A reading of Deuteronomy as a model of continuity, adaptation and innovation for contemporary discussions of Anglican liturgy.

JENNIFER MIRIAM CORCORAN

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

MARCH 2017

Abstract

This work examines the important question of why there is deadlock in current Anglican discussions of fresh expressions of church. The study outlines the different perspectives represented by *Mission-shaped Church* and *For the Parish*, and how the discussions up to this point, in focusing on ecclesiology as a methodological approach, have not provided a way of bringing people together.

This study will argue that a liturgical methodological approach provides a more appropriate model for discussion of mission in an Anglican context, and that a liturgical paradigm of continuity, adaptation and innovation presents a positive approach that can bring both sides of the current debate together.

Up to this point, there has been a lack of thorough biblical research in this debate, and therefore the paradigm of continuity, adaptation and innovation will be based on a liturgical reading of Deuteronomy. This text is particularly appropriate given the way in which the narrative context shows the community responding to the change from a nomadic to agrarian lifestyle.

The work undertakes a detailed liturgical reading of Deuteronomy 6 and 26, providing a more rigorous definition of the term liturgical and applying it to demonstrate the presence of continuity of community practices alongside adaptation of those practices and innovation in introducing new practices. It is these three strands of continuity, adaptation and innovation that are used in providing a paradigm of community change and transition that responds to the initial question and provides a means of holding together a variety of perspectives and seeking a way forwards.

Acknowledgements

Thanks must go to Dr Doug Ingram, Rev Dr George Lings and Dr Ben Fulford. The first people who encouraged me to think that there really might be a contribution to make to the discussion of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context from the Old Testament. They were invaluable in helping me work through my initial thoughts and in beginning to realise the joys and challenges of doctoral study. I am grateful to the following educational trusts for enabling me to study through providing funding: St Luke's College Foundation, Tyndale House Erasmus Fund, Foundation of St Matthias, Women's Continuing Ministerial Educational Trust, and the Diocese of Southwell and Nottingham. I am also grateful to Rt Revd Colin Buchanan who read the first chapter, making vital comments. I want to thank Rev Dave Talks who volunteered to proof read my work, numerous errors would have still been present without his attention to detail.

I want to express my deep-felt thanks and appreciation for the time and support that Dr David Firth has given to me since taking over as my supervisor. He has been constantly demanding throughout, but without it I would never have got to this point. His and Lynne's encouragement and prayerfulness for me and the family through this journey has been invaluable. My constant friend and study-buddy throughout, Rev Suse Chapman, has been a huge support to me. Having someone to share the pressures and joys of writing a PhD with, and of life too, has been much more of a gift than I can put into words. To my amazing parents, who both sadly died during the time I've worked on this. You were always a great support to me. I miss you. To my wonderful husband who has been by my side throughout this crazy adventure. I am so glad that you are in my life and that we face things together. To the gift of my two lovely little people, you are amazing and wonderful, and you teach me every day about joy and living in the moment.

> **16** Circumcise, then, the foreskin of your heart, and do not be stubborn any longer. **17** For the LORD your God is God of gods and Lord of lords, the great God, mighty and awesome, who is not partial and takes no

bribe, [18] who executes justice for the orphan and the widow, and who loves the strangers, providing them food and clothing. [19] You shall also love the stranger, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt. [20] You shall fear the LORD your God; him alone you shall worship; to him you shall hold fast, and by his name you shall swear. [21] He is your praise; he is your God, who has done for you these great and awesome things that your own eyes have seen. (Deut 10:16-21).

Abbreviations

ANE	Ancient Near East
ASB	Alternative Service Book
AsTJ	Asbury Theological Journal
ATR	Anglican Theological Review
BAR	Biblical Archaeology Review
BBR	Bulletin for Biblical Research
BDB	Brown-Driver-Briggs
BHQ	Biblica Hebraica Quinta
BI	Biblical Interpretation
BibRev	Bible Review
BibThBul	Biblical Theology Bulletin
CBQ	Catholic Bible Quarterly
DtrH	Deuteronomic History
EJT	European Journal of Theology
ExpT	Expository Times
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
IALC	International Anglican Liturgical Consultations
Int	Interpretation
IVP	Inter-Varsity Press
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JETS	Journal of Evangelical Theological Studies
JLT	Journal of Literature and Theology
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
LXX	Septuagint
NIDOTTE	New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OUP	Oxford University Press
RdQ	Revue de Qumran
SamP	Samaritan Pentateuch

SL	Studia Liturgica
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
SWJT	Southwestern Journal of Theology
TDOT	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentary
TNICOT	The New International Commentary on the Old Testament
TynBul	Tyndale Bulletin
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTE	Vassal-treaty of Essarhaddon
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Gen	Genesis
Exod	Exodus
Lev	Leviticus
Num	Numbers
Deut	Deuteronomy
Josh	Joshua
1 Sam	1 Samuel
2 Sam	2 Samuel
1 Kgs	1 Kings
2 Kgs	2 Kings
1 Chr	1 Chronicles
2 Chr	2 Chronicles
Ezra	Ezra
Neh	Nehemiah
Esth	Esther
Job	Job
Ps	Psalms
Prov	Proverbs
Eccl	Ecclesiastes
Isa	Isaiah
Jer	Jeremiah
Lam	Lamentations
Ezek	Ezekiel
Dan	Daniel
Hos	Hosea
Joel	Joel
Amos	Amos
Mic	Micah
Zech	Zechariah
Mal	Malachi
Mark	Mark
Luke	Luke

Contents

Introduction to Chapter One 1

Ecclesiological and liturgical approaches to continued dialogue 5

A liturgical approach 7

Conclusion to ecclesiological and liturgical approaches to dialogue 13

The importance of liturgy to Anglican identity 13

The argument for a common liturgical pattern 15

The history of Anglican liturgy 18

Early Church 18

Reformation 20

Post-reformation 22

20th Century developments 24

Questions of Inculturation 36

Conclusion to the importance of liturgy to Anglican identity 39

A liturgical response to the deadlock 40

Deuteronomy as a text of formation and transition 42

A liturgical hermeneutic 45

'Anamnesis and the Eucharist' 46

Anamnesis 48

Liturgical collapse of time 53

Worship and mission 54

Conclusion to a liturgical response to the deadlock 59

Conclusion 60

Introduction to Chapter Two 63

Use of 'liturgy' and 'liturgical' in wider scholarship 66

Learning and Education 67

Liturgical and cultic influences on the text 69

Liturgical reception of the text 72

Conclusion to use of liturgy and liturgical in wider scholarship 73

The three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic 74

The importance of Remembering 74

The liturgical collapse of time 79

Importance of הַיּוֹם 82
Worship and Mission 83
Conclusion to the liturgical hermeneutic section 86
The text demonstrating the liturgical characteristics 87
Continuity 87
Adaptation 89
Adapting biblical law codes 90
Adapting treaty and covenant documents 94
Innovation 96
Conclusion to liturgical characteristics in the text 99
Conclusion 100
Introduction to Chapter Three 102
Translation and notes 102
Notes on the text 104
The use of 'liturgical' as a description of Deuteronomy 6 in wider scholarship 109
Verses 4-9 110
Verse 13 111
Verses 20-25 112
Reception 113
Conclusion to the use of 'liturgical' as a description of Deuteronomy 6 in wider scholarship 116
Gittoes' three strands 116
The Importance of remembering 117
Liturgical collapse of time 118
The connection between worship and mission 122
Internal structure of Deut 6 123
Passing on the faith 126
Conclusion to Gittoes' three strands 128
Continuity, adaptation and innovation in Deuteronomy 6 129
Continuity 129
Adaptation 131
Innovation 134
Conclusion to continuity, adaptation and innovation 135

Can love be commanded? How does a liturgical reading contribute to this important and ongoing discussion? 135
Moran 136
Lapsley 140
Treaty documents....142
The importance of grace....146
How is אהב to be interpreted?....150
Conclusion to a liturgical response to whether love can be commanded .157
Conclusion....158
Introduction to Chapter Four....160
Translation 161
Notes....162
The use of 'liturgical' as a description of Deuteronomy 26 in wider scholarship 167
Von Rad and the 'little historical credo' 168
Wider analysis of the liturgical nature of Deut 26 172
Conclusion to the use of liturgical as a description in wider scholarship ..177
A liturgical hermeneutic 177
The importance of remembering 177
Liturgical collapse of time....180
Worship and Mission 184
Conclusion to the liturgical analysis 186
Continuity, adaptation and innovation in Deut 26....186
Continuity 187
Adaptation 189
Innovation....192
Conclusion to continuity, adaptation and innovation 195
The importance of liturgy as a framework for the law code....195
Radical democratisation 200
Democratisation of power, Deut 16, 18 and 29 201
Deut 12 and centralisation 203
Profane slaughter 205
Conclusion to Radical Democratisation....209
Conclusion....210

Introduction to Chapter Five 212
A liturgical methodology 213
Continuity 214
Adaptation 216
Innovation 217
Forming a response to the original question 223
Missional liturgical examples of the paradigm 228
Integration of children 235
Movement and sensory involvement 237
Speaking out loud 239
Opportunity to commit and re-commit 240
Prayer 240
Innovation of first fruits 241
What is being celebrated? 242
Moving the timing of the celebration 243
Communal eating and celebrating 244
Employment and immigration 244
Bringing an offering 245
Not just innovation 246
Conclusion and Summary 247
Bibliography 251
Internet resources 270

Chapter One: Why is there deadlock in current Anglican discussions of Fresh Expressions of Church?

Introduction to Chapter One

In 2004 the Church of England produced a report entitled *Mission-shaped Church.*[1] The emphasis of this report is to encourage the church to respond to the rapid changes in contemporary culture, and to reflect this through creative re-imaginings of the 'shape' of church.[2] The incarnation[3] and the creativity of God[4] are key theological motifs used in the report to support the approach of holding lightly to church practice in order to respond creatively to the surrounding context. The importance placed on traditional Anglican practices are minimised, or at best become negotiable, in order to form what have become known as fresh expressions of church. It would not be an exaggeration to state that the importance the report places on the need for change, in response to the changes in contemporary culture, far outweighs any importance placed on maintaining continuity with what has gone before.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of this one report and the effect that it has had, and indeed continues to have, on the Church of England.

> No Synod report for many years has had such an impact as Mission-shaped Church on the way the Church of England understands itself and its commitment to mission. The original report has sold over

[1] Church of England Mission and Public Affairs Council, *Mission-shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context*, GS 1523 (London: Church House Publishing, 2004).
[2] *Mission-shaped Church,* p. 1.
[3] *Mission-shaped Church,* p. 12.
[4] *Mission-shaped Church,* p. 13.

> 27,000 copies. It has been distributed and widely used in a number of other parts of the Anglican Communion and beyond. A German edition has also been published.[5]

In describing the impact of the report, Giddings adds that is 'is not too much to say that the report identified and provoked a revolution in the church's understanding of its mission in a changing context.'[6] A further measure of the impact of the report is seen through the number of publications that followed from Church House Publishing, developing the concept of 'Mission-shaped' and applying it to different contexts.[7] The importance of this report is also seen in the follow-up report to the General Synod of the Church of England in 2010, and the far-reaching range of proposals that were part of the motion put forward to Synod as a key part of this second report.[8]

Given this unprecedented reception of a Church of England report, it would be easy to assume that the report itself, and the far-ranging consequences deriving from it, were broadly celebrated and accepted by the church. This, however, is not the case. A number of edited volumes written since the

---

[5] P. Giddings, 'Foreword' to *Mission Shaped Church: A Mixed Economy for Mission*, report from the Mission and Public Affairs Council GS 1761 (London: Church House Publishing, 2010) p. 1.

[6] Giddings, 'Foreword', p. 1.

[7] S. Gaze, *Mission-shaped and Rural: Growing Churches in the Countryside*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006); M. Withers, *Mission-shaped Children: Moving Towards a Child-centred Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006); S. Hope, *Mission-shaped Spirituality: the Transforming Power of Mission*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006); P. Bayes & T. Sledge, *Mission-shaped Parish: Traditional Church in a Changing Context*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006); T. Sudworth, *Mission-shaped Youth: Rethinking Young People and the Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2007); S. Croft (ed.) *Mission-shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today's Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2008).

[8] 'Motion for 2010 1.1. That this Synod • affirm the mixed economy of traditional churches and fresh expressions of church, working in partnership, as the most promising mission strategy in a fast changing culture; • encourage those responsible for vocations and training in dioceses and parishes to promote the imaginative recruitment, training and deployment of ordained and lay pioneer ministers in and beyond title posts; • commend the making of Bishops' Mission Orders to integrate suitable fresh expressions of church in the life of the dioceses; and • request the Mission and Public Affairs Division and the Research and Statistics Unit to gather evidence on the spiritual and numerical growth of the mixed economy church in general and fresh expressions of church in particular, and to bring a further report or reports to Synod in the next quinquennium.' *Mission Shaped Church: A Mixed Economy for Mission*, report from the Mission and Public Affairs Council GS 1761 (London: Church House Publishing, 2010) p. 3.

report was published contain chapters raising questions about the substance, theology, proposals and ecclesiology of *Mission-shaped Church*.[9] As well as these, John Hull wrote a short but important and detailed critique of the report. He rightly points out that the report fails 'to distinguish clearly between the church and the mission of God',[10] and, as he argues, this lack of clarity leads to confusion in the report about the role of the church in mission.[11] Hull also questions the report's use of McGavran's 'homogeneity principle'.[12] In discussing this principle, he raises the point that in a mixed context the poorer and less well-educated people are usually dominated by those who are wealthier and more educated. Despite raising this, Hull is still deeply critical of the way *Mission-Shaped Church* argues for churches in poorer communities to reflect the local community by being made up of those from that area.[13] Hull's critique of McGavran's principle is important and highlights the risk of creating segregated, interest-based groups as potential fresh expressions of church. Having acknowledged the point, however, about the potential for domination of some social groups in mixed settings, he does not then provide an alternative solution, other than a hope that 'ultimately all human diversity will be gathered into the single church which will fill the earth.'[14] What would have been more helpful in his critique, would have been to suggest a practical solution that finds a middle ground between either potential segregation or potential domination.

---

[9] See for example, M. Percy, 'Old tricks for new dogs? A critique of fresh expressions' in ed. L. Nelstrop & M. Percy, *Evaluating Fresh Expressions: Explorations in Emerging Church*, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008) pp. 27-39; A. Tilby, 'What Questions does Catholic ecclesiology post for contemporary mission and fresh expressions?' in ed. S. Croft, *Mission-shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today's Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2008) pp. 78-89; M. Percy, 'Many rooms in my Father's house: The changing identity of the English parish church' in ed. S. Croft, *The Future of the Parish System: Shaping the Church of England for the 21st Century*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006) pp. 3-15.

[10] J. M. Hull, *Mission-Shaped Church: A Theological Response*, (London: SCM Press, 2006) p. 1.

[11] Hull, *Mission-Shaped Church: A Theological Response*, p. 1.

[12] Hull, *Mission-Shaped Church: A Theological Response*, p. 14. For further information about McGavran's 'Homogeneous Unit Principle' see D. A. McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth*, (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1970) pp. 85-87, 287-90.

[13] Hull, *Mission-Shaped Church: A Theological Response*, pp. 14-15.

[14] Hull, *Mission-Shaped Church: A Theological Response*, p. 16.

Undoubtedly, however, the strongest and most sustained critique to arise thus far is *For the Parish.*[15] The authors argue vigorously for the importance of continuity of practice and tradition in the face of change. They critique the lack of rigorous theological work in the report, highlighting amongst other things the report's emphasis on the individual over the communal[16] and the way in which the link between salvation and the ecclesial community is lessened.[17] Davison and Milbank are right to raise the concerns that they have, and it is without a doubt that they have provided a voice for a section of the Church of England that has felt overlooked and marginalised in the push towards a broad acceptance and development of fresh expressions of church. As Gittoes, Green and Heard have recently helpfully highlighted, the 'upsurge in energy and enthusiasm for fresh expressions of church has led, in some instances, to feelings of isolation, bewilderment and even hostility for some in traditional parish contexts.'[18] Yet, despite this, *For the Parish* is itself not without criticism. One of the main concerns is that *For the Parish* presents a 'highly idealized image of parish life, which fails to recognize the extent of secularization and ignores or rejects any Christian ministry that lies beyond a narrow definition of "the traditional parish".'[19] *For the Parish* does raise important questions about fresh expressions of church in the Church of England, and importantly provides a voice for part of the church that has felt pushed to one side. The unrealistic portrayal of parish life and lack of engagement with ministry beyond the traditional parish, though, means that the authors have not managed to draw together those on both sides of this important and on-going debate.

The responses and reactions to *Mission-shaped Church* and *For the Parish* have reached deadlock. Those who oppose the level and speed of change

---

[15] A. Davison, & A. Milbank, *For the Parish: A Critique of Fresh Expressions*, (London: SCM Press, 2010).
[16] Davison, & Milbank, *For the Parish,* p. 14.
[17] Davison, & Milbank, *For the Parish,* p. 60.
[18] J. Gittoes, B. Green & J. Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology: Church, World and the Kingdom of God*, (London: SCM Press, 2013) p. 1.
[19] D. Goodhew, A. Roberts & M. Volland, *Fresh!: An Introduction to Fresh Expressions of Church and Pioneer Ministry*, (London: SCM Press, 2012) pp. 43-44.

being pursued by the Church of England argue that in breaking continuity with the past there is a serious risk of losing the fundamental identity of the Church of England. Those keen to continue moving in the direction that the *Mission-Shaped Church* report is suggesting, argue that a loss of ability to change and adapt means increasing irrelevance to contemporary society and continued decline in attendance. It is vital for the Church of England that a way is found to draw people from both sides of this debate together. As Gittoes, Green and Heard state, 'a sustained conversation is needed if we are to avoid the fragmentation of parish and new churches, and a divided understanding of what it means to be church.'[20] Attempts thus far to find common ground from which to have this shared conversation have not succeeded, with some keen to stress the importance of continuity with the past, whilst others emphasise the need to adapt to new contexts. In order to propose a new approach for this current impasse it will be important to show the vital link between the Church of England's practice and its doctrine. Before doing this, it is important to understand how others have been approaching this question and why the approaches used thus far have not succeeded in drawing both sides of the debate together.[21]

Ecclesiological and liturgical approaches to continued dialogue

Up to now the theological method used to address this question has been ecclesiological rather than missiological. Croft helpfully articulates the rationale for this approach, stating that although both missiology and ecclesiology are crucial to the wider discussion, he believes that missiology 'is much better resourced than thinking and reflection on church.'[22] The

[20] Gittoes, Green & Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology*, p. 2.
[21] The focus of this study is specifically on the Church of England's response to Fresh Expressions of Church and presents an argument that a liturgical approach to this question is more fitting given Anglican self-understanding. It may be that aspects of this work could contribute helpfully to discussions of fresh expressions of church beyond the Church of England, but any such insights would be incidental and do not fall within the intentional focus and scope of this work.
[22] S. Croft, 'Fresh Expressions in a Mixed Economy Church: A Perspective' in ed. S. Croft, *Mission-shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today's Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2008) p. 14.

premise, therefore, has sought to find a way to defend fresh expressions of church as genuine examples of the church as understood by Anglican ecclesiology. If this can be achieved, then the underlying missional push for cultural and contextual adaptation will be supported by the developing ecclesiological understanding.

What this has led to in practice, however, has been an attempt to find the minimal 'essence' of the church so that it can then be re-clothed and transplanted into different cultural settings and contexts.[23] In other words, a gathered community could be called a 'church' if it fulfils and demonstrates particular criteria a writer argues are what defines a church. This 'reductionist' approach to ecclesiology has been strongly criticised by Davison and Milbank throughout their book. This is not a surprise given that a more catholic theology of church will place a higher emphasis on the importance of continuity and tradition. This creates a point of sharp disagreement with the often more evangelical approaches of those involved with fresh expressions of church and the *Mission-shaped Church* report in particular, given that it places far less emphasis on the maintenance of church structures, traditions and practices.

One way in which Davison and Milbank reject this method is to argue that it is not at all easy to separate the content of something from its form, as this reductionist approach seeks to do, and that while the two are distinguishable they are inseparable.[24] In other words, they do not support the premise that it is possible to pick up certain characteristics from their cultural and sociological context and transplant them into a different context. This has meant that the primary ecclesiological approach to exploring fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context has not succeeded in drawing

[23] See for example, M. Atkins, 'What is the essence of the Church?' in ed. S. Croft, *Mission-shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today's Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2008) pp. 16-28; S. Croft, 'What counts as a fresh expression of church and who decides?' in ed. L. Nelstrop and M. Percy, *Evaluating Fresh Expressions: Explorations in Emerging Church*, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008) pp. 3-14.
[24] Davison, & Milbank, *For the Parish,* p. 1.

people together. As such, it is surprising that ecclesiology is still the dominant methodological approach within the recent Church of England report on fresh expressions of church, published jointly with the Methodist Church.[25] What will be argued for below is that a liturgical rather than ecclesiological approach can provide the means for sustained and continuing dialogue for both sides of the debate. As will be demonstrated, this is because a liturgical approach is more appropriate given Anglican self-understanding and identity.

A liturgical approach

The methodology of *Mission-shaped Church*, in terms of how to go about starting a fresh expression of church, intentionally places issues of liturgy and worship aside. The directions given to those wanting to begin a fresh expression of church are that it should start by listening to the context and serving the community.

> This is the start of "incarnational mission". Which means following the example of Christ and seeking to evangelise within the community you are now serving. In that context we can begin to make disciples. The very last thing that is decided is the nature of the worship service. Fresh expressions are not about planting a congregation which worships the way the planters prefer and then hoping that other people like it! Listening comes first, decisions about worship styles last.[26]

This shows the lack of regard given to the importance of worship and liturgy, relegated as it is to final place and described in terms of 'worship style'. Within such a methodology there is no attention given to issues of community formation through worship, nor the inter-related nature of baptism, Eucharist and mission within Anglican liturgical theology. Indeed, this absence of the importance of the liturgical is commented on by Davison and Milbank. They argue that by ignoring liturgy it is unclear how fresh expressions of church 'embody an ethical programme, and a mode of Christian living.'[27] Equally

[25] Archbishops' Council and Trustees for Methodist Church Purposes, *Fresh Expressions in the Mission of the Church: A Report of an Anglican-Methodist Working Party*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2012) p. 9.
[26] Archbishop's Council, *The Fresh Expressions Initiative*, GS 1766 (London: Church House Publishing, 2009) p. 2.
[27] Davison & Milbank, *For the Parish*, p. 209.

absent from this approach is any engagement with work produced from decades of liturgical thinking and development in the Church of England. The contribution that this work could have been making to this discussion will be explored below. This is an understandable reaction against churches which for too long have prioritised worship over evangelism and mission, but a response that has side-lined worship has resulted in neglecting crucial insights that could have been gained through engaging with questions of liturgy and liturgical renewal.

One particular way that Davison and Milbank argue for the importance of liturgy, and in particular Anglican Eucharistic liturgy, is that participation in the liturgy provides a 'grammar' for Christian life.[28] In other words, the regular repetition of and participation in the liturgy enables the individual and the community to grow in knowledge and understanding of God and the Christian life. Whilst they demonstrate the role of liturgy in shaping ethics, which is important, they do so through a static and traditional picture of Anglican parish Eucharistic worship. What is emphasised is an ahistoric church liturgical tradition that not only does not allow for the possibility of adaptation to context but does not even acknowledge that there might be a need for this. This assumption creates clear conflict between them and those exploring fresh expressions of church. As well as this, there is also an implicit assumption within their writing that an individual will know and understand the theology contained within the liturgy. So, for example, they write that to 'respond to the greeting is to affirm the gatheredness of the others present; their value and integrity in Christ is affirmed in the same phrase that unites us in the one body, sharing the one Spirit.'[29] Whilst there is no dispute over their theological interpretation of the liturgy, there has to be a question as to whether every member of the congregation realises that this is what is

[28] Davison and Milbank, *For the Parish*, p. 211.
[29] Davison and Milbank, *For the Parish*, p. 213.

happening at this, and at other moments in the liturgy that are similarly described.[30]

One book that does offer some reflections on the possible place of liturgy and worship within fresh expressions of church is Croft and Mobsby's edited volume, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*.[31] Much of the volume is made up of interesting but anecdotal chapters of people reflecting on their own practice and experience. Wallace, as an example, discusses 'Visions', a fresh expression of church in York, and describes their journey through a variety of different liturgical experiments before ending up with their current model. She does acknowledge, however, that this came about more through trial and error than an intentional theologically rationale.[32]

Through reflections on their experience of starting and running a fresh expression of church, Rundell provides a helpful response to the thinking of Davison and Milbank that liturgy, even in an Anglo-Catholic context, should not be adapted. He argues strongly that the Mass that they celebrate today is not that of Hippolytus or Cranmer but rather 'it is a successor to all of them. It is the result of much borrowing, adapting and changing over time. Tradition is, above all, a dynamic entity, not a static museum piece.'[33] He goes on to add that liturgy became for them the means to communicate the story of salvation.

---

[30] A recent study presents interesting reading as to how much of the rich theology present within Eucharistic Prayers, the particular area of focus, is comprehended and recalled by worshipping members attending Church of England services. The analysis of the research undertaken suggests that even long-standing members of Anglican congregations may not remember and comprehend the theological depth and content of liturgical services. R. Cresswell, *An Investigation into the Levels of Recollection and Comprehension of Themes within Common Worship Eucharistic Prayers Amongst the Laity in the Church of England*, (Unpublished Master's Dissertation: University of Chester, 2017) p. 44.

[31] S. Croft & I. Mobsby (eds), *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009).

[32] S. Wallace, 'Alternative Worship and the Story of Visions in York', in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) pp. 12, 14.

[33] S. Rundell, 'Blesséd: A Sacramental Perspective of Alternative Worship with Young People' in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) p. 134.

> The Mass provides both fixed points of reference and an ever-changing cycle of encounter with God, and this mix of the familiar and the challenging provides a framework on which to hang new explorations of worship; rather than being a limit to fresh expressions of worship, it forms a skeleton upon which a new creation is formed (2 Cor. 5.17).'[34]

Through this, Rundell then provides a challenge to the assumptions strongly set out in *Mission-shaped Church* about placing matters of worship-style at the back of the queue in terms of the process of developing fresh expressions of church. The reflection, stemming from their own experience of setting up and running a fresh expression aimed at reaching out to young people specifically, showed that worship was a way of providing an encounter with God for seekers as a key part of intentional and deliberate evangelism.[35]

Given that each author within this volume wrote separately with no knowledge of nor interaction with each other, there are obvious differences of emphasis and this means that there is no consistent model or theological approach to fresh expressions of church that is explored. As such, whilst it is interesting to read the reflections on practice and to note that these explorations arising from a more Anglo-Catholic perspective, the book does not provide a consistent theological reflection on which to develop. It is also important and interesting to note that despite the focus on liturgy and worship throughout the book as a whole, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, continues to show an emphasis on ecclesiology rather than liturgy in his introduction to the volume.[36]

It is not only those seeking to defend and promote fresh expressions of church that have opted for an ecclesiological approach, but similarly almost all critics of *Mission-shaped Church* and *For the Parish* have done so through discussions of ecclesiology, rather than that of worship and liturgy. So, for

[34] S. Rundell, 'Blesséd', p. 135.
[35] S. Rundell, 'Blesséd', p. 134.
[36] R. Williams, 'Address to the Fresh Expressions National Pilgrimage, Coventry Cathedral, December 2008' in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) p. 7.

example, Hull's critique of *Mission-shaped Church* does not mention the relegation of liturgy and worship in the text, but focuses on a perceived confusion between ecclesiology and missiology.[37] Similarly, a more recent critique points to the strengths and weaknesses of both volumes, but mentions worship only briefly and simply to illustrate that care needs to be taken not simply to reject all forms of 'traditional' Anglican worship.[38]

In their recent publication in direct response to this deadlock, showing that this is still very much a pressing issue, Gittoes, Green and Heard have also opted to take an ecclesiological approach.[39] At several points Gittoes, Green and Heard raise the importance of the role of worship within the church. They draw attention, for example, to the silence in *For the Parish* about 'the gap between those who attend worship on a regular basis and those living and working within the parish.'[40] From this they argue that unless 'we are able to describe accurately the world within which we live and worship and work, unless we make space to hear the stories and assumptions of those who come to us, we cannot fully engage with the mission of God.'[41] Similarly, in a later chapter, Gittoes draws attention to the attitudes to worship in both *Mission-shaped Church* and *For The Parish*, in that on the one hand patterns are flexible and missional situations demand innovation, and on the other hand the emphasis on the given nature of received patterns of worship through the ages.[42] These observations and reflections on the place and nature of worship within this debate are raised here, but are not explored further in the book. Importantly, what they do note in their book is the crucial need 'to affirm the connection between inheritance and innovation.'[43] Neglecting the importance of liturgy in this debate has not only meant side-lining a significant part of Anglican self-understanding, but also ignoring the

[37] Hull, *Mission-shaped Church.*
[38] Goodhew, Roberts & Volland, *Fresh!,* pp. 27, 30-31, 58.
[39] Gittoes, Green & Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology*, p. 1.
[40] Gittoes, Green & Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology*, p. 7.
[41] Gittoes, Green & Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology*, p. 7.
[42] J. Gittoes, 'Where is the Kingdom?' in Gittoes, Green & Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology: Church, World and the Kingdom of God*, (London: SCM Press, 2013) p. 99.
[43] Gittoes, Green & Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology*, p. 3.

lessons that could be learned from the way in which liturgy has changed, developed and adapted to different contexts over time. It is clear that an approach that could hold together both 'inheritance' and 'innovation' would have a lot to offer in terms of providing the means of discussion for both sides of the debate.

