

the one never-failing and always available Physician of the soul.

In conclusion, we would remember that our faith in these days of religious enlightenment ought to be more instructed than that of this woman whose case we have been considering. For, as we have seen, it is one of the laws of the kingdom of God

that we are to act according to our light. But though this should be the case, still it is to be feared that few of us equal in regard to its moral accompaniments the faith exhibited either by the Syrophœnician woman, or the woman who was healed by touching our Lord's garments on His way to raise Jairus' daughter.

## The Unity of Deuteronomy.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

### II.

5. THE principal consideration which led Steuernagel to his new partition of Deuteronomy, was the interchange of 'thou' and 'ye' in addressing Israel.

(a) All that Steuernagel himself asserts regarding this interchange, is as follows:—(a) 'For instance, in 5<sup>1-28</sup> Israel is addressed in the 2nd plur., only in the Decalogue 5<sup>6-18</sup> in the 2nd sing. Similarly, in 12<sup>1-12</sup> we find the 2nd plur., in 12<sup>13ff.</sup> the 2nd sing.' (*Dt*, 1898, p. iii.). This is simply the statement of a fact, it is no argument, and when he adds that in chap. 28 the 2nd sing., and in chap. 29 the 2nd plur. is employed, this is not even an accurate statement of fact, for from 28<sup>62</sup> onwards there is a preference for the 2nd plur., and to this usage 29<sup>1b</sup> attaches itself. (β) In his dissertation *Der Rahmen des Dt* (1894, p. 4) he remarks, 'This interchange seems to be no fortuitous one, for one observes that the narrative portions regularly contain the plural form of address, whereas in the other portions down to 9<sup>7a</sup> the people is almost uniformly addressed in the singular number. Where, on the other hand, in these sections there is a change of number, this is the case for the most part in sentences of a formal character (6<sup>1-3. 17f. 81</sup>) or in sentences whose omission does not disturb the context (6<sup>14 7<sup>5. 7. 8a. 25a</sup></sup>). Only from 10<sup>12</sup> onwards is the state of the case different as regards this change of number.' In *Dt* (1898, p. 37) he calls the section 10<sup>12-11<sup>32</sup></sup> 'transitions to the communication of the law,' and merely adds, 'In these there is a network of singular and plural elements interwoven with one another.' Why, then, has he based upon this change of number the judgment that in *Dt* 5 ff. a document

Sg and a document Pl are combined? Because this change of number appears to him to be no fortuitous one. And why? Because in the narrative sections of *Dt* 5-11 the plural is preferred, whereas in the other portions down to 9<sup>7a</sup> the singular is mostly employed. But may not this circumstance be connected with deeper reasons? May not the change of number be due to syntactical laws and psychological motives? Steuernagel has not put this preliminary question, but I have done so, having, in connexion with another syntactical investigation, examined also this change of number. Not only have I put the preliminary question, but I have found the answer to it.

(b) First of all, I investigated this change of number *in the Book of Dt itself*. The result is as follows:—

(a) The transition from the 2nd *sing.* to the 2nd *plur.* appears to be in *Dt* traceable to the following considerations. Above all, it is to be observed that the collective notion 'Israel' could be construed with a singular before it and a plural after it, like other collectives (see my *Syntax*, § 346 d). In this way, apart from 'behold . . . you' (1<sup>8 4<sup>5</sup> 11<sup>26</sup></sup>; cf. my *Syntax*, § 344 g, 348 n) we may explain the sing. 'hear' (שמע) before 'O Israel' with the subsequent 'your' (4<sup>1 5<sup>1</sup> 20<sup>3</sup> †</sup>). The same consideration accounts for the sing. 'take heed' (שמרת) and the 'you,' etc. (24<sup>8ab. 9ab 25<sup>17ab</sup></sup>). Nay, this collective character of the word 'Israel' has a still wider scope. It involves at least the abstract possibility that the word may be replaced by 'thou' or 'ye,' and if anyone should propose to explain in this way some of the

instances where the address begins with 'thou' and is continued with 'ye' (8<sup>1</sup> 9<sup>7</sup>, etc.), no absolute veto could be laid upon such a procedure. For elsewhere also collectives are represented by the singular at the outset, but farther on by the plural (cf. my *Syntax*, § 346 k, l, p). But if, after all, the question still arises why the speaker in certain instances forgot the 'thou' and preferred the 'ye,' I believe the following answers may be given.

