 32:1-6 will be investigated as well. Lastly, the theme of prohibition to worship Yahweh through images in Exodus 32:1-6 is studied.

Chapter 4 studies with Isaiah 40:18-20 within its macro unit in Isaiah 40:12-31, Isaiah 40-55 and Isaiah as a whole. Attention is given to passages dealing with rhetorical questions followed by a prohibition on idol-fabrication in Isaiah 40:12-31 and in Isaiah 40-55: Isaiah 41:1-7; 44:6-20; 46:5-7, focusing their compositional strategy and in Isaiah as a whole, focusing on its genre as prophetic covenantal lawsuit. Its in-textuality,

its thematic and theological approach, and the comparison of Exodus 20:2-6 with Isaiah 40:18-20 to indicate thematic-theological continuity and linguistic affinity by using inner-biblical interpretation are also explored.

Chapter 5 summarizes and concludes the whole thesis and draws a final conclusion.

1.3 Rationale

1.3.1 The final text of the canon

This study focuses on the final form of the present text, neither on the prehistory of the text and a “critically reconstructed” text, nor a “traditionally received text (*textus receptus*)” in the Bible (Sailhamer 1995:223). Thus, the starting point of exegesis is not the reconstruction of the source of the present text or the uncritical acceptance of the “traditionally received” text, but the establishment of canonical text of the Old Testament (Sailhamer 1995:223).

1.3.1.1 Text as divine narrative

The concern of historical criticism - source or literary criticism, form-criticism and tradition-criticism – is, on the one hand, to find the history of a text, rather than the literary meaning of the final text (Cf. Song 1992:11). Lee (2004:164) points out that “historical criticism developed from a ‘literary problem’ (incongruent text), but now, in the process of its development, it is being questioned on the basis of a ‘literary solution’, by a synchronic reading” and that “final text as a coherent unit in the light of literary

unity raises doubts about the validity of historical methodologies that are heavily or exclusively dependent on traditional historical...criticism.” Historical criticism concentrates on finding the original literary units in the Bible and thus lacks the synthetic aspect focusing on the finally constructed text.²⁵ Even redaction criticism does not go beyond the limit of literary criticism, although it also concerns itself with the text’s final form and asks after the redactor’s purpose in composing the text from the various redactional elements within the text.

The appropriate approach to a text is to start by investigating the present form of the text and read the text as it stands (Cf. Morberly 1983:24; Long 1989:19; Song 1992:13).²⁶ This leads us to an approach of reading the text with the positive expectation that a text makes sense as a constructed unit, especially biblical stories (Polzin 1980:17; cf. Frei 1974:324). This positive attitude to the present text is directly related to a literary work in its totality (Song 1992:14). If we appreciate the present text as a whole, we become aware of the detailed literary techniques or stylistic features used in the text (Cf. Patrick and Scult 1990:16). It is necessary to pay attention to

²⁵ This reconstruction of the biblical narrative for the meaning of the biblical text by historical criticism is shown not only in the radical historical criticism, but also in the more conservative scholarship (Cf. Sailhamer 1992:74). However, it is the written text in its final form that is inspired and useful for instruction on the status of the Bible, not the event, which is dealing with in narrative of the text. Although we stress the narrative as history-like, it is the message of this text that is the locus of revelation. According to Frei (1974:46), “the precritical understanding of Scripture, which looked to the narrative text for its clues to meaning, has been gradually replaced by a historical reading of the Bible, that is, one which looked for meaning beyond the narratives themselves to the events they recorded.” The text as depiction of the event is the source of divine revelation in terms of giving an accurate access to the event (Cf. Dressler 1981:113-138; von Rad 1962). Frei (1995:75) indicates that “the shift in protestant biblical interpretation regarding the meaning of biblical narrative was a move away from finding the meaning of the Bible in the biblical narrative themselves and an accompanying attempt to find meaning in the actual events that are the subject matter of the Bible.” However, as Sailhamer (1992:73) says this doesn’t mean that the event recorded in the narrative is not history. Rather, although the event is real historical one, we can get to know the inspired revelation from the narrative of the Bible.

²⁶ Von Rad (1962) induced a fundamental reversal of biblical theologian’s attention to the historical focus in biblical theology to that of the narrative text. Childs (1974:195f.; cf. Westermann 1985:207-209; Schwartz 1991:36) also points out the narrowness of the research oriented by historical concern and the neglect of the present text in literary criticism.

literary techniques and stylistic features within a text and find the theological intention of the author as conveyed by the literary devices used (Cf. Long 1989:37-42; Alter 1981:19). This idea implies that the author's or composer's intended motif and meaning is determined by the structure of the contents and by the shape of the work (Cf. Eissfeldt 1965:156-157; Knierim 1985:395-415). Thus, it is important to trace the ways the biblical writers organized and fashioned literary units into complete unified literary texts and whole books. We have to allow room for understanding the quality of the Hebrew literature not only in the micro aspects of the literature but also in the macro aspects of the whole work (Cf. Song 1992:11). The text's purpose is reflected in its composition. We need to understand the theological characteristics of the smaller and larger compositions and the direction, goal and tendency of an author/composer by interweaving these smaller literary units into the larger whole of the entire work (Cf. Sailhamer 1992:34-45). As Lee (2004:165) points out, "[o]ne uncovers historical meaning neither behind nor beyond the text, but within the intrinsic literary structures and contents of the literary text." This means that we do not have to limit the aim of biblical realism to a mere literary analysis understanding that the narrative were only intended to be "history-like," not real history (Cf. Frei 1974:46-50; Sternberg 1985:82). In reality, a literary approach on the Bible's witness such as Ryken (1984; 1987a; 1987b) who emphasizes "the importance of the concept of the Bible as 'God's Storybook'" has a potential pitfall that "if the Bible is a 'Storybook', it simply cannot be a 'Historical book'", although "[w]ithout denying the historical nature of the Bible, the literary approach may simply assist us...to come to an understanding of the convention of ancient Israelite storytelling (Longman 1987:27ff cited by Lee 2004:178), or serve as a means to provide historical reality behind literary form, such as the portrayal of the patriarchal 'God Shaddai' behind the poet of the book of Job (Polzin 1977:127:ff cited by

Lee 2004:178).” For Collins’ ‘history-like’ approach that says that “the narratives of the Old Testament are not indeed historical in empirical-positivistic sense” (Lee 2004:185), a pitfall that the approach has, can be warned. “An unlimited mental projection may extend from the realm of history to literature without a referential parameter” (Lee 2004:185). While the absolutist understanding of history that doesn’t regard the Bible as valuable historiography because “the Bible is a story rather than a history” (Lee 2004:178) is a pitfall, the pure literary approach on the Bible that regards the Bible as story-like history is another one.