The words 'liturgy' and 'worship' are defined and understood variously, depending on context and audience. For the purposes of this work it will be helpful to set out the specific ways they are being used for this study. Worship is understood here as more of a generic concept.[44] For example, it is a term that has clear breadth of meaning beyond just Anglican or indeed Christian church services. It is indeed a 'universal phenomenon',[45] having to do with 'reaching out to the Transcendent'[46] or 'assigning worth to what is thought to be worthy and giving expression to that estimate of value.'[47] In other words, worship can happen anywhere, individually or corporately, demonstrating what is held to be important by that person or people at a given time. It has a breadth of reference that can denote a variety of spiritual practices, both Christian and non-Christian, occurring in a variety of settings both traditionally associated with spirituality and beyond these arenas. As compared to this, liturgy is being used here in a more specific and focused way. The term originated from a general, non-religious Greek word meaning the work of the people,[48] it then came to mean a communal act of public worship containing some sort of ritual activity.[49] As such, liturgy is used here

[44] W. A. Dyrness, *A Primer on Christian Worship: Where we've Been, Where we are, Where we can go*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009) p. 1.
[45] P. Bishop, 'Worship' in ed. P. E. Fink, *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1990) p. 1331.
[46] J. D. Crichton, 'A Theology of Worship' in ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright & E. Yarnold, *The Study of Liturgy*, (London: SPCK, 1978) p. 6.
[47] C. P. Price & L. Weil, *Liturgy for Living*, revd. edn. (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Morehouse Publishing, 2000) p. 8.
[48] Price and Weil, *Liturgy for Living*, p. 13.
[49] See for example, L. J. Madden, 'Liturgy' in ed. P. E. Fink, *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1990) p. 741; K. F. Pecklers, *Worship*, New Century Theology (London: Continuum, 2003) p. 23; L. Weil, *A Theology of Worship*, The New Church's Teaching Series vol. 12 (Lanham, Maryland: Cowley, 2002) p. 7; J. F. White, *Introduction to Christian Worship*, 3rd edn. (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 2000) p. 26.

to mean specific practices that take place within the context of intentional, communal times of worship. This encompasses particular texts that may be used, such as the *Book of Common Prayer* or *Common Worship*, as well as specific acts, for example baptism or Eucharist. Liturgy, however, is more than simply the written text on the page of an order of service, it is also the 'form' that shapes Christian communal gathering encompassing not only words, but also music, movement, gesture, silence.[50]

Conclusion to ecclesiological and liturgical approaches to dialogue

The reaction to the *Mission-Shaped Church* report introduced concepts, practices and decisions that have created a significant level of concern for some within the Church of England. An ecclesiological methodology has been used in much of the material that supports fresh expressions of church, and although this has not enabled dialogue between both parties it still continues to be used. It is clear that issues of worship and liturgy have remained very much at the edges of these on-going conversations, and although comments are made, these have remained significantly underdeveloped. The next section will demonstrate why debating issues of Anglican ecclesiology and self-understanding without reference to liturgy is to make a fundamental omission. This will also set out why a liturgical approach to this question is therefore the most appropriate and why this approach has the capacity to hold together questions of continuity, adaptation and innovation, points noted above as crucial for this on-going dialogue.

The importance of liturgy to Anglican identity

Liturgy is fundamental for Anglican self-understanding. Whilst other reformed churches are rooted in 'confessional documents, or doctrinal

[50] M. Perham, *To Tell Afresh*, (London: SPCK, 2010) p. 28

formularies, or a systematically articulated theology,'[51] and the Roman Catholic Church is led from within the Magisterium, the 'Anglican anchor is worship'.[52] Anglican doctrine is not expressed through a statement of beliefs, there is no 'key year or key text'[53]; instead Anglican identity 'emerges from a combination of text, institution, context and practice, both ecclesiastical and secular and drawn from a number of key periods.'[54] As compared to other churches within the reformed tradition, an Anglican expression of its theology appears at the end of its reformation, not at the beginning.[55]

In his contribution to the volume exploring fresh expressions of church from an Anglo-Catholic perspective, Maclaren reflects on the importance of liturgy for Anglican self-understanding.

> But at the core, [Anglicans] have sought to retain the grand and robust beauty of holiness. And in particular, they have cherished ancient liturgy as a way of doing so. By centring on worship – liturgical worship, with a contemplative leaning, with a taste for the beautiful – Anglicans were less infatuated with attempts to shrink-wrap the mysteries of God and gospel in tidy, little, square verbal packages; like the Psalmist, the one thing they desired, the one thing they sought above all others was the beautiful holiness of God. If the locus of constricting religion is in books, the locus of Anglican religion is in liturgy. If the one is focused on argument and correctness, the other is focused on reverence and awe.[56]

An Anglican understanding of doctrine is contained in a remarkably muted five lines in the Canons of the Church of England. The canon states that

---

[51] C. Hefling, 'Introduction: Anglicans and Common Prayer' in ed. C. Hefling & C. Shattuck, *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, (Oxford: OUP, 2006) p. 3.
[52] Hefling, 'Introduction: Anglicans and Common Prayer', p. 3.
[53] M. Chapman, *Anglican Theology*, (London: T & T Clark, 2012) pp. 8-9.
[54] Chapman, *Anglican Theology*, pp. 8-9.
[55] W. P. Haugaard, 'From the Reformation to the Eighteenth Century' in ed. S. Sykes, J. Booty, J. E. & J. Knight revd. edn. *The Study of Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1998) pp. 10-11. For further insight into early Anglican understanding of polity and worship see also *The Books of Homilies*, the first printed work relating to the public worship and teaching of the Church of England, first printed in 1547. J. Griffiths (ed.) *The Two Books of Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859) p. 1.
[56] B. Maclaren, 'One, Holy, Catholic and Fresh?' in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) p. 20.

Church of England doctrine is 'grounded in the Holy Scriptures, and in such teachings of the ancient Fathers and Councils of the Church as are agreeable to the said Scriptures.'[57] It is found in three places, two of which are liturgical, namely *The Book of Common Prayer*, and the Ordinal, as well as the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.[58] This short canon forms the heart of the Declaration of Assent, 'made by deacons, priests and bishops of the Church of England when they are ordained and on each occasion when they take up a new appointment'.[59] Similarly Readers and Lay Workers make the declaration, but without reference to administering sacraments, when admitted and licensed.[60] The canon is therefore both to be found in liturgical settings as well as recited in liturgical settings during services for ordination and licensing, underlining the significance of liturgy for Anglican doctrine. This is further reinforced by the way in which theological understandings of practices such as baptism or the Eucharist are, for the Anglican Church, expressed primarily through the liturgy for those services. What is understood and believed is expressed in what is spoken and enacted through the liturgy and rubrics of the services. This is why any change to liturgy or practice within Anglican services can be so controversial, as a change in liturgy could potentially also mean a change in doctrine.

The argument for a common liturgical pattern

Given the importance of liturgy for Anglican understanding, it is not surprising that there is strong criticism against liturgical change and adaptation, generally expressed in terms of the importance of maintaining identity and doctrinal orthodoxy.[61] Davison and Milbank argue that a 'common liturgy is

[57] Church of England, *The Canons of the Church of England: Canons Ecclesiastical promulgated by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1964 and 1969 and by the General Synod of the Church of England from 1970*, 6th complete edn. (London, Church House Publishing, 2008) p. 10.
[58] Church of England, *The Canons of the Church of England*, p. 10.
[59] Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2000) p. xi.
[60] Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship,* p. xi.
[61] See for example Davison, & Milbank, *For the Parish,* p. 96; Tilby, 'What Questions does Catholic Ecclesiology pose for Contemporary Mission and Fresh Expressions?', pp. 78-89; C. Irvine, *The Art of God: The Making of Christians and the Meaning of Worship*, (London: SPCK,

central to the identity of the Church of England.'[62] They are not alone in holding this position. Tilby[63] writes one of the few chapters mentioning liturgy within the discussion of *Mission-shaped Church* and fresh expressions of church, in which she emphasises that the 'shape of the Body in Anglican ecclesiology is in essence a liturgical shape.'[64] She points to the importance of keeping to a coherent practice of orthodox liturgical understanding within Anglicanism in order to maintain identity, given the lack of other referential anchors.[65] In a similar way, Irvine argues that an increasing focus on adaptation to the local is a move towards 'a narrow parochialism and an increasing "congregationalism" within the Church of England.'[66] It is certainly appropriate to raise the point that the Church of England must be cautious about embracing anything that moves it away from its identity as an episcopal church towards a more congregational ecclesiology. The idea, though, that the church cannot reflect local concerns without giving up its nature is clearly untrue given its ability to respond appropriately to specific local concerns, be they crises and tragedies or joy and celebration. Sykes too raises concerns about changing liturgical practices, arguing that liturgical revision is conducted by what he describes as '"Élite" groups' who are exercising 'dominance over "lower" participants in the Church'.[67] He is right to raise awareness of potential issues of power and control in church settings, but any type of change, regardless of whether it is liturgical or not, would have the potential to feel like an imposition on people who perceive themselves as

---

2005) p. 63; M. Perham. 'Introduction' in ed. M. Perham, *The Renewal of Common Prayer: Unity and Diversity in Church of England Worship*, *Essays by the Liturgical Commission*, (London: SPCK, 1993) pp. 4-5; S. Neill, 'Liturgical Continuity and Change in the Anglican Churches' in ed. D. Martin and P. Mullen, *No Alternative: The Prayer Book Controversy*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981) p. 10; S. Sykes, *Unashamed Anglicanism*, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1995) pp. 116-118.

[62] Davison, & Milbank, *For the Parish,* p. 96.

[63] Tilby, 'What Questions does Catholic Ecclesiology pose for Contemporary Mission and Fresh Expressions?', pp. 78-89.

[64] Tilby, 'What Questions does Catholic Ecclesiology pose for Contemporary Mission and Fresh Expressions?', p. 78.

[65] Tilby, 'What Questions does Catholic Ecclesiology pose for Contemporary Mission and Fresh Expressions?', p. 84.

[66] Irvine, *The Art of God*, p. 63.

[67] Sykes, *Unashamed Anglicanism*, p. 118.

powerless. At the same time, however, it also needs to be noted that inertia and lack of change could also hide serious issues of power and control in church contexts.

An argument for maintaining traditional liturgical practice is often expressed, particularly within *For the Parish*, with the assumption that there exists a transcendent, ahistorical church culture and liturgy. Any attempt to change or adapt liturgical practices would therefore risk removing this inherent abstract and otherworldly quality. Hardy argues strongly against this acultural view of and approach to liturgy.

> Where they cannot distinguish between what is fundamental and what comes from transient historical and cultural influences, they are driven to repeat the 'whole package' as the 'only way' to preserve what is fundamental, and they end up resisting all change and drawing lines between themselves and others. Like people everywhere who feel isolated and threatened, they cling to old practices and oppose anything different.[68]

Although written prior to *For the Parish*, Hardy, in effect, anticipates the approach and attitude demonstrated by Davison and Milbank. In contrast, he argues for creativity rather than repetition within 'evangelical Catholicism',[69] the term for that he proposes and defends in his book. He makes crucial connections between worship, mission and context,[70] relationships that can be overlooked by those arguing against liturgical adaptation, but that are especially significant for this debate. He adds that in 'a world of rapidly increasing social complexity, the Church cannot simply adhere to fixed traditional forms and maintain itself by "managing" itself.'[71] In other words, the response by the church to changes in contemporary society cannot simply be to continue doing what it has always done.

---

[68] D. W. Hardy, *Finding the Church*, (London: SCM Press, 2001) p. 82.
[69] Hardy, *Finding the Church*, p. 87.
[70] Hardy, *Finding the Church*, p. 4.
[71] Hardy, *Finding the Church*, p. 4.

The next section will show that an examination of the history of Anglican liturgy reveals that it has always been changing and adapting to context, which provides strong support for the argument for change. Importantly, this also shows that there have been significant factors that have continued through times of change, showing that continuity and adaptation are both normal parts of liturgical development.

The history of Anglican liturgy

The liturgy of the Church of England has been through a process of constant change. As Stevenson writes, even the 1662 Book of Common Prayer itself 'is an embodiment of an organic development, which introduced, at the eleventh hour, two gems of Anglican devotion, the General Thanksgiving and the Prayer for All Sorts and Conditions of Men.'[72] Spinks even goes as far as saying that 'the idea that the Church of England ever had complete liturgical uniformity as provided by the services in the Book of Common Prayer is simply not true.'[73] To understand this process it is important to look at each significant stage of development as this will show the influences and theological understandings that pulled the Church of England in different directions and affected its liturgical practices.

Early Church

In terms of recognising the importance of context, it is very clear that the Jewish background of many of the first disciples influenced aspects of early Christian worship practices. This influence can be observed in a variety of liturgical settings, such as baptism, confirmation, daily offices, communion, ordination and the liturgical calendar.[74] In terms of the extent of this cultural

[72] K. Stevenson, 'Anglican Identity and Church of England Worship Today: An Historical Reflection' in ed. M. Perham *The Renewal of Common Prayer: Unity and Diversity in Church of England Worship, Essays by the Liturgical Commission*, (London: SPCK, 1993) p. 9.
[73] B. Spinks, 'Not So Common Prayer: The Third Service' in ed. M. Perham, *The Renewal of Common Prayer: Unity and Diversity in Church of England Worship, Essays by the Liturgical Commission*, (London: SPCK, 1993) p. 55.
[74] R. T. Beckwith, 'The Jewish Background to Christian Worship' in *The Study of Liturgy*, revd. edn. ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright, E. Yarnold S. J. & P. Bradshaw (London: SPCK, 1992) pp. 73-79.

impact, one of the most influential authors on liturgical practices, Dix, has argued that the pattern for the Eucharist has been unchanged since the celebration of the Last Supper by Jesus and his disciples.[75]

> At the heart of it all is the Eucharistic action, a thing of an absolute simplicity – the taking, blessing, breaking and giving of bread and the taking, blessing and giving of a cup of wine and water, as these were first done with their new meaning by a young Jew before and after supper with his friends on the night before He died. Soon it was simplified still further, by leaving out the supper and combining the double grouping before and after it into a single rite. So the four-action Shape of the Liturgy was found by the end of the first century.[76]

This presentation of Eucharistic history has influenced liturgical scholarship for a number of years. More recent scholarship, however, has questioned the assumptions that Dix presents.[77] Spinks argues convincingly that it is not possible to assume that the limited records that are preserved showing liturgical practices from the first two centuries represent anything like a universal practice or understanding.[78] Bradshaw, similarly, argues strongly that what evidence exists points instead to variety rather than uniformity of practice,[79] stating that there appear to have been several different forms of Eucharistic-type celebrations in the first 250 years of Christian communities.[80] He goes on to argue that the lack of texts from this time 'is not just because they have not survived but because Christians generally do not seem to have written down their prayers but preferred oral transmission and improvisation.'[81] It has even been suggested that this variety of tradition may be observable within scripture and early church writing.

> Indeed, the Last Supper tradition reported in Mark and Matthew may well betray inculturation already, since it seems to portray that Supper in terms of one form of primitive Christian *Eucharistic* usage in which the bread and cup events occur back-to-back *within* a meal rather

[75] D. M. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, (London: A & C Black ltd., 1945) p. 743.
[76] Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 743-44.
[77] See for example C. Cocksworth, *Holy, Holy, Holy: Worshipping the Trinitarian God*, Trinity and Truth Series (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2004) p. 94; A. J. Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2006) p. 3.
[78] B. D. Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day*, SCM Studies in Worship and Liturgy (London: SCM Press, 2013) p. 51.
[79] P. F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, (London: SPCK, 2004).
[80] Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, p. 60.
[81] Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, p. 38.

> than separated by the meal, as one sees in Luke, 1 Corinthians, and *Didache* 9-10.[82]

The limited evidence that does exist from the early church clearly shows that Christian worship was strongly influenced by its Jewish context. The weight of current argument also points towards a reasonably high level of contextual adaptation and development, with local improvisation not only being permitted but encouraged.

Reformation

The beginning of the Anglican Church was turbulent. The 1662 Book of Common Prayer, as it now stands, has to be understood as a product of liturgical process, adaptation and variation that spanned over a hundred years. The initial 'radical changes'[83] of Protestant reformation carried out during the reign of Edward VI were put into reverse when Mary became queen. Several leading reformers, such as Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were killed, whilst others fled to places such as Geneva in order to escape persecution.[84] When Elizabeth I became queen there was a turn once again towards Protestantism, and her reign led to a rapid process of liturgical writing and development.

> In 1548 an English vernacular communion preparation was issued that was to be inserted prior to the place of communion in the Latin Mass. In 1549 a *Book of Common Prayer* (*BCP*), with an Act of Uniformity, replaced all Latin rites other than for ordination. The latter were replaced in 1550. The 1549 Prayer Book, some of the services of which seemed little more than vernacular translations, were replaced in 1552, with a new Act of Uniformity, by a more obviously Protestant book. The chief architect and primary liturgiographer of these liturgical projects was Archbishop Thomas Cranmer.[85]

Politics clearly had a direct influence of the development of Anglican liturgy, and Spinks points out that the Reformation brought about more deliberate

---

[82] A. Kavanagh, 'Liturgical Inculturation: Looking to the Future' in *Studia Liturgica* vol. 20 no. 1 1990, p. 96.
[83] C. J. Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) p. 33.
[84] Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, p. 33.
[85] Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, p. 313.

and self-conscious liturgical writing than had been the case previously.[86] The Anglican Church simultaneously had to stand up to both the doctrine of the Church in Rome on the one hand and the practices of the Puritans in their own country on the other. This was achieved by ensuring doctrinal limits through the Articles of Religion, whilst the practical concerns were managed 'by an insistence on liturgical and organizational conformity.'[87]

The different prayer books produced over the years of tension and transition are clearly marked as products of their particular time and context,[88] revealing and reflecting the theology, ecclesiology and language of their day. The politics, theology and social context of the Reformation had a direct impact on the development of the first Anglican liturgies, with several different texts produced in quick succession, leading finally to the version in 1662, still in use to this day.

It is notable that an analysis of the language of the Book of Common Prayer shows a limited use of the available scriptural imagery and metaphors for God, with a preference for language that is hierarchical and patriarchal. [89] Interestingly the very idea of change and development was written into the Preface of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer. It states that 'the liturgy is seen as one of the human aspects of the Church which may, for appropriate and serious reasons, undergo change or correction so that it may serve its true purpose.'[90] Given the changes that continued to take place until the Book of Common Prayer reached its final form in 1662, it is more than a little ironic that in the final version of the prayer book this statement was omitted.

---

[86] Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, p. 271.
[87] Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, p. 33.
[88] R. D. Williams, 'Imaging the Kingdom: Some Questions for Anglican Worship Today' in ed. K. Stevenson and B. Spinks *The Identity of Anglican Worship*, (London: Mowbray, 1991) p. 6.
[89] D. Holeton, 'The Formative Character of Liturgy' in ed. T. J. Talley *A Kingdom of Priests: Liturgical Formation of the People of God*, Grove Liturgical Study no. 53 (Nottingham: Grove, 1988) p. 10.
[90] L. Weil, 'The Gospel in Anglicanism' in ed. S. Sykes, J. Boots and J. Knight, *The Study of Anglicanism*, revd. edn. (London: SPCK, 1998) p. 60.

Post-reformation

A significant movement within the Anglican Church in the 1800s was the Oxford Movement, also known as Tractarianism. It can be traced back to its origins at the 'Assize Sermon delivered on 14 July 1833 by John Keble, and the meeting at Hadleigh Rectory, 15-19 July 1833.'[91] This movement brought about the introduction of ideas such as the eastward position for celebrating communion, candles, and Eucharistic vestments, which was 'met with open hostility from Protestant-minded Anglicans.'[92] Liturgical uniformity, if it had ever existed, was fading. It was not simply candles and clothing that was changing, but the Tractarians brought about a much more sacramental understanding of baptism, Eucharist and confession[93] than had commonly been held before. White describes the changes that happened to Anglican worship between 1833 and 1928 as 'only slightly less striking than those of the Reformation era.'[94] Anglican theology and worship was being moved away from its reformed heritage towards embracing more catholic practices and theologies.

The Oxford Movement, in support for these changes, looked back beyond the Reformation in order to connect the Anglican Church with its catholic heritage.[95] The reintroduction into Anglican services of what were widely held to be more catholic aspects of church tradition caused some to push for an emphasis on more 'reformed' values within the Church of England. As part of the response to these developments, the Parker Society was formed by the evangelical wing of the Church of England, keen to emphasise the importance of the Reformation for Anglican theology and ecclesiology. As Cocksworth states, there 'is no doubt that Evangelicals had a great love for the 1662

[91] J. Fenwick & B. Spinks, *Worship in Transition: The Twentieth Century Liturgical Movement*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995) p. 39.
[92] P. Butler, 'From the Early 18th Century to the Present Day', in ed. S. Sykes, J. Booty, J. E. & J. Knight revd. edn. *The Study of Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1998) p. 45.
[93] J. F. White, *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition*, (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1989) p. 110.
[94] White, *Protestant Worship,* p. 108.
[95] Chapman, *Anglican Theology,* pp. 11-16.

communion service. They saw it as essentially Cranmer's rite.'[96] Both groups began to publish widely in an attempt to establish themselves as the 'true' voice of Anglicanism, looking back to either the Reformation or historical Catholicism in order to support their arguments. Chapman rightly points out, though, that both parties were equally guilty of imposing their own interpretations on the historical events they selected, to further their particular concerns.[97]

A continuing effect of the Oxford Movement on the Church of England was the success of the Parish Communion Movement, instigating a weekly celebration of communion in every parish. Prior to this, in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, communion may have been celebrated only four or five times a year in Anglican parish churches.[98] Bishops, alongside those more catholic members of the church, had been asking for more frequent communion services,[99] as had a significant number of people in the evangelical tradition.[100] There is also clear evidence that as overseas mission was becoming significant at this time, important connections were being made between the Eucharist and the mission of the Church.[101] As Sachs comments, by the mid-1800s a growing awareness of the missional context abroad was connected with the need for liturgical renewal.[102]

The developments from this period in the history of the Church of England have had a long-lasting effect on church practices, as can still be witnessed today. It is interesting that many things often assumed to be 'typically Anglican', such as candles, vestments and frequent Eucharistic service, are actually a product of change and adaptation in the nineteenth century rather than stemming from its origins in the seventeenth century. This period of

---

[96] Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, p. 110.
[97] Chapman, *Anglican Theology*, p. 46.
[98] Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, p. 61.
[99] Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, p. 62.
[100] Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, pp. 73-75.
[101] J. Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist: Contemporary Anglican Approaches*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008) p. 48.
[102] W. L. Sachs, 'Plantations, Missions and Colonies' in ed. C. Hefling & C. Shattuck, *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, (Oxford: OUP, 2006) p. 153.

history also shows that sharp divisions in the church about different approaches and practices in worship are not a novel occurrence.

20th Century developments

The pace of liturgical change and development accelerated during the twentieth century. Part of this was prompted by the fact that the Church of England was finally beginning to recognise that 'in no Anglican church did either clergy or people make any serious attempt to carry out the rubrics exactly.'[103] It was difficult for those arguing against change to maintain that standardisation of liturgical practice was the norm across the country when growing evidence indicated otherwise.

A further and significant contribution to this increasing pace of change was the interaction between the Anglican Church and the different cultures it was engaging with in worldwide mission. Avis rightly points out that as different cultures and nations became part of the growing Anglican Communion, it could no longer simply be centred around 'centralization or uniformity.'[104] This had a direct impact on the church, when as early as in 1908, resolution 36 of that year's Lambeth Conference stated that 'liturgical uniformity should not be regarded as a necessity throughout the Anglican Communion.'[105] Whilst this was seen initially as a need arising from missional engagement, Brown, writing in 1965, argues that the church in Europe and America had also to recognise the need for mission and evangelism within their own countries, just as much as the churches elsewhere around the world. He goes on to argue that it was this local evangelistic need that was revealing 'the inadequacies of our theology and of the irrelevance of much of our worship'.[106] Despite this growing awareness, 25 years after Brown was writing, the same concerns were being raised that issues of liturgical

[103] Neill, 'Liturgical Continuity and Change in the Anglican Churches', p. 4.
[104] P. Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology*, (London: T & T Clark, 2007) p. 9.
[105] D. Holeton & C. Buchanan, *A History of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations [IALCs] 1983- 2007*, Grove Joint Liturgical Studies, 63 (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2007) p. 5.
[106] L. W. Brown, *Relevant Liturgy*, (London: SPCK, 1965) p. 28.

adaptation are just as relevant for people living in England as they are for those in other countries.[107] The important issue of liturgical change and adaptation to context has been on the Anglican Communion's agenda for over 100 years, and has been raised as an issue for the national church for at least 50 years. Given this lengthy awareness, and the direct connections made by people between liturgical change and a missional context, it is surprising that liturgy has not featured much more prominently in the current debate surrounding the impact of the *Mission-Shaped Church* report.

Rural and urban concerns

An interesting response to the Parish Communion movement is seen in a 1990 Church of England report into rural ministry. Whilst acknowledging the importance of regular celebrations of communion, the report highlights that in a rural setting a regular weekly parish communion can unintentionally end up excluding many in the parish. Those feeling excluded are not just adults and children who are not confirmed, but those in village communities from other denominations who find themselves worshipping at the local parish church as it often can be the only place of worship in the community.[108] As a consequence, the report makes this statement. '*We recommend that each church discusses the frequency of its communion services and that it reviews this from time to time in the light of the needs of the people it exists to serve*.'[109] The report also argues for an increased awareness of the need for adaptation to context.[110]

> All these special services, marking as they do events which cut across the lives of the whole community, offer an enormous evangelistic opportunity. They present the Church with a chance to show all members of the parish that they are welcome in a church which not

[107] D. R. Holeton 'Introduction' in ed. D. R. Holeton, *Liturgical Inculturation in the Anglican Communion*, Grove Liturgical Study 62 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1990) p. 7.
[108] This is a concern highlighted in the report written prior to developments of the introduction of 'communion before confirmation'.
[109] 'Faith in the Countryside' Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Rural Areas (Worthing: Churchman Publishing, 1990) p. 189. Italics original.
[110] 'Faith in the Countryside', p. 198.

> only has a human face, but which can also be fun, and, most importantly, that God is concerned with every aspect of their life.[111]

This report explores the impact that practices and traditions of the Church of England have on specifically rural settings, highlighting issues of mission, outreach and contextual adaptation. Despite the important points the report raises, it is not referenced in *Mission-Shaped Church* at all, and as such any insights that it could have contributed are over-looked.

It is not just from a rural perspective that the Church of England has examined questions raised about the suitability of Anglican liturgy, but urban concerns were considered in a report that came out five years before 'Faith in the Countryside'.[112] The urbanisation of society has continued to be an issue with which the Church of England has struggled. It is undeniable that the Church of England has often privileged the rural over the urban and by an implicit middle-class nature can alienate people living in urban and inner-city areas.[113] In his historical survey, Butler describes the church as 'antiquated and cumbrous', showing that it struggled to respond to the changes of the 1700s, with the rise in population and the rapid growth and expansion of towns and cities due to the Industrial Revolution.[114]

The introduction to *Faith in the City* notes the challenges arising from the disconnect between traditional Anglican worship and a highly urban setting, describing the Church of England as 'a bearer of rural nostalgia.'[115] It is interesting to note that even though *Faith in the City* raises this valid criticism, *For the Parish* continues to reveal an obviously rural bias twenty-five years later.[116] In reaction to this rural focus, *Faith in the City* states that the

---

[111] 'Faith in the Countryside', p. 198.
[112] Church of England Archbishop's Commission on Urban Priority Areas *Faith in the City: a Call for Action by the Church and Nation*, (London: Church House Publishing, 1985).
[113] V. R. Atta-Bafoe & P. Tovey 'What does Inculturation mean?' in ed. D. R. Holeton, *Liturgical Inculturation in the Anglican Communion*, Grove Liturgical Study 62 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1990) p. 15.
[114] Butler, 'From the Early 18th Century to the Present Day', p. 32.
[115] Church of England Archbishop's Commission on Urban Priority *Faith in the City*, p. 5.
[116] Davison, Milbank, *For the Parish,* see the examples provided in the chapter '*Rebuilding a Christian Imaginary in the Parish*" pp. 170 - 208, especially p. 164.

church's commitment to what is local should 'be clear in the patterns of worship, music, presentation of the Gospel, and, indeed, in theology.'[117] In response to this, members of the Liturgical Commission spent time in Urban Priority Area (UPA) parishes, which subsequently led to the production of *Patterns for Worship.*[118] This book of liturgical resources developed out of this acknowledgement and realisation that 'one blanket liturgical solution would not easily meet the differing demands of the local sub-cultures.'[119] The Church of England report, also called *Patterns for Worship*, highlights the needs in particular of UPA parishes and the desire to resource 'Family Services'[120] as the reasons for providing new resources and flexible worship structures.[121] Significantly, the report also acknowledges that the needs of the local community are not best served by 'a group of experts at the centre'[122] but rather by provision of a framework which will encourage the creation of local liturgy. This encouragement for creativity is not picked up by either *Mission-shaped Church* or *For the Parish*, as neither make mention of *Faith in the City*.

As seen from the response particularly to the *Faith in the City* report the pace of liturgical change developed through the twentieth century. There was a growing seriousness with which the national church invested time and resources into exploring and encouraging liturgical adaptation to context. Yet just as this was growing and developing, so too did the reaction against this process of change.

---

[117] Church of England Archbishop's Commission on Urban Priority Areas *Faith in the City,* p. 75.
[118] Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Patterns for Worship*, (London: Church House Publishing, 1995).
[119] T. Lloyd, 'Inner City England' in ed. D. R. Holeton, *Liturgical Inculturation in the Anglican Communion*, Grove Liturgical Study 62 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1990) p. 41.
[120] The concept of 'Family Services' were a development within parishes as a response to the Parish Communion movement. D. C. Gray, 'Liturgy and Society' in ed. K. Stevenson and B. Spinks *The Identity of Anglican Worship*, (London: Mowbray, 1991) p. 141.
[121] Church of England Liturgical Commission, *Patterns for Worship: a Report by the Liturgical Commission of the General Synod of the Church of England*, GS 898 (London: Church House Publishing, 1989) p. 2.
[122] Church of England Liturgical Commission, *Patterns for Worship,* p. 2.

The Liturgical Movement

The Liturgical Movement originated from the Roman Catholic Church but has had clear influences on a number of other denominations.[123] Fenwick and Spinks argue that the Liturgical Movement could be considered as one of the most important and central parts of the church in the twentieth century. They are keen to point out that they do not consider this to be solely about texts, but more broadly about how Christians understand and experience worship and how this shapes their understanding of faith.[124]

Vatican II (1962-1965) had a significant impact on liturgical reform in several denominations including the Anglican Church.[125] Chupungco demonstrates the importance in the Roman Catholic Church that Vatican II had in terms of encouraging the cultural adaptation of liturgy, and stressing the importance of 'unity' rather than 'uniformity'.[126] He adds, significantly, that in 'SC40 Second Degree of Adaptation' they dropped the word 'missions' to recognize that adaptation can be just as appropriate in 'France' as it is in 'mission countries'.[127] He goes on to argue that when liturgy is not adapted to context there is a growing disconnect, an individualised piety that moves away from main church body, pointing to things like 'family chapels' as an example of this. He writes that this leads to a remembering of a past story, rather than engaging it as a present reality.[128] From an Anglican perspective, Oliver echoes these concerns. He stresses the importance of cultural adaptation of liturgy, arguing that 'otherness' of liturgy is not the equivalent of 'otherness' of God, stating that worshipping '"as if we were in Restoration England" is not necessarily worshipping "as if we were in the presence of God".'[129] Care has to be taken that tradition does not become something that ends up being

---

[123] Fenwick & Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p. 37.
[124] Fenwick & Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p. 2.
[125] J. F. Baldovin 'The Liturgical Movement and Its Consequences' in ed. C. Hefling & C. Shattuck, *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, (Oxford: OUP, 2006) p. 249.
[126] Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, see esp. pp. 42ff.
[127] Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, pp. 51-52.
[128] Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, p. 33.
[129] J. M. C. Oliver 'Worship, Forming and Deforming', in R. Meyers & P. Gibson, *The Worship-Shaped Life: Liturgical Formation for the People of God*, Canterbury Studies in Anglicanism (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) p. 13.

worshipped in and of itself, but is simply an aid in worship of God. As White argues, one of the main strengths of the gospel is the way it can be expressed in the different 'particularities of human culture'[130] rather than something that is abstracted away from the particular.