The following plural may in many instances have an enumerative or frequentative sense: the 'thou shalt fear Jahweh thy God' (6<sup>13</sup>) is followed by 'ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people which are round about you' (v. 14). The people, which in 6<sup>13</sup> is addressed as 'thou,' may then be involuntarily divided into its tribes and individuals (v. 14), because there were various kinds of idolatry on the borders of the territories of Israel. The same phenomenon is repeated in 6<sup>15f</sup>. Likewise, in the כָּבֹד of 7<sup>4b</sup> the many instances of idolatry may be in view which might emerge in connexion with the many marriages (v. 3). Besides, a following וְהִשְׁמִידְכֶם מִהָר might be intended, which has escaped the notice of Steuernagel, and then the תַּעֲשֶׂה of the Samaritan (not mentioned by Steuernagel) in 7<sup>5a</sup> loses its last support. Again, in 7<sup>7</sup> the pronoun 'you' might naturally be assimilated to the 'more in number.' 7<sup>12a</sup> may be frequentative. Compare especially 'thine hand' with 'ye shall burn' (7<sup>24f</sup>). The kings (7<sup>24</sup>) were subjected to the whole nation and essentially at the same time, but the burning of the images (7<sup>25</sup>) could take place only at different times in particular cities and villages. In 8<sup>1</sup> the 'ye shall observe,' etc., looks to the numerous future generations of Israel. In the same way we may explain the 'ye shall surely perish' of 8<sup>19b</sup>. The different instances of rebellion against Jahweh may be in view in 9<sup>7b</sup>, where the יִצְחָק of the Sam. appears to me the preferable reading, as corresponding with the subsequent בָּאִתְּכֶם ('ye came'). Specially clear appears to be this disintegration of the nation of Israel in 10<sup>15b</sup> to which 10<sup>16f</sup> was assimilated. Perhaps 11<sup>8b, 9</sup> should be explained in the same way. In 11<sup>10</sup> the new section begins again with 'thou,' by which the singular Israel is most naturally represented. Hence this אֲתָה is not to be set aside in favour of the אֲתָם of the Samaritan. Rather may the following יִצְחָק of the M.T. have arisen from יִצָּח

on account of the following מִשֵּׁם, a point which Steuernagel has overlooked. Also 11<sup>11a</sup> looks to the future of the people.

Let us compare, further, 'your children' (11<sup>2</sup>) and 'your sons' (12<sup>12</sup>) with 'thy son,' etc. (12<sup>18</sup>). It is the many future generations and the many peoples that are contemplated by the 'ye' of 13<sup>4b</sup> [Eng.<sup>3b</sup>] 8a. Quite natural was the form of expression, 'ye are the children of the Lord' (14<sup>1</sup>). The 'unto Him ye shall hearken' (18<sup>15</sup>) is certainly a necessary element of the address. Steuernagel (*Dt*, 1898, *ad loc.*) explains these words as a secondary addition. He has not observed that the plural verb might be an assimilation to the preceding 'of thy brethren.' Neither is וְעִשִׂיתֶם ('then shall ye do,' 19<sup>19</sup>) 'an ancient copyist's error' (Steuernagel, *op. cit.* p. 74). Note that the plural שְׂפָטִים precedes. In the same way the 'ye' of 20<sup>2a</sup> may look to the 'people' of 20<sup>2b</sup>. Further, plural subject and plural object correspond in 20<sup>18</sup>, as does plural with plural and singular with singular 23<sup>5ab</sup>. A plurality of Israelites are also referred to in 24<sup>4b</sup> if the Sam. תְּהִיָּא is correct. To the same category may belong 27<sup>11</sup>; observe also the plural 'the stars of heaven' in 28<sup>62</sup>. The many instances of idolatry of future generations are probably in view in the plural of 32<sup>16-18</sup>.

It is possible also that in several instances the singular is avoided in addressing Israel, in order to prevent collision with the 'thou' by which Moses or God is addressed (cf. 9<sup>10-10</sup> 13<sup>8b, 4b</sup>).

(β) The transition from the plural to the singular form of address may be intended to have partly a collective partly an individualizing effect, and in either case to arrest strongly the attention of the hearers.

This transition has the collective effect when the 'thou' is used to designate the people as in 4<sup>29</sup>, where the Samaritan rightly offers the reading ובקש, and where the transition to 'thou' may be owing to 'Jahweh thy God.' This is the cause of the transition in 6<sup>15</sup> ('Jahweh thy God'), 6<sup>17b</sup> (for in 6<sup>18f</sup> the whole nation is plainly intended), and in 7<sup>6</sup> ('for thou art a holy people'). In 7<sup>8b</sup> the speaker returned to the employment of 'thou,' which predominated in 7<sup>1f</sup>, and in view of 7<sup>9</sup> we do not need to postulate a reading ויפרכם מ'. Compare, further, 7<sup>12b</sup> ('Jahweh thy God . . . which He swore unto thy fathers') 8<sup>2</sup> 9<sup>1</sup> ('hear, O Israel') 10<sup>12</sup> 12<sup>1</sup> 14<sup>2, 21a</sup> ('thou art an holy people'). This transition to 'thou' has at the