This study maintains that the present text of the canon has to be regarded as representing real history. “The Bible”, as Frei (1974:46-50) points out, “was read literally and historically as a true and accurate account of God’s acts in real historical events. It was assumed that the realism of the biblical narratives was an indication that the biblical authors had described historical events just as they had happened. The real world was identified as the world actually described in the Bible, and one’s own world was meaningful only insofar as it could be viewed as part of the world of the Bible.” But it does not mean that the text of the Old Testament is just history or literary. It is, more accurately, a narrated history, that is, a literary narrative configuration of divine acts in history. Lee (2004:190) suggests that the text of the Old Testament “should not be considered a purely historical book, not pure literature, but a divine narrative.”²⁷ Lee

²⁷ Lee’s (2004) approach to the characteristic of witness of the Bible can be defined as *divine narrative* (as a compound noun) that indicates “the *Word-Revelation* in its final form of canonical texts.” The divine narrative approach, sharing an important element of continuity of the revelation history approach within the reformed tradition, namely the concept of revelation as a divine activity in history, regards the origin of Old Testament as not in human element but in divine revelation and in the sense the modifying word *divine* is added to *narrative* (Cf. Lee 2004:188-189). Lee (2004:202) explains what the term *narrative* implies in related with history as follows: “it [narrative] views history not as a corresponding ‘mirror-image’, but as a ‘literary coherence’ of a ‘written configuration’ about *real events*.” In this sense, the Old Testament is defined as “a narrative [that]...reflects an ancient Israelite literary coherence about corresponding events.”

(2004:191) says that “what appears to [be] irrefutable in present situation of biblical exegesis, is the view that the Old Testament is neither a ‘scientific historical book’ in the modern critical sense, nor ‘pure literature’ in terms of modern literary theories. It involves...a mystery. At this stage one can accordingly postulate that such a categorization was in fact a product of modern rationalism and irrationalism (which was certainly unknown to ancient Hebrew Writers), rather than a projection of ancient Hebrew convention inherent in the Old Testament texts.” What is clear from the Old Testament writing is that “Hebrew writers were not writing literature or historical book in term of modern empirical-positivistic or post-positivistic principle” (Lee 2004:193). Rather, “they were writing an inspired narrative of divine revelation in history” (Lee 2004:193). “The Old Testament writers narrate miraculous events ‘as if’ they are real. The question is not whether or not they did happen, but whether the Old Testament writers interpreted them as real or not, as God’s invention or not” (Lee 2004:197). “[T]he biblical miracle accounts...cannot be subjects to observable verification, which hence becomes, in terms of historical criticism, clearly a ‘story’ and not ‘history’.

However, what we are concerned with here, is not an analysis on the basis of modern categorization, but an interpretation on the basis of what the Old Testament writers tell us to have witness. That is to say there is not internal clue, for example, in the book of Exodus that indicates that miracle accounts are merely a literary invention. The Writer tells the story ‘as if’ it is real. To the writer of Exodus, miracles did in fact happen.” (Lee 2004:197). “Whether miracles are beyond science, or a violation of laws of nature, on the basis of which one may argue that such events cannot take place, it is a least clear that we have no grounds to argue that biblical authors are lying or presenting a fake account...The internal interpretation of ‘extra-ordinary’ events ‘as if’ they were real, reinforces the divine nature of [the] Old Testament narratives” (Lee 2004:1999).

Eslinger (1992:57) thus points out that “the Bible was read as history and its plot was taken for the real sequence of events that it describes.” Maier (1990:332) takes the same approach, placing the priority on the narrative of a text. Maier’s (1990:332) approach is called “biblical-historical” exegesis by himself, trying to distinguish his own method with historical-critical method and express “the priority and uniqueness of the Bible,” but “does not overlook the importance of history.” Maier (1990:333) suggests the method of biblical-historical exegesis as a way to approach to a text, insisting that the biblical narrative itself has a priority on any historical material. Although everything that happened in history was not written down, the matters written in text are, in essence, identical with what really happened in history. Sailhamer (1995:234) says that “Maier calls for an approach to biblical interpretation that is commensurate with unique nature of the Bible itself and yet does not give up important historical interest.” Sailhamer (1995:238) also shows how a present text has to be read under “the narrative purpose of these inter-textual references.” Sailhamer (1995:238) maintains that although the events of some narratives are antecedent, “but not necessarily the narratives themselves” in comparison of two texts containing two events, which one precedes the others. Sailhamer (1995:238) says that it is important to ask, “within the texts themselves, what order of priority of the existing texts is being maintained.” Most of all, the nature of the Old Testament itself argues strongly that the word of God given to his people was immediately recorded and placed at the holy place or beside the ark of the covenant for truthful preservation. We can see in the witness of the Old Testament itself that its inspiration comes from by God and that it bears authority as the word of God, as found in the response of the people of God to acknowledge and accept it in the Law (Cf. Ex 24:7; 2 Ki 22-23; 1 Chr 34; Nh 8:9, 14-17; 10:28-39; 13:1-3) (Beckwith 2003:52-53; Vasholz 1990:82). We can guess that the Prophets also followed a similar process and

evoked their authority as the word of God from the people of God. The prophecies of the prophets were preserved to be tested how they are fulfilled in the future with careful caution in shrine or Temple. In this sense, the history recorded in the text of Scripture is real history and the text is the focal point of divine revelation.²⁸

It is necessary to point out that not only the characteristic of a text as narrative has to be studied but also the history represented in the text.²⁹ This study will accept the order of the biblical narrative, not being restricted by reconstruction of biblical history of biblical criticism in dating biblical texts being studied. This study represents that chronological order of the events in the Bible is identical with one that the final text of the canon recounts, although there are some exceptions.

According to Sailhamer (Cf. 1995:75-79), we can read the Bible on three level: (1) as biblical narratives, (2) according to the historical events depicted by them (Ostensive reference), (3) the world of the reader.

²⁸ A history without a text has no meaning. It can imply that it is only when God addresses his people in real life situations interpreting for them the meaning of those events using them to reveal himself as God of history that they start to have religious meaning. This study, however, sustains that the text can be a word of God not because the people of God accept and authorize the texts as the word of God. Rather, the people of God just recognize and accept the text as the word of God, just because it has an authority as a word of God. The external and internal evidence says that from the very beginning of the biblical text's existence high authority was attached to its contents (Cf. Kline 1981:27-68; Harrison 1969:264).

²⁹ The reports on those events can be said to be sometimes arranged according to theological purpose, not necessarily indicating the order in which things happened. To equal the order of the narratives with the order in which the events took place is criticized as a fundamentalistic fault, which makes faith dependable upon a history reconstructed rather than the literal word of God. Thus, rather, it seems to be the theological linking of some incidents in history that forms the theology of the Bible. However, this study follows the biblical narrative sequence of text as it stands, although this study recognizes the text can be arranged against the order of the real events by author in some case in the Bible. This study retains this point of view to equal the order of the narratives with the order in which the events took place because it is not the case.

Applied to this study it means that the course of the actual historical events can be represented as $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$ (Event A causes event B which in turn causes event C and that is precisely what is depicted in the biblical narratives ($A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$) and is understood as such by the reader ($A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$). For instance, as we shall see in chapter 2, 3 and 4 of this thesis, when we are reading the biblical narratives in Exodus 19-24, Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20, the actual event consisted of God's first giving the Decalogue and Israel's receiving of the Decalogue at Mt. Sinai through Moses (Ex 19-24 (A)). The golden calf episode in Exodus 32:1-6 indicates that the second commandment as a covenant law was violated by his people (B). Isaiah's disputation against making any image of God (Is 40:18-20) (C). They comprise sequential events. According to our approach to the final text and its witness, the events in real life happened exactly in the same order. They are recorded in the biblical narratives (Ex 19-24; 32:1-6; Is 40:18-20) and are understood as such by the precritical reader.