Two significant points arise out of the liturgical movement that are important for this particular debate. The first is that an important part of this movement has included 'a protest against individualism'.[131] The second is a reaction against 'clericalism', within Roman Catholicism and much of Protestantism. Increased literacy and education amongst the laity has led to increased involvement, this 'has resulted in a *decentralizing* of the manner in which worship is conducted.'[132] An increase in participation clearly relates to the aspirations of those involved with fresh expressions of church, as they seek to find ways of engaging with people. A stand against individualism, however, provides an important counter to a negative aspect of contemporary society, which would help to ensure that modern culture is not simply embraced without some degree of critique.

Given the significance of the Liturgical Movement, and what it could contribute to the ongoing discussion, it is surprising that this has not been picked up on or developed by those writing about adaptation and cultural awareness in discussions about fresh expressions of church in Anglican contexts.

International Anglican Liturgical Consultations (IALCs)

One place within Anglicanism that sought to discuss the importance of liturgy for the wider church communion have been the IALCs.

From as early as the late 1800s, Anglicans outside of England were beginning to develop and explore adaptations of the BCP.[133] The 1968 Lambeth

---

[130] S. J. White, *Groundwork of Christian Worship*, (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1997) pp. 188-9.
[131] Fenwick & Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p. 5.
[132] Fenwick & Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p. 6.
[133] Holeton & Buchanan, *A History*, pp. 5-7.

Conference 'did not address liturgical revision directly',[134] although it was clear by this point that significant liturgical development was occurring across the Anglican Communion.[135] In an attempt to draw together some shared thinking and discussion, the first IALC took place in 1985 in Boston. The ecumenical gathering of international liturgical scholars was already taking place there, for the residential meeting of *Societas Liturgica*. This meant that many of those who would want to be part of the IALC would be in the same place.

Comments arising out of the IALCs demonstrate a continuing conversation within global Anglicanism about the importance of cultural awareness and the need for appropriate liturgical adaptation. The York statement 'Down to Earth Worship' proceeding from the 3rd IALC, held in York in 1989, highlighted the danger that a lack of inculturation meant people were willing 'to live in two different cultures, one of their religion and the other of their everyday life.'[136] This is a significant challenge for those arguing against adaptation and change.

An important conclusion from IALC 5, in 1995, stated that Anglican unity would continue to exist in common approaches to and structures of worship, rather than in adhering to specific words.[137] Written prior to the publication of *Common Worship* in 2000, this idea of common patterns and outlines does now exist alongside more formal written liturgies, for example the outline for A Service of the Word and also for A Service of the Word with a Celebration of Holy Communion.[138]

There has been a desire arising from IALC gatherings to encourage both Provinces and smaller groups to recognise the value of a cultural contribution

[134] Holeton & Buchanan, *A History*, p. 9.
[135] Holeton & Buchanan, *A History*, p. 11.
[136] 'The York Statement: "Down to Earth Worship" Liturgical Inculturation and the Anglican Communion' Finding of the 3rd IALC, York, 1989. in ed. D. R. Holeton, *Liturgical Inculturation in the Anglican Communion*, Grove Liturgical Study 62 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1990) p. 9.
[137] Holeton & Buchanan, *A History,* p. 38.
[138] Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship,* pp. 24-25.

to liturgy. Despite the encouragement for cultural adaptation and provision given for local variety this is not always acted upon. It is also clear that there is still a strongly held view amongst some that this level of variety undermines the unity of the Anglican Church. In response to inaction, the Consultations raised concerns that Provinces 'should be wary lest sheer conservatism in liturgy, or an overdependence upon resources from elsewhere, in fact becomes a vehicle of cultural alienation, making Anglican worship a specialist cult, rather than a people's liturgy.'[139] This again highlights the concern that when liturgy is not reflective of the culture, it presents instead an alternative culture to those involved that can become a retreat away from the rest of life.

One of the principles and recommendations from IALC 5, in 1995, was that the 'embodied character of Christian worship must be honoured in proclamation, music, symbol, and ritual.'[140] This is more than simply a change of text, but touches every aspect of worship in terms of 'buildings, furnishings, art, music, and ceremonial'.[141] Gibson adds to this by saying that it is through a level of openness to local creativity that the people of God will be formed for mission and social action in the midst of their own culture and setting.[142] Given the focus here on listening to the local community, a primary goal for those involved with fresh expressions of church, it is again surprising that these insights have not been incorporated in any way into the work so far. A deliberate methodological move away from liturgy and worship has meant missing out on important developments in this area that would have provided support and insight to the work in support of fresh expressions of church.

Changing liturgical texts

In the 19th century, the Church of England began exploring ways of changing and updating the Book of Common Prayer. It brought out the Convocation

[139] P. Gibson, 'International Anglican Liturgical Consultation: A Review' in Studia Liturgica 29.2 1999. p. 241.
[140] Holeton & Buchanan, *A History,* p. 39.
[141] Gibson, 'International Anglican Liturgical Consultation: A Review', p. 240.
[142] Gibson, 'International Anglican Liturgical Consultation: A Review', p. 240.

Prayer Book in 1880, but this made no significant changes and was not adopted.[143] In 1906 a Royal Commission report began the process of revision that 'culminated in the proposed *BCP* 1927, which failed to gain parliamentary sanction, as was also the case of its revision in 1928.'[144] Both wings of the church reacted negatively towards the 1928 prayer book. 'Evangelicals opposed both versions of the book because they seemed to extend some toleration to reservation of the sacred elements after communion; Anglo-Catholics opposed the books because they did not authorize reservation with a view to adoration.'[145] The Church of England would have to wait several decades before any serious liturgical revision was back on the agenda.

The 1958 Lambeth Conference received a report on the Book of Common Prayer which instigated a movement of liturgical revision not only in England but more widely throughout the Anglican Communion.

> The Report stressed the primacy of worship in the life of the Church, and the place of the Prayer Book in the life of the Anglican Communion. It also suggested the recovery of "primitive" elements which had fallen out (e.g. at the Eucharist, the use of an Old Testament lesson, and in the Eucharistic prayer, thanksgiving for the mighty works of God) and fuller participation of the laity (e.g. the restoration of the prayers of the people).[146]

The suggestion in the 1958 Lambeth Conference report was that the church should depart from the Book of Common Prayer as the normal pattern for communion services, but this 'movement away from the Reformed Anglican position was viewed with the most serious concern by Evangelicals'.[147] Even though newer texts have been developed over time, the BCP has always remained an authorised text for the Church of England.

Although the 1928 prayer book was never officially authorised, it was 'unofficially' used by churches for over 30 years before the Liturgical

[143] Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, pp. 344-5.
[144] Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, pp. 344-5.
[145] Neill, 'Liturgical Continuity and Change', p. 5.
[146] Fenwick & Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p. 71.
[147] Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, p. 111.

Commission sought authorisation for experimental use over a trial period of 7 years. This took place in 1966 and it subsequently became known as Series 1.[148] The Liturgical Commission had already been working on their own new liturgies and in 1965 published Series 2 with 'Morning and Evening Prayer, Intercessions and Thanksgivings, Thanksgiving after Childbirth, Burial, and an appendix'.[149] An order of service for the Eucharist was published in 1967, with Baptism, Confirmation and Evening Prayer following in 1968. 'The proposed services for Burial and Thanksgiving after Childbirth failed to secure authorization, and no proposals for Marriage or Ordination were made. The Series 2 range of services was, therefore, strictly limited.'[150]

A further push towards the use of contemporary liturgical language in services from the mid-1960s onwards, arose out of the continuing development of modern English translations of the Bible. When the Liturgical Commission published Series 3 in 1970 all its services were written in contemporary language.[151] The various services were published over a 9-year period, but after a while it was felt necessary to draw the liturgies together into one authorised place, rather than being in separate publications. In 1980 the 'Alternative Service Book (ASB)' was published and authorised initially for 10 years, but then extended for a further 10.[152] In 2000 the first 'Common Worship' volume was published, containing an order for Morning and Evening Prayer, Compline, Holy Communion, Thanksgiving for the birth of a child, Baptism, Collects, Psalms and Canticles.[153] Subsequent volumes have followed with other services as well as seasonal resources and service patterns. One of the main practical differences between ASB[154] and Common Worship, is that the ASB was a one volume book of 1296 pages, whereas

[148] P. Bradshaw, 'Services and Service Books' in *Companion to Common Worship*, Vol. 1, ed. P. Bradshaw, (London: SPCK, 2001) pp. 17-18.
[149] Bradshaw, 'Services and Service Books', p. 18.
[150] Bradshaw, 'Services and Service Books', p. 18.
[151] Bradshaw, 'Services and Service Books', pp. 18-19.
[152] Bradshaw, 'Services and Service Books', p. 20.
[153] Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship*.
[154] *Alternative Service Book 1980: together with the Liturgical Psalter*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press | London: William Clowes Ltd. | London: SPCK, 1980).

Common Worship is intentionally designed to be a library of resources, made up of several different volumes.

Changing language in new prayer books

One particular argument raised against liturgical adaptation has been the change from traditional to contemporary language. In a response to Series 3, Thompson typifies this argument in his discussion of the change from relative to main clauses, meaning the way, for example, that 'which is' becomes 'this is'.

> Simplify language in this way and you abolish (and therefore seem to deny) the ontological dimension – the awareness of the eternal, the abiding, of that which is too great and too mysterious to allow, in human terms, of complete predication. The result is to present the religious experience as something almost childish and infra-rational. The very syntax of series 3 kills manifestation stone dead.[155]

A great attachment has thus been placed on traditional language and archaic grammar, which, with its difference from contemporary phraseology, has come to be seen to carry a depth of meaning and reverence going beyond simply the words and language in itself.

Given the importance of this, Davies undertook detailed research into people's understanding and perception of using traditional and contemporary language in liturgy. He summarises the main arguments for the use of contemporary language in liturgy as being motivated by theological considerations, social change and cultural change.[156] He also states that those arguing against this articulated the change as a sense of loss, a betrayal of heritage, that a change in language changes the faith, and a loss of the numinous in worship.[157]

One of the significant points raised by those arguing against modernising liturgical language has been to emphasise a focus on the transcendent within

---

[155] I. R. Thompson, 'Gospel Message or Gospel Manifestation' in ed. D. Martin and P. Mullen, *No Alternative: The Prayer Book Controversy*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981) p. 31.
[156] P. N. Davies, *Alien Rites?: A Critical Examination of Contemporary English in Anglican Liturgies*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005) pp. 30-36.
[157] Davies, *Alien Rites?,* pp. 37-44.

worship, and the perception that this is lost in newer liturgies. Davies addresses this question directly. He asks rightly whether it is helpful as a starting point to set up a dichotomy between transcendent and immanent, and even whether the term transcendent is being used consistently.[158] In an attempt to examine this point further, Davies explored the use of the word 'numinous' in particular, seeking to ascertain what is at the root of such comments and whether there is any consistency in its use. From his research, he concludes that use of this word in describing liturgy is subjective and very much dependent on the perception of the individual worshipper.[159] He adds that describing 'the language of a text as "heightened" or "life-giving" gives no indication of its vocabulary or grammatical structure.'[160]

Given that Davies found it difficult to identify exactly what was meant by people describing liturgical language as either transcendent or numinous, the argument against changing liturgical language becomes highly subjective. Some people have attached particular significance to certain words as they appear in liturgical settings, that go beyond any surface meaning of the words. Fenwick and Spinks provide a helpful reminder, though, that meanings that have become attached to particular 'liturgical' language may be quite different from its original meaning. For example, in discussing the use of the word 'thou' in liturgy, they state that 'although Cranmer did indeed address God as "thou", he also called Mrs Cranmer "thou" and his horse "thou".'[161]

This makes discussions of liturgical language more complex as individuals have attached layers of meaning to some words that do not necessarily reflect original usage, and can be based on deeply personal and subjective reasoning. Davies goes on to question whether it is ever right to assume that everyone will derive the same meaning from words and symbols.[162] This is an

[158] Davies, *Alien Rites?,* pp. 4-6.
[159] Davies, *Alien Rites?,* p. 44.
[160] Davies, *Alien Rites?,* p. 44.
[161] Fenwick & Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p. 149.
[162] Davies, *Alien Rites?*, p. 15.

important question to raise for this particular discussion given that the authors of *For the Parish* base some of their argument on the assumption that everyone will have the same response to particular religious symbols.[163] Davies' conclusion here, although obviously not written as a response to *For the Parish*, raises a clear challenge to this assumption, demonstrating how much individual experiences and background will influence the way they perceive and respond to things.

The work that Davies has carried out shows that understanding and interpretation of language in liturgy and worship can be highly subjective, but it is important to recognise that for those individuals it remains something very important and deeply spiritual. It cannot be denied, however, that those for whom traditional language in worship remains significant, are more than likely to be those who have grown-up experiencing it first-hand. This is true not only of those who have maintained regular church attendance but also for those who had some childhood experience of church and then return subsequently. This then raises two points in terms of practice and mission. On the one hand, for those with no previous church experience, traditional language may well appear archaic, distant and confusing, and as such a more contemporary use of language may well be appropriate. On the other hand, however, for people who have some residual memory of church from their childhood, it may well be that a traditional language service could be the most mission-focused choice for a fresh expression of church.

Questions of Inculturation

Inculturation is significant for this debate and is sometimes used as a theological defence by those arguing for adaptation of practice to new contexts. It is not always clear, though, exactly what is intended by this term, how it is being used by different writers, and even whether this term provides the most helpful theological support for this on-going discussion.

[163] Davison, & Milbank, *For the Parish,* e.g. p.144.

A significant influence on missional thinking and inculturation is Sanneh. He introduces the word 'translation' to describe the process of taking the basis of the gospel message and communicating it in a different culture.[164] Sanneh's work had a direct influence on the missional approach of *Mission-shaped Church*. The report uses Sanneh's concept of translation to support their argument to inculturate church,[165] linking it with the idea of incarnation, although they are careful to state that the incarnation of Christ was a unique event.[166]

It is not only the *Mission-shaped Church* report that has been influenced by Sanneh's thinking. Kirk, for example, also makes use of Sanneh's concept of translation. He argues that the gospel is 'always culturally mediated',[167] but that 'there has to be a clear core whose meaning, though expressed in different ways, does not change in substance.'[168] This is clearly similar to the idea expressed in *Mission-shaped Church* about extracting the nature of church and placing it in a new context. Kirk describes this process of culturally mediating a stable core as similar to 'dynamic equivalence' from the study of linguistics. The benefits of this process, he argues, are that it is designed to guarantee both faithfulness to the original meaning, and thus 'guard the integrity of the text against deformation, and appropriateness to a particular situation.'[169] It is important to note that Kirk does not like the term 'inculturation', as he argues that simply seeking the culturally appropriate words to translate from one language into another can result in a lack of cultural critique. He argues instead that contextualisation is a better term because it includes a more critical stance towards culture.[170] This reflects the influence of liberation theology on his thinking, with an emphasis on

---

[164] L. Sanneh *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*, (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1989).
[165] *Mission-shaped Church*, p. 89.
[166] *Mission-shaped Church*, p. 87.
[167] J. A. Kirk, *What is Mission?: Theological Explorations*, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1999) p. 75.
[168] Kirk, *What is Mission?,* p. 83.
[169] J. A. Kirk, *Mission under Scrutiny: Confronting Current Challenges*, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2006) p. 88.
[170] Kirk, *What is Mission?,* pp. 90-91.

challenging injustice. A lack of cultural critique is borne out in concerns raised by Webber. He criticises the way in which some modern-day church practices can encourage contemporary, therapeutic, privatised worship[171] which clearly reflects a more self-focused modern society, highlighting the need to avoid capitulating to the negative aspects of contemporary culture. Other scholars also raise concerns about the potential lack of cultural critique in contemporary liturgical services.[172]

Walls, briefly notes Sanneh but does not directly build on his work. Instead, he approaches the question of inculturation through describing an alien coming infrequently to earth, noticing the similarities and dissimilarities in Christian communities, and then emphasising those aspects that have remained constant throughout.[173] He then uses this principle to examine different phases of Christian history. Walls' approach is subsequently picked up and extended by Bevans and Schroeder.[174] Whilst this approach is helpful in noting the similarities and points of continuity between vastly different examples of practice, neither Walls, nor Bevans and Schroeder, explore the points of transition between the different segments of historical practice that they describe. As such, their potential contribution to this discussion, which is located specifically at a point of transition and change, is limited.

There are two important concerns that arise out of the use of inculturation. First, as Kirk raises, is the question of whether there is room for cultural critique as part of a process of inculturation, given that its primary purpose is to take the essence of something and clothe it in the new culture's apparel. A more significant problem, however, is the lack of space for innovation. Inculturation has been described as taking what is already known into a new

---

[171] R. E. Webber, *Ancient-Future Worship: Proclaiming and Enacting God's Narrative*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2008) p. 151.

[172] See for example D. Rienstra & R. Rienstra *Worship Words: Discipling Language for Faithful Ministry*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2009) p. 191; G. Wainwright, 'The language of Worship' in *The Study of Liturgy*, revd. edn. ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright, E. Yarnold S. J. & P. Bradshaw (London: SPCK, 1992) p. 525.

[173] A. F. Walls, *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*, (New York, New York: Orbis | Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996) pp. 3-9.

[174] S. B. Bevans, & R. P. Schroeder *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission*, (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2004).

setting: there is no space provided for innovation in the context and this is crucial for liturgical adaptation.

An example of the need for space for innovation arises out of comments about the two initial attempts at modernising Anglican liturgy, 'First Series' and 'Second Series' from the preparatory material for the 1968 Lambeth Conference.

> Much more radical criticism is concerned with the relevance to modern congregations of the 'office' type of liturgical worship. Desires have been expressed for a non-sacramental Sunday service that would be very much freer, even at the cost of jettisoning much traditional material, for example regular use of the Psalms, the New Testament Canticles, unvarying use of the Apostles' Creed, etc.[175]

This articulates an important desire to bring in more significant liturgical reform, rather than just adjusting the edges. In other words, it is not simply about changing some of the language to make it more understandable, but is about acknowledging different needs and then seeking to provide liturgy that will facilitate this. This points to more creative change, than simply translation. What is needed is a paradigm that can both incorporate the ideas of inculturation but crucially provide space for innovation as well.

Conclusion to the importance of liturgy to Anglican identity

It is clear from this exploration of liturgical practice and development in the Church of England, and including the brief comments about Early Church practices, that liturgy cannot be understood as a constant, unchanging acultural phenomenon. There is no one point of Anglican history that can be looked to as being the point of 'definitive Anglicanism',[176] but rather there has been a continual process of liturgical development. It is clear that there are those, and *For the Parish* is representative of this view, that want to maintain a transcendent, ahistorical church culture and liturgy. They argue strongly that attempting cultural liturgical adaptation is to remove this inherent

[175] Lambeth Conference, *Lambeth Conference, 1968: Preparatory Information*, (London: SPCK, 1968) p. 37.
[176] Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism*, p. 160.

abstracted and otherworldly quality. Some of this desire, as Davies explored, was to hold on to something 'numinous' within a liturgical setting. As his work revealed, however, these comments were based on subjective, personal opinion and as such it is difficult to assume that others, without the same background and experiences, would react in the same way to particular words, phrases and concepts. The argument against change, however, does not pay sufficient attention to the realities of liturgical history and therefore to argue against change is, in effect, to argue against the continuation of the historical journey of Anglican liturgy.

It is important to stress that the purpose of this survey of liturgical history is not to propose permission for anyone to do anything, anywhere. It is important to remember the clear and vital link that exists between Anglican liturgy and its doctrine, as set out above. Rather, in terms of the discussion of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context, what is required is a liturgical paradigm that can hold together both continuity with existing community identity, and adaptation to new contexts. It is also crucial that, arising from the reflection on 'inculturation', any such model includes innovation.

A liturgical response to the deadlock

The on-going discussions about fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context have been conducted on the one hand by appeals to tradition, and on the other by appeals to missional imperatives seeking to adapt practice to the changing context of contemporary society. Primary use of ecclesiology as a theological method has revealed a lack of understanding of Anglican ecclesiology, in that there have been significant omissions of discussions of liturgy, despite the emphasis placed on liturgy and worship as defining Anglican ecclesiological characteristics. An analysis of the history of development of Anglican liturgy clearly shows continual development and

adaptation to context, which has much to offer to this particular discussion. Given the predominance of the ecclesiological approach and the fact that this has created a deadlock between the different parties involved, it is vital for a new method and approach to this question to be developed in order to reinvigorate the discussion and draw people together. A liturgical approach to this debate becomes a clear option, and one that is reflective of the very nature of Anglican self-understanding. The levels of adaptation to context that have been observed should make this type of methodology attractive to those arguing for change, whilst at the same time Anglican liturgy connects the church to its history, making it attractive to those arguing for continuity of practice. A liturgical paradigm of continuity, adaptation and innovation can therefore hold the key to unlocking the deadlock in this debate.

A surprising omission in the work on both sides of this debate so far has been any sustained and rigorous engagement with the Bible. Certain biblical passages have been used to support certain lines of argument, for example those in favour of fresh expressions of church have made some use of Acts.[177] The use of scripture has remained somewhat limited however, with infrequent reference to in-depth scholarship, resulting in a reliance on mainly simplified or surface level readings of texts. This point is noted by Davison and Milbank in their conclusion, where they argue for the need for more thorough biblical work to be done in this field.[178] For such an important discussion in the Anglican church, this omission is surprising, given that Anglican theological method, as argued for and defended by significant Anglican theologians such as Hooker and Maurice, has long been built upon the three aspects of scripture, tradition and reason. [179] Anglicanism has a strong heritage and tradition of working through its doctrine with these three

[177] See for example, *Mission-Shaped Church*, pp. 89-90, 94; M. Moynagh, 'Do we Need a Mixed Economy?' in ed. L. Nelstrop & M. Percy, *Evaluating Fresh Expressions: Explorations in Emerging Church*, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008) pp. 177-86.
[178] Davison, & Milbank, *For the Parish,* pp. 229-230.
[179] S. W. Sykes, *The Integrity of Anglicanism*, (London & Oxford, Mowbrays, 1978) p. 63.

strands, the church in historical continuity,[180] Scripture, as an influence from the Reformation,[181] and reason as an appeal to scholarly enquiry.[182] It is apparent that the discussion of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context has been conducted, up to now, almost entirely in the fields of doctrine, in terms of the ecclesiological work as described above, and reason, in terms of the reflections and explorations produced for this on-going debate. It is now vital that scripture is brought into this discussion, especially given the current failure of other approaches to bring both sides together.

Given the importance of both liturgy and scripture to the Anglican Church, a method that draws both together would have a lot to contribute. A scripturally based model that could demonstrate continuity with tradition, adaptation to context and innovation could break the impasse and provide a means for sustained conversations and listening.

Deuteronomy as a text of formation and transition

As mentioned above, several writers in this field have referred to Acts in their writings and, given the pursuance of an ecclesiological methodology it is not a surprise that, in seeking some sort of scriptural support, this has become a particular text of choice. The debate as has been described above, however, is not primarily to do with ecclesiology, but rather to do with community identity, continuity and change. Whilst the book of Acts is clearly set at a point of great change and adaptation, which would be appropriate for some of the needs of this discussion, the text articulates the transition from a faith community moving from 'pre' to 'post' Messiah, and to the inclusion of Gentiles into the worshipping community. Although the Church of England is rightly addressing its need to reach out to different sub-cultures within the country, amongst other missional imperatives, this cannot be seen in the same light as the dramatic changes as seen in Acts. What would be more

[180] P. Avis, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: An Introduction*, (London: SPCK, 2000) p. 33
[181] Avis, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church,* p. 36.
[182] Avis, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church,* p. 40.

appropriate, is a text that shows the same community of faith maintaining the same basic theology and identity but at a point where the context in which they found themselves was changing dramatically. One such obvious choice of text is Deuteronomy. The narrative context of the book is at a point of dramatic and significant change and transition for the faith community, as they move from being a nomadic community to settling in the Promised Land. Yet the book does not simply restate all that has gone before, but, in response to the changing context, it adapts and reframes traditions, at points demonstrating radical innovation as well, whilst simultaneously maintaining the long-standing traditional identity of Israel. Deuteronomy is also described as being liturgical by numerous scholars and this will be important to examine in detail in the following chapters. Given that liturgy has been highlighted as the primary method for this contribution, a liturgical reading of Deuteronomy that highlights issues of continuity, adaptation and innovation in order to provide a paradigm for the contemporary setting would be profoundly significant.

This is not the first time that it has been proposed that Deuteronomy could provide a resource for contemporary theological concerns. In 1977, Lohfink produced a short but important article arguing that the deuteronomic law could function as an example for approaching theology in the light of contemporary cultural and social issues challenging the Roman Catholic Church at that time.[183] Lohfink frames his discussion of the deuteronomic law code by positioning it within a context of the dominance and then waning influence of the Assyrians and the treaty that the people of Israel made with them. Whilst noting that Lohfink's time-frame for the text is not the only perspective amongst wider scholarship, what is significant here is the connection that Lohfink draws between the response found in the

[183] N. Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology' trans. R. Kugelman in Biblical Theology Bulletin Vol. VII, no. 1 Jan 1977, pp. 12-21.

deuteronomic law code to external powers and pressures and the contemporary church situation.

Lohfink states that external societal pressure brought the Roman Catholic church to a point of crisis by the 1970s and that examining the way in which Deuteronomy presents a response to external pressures provides an important model. He argues that Israel responded to the crisis of external pressure theologically, but not in a way that simply repeated the truth of the existing tradition or that created something completely new.

> A theologian is not worth much, if he only produces a true theology. Then one would have remained with the old Yahwist book and no new book of Deuteronomy would have been composed. Much depends on this: the theology besides being true must fulfil its function in the crisis. It is correct only if it knows how to make the traditional worldview attractive once again. Deuteronomy shows us the paths that led to this. It has through systematization, made the bewildering abundance of the traditional institutions and their related theories once again intelligent and understandable. In doing this it has not shrunk from using supporting elements of the competing worldview. In integrating them it has transformed them but now they are there and no one would have to abandon his own traditions if he also wanted to integrate what was present in his own day.[184]

At the end of his article, Lohfink returns to his original question of the slow response of the Roman Catholic Church to the developing pluralism in the Western World. He argues that the example from his work on Deuteronomy shows that the response to the changing worldview was not simply to reproduce 'a true theology', but rather that 'the theology besides being true must fulfil its function in the crisis. It is correct only if it knows how to make the traditional worldview attractive once again.'[185] Lohfink's article articulates a connection between the adaptive practices of Deuteronomy and the contribution a study of these can make to a real-time question about the

[184] Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology', p. 21.
[185] Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology', p. 21.

relationship between the contemporary church and the challenges of the world-views around it.

Lohfink is addressing the impact of societal change upon the Roman Catholic Church and the slowness of the Church's response to these dramatic changes. The focus of this study is on the specific question of change and adaptation of practice in the context of fresh expressions of church in Anglican settings. This is in many ways different from the more general questions to which Lohfink is responding. But at the same time there is clear common ground between the two in terms of recognising the changes in the society where the church finds itself, and the degree to which these changes should affect practice and theology. Lohfink's approach to the question and the way he argues that Deuteronomy demonstrates a way to 'think anew and formulate anew the traditions'[186] shows that there is something within the adaptive nature of Deuteronomy that means it has something to contribute to this particular, focused debate. He raises the possibility of using Deuteronomy in a response to contemporary societal changes, but in a relatively short article, only 10 pages, is limited to the extent in which he can explore this in detail. Although he clearly begins some interesting work in this area, he does not have the space to explore this more fully, nor to go beyond his chosen limitation of the exploring only the deuteronomic law code.

A liturgical hermeneutic

In order to undertake a liturgical reading of Deuteronomy it is necessary to develop an appropriate liturgical hermeneutic. To achieve this, the work of Gittoes will be used to provide the basis for this hermeneutic. Gittoes is appropriate to use for this particular research as she locates her discussion of *anamnesis* and Eucharistic theology firmly within the wider discussion of fresh expressions of church within the Church of England and as a response to *Mission-shaped Church*.[187] Although she does not cite *For the Parish* directly

[186] Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology', p. 21.
[187] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist.*

in this text, she does provide an analysis and critique of the work of Pickstock, who demonstrates similarities to the theology and perspective of Davison and Milbank.

'Anamnesis and the Eucharist'

Gittoes' discussion of *anamnesis* and the Eucharist is rooted in an Anglican understanding of liturgy and ecclesiology. She contributes significantly to the on-going discussion of fresh expressions of church and highlights how *Mission-shaped Church* does not address the important connection between participation in the Eucharist and God's mission.[188] In her conclusion she draws attention to the need for further exploration of the relationship between Eucharist and mission, citing the way mission is often separated in theological dialogue from 'ecclesiology, the sacraments and the place of pastoral care.'[189] She acknowledges from the beginning that there are significant aspects such as the role of the Spirit (*epiclesis*), priesthood, and ministry that are beyond the scope of her particular focus.[190]

Gittoes sees *anamnesis* as a 'transformative encounter',[191] which connects the church to 'Christ's life, death and resurrection'[192] and, at the same time, draws it into mission and ultimately 'fulfilment at the eschaton.'[193] This connection between *anamnesis* and mission is vital to the book and significant for the contribution she is making to the wider debate, as is the attention that she gives to how the past event, the present celebration and the future fulfilment are drawn together. Gittoes argues extensively that the church is formed and shaped through *anamnesis*, that corporate and individual identities are transformed through both remembering and

[188] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 143.
[189] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* pp. 147-8.
[190] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 4.
[191] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 2.
[192] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 2.
[193] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 2.

anticipating.[194] There is an active connecting with and participating in the story of redemption that shapes the people for participation and mission.[195]

Two particular terms, source event and connection, are vital for understanding her approach to this subject and the direction that she takes through the material she engages with. The first significant phrase, 'source event', she uses to refer to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. In discussing Rowan Williams, one of three theologians that she engages with in depth, Gittoes highlights how Williams draws out each believer's own complicity within the source event. This is not about a simple, historic remembrance, but by *anamnesis* they are brought to the point of betrayal, vulnerability and failure, which through the cross and resurrection is transformed into discipleship, and through becoming the Body of Christ are enabled to participate in mission.[196]

The second, 'connection', is the term Gittoes chooses for describing the inter-related nature of 'the historical, sacramental and ecclesial embodiments of resurrection'.[197] She also uses this term to articulate how the Eucharistic *anamnesis* transforms the church, corporately and individually, in the present, including mission and service, and into anticipation of the future. [198] She supports this understanding by drawing a connection of encounter and transformation through the narrative of the Emmaus road, Luke 24. She argues that though the disciples' encounter Jesus at the point of confusion, he is recognised by them as he breaks bread, and this transforms them. They return to Jerusalem and as they share with the other disciples, the Body of Christ is strengthened, 'there the Church comes into being and begins to engage in mission.'[199] She emphasises that the narrative does not finish at the point of breaking bread, but it continues, because the encounter has an

[194] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 1.
[195] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* pp. 1-2.
[196] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 112.
[197] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 3.
[198] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 3.
[199] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 149.

effect, remembrance, encounter and transformation.[200] This narrative becomes the governing story for her study. It is the only biblical material that she overtly engages with, but it remains very much a surface level reading.