same time in view to touch the audience by the tone of earnestness. This shows itself with special clearness in 'that thou mightest fear Jahweh thy God' (6<sup>2</sup>). Hence probably we may explain why in Dt one does not meet with 'Jahweh *your* God' so often as 'Jahweh *thy* God' (cf. 4<sup>25</sup> [Sam. 'your God'] 10<sup>9, 20</sup>, etc., 12<sup>7b, 9b</sup> [Sam. 'your God']; the Samaritan has added אלהיך, 'thy God,' other twelve times [6<sup>12, 18</sup> 10<sup>13</sup> 14<sup>2b</sup> 15<sup>4</sup> 16<sup>2b, 15</sup> 17<sup>10</sup> 18<sup>5b, 12a</sup> 28<sup>59</sup> 30<sup>8</sup>], and has dropped it only in 9<sup>5</sup>). In this expression the 'thou' is primarily collective, as it is surely in the constant קרבך, 'thy midst' (4<sup>3</sup> 6<sup>15</sup> 7<sup>21</sup> 13<sup>2, 6, 12, 14, 15</sup> 16<sup>11</sup> 17<sup>2, 7</sup> 18<sup>15</sup> 19<sup>19f, 21</sup> 21<sup>9, 21</sup> 22<sup>21, 24</sup> 23<sup>17</sup> 24<sup>7</sup> 26<sup>11</sup> 28<sup>43</sup>). In any case, the collective notion 'people,' according to the syntactical analogy (see my *Syntax*, § 346 d), might be construed equally with the plural or the singular (27<sup>1b, 2a, 4ab</sup> 28<sup>62b, 68b</sup> [the Sam. offers in both places the plural] 29<sup>1f, 30<sup>18</sup></sup> [Sam. אהמ]).

Let us now examine another set of passages, where we have the transition from *plural* to *singular*. 7<sup>25</sup> begins with 'the graven images of their gods shall ye burn with fire,' and continues, 'thou shalt not desire the silver or gold that is on them,' etc. Alongside of this I would place 11<sup>11ab, 14b</sup> 12<sup>5bβ</sup> [Sam. באהמ]. In 12<sup>13</sup> the 'thou' corresponds with 'in every place.' The singular appears to me to be distributive in 13<sup>1b</sup> [Sam. תוסיפו]<sup>8b</sup> like 'the stranger' and 'thy' in 14<sup>21</sup>. Add to this 4<sup>34</sup> [Sam. עיניכם] 29<sup>2</sup> [Eng.<sup>3</sup>]<sup>4</sup> ex. [in the last-cited passage the Sam. offers 'נעליכם ונ']. For the memory of every individual member of the nation is to be stirred up; and 'thine own eyes' would be a better rendering than 'thine eyes.' In the above passages the singular has an individualizing effect.

But both sets of passages, in which the address passes over from the *plural* to the *singular*, have this in common that the address is meant to be

made more impressive by the choice of the singular. After I had perceived this main purpose of the change from 2nd *plur.* to 2nd *sing.*, I was astonished to read as the result of Steuernagel's examination that 'the plural portions of Dt 5-11 have for their object to inform regarding the origin of the law, while the singular portions exhort to loyalty to Jahweh' (*Dt*, 1898, pp. 20 f.). For this aim of the singular sections coincides with the arresting or parenetic tendency which naturally belongs to the confidential or individualizing 'thou.'

Further, the 'thou' with which Moses, the direct receiver of the law, had to be addressed, appears to have its rôle to play. For along with 'which I command you' (4<sup>2</sup> 11<sup>13, 22, 27f.</sup> 12<sup>11</sup> 13<sup>1</sup> 27<sup>1, 4</sup> 28<sup>14</sup>) we find the much more frequent 'which I command thee' (4<sup>40</sup> 6<sup>2, 6</sup> 7<sup>11</sup> 8<sup>1, 11</sup> 10<sup>13</sup> 11<sup>8</sup> 12<sup>14, 28</sup> 13<sup>19</sup> 15<sup>5, 11, 15</sup> 19<sup>7, 9</sup> 24<sup>18, 28</sup> 26<sup>16</sup> 27<sup>10</sup> 28<sup>1, 18, 15</sup> 30<sup>2, 8, 11, 16</sup>), and at least in 11<sup>8</sup> [where the Sam. has מצוה אהמ], the above suggestion appears to me a likely one.

In any case, it being a fact that the collective notion 'Israel' would suit either the form of address with 'thou' or with 'ye,' the 'thou' or the 'ye' which was due to any of the above-mentioned causes might readily be retained even if the same motive did not continue at work in all the subsequent instances. It is so, perhaps, in 7<sup>8a</sup> 12<sup>13ff.</sup> 14<sup>21bff.</sup> Finally, there came to be the following possibility. A striving after variety might occasion the transition from the one form of address to the other, in order to bring about a pleasing equipoise of the two forms of expression. This motive has, perhaps, been at work, e.g., in 11<sup>16</sup>, if the explanation is not that particular instances of pernicious idolatry are meant to be distinguished.

(To be concluded.)