According to critical scholar's view, the actual order of events in history ($X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$) are not necessarily identical with the depiction of these events in the biblical narrative ($A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$). Though the biblical text may recount, the actual event consisted of God's first giving of the Decalogue and Israel's receipt of the Decalogue in Mt. Sinai through Moses in Exodus 19-24 (A), The golden calf episode in Exodus 32:1-6 (B), Isaiah's critique on making any image of God in Isaiah 40:18-20 (C), the actual course of events may be represented quite differently. According to a common modern reconstruction, for example, there were a theological crisis of Israel's monotheism in the post-exilic period (X). As a response against the theological crisis, a theologian or a group of Yahweh monotheist tried to write Israel's history of Yahweh Monotheism (Y). The event at Mt. Sinai of God's giving the Decalogue and Israel's receipt of it, the golden

calf episode and Isaiah's critique on making any image of God was written or modified as a response against the theological crisis of Yahweh monotheism in post-exilic period (Z). One can see easily that such an account does not mesh with what is recounted in the Bible. In the critical view the reader actually understands the meaning of the biblical account, not in its own terms (A→B→C), but in terms of its ostensive reference to "real" events (X→Y→Z). The narrative meaning (A→B→C) is replaced by the meaning of the actual events (X→Y→Z) as if that was really what the biblical narratives were about. The source of the Bible's meaning was no longer the meaning of the narrative itself (text) but the meaning of the historical events behind the text.³⁰

1.3.1.2 The establishment of canonical text of the Old Testament

The reconstruction of original text of the Old Testament is another standpoint of this study on the canonical text (Sailhamer 1995:223). We have to recognize the problem of discovering the original text of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, this aim can be attained by using mainly textual criticism and even others (Sailhamer 1995:223). The verbal inspiration of the Bible has to be applied to the level of the text at the point of the composition of each biblical book, which is reconstructed by criticism (Sailhamer 1995:219).³¹ The text of the Old Testament has to be translated because "problems in

³⁰ It simply says that an event on its own does not have any meaning. This study's point of view is also different from the view that it is only when it is theologically interpreted that has a revelational meaning. This study's point of view is exactly that in the events dealt with above mentioned, at least, the source of the biblical narrative's meaning is the texts reporting historically and chronologically happened events.

³¹ Sailhamer (1995:218) depicts this work as "a text-archaeology" and thus suggests that "we should attempt to peel back the postbiblical layers until we uncover the layer of the canonical text (or canonical texts), and from there attempt to isolate both the compositional layer of the individual books and the canonical redaction." Sailhamer says that while Blum (1990) tries to "feel one's way back from the compositional level to the sources," he is concerned "in working in other direction: from composition [level] to canon. This study follows Sailhamer's (1995:218). However, this study doesn't fully agree with Sailhamer's (1995:218) supposition that attempts "to isolate both the compositional layer of the individual books and the canonical redaction" because the levels of a text which he assumes is just a

the Masoretic text and other ancient versions... pose [some] difficulties in our attempts for a proper translation of the biblical texts.” and thus if needed, “various historical and exegetical methods, such as textual and philological analysis, literary criticism, and even form and redaction criticism”, even though each tool has to be examined for its methodological validity, need to be concerned (Lee 2004:204-205).

1.3.2 Inner-biblical interpretation between texts

A biblical text normally has a long history. Every text in Scripture has its own history of interpretation. After the text became part of the growing canon, it became part of a long history of interpretation. This means that the way the Bible came into existence throws light not only on the complexity of its genesis, but also on the complexity of the meaning inherent in the text. The Bible witnesses self-referential allusion, which can be regarded as “a product of the Bible’s lengthy production history which is related with the Bible’s compositional history.”³² Inner-biblical interpretation can provide the rich

theoretical hypothesis, not a proven fact.

³² There is an important distinction between the text and the subsequent interpretation of that text. This study proposes a list, which guides the relation between the text and the subsequent interpretation of the text as following: First, the meaning of the text of the Old Testament is the original biblical author’s one. In general, biblical scholars accept that a text from the any passages of the Bible is not necessarily the product of one single author. However, the meaning of the text basically remains that of the original author and not the secondary interpretation of a later generation. This is true even when the later interpretations happen to be included in the Bible itself, that is, being “inter-biblical.” (Cf. Sailhamer 1995:84). The intention of the original author of the text can still be seen in the text. Secondly, there is an important distinction between the text of Scripture and its socio-religious context (Sailhamer 1995:84). The socio-religious role of the Scriptures may be of historical or sociological interest, but it is not a part of the inspired meaning of the text. Thirdly, there is an important distinction between the text of Scripture and the truth of reason and personal experience (Sailhamer 1995:84). The relationship between author, text and reader is defined as follows: The text means what the author intended it to mean. It means what he says. There is a text, that has an author, who writes for his readers (Nielsen 1990:90). For the relationship between author and reader, the role of author as a producer of meaning can be identified by its reader. Although we are aware of an intentional fallacy, it doesn’t imply that the author is dead (Nielsen 1990:90). Rather, a reader has to try to find out the intention of the author from the explicit evidence of the text (Cf. Vanhoozer 1998:201-280). The meaning of a text is produced from what the author intends and reader understands. Inner-biblical interpretation as ongoing dialogue between older and younger texts is not only the invention of later readers but also is intended from the very beginning

knowledge how the literary interconnection of the Bible was formed in the form we have it today” (Eslinger 1994:47).³³

1.3.2.1 Theoretical consideration

Fishbane (1985) asserts that there is a possibility of inner-biblical allusion and exegesis.³⁴ According to Fishbane (1985), inner-biblical exegesis, like its rabbinic

(Nielsen 1990:92). As Nielsen (1990:92) points out, although “there may be other kinds of intertextuality than author himself is aware of, new readers may add to this dialogue as well, but new intertextuality does not abolish the first one, the one intended by the author.” This study considers that the task of the exegete is to try to trace this dialogue, but to trace it through history. Thus inner-biblical interpretation done in this study comes from the historical situation in which the text was written, used and reused.

³³ It is, however, not easy substantiating the interconnection between texts in the Bible. Aside from the some issues of inner-biblical allusion and exegesis for the study of the relation between two passages in the Bible, deciding on the dating of texts and the sufficient conditions for indicating a parallel borrowing, may be uncertain. Nevertheless, the Old Testament has a long and hermeneutically rich process in its composition. Sailhamer (1995:298) contends that “[b]ooks [of the Old Testament] were written (e.g., the Pentateuch), supplemented (e.g., Dt 34:10ff.), exegeted (e.g., Nh 9; Ps 8; Hs 12:5), applied (e.g., the prophetic books, borrowed (e.g., Chronicles), and developed (Dn 9)”.