Gittoes is not a biblical scholar and, other than the limited use of Luke 24, does not make any sustained use of scripture in her book. What she does offer, however, are three vital characteristics of liturgy that can be used to form a liturgical hermeneutic for engaging with Deuteronomy. These three characteristics are the connection of the community to their source event through *anamnesis*; the way in which liturgy collapses time, described by Gittoes as the connection between the past event, present celebration and future fulfilment; and the significant connection between Eucharist and mission. Each of these characteristics will be explored further below.

Anamnesis

Through the book, Gittoes explores both the use of the term *anamnesis* and its potential contribution to broader ecumenical discussions. She does this by engaging with the 'Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC)' and the World Council of Churches Faith and Order Paper, '*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (BEM)'.

The official Church of England written response to BEM and ARCIC, she argues, shows that *anamnesis* can hold together the past, present, future aspects of the Eucharist, which supports her argument. Her own reflection on ARCIC and BEM is that the use of *anamnesis* has allowed for a movement towards greater ecumenical understanding.[201] Significantly, for the purposes of discussions about fresh expressions of church, in summarising the ARCIC document 'God's gift of authority', Gittoes draws attention to how the report shows that authority and tradition are encountered in the localised, rooted

[200] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 149.
[201] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 16.

community. She also highlights the importance that tradition is 're-received' and actualised afresh in new contexts.[202]

As she begins to analyse how other scholars have made use of the term, three things emerge as significant. First the extent to which *anamnesis* is church-forming; second how it is seen to hold together the past, present and future; and third how *anamnesis* brings about transformation. She argues strongly that there are significant benefits in not seeking to restrict the definition, as this enables the discovery of new insights from ecumenical and historical explorations. She describes such a move as 'essential in exploring further the transformative and missiological dimensions of *anamnesis*.'[203] Whilst there are potential dangers in working with a more open definition of such a significant word, this approach does allow Gittoes to undertake the exploratory work that she sets out to do.

Gittoes, building on Welker's understanding of cultural memory, reiterates that it is vital to see *anamnesis* as a purposeful activity. It is effective not just in 'establishing bonds of identity and community, but also in forming a community equipped by the Spirit to engage in loving service and missionary activity.'[204] She focuses particularly on two terms that Welker uses, the idea of a 'cold' cultural memory, which 'can potentially stabilise a community against transformation', and a 'hot' cultural memory which enables communities to engage with development.[205]

Gittoes also borrows from Begbie, who explores the links between theology and music, picking up on the phrase 'non-identical repetition', showing how repetition can both stabilise and destabilise. Gittoes, from Begbie, makes the point that in terms of church practice there can be two extremes, one of

---

[202] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 20.
[203] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 14.
[204] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 24.
[205] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* pp. 24-25. See M. Welker, *What Happens in Holy Communion?*, trans. J. F. Hoffmeyer (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000) pp. 126-133; see also J. Assman, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) pp. 50-53.

endless repetition which can become mostly empty, and the other seeking novelty above everything else. Both of these fail to hold on to the combination of the stabilising and destabilising effect.[206] In her conclusion, Gittoes returns to this idea of 'non-identical repetition' to describe the way in which the Eucharist continues to be the point of encounter at the moment of betrayal and healing, and that because of this continued transformation the 'Eucharist is repeated, but also unrepeatable.'[207] What Gittoes does not draw out explicitly from this, which is a surprise given the missional setting of the book, is how this term could also be used to support the contextualisation of liturgical worship. In other words, emphasising the idea that the aim of the Eucharist is not to repeat it identically, opens the possibility for *anamnesis* to reflect the locality.

A wider understanding of Anamnesis

Given the significance of this term for Gittoes, it is useful to show that Gittoes' understanding of the term is coherent with wider liturgical scholarship.

As a specific liturgical term, *anamnesis* 'signifies that part of the anaphora in which it is explicitly stated that the church is offering the bread and cup with this meaning and for this purpose, in obedience to Christ's command so to do.'[208] But the term carries something much broader and more significant than a simple liturgical moment. As Bishop argues, worship in general arises out of this idea of remembering, and remembering God's action in human history.[209] Like Gittoes, von Allman highlights the way in which *anamnesis* is an active remembering that makes the past event a present reality. [210]

Ladrière explores the way liturgical language functions as more than simple repetition or a mere act of remembering from the perspective of linguistic

---

[206] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 28.
[207] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 146.
[208] W. J. Grisbrooke, 'Anaphora' in ed. Davies, J. G. *A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, (London: SCM Press, 1986), p. 18.
[209] Bishop, 'Worship', p. 1331.
[210] J.-J. von Allmen, *Worship: Its Theology and Practice*, (London: Lutterworth, 1965) p. 34.

analysis. The specific use of liturgical language, he argues, means that recalling past events and repeating them makes them real for the present.[211] He goes on to add that this is not just 'a mere quotation but the resumption into acts of today of words written or spoken at a given moment in the past.'[212] In other words, this is not simple commemoration but a bringing into the present the realities of the events themselves.[213] In writing from a Roman Catholic perspective, he particularly emphasises the role of the 'celebrant' in the way liturgical language brings about an affect. For example, the celebrant 'repeats once again that which Christ did, in giving again to the words which Christ used that efficacy which Christ gave them, in conferring on them again the power to do what they mean.'[214] Even acknowledging this potential point of difference between his and a more reformed position does not reduce the significance of his thinking for this study. For example, exploring the way in which language and an individual's attitude relate in liturgy.

> 'Liturgical language uses certain characteristic performative verbs, such as "to ask", "to pray", "to give thanks". Such verbs express illocutionary acts presupposing certain attitudes: trust, veneration, gratitude, submission, contrition, and so on. These attitudes come into effect at the very moment when, by virtue of the enunciation of the sentence, the corresponding act takes place. The preformative verb is not a description of the attitude which its enunciation presupposes; its function is not to indicate the existence of this attitude, but it, so to speak, the attitude itself: it makes it exist in an effective manner by virtue of the illocutionary act underlying its enunciation.'[215]

He also argues that a specific aspect of liturgical language brings about a linking together of past, present and future.[216] In other words, while calling to mind the past event in the present, the congregation is at the same time

---

[211] J. Ladrière, 'The Performativity of Liturgical Language' trans J. Griffiths in ed. H. Schmidt & D. Power, *Liturgical Experience of Faith*, (New York, New York: Herder & Herder, 1973) p. 60.
[212] Ladrière, 'The Performativity of Liturgical Language' p. 60.
[213] D. Hilborn, 'From Performativity to Pedagogy: Jean Ladrière and the Pragmatics of Reformed Worship Dialogue', in ed. S. E. Porter, *The Nature of Religious Language: A Colloquium*, (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1996), p. 176.
[214] Ladrière, 'The Performativity of Liturgical Language' p. 61.
[215] Ladrière, 'The Performativity of Liturgical Language' p. 57.
[216] Ladrière, 'The Performativity of Liturgical Language' p. 61.

looking towards that which is being waited for.[217] This relates directly to the second liturgical strand, that of the liturgical collapse of time where past, present and future and drawn together.

A further important point for this particular study is Ladrière's reflections on the way in which liturgical language has the ability to form community.[218] One way in which this takes place is through the way that liturgical language 'makes especial use of "us" and "thou". The plural form, in "me" and "us", indicates that there is a number of speakers, but that they are acting collectively, as if there were only one speaker.'[219] This he describes as 'the second kind of performativity of liturgical language: *institution*'[220] and it is this use of language that creates community. This is particularly important to show that not only can liturgy provide a theological framework for on-going discussions, but can help to create and form new worshipping communities in practice.

It is important to note, as Grisbrooke does, that the English term 'remembering' does not fully capture the whole sense and meaning of the word *anamnesis*. He helpfully contrasts the difference between the English words like remembrance that suggest recalling something that is 'past and absent'[221] and what he describes as a Greek word that is trying to capture a Semitic concept that 'is an objective act, in and by which the person or event commemorated is actually made present, is brought into the realm of the here and now.'[222] It is helpful to note the Hebraic roots of the concept of *anamnesis*. Von Allman makes a useful connection from this liturgical understanding of remembering to the Hebrew root זכר. The word 'ἀναμνησις occurs five times in the LXX, in Lv 24^7 where it represents the Hebrew אַזְכָּרָה, in Nu 10^{10}, where it translates זִכָּרוֹן, in Ps 38^1 and 70^1, where

[217] Hilborn, 'From Performativity to Pedagogy', p. 177.
[218] Ladrière, 'The Performativity of Liturgical Language' pp. 58-59.
[219] Ladrière, 'The Performativity of Liturgical Language' p. 57.
[220] Ladrière, 'The Performativity of Liturgical Language' p. 57.
[221] Grisbrooke, 'Anaphora' p. 18.
[222] Grisbrooke, 'Anaphora', p. 18.

it renders the hiphil of the verb זָכַר, and in Wis 16[6].'[223] Similarly to the points noted here in the definition of *anamnesis*, the word זָכַר is about more than simply bringing something to mind, but includes a sense of action as well.

> Compare the Hebrew verb שָׁמַע which always means so much more than merely "to hear", the implication being always "hear and do", "hearken". So in the same way זָכַר has the sense of "remember and do".[224]

This is also mentioned by Rienstra and Rienstra who similarly make the connection between Christian remembering in worship and the importance for the Israelites of remembering their story.[225] They support this assertion by highlighting that the Israelites were called to remember their own story of rescue from slavery and to remember how their law both protects and provides identity. They also emphasise the way that remembering was conducted through acts of worship.[226]

This demonstrates the depth and significance of this particular word, and that there is a direct connection between the contemporary understanding of the liturgical use of the word *anamnesis* and some of the worship practices that are articulated within the Old Testament texts.

Liturgical collapse of time

The second of the liturgical characteristics drawn from Gittoes' work is a liturgical collapse of time. This indicates the way in which an aspect of the function of liturgy is to make both the past a present reality, whilst simultaneously also recognising the present reality of the promises that God has made about the future. Gittoes describes this in a way that shows the close relationship between this strand and the first, in that the 'sacramental act of *anamnesis* draws the Church into a transformative encounter with the risen Christ in the present. This occurs within the context of retrospection

[223] H. M. Sykes, 'The Eucharist as Anamnesis' ExpT 71 (1960), p. 115.
[224] Sykes, 'The Eucharist as Anamnesis', p. 116.
[225] Rienstra & Rienstra *Worship Words,* p. 76.
[226] Rienstra & Rienstra *Worship Words,* p. 76.

and anticipation.'[227] She goes on to add that it is the word *anamnesis* itself that designates 'the connection between past and future in the present'. [228]

There are clear connections between this characteristic and that of *anamnesis*, because, as has been discussed above, the concepts of *anamnesis* 'carries with it a sense of making the past present.'[229] But this point is more than active remembering, but articulating the way in which liturgy collapses the distinctions between past event, present and future.[230] Or, as Irvine describes it, time is condensed 'in the *kairos*, the moment of God's acting in and through the Spirit, in and through the occasion of worship.'[231]

Worship and mission

The third liturgical characteristic is the strong connection that Gittoes makes between the Eucharist and mission. As her work draws towards the conclusion, Gittoes argues that the 'Eucharist is Church-generative, and therefore demands attention to explicitly missiological issues.'[232] She expands this by going on to argue that this means the church is to be engaged 'with the complexity and particularities of life.'[233] This, she argues earlier, is because the church is transformed through Eucharistic encounter and that therefore the 'effects of such transformative encounter are discerned in terms of mission, service and engagement with the social political issues of the world.'[234] In other words, a Eucharistic celebration can never simply be an internalised and complete action, it leads to transformation of the individual and the corporate gathered community, who then live out this transformation in the world.

Other liturgical scholars also demonstrate a vital connection with the importance of mission, although the connection is sometimes widened to

[227] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 2.
[228] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 3.
[229] Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, p. 20.
[230] von Allmen, *Worship: Its Theology and Practice*, pp. 34-5.
[231] Irvine, *The Art of God,* p. 134.
[232] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 146.
[233] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 146.
[234] Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist,* p. 3.

include the idea of worship more broadly rather than Gittoes' understandable but more narrow focus on the Eucharist.[235] This broadening out of the connection is obviously helpful in terms of making links with worship in the Old Testament, as a direct parallel with the Eucharist would be inappropriate. It is clear, however, that this connection between worship and how individuals and communities of faith lived out their lives is very important, seen in both the early church communities and, importantly, in the Old Testament.

> From the Hebrew prophets through Augustine of Hippo we have repeatedly seen this kind of concern for the verification of worship in the very lives of the communities who offer it. Whether the prophetic critique of Amos, the words of ritual critique and reform addressed to early Christian meal fellowships by the gospel and other New Testament writers, catechumenal formation, liturgical homilies, or developments in the concept of the Eucharist as the sacrifice of Christ and the church, the concern that Christians live according to how they worship and believe is, indeed, a consistent concern through the ages. And a major part of that concern is directed toward the poor, the widows, the orphans, and the hungry.[236]

This liturgical characteristic is not a modern construction, therefore, but reflects something that was important to the early church communities and the writers and compilers of the Old and New Testaments. This then shows that this liturgical characteristic in particular, as part of the liturgical hermeneutic, is not imposing something foreign onto the Old Testament text, but is actually picking up themes that have been important first for Israel and subsequently for the Christian faith communities, and then using this to reflect back on the text itself.

In terms of 'mission' and the Old Testament, I am using Wright's definition of 'mission' in order to avoid an anachronistic and inappropriate reading into the Old Testament setting. Wright argues that Israel did have a missional role 'in

---

[235] See for example Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism,* p. 104; P. A. Avis, *Ministry Shaped by Mission*, (London | New York, New York: T & T Clark, 2005) p. 28; White, *Groundwork of Christian Worship*, p. x; Fenwick & Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p. 10; Dyrness, *A Primer on Christian Worship*, p. 119.

[236] M. E. Johnson, *Praying and Believing in Early Christianity: The Interplay between Christian Worship and Doctrine*, (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2013) p. 126.

the midst of the nations',[237] but he defines this in terms of the purpose and function, rather than proselytising. Wright's missional hermeneutic stresses the involvement of the people of God and the holistic inclusion of both the whole of life and whole of creation.[238] What this means for the connection with Gittoes' work, is that from this, the mission of Israel is to be understood as the ethical and social outworking of the demands of God. Israel are the people who have been particularly set apart by God for a particular purpose, as is demonstrated throughout the Old Testament.

> Primarily Israel is to serve the marginal in its midst: the orphan, the widow, the poor, and the stranger. Whenever the people of Israel renew their covenant with Yahweh, they recognize that they are renewing their obligations to the victims of society.[239]

This understanding can also be found continuing into the New Testament, where participation in the mission of God means following after Jesus in 'the particular form of a servant.'[240]

Mission is important for this wider discussion and the concept of *Missio Dei* is significant for the work that has developed in terms of fresh expressions of church. The focus of this study is not mission per se but rather providing a liturgical framework in order to provide a means of communication between the two sides of this on-going discussion. Despite this, it is still important to set out the understanding of mission that is used for this study and also how liturgy is being understood as functioning missionally. This will also be important in the final chapter when the work developed from the detailed textual study will be brought back to the initial thesis question in order to

---

[237] C. J. H. Wright, 'Mission as a Matrix for Hermeneutics and Biblical Theology' in ed. C. Bartholomew, M. Healy, K. Möller and R. Parry, *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation*, Scripture and Hermeneutic Series (Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press | Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2004) p. 106.
[238] Wright, 'Mission as a matrix', p. 137.
[239] D. J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1991) p. 18.
[240] J. G. Flett, *The Witness of God: The Trinity,* Missio Dei*, Karl Barth, and the Nature of Christian Community*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010) p. 197.

begin to demonstrate how the liturgical work can begin to contribute in real and practical ways.

A particularly significant writer on *missio Dei* is Bosch. He argues in a consistent and detailed way that challenges the then predominant understanding of mission as something that the church 'does'. In countering this assumption, he instead roots the basis of *missio Dei* into a significant theological understanding of the nature of God.[241] Mission, he argues, flows out of 'God's self-revelation as the One who loves the world, God's involvement in and with the world, the nature and activity of God'.[242] It is into God's mission that the 'church is privileged to participate.'[243] Mission then becomes the 'very nature'[244] of Christianity and to participate in mission is to participate in the movement of God's love toward people, since God is a fountain of sending love.'[245] All of this, Bosch argues convincingly, means that mission cannot be an added extra in the life of the church. In light of his work, 'any account of Christianity in which missions are understood to be something the church does after she has become settled in a place and time cannot help but be an unfaithful account of the gospel.'[246]

Bosch's arguments are picked up and reflected upon by a number of scholars subsequently. One of whom, Flett, continues this argument that mission stems out of the very nature and being of who the church is, as he argues, it is not an act an otherwise constituted church may or may not choose to perform.'[247] He goes on to add that

> Concrete, active, intentional missionary existence is no second step alongside fellowship with God. It is not a task the community may or may not choose to perform. If the community abandons her task, she ceases to be the Christian community, for she is then guilty of

[241] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, p. 390.
[242] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, p. 10.
[243] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, p. 10.
[244] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, pp. 8-9.
[245] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, p. 390.
[246] S. Hauerwas, 'Beyond the Boundaries: The Church is Mission' in ed. V. Mortensen & A. O Nielsen, *Walk Humbly with the Lord: Church and Mission Engaging Plurality* (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010) p. 55.
[247] Flett, *The Witness of God*, p. 204.

> withdrawing from the history of God's own fellowship. Mission occurs when God encounters humanity, calling, upbuilding, and sending his community in the humanity proper to her, compelling and enabling her by the Spirit to transcend her self-occupation and to participate in Jesus Christ's prophetic work.[248]

Importantly, this understanding of mission does not mean that liturgy and the church community need to be neglected or side-lined in order to focus on 'doing' mission 'out there'. It is a more traditional understanding of 'mission' that has created unnecessary competition between the 'church' and the 'world' in the past. This is turn neglects the role of the church in the plan of salvation which is, as mentioned above, a criticism by Davison and Milbank of *Mission-Shaped Church*. Tracing the development of *Missio Dei* through the Bible reveals that 'God's mission in the world is the formation of a people'.[249] Or, as Hauerwas describes it, believing in the cross and resurrection 'requires being made a participant in a community whose existence depends on the miracle of the resurrection.'[250] It is important to hold in mind that, as Bosch argues, this does not mean that the church then becomes the goal of mission or the starting point, but both 'church' and 'mission' find their place within the wider concept of *missio Dei*.[251] What this then means for the purposes of this particular study is picking up on the twin themes of participation and service. Participation in terms of joining in and being formed as part of the people of God, and service in terms of the outworking of participation in the mission of God.

Interestingly, for the purposes of this particular piece of work, Bosch also argues that to relegate worship to a final place is to overlook a vital aspect of what mission actually is.

---

[248] Flett, *The Witness of God*, p. 284.
[249] B. Stone, 'The Ecclesiality of Mission in the Context of Empire' in ed. V. Mortensen & A. O. Nielsen, *Walk Humbly with the Lord: Church and Mission Engaging Plurality* (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010) p. 108.
[250] Hauerwas, 'Beyond the Boundaries', p. 61.
[251] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, p. 370.

> The Christian mission is always Christological and pneumatological, but the New Testament knows of no chrisotology or pneumatology which is not ecclesial … Mission is moored to the church's worship, to its gathering around the Word and the sacraments.[252]

In terms of participation and service, the way that liturgy forms the people of God to be in and part of the mission of God is fundamentally important. As noted above, Ladrière's work demonstrates the way in which liturgical language can create community, forming the people of God. Part of the work of the final chapter will be drawing out the points of the textual study to begin to show how liturgy can be used in terms of adaptation and innovation in fresh expressions of church, and existing models of church, to equip and aid participation and service.

Conclusion to a liturgical response to the deadlock

This section began by reiterating the need for a liturgical paradigm of continuity, adaptation and innovation, summarising the work of the previous section, and highlighting the surprising lack of biblical work in this important and on-going discussion. Both points were drawn together to argue that a scriptural model of change demonstrating continuity, adaptation and innovation would make a significant contribution to this on-going discussion. Equally, an Old Testament text rather than New Testament is more suitable because the narrative situation better represents the current situation, given the importance being placed on maintaining continuity and identity whilst adapting to different contexts. Further to this, the Old Testament more clearly represents changes over time, whereas the New Testament is more like a snapshot of a particular, shorter period. Deuteronomy is an obvious text, given that its narrative context provides both a text of community formation and continuity with the past whilst at the same time looking to the future as a time of change and transition into a different context. The work of Gittoes, located within this particular discussion, then provides three liturgical

[252] Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, p. 385.

characteristics which will be used as a liturgical hermeneutic for reading Deuteronomy.

Conclusion

This chapter has addressed important questions about the developments arising from the publication of the Church of England report *Mission-shaped Church* and how this has been received, both positively and negatively, within the Anglican Church in England. Attempts to draw the two parties together have, thus far, had rather limited success. Approaches that have been based on ecclesiological methodology have failed to provide a solution to the deadlock, and there has been fundamental disagreement as to whether a reductionist ecclesiology is even an appropriate model for the task.

Given the importance of liturgy to Anglican ecclesiology and self-understanding, it has been surprising that this has been almost entirely overlooked in this important discussion. A liturgical approach to this on-going discussion has much to offer to both sides of the debate. For those who are positive about fresh expressions of church in an Anglican setting, it provides support for continual and cultural adaptation. For those who are negative about the changes and developments, it ensures an important connection to Anglican history and identity. The historical review demonstrated both these concerns for continuity and adaptation. Comments about issues raised around the use of the term 'inculturation' also highlighted concerns about the lack of space for both innovation and cultural critique. A liturgical model has not been explored before now, but it has much to offer in terms of breaking the current deadlock in providing a paradigm of continuity, adaptation and innovation.

As set out above, the methodology for the liturgical approach has been taken from Gittoes, whose own work is very much part of this wider discussion. In

the section engaging with Gittoes' work, it was highlighted that there was a significant lack of rigorous scriptural work in this field, despite the importance placed on scripture as one of the three areas that make up the traditional Anglican approach to theological method. A liturgical reading of scripture, therefore, in order to provide a paradigm of continuity, adaptation and innovation is proposed.[253] As stated above, Deuteronomy provides an ideal text for this work given its communal focus and narrative setting at a point of major transition and change.

In order to create this liturgical paradigm, Chapter Two will examine the way in which the terms 'liturgy' and 'liturgical' have been used in critical scholarship to describe Deuteronomy, showing that this has been done with a lack of clear definition and no reference to liturgical scholarship. Having demonstrated the weaknesses in definition, the liturgical hermeneutic as set out above, will be used to examine the text and then the chapter will explore the text for the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation.

Chapters Three and Four will use the liturgical hermeneutic to engage with two chapters of Deuteronomy in detail. The first of these will focus on Deuteronomy 6 and the second on Deuteronomy 26, both chapters being chosen due to the frequency with which scholars use the terms 'liturgical' and 'liturgy' to describe them. They are also representative of different parts of the overall text, Deut 6 coming from the introductory framework and Deut 26 from the deuteronomic law code. Having used the liturgical hermeneutic, the text will be explored in detail for the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation. Chapter Five will draw together the points raised through this textual study, particularly in terms of continuity, adaptation and innovation, in order to bring these back to the initial question of the deadlock in current discussions of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context.

[253] For further discussion on the use of Old Testament texts as a paradigm for contemporary ecclesiological questions and issues see C. J. H. Wright, *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God*, (Nottingham: IVP, 2004) pp. 65-73, 183-84, 206-09, 320-21.

As an important part of this practical outworking of the biblical work, the liturgical models set out will show how a missional liturgy can equip and enable participation and service.

Chapter two: A liturgical reading of Deuteronomy

Introduction to Chapter Two

The previous chapter explored the current impasse in discussions of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context. The conclusion drawn from this was that a liturgical rather than an ecclesiological approach could provide an important paradigm that would be fruitful for ongoing discussion. Up to this point, however, matters of liturgy and worship had been mostly overlooked in the literature produced by both sides of the debate. The work of Gittoes was used, as someone engaged in this area of study, to draw out three strands which form a liturgical hermeneutic. These three strands are first, the importance of remembrance, second, a liturgical collapse of time, and third, the vital connection between worship and mission. Further to this, Deuteronomy was shown to be an appropriate choice for this study, given its narrative setting of community adaptation for a changing context.

This chapter, and Chapters Three and Four, will demonstrate the way that the terms 'liturgy' and 'liturgical' have been used to describe Deuteronomy in generally undefined ways. In contrast, the liturgical hermeneutic provides a clear definition for identifying a text as liturgical and, having taken this approach to the text, each chapter will then explore the text for the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation. The significant points will then be drawn together in the final chapter in order to form a paradigm with which to respond to the original question. This current chapter will look at the text as a whole, highlighting important overarching themes and key points, before the next two chapters explore first Deut 6 and then Deut 26 in detail.

This study is taking a synchronic approach to the text.[254] This is not to ignore questions that have been raised by diachronic studies which have made important contributions to the field, for example addressing previously held assumptions surrounding issues such as dating, authorship, form, and place of composition. A synchronic approach, however, focuses on the final text as more of a unified whole[255] and allows for a reading that is following unity of thought and expression, rather than seeking to discern points of variance which may or may not then indicate the presence of different sources. This approach will draw attention to the text's structural and stylistic unity and reveal whether the liturgical features and characteristics cross particular parts of the text that have been used previously to identify different redactional layers.[256]

Taking this approach is not to deny the presence of underlying sources, but to recognise the deliberate presentation of the final text and how the sources have been 'woven into a complex artistic whole.'[257] As Noble helpfully sets out, this is not to set synchronic and diachronic approaches against one another as they should not be viewed as entirely separate methodological approaches, 'because each has implications for the text's method of composition.'[258] The purposes of this study is not an attempt to reconstruct original sources through detailed textual analysis, 'as the recovery of these

[254] For a brief history of how scholars have developed synchronic approaches to Old Testament texts see R. Routledge, *Old Testament Theology: A Thematic Approach*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2008) pp. 56-60.
[255] B. K. Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology: an Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2007) pp. 114-115;
[256] For discussion of the use of *Numeruswechsel* as an approach to discerning redactional layers see G. Minette de Tillesse 'Sections "tu" et sections "vous" dans le Deutéronome' in *VT* 12.1 (Leiden:Brill, 1962) pp. 72-73; E. W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967) pp. 27-8; R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002) pp. 3-6; G. von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch' in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, Trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken (Edinburgh | London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966) p. 27.
[257] R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, revd edn. (New York, New York: Basic Books, 2011) p. 21;
[258] P. R. Noble, 'Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Biblical Interpretation' JLT 7:2, 1993, p. 145.

sources becomes exceedingly difficult.[259] Instead, the focus of attention here is to undertake a synchronic approach using the liturgical hermeneutic to enable an exploration of the presence of the three liturgical strands, asking whether this will reveal an intentional theme which can provide a coherent reading across the whole text.

Hwang provides a helpful example of this type of synchronic approach to studying Deuteronomy when he examines the theme of the 'fathers' as an intentional rhetorical device rather than something that reflects compositional layers.[260] This is helpful, not only as it demonstrates taking a synchronic approach to trace a particular theme across the text as a whole but, significantly for this study, are the ways in which a number of key points he raises as particular to this approach relate closely to the liturgical hermeneutic. For example, he argues that the repetitiveness of the text is a 'homiletical strategy designed to inculcate the audience with *memory*. The book is shot through with exhortations for Israel to remember the past.'[261] This clearly relates to the first liturgical strand, that of the importance of memory. He also goes on to argue that this particular rhetorical approach is not simply about recounting the past, but 'actualises' it for the contemporary audience.[262] This concept relates to the second liturgical strand, in which the liturgical collapse of liturgical time draws together the past and the future into the present moment. He then argues that this approach acknowledges the way in which Deuteronomy assumes that its words will have authority for future generations.[263] Although he does not draw this out specifically, Hwang's comment is not dissimilar to the third liturgical strand, that of the vital connection between worship and mission, in that he is identifying the way a function of the text was to affect the way future generations would live

[259] Noble, 'Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches', p. 141.
[260] J. Hwang, *The Rhetoric of Remembrance: An Investigation of the 'Fathers' in Deuteronomy*, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2012) p. 4.
[261] Hwang, *The Rhetoric of Remembrance*, p. 7.
[262] Hwang, *The Rhetoric of Remembrance*, p. 8.
[263] Hwang, *The Rhetoric of Remembrance*, pp. 8-9.

their lives. This similarity of themes then supports using a synchronic approach in order to use the liturgical hermeneutic in reading the text.[264]

Use of 'liturgy' and 'liturgical' in wider scholarship

This work is predicated on the liturgical nature of Deuteronomy. The next section will demonstrate different ways in which scholarship has used the words 'liturgy' and 'liturgical' to analyse and describe Deuteronomy. These terms are used relatively often by scholars to describe particular aspects and features of Deuteronomy, but there is often no clear definition indicating what the writer specifically means or what particular liturgical qualities are being identified in the text. Similarly, in virtually every occurrence no connection is made between these observations and contemporary liturgical studies to support why particular features of the text should be understood to be liturgical. This lack of clarity creates difficulties in knowing what is intended by scholars using the terms, and also creates areas of conflict where scholars disagree because there is insufficiently definition.

This section will set out three particular ways in which the text has been described as either being 'liturgical' or demonstrating characteristics of liturgy. These are first, connections between the liturgical nature of the text

[264] Other scholars who have also adopted a synchronic approach to Deuteronomy in order either to explore a particular theme or to respond to the rhetorical setting of the book include R. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary study of the Deuteronomic History, Part One: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980); D. T. Olson, *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses: A Theological Reading*, (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 1994); J. G. Millar, *Now Choose Life: Theology and Ethics in Deuteronomy*, (Leicester: Apollos, 1998); J. G. McConville, *Deuteronomy*, Apollos Old Testament Commentary (Downer's Grove, Illinois | Nottingham: IVP, 2002); J. Robson, *Honey from the Rock: Deuteronomy for the People of God* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2013); P. T. Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah: A Reappraisal*, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2006); P. Barker, *Deuteronomy: The God who keeps promises*, (Melbourne: Acorn Press, 1998); C. J. H. Wright, *Deuteronomy*, New International Biblical Commentary Old Testament Series, 4 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996). See also R. W. L. Moberly, *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34* (JSOTSup 22; JSOT Press (1983) esp. pp. 15-43; R. Rendtorff, 'The Paradigm is changing: Hopes and Fears' *Biblical Interpretation* Vol. 1 no. 1 Feb 1993, pp. 34-53.

and the emphasis placed on learning and education; second, liturgical and cultic influences on the shape and content of the text; and third, the later liturgical reception of the text. After examining these weaknesses, the three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic will be used to demonstrate that the text is indeed liturgical.