³⁴ Fishbane (1985:6) suggests that “the content of tradition, the *traditum*, was not at all monolithic, but rather the complex result of a long and varied process of transmission, or *traditio*.” He identifies inner-biblical interpretation as post-biblical interpretation. The Hebrew Bible is a composite source, so that discerning the traces of exegesis in this Scripture is not a matter of separating biblical (the *traditum*) from post-biblical (the exegetical *traditio*) materials but of discerning its own strata (Fishbane 1985:10). Similar to the post-biblical exegesis, in the Hebrew Bible itself citations are made before a new interpretation of the older text is represented (Fishbane 1985:11). In the process of reinterpretation and reuse of the older *traditum*, new procedures or insights are incorporated into the formulation of the older revelations. But does the new revelation or reinterpretation of the older revelation necessarily poses the insufficiency of the older revelation, not just the explication of the meaning of the older revelation? Moreover, is it right that the actual acknowledgement in the latest historical strata of the Hebrew Bible that a human *traditio* had exegetically changed the divine *traditum*? (Fishbane 1985:15). Fishbane (1985:18) represents two issues of inner-biblical exegesis: The first is-particularly in divine revelations that are succeeded by human interpretations – of no passing cultural interests. The final process of canonformation, which meant the solidification of the biblical *traditum* and the onset of the post-biblical tradition, was thus a culmination of several related processes (Fishbane 1985:18). Each transmission of received traditions (*traditum*) utilized materials, which were or became authoritative in this very process; and each interpretation and explication was made in the context of an authoritative *traditum*. Further, each solidification of the *traditio* was the canon in process of its formation; and each stage of canonformation was a new achievement in Gemeindebuilding in the formation of an integrated book-centered culture. Inner-biblical dynamic of *traditum* - *traditio* is thus culturally constitutive and regenerative in the most profound sense (Fishbane 1985:19). The second is the question where all biblical sources came from. Jewish tradition answers that the exegetical tradition of the Torah of Moses can be traced to Sinai according to their tradition. Some modern scholars refer to the Alexandrian *oikoumene*, with its editing and exegesis of Homeric texts, and with its highly developed rhetoric and legal traditions as the catalyst and shaper of Jewish ‘oral tradition’ (Fishbane 1985:19). Thirdly it is suggested by Fishbane (1985:15) that “the Jewish exegetical traditions are native and ancient, that they developed diversely in ancient Israel, in many centres and at many times, and that these many tributaries met in the exile and its

successor, tried to make the obscure clear, to expand the applicability of the text, and to bring the sacred traditions up to date. We have to examine Fishbane's (1985) assumption and methodology in two aspects. The first is the rabbinic mode which Fishbane (1985:2) follows to recover the way of inner-biblical interpretation forming literary connections in the Bible.³⁵ Fishbane's (1985) generic scheme has been criticized for forcing inner-biblical exegesis into a rabbinic mold (Eslinger 192:48-49). Kugel (1987:275-276) says that exegesis in biblical times was not terribly different from what we know in postbiblical times; indeed, it was really rather proto-rabbinic." In some respects there are some discontinuity between inner-biblical interpretation and Jewish exegetical tradition.

In Fishbane's (1985) supposition, it is right that he starts from the Sinai, but as far as oldest post-Sinaitic legal exegesis is concerned, he is not right because he doesn't consider it as a divine revelation as the Bible narratives says, but as a human interpretation turned into being a divine revelation having divine authority through a triple process of pseudegraphic exegesis (Fishbane 1985:97-98).³⁶

aftermath to set a new stage for biblical culture which was redirected, rationalized, and systematized in the lively environment of Graeco-Roman world."

³⁵ As Fishbane (1985:2) says, some questions can be asked: "Does the early Jewish exegetical dynamics of *traditum* and *traditio* has continuity with inner-biblical exegesis? Does the Jewish exegetical tradition come to be formed as soon as the stabilization of canonformation is finished. Does Jewish exegetical tradition root in the biblical past itself, not fostered by competing sects with different claim on the biblical heritage? Does the Hebrew Bible also reflect the prehistory of those post-biblical phenomena whose contents are so new and often 'unbiblical'?"

³⁶ The law collections in the Pentateuch present a distinct context for inner-biblical legal exegesis (Fishbane 1985:163). Fishbane (1985:256) asks how the older legal *traditum* retain or lose its authority in the face of a legal *traditio* which transforms and revises it, or, furthermore, how a legal *traditio* attain or assert its authority and to what degree it emerge as a *datum* in its own right. Fishbane (1985:257) maintains that "a dialectic between revelation and tradition" in logistic circles was the prevailing technique of the Pentateuchal legal corpora and may be termed *pseudepigraphic exegesis*. The incorporation of legal interpretations into the corpora, with and without technical formulae, does not simply mean the subordination of the ongoing human tradition to the established and authoritative legal *traditum* (Fishbane 1985:257-258). It is a dignification and elevation of human exegesis to the status of divine revelation (Fishbane 1985:257-258). For the voice of the human teacher is reauthorized through the voice of Moses, who speaks or repeats the divine revelations given to him. A triple process is thus at

The second problem of Fishbane's (1985) approach is a historical approach supposing historical-critical literary history. For Fishbane (1985) literary integrity would be an example of exegetical ingenuity, not of the text's integrity (Eslinger 1992:51). A more serious weakness in Fishbane's (1985) approach arises from his reliance on historical-critical literary history (Eslinger 1992:51). However, Eslinger (1992:52) says, "recent historical work on the Bible is increasingly pessimistic about using it as a source for writing about its own or ancient Israel's history." This pessimistic view stems from the reconstruction of ancient Israel's beginnings (Cf. Whitelam 1986:45-70; Thompson 1987:27; Garbini 1988). Fishbane's (1985) categorical analysis is already premised on the diachronic assumptions of historical-critical literary history (Eslinger 1992:52). If

work here: first, each element of the human legal *traditio* is legitimated by its transformation into a part of the given authoritative divine *traditum*; second, Moses is thereby transformed from the mediator of specific revelations to the mediator of whatever was spoken in his name, or taught as part of his teachings; and third, the word of YHWH becomes as comprehensive as the *traditum* itself, there being nothing of a cultural-religious authority which is not part of the divine revelation" (Fishbane 1985:258). Every legal *traditum* and every legal *traditio*, thus becomes part of 'the word of YHWH to Moses'. In the narrative historiographies, in fact, where exegetical traditions were not incorporated into any corpora, new human teachings and exegetical blends were authorized as according to the word of YHWH through Moses' (Cf. 2 Chr 35:6), or 'written in the book of Moses' (cf. 2 Chr 35:12) (Fishbane 1985:258). The development of this process of authorizing or reauthorizing legal traditions by pseudographically ascribing them to Moses from YHWH can be traced, of course, to non-exegetical legal tradition (Fishbane 1985:258). Pseudographic exegesis thus has its parallels in pseudographic attributions within the legal *traditum*, which cannot be considered exegetical by any means (Fishbane 1985:260). The Pentateuch is the synthetic result of such proceedings. The growing consensus among the people on how to correlate the written legal *traditum* would thus have been as much a factor as any other in the eventual limitations put on its growth (Fishbane 1985:265). Thus, Fishbane (1985:265) supposes that "the Pentateuch used the legal achievement of early-exilic legal rationality, or that it is the inner-biblical expression of synthetic legal exegesis *par excellence*."

However, what Fishbane terms as *pseudepigraphic exegesis* can be said as the various amendments to the Decalogue (Ex 20:1-17) and the so-called the Book of Covenant (Ex 20:18-23:33) as constitution of the Sinai Covenant. "Many of the laws in Numbers were indeed revealed by God after the Israelites left Sinai, but not a secondary "afterthoughts." They were, rather, a variety of statutes memorably imposed during the wilderness wanderings in response to specific needs as they arose." (Stuart 2006: 439) Moses "a sort of amanuensis...a scribe with no authority of his own to issue a single word of law but one who must always get everything he wrote down from the direct revelation of Yahweh." (Stuart 2006:33; cf. Watt 1998:415-426). He had no authority to issue an answer himself (Cf. Nm 15; 27). "The strictly covenant portion of the book (Ex 20:1-31:18) find completion not in Exodus but in the book of Leviticus as indicated by the closing word of Leviticus [27:34]... Exodus gets the Sinai covenant underway but does not complete it...the laws in Numbers continues the process of the revelation of legal guidance under the covenant made at Sinai, as Israelites experiences the need for divine guidance on matters not yet revealed even as of the end of Leviticus" (Stuart 2006:439).

the model of the Bible's literary history is wrong, the analysis of inner-biblical exegesis can only compound the fallacy (Eslinger 1992:52). Eslinger (1992:52) expresses his pessimism concerning "the diachronic assumptions of historical-critical literary history", not merely "the diachronic assumptions of literary history of the Bible narrative".³⁷ Eslinger (1992:52, 56-58) argues that the only legitimate approach to inner biblical allusion is a "self-consciously literary analysis" that reads texts "atemporarily and without assumptions about vectors of dependence." It might seemingly be understood as an abandonment of diachronic approach and a accepting synchronic approach. Eslinger (1992:56-58), however, sticks to the diachronic approach on the relation between text, proposing a self-consciously literary analysis of the textual interconnections in biblical literature. A self-consciously literary analysis used in his saying might be a key to understand his view. Eslinger (1992:56) insists that "most biblical literature already follows the sequence of the Bible's own plot...a plot line in which almost all biblical literature is implicated or within which it can be situated on the basis of literary

³⁷ Often, as Sommer (1996:479-489) and Leonard (2008: 257) do, Eslinger (1992) is misunderstood to abandon diachronic approach altogether. Eslinger's position is not born out of a skepticism over the Bible's value as a historical resource (Cf. Leonard 2008:257), but out of optimism over its value as a historical resource and pessimism over reconstructing of the historical plot of the Bible itself because "there is little basis for consensus about Israel's history, once we set aside the plot of the Bible itself, and even less for a dependent scheme of biblical literary history" (Eslinger 1992:52). Thus, his saying has not to be understood as a pessimistic view about the possibility of diachronic approach on the relation between two texts in the Old Testament or as a purely synchronic approach (Leonard 2008:257). Rather, it is an effort to use a chronological sequence of the Bible narrative, not on the reconstruction of the Bible history of the historical-critical method. So, the criticism that Eslinger (1992:49) derides diachronic approach as literary naiveté is also not right because he attacks only the assumption of *historical criticism* by Fishbane (1985), allowing only straight description, without asides or any sort of expository comment, in any unilaterally authored document, that is, an author does not write an interpretive gloss on his own text. Eslinger (1992:49-50) just rejects Fishbane's way of diachronic interpretation with complete disregard for narrative voice structure, especially diverse modalities available in a narrator's voice of the Bible itself, not diachronic approach following a narrator's voice of the Bible itself. Eslinger (1992:50) just want to say about Fishbane's (1985:47) idea on the formulaic marker of gloss (1985:44-45): "Why later?, Why not by "original" author? Does it not make as much sense, maybe more, for the "original" author to clarify an ambiguity? Or do we assume that ambiguity is dysfunctional and always expunged instead of clarified when perceived by an author?" Eslinger (1992:55; cf. Dozemann 1989:207-209, 216, 223) points out that "Fishbane's (1985) methodological rule betrays the operation of fundamental assumptions about text sequencing in the Bible."

evidence in the book.”³⁸ As far as we follow the plot of the Bible, even Fishbane (1985) and Day (1988) do this, it can always be supposed that the relation between two texts must be identified according to the Bible’s own plot line (Cf. Eslinger 1992:57). Thus, Eslinger (1992:57) points out that the study of the Bible has moved through at least two stages and a new third stage:

First, it was read as history and its plot was taken for the real sequence of events that it describes. Second, in a reactionary movement still dominated by concern for history but now suspicious of the history of the plot it portrays, the Bible was read as a reflection, both of history that its plot lay out and more clearly, of the period and society in which it was written....Lastly, the Bible is being read without regard for the issues of history and historicity. This shift in focus should not, as it so often is, be taken as a rejection of historical study: it is not. Rather, it is a conscious decision to focus on a given, biblical literature, and a rejection of an appropriation of this given for inappropriate purposes-the writing of history from a literature whose historiographical purpose, if it has one, is unstated and, so far not demonstrated. In the study of i.b.a. we can turn again to the sequence of events actually described or implied in much of biblical literature and follow the chain of reverse trajectory allusions through from creation and to apocalypse.

It is Eslinger’s (1992) way taking the chronological sequence of the Bible narrative in relation between two texts, which is different from the diachronic approach of historical criticism. Eslinger’s (1992) approach rejects a diachronic approach, not the chronological sequence of the Bible narrative and thus cannot be categorized as a purely

³⁸ Eslinger (1992:56 n.14) refers Jacobson (1982) as an example for that case.

literary approach that takes “*areferential-ahistoric*” (Lee 2004:186) attitude and “the question of “in relation to what or to whom” can lose its central force” (Lee 2004:186). Thus, this study represents not a diachronic approach based on the negative attitude on the sequence of biblical narrative, but a synchronic approach on the text based on a positive attitude on the sequence of biblical narrative and not a “*areferential-ahistoric*” approach.

In reality, Fishbane’s suggestion is a trailblazer in focusing on the re-use of the text, not on tradition (Cf. Holter 2003:16; Levinson 1997:3-22). Sommer (1998:9) says “[i]nner biblical allusion and exegesis can investigate which text is earlier than others or later, that is, who is alluder or who is source, while the intertextual critic would not need to ask whether the author of one text borrows from other text, or vice versa.” According to Sommer (1998:6ff), however, inner-biblical exegesis has to be separated from inner-biblical allusion. “The interpretation of the older text functions silently, even unconsciously because the prophet Isaiah revises ideas from the older texts, readers may begin to understand the older texts in a new fashion” (Sommer 1998:173).³⁹

Scholars who suppose that a reference to a biblical story is not necessarily an allusion to a biblical text represent that it may be a type of tradition. Scholars agree that Isaiah like the other prophets, reused Pentateuchal tradition.⁴⁰ Sommer (1998:133) considers Israel’s use of such elements as belongings to the study of tradition history, rather than

³⁹ Each case can be subdivided as follows: For the former, was it written or oral source, albeit be considered to be redacted to the present final form. For the latter, was it redacted completely into the present form of the text, or written in the present form of the text by a single author up to that time?