Learning and Education

One way that scholars have attempted to demonstrate the liturgical nature of Deuteronomy has been to highlight ways that allegedly liturgical texts have a specific function in the text's overall aim of passing on faith to the next generation. This idea of teaching and education is emphasised by Robson who argues that in 'Deuteronomy the *tôrâ* is a portable Horeb.'[265] He defines this by arguing that as the community gather it is with the purpose of hearing again the words God spoke at Horeb. This, he states, is to learn from them and pass them on to the next generation, and he points to Deut 4:10 in support of this.[266] Building on this, he also adds that the 'day of the assembly' as seen in 9:10; 10:4 and 18:16 is 'paradigmatic of every "assembly", whether of synagogue or of church.'[267] From this perspective, the liturgical gathering of the community is associated with hearing and responding to God's law, as spoken to the community initially at Horeb.

Whilst the verses he cites support this interpretation of the assembly as a place of learning, he does not go on to explore how this then compares with other types of communal gatherings described in Deuteronomy, for example, passages such as the pilgrimage festivals which draw on important communal features such as feasting and providing for the poor (Deut 16:7; 16:11). These passages are about more than just education and learning, but Robson does not comment on how they might be part of his reading of the text as liturgical. It is not that education is not a significant theme in Deuteronomy, or that it does not feature at times of communal gathering, but this is clearly

[265] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, pp. 124-5.
[266] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, pp. 124-5.
[267] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, pp. 124-5.

not the only feature present in the text at these times. As such it is apparent that, although significant to the text as a whole, it would be difficult to sustain the argument that intentional education could be the key identifier of liturgical characteristics in the text.

In exploring ways in which liturgy and worship function as educational tools in the text, Weinfeld draws attention to the way that 'the catechisms attached to Passover and the crossing of the Jordan are rooted in a liturgical tradition that came to actualize the soteriological events of the Exodus and the conquest.'[268] The rescue from slavery in Egypt is a significant theme in Deuteronomy. There are repeated calls to remember God's deliverance of the people from Egypt (6:12, 21; 7:8; 8:14; 15:15) as well as the way in which remembering is used as motivation for obedience (10:19; 16:12; 24:18). The worship of the community is clearly closely bound up with the story of salvation and rescue from Egypt throughout the text, and the notion of remembering, collapsing time and connecting worship with action relate directly to the strands of the liturgical hermeneutic. What Weinfeld does not provide, though, is evidence as to how the particular points he identifies relate to liturgical understanding and how he is defining the term 'liturgical'.

Several scholars also make the argument that Deuteronomy is not simply focused on education for the sake of imparting knowledge, but that the emphasis is placed on behaviour and attitude.[269] Support for this is found in the way that, for example, unlike the rest of the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy is the only book 'that is accompanied with instructions for its liturgical use'[270] and the only one 'which prescribes the recitation of prayers in ritual

[268] M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, Anchor Bible (New York, New York: Doubleday, 1991) p. 329.
[269] See for example, S. E. Balentine, *The Torah's Vision of Worship*, Overtures to Biblical Theology (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1999) p. 190; T. E. Fretheim, *The Pentateuch*, (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1996) p. 160; J. A. Thompson, *Deuteronomy* TOTC (Leicester: IVP, 1974) p. 76.
[270] D. I. Block, *How I Love Your Torah, O Lord!: Studies in the Book of Deuteronomy*, (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2011) pp. xiv-xv.

ceremonies (Deut 21:8; 26:3b-10a; 15).'[271] Whilst this does relate to the third strand of the hermeneutic, that of the important connection between worship and mission, this is not something that is identified by these other scholars, and no explanation is provided as to why this should be understood as a liturgical attribute.

Liturgical and cultic influences on the text

A number of scholars defend the use of the word 'liturgical' to describe Deuteronomy by arguing that cultic or liturgical settings have influenced the shape of the text. Von Rad, for example, argues that a cultic origin can be observed by the movement through the text from the recital of laws to the covenant formulation. This, he states, reflects the cultic pattern on which it is based, so that it 'retains the pattern of hortatory allocution, reading of the Law, sealing of covenant, blessing, and curse.'[272] He does also go on to argue, though, that the final form of the book moves beyond its cultic origins,[273] with the text now presented as an instructional sermon for lay people.[274] One specific way in which he argues for the influence of the cult on the text is the repeated use of the word הַיּוֹם, which, he states, is not simply stylistic but is cultic in the way it recounts the story of freedom from slavery in Egypt.[275] Von Rad is right in drawing attention to a liturgically important word, and its relevance for the liturgical hermeneutic will be explored in more detail below. Yet despite doing this and arguing that the word has cultic significance, he does not go on to provide evidence to support how or why this claim should be considered as liturgically meaningful.

[271] M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972) p. 32.
[272] von Rad, 'The Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 33. See also G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, trans. D. Barton (London: SCM Press, 1966) p. 12.
[273] von Rad, 'The Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 33.
[274] von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 23.
[275] von Rad, 'The Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 28.

Cairns also argues for the influence of liturgical repetition on the text[276] which, he states, can be seen in the Book of the Covenant as well. Similarly to von Rad, Cairns argues that the Deuteronomic law code, as well as chapters 6-11, came to their current shape through repeated use in festivals in northern Israel.[277] The shape of the liturgy of the festival, 'reading of the law, recital of Yahweh's gracious deeds, solemn reiteration of blessings and curses, homilies and exhortations', he argues, can then be seen to have influenced the compilation of Deuteronomy.[278] Similarly, Fretheim points to an underlying liturgical influence on the text. This he describes in terms of the public, formal recounting of God's promises, followed by the obligations that both God and the people make to one another.[279] But, as with von Rad, whilst both Cairns and Fretheim draw attention to important textual features, neither go on to provide a definition as to why these particular textual features can be used to identify liturgy or liturgical texts.

A further use of the potential cultic influence on the text is made by Christensen. He argues for the significance of the liturgical dimension of the text and uses this as the governing aspect for his commentary.[280] He emphasises the liturgical setting of the text, adding that it 'was no doubt composed with music as an essential aspect of the tradition itself.'[281] While appearing to emphasise the liturgical nature of the text, he goes on however to describe it instead as a 'didactic poem, composed to be recited publicly to music in ancient Israel within a liturgical setting.'[282] From this, his focus becomes reading the text as poetry, detailing the musical setting,[283] as opposed to reading it as a liturgical text with a musical setting. It is also

---

[276] I. Cairns, *Deuteronomy: Word and Presence*, ITC (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans | Edinburgh: Handsel Press ltd., 1992) p. 6.
[277] Cairns, *Deuteronomy,* p. 20.
[278] Cairns, *Deuteronomy,* p. 20.
[279] Fretheim, *The Pentateuch*, p. 159.
[280] D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1991).
[281] Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. lx.
[282] D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1 - 21:9*, 2nd edn. (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, 2001) p. lxxxiv.
[283] Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1 - 21:9*, p. lxx.

difficult to know at times whether Christensen argues for what he sees as arising genuinely from his engagement with the text or simply in support his own particular interpretation of it.[284] As such, both Gerbrandt,[285] and Merrill[286] who is himself broadly supportive of Christensen's commentary, question the ultimate usefulness of his approach in understanding the text.

In support of the perceived musical and poetic textual dimensions, Christensen notes van Goudoever's article in which he sets out his argument for understanding the significance of the date in Deut 1:3. Van Goudoever argues that the text should be understood liturgically, seeing Deuteronomy as preparation for the Passover celebration in Josh 5.[287] He describes Deuteronomy as 'probably the most liturgical book of the Bible',[288] but frustratingly this is nothing more than a passing comment in a brief conclusion to a short article. He does not develop this point and the examples he cites in support of his argument are merely that of the Sabbatical year and the liturgical text of 26:1-11.[289] If he does think the text is liturgically significant, he does not provide further support for this, nor does he go on to explore this in more detail and neither does he explain how he defines or is using the term 'liturgical'.

It is not impossible that a cultic or liturgical setting has had some influence on the overall shape of the text. For example, the text begins by recounting the history of the people of God. It establishes from the beginning who they are, and are to become, in relation to the God who has rescued them from slavery in Egypt. Chapter 5 sets out the 'text', the Decalogue, which is then

[284] G. Gerbrandt, 'Review of D. L. Christensen Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9' in Bulletin for Biblical Research 14.2 2004, pp. 276-278.
[285] Gerbrandt, 'Review of D. L. Christensen', pp. 276-278.
[286] E. H. Merrill, 'Review of D. L. Christensen *Deuteronomy 1:1-21*' in Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 46.4 2003, pp. 720-722.
[287] J. van Goudoever 'The Liturgical Significance of the Date in Dt. 1, 3' in *Das Duteronomium Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1985) p. 145.
[288] van Goudoever, 'The Liturgical Significance', p. 148.
[289] van Goudoever, 'The Liturgical Significance', p. 148.

expounded in chapters 12-26.[290] Chapter 12, the beginning of the Deuteronomic law code, begins with a focus on worship, reflecting the opening theme of the Decalogue. Worship then forms a frame around the law code, as it closes with an explicit liturgy in chapter 26, which takes the form of an offering, containing within it a creedal-type statement. There is also a point of communal gathering and re-commitment in chapter 29, with an emphasis that all within the community are expected to respond, including women, young children and resident aliens. This does broadly appear to follow what could be understood to be some sort of coherent liturgical or cultic pattern. Craigie in particular argues that a clear liturgical connection can be observed by drawing a link between the text and the covenant renewal at Shechem,[291] and he draws on Josh 8:30-35 in support of this. Whilst this might be a plausible reading of the text, again what is lacking is a clear definition of terms.

Liturgical reception of the text

A number of scholars have argued that the liturgical nature of Deuteronomy can be demonstrated through the later liturgical reception of the text, or parts of the text. For example, Block explores the reception of the *Shema* in particular, noting that not only is it recited twice a day by Orthodox Jews, but 'it appears immediately after the Decalogue in the Nash Papyrus, a second-century BCE liturgical text, and in a first-century CE phylactery text from Cave 8 at Qumran, where the *Shema* is written in a rectangle and surrounded by other texts.'[292] Tigay also argues that Deuteronomy has influenced the shape of Jewish worship, looking not just to the recitation of the *Shema*, but also the blessing after meals. He argues that the *Birkat Ha-Mazon* is based on Deut 8:10 and that the 'recitation of *Kiddush* on the Sabbath is based on the rabbinic interpretation of *le-kaddesho*, "to sanctify it," in the fifth

[290] J. H. Walton, 'The Decalogue Structure of the Deuteronomic Law' in eds. Firth, D. G. and P. S. Johnston *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2012).
[291] P. C. Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1976) p. 32.
[292] Block, *How I Love Your Torah*, p. 75.

commandment (5:12).'[293] Similarly, Weinfeld makes a case for the liturgical reception of Deuteronomy through the rest of the Old Testament and into later Jewish liturgy. In discussing the use of the *Shema*, he writes that this

> declares the acceptance of the exclusive Kingship of God is preceded by a benediction which proclaims God's love to Israel especially in the election of his people, an idea taken from the deuteronomic liturgical orations. This is followed by the *Ge'ullah* Benediction centred on the redemption from Egypt, which is also one of the basic tenets in the liturgies of Deuteronomy.[294]

He argues that the way in which both the individual and the community are brought together in Deuteronomy's liturgy can also be seen in later Jewish prayers.[295] He also goes on to argue a deuteronomistic liturgical influence can be observed in DtrH.[296]

These scholars are right in showing how later liturgical practice appear to have drawn from particular Deuteronomic texts, but this in itself does not have to mean that the original texts are themselves liturgical. There are numerous examples in Anglican liturgy where biblical texts are placed into a liturgical setting, but this later use does not then mean that the original contexts of the verses can be automatically identified as liturgical.[297]

Conclusion to use of liturgy and liturgical in wider scholarship

The above sections have each examined a different way in which scholars have argued that Deuteronomy is a liturgical text. Whilst some of the points raised are similar to aspects of the liturgical hermeneutic, no clear definitions have been provided in order to support the argument. This lack of definition

---

[293] J. H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996) p. xxviii.
[294] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 43.
[295] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 43-44.
[296] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 43.
[297] For example, Holy Communion, Order One, the Summary of the Law at the beginning of the Prayers of Penitence quotes Mark 12:29 – 31, which in turn is an adaptation of Deut 6:4-5, Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship*, p. 168; The second option for prayer of confession ends with words from Micah 6:8, Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship* p. 169; The opening line of the Gloria is an adaptation of Luke 2:14, Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship*, p. 171.

makes it difficult to know exactly what is being referred to when the terms 'liturgical' or 'liturgy' are being used. Equally, on the occasions when evidence is provided, there is no link made to liturgical studies in order to show why this particular approach should be understood to define something as 'liturgical'.

The three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic

The previous section has shown that scholarship frequently uses the terms 'liturgy' or 'liturgical' in discussion and analysis of Deuteronomy in ways that lack clarity and definition. Having stated above that the text is being used because of its inherent liturgical qualities, this section will demonstrate this by showing the presence of the three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic, the importance of remembering; the liturgical collapse of time; and the connection between liturgy and mission. The three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic provide a clear definition for the terms 'liturgy' and 'liturgical' and, as was shown in the previous chapter, are directly drawn from contemporary liturgical studies.

The importance of Remembering

The first strand of the liturgical hermeneutic drawn from Gittoes' work is the importance of remembering. This section will show that the idea of 'remembering' is not only present in the text but is an important theme and concept throughout, and is used in the text to support significant theological themes.

The concept of 'remembering' is a much more prominent theme in Deuteronomy than the rest of the Pentateuch. It is used in a significant and particular way as part of the rhetorical strategy adopted throughout the text to impress its particular theological motifs on subsequent generations. The word is used distinctively by Deuteronomy, as is demonstrated by comparison

with the wider Pentateuch. For example, in Genesis it is almost always God who is the subject of the verb, either in committing to remember his covenant (e.g. Gen 9:15, 16) or to remember particular individuals in order to bring about deliverance or a change in circumstance (e.g. Gen 8:1; 19:29; 30:22). The only two occurrences in Genesis where people are the subject are in the Joseph narrative, the cupbearer's promise to remember Joseph and subsequent forgetting (Gen 40:14, 23; 41:9); and Joseph himself remembering the dreams he had about his brothers (Gen 42:9).

Similarly, in Exodus, God is again the subject of remembering (e.g. Exod 2:24; 6:5; 32:13) but there are also four occurrences of the people being encouraged to remember, one of which occurs in the Decalogue (Exod 13:3; 20:8, 24; 23:13). In Leviticus the word only occurs twice, in one verse, and both times it is God who is the subject (Lev 26:42, 45). In Numbers, one use of the word has God as subject (10:19) and one use is a narrative context where the people are grumbling about how good life was in Egypt (11:5). Of the other three occurrences, one is the title of a particular type of offering (5:15) and the other two are associated with the instruction to wear tassels on garments in order to have a physical reminder of God's commands.

Of the 14 occurrences in Deuteronomy, which is more than any one of the other individual books of the Pentateuch, the most significant contrast is that all but one has the people as subject, rather than God. The exception to this occurs during the passage where Moses is recounting the Golden Calf incident to the people. The word can also be seen to be important given that in 11 out of 13 occurrences it occurs at the beginning of the verse, and on another two occasions the construction תִּזְכֹּר זָכֹר is used to underline further the stress and insistence on remembering.

This is not simply about the presence of the word, however, but more importantly it is the vital role 'remembering' plays in the outworking of Deuteronomy's theological agenda. It is more than mere recollection as Moses addresses the later generation as if they themselves were the ones

who had been rescued by God from slavery in Egypt and had heard the initial proclamation of the law. As Childs puts it, memory 'provides the link between past and present. The Deuteronomist is acutely aware that Israel's redemptive history has not ceased. Her history continues only as present Israel established her continuity with the past through memory.'[298]

זכר has a paraenetic function within deuteronomic preaching[299] and the specific use of the word arises out of a point of crisis creating an urgent need to renew the tradition.[300] The continuing work of 'Israel's redemptive history' is brought about through active engagement with the past, calling each generation to that point of decision, just as with the original wilderness generation.[301] Remembering therefore becomes something that is more multifaceted that simply meaning to recall something that happened in the past,[302] but is used in order to encourage faith and obedience to the law and commandments[303] and this is achieved in a number of ways. On four occasions, the construction עַל־כֵּן is used to connect the act of remembering with observing the law (5:15; 15:15; 24:18, 22). Based on this, Ellman rightly argues that this

> grammatically makes the commandment a function of the memory. It makes the fulfilment of commandments the logical and inevitable result of memory and underscores D's ideal of a seamless transition from the act of memory (speaking) to the act of fulfilling the law that D demands.[304]

What she does not go on to comment on, though, is that this is not the only way in which the act of remembering is linked firmly to the importance of

---

[298] B. S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, Studies in Biblical Theology no. 37 (London: SCM Press, 1962) pp. 55-56.
[299] Childs, *Memory*, p. 47.
[300] Childs, *Memory*, p. 80.
[301] Childs, *Memory*, pp. 55-56.
[302] H. Eising, *zākhar*, in ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and H. Ringgren trans. D. E. Green *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament Vol. IV*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1980) p. 66.
[303] Eising, *zākhar*, pp. 67-68.
[304] B. Ellman, *Memory and Covenant: The Role of Israel's and God's Memory in Sustaining the Deuteronomic and Priestly Covenants*, (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2013) p. 60.

keeping the commandments. In 8:18 and 16:3 this same stress on connecting remembering with keeping the law is achieved through the use of לְמַעַן. In 16:12 this connection is achieved through וְשָׁמַרְתָּ and, although not appearing in the same verse as זָכַר, 24:8 stresses the importance of following the commandments carefully through two variations of שׁמר.

Other words throughout Deuteronomy also emphasise the importance of remembering. Other than three times in Genesis, all of which have a narrative context (Gen 27:45; 40:23; 41:30), the word שָׁכַה does not appear at all in the Pentateuch other than the 13 times in Deuteronomy. Whilst remembering is important due to its motivation in terms of keeping the law, forgetting, in Deuteronomy, will bring about the exact opposite, worshipping idols (4:23), not keeping the commandments (8:11), forgetting God (8:14; 32:18) and worshipping other gods (8:19).[305] The importance of remembering is also furthered through the use of words which 'represent the acquisition, maintenance, and transmission of memory through instruction, learning, and repetition of canonic lessons.'[306] Moses instructs the people that they are to recite and repeat the laws and commandments.[307]

The stress placed on the importance of remembering is further emphasised through the use of the word למד occurring 16 times in Deuteronomy but not featuring at all in Genesis – Numbers. Ellman states that in response to the need to remain faithful to the covenant with God, Deuteronomy introduces a system by which the people 'continually speak, learn, and teach about God and God's law. In order that the people do so, Deuteronomy offers a religious practice based on the verbalization of memory.'[308] She argues that this is a more cognitive approach as compared to the more sensory approach of the priestly narrative.[309] The survey conducted here of the use of significant

[305] See also Ellman, *Memory and Covenant*, p. 62.
[306] Ellman, *Memory and Covenant*, p. 65.
[307] Ellman, *Memory and Covenant*, p. 65.
[308] Ellman, *Memory and Covenant*, p. 46.
[309] Ellman, *Memory and Covenant*, p. 46.

words connected with remembering, those of learning, speaking and not forgetting, supports the conclusion that she is making.

What also comes across clearly is that this is all to have an effect on the hearts of the people, with the laws being put or placed on their hearts. לֵב is used 43 times in Deuteronomy, in comparison with only 3 times in Genesis, once in Exodus, 3 in Leviticus and once in Numbers. The laws and commandments are to be 'on' their hearts (6:6 עַל), they are to 'lay' or 'put / place' the commandments on their hearts (4:39 שָׂכַב and 11:18; 32:46 שׂוּם) and in 30:6, God will circumcise their hearts. The heart is important, but not simply as the place where knowledge is stored. Memory in Deuteronomy is purposeful and transforming and this is more than simply an act of bringing a past event to mind.

> Memory functions as an actualization (*Vergegenwärtigung*) of the decisive event in her tradition. The sign of the continuing relationship of Yahweh to his people is the rest of the Sabbath. Israel in every generation remembers and so shares in the same redemptive time.[310]

Crucially therefore, and particularly in light of Gittoes' work, this is not just remembering in order to fully participate in the events of the past, but remembering in order to affect the future and to orientate behaviour. The commandments are placed on the heart so that lives will be lived accordingly. For the purposes of Deuteronomy, 'the past is brought into the present with compelling power. Action in the present is conditioned by what is remembered.'[311] Remembering means that the people will keep the commandments and do what is expected of them, whereas forgetting would mean an effective rejection of God and a turning aside to other gods.

[310] Childs, *Memory*, pp. 53-54.
[311] E. P. Blair, 'An Appeal to Remembrance: The Memory Motif in Deuteronomy' in Interpretation Jan 1961 15:1, p. 43.

The liturgical collapse of time

The second strand of the hermeneutic is the liturgical collapse of time. As noted in the previous chapter, this describes the way in which liturgy seeks to make what happened in the past a present reality, while simultaneously drawing the promises of God about the future into the present. As with the previous section, the text will be examined to see whether this strand of the hermeneutic is present, and if so to what effect.

Whilst the three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic are distinct, they are also closely connected, and this can be observed when comparing the first and second strands. So, for example, as was stressed previously, the function of remembering and memory in Deuteronomy is not simply to call something to mind, but it is an intentional remembering in order to have an active effect on both the individual and the wider community in the present. The centrality of memory means that the portrayal of religion in Deuteronomy is not limited by time.[312] The expectation is established from the beginning (Deut 5:3) that the law and covenant was not something merely given to their ancestors in the past, but is actively being made real to them in the present.[313] The gathered people are addressed as if they are the first generation to hear the words, emphasised by the placement of the negative לֹא at the start of the verse. This liturgical collapse of time then brings about an urgency in drawing the people of the community to a point of deciding for themselves to follow the law that Moses has set out for them.[314] Through this, Moses addresses the people as if they had memories of things that they had not experienced (Deut 4:9-13; 11:2-7) and so brings the story of the nation into the present,[315] actualising the faith by drawing together past, present and future into one.[316] This then in turn becomes a paradigm of each

[312] Ellman, *Memory and Covenant*, p. 104.
[313] A. Popovic, 'The Bible as a Book of Memory' in Antonianum LXXIX (2004) p. 420.
[314] W. Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 2001) pp. 65-6.
[315] Ellman, *Memory and Covenant*, p. 65.
[316] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 29.

new generation being taught about the law, receiving it and committing to live according to it, before continuing the pattern by teaching it to the next generation.[317] The expectation that people would live according to the law relates closely to the third strand of the liturgical hermeneutic, the connection between worship and mission, and this is will be explored in more detail below.

It is not just bringing the past into the present moment that is demonstrated in Deuteronomy but there is a recognition of the role that the future generations will have. This is, in part, the narrative's anticipated fulfilment of the promises of possession of the land that had been given to the previous generation. As Hwang describes it, the narrative trajectory of the text sees that the generation being addressed 'inherits the promise given to the patriarchs and partially fulfilled through the deliverance from Egypt, in addition to becoming ancestors of future generations who will reflect back on this seminal moment before Israel entered the land.'[318] This narrative pull across the generations also combines with the way the text addresses each new generation, including those who would have been settled into the promised land for many years, as though they were the generation of those about to enter it.

This pull between past, present and future shifts throughout the text and is demonstrated through Polzin's examination of the use of reported and direct speech in Deuteronomy specifically through the three speeches of Moses. Polzin states that in the first speech (1:6-4:40), Moses speaks mostly about past events and statements. In the second speech (5:1-28:68), Moses begins to speak about the future and there is the inclusion of other people's statements about what they will do or say in the future (6:20-25; 7:17; 9:4). In the third speech (29:2-31:6), the focus is almost entirely on the future, 'whenever Moses quotes anyone directly, it is their *future* utterances he

[317] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, p. 38.
[318] Hwang, *The Rhetoric of Remembrance*, p. 6.

quotes'.[319] He also adds that the ending of the book (31:7-33:29) has a future orientation as well.[320] The reader or listener is then taken through the journey of past, present and future through the different time-frames present in Moses' speeches. At the same time there is the awareness that the generation being addressed by Moses are not actually those who were brought out of slavery in Egypt. Equally, those reading the final form of the text are not the generation about to cross into the Promised Land for the first time, but are addressed as if they are.[321] This adds additional layers of time which are then intentionally drawn into the liturgical collapse of time observed in the text. Indeed, if the later generation about to cross into the Promised Land were not addressed 'as if' they were a previous generation, then the text may well not have the capacity to draw subsequent generations back to the moment of decision that faces those about to enter the land.

The covenant between God and his people is a significant theological concept in Deuteronomy, and features much more prominently than in the rest of the Pentateuch, with the exception of Genesis.[322] Through the collapse of time, each generation is drawn back to the point of hearing the law as if for the first time and being brought to the point of decision making and commitment. In the speeches 'Moses "concertinas" past and future events into the "today" of the plains of Moab. Alongside this compression into the existential "now" there is a strong sense of unfolding history, a storyline that reaches back into the past, and will reach into the future.'[323] As mentioned above, this can be seen through 5:2-3 where those being addressed are spoken to as if they are the first recipients of the covenant. The text showing the urgency in making this about the current generation. As Miller helpfully describes it, the words when translated literally would be 'made not with our ancestors but "with us, we, these ones, here, today, all of us, living." The text uses seven words

[319] Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, pp. 25-6.
[320] Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, pp. 25-6.
[321] E. J. Woods, *Deuteronomy*, TOTC (Nottingham | Downer's Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2011) p. 184.
[322] The word בְּרִית occurs 27 times in Deuteronomy and also in Genesis, only 13 times in Exodus, 8 in Leviticus, 5 in Numbers.
[323] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, p. 31.

heaped one upon another to stress the contemporary claim of the covenant.'[324] Through this, the text stresses the importance of remembering and not forgetting the covenant (Deut 4:23; 8:18), that there are promises of blessing for keeping the covenant and punishment for forgetting (7:12; 17:2; 29:20, 24; 31:16, 20; 33:9).[325]

It is also interesting to note that a liturgical collapse of time, linking past, present and future together, can be observed in Jewish liturgical practice. The reading of the Torah is cyclical, 'always returning to the beginning',[326] as when the reading of Deuteronomy is completed, the cycle of readings then returns to begin Genesis. This practice creates a pull of 'forwards and backwards', with anticipation of what will be read and reflection on what has already been read.

Importance of הַיּוֹם

A further way in which the liturgical collapse time is seen in Deuteronomy is through the repeated use of the word הַיּוֹם which often connects the past event, with the present as well as anticipating future fulfilment. Halbe draws attention to this play of time, how the call of 'this day' draws each generation to the moment of the covenant.

> Eines Anfangs voller Spannung: bestimmt durchs 'Schon jetzt' der Horeb-*b^{e}rît*, bestimmt durchs 'Noch nicht' der Ankunft, erst recht des 'Ruhens' im Land. Das 'Hören' in diesem 'Heute' versetzt in Horeb-Gegenwart: trotz Horeb-Distanz (Ctn 5); versetzt auf den Weg hin ins Land: trotz Sitzens darin. Spiel mit der Zeit, das Zeit unterbricht: 'Heute'![327]

[324] Miller, *Deuteronomy*, p. 67.
[325] See also P. R. Williamson, 'Covenant' in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* ed. T. Desmond Alexander & D. W. Baker (Nottingham | Downer's Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2003) pp. 152-3.
[326] R. E. Friedman, *Commentary on the Torah*, (New York, New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2003) p. 681.
[327] J. Halbe, "'Gemeinschaft, die Welt unterbricht": Grundfragen und -inhalte deuteronomischer Theologie und Überlieferungsbildung im Lichte der Ursprungsbedingungen alttestamentlichen Rechts' in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven University Press: Leuven, 1985) p. 57.

It is this rhetorical device which brings each new generation to the edge of the Promised Land, identifying with the events of a previous generation. They then become representative for all following generations who, like them, become those people who stand and hear the word of God and choose to respond.[328] Von Rad argues that the repeated use of this word is a literary device, but brings about 'a vivid reconstruction of the events in the redemption story as such as only the cultus can furnish.'[329] Given the way in which the use of this word pulls the past into the present, and that the 'present' transcends the 'present' of the writer / editor and assumed first audience of the text, this is clearly connected with the liturgical collapse of time and provides support for von Rad's argument that this is something particular that arises out of a liturgical rather than solely rhetorical context.

Worship and Mission

The third liturgical strand from the hermeneutic is the vital connection between worship and mission. As was stated in the previous chapter, the understanding of 'mission' that is being used here is following Wright's model[330] and, rather than being seen in terms of proselytising, is instead understood as the ethical and social outworking of the demands of God. Again, the text will be examined to see whether this strand can be observed, and if it is then to what extent and purpose. As with the previous two strands of the hermeneutic, there is a close relationship between this one and the other two, and some of the comments above also contribute to the work here, whilst at the same time there is still a particular and distinctive focus for this third strand.

An important way that Deuteronomy makes the connection between worship and mission is the emphasis placed on teaching and learning. This is a significant change from the rest of the Pentateuch as the word למד does not

[328] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, pp. 38-39; S. K. Sherwood, *Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*, Berit Olam (Collegevile, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2002) p. 209.
[329] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 28.
[330] Wright, 'Mission as a Matrix for Hermeneutics and Biblical Theology'.

feature prior to Deuteronomy. As noted above, this is not simply learning for the sake of growing in knowledge, but education in order to affect the way in which lives are lived out. The text that clearly demonstrates this as over half of the occurrences of לִמַּד happen alongside לַעֲשׂוֹת, or a variation of עשה (Deut 4:1, 5, 14; 5:1, 31; 6:1; 17:19; 18:9; 20:18; 31:12), emphasising the strong link between learning and doing. The stress placed on the link between learning and acting appropriately is further emphasised twice by the addition of וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם (5:1) and וְשָׁמְרוּ (31:12). Of the other occurrences of the word, the importance of teaching children is emphasised (Deut 4:10; 11:19; 31:13),[331] a connection is made between bringing and eating the tithe in the place that God will choose, so that the people will learn (14:23), and finally Moses is instructed to write the song and teach it to the people (31:19, 22). Braulik explores the use of לִמַּד in a synchronic study of passages. He concludes by stating that the emphasis is placed on the people to pass on their own experiences to the next generation, and he particularly references Deut 4:10 in support of this. As he argues, Deuteronomy 'is first and foremost concerned with teaching and learning a faith related to the community.'[332] This model of associating learning with action seeks to ensure that each generation will take on the responsibilities of the faith and live accordingly.