⁴⁰ Not only the exodus from Egypt, but also other traditions, like creation, pre-patriarchal, patriarchal, wilderness tradition, are alluded in Isaiah in 40-55 (Tull Willey 1997:28-29; cf. van der Merwe 1956; Anderson 1962; Zimmerli 1963). Anderson (1962) points out that the Sinai tradition is not cited in Isaiah 40-55. The question, however, still remains whether it comes from a separate document or from an oral tradition.

to the study of inner-biblical allusion and exegesis.⁴¹ Sommer (1998:133) points out that “vocabulary items do point to a particular text, but the link between them may result from common use of a theme rather than from one text’s borrowing from the other.” It was concluded that Isaiah used widespread Israelite stories or ideas, rather than any particular text in which those stories appear.⁴² Isaiah makes a thematic linkage between the Pentateuch and his own writing. The thematic category of polemic occurs only in his allusion to Pentateuchal material (Sommer 1998:151). Sommer (1998:151; 273) suggests that the Pentateuchal tradition alluded to was not in the present final text, but in an oral or separate source. Many scholars suppose that authors utilize oral and popular traditions, as well as certain documents, not from a final text, but preserved in writing in a pre-final form not known to us. They suggest that Isaiah had a particular form of Pentateuchal text before him with recognizable vocabulary and stylistic features, not necessarily the present final form as we have it today.⁴³

For the prophet’s reusing of Pentateuchal material, some scholars (Chavasse 1964; Ogden 1978; Janzen 1989; cf. Tull Willey 1997:32) argue that the prophet reused the

⁴¹ “Tradition-history moves back from the written sources to the oral traditions from which the originated. Inner-biblical exegesis starts with the received Scripture and moves forward to the interpretations based on it. In tradition-history, written formulations are the final of many oral stages of *traditio* during which the traditions themselves become authoritative; By contrast, inner-biblical exegesis begins with an authoritative *tradicum*.” Inner-biblical exegesis takes the stabilized literary formulation as its basis and point of departure (Fishbane 1985:7). Responses to it are thus interpretations of a basically fixed *tradicum*, despite the somewhat fluid record of the most ancient manuscripts and versions (Fishbane 1985:7-8). Dynamics between *tradicum* and *traditio* can be reformulated as those between authoritative teachings or traditions whose religious-cultural significance is vital, and the concern to preserve, render contemporary, or otherwise reinterpret these teachings or traditions in explicit ways for new times and circumstances (Fishbane 1985:8).

⁴² Several cases in which Isaiah depended on texts from the Pentateuch have been noted and discussed by Kaminka (1938; cf. Sommer 1998:151ff) who already recognized the problem of distinguishing between allusions to a specific Pentateuchal text and the use of widespread traditions. Although Weinfeld (1991:82) notes possible cases of the book of Deuteronomy’s influence on Isaiah, Sommer (1982:273) contends that “most of these are examples of Deuteronomistic phrasing or ideology that come not from a specific verse but from the deuteronomistic stream of tradition.” Furthermore, Sommer (1998:273) says that “most of the phrases or ideas in Isaiah cited by Weinfeld could easily have been based on Deuteronomistic sections of Jeremiaiah or Ezekiel.”

⁴³ The evidence from Isaiah’s allusions does not allow us to know whether Isaiah knew these as separate documents or in a redacted form (Cf. Sommer 1998:149).

Pentateuch as a written source by means of intertextuality, not along the way indicated by tradition-historical study.

Fishbane (1985:415-416) argues that the way the prophets reused a text was the form of aggadic exegesis.⁴⁴ Fishbane (1985:285) asserts that “the vast majority of cases of aggadic exegesis involve implicit or virtual citations” that can be identified more frequently on the basis of “multiple and sustained lexical linkages between two texts... where the second text (the putative *tradition*) uses a segment of the first (the putative *tradtium*) in a lexically recognized and topically rethematized way” (Cf. Tull Willey 1997:31). Eslinger (1992:47), moreover, says that it can be supposed that the Pentateuch was already in its final form before the writing of the book of Isaiah took place.⁴⁵ Eslinger (Cf. 1992:52-53) argues that the dependence on the Pentateuch was in the form of a final written text. It was not used as a mere tradition, although it doesn’t mean that the particular text was quoted word by word from the Pentateuch. It could have been the Pentateuchal material in its final form (Cf. Eslinger 1992:47-58).

As stated many times now, there is no way of asserting whether Isaiah’s source is identical to our present form of the Bible or not. The statement that the text Isaiah used may have been the same as the present final form we have today can only be made if we had that original manuscript Isaiah had before him. Any conclusion that the present text is the same as the text Isaiah had before him is therefore wishful, but cannot be proved.

Although we are dealing with a growing canon, it doesn’t mean that the text of the

⁴⁴ As Tull Willey(1997:30) says, Fishbane (1985) argues that in many prophetic texts, some texts were created as aggadic reinterpretations of already authoritative texts, necessitated by new social contexts and disseminated in new prophetic genres.

⁴⁵ Eslinger, however, does not explain how his supposition can be verified.

Pentateuch as part of the canon as it stands today is placed before the Prophets Isaiah, cannot be supposed. We, however, think that the final form of the Pentateuch or its essential parts appeared before the era of the prophets (Cf. Kitchen 2003; Vasholz 1988; Harrison 1969).

Fishbane's (163-230) inner-biblical legal exegesis and explication in the Pentateuchal legal corpora will be used to explicate the relation between Exodus 20:2-6 and Exodus 32:1-6.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Fishbane's (163-230) suggestion for inner-biblical legal exegesis and explication in the Pentateuchal legal corpora can be summarized as follows: "Despite the integrated and developed traditions of law in ancient Mesopotamia, new legal collections are not exegetical revisions of earlier ones, and that a body of legal exegesis has not been discovered as yet (Fishbane 1985:96)...In contrast to the case of ancient Mesopotamia, despite the proposition that biblical legal corpora are formulated as prototypical expressions of legal wisdom, the internal traditions of the Hebrew Bible present and regard the covenantal laws as legislative texts (Fishbane 1985:96)...Thus, each of the various legal collections in the Hebrew Bible is subject to repeated exegetical revision. Later collections reflect (in many cases) what are (in part) exegetical revisions or clarifications of earlier ones. The biblical legal traditions developed a body of legal exegesis preserved in non-legal texts (Fishbane 1985:96)...Later legal draftsmen reformulated an old legal *responsum* which was received by tradition and incorporated into matters perceived to be analogous, or otherwise related -to the basis of pure legal speculation or practical legal tradition (Fishbane 1985:104)...Inner-biblical legal exegesis is broadly lemmatic in nature. This exegesis is related to an authoritative *traditum*, which is manifested in several stylistic forms: formal lemmatic exegesis, informal lemmatic exegesis, implied lemmatic exegesis (Fishbane 1985:266-268). Although there is a lack of information on the life setting of inner-biblical information, it can be supposed that there would always have been occasions where the mere fact of a written *traditum* provided the life-context of interpretation, being a textual context. Its verbal and semantic character, in a single word, its textual character provides the setting for new exegesis (Fishbane 1985:269)...Legist would study the text, recognize ambiguities or loopholes, and supplement the text with new materials; historians would study the text, or learn about its ambiguities from legist; and polemicist would study the text, or comb it for allusions, in order to justify their cause or promote their interests (Fishbane 1985:269-270)...However, "the mental matrix of the interpreter must be recognized. Exegesis is not simply an event in the social world, or one which arises out of texts. It is also one which presupposes certain mental attitudes (Fishbane 1985:270)...Thus, the real life setting of inner-biblical exegesis is layered and interrelated. Having a triadic structure, comprising of mental, textual and social-historical modes (Fishbane 1985:270)...In the case of the exegesis of cultic laws without formulae of citation and comparison, a shift from a divine voice to its prophetic explication in an aggadic exegesis of an old law is supposed (Fishbane 1985:301)...A lemmata from the old law can be absorbed into a prophet's reinterpretation of it without any technical formulae. The analogical relationship between the Pentateuchal and prophetic materials is therefore not that of a simile but rather of a metaphor (Fishbane 1985:303)...The Pentateuchal legal materials dealing with the rules and regulations of the given topic, serve as the linguistic and ideological matrix for their inversion and reapplication in a prophet's discourse (Fishbane 1985:305)."