Within this discussion, there are two particular verses that stand out as being particularly important. The first is the use of the word within the instructions on appointing a king (Deut 17:14-20). While vv. 15-17 set out to place limits on the king, the only positive instruction, or the one thing that the king has to do, is educational. He is to write out his own copy of the law, read it every day and follow the commandments (vv. 18-20). This places unusual limitations on the king in comparison with monarchy in the ANE. Alongside this command, is a further unusual instruction in that learning is not just to be

[331] See also J. R. Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013) p. 51.
[332] G. Braulik, *The Theology of Deuteronomy: Collected Essays of Georg Braulik, O. S. B.*, (N. Richland Hills, Texas: BIBAL Press, 1994) p. 198.

kept for the king and the community's leaders, but, as seen in 31:12, it is for the whole community, including women, small children and resident aliens. There is not an expectation on them to write out their own copy of the law, but rather they are expected to hear, learn and then do all the words of the law. Limiting the king whilst simultaneously expecting the entire community to learn and keep the law demonstrates a radical democratisation of the society, and one that is rooted in learning and following the commandments and laws. This is an important theme that will be developed more fully in Chapter Four.

Another important way in which Deuteronomy seeks to affect the behaviour of the people is the repeated references to their own experiences of slavery in Egypt. There is a constant reminder of the previous status as slaves in Egypt throughout the book[333] and a threat at the end of the book of the possibility of a return to slavery in Egypt if they reject God's laws (28:68). This persistent reiteration of the themes of Egypt and slavery are deliberately intended to have a direct effect on their behaviour and their ethics.[334] In his recent book, Robson draws attention to the way in which the experience of the Exodus was to have an effect on ethical behaviour, describing it as 'the root both of profound theology and of moral obligation.'[335] He supports this claim by showing how the root עבד provides a point of comparison between serving first Pharaoh in Egypt and then serving Yahweh. He goes on to add that keeping the Sabbath then aids in reinforcing this, as people stopped carrying out their labour (עבד) including all slaves and animals.[336] There is a clear expectation to treat all people with mercy and care, particularly the vulnerable and marginalised, as can be seen through repeated references to

[333] Deut 5:6, 15; 6:12, 21; 7:8; 13:6, 11; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18, 22.
[334] S. L. McKenzie, 'The Theological Legacy of Deuteronomy' in ed. C. Bultmann, W. Dietrich, C. Levin, *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag*, (Göttingen: Vendenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002) p. 42.
[335] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, pp. 35, 36.
[336] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, p. 37.

widows, orphans and resident aliens,[337] those who were the most economically vulnerable in society. Anyone with slaves has to include them in the Sabbath rest (5:14), which would have had a potential economic impact for their owners. But they are to be specifically included in sharing the feasting and celebrations with the rest of the community (12:12, 18; 16:11, 14), particularly in the celebrations for the Festival of Booths and the Festival of Tabernacles.

Conclusion to the liturgical hermeneutic section

The presence of three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic, drawn from Gittoes' work, provides clarity for describing the text as a 'liturgy' or as 'liturgical'. This liturgical influence can be seen in the structure of the book as a whole, for example the liturgical framing of the deuteronomic law code, as well as the way in which liturgy helps emphasise particular key deuteronomic theological concepts. The importance of 'today' and the associated rhetorical strategy is used effectively to encourage obedience to the commandments and the education of the community's children. The use of the three strands of the hermeneutic have shown the importance of remembering, how this emphasises the value placed on the covenant between God and his people that Deuteronomy presents, and how remembering is contrasted with the dangers of forgetting. This approach has also drawn attention to the pull towards the point of decision, with each subsequent generation being brought to the immediacy of 'today' and the need to decide to take on the ethical and moral obligations expounded throughout. Having shown this, the next section will explore the presence of the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation in the text, showing the role that these have in shaping the text and drawing attention to its particular theological priorities.

[337] Deut 10:18; 14:29; 16:11, 14; 24:17, 19, 20, 21; 26:12, 13; 27:19.

The text demonstrating the liturgical characteristics

The previous section, through use of the liturgical hermeneutic, has clearly shown the liturgical nature of Deuteronomy, and how these three strands are vital to the expression and outworking of the book's overall theology and purpose. The first chapter proposed that a liturgical model had much to offer the current deadlock in discussions of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context, through a liturgical model of continuity, adaptation and innovation. Having demonstrated the appropriateness of reading Deuteronomy as a liturgical text, this next section will now focus on the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation. Each one will be explored in turn, highlighting their presence and function in the text.

Continuity

Deuteronomy makes strong links to what has gone before, both narratively and canonically. There are reminders that the land the people are about to enter is that which was promised to their ancestors, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (1:8; 6:10; 9:5; 29:12; 30:20; 34:4), rooting the future action of taking the land back into the stories of the community's past. The land becomes a vital and significant theme throughout Deuteronomy[338] and functions rhetorically to connect the generation to what has gone before. This is partnered with similarly frequent references to Egypt as the land of slavery, as mentioned above.[339] The effect is a contrast between the land of slavery from which God rescued them, and the land of promise that God is bringing them into. Both the remembering and the fulfilment of the promise are used to encourage the people to live according to the laws and commandments that Moses is teaching.

[338] Reference to the land as the fulfilment of the promises that God swore to his people appears in 27 out of 34 chapters: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16,17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34.

[339] The 'land of Egypt' or 'land of slavery' is mentioned in 15 out of 34 chapters: 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 29, 34.

Although 'land' is a vital concept to the book, the theme of creation is referred to only once (4:32) and events that occurred prior to the ancestors arriving in Egypt are barely cited, other than references to the three ancestors as mentioned above. Rather than creation as the significant story throughout the book, the 'source event', as Gittoes would describe it, for the community is the rescue from slavery in Egypt and the giving of the law. Teaching of the law and commandments to the next generation is the primary focus, and the frequent references to rescue from slavery in Egypt act as motivation to keep the law. The preference for the Egypt story over the Creation story can be seen in the Decalogue. Although very similar to what is found in Exodus, the most significant change is that the motivation to keep the Sabbath is founded on remembering the rescue from slavery in Egypt (5:15), rather than the importance of resting on the seventh day, as observed in the creation account (Exod 20:11). Despite this important adaptation to the Sabbath commandment, the presence of the Decalogue does also provide a strong current of continuity with Exodus.

There are also numerous other ways in which Deuteronomy creates continuity through references to events that are recounted elsewhere in the Pentateuch. For example, the appointment of leaders for the community other than just Moses, with the description of 'commanders of thousands, commanders of hundreds, commanders of fifties, commanders of tens' in 1:15 also appears in Exodus (Exod 18:21). Both use slight variations in language in their accounts but they do use the same word for leader, שֹׁטְרִי. Similarly, Deuteronomy refers to the defeat of King Og several times,[340] an incident that is narrated in detail in Num 21:21-35 and referenced again in Num 32:33. The testing of God by the people at Massah is referred to in Deut 6:16; 9:22; 33:8 and recounted in detail in Exod 17:1-7. The provision of Manna in the wilderness is mentioned in Deut 8:3, 16 as well as Exod 16 and Num 11. The use of two tablets to record the law is mentioned in Deut 10:1-

[340] 1:4; 2:24, 26, 30, 31, 32; 3:2, 6; 4:46; 29:6; 31:4.

11 and Exod 24:12; 31:18; 32; 34; 38:7. That 70 ancestors originally went to Egypt is recorded in Deut 10:22 as well as Gen 46:27 and Exod 1:5.

Most of the references are relatively brief in comparison with the accounts found elsewhere in the Pentateuch. The narrative of the Golden Calf, also in Exod 32, however, is unusual, in that there is a lot of detail provided in Deut 9:7-29. This unusual amount of detail underlines the importance the text places on worship of God in the way that is being set out, and the contrast made with idolatry and the worship practices of other nations, both of which are to be absolutely avoided.

One further point of continuity is the geographical location that is given in the final verse of Numbers (Num 36:13) and the first verses of Deuteronomy (Deut 1:1, 5). Both texts mention being in Moab and by the Jordan river, and both are about Moses giving the law, either the 'commandments and rules' given through Moses, as Numbers puts it, or that what follows are the 'words' and 'law' that Moses speaks to the people, in Deuteronomy. All of these help ensure a continuity for the community with what has gone before. The fact that many of the events referred to are done so with a limited amount of detail strongly suggests that those responsible for Deuteronomy assumed a wider knowledge of these particular incidents and stories.

Adaptation

The previous section highlighted the way in which Deuteronomy demonstrates continuity with the rest of the Pentateuch. At the same time, however, it also becomes apparent that the text uses and adapts these references for its own purposes and to forward its own particular agenda,[341] for example the importance of keeping the law and commandments and the emphasis placed on avoiding idolatry and improper worship. This level of adaptation can be demonstrated through comparison with both the other biblical law codes as well as wider cultural covenant / treaty documents.

[341] See for example, McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 19.

Adapting biblical law codes

Several scholars argue that the Deuteronomic law code (chs 12-26) is a later and expanded version of the Book of the Covenant (Exod 21-23).[342] Whilst there is continuity from the Exodus chapters, there is also adaptation and even innovation. This latter point will be covered in more detail in the following section.

Although Deuteronomy gives a lot of attention to matters of worship, and even introduces some aspects that are not found elsewhere (12:11, going to the place that God will chose as a dwelling for his name; 14:28, the third-year tithe; 26:5-10, provision of words for the individual worshipper to recite), not everything that appears elsewhere in the Pentateuch is repeated in Deuteronomy. For example, although important themes in both Leviticus and Numbers, Deuteronomy gives no attention to purification rites or guilt offerings. Similarly, atonement is mentioned only twice in Deuteronomy, once in Moses' song (32:43) and once where atonement is sought for an unsolved murder (21:8). Although instructions are given for the elder to kill a heifer as part of the ritual prescribed for dealing with the unsolved murder, this is not a description of a 'ceremonial slaughter with blood sprinkling'.[343] The neck is broken by the elders and not the priests, and although there is prayer, again uttered by the elders and not the priests, there is no sense in which the 'sin' of the murderer has been transferred onto the heifer as with the day of atonement set out in Lev 16. Similarly, where Deuteronomy

[342] See for example Lundbom, *Deuteronomy,* p. 416; Cairns, *Deuteronomy,* p. 120; R. Clements, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, Epworth Commentaries (Peterborough: Epworth, 2001) p. 52; E. H. Merrill, *Deuteronomy* (Nashville, Tennessee: B & H Publishing Group, 1994) p. 22; J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, trans. W. R. Smith (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1973) p. 402; von Rad, 'The Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 28; P. Jenson, 'Snakes and Ladders: Levels of Biblical Law' in ed. K. Dell, *Ethical and Unethical in the Old Testament: God and Humans in Dialogue*, (New York, New York | London: T & T Clark, 2010) p. 189; J. G. McConville, 'Deuteronomy, Book of' in ed. T. Desmond Alexander & D. W. Baker, *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, (Downer's Grove, Illinois | Nottingham: IVP, 2003) pp. 183-4. However, Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology,* pp. 86-89, believes that the distinction between the two law codes has been overstated and that they are more similar to each other in terms of their theological perspective on worship and understanding of God than is often portrayed.

[343] M. Weinfeld, 'Deuteronomy's Theological Revolution' in Bible Review 12:1 1996, p. 41.

describes various offerings, the focus of attention is the effect on the people rather than God, and no comment is made about the 'daily offerings by the priests, in which the public had no direct part, even though these were the principal services conducted at the chosen sanctuary.'[344] Attention throughout the text is repeatedly drawn towards the community celebrating as a whole, rather than upon the role and responsibilities of the priests, Levites and elders.[345]

Further adaptation within the law code can be observed in a number of other places. For example, when the community are gathered to renew the covenant (29:10) and to hear the public reading of the law (31:12), it is not just the elders, but also women, children and foreigners who are specifically included. This is in contrast to Exodus when Moses summons only the elders or the leaders of the community to hear the law (19:7; 34:31) and to renew the covenant (24:21). There are two occasions where the whole community is mentioned in Exodus (35:1, 4), but this is for two particular purposes, first to hear about the Sabbath commandment and second to commit to build the tabernacle according to the instructions Moses received.

Similarly, there is adaptation when examining the laws dealing with slavery. In Exod 21:2 the focus is on the master who buys the person, whereas in Deut 15:12 it is instead on the poor person who sells themselves, or is sold. It is also in Deut that female slaves are specifically included 15:12, 17 as compared with Exod 21:1-11. The words used to describe the person in slavery change as well, from 'slave' in Exod 21:2 to 'brother' or 'kinsman' in Deut 15:12.[346] This subtle change in language and approach is firmly rooted in the theme that runs throughout Deuteronomy, reminding the people of their own experience of slavery, and the use of this to influence their behaviour towards slaves.

[344] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 122.
[345] Block, *How I Love your Torah, O Lord*, p. 115.
[346] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, pp. 148-149.

There is a clear change and adaptation of the 'question and answer' between the child and parent regarding the purpose of keeping the Passover festival. Comparing Exod 13:14 with Deut 6:20 reveals how this transforms from being centred around the ritual context to one focused on education and learning. This will be explored in more detail in the next chapter which focuses on Deut 6. Given the emphasis on learning and passing on the faith to the next generation, it is not surprising that in comparison to the equivalent Exodus passage, Deuteronomy adds that those who are to be appointed leaders should also be wise.[347]

Why does Deuteronomy make these adaptations?

Rather than replacing or supplementing other law codes, the significance of the deuteronomic law code is its innovative reinterpretation to support its theological purposes. Berman argues that the idea that Deuteronomy was written to replace previous law codes is shaped through modern understandings of law codes as 'statutory', in which revisions to laws automatically negate the previous ones. But this does not reflect the 'common law' understanding of law codes as seen in other ANE examples, for example the Code of Hammurabi. These wider ancient law codes, as well as the ones in the Pentateuch, should be understood more as 'prototypical compendia of legal and ethical norms rather than statutory codes.'[348] Berman argues that revision of an older text does not mean the authority of the earlier text is thereby rejected, but that the earlier regulations are being adapted to changing contexts.[349] It is clear from this section that previous laws and commandments are being adapted to take into account the different contexts of a settled life in the land, and Berman's argument here shows that this is a normal process of adaptation that can be observed in other law codes in the ANE.

[347] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 64.
[348] J. Berman, 'Supersessionist or Complementary? Reassessing the Nature of Legal Revision in the Pentateuchal Law Collections', JBL 2016 135.2 p. 209.
[349] Berman, 'Supersessionist or Complementary?', p. 211.

The narrative context further supports this idea of adaptation to the changing context as the people move from the nomadic life style of wandering through the wilderness to the more settled, agrarian life as they settle in the Promised Land. The liturgical hermeneutic also supports the idea of holding onto the importance of the past by bringing it into the present through a liturgical collapse of time, whilst recognising the presence of continuity, adaptation and innovation as liturgical characteristics. Fishbane's description of 'aggadic exegesis' as 'an ongoing interchange between a hermeneutics of continuity and a hermeneutics of challenge and innovation.'[350] He describes the extant tradition as the *traditum*, and then the *traditio* becomes the point at which each generation tests the existing traditions as they seek to confront their 'religious situation and mundane needs, to reform its values and heritage, and to renovate its ideals and history.'[351] This is not about rejecting tradition but adapting 'ancient tradition to new situations.'[352] One way in which it can be demonstrated that the past is not being negated but drawn into the present are the references to the Decalogue and the reception of the law by Moses.[353] This is seen through the narrative setting of the text as the generation about to enter the Promised Land need to adapt practices to take account of their changing circumstances.

New concerns in terms of towns, housing and farming need to be brought into the remit of the law and commandments.[354] As Minette de Tillesse describes it, this about the transmission of a tradition into a new context.

> On y trouve des documents fort anciens, qui ont été repensés, rajeunis, commentés pour la génération contemporaine. Il ne s'agit pas d'archives mortes, mais d'une tradition vivante véhiculée par un people et constamment adaptée au présent.[355]

---

[350] M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985) p. 428.
[351] Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation,* p. 428.
[352] Popovic, 'The Bible as a Book of Memory', pp. 416-17.
[353] R. Achenbach, 'Review of *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah: A Reappraisal*' in Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 120:1 2008. pp. 162-3.
[354] Fretheim, *The Pentateuch*, p. 170.
[355] Minette de Tillesse 'Sections "tu" et sections "vous" dans le Deutéronome' p. 81.

The text sets out what has been previously received by their ancestors in a way that both continues the idea of being the received law of God, but whilst adapting it for the context of later generations.[356] It has also been argued that through this process of adaptation, Deuteronomy provides a hermeneutical paradigm of adaptation for ongoing and contemporary situations.[357]

Adapting treaty and covenant documents

ANE covenant or treaty documents have clearly influenced the structure of Deuteronomy.[358] This can be observed, for example, through the presence of a historical prologue (Deut 1-4) and the section of blessings and curses (Deut 27:9 – 28:68).[359] What is equally clear, however, is that it is not a simple case of Deuteronomy following an established covenant or treaty form, but rather the form has been adapted in ways to support the text's own theological priorities. For example, the inclusion of sections on justice and social concern (e.g. 14:29, the provision of food for the vulnerable in the community) are different from what would be found normally in a treaty document.[360] Equally, Deuteronomy is longer than any extant covenant document and contains material like the hymn (Deut 32) that would not usually be found in this type of document.[361] Given the dissimilarities, it is appropriate to argue that even if there are clear points of comparison between Deuteronomy and treaty documents, there are enough points of difference to make the case that this is not the over-riding form, and that it is not correct to assume that it is an absolute match.[362] Rather, it is more appropriate to see an association

---

[356] See also von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 29; Thompson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 30; 67-68.
[357] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 217; Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 22-23, 93; Barker, *Deuteronomy*, p. 52.
[358] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 20; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 17-18, 36; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 6; J. M. Fuhrmann, 'Deuteronomy 6-8 and the history of interpretation: An Exposition on the First Two Commandments' JETS 53, 1, March 2010, pp. 61-62; M. G. Kline, *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1972) p. 35; Thompson, *Deuteronomy,* pp. 20-21.
[359] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 30.
[360] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. xv; J. H. Hunt, 'The Deuteronomists as Loyal Opposition' in The Asbury Theological Journal, Spring 2001, 56:1, p. 10; Fretheim, *The Pentateuch*, p. 164.
[361] Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, p. 29.
[362] von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 21; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. xv.

between Deuteronomy and a general treaty tradition, rather than seek to demonstrate definite connections with specific examples.[363]

Deuteronomy is setting out to persuade people about faith and shape their communal life, rather than to become a simple legal document.[364] This idea of Deuteronomy as constitution rather than law code recognises the distinct rhetorical and paraenetic style. One example of this distinct style is the insistent encouragement to choose and to respond, emphasised by the use of הַיּוֹם, calling each generation to the point of decision. The significance of this exhortation is also seen through the numerous occurrences of לִמֵּד (4:1, 5, 10, 14; 5:1, 31; 6:1; 11:19; 14:23; 17:19; 18:9; 20:18; 31:12, 13, 19, 22). This word indicates the importance placed on teaching and instruction within Deuteronomy and significantly does not appear in the rest of the Pentateuch.[365] The paraenetic material in Deut 4, 5-11 is bracketed by instructions to teach children and embody the laws as part of everyday life (6:6-9; 11:18-20).[366]

It is clear, therefore, that the rhetorical nature of Deuteronomy has also had an effect on the final form of the text, whether these are to be understood as a sermon[367] or a farewell speech.[368] The rhetorical aspects of the text are prominent, and even vital for understanding the function of the text as urging the readers and hearers on to a point of decision after having had the law expounded to them. The division of the text along the lines of Moses' speeches accounts well for much of the textual material and its rhetorical nature and purpose, but whilst there are passages such as Deut 6 that fit

[363] A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, (London: Oliphants, 1979) pp.33-34; Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 43.
[364] Thompson, *Deuteronomy,* pp. 12-13; von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 19; Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, pp. 64, 66; S. D. McBride, 'Polity of the Covenant People: The Book of Deuteronomy' in Interpretation 41.3 July 1987. pp. 237, 231; J. G. McConville, *Grace in the End: A Study in Deuteronomic Theology*, Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1993) p. 159.
[365] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 55-56.
[366] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 2.
[367] Minette de Tillesse 'Sections "tu" et sections "vous" dans le Deutéronome', p. 75.
[368] von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 22-23.

within this model, others such as Deut 26 do not fit within the model of a sermon or speech, issuing, as it does, words and actions to be followed by the people having entered the promised land.

Innovation

Having demonstrated ways in which the text adapts both Pentateuchal material as well as the legal code structures, it also becomes clear that Deuteronomy introduces ideas and concepts that are not found elsewhere. The previous section touched on the way in which the text is delivered as Moses' speech to the Israelites. The fact that this is over 90% of the book is immediately revealing something in its delivery that is distinct from the rest of the Pentateuch.[369] This deliberate and distinctive rhetorical approach and language is used within Deuteronomy to bring each new generation to the point of accepting the law and committing to live their lives according to its precepts. Something that makes Deuteronomy distinct, particularly in comparison with Leviticus, is that this rhetorical emphasis is used to focus attention on to the people, as compared with the focus being on the Priests.

A further way in which Deuteronomy innovates can be seen in a number of ways in which the text addresses the political structure of the nation in ways which are not paralleled in the other Pentateuchal law codes. For example, in the process for dealing with legal matters (17:8-11), the text introduces the word דִּין in the context of judging and cases of laws, which is not used elsewhere in the Pentateuch. Immediately following this, is the law of the King (17:14-20), again a provision that is not found elsewhere. Interestingly though, and as mentioned above, in comparison with other ANE monarchies, the law found here is remarkably limiting in terms of acquisition of wealth and goods. Equally, the instructions regarding the Prophet that God will raise up for the people (18:14-22) is not found elsewhere.

[369] G. Fischer SJ, 'Eigenart und Bedeutung des Deuteronomiums in der Tora' in *Deuteronomium - Tora für eine neue Generation*, Herausgegeben von G. Fischer, D. Markl und S. Paganini (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011) p. 16.

There are also distinct words that Deuteronomy introduces that are peculiar to it. For example, the word באר which appears for the first time in 1:5 is a new and very unusual word in the Torah.[370] Similarly the root אהב is significant within Deuteronomy in the way it is used to depict the relationship between God and Israel not seen previously.[371] The use of this word will be explored in more detail in the following chapter due to its significance in Deut 6.

One of the striking ways in which Deuteronomy adapts and innovates is in terms of the treatment of instructions for Passover. Deuteronomy transforms what had previously been a family celebration located in the home into one of the three annual festivals, calling everyone to attendance at the central place of worship. The text also conflates the two originally separate celebrations of Passover and the feast of unleavened bread, changes that von Rad describes as 'especially radical'.[372]

Worship is given a distinctive significance in Deuteronomy, its importance in the law code revealed through repeated calls to seek the place that God will choose to put his name (12:5, 11, 21; 14:23, 24; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2). 'Dtn ist jenes Buch in der Tora, das wie kein Andres die singuläre Nähe Jhwhs zu Israel als innerste Mitte des Glaubens beschreibt.'[373] This can be seen through the way in which concerns for the right worship of God surround the law code (Deut 12; 26). There is more of a focus on a holistic, emotional response, rather than just an external obedience. For example, the only uses of the verb מול in Deuteronomy (10:16; 30:6) encourage circumcision of the heart, an attitudinal change rather than an external, physical one. There is also an emphasis on rejoicing in Deuteronomy, with the verb שמח occurring seven times, in various forms, as compared to only once in Leviticus.[374]

---

[370] Fischer, 'Eigenart und Bedeutung', p. 17.
[371] Fischer, 'Eigenart und Bedeutung', p. 18.
[372] von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 17.
[373] Fischer 'Eigenart und Bedeutung des Deuteronomiums in der Tora', p. 19.
[374] Block, *How I Love your Torah*, p. 115.

Deuteronomy uses innovation and rhetorical technique to present to Israel a vigorous call to re-engage with their national identity. Whether read as instilling an identity prior to conquest, or re-energising flagging morale after the invasion of the Northern kingdom, Deuteronomy's rhetorical innovation calls each new generation of the people of God to the point of decision.[375] Brueggemann writes persuasively that Deuteronomy looks in two directions, back to what he calls 'rootage' and forwards to 'crisis'.[376] What is significant is the innovation and adaptation that is an integral part of the text and the call to urgent re-engagement with identity and purpose. Deuteronomy holds together both a demand for faithfulness to the past and a call for innovative reinterpretation into a new context.

The main focus of chapter 12 is to restrict worship from multiple sites of sacrifice to the one place that the Lord will choose. This is considered one of the most important and distinctive aspects of the Deuteronomic law code.[377]

> It dominates the so-called law-code (Deut 12-26), in which worship is a major theme, appearing not only in laws that concern worship directly (Deut 12; 14:22-29; 15:19-23; 16:1-17, 21; 18:1-8; 26:1-15) but also in a law about administration of justice (17:8-13). It also occurs in one worship context outside of the law-code (31:11).[378]

Chapter 12 draws a sharp distinction between the worship of foreign gods taking place in a multitude of sites across the promised land with the worship of God which is to be focused solely in his choice of place. Israel is to seek after Yahweh in the place that he chooses and not be distracted by the practices of other nations.[379] This is not an arbitrary command, however, but is considered vital for maintaining the proper worship of Yahweh.[380] As Robson argues, the 'ultimate focus is not *Kulteinheit* ("unity of worship" at a

[375] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 6; Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology*, pp. 1, 6-14.
[376] Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, p. 21.
[377] Clements, *Deuteronomy*, p. 27; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 118-119; von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 88-89.
[378] J. G. McConville & J. G. Millar, *Time and Place in Deuteronomy*, JSOTSup 179 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) p. 89.
[379] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 193-194.
[380] Cairns, *Deuteronomy,* p. 125.

central sanctuary), but *Kultreinheit* (purity of worship), although unity of worship is Deuteronomy's way of ensuring purity of worship.'[381] These changes are made both for strongly theological and practical reasons. It was vital that Canaanite places of worship were destroyed and removed, so that the Israelites did not take over these places and begin adopting their worship practices and customs, risking engagement in worship of other gods. The emphasis is put on worshipping God alone, and doing so only at the place that he will choose to set his name. The importance of this will be explored in more detail in Chapter Four.

Conclusion to liturgical characteristics in the text

This section has focused on the way in which the text demonstrates the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation. The points raised here will be drawn into the final chapter in order to form a paradigm to respond to the original question of why there is deadlock in current discussions of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context. The section exploring continuity showed that vital connections are maintained with the on-going story of the people, for example through repeated references to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as well as Egypt as the place of slavery and suffering in contrast with the Land of the Promise which will be a place of deliverance. In exploring adaptation in the text, key points when comparisons are made between Deuteronomy and the other Pentateuchal law codes reveal that there are a lack of specific instructions regarding, for example, purification rites of guilt offerings. The focus of worship is on the community as a whole and the effect that the worship is to have on them, rather than the priests and the rituals themselves. The text also showed more inclusivity in terms of women, children and the marginalised. When comparing the text with other ANE law codes it becomes clear that Deuteronomy while influenced by this form goes beyond what would normally be found in a treaty or covenant document. In terms of innovation, the text has a

[381] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, p. 130.

predominantly rhetorical setting, which is in contrast with the wider Pentateuch. There is a stress on learning and desire to affect behaviour, alongside the unusual limits placed on the king and how this begins to reveal something about the presence of radical democratisation, a concept that will be explored more fully in Chapter Four.

Conclusion

This chapter has set out the methodology for a liturgical reading of the final-form of Deuteronomy. It is clear that uses of the terms liturgy or liturgical in describing the text have been inadequately defined, leading to confusion and a lack of specificity. The use of the liturgical hermeneutic drawn from Gittoes' work, as defined in the previous chapter, has clearly shown that Deuteronomy is indeed a liturgical text and has provided a more a robust definition for this assertion, and one that relates to contemporary liturgical studies. The use of the three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic, as well as the liturgical characteristics, have drawn attention to significant aspects of the text, its structure and content, which will be drawn into the liturgical model in the final chapter as a response to the question set out in the first chapter.

As it is not possible in this study to undertake a detailed reading of the whole of Deuteronomy, having highlighted some of the key features of the text as a whole in this chapter, the next two chapters will each take a chapter of Deuteronomy and examine them in close detail. This work, along with the findings from this chapter, will be drawn into the model in the final chapter as a response to the initial question. The next chapter will examine Deut 6, one of the most significant chapters in Deuteronomy. It is frequently described in liturgical terms, but it will be shown that this is done with a lack of definition. The liturgical hermeneutic will then be used to analyse the text and this work, alongside the use of the liturgical characteristics, will contribute to a

discussion of how the idea of 'love' in Deut 6 is to be understood, and what significant insights can be gained from a liturgical reading. Chapter Four will then undertake an examination of Deut 26, again highlighting ways in which the term liturgical has been used with a lack of definition, before using the liturgical hermeneutic to analyse the text. This work, along with particular insights from other significant chapters within Deuteronomy, will then be used to argue for a movement of radical democratisation through Deuteronomy, that is particularly revealed through this hermeneutic. The final chapter will then draw all of these insights together and return to the original question of why there is deadlock in current discussions of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context, to provide a paradigm that will enable creative ongoing discussion.

Chapter Three: A liturgical reading of Deuteronomy 6

Introduction to Chapter Three

Deuteronomy 6 has long been viewed as exhibiting liturgical characteristics and as such is an obvious choice for detailed textual work using the liturgical hermeneutic outlined in Chapter Two, using the three liturgical strands based on the work of Gittoes.

Following the translation with accompanying notes, this chapter will examine the way in which scholars have used the term liturgical when describing Deut 6 this reveals a lack of rigorous methodological support. Having established this, the three liturgical strands of the hermeneutic will be used to provide a more robust definition of 'liturgical', revealing significant aspects, characteristics and structural points through this approach. Having provided this liturgical definition, the chapter will then examine the text for the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation. An important discussion arising from Deut 6 is the how the word אהב is interpreted and how this relates to the influence of ANE treaty documents on the text. The arguments in this discussion will be examined, before showing that a liturgical reading undermines the reliance upon the ANE treaty documents.