Fishbane's (1985:276) view that "the historical development of the idea of a legal-exegetical *traditio* endowed with religious dignity is a direct consequence of the growth of the human legal *traditio* under the auspices of the legal *traditum* believed to be of divine origin." is problematic. Nevertheless, it is acceptable that "the representation of the legal *traditio* as part of the legal *traditum* has the effect of transforming the closed sense of the *traditum*. The legal *traditum* would inevitably appear as a historical *datum* which sponsors and incorporates new and often transformative exegetical meanings" (Fishbane 1985:276).⁴⁷

Fishbane's (1972:300-307) inner-biblical aggadic exegesis of cultic laws without formulae of citation and comparison will be used to explicate relation between Exodus 20:2-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20.

Fishbane (1972:281-317) suggests inner-biblical aggadic exegesis to indicate the way in which older texts were re-used in younger texts, that is, the legal texts were re-used in the prophetic texts in the Old Testament.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Fishbane (1985:276f.) explains the process of how the legal *traditio* transforms the closed sense of the *traditum* as follows: "The legal *traditio* would appear as that which explores and even reveals the full potential of the legal *traditum* dealing with new historical circumstances. In a word, an exegetical tradition faithful to the determinants of the *traditum* would be preserved and acknowledged as its true historical ally-not as an alien factor (Fishbane 1985:276)...The tradents and draftsmen of ancient Israel may even have perceived the *traditio* as having some divine status from its very onset - if only in the sense that the *traditio* was understood as part of the full potential of the legal revelation (Fishbane 1985:276-277)...Hence, obscurities in the *traditum* had to be clarified; its (real or apparent) implications drawn out; its incomprehensiveness supplemented; and its contradictions shown to be more apparent than real (Fishbane 1985:277)...There would thus develop the notion that the original written legal *traditum* may be supplemented by a legal exegetical *traditio* which is inspired by it, and that the continuous inspiration of the *traditum* upon its faithful exegetes is nothing other than the continuous revelation of God through that *traditum* (Fishbane 1985:277)."

⁴⁸ Fishbane's (1972:281-317) suggestion for inner-biblical aggadic exegesis can be summarized as follows: "The sphere of aggadic exegesis is clear when it is compared with legal exegesis (Fishbane 1985:282)...First, while inner-biblical legal exegesis is singularly concerned with the reinterpretation of pre-existing legal texts, inner-biblical aggadic exegesis utilizes not only pre-existing legal materials, but also the broad and detailed use of moral dicta, official or popular theologoumena, themes, motifs, and historical facts. Secondly, while inner-biblical legal exegesis is distinctively concerned with making pre-

Fishbane (1985:291) represents the methodological guideline, not the absolute requirement to recognize aggadic exegesis as follows: First, “[t]he easiest and most explicit means of recognizing aggadic exegesis is where it is formally indicated through technical formulae. By means of explicit citations or text referral the *tradtum* is set off from the *tradtio* which reapplies or reinterprets it.” Secondly, “[a]ggadic exegesis may also be noted and isolated by comparing parallel texts within the MT, or between the MT and its principal versions.” Thirdly, “[a] third means of isolating aggadic exegesis depends on a more subjective text-critical judgment. In these cases a *tradtum* is incorporated into a *tradtio* - which transforms it or re-employs it. Of particular aid and

existent laws applicable or viable in new contexts and with actions based on the received *tradtum* or its revised *tradtio*, inner-biblical aggadic exegesis is primarily concerned with utilizing the full range of the inherited *tradtum* for the sake of new theological insights, attitudes, and speculations, but action is not a necessary characteristic of aggadic exegesis (Fishbane 1985:282). . . . Aggadic exegesis is not content to supplement gaps in the *tradtum*, but characteristically draw forth latent and unsuspected meaning from it. In this way, aggadic exegesis utilizes the potential fullness of received formulations and makes this potential actual (Fishbane 1985:283). . . . For inner-biblical legal exegesis particularly serves to fill a felt lack in the *tradtum*, and to clarify for all practical or theoretical purposes the plain sense of a Scriptural dictum, while inner-biblical aggadic exegesis gives particular emphasis to its *sensus plenior*, its fullness of potential meanings and applications: the legal exegesis shows how a particular law can be clarified and reinterpreted *qua* law; while aggadic exegesis shows how a particular law, whether it is a particular law or whatever, i.e. *topos*, theologoumenon, moral dicta and so forth, can transcend its original focus, and become the basis of a new configuration of meaning (Fishbane 1985:283). . . . An analysis of the strategic reuses of prior *tradtio* - *tradtum*-*tradtio* dynamic - is the core of aggadic exegesis, which presupposes a careful methodological distinction between the sponsoring *tradtum* and the creative *tradtio* of it, showing a variety of ways that prior *tradtio*, i.e. creative combination of earlier words or *topoi*, even complex transformations of them (Fishbane 1985:283). . . . Not only explicit citation or referrals (e.g. Ezk 18:4-32; Jr 3:1; Hg 2:11-14) - few instances of inner-biblical aggadic exegesis, but also implicit or virtual citations - the vast majority of cases of inner-biblical aggadic exegesis, are the way which occur in the Bible (Fishbane 1985:284-285). . . . We can recognize the inner-biblical aggadic exegesis by a close comparison of the language of a given text with other, i.e. earlier Scriptural dicta or *topoi* (Fishbane 1985:285). Where such a text (the putative *tradtio*) is dominated by these dicta or *topoi* (the putative *tradtum*), and uses them in new and transformed ways, the likelihood of aggadic exegesis is strong (Fishbane 1985:285). . . . Identification of aggadic exegesis where external objective criteria are lacking is proportionally increased to the extent that multiple and sustained lexical linkages between two texts can be recognized, and where the second text (the putative *tradtio*) uses a segment of the first (the putative *tradtum*) in a lexically reorganized and topically rethematized way (Fishbane 1985:285). . . . Even on the basis of far less lexical evidence, it could have been contended that a redefined phrase ‘re-employs, literally or equivalently, words or formulas of earlier Scriptures, that is, that earlier biblical texts are exegetically reused, or ‘reactualized’ in new context (Fishbane 1985:286). The aggadic reinterpretation is only the idea of any given topic that is transposed and it can be not a legal exegesis but an aggadic exposition of a legal *tradtum* (Fishbane 1985:306). In the aggadic tradition, the true meaning of any law is delineated, but its original meaning is not violated (Fishbane 1985:307).”

importance in this judgment is the dense occurrence in one text of terms, often thoroughly reorganized and transposed, found elsewhere in a natural and uncomplicated form.”

1.3.2.2 Practical consideration

This study will investigate the possibility that it can be determined just “how textual allusions are to be confidently identified in the first place, and then evaluated in terms of their direction of dependence” (Leonard 2008:242). Two matters are raised: “What evidence is needed to establish a link between one biblical text and another text or tradition?” and “if a link between texts can be established, what evidence is needed to ascertain the direction of the textual or traditional influence?” (Leonard 2008:242; cf. Hays 1989:14-21; Sommer 1998:6-10; Tanner 2001).

When evidence emerges for one text’s dependence on another, some standard is needed for gauging the strength of that evidence (Leonard 2008:245; cf. 2006:26-35; Hays 1989:29-32; Edenburg 1998:72-74). For studying one text’s dependence on another, Leonard (2008:246) proposes seven principles as methodological guidelines to follow:

- (1) Shared language is the single most important factor in establishing a textual connection.
- (2) Shared language is more important than nonshared language.
- (3) Shared language that is rare or distinctive suggests a stronger connection than does language that is widely used.
- (4) Shared phrases suggest a stronger connection than do individual[y] shared terms.

- (5) The accumulation of shared language suggests a stronger connection than does a single shared term or phrase.
- (6) Shared language in similar contexts suggests a stronger connection than does language alone.
- (7) Shared language need not be accompanied by [a] shared form to establish a connection.

The principles outlined above offer guidance for the difficult task of identifying textual allusion. Equally difficult, if not mere so, is the matter of determining the direction of these allusions (Leonard 2008:257). When dealing with passages in the Old Testament , it is rarely possible to establish so definitely the priority of texts (Leonard 2008:257). For the determining of the direction of these allusions, Leonard (2008:257) suggests a series of fundamental questions:

- (1) Does one text claim to draw on another?
- (2) Are there elements in the text that help to fix their dates?
- (3) Is one text capable of producing the other?
- (4) Does one text assume the other?
- (5) Does one text show a general pattern of dependence on [another] text?
- (6) Are there rhetoric pattern[s] in the text that suggest that one text has used the other in an exegetically significant way?

Hays (1989:29-32) also suggests seven rules of thumb for the critic who looks for borrowings in Paul. The rules can also be applied for fathoming borrowing between two texts of the Old Testament. Hays's (1989:29-32) guidelines are as follows:

- (1) Availability-whether the author could have known the alleged source
- (2) Volume-determine the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactic patterns
- (3) Recurrence-whether the author uses the passage elsewhere
- (4) Thematic coherence-whether the allusion fits into the tenor of the work as a whole
- (5) Historical plausibility-could the author have intended such an allusion, and would the audience have understood it?
- (6) History of interpretation-have other noticed it?
- (7) Satisfaction-whether the proposed reading makes sense?

If two texts share vocabulary items that are commonplace in Hebrew, the parallel between them is most likely coincidental. If they share terms that often appear together in biblical or ancient Near Eastern texts, then there is strong likelihood that they independently draw on a traditional vocabulary cluster. But these doesn't necessarily satisfy the genuine borrowing from other text. In some cases, they can't fit the category of aggadic exegesis while in some cases they are indeed cases of aggadic exegesis. If a text repeatedly reflects the wording or ideas of earlier texts, then examples of shared vocabulary which display those tendencies are likely to represent genuine cases of borrowing (Sommer 1996:485; cf. Seidel 1955-1956:150). The aims is to show the borrowing of one text from another and to find such a pattern in a convincing way, e.g. a stylistic trait with great frequency (Sommer 1996:485). Such a pattern helps to show that one's text is the borrower and which source is borrowed, since the text in which one observes the pattern is the text that re-uses older material (Sommer 1996:485).

Applying these principles mentioned above will present a link between Exodus 20:2-6 and Exodus 32:1-6 and between Exodus 20:2-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20.

1.4 Aim of the Study

The thesis proposes that the idea of Yahweh's incomparability and the prohibition of making images of God are closely related to each other. This is explicated in the golden calf episode in Exodus 32:1-6. In the final instance this thesis indicates that the 'God's incomparability and the prohibition of making any image of God construct' found in the two sections of Exodus is also seen in Isaiah 40:18-20

The aim of this study is to highlight the significance of aniconism in the form of the prohibition of making any images of God in Exodus 20:4-6, which is linked to the introduction in Exodus 20:2 stating God's redemptive history and the first commandment in Exodus 20:3 commanding exclusive worship to God in the Decalogue. The way it is formulated there is the explicit provenance of the prohibition founded in the rest of the Old Testament, especially in Exodus 32:1-6 and Isaiah 40:18-20. We can refer to the prohibition in Exodus 20:2-6 as the 'construct of the introduction and the first two commandments of the Decalogue'. Its significance of this prohibition construct in Exodus 20:2-6 can be elucidated by comparing it with the prohibition of making any image of God in the rest of the Old Testament. Inner-biblical interpretation will be used as a tool indicating this relationship.

The thesis of this paper is that there exists a direct and conscious dependency on aniconism as formulated in the Introduction and the first two commandments of the

Decalogue construct by the Old Testament Prophets when they presented a prophetic covenant disputation such as stated in passages like Isaiah 40:18-20.

After having indicated the terminological, theological and thematic parallelism between the relevant texts of Exodus and Isaiah, the relation between the passages will become clear, indicating a clear dependence of the Isaiah text on the Exodus text. Showing the similarities between the first and second commandments of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:2-6 and the passage in Isaiah 40:18-20 will enable us to delve deeper into the relationship arguing that the Isaiah text is the alluding and the Exodus text the alluded text.

The similarity between the two texts can indicate a common principle of worship in Old Testament assemblies, which can in return guide present-day worshipping communities. When we apply the principles of the second commandment, we can understand that God demands not only negatively that we do not worship Him through images, but also positively to worship God according to His revelation. Given the unanimity of biblical legal codes and prophecy concerning the prohibition of making any image of God, the question can be raised what reason was for the prohibition on making any image of God in early Israel and its later period including Isaiah's. The answer to this question provides a possible clue to the distinctiveness of Israel's early religious cult. These laws on prohibition to make any image of God are of the essence for (mono) theism. The incomparability of God's sovereignty determined the way to worship the infinite, transcendental God, provided the principles of worship in the Old Testament assembly, as well as in the New Testament church, and even today. The principles of worship of the Old Testament assembly can be applied to the New Testament church and will

include the Reformed or the Presbyterian Church in Korea rooted in the Puritan tradition of having a regulative principle for corporate worship. The present-day worshipping community has the essential task to study the Bible and to apply the meaning of the text in their worship. This study will provide a hint for the dispute of scholars who are arguing what the principles of Presbyterian worship are to be. This study suggests that the thesis of this study can contribute to the argument of scholars who study Presbyterian worship, supplying a biblical foundation for its worship.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ While it will be necessary to consider some of the historical material involved in the formation of the Puritan regulative principle of worship, this study is not intended to be the exhaustive treatment of the historical issues. This is intended to be primarily an exercise in exegetical and theological research. Since a true theology of worship must depend upon the teaching of Scripture, certain passages will be considered as the need arises to structure more accurately biblical teaching on the regulative principle. Therefore, this study will focus on the exegesis to lay my position among various controversial positions with adequately citing key sources. Though this is a study of regulation of worship, it is not primarily a work of worship or liturgics in general. In this research, I will not intend endorsement of any principle of worship a priori. Rather, the goal is an open discussion of the biblical and theological basis for regulating worship. This will be accomplished by an approach on some texts in relation with the regulative principle of worship in exegetical and theological. My hope is that this analysis will point the way toward a greater coherence in Puritan and Presbyterian regulative principle of worship, as well as greater happiness and satisfaction in truth as divinely command.