Translation and notes

6:[1] And this is the commandment - the statutes and judgments - which the Lord your God has commanded to teach you to do in the land that you are crossing over into, to possess it, [2]so that you will fear the Lord your God, by keeping all his statues and his commandments which I am commanding you,

you and your children and your children's children, all the days of your life, so that your days will be long [3]and you may hear, O Israel and be careful to do them so that it will go well for you, and that you will increase mightily according to what the Lord the God of your ancestors promised to you, a land flowing with milk and honey. [4]Hear Israel, Yahweh our God is the only Lord, [5]and you shall love Yahweh your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might, [6]and these words which I command you today will be upon your heart. [7]Teach them incisively to your children, and speak about them in your resting in your home, and in your walking on the road, and in your lying down and your rising up. [8]And bind them as a sign upon your hand and they will be as frontlets between your eyes. [9]And you shall write them upon the door-posts of your house and on your gates. [10]And it will be when the Lord your God will bring you into the land which he swore to your ancestors, to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob, to give to you – cities that are large and good that you did not build, [11]and houses of all good things which you did not fill, and wells which you did not hew out, vineyards and olive trees that you did not plant – and you will eat and you will rest, [12]be on your guard lest you forget the Lord who brought you out from the land of Egypt, from the house of slavery. [13]The Lord your God you shall fear, him you will serve and by his name you will swear. [14]Do not walk after foreign gods, gods of the people who are around you, [15]for a jealous god is the Lord your God in your midst, lest the anger of the Lord your God is kindled against you and exterminates you from the face of the earth. [16]Do not test the Lord your God like you tested him at Massah. [17]You shall surely keep the commandments of the Lord your God, and his testimony and his statutes which he commanded you, [18]and you shall do what is right and good in the eyes of the Lord so that it will go well for you, and you may come and possess the good land which the Lord swore to your ancestors [19]by driving out all your enemies from before you just as the Lord promised. [20]When your son asks you in time to come, saying 'What mean the testimonies and the statutes and the judgments which the Lord our God has commanded you?' [21]And you will say to your son, 'We were slaves to Pharaoh in Egypt and the Lord brought us out from Egypt by a

strong hand. [22]And the Lord gave great and terrible signs and wonders, against Egypt, against Pharaoh and against all his household before our eyes, [23]and us he brought out from there in order to bring us in to give to us the land which he swore to our ancestors. [24]And the Lord commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear the Lord our God, for our good, that he might preserve us alive, like this day. [25]And righteousness will it be to us when we are careful to do all of this commandment before the Lord our God, just as he has commanded us.'

Notes on the text

6:1

זֹאת is singular and relates to commandment rather than to statutes and judgments which are plural. McConville makes this explicit by introducing 'that is' between 'commandment' and 'the laws'.[382]

6:3

מְאֹד Lundbom[383] and Weinfeld[384] both use 'greatly' here. Christensen uses 'greatly', but gives 'mightily' as an alternative reading in his notes.[385] The choice was taken here to opt for 'mightily', even though 'greatly' could be a better English translation, but 'mightily' maintains the connection with the use of the same Hebrew word in 6:5, where the word 'great' would be inappropriate.

6:4

שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד

This is a particularly difficult verse to explain[386] as a number of different translations are possible[387] and there is no similar construction for comparison.[388] Waltke and O'Connor state that, for the final four words, the

[382] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 137.
[383] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 304.
[384] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 320.
[385] Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, pp. 131-132.
[386] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 89.
[387] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 76.
[388] B. K. Waltke & M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990) p. 135.

'simplest solution is to recognize two juxtaposed verbless clauses', [389] but they acknowledge that most scholars do not choose this approach.

It would be difficult to support an argument that 'Yahweh is our God' is an appropriate translation for the first two words as אֱלֹהֵינוּ never appears in Deuteronomy as the predicate to יְהוָה but always in apposition.[390] This strongly suggests that 'Yahweh our God' or 'The Lord our God' is a more appropriate translation for the first two words. Tigay, however, whilst acknowledging the lack of support within Deuteronomy itself, points to Zechariah 14 as evidence that reading the phrase as subject and predicate was therefore 'the only interpretation that was demonstrably held in biblical times.'[391] Tigay uses this as evidence to support the interpretation of 'Yahweh is our God', but it is questionable as to whether a single usage in Zechariah is more significant than the internal evidence from Deuteronomy itself.

Further difficulty arises in establishing the relationship between the first two and second two pairs, as well as the translation of the second pair. Weinfeld argues that 'Yahweh our God, Yahweh is one' is also not a good translation because 'the first subject is discontinued'[392] and argues instead for 'Yahweh our God is one Yahweh.'[393] McConville argues for the exact opposite of Weinfeld, stating that 'Yahweh our God is one Yahweh' is 'least likely because it involves qualifying a proper name with an attributive adjective.'[394] His preference is, rather, for 'The Lord our God, the Lord is one.' If אֶחָד is an adjective, then it would be assumed to be predicative rather than attributive as it does not agree in definiteness with יְהוָה. Williams, however, points out that אֶחָד is sometimes anarthrous, citing 1 Sam 13:17f in support.[395]

---

[389] Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, p. 135.
[390] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 337; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 90.
[391] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 439.
[392] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 337.
[393] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 337.
[394] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 141.
[395] R. J. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, 2nd edn. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976) p. 19.

As well as meaning ‘one’ or ‘first’, אֶחָד can also mean ‘only’ as an attributive adjective, ‘alone’ or ‘integral’ as a predicative adjective,[396] or ‘alone’ as an adverb.[397] But Tigay questions the use of אֶחָד to mean alone in this context rather than using the more usual word for alone, לְבַד.[398] He also argues that this verse is describing the relationship between Israel and Yahweh, that he alone is to be their God, and that this is not a statement of monotheism, as this was made in 4:35, 39.[399]

In seeking to translate אֶחָד, Janzen argues that translations fall into two categories, either they are asserting something about the nature of God, that he is ‘one’, or ‘unique’, or that it is a statement about God's relationship to Israel, ‘Yahweh alone’. He argues that when analysed within ‘the context of Israel’s covenant traditions’ the verse is seeking to assert something about Israel’s need for loyalty and faithfulness to Yahweh alone, rather than stating an abstract idea of God's nature.[400] Tigay also argues that the translation should not be ‘the Lord is one’ as this makes the second יְהוָה superfluous.[401] However, this is not necessarily a strong argument against this translation as Hebrew does make use of repetition or seemingly redundant words for emphasis and rhetorical effect.[402] Von Rad’s argument is subtly different from Janzen’s two broad categories. Whilst having stated, as Janzen captures, that the translation ‘Yahweh alone’ is about God's relationship with Israel in the face of temptations from the Canaanites, he argues that ‘Yahweh, our God, is one Yahweh’ is actually about stating the ‘oneness of Yahweh’ whilst

[396] Waltke & O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax,* p. 274.
[397] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 141.
[398] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 439.
[399] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 76.
[400] J. G. Janzen, ‘On the Most Important Word in the Shema (Deuteronomy VI 4-5)’ in Vetus Testamentum 37.3 1987, p. 280
[401] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 439.
[402] See for example Waltke and O’Connor's discussion of the pleonastic pronoun in Gen. 36:8, Waltke & O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, p. 131.

numerous traditions and sanctuaries of Yahweh were in existence. Both of these positions are coherent within deuteronomic theology. [403]

This verse may well be deliberately amphibological in attempting to record something that cannot be captured, in that it is making a statement about God. So, for example, as Nelson states, 'one' may indicate Israel's unique relationship with Yahweh, or that he is 'incomparable', meaning that there is no god like him, or that it is a statement about his character, 'Yahweh's oneness signifies a personal integrity that allows for no duplicity in promise or intention.'[404] Firth, drawing on Empson's work on ambiguity, provides a definition of a particular type of intentional authorial ambiguity defined as 'type 3 ambiguity', where writers 'draw on and use multiple meanings inherent in words but without actually resolving them one way of another.'[405] This intentional ambiguity then remains open to the various different interpretations as each is able to state something different about Yahweh's nature, character and relationship to Israel. Indeed, this particular use of ambiguity stresses the value of holding the different potential meanings together for the reader.[406] So whilst the exact meaning is difficult, if not impossible categorically to supply, the sense that the phrase conveys is supremely significant. Whether or not this is understood as monotheism or simply that Yahweh is the only God that Israel is to acknowledge, he is, for them, first and ultimate. This theological sense is clearly coherent with the deuteronomic emphases in the wider text. In terms of liturgy, this then leaves the phrase open to wonder and contemplation, giving a call to worship that encourages thought and reflection, albeit within particular parameters, rather than one that sets out a categorical fact that does not then encourage any further wonder.

6:10

[403] von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 63.
[404] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 89.
[405] D. G. Firth, 'Ambiguity' in ed. D. G. Firth & J. A. Grant, *Words and the Word: Explorations in Biblical Interpretation and Literary Theory*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2008) p. 165.
[406] Firth, 'Ambiguity', p. 165.

There is disagreement as to whether God is giving the land or the cities. Weinfeld translates the verse 'into the land...to give you - great and flourishing cities that you did not build',[407] but this makes an awkward incomplete sentence in English. McConville too has God giving the land, and translates the verse 'into the land...that he would give you, a land of fine, large cities'.[408] This clarifies the sentence, unlike Weinfeld, but does mean inserting the words 'a land of' into the text which is not there in the original. I have chosen to translate the verse as God giving the cities rather than the land, which Lundbom also does,[409] and is supported by Josh 21:2.

6:19
לַהֲדֹף אֶת־כָּל־אֹיְבֶיךָ מִפָּנֶיךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה

I have translated this verse 'to drive out all your enemies from before you just as the Lord promised', whereas McConville has 'and you will drive out your enemies before you - as the LORD also promised.'[410] Including the words 'and you will' makes a strong connection between the action in v.18 ('and you will come') and this current verse. However, in v. 18 the two verbs וּבָאתָ וְיָרַשְׁתָּ are both Qal perfect 2ms with ו prefix, whereas the first word in v. 19 לַהֲדֹף is a Qal infinitive construct with a ל prefix, therefore 'to drive out' rather than 'and you will drive out' indicates this difference in the original.

6:20
כִּי־יִשְׁאָלְךָ בִנְךָ מָחָר לֵאמֹר מָה הָעֵדֹת וְהַחֻקִּים וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶתְכֶם

Translations of this verse insert the word 'mean' (or 'meaning') which is not explicitly in the original text. Lundbom states that the 'interrogative pronoun מָה, normally "what?" can be translated "why?" or "what mean(s)?" For the

[407] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 330.
[408] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 137.
[409] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 137.
[410] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 137.

latter translation, which suits the present context (AV and all modern English versions), see also Exod 12:26; 13:14; Josh 4:6.'[411]

6:22
וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֹתֹת וּמֹפְתִים גְּדֹלִים וְרָעִים בְּמִצְרַיִם בְּפַרְעֹה וּבְכָל־בֵּיתוֹ לְעֵינֵינוּ

McConville introduces the word 'plagues' into the sentence that is absent from the Hebrew.[412] Neither Lundbom or Christensen have done this.[413]

The use of 'liturgical' as a description of Deuteronomy 6 in wider scholarship

Several scholars either specifically use the word liturgical in their analysis of Deuteronomy 6, or more broadly describe a cultic context as significant in interpreting the chapter.[414] When this language is examined closely, however, it becomes clear that there is a general lack of definition as to what the term or concept means. Where there is occasionally a definition suggested, there is no explanation why particular criteria are appropriate in designating something as liturgical.

In 'The Problem of the Hexateuch', von Rad argues for the significance of regarding Deut 26:5b-9 as a short historical creed.[415] Although Deut 26 will be the focus of Chapter Four, it is helpful to reference this discussion here as von Rad asserts a strong connection between these verses in Deut 26 and Deut 6:20-24. He views these latter verses as distinct from the surrounding paraenetic material, with the introductory words showing that 'it can be recognised as a direct quotation of more of less stereotyped material.'[416] Whether or not von Rad's analysis of the historicity of these two passages is

[411] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 324.
[412] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 137.
[413] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 323; Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, p. 149.
[414] see for example, A. C. Welch, 'The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter vi' in The Expository Times 1929/30 Vol. 41, p. 551.
[415] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch' pp. 3-4.
[416] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch' p. 5.

correct is not the focus here, rather it is the undefined way in which he describes these two passages, along with Josh 24:2b-13, as creedal or liturgical.

Von Rad uses the phrase 'liturgical formulation'[417] to describe 26:5b-9, but he does not specify what it is about this text, or later about 6:20-24 or Josh 24:2b-13, that makes them identifiably 'liturgical'. He does add, in a footnote to this comment, that the 'rhythmical and alliterative character of the opening phrases in particular reveal its antiquity.'[418] This, however, is a comment defending his assertion regarding the age of these verses and not a description of its liturgical nature. He goes on to summarise the content of these three passages, describing the way they each outline God's saving action in the past, and have a communal rather than individual focus. I will show below that these characteristics can be seen to indicate that a passage is liturgical, but this is not a point that he makes, and ultimately this particular paragraph remains mostly descriptive.[419] Von Rad does begin to make a connection between liturgy as being something that draws attention to the salvation history of God and his people. But again this remains somewhat implicit and beyond this there is no detail provided as to what specifically makes this chapter identifiably liturgical.

Verses 4-9

Von Rad argues that the phrase 'Hear, O Israel' is a 'stereotyped formula in Deuteronomy (5.1; 9.1; 20.3; 27.9)'[420] and 'probably' a summons to gather for worship.[421] Other than the repeated nature of an important phrase through the book, von Rad does not give any other evidence to support his argument. In response to von Rad, McBride states that whilst this is not unlikely, 'it is a generalization which sheds little light on the meaning and possible origin of

[417] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch' p. 4.
[418] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch' p. 4n.
[419] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch' pp. 4-5.
[420] von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 63.
[421] von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 63.

6:4.'[422] The repeated use of an idiosyncratic phrase throughout Deuteronomy, of which there are several, is not sufficient evidence alone to determine an originating context of worship, and von Rad is right to be cautious in suggesting this as possibility rather than certainty.

In trying to explain why he regards vv.4-9 as having 'all the marks of a well-crafted liturgy',[423] Lundbom details the way these verses move from confession, through instruction to love Yahweh, and finally a commitment to follow his commandments.[424] This could well be a liturgical structure, but he does not indicate how this is connected to liturgical studies, nor if he therefore considers every report of confession and commitment to Yahweh to be understood as liturgical. Neither does he state whether a passage has to have all of these elements, in this order to be liturgical.

Moberly highlights the difficulty that exists in discerning the original context for the *Shema*, important for translation and interpretation, given the life these verses gained in Jewish religious practice, and also the later association for Christians with Trinitarian theology and creedal statements.[425] Given the importance of the *Shema*, this text will be discussed in more detail below, when examining Moran's argument and interpretation, but it is important to show here that, as Moberly states, discerning an origin for these verses, and whether or not that is liturgical, is not a simple task.

Verse 13

Both Christensen[426] and Craigie[427] point to the words תִּירָא and תַּעֲבֹד in v. 13 to show that this verse is closely related to worship of God. This could well be true, but there is always a risk in arguing that the use of one particular word is

[422] S. D. McBride, 'The Yoke of the Kingdom: An Exposition of Deuteronomy 6:4-5' in Interpretation 27:3, 1973, p. 289.
[423]Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 316.
[424] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 316.
[425] R. W. L. Moberly, *Old Testament Theology: Reading the Hebrew Bible as Christian Scripture*, (Baker Academic: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2013) pp. 10-12.
[426] Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, p. 147.
[427] Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, p. 173.

sufficient criterion to indicate a given characteristic of the text. Driver, similarly, argues that the word עָבַד is primarily associated with 'executing definite and formal acts of worship', supporting this from a number of verses in Exodus (Exod 3:12; 4:23; 7:16; 10:26; 13:5; 12:2, 30). He further argues from Numbers that the word is associated with the technical duties of priests and Levites (e.g. Num 4:47; 16:9).[428] Whilst there is a clear association between this word and formal worship, particularly as noted by Driver in both Exodus and Numbers, Ringgren argues that whilst עָבַד is used in Deuteronomy almost entirely with Yahweh as subject it 'far transcends any specifically cultic context'.[429] In other words, עָבַד is used in Deuteronomy beyond merely liturgical settings, making it difficult to argue with any degree of certainty that the use of this word by itself would mean that those verses are liturgical.[430]

Verses 20-25

Several scholars argue for a liturgical or ritualistic context as the setting for the child's question in vv. 21-24,[431] although there is disagreement about its historicity.[432] Weinfeld states that vv. 20-25 are a 'liturgical declaration of a distinctly didactic character',[433] arguing that a liturgical setting demonstrates the 'oratorical style of the deuteronomic school'.[434] He also notes that there

[428] S. R. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1895) p. 94.
[429] H. Ringgren, '*ʿāḇaḏ*' in ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, H. Ringgren & H-J Fabry, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* Vol. X (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge, 1999) p. 386.
[430] For the use of עָבַד through Deuteronomy in clearly non-liturgical contexts see 5:13; 15:12, 18, 19; 20:11; 21:3, 4; 28:39, 48.
[431] Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, p. 150; Thompson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 126; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 34.
[432] Woods views vv. 20-25 as a 'historical credo' (Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 139). Cairns also argues that vv. 21-22 are 'creedal', but argues against separating them from the wider context (Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, p. 87). Mayes argues that a connection with a specific ritual, which he identifies in vv. 4-9 can be observed, when vv. 10-19 are viewed as a late insertion (Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, p. 179). McConville raises fundamental questions, however, as to whether there is sufficient evidence to support the claim that this was an original creed (McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 144).
[433] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 34.
[434] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 34.

is an acknowledgement of aspects that appear to have 'national and historical significance'.[435] It is clear that the stress of these verses is on the importance of passing on the faith to the next generation, and continuing the communication of this national and historical significance that Weinfeld has identified. Christensen suggests that the child's question in vv. 21-24 could indicate 'a worship setting parallel to the beginning of the Passover seder meal.'[436] Similarly, Thompson sees in these verses a 'liturgical formulation' through recital of the facts.[437] The importance of the child's question in these verses will be explored more fully below, but for the immediate purposes it remains clear that use of the word 'liturgical' or the description of something as having a worshipping context is being used here in a generalised way. There is no specific identification of liturgical features, or sufficient explanation as to how these particular features can be used to identify a text as liturgical.

Reception

There is evidence for a liturgical reception of the *Shema* in Jewish practice, but a detailed examination of the evidence for this reveals that it is not as clear as some scholars have argued. The question also remains, however, as to whether a later liturgical reception of a text can be used as an argument for an original liturgical context.

The appearance of the *Shema* in the Nash Papyrus, a document from the second half of the C2nd BC,[438] is used by Lundbom[439] and Block[440] to demonstrate the liturgical significance of these verses. Weinfeld argues that an additional title at 6:4[441] found in the Nash Papyrus, as well as in the LXX, is 'a liturgical addition serving as an introduction to the *Shema* proclamation',

[435] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 33.
[436] Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, p. 150.
[437] Thompson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 126
[438] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 309.
[439] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 309.
[440] Block, *How I Love your Torah, O Lord*, p. 75.
[441] "And these are the laws and the rules that Moses [YHWH in the LXX] commanded [the Israelites] in the desert when they left Egypt".

which he does not consider to be genuine.[442] He uses this in support of understanding 6:4 as liturgical, but all this evidence can actually be used to show for certain, is that there is a later textual addition, in some versions, that may be considered to be liturgical.

The use of the Nash Papyrus to support a liturgical reading is not as straightforward as has been suggested, as 'there is very little of the Hebrew text of the *Shema* preserved. In fact all we have is the final word on line 23 and the six words on line 24 (two in partial form).'[443] Foster goes on to argue that what the text reveals is 'diversity in the tradition surrounding this supposedly foundational liturgical text.'[444] He ends his article by arguing that it is impossible to draw any strong conclusions about the purpose of the Nash Papyrus, but points to the fact that a scribe at some point had the freedom to bring different passages together for his particular purpose.[445] So whilst this document may well show a later use of the *Shema*, it is difficult to know with certainty the purpose of the document, and difficult to use this to draw any firm conclusions about the original purpose, setting or context of Deut 6.

McBride uses the *Mishnah Tamid* 4:3-5:1 to support his argument for a liturgical tradition for 6:4-9, alongside other verses.[446] He writes that 'the liturgy associated with the daily Temple sacrifice included the reading of four biblical passages which are: the Decalogue, the *Shema*, Deuteronomy 11:13 (-21) and Numbers 15:37 (41).'[447] He also suggests that it was not just 6:4 that was used but possibly 6:4-9 as a whole.[448] McBride is right in showing that the *Mishnah Tamid* specifically mentions the recital of the *Shema* in two places, 4:3T and 5:1B within the Fifth Division, 'Holy Things'.[449] But,

---

[442] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 337.
[443] P. Foster, 'Why Did Matthew get the *Shema* wrong? A Study of Matthew 22:37' JBL 122, 2, 2003, p. 328.
[444] Foster, 'Why Did Matthew get the *Shema* wrong?' p. 328.
[445] Foster, 'Why Did Matthew get the *Shema* wrong?' p. 328.
[446] McBride, 'The Yoke of the Kingdom', p. 275.
[447] McBride, 'The Yoke of the Kingdom', p. 275.
[448] McBride, 'The Yoke of the Kingdom', p. 276.
[449] J. Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation*, (New Haven | London: Yale University Press, 1988) p. 869.

significantly, Foster challenges the assumption of the reliability of using this early evidence to assume a stable and widespread use of the *Shema* in the first century. He argues that the 'final form of the *Mishnah* cannot be dated before the beginning of the third century' and that although we know from this that there was a rabbinic practice of saying the *Shema* this may not be representative of the behaviour of the majority of Jews at this time.[450]

As with Foster, Schiffman also points to a certain degree of variety in practices up to the late Second Temple period, continuing to indicate that there was variety and flexibility in practice, and not an early established shared pattern to which everyone conformed. As with the phylacteries that have been discovered, Qumran *mezuzot* contain additional passages such as Exod 20.1-14 and Deut 6.6-18, the Ten Commandments. 'The presence of *mezuzot* with additional passages and in plene, sectarian orthography alongside *mezuzot* in accord with Pharisaic regulations demonstrates that both types of *mezuzot* were in use in Second Temple times.'[451]

What these discussions of both the Nash Papyrus and the *Mishnah Tamid* demonstrate is not the sure and certain support for an original liturgical context for the *Shema*, but rather an open process of adaptation in the development of the liturgical use of this verse. The Church of England liturgy for Holy Communion and Morning and Evening Prayer on a Sunday contains over 100 direct scriptural quotations, adaptations or allusions.[452] A specific example in an option given for the invitation to communion has the response, 'Lord, I am not worthy to receive you, but only say the word, and I shall be healed.'[453] This is clearly an adaptation of phrases from Luke's account of the healing of the Centurion's servant. This later use does not mean that that original setting of Luke 7:1-10 is itself liturgical, and shows that a later

[450] Foster, 'Why Did Matthew get the *Shema* wrong?' p. 322.
[451] L. H. Schiffman, 'Phylacteries and Mezuzot' in ed. L. H. Schiffman & J. C. VanderKam, *Encyclopaedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) p. 677.
[452] For further details of the use of scriptural quotations in the Eucharistic texts of Common Worship see P. Gooder & M. Perham, *Echoing the Word: The Bible in the Eucharist*, (London: SPCK, 2013).
[453] Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship*, p. 180.

liturgical reception of a text cannot automatically be used as evidence of an original liturgical context.

Conclusion to the use of 'liturgical' as a description of Deuteronomy 6 in wider scholarship

This exploration has shown that the term 'liturgical', or the idea of a liturgical context, has been used in relation to Deut 6 in largely undefined ways. There has been a lack of clarity and definition as to what specifically makes a text 'liturgical'. When an attempt has been made to provide criteria there is no reason provided as to why this identifies something as liturgical, or how this is connected with wider liturgical scholarship. Some scholars have tried to use the occurrence of single words, stereotyped phrases or didactic characteristics as an indication of liturgy. None of these, however, can be used by themselves to show that a text is liturgical, and again there is a lack of clarity as to why these particular words or phrases should be considered as liturgical. Similarly, the argument of a later liturgical reception cannot prove for certain that the original context of a verse is liturgical. What this shows is that the term 'liturgical', or the idea of a liturgical origin, becomes a hollow term that is filled by a scholar's own perception of what might make something liturgical. This makes it much less useful for biblical studies, and clearly demonstrates the need for coherent and clear criteria for showing whether a text demonstrates liturgical characteristics or not.

Gittoes' three strands

Having shown that the term 'liturgical' has been used in a broadly undefined way when discussing Deut 6, this next section will apply the liturgical hermeneutic detailed in Chapter Two to this text. Each of the three strands of the hermeneutical model will be examined in turn, demonstrating how each one is clearly present in the text, before the next section then explores the presence of the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation. This methodology particularly draws attention to the importance

of passing on the faith to the next generation and the stress that this chapter places on this instruction, and as such this will also be explored in detail.

The Importance of remembering

As stated in Chapter One, anamnesis, as a liturgical term, is understood as an active remembering that makes the past event a present reality.[454] This concept is important to both Christian worship and Israelite tradition,[455] as Thompson states, in biblical faith 'the remembrance of God's past mercies and delivering acts is fundamental.'[456]

There is no need for the root זכר to appear in these verses to know that the full focus is impressing upon the Israelites the vital importance of practices that will remind them, and their children, of the importance of remembering God's rescue of his people from Egypt. The use of the word לְבָנֶיךָ here is part of the deuteronomic rhetoric, seeking to draw each new generation to this moment of instruction and commitment to remember and to pass on the faith. Similarly, the use of second masculine singular verbal forms and second masculine singular pronominal suffixes continues this stress of the instruction 'to you' for each individual, as well as for the people as a whole.

The emphasis on the importance of remembering is also shown through the continuation of the imperatival force of the verb from v.4 to the verbs at the beginning of vv.6-9. The command is to put these practices into place, by making physical signs, in order to remember 'these words', which are the commandments mentioned in v.1. These verses seek to ensure that remembering becomes part of everyday life, marked by physical signs on an individual's person, their home and their gates. It is unclear, though, whether these instructions were intended to be interpreted literally or were rhetorical hyperbole.[457] But, what is important is that in Deuteronomy, as Reeder

[454] von Allmen, *Worship*, p. 34.
[455] Rienstra & Rienstra, *Worship Words*, p. 76.
[456] Thompson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 124.
[457] For more detail of this point see McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 142.

describes it, 'the covenant is preserved by being woven into the daily life of the family, firmly placing Israel's relationship with God at the very center of social existence.'[458] The means of remembering God's deliverance was intended to be an integral part of everyday life.

A significant example of remembering is the child's question in v.20, with the emphasis on sharing the people's history with the next generation. As Thompson states, this 'recitation' in response to the child's question is done through the story of redemption, and so 'belief in God was thus expressed not in terms of an abstract formulation, but in terms of God's dynamic activity.'[459] It is this repetition, argues Reeder that passes on the promise of God, given initially to their ancestors, to the next generations.[460] The community had a responsibility[461] to the younger generation to pass on their 'heritage',[462] and these verses show that it was to be deliberately and intentionally managed. This question has been adapted from the equivalent text in Exod 13:14, and this will be examined in more detail in the section exploring adaptation in the text below.

This exploration of the concept of memory within chapter 6 shows that not only is this clearly present in the text but is significant to the chapter's purpose and theology.

Liturgical collapse of time

The second of Gittoes' liturgical strands is the collapse of time, the pulling together of past, present and future. One of the most significant ways this is indicated in Deuteronomy is through the use of the word הַיּוֹם. A particularly common usage of this word within Deuteronomy is to convey actuality, seeking to ensure that 'the crucial importance of "today," the present, for the

[458] C. A. Reeder, *The Enemy in the Household: Family Violence in Deuteronomy and Beyond*, (Baker Academic: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2012) p. 20.
[459] Thompson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 126.
[460] Reeder, *The Enemy in the Household*, p. 51.
[461] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 325.
[462] Welch, 'The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter vi', p. 550.

future is revealed'.[463] This connection between different time frames, and the significance that one point of time has for another, is frequently carried by this word throughout the text.

> *yôm* as *nomen regens* can take on an historical aspect in the context of an attributive *nomen rectum*: one might speak, for example, of "the day that the LORD spoke to you at Horeb out of the midst of the fire" (Dt. 4:15) or "the day when you came out of the land of Egypt" (Dt. 16:3; to be "remembered" [*zāḵar*] cultically; cf. the frequent use of actualizing *hayyôm* Deuteronomy). In this way special times were indicated that had important (transforming) significance for the life of the people; what was important, however, was not the actual point in time, but the event recorded.[464]

This word is used three times in Deut 6 (vv.6, 24 twice, one of which is plural). It is interesting that commentators do not appear to comment on the use of הַיּוֹם in either of these two verses, though understandably there is much within these and surrounding verses that is also significant to discuss. This liturgical reading of the text is, therefore, highlighting an important aspect of the text that has been regularly passed over.

Both vv.6 and 24 contain synonyms for 'law' (הַדְּבָרִים v.6; הַחֻקִּים v. 24) a central focus within Deuteronomy, and both have a future orientation, although this is more explicit in v.24. By using the word הַיּוֹם the rhetorical effect draws current and future readers or hearers into recognising both the significance of remembering and obeying the commandments into the future, but also of committing to them at the present moment. The 'present moment', though, is not just the present of those hearing or reading these words, but becomes fused with the original 'present moment' of the narrative setting, of Moses addressing the Israelites on the cusp of entry into the land.

Nelson writes that vv.2-3 move 'Yahweh's past act of commanding (v.1) to the present discourse of Moses and on to the extended time and wonderful

---

[463] M. Sæbø 'יוֹם *yôm*' in ed. G J Botterweck and H. Ringgren, trans D. E. Green *TDOT* vol. VI (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1990) p. 26.
[464] Sæbø, 'יוֹם *yôm*', p. 30.

locale of Israel's obedience. Reference to the land and to future generations forges a rhetorical connection to those reading the book.'[465] In other words the idea of 'collapsing time' is an intentional technique drawing the timeframe of each successive reader into dialogue with the timeframe of the narrative. Similarly, McBride notes that the 'opening words of Deuteronomy 6:4 are a summons to those who would be Israel in any age'.[466] He goes on to state that this is achieved through the idea of hearing as 'an act of initiation and assent'.[467] This 'active hearing' continues to form the community of not only those who heard the original words and those who will hear in the future. Lundbom too, argues that מָחָר, although literally meaning 'tomorrow', is also used to refer to the distant future, supporting this by reference to Exod 13:14, Josh. 4:6, 21; 22:24, 27-28.[468] A key part of the rhetorical strategy of this chapter, then, is this 'collapse of time' in order to draw each new generation into the world of this text.

McConville also shows the way in which the language of the final few verses of this chapter draws together the past, present and future. For example, the future-orientated words in vv.20, 24 focus on the life to come in the land,[469] these 'verses extend the thought, establishing a connection between the past (exodus), and the future (possession of the land).'[470] This connection is also emphasised by the way in which those addressed are both simultaneously those who were delivered from Egypt, those who were given the law, and those who will go on to live out the law in the new land.

Bruckner points to the importance of keeping the commandments of God, stating that one 'cannot overestimate the centrality of the memory of the Exodus and the consolidation and formation of a new sociality created in

[465] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 88.
[466] McBride, 'The Yoke of the Kingdom', p. 291.
[467] McBride, 'The Yoke of the Kingdom', p. 291.
[468] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 324.
[469] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 139.
[470] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 144.

Israel through the giving of the Torah (instruction).'[471] As Bruckner articulates, the past is remembered but crucially is done so purposefully, in order to shape and form the community and to cultivate obedience to God's instructions and commandments. Bruckner, within his specific context of writing about a whole and healthy person, draws out the stress placed on the way that remembering past choices forms 'a habit that shapes one's own life decisions. It calls one to invest one's heart-mind in the tradition of good choice by remembering God's acts of deliverance and rehearsing the choices of the past.'[472] Bruckner's work here, although not his principal aim, also demonstrates the close connection between this liturgical strand and that of the connection between worship and mission.

Woods follows Friedman in arguing that v.5 should be translated as 'and you *shall* love the Lord your God',[473] rather than simply 'love the Lord your God'.[474]

> This translation shows how the Hebrew text continues the force of the opening imperative (or command) hear at the beginning of verse 4, and links that to the command to love God in this verse. Further, the phrase 'and you shall love' is the first of seven perfect verbs (all 2ms) prefaced with and, all with imperative force, linking verses 5-9. The call to love God is the appropriate response to all that verse 4 implies about the uniqueness of Yahweh himself, as this relates to Israel, both past, present and future.[475]

As Woods makes clear, the rhetorical force of this passage draws these three time-frames together. His work, as with that of Bruckner's, shows how this collapsing of time is closely connected with what was expected of Israel not only in terms of worship but also in diverse areas of their lives as they lived out their identity. This third liturgical strand will now be explored in detail.

---

[471] J. K. Bruckner, 'A Theological Description of Human Wholeness in Deut 6' in Ex Auditu vol. 21 2005, pp. 6-7
[472] Bruckner, 'A Theological Description', p. 8.
[473] italics mine.
[474] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 136.
[475] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 136.

The connection between worship and mission

The third liturgical strand identifies the vital connection made between the community's worship and the way they are to live. In Deut 6 there is a particular focus and emphasis on compelling the people to continue to fear the Lord and follow his commandments. As described in Chapter Two, the meaning of the word mission follows Wright's model, understood as the purpose and function of the people of God, rather than proselytising.[476] What is being explored in particular is the connection between the worship of the community and the way they were to live out their 'mission'.

Throughout Deut 6 the memory of rescue from slavery in Egypt is used as a continual repeated refrain underpinning the vital importance for Israel to live as God is instructing them. As Robson puts it, the Exodus is 'the root both of profound theology and of moral obligation.'[477] It is from this fundamental starting point that Israel discovers its identity and its responsibility, and these are inextricably linked. As Israel is reminded of their identity as slaves redeemed by God, so they are to worship him and live their lives according to the commandments that he is giving to them through Moses. If they live in this way, then they will receive God's blessing and, significantly, the nations around them will observe and learn about Yahweh through both their worship and their social and communal ethic.

The repetition of the exodus theme, however, is not just historically informative, but is used to influence Israel's behaviour,[478] particularly in relation to the treatment of the poorest and most vulnerable in society. As Nelson observes, the call to hear in v.4 'seeks to evoke both attentiveness and obedient response: hear that you may respond (cf. 20:3-4; 27:9-10).'[479] Lapsley, also, points to the way in which the emotional memory of the Israelites is stirred, 'out of this affective response will arise love for the

[476] Wright, 'Mission as a Matrix for Hermeneutics and Biblical Theology', p. 137.
[477] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, pp. 35, 36.
[478] Robson, *Honey from the Rock,* p. 64.
[479] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 91.

stranger, which then takes form in practical action.'[480] It is their memory of slavery in Egypt that prompts them to treat rightly the stranger amongst them. Bruckner argues that this connection between worship and mission is central to the wider Old Testament, as can be demonstrated through prophetic outrage when 'the ethics of daily action and worship become separated in Israel'.[481]

The whole of life was drawn into the orbit of worship, with different aspects of daily work, as well as cultic practices, showing the strong connection in Deuteronomy between the worshipping life of the community and the practical ethic through which they were to live. 'Again, as elsewhere, each generation is to teach the next. YHWH did not intend the covenant to be treated as esoteric doctrine, but to become the basis of living life.'[482] Weinfeld observes that vv.20-25 are not only related to the Passover but call for observation of the law as a whole, and so 'education in Deuteronomy is not linked to Passover alone but is a process going on throughout the year.'[483]

Internal structure of Deut 6

The structure of this chapter intentionally emphasises this crucial link between worshipping God and following his commandments. The structure and rhetorical devices are employed to insist that worship and service are fundamental to the future and identity of the people. This emphasis is brought about through repetition and development, whilst the chapter as a whole is unified by an inclusio that demonstrates these. V.1 contains the phrase וְזֹאת הַמִּצְוָה this is repeated in v.25, but in this second verse it is no longer simply just *this* commandment, but has become אֶת־כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת. This repetition is sometimes missed in translation as some opt for 'these' rather than 'this' in v.1, influenced no doubt by the plural of statutes and

[480] J. E. Lapsley, 'Feeling our way: Love for God in Deuteronomy' in Catholic Bible Quarterly, vol. 65, no. 3 July 2003, p. 363.
[481] Bruckner, 'A Theological Description', p. 13.
[482] M. E. Biddle, *Deuteronomy*, Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary (Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys, 2003) p. 124.
[483] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, p. 357.

judgements, and some, for example the NIV, use ‘law’ rather than ‘commandment’ in v.25. Keeping the same words ‘this’ and ‘commandment’ in English helps to set out the parameters of the inclusio.

This repetition with development then carries on into vv.2 and 24. Both contain a Qal version of the verb יראּ and point to the blessings of long life that this obedience will bring. So, in v.2 the phrase כָּל יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ occurs, but in v.24 it is כָּל־הַיָּמִים לְחַיֹּתֵנוּ. This repetition is also frequently missed in translation as rendering the repetition in v.24 into English is difficult. There is also an important rhetorical transition from a 2MS suffix in v.2 to a 1CP suffix in v.24. In an obvious way, this change in v.24 occurs because this verse is part of the recorded speech of what will be said in response to the child's question, and therefore naturally becomes ‘us’ rather than ‘you’. But this is also an important rhetorical development in the repetition and development. When the themes of blessing due to obedience are returned to in vv.24-25, it is no longer a simple, didactic instruction from Moses to the people, but has become a dynamic ‘*we* will keep the commandments’ just as God ‘has commanded *us*’. Also this is not simply repetition of a theme, but throughout the chapter when the theme returns in the second half it is an active encouragement ‘to do’, not simply an exhortation to hear. When considering the added dimension of later readers and hearers, it is again an example of Deuteronomy’s urgent motivational rhetoric that draws each new generation to the point of decision and commitment.

The rest of the chapter can be seen as continuing this repeated development, with vv.3-6 introducing a theme that is developed in vv.17-19, and then the theme of vv.7-9 developed in vv.21-25. The partnered verses 3-6 and 17-19 are focused on keeping the commandments so that life will go well in the land. There is a distinct transition from the first section where the verbs are ‘hear’, ‘observe’, ‘increase mightily’, ‘hear’, ‘love’ and ‘be’. These, in general, give a passive impression, with a focus on hearing and observing. This creates a particular contrast to the verbs in vv.17-19 when the concept of keeping the

commandments, and long life in the land return. The verbs here are 'do', 'come', 'dwell' and 'drive out', indicating more action than passive receiving, so whilst the theme is returned to, there is again a greater emphasis on active engagement. This intensity, compelling the people to follow the commandments, is demonstrated through the construction תִּשְׁמְרוּן שָׁמוֹר which in Deuteronomy is unique to 6:17.[484]

This then gives a middle section of vv. 10-16 that describes the blessings that God will give to the people if they are obedient, and also the warnings not to turn away from following God. This concept of blessings partnered with warnings is then developed in more detail in later chapters of Deuteronomy. Through this reading, v.13 becomes the central verse of 10-16, and this is highly significant because it is the only other verse in the chapter that uses the word יראּ besides vv.2 and 24. The focus of v.13 is on both worshipping and serving God, the two themes that are stressed as being connected in this liturgical strand. So at the beginning, centre and end of the chapter is a focus on worshipping God and living according to the law.

This pattern of repeating a theme that then puts into practice what has been introduced in the earlier paired verses continues in vv.7-9 and vv.21-25. Unlike vv.3-6, vv.7-9 have a more active dimension, but the repetition of theme from this verses to vv.21-25 transitions not from passive to active, but from general instruction to something much more specific. In vv.7-9 the instruction is to teach the commandments to your children, to speak about them, to bind them as a sign and to write them on your doorposts and gates. When this theme of instruction returns in v.21, it is no longer a general encouragement to teach, but a direction on how this instruction is to be carried, with specific words provided. These words contain a brief history of the people's rescue from slavery in Egypt and then, as noted above, a repetition of the themes of worshipping God and living according to his commandments. Through this inclusion of repetition and development in this

[484] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 139.

chapter is a movement from passive to active and from general instruction to specific. This is used to reinforce the particular deuteronomic themes of hearing the law, committing to keeping the law and ensuring that it is passed on to the next generation.

Passing on the faith

This chapter places great significance and emphasis on the importance of passing on the faith to the next generation.

> Thus in 6:1 we have Moses reporting that the commandments he is about to recount are those that Yahweh had commanded him to teach (*lmd*) the people, with the clear intention that this teaching should be passed on as the necessary precondition to their children's continued enjoyment of life in the land.[485]

Teaching the commandments to the next generation ensures that the covenant relationship with God is continued.[486] As with the importance of the child's question, discussed above, vital to this strand of worship and mission is the importance of passing on the faith to the next generation. Through the inclusio outlined above, the text highlights the urgency of ensuring that passing on the faith to the next generation is understood as important and then provides instruction as to how this should happen. As Wright states, the text 'bends every rhetorical, literary, emotional, and moral skill to the task of equipping and motivating God's people to live for the purposes of God in each generation.'[487] What is also apparent is that the liturgical strands of the hermeneutic are present within this rhetorical urgency. As Fishbane describes is this insistence 'anticipates the future and the responsibility to guide succeeding generations towards participation in the legacy of the communal past.'[488] Although not the point that he is making, his analysis shows the inter-relation between the liturgical collapse of time and the importance of worship and mission. The focus of

---

[485] D. G. Firth, 'Passing on the Faith in Deuteronomy' in ed. D. G. Firth & P. S. Johnston, *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, (Nottingham: IVP, 2012), p. 162.
[486] McKenzie, 'The Theological Legacy of Deuteronomy', p. 38.
[487] Wright, *Deuteronomy*, p. 8.
[488] M. Fishbane, *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts*, (New York: Schoken Books, 1979) p. 80.

Deuteronomy's teaching is that Israel will learn to fear the Lord. This central theme has a forward-looking cast, in that fear of the Lord is directly related to God's blessing in the future. Learning to fear God leads to making right choices, leading to God's blessing.[489]

Miller explores the importance of the child's question in this chapter in a helpful article, in which he argues that teaching the children is central to the character of Deuteronomy.[490] He states this is seen through the combination in the text of both polity and instruction,[491] that the text not only creates a constitution for the identity of the people of God, but also stressing the need and means for this to be passed on. But, significantly, this is not simply about the learning the societal rules and regulations, but this is learning 'the *story behind the rules*, out of which they come and on which they are grounded.'[492] Miller also stresses that this instruction is not simply academic, but is fundamentally contextual and practical. It arises from participation in and observation of the regular community practices, which provoke the question of 'why?'.[493] Similarly, the focus of Welch's short article on the purpose of Deut 6 is on the importance of educating the next generation in the faith of Israel, arguing that if anything the chapter looks more like an introduction to 'a system of education, than to a statement of the law.'[494] As Welch also describes, by being trained according to the instructions in Deut 6, they discover the nature of the God that they worship and are reminded of their identity as those rescued from slavery in Egypt.[495] This ensures a strong connection is made between the story that shapes the community through passing on the faith to the next generation and their worship of God.

---

[489] P. D. Miller, 'That the Children May Know: Children in Deuteronomy', in gen. ed. M. J. Bunge, *The Child in the Bible*, (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge, 2008, pp. 53-54.
[490] Miller, 'That the Children May Know', p. 45.
[491] Miller, 'That the Children May Know', p. 46.
[492] Miller, 'That the Children May Know', p. 50.
[493] Miller, 'That the Children May Know', pp. 51-52.
[494] Welch, 'The Purpose of Deuteronomy', p. 551.
[495] Welch, 'The Purpose of Deuteronomy', p. 550.

It is also clear that the presence of continuity, adaptation and innovation is also woven into the description of passing on the faith. For example, Firth, in his discussion of how Deuteronomy is orientated towards passing on the faith, uses Speech Act theory, describing Moses' speech as the 'illocutionary act' with the associated perlocution[496] being different for each subsequent generation.[497] This makes a clear connection between the inbuilt aim of the deuteronomic text to ensure that the covenant faith is continually communicated and the adaptive nature of the text, highlighted through this liturgical reading. It terms of adaptation, it is also interesting to note that within the VTE there are instructions about educating the family in the ways of the treaty.[498] In borrowing from the treaty tradition, Deuteronomy may well be both continuing and adapting this practice of generational education. Continuity, adaptation and innovation will be explored more fully in the following section.

Conclusion to Gittoes' three strands

Examining Deut 6 through each of the three liturgical strands in turn shows the presence of the importance of remembering, the liturgical collapse of time and the connection between worship and mission, and that they are clearly significant features of the text. Applying a rigorous liturgical hermeneutic to the text shows that previous scholars' assumptions about the liturgical nature of Deut 6 were correct, but provides the means to articulate why this is so. Not only that, but this reading has drawn attention to aspects of Deut 6 that have either been previously overlooked, or just unnoticed as in the case of the inclusio structure detailed in the section on worship and mission.

---

[496] Illocution being an utterance that is intended by the originator to bring about an effect, perlocution being the effect an utterance has on the hearer. W. R. Tate, *Handbook for Biblical Interpretation: An Essential Guide to Methods, Terms, and Concepts* 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2012) pp. 207, 316.
[497] Firth, 'Passing on the Faith', p. 159.
[498] R. Frankena, 'Vassal-treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy' in *OTS* vol. 14, 1965, p. 142.

This reading has also drawn attention to the presence of adaptation within the text, firstly through the adaptation of the child's question in Exodus, moving the focus away from the Passover ritual and onto the meaning of the law and commandments. Secondly, through the adaptation of the way in which the VTE sets out instruction for passing on teaching to the next generation. This emphasis on passing on the faith is integral to the process of continuity, adaptation and innovation, and this has an important contribution to make to the paradigm that is developed from this work and taken back to the original question.

Continuity, adaptation and innovation in Deuteronomy 6

The previous section provided a clear definition of liturgy through the use of the liturgical hermeneutic and showed that when using the three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic it can be shown clearly that this chapter is liturgical. Having demonstrated that the text is liturgical, this next section will now explore the ways in which the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation are present in the text. These important points will be drawn into the concluding chapter as part of the paradigm formed in response to the initial question.

Continuity

There are many ways in which Deut 6 demonstrates clear continuity with the wider Pentateuch. One way, for example, is the continuity of reference to the law and commandments. In Exod 19:3, 6 and Lev 27:34, God gives the law first to Moses so that he can then pass it on to the rest of the people, similarly in Exod 24:12 Moses is told that what is written is for the people's instruction. Exodus does recount that Moses then passes on the teaching to the people, e.g. Exod 19:7. Interestingly the focus is on the leaders of the people here whereas in Deuteronomy the focus is instead on the whole gathered

community, for example Deut 4 addresses the people as a whole and there is no mention of leaders, elders or priests being set apart to hear the law first. Although, as was mentioned, Exodus states that Moses passed on the teaching, this is mentioned but not in detail, whereas in Deuteronomy this is the primary focus. It is as if Deuteronomy is the record of the teaching that is mentioned in Exodus.

Several scholars point to the echoes of the Decalogue that appear in Deut 6 as it follows on from the Decalogue in Deut 5, in particular the way in which the chapter expands on the first two commandments.[499] Deut 6:13 emphasises the importance of God's name as was set out in Deut 5:11 and Exod 20:7. Although in Deut 6:13 it is set out as a positive instruction to 'swear in God's name' rather than the earlier prohibition of not taking God's name in vain. Deut 6:14 repeats the phrase אֱלֹהִים אַחֵרִים to warn of the dangers of turning away from Yahweh, expanding what is in Deut 5:7 and Exod 20:3 by adding that they are not to follow the gods of the peoples around them. There is also a repeat of the description of God as a 'jealous God' with a repetition of the phrase אֵל קַנָּה from Deut 5:9[500] and Exod 20:5.

Further points of continuity arise out of repeated words and phrases that make direct connections with what narratively precedes the point at which the people are about to cross over to into the land. For example, reference to the land itself as a promise from God to their ancestors in Deut 6:10 is also mentioned in Gen 26:3; 50:24; Exod 13:5, 11; 32:13; 33:1; Num 14:23; 32:11. Alongside the mention of the land is the reference to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Deut 10, which clearly refers back to these narratives in Genesis.

Deut 6:16 makes reference to the incident at Massah, where the people tested God. This is also returned to again in Deut 9:22; 33:8. This incident is

[499] See for example McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 139. For a recent summary of this discussion see J. H. Walton, 'The Decalogue Structure of the Deuteronomic Law', in ed. D. G. Firth and P. S. Johnston, *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2012) pp. 93-117.
[500] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 138.

recorded in more detail in Exod 17:1-7, and is used here in Deuteronomy as a warning to the people to do this again. The fact that this is only a passing reference and not the story in detail strongly suggests that the writer or editor assumed that the audience would be familiar with the wider details. Deut 6:8 mentions the use of phylacteries, also mentioned in Exod 13:9, but this is extended by the introduction of the instruction also to write the commandments on the door posts of their houses and their gates. This demonstrates the way in which the liturgical characteristics are inter-related as a point of continuity also becomes a point of innovation at the same time, and also how innovation often develops out of something pre-existent.

Adaptation

A significant aspect of adaptation is the way the theme of 'love' has been taken up from the vassal treaty documents. This is explored in detail in the major section below examining the extent to which it is possible to 'command' love.

A further example of adaptation is seen through the similarities and differences between the child's question here and also in Exod 13:14.[501] The question in Deut 6 is about the importance of the law, a major focus within the book, rather than the specifics of ritual practice, a concept to which Deuteronomy gives little attention. Fuhrmann, whilst drawing attention to these differences argues that the law in Deuteronomy functions in the same way as the Passover does in Exodus, as 'both are based in Yahweh's action of delivering the people from Egypt.'[502] This is not an unreasonable comparison, but does not alter the fact that the object of the question and the content of the reply has been changed. As Weinfeld argues, the writer of this passage has 'transformed a collocution attached to a ritual ceremony into a liturgical

[501] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 144; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 93-94; Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 139; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, pp. 329-30.
[502] Fuhrmann, 'Deuteronomy 6-8 and the history of interpretation, p. 59.

oration irrelevant to the ceremony.'[503] This is clearly a significant adaptation from the Exodus context.

The similarity between the Exodus and Deuteronomy passages has led some scholars to argue that the question in Exodus is a deuteronomic insertion, for example Childs who assigns Exod 12:24-27a and 13:3-16 to D, although acknowledging that it is not easy to assign sources in 12:1-13:16.[504] Dozeman points to both the Mosaic presentation of teaching in 12:21-27[505] and a similarity of style between these verses and parts of Deuteronomy and the deuteronomistic history[506] as supporting a D source. Similarly, Meyers points to the similarity of Exod 12:24-26 to Deut 6:20 and the use of 'deuteronomic language' in support of this argument.[507] Meyers does not specify what it is about the language in Exod 12:24-26 that is especially 'deuteronomic', and neither she nor Dozeman give any space to consider whether there could be a third, external source from which both Exodus and Deuteronomy are drawing.[508]

Noth argues that both 12:24-27a and 13:1-16 are deuteronomistic insertions, basing this on the use of the singular in otherwise plural passages.[509] But, as Propp states, whilst the argument for a D source insertion does appear persuasive initially, there are still questions that arise. For example, the location of the D material within E material and a difference in style and substance from Deuteronomy, for example, 'the concept of *Pesaḥ* in 12:21-23, 25-27 differs sharply from Deut 16:2-8'.[510] Lohfink too argues that Exod 13:3-16 in particular 'is not strictly Deuteronomic', but 'proto-

[503] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 34-35.
[504] B. S. Childs, *Exodus*, (SCM Press: London, 1974) p. 184.
[505] T. B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, Eerdmans Critical Commentary (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge, 2009) p. 272.
[506] Dozeman, *Exodus*, p. 274.
[507] C. Meyers, *Exodus*, The New Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) p. 98.
[508] W. H. C. Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, The Anchor Bible (Doubleday: New York, New York, 1999) p. 377.
[509] M. Noth, *Exodus*, trans J. S. Bowden (SCM Press: London, 1962) pp. 97-98; 101.
[510] Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, p. 376.

deuteronomistic'.[511] Durham, following Lohfink's argument here, also adds that assuming a D insertion is to suggest a late 'date for material that must obviously have been extant and in active use much earlier.'[512]

Asking whether these verses are a deuteronomic insertion into the Exodus text is, however, to ask the wrong question. What is more likely is a wider catechetical tradition from which both of these passages are drawing.[513] Soggin points to the differences in style to support the argument for this shared tradition.

> Dass es sich aber um Varianten einer einzigen Formel handelt, dürfte klar sein Jos. xxii 24 zeigt, wie sich eine derartige Bildung in ganz anderem Zusammenhang erhalten, und unter durchaus verschiedenen Umständen einen neuen Gebrauch finden konnte.[514]

By drawing Josh 22:24 into this discussion, Soggin points to the five similar uses of a 'child-father' question and response to defend an argument for variations on a shared tradition. What this also shows is an openness to adaptation and innovation within what appears to be a broadly liturgical setting. Significantly this then relates to the adaptation that is seen in the examination between the Exodus father-son question and the Deuteronomy adaptation thereof. This might well indicate that education is a significant motivating factor in the liturgical adaptation of material throughout this chapter, and also throughout Deuteronomy as a whole.

Repeated rhetorical devices through the text draw each generation to commit itself to the law, whilst at the same time ensures that they are remembered and communicated to the following generation. This question here is an example of this. Dozeman draws a link between the catechetical pattern of question and answer as seen here in both passages with the liturgical

---

[511] N. Lohfink *Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungs-fragen zu Dtn 5-11*, (Rome: E Pontifico Instituto Biblico, 1963) p. 121.
[512] J. I Durham, *Exodus*, Word Biblical Commentary, (Thomas Nelson: Nashville, Tennessee, 1987) p. 163.
[513] Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, p. 377. Durham, *Exodus*, pp. 176-77. J. A. Soggin, 'Kultatiologische Sagen und Katechese im Hexateuch' VT 10 1960, p. 345.
[514] Soggin, 'Kultatiologische Sagen und Katechese im Hexateuch', p. 324.

principles of the Eucharist, describing it too as 'an *anamnesis*, an activation of memory to participate in a past event of salvation.'[515] Captured in this adaptation of the catechetical question is not only the imperative to remember, but also the connection between what has happened and what will happen, demonstrating the inter-relation between continuity, adaptation and innovation.

Innovation

Although mentioned above as an adaptation from Treaty language, it is also important to highlight that fact that Deuteronomy is unique in the way it frames the relationship between God and his people in terms of love. This theme is more dominant in Deuteronomy than any other Old Testament book,[516] and further, Deuteronomy is the first book of the Pentateuch to introduce the concept of loving God.[517] The compulsion on the people to love God is a theme that runs throughout the book, both in the Deuteronomic Law Code and in the framing chapters around it.[518] This is an important and significant theme. As such it will be explored in more detail in the section below which argues that a liturgical reading of this chapter makes a significant contribution in the on-going debate as to whether it is possible to command 'love' or not.

As was mentioned above in the discussion on 'Continuity', the use of phylacteries is something that is also noted in Exod 13:9, but Deut 6 expands on the idea of placing symbols on the person and introduces the idea of placing symbols on doorposts and gates. This will only be possible once the people have entered and settled in the Promised Land and shows the way in which a pre-existent instruction is now being used as a basis for a new

[515] Dozeman, *Exodus,* p. 277.
[516] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 310; Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 63.
[517] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 77.
[518] 5:10; 7:9; 10:12; 11:1, 13, 22; 13:3; 19:9; 30:6, 16, 20.

instruction that will only make sense in the new social setting in which the people will find themselves once settled.

Keeping the law is a vital focus for Deuteronomy. The section on remembering showed the way in which themes of remembering and forgetting are used to emphasise the importance of keeping the law. The urgency of ensuring this is communicated can be seen in a unique construction in 6:17, שָׁמוֹר תִּשְׁמְרוּן.[519] This phrase does not occur anywhere else in the Old Testament, other than Deut 11:22, which is not surprising giving that Deut 11 picks up many of the themes, concepts and phrases from Deut 6, reinforcing them before the beginning of Deuteronomic Law Code in Deut 12.

Another phrase unique in its construction in comparison with the wider Old Testament is 6:4, and as noted above, this lack of similarity to other texts is one reason that translation is more complex.

Conclusion to continuity, adaptation and innovation

This section has explored the presence of the liturgical characteristics continuity, adaptation and innovation. The points that have been brought out in this section highlight the focus in Deuteronomy that is placed on keeping the law and commandments, the importance of passing on the faith to the next generation, and introducing the aspect of loving God into the covenant relationship between people and God. The next section will now explore the important theme of love in more detail.

Can love be commanded? How does a liturgical reading contribute to this important and ongoing discussion?

[519] See also, Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 139.

An important discussion arising from scholarship on Deut 6 is the interpretation of vv.4-6 and the crucial question of whether or not it is possible to command an emotion such as love. Moran has written a significant article on this question and draws on the ANE treaty tradition to support his argument which states that, like the treaty tradition, 'love' is to be understood in a non-emotional way and therefore it is entirely possible for it to be commanded or required. This argument assumes that Deut 6 is simply lifting directly from the treaty tradition and using the concept without adaptation. This section will detail Moran's argument, showing the strengths and weaknesses, as well as how other scholars have interacted with this. It will then explore the background of the treaty tradition, examining the text for other understandings of the word אהב. This will show that there is support for arguing that Deuteronomy does in fact adapt the treaty tradition, using it for its own theological purposes. A liturgical reading of the text then provides a coherent way of responding to Moran's argument, acknowledging the strengths but recognising the weaknesses, and allowing for a more strongly supported defence of interpreting אהב as a word that does contain emotional and affective connotations.

Moran

Moran's article[520] outlining the influence of ANE treaty documents on the concept of love in Deuteronomy is a significant study, with a large influence on subsequent scholarship. He aims to challenge the broad consensus, as was, that argued for Deuteronomy's dependence on Hosea in its understanding and use of the word love, proposing as an alternative a reliance on ANE treaty documents.

Moran states that there are fundamental differences between Hosea and Deuteronomy, arguing that Hosea never mentions Israel's love for Yahweh, whereas in Deuteronomy 'it epitomizes the book's central preoccupation,

[520] W. L. Moran, 'The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy' in Catholic Bible Quarterly 1963, vol. 25, issue 1, pp. 77-87.

namely, observance of the Law.'[521] He argues further that in Hosea, God's love for Israel is portrayed both through the image of love of a husband for his wife (Hos 3:1), and love of a father for his son (Hos 11:1). In contrast this imagery is absent in Deuteronomy, and that while there is a mention of the father-son relationship in the book there is no connection between this and love, and further there is no 'trace' of any marriage analogy.[522] In this, Moran is arguing against von Rad who states that the love of Yahweh for Israel is portrayed in Deuteronomy as the love of a father for his son. The two examples von Rad provides to support his argument are, however, not particularly convincing. 14:1 simply describes the people as sons of Yahweh and 8:5 describes the discipline of Yahweh to his people as analogous to that of a man with his son.[523] Given that neither of these verses use the word אהב either, Moran is right to question the strength of von Rad's assertion here.

Several scholars also, like Moran, argue for an interpretation of אהב that is less to do with emotion and more to do with obligation. For example, McBride states that love is neither an emotion to strive for, a 'lofty spiritual ideal' nor a 'mystical exercise in piety', and argues instead that it is both a duty and expectation of Israel towards God.[524] Similarly Lundbom, who specifically cites Moran, argues in favour of the parallel between Deuteronomy's articulation of love between Israel and God, and that of ANE vassal treaties.[525]

Bascom continues Moran's argument that the Deuteronomic use of the word אהב refers to loyalty,[526] arguing that loyalty can be commanded but 'how

[521] Moran, 'The Ancient Near Eastern Background', p. 77.
[522] Moran, 'The Ancient Near Eastern Background', pp. 77-8.
[523] G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology: Volume One, The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*, trans. D. Stalker, (Edinburgh | London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962) p. 224
[524] McBride, 'The Yoke of the Kingdom', p. 298.
[525] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 310.
[526] R. A. Bascom, 'Adaptable for Translation: Deuteronomy 6:5 in the Synoptic Gospels and beyond' in ed. R. D. Weis & D. M. Carr, *A gift of God in due season: Essays on Scripture and Community in Honour of J. A. Sanders*, JSOTSup 225 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) p. 169.

does one command a feeling?'[527] Bascom uses the three variant Gospel readings of Deut 6:5 to recover what he argues is the meaning of the original verse. He proposes a 'functional equivalence translation' rather than the more popular 'word for word' approach as he argues that the latter results in a 'sentimental or emotional' reading of the verse whereas the former 'focuses on loyalty and obedience'.[528] He also notes that some 'textual witnesses for the Septuagint of 6:5 have διανοια (mind) instead of καρδια (heart) for the first term of the list.'[529] This, he argues, continues to lend support for a 'non-emotional' reading of the text.

Bascom also argues that in 6:5, מאד should be translated as an adverb rather than a noun. 'Thus for the last part "and do it as strongly / competently as you can" may be closer to the force intended.'[530] This could then mean that the first two words are being used as a way of encapsulating the whole of a person, with the third being an adverb, e.g. the 'whole of oneself' is to do this 'strongly'. Moberly, however argues against this interpretation. He cites the repetition of these words from Deut 6:5 in 2 Kgs 23:25, arguing that in this latter verse מאד is interpreted as a noun as it is referring to Josiah's 'strength' in carrying out the reforms that have taken place.[531] Given that the almost exact repetition of the words is likely to be a deliberate citation in 2 Kgs to further Josiah's reputation in showing him as having lived up to this high example, it is more than likely that the phrase is taken to mean the same in both instances. Moberly is right in placing this verse within the context of Josiah's completion of the reforms, but this in itself does not definitively prove that the word could not be an adverb, as Josiah clearly carried out the

[527] Bascom, 'Adaptable for Translation', p. 169.
[528] Bascom, 'Adaptable for Translation', p. 167.
[529] Bascom, 'Adaptable for translation', p. 176.
[530] Bascom, 'Adaptable for translation', pp. 173-4.
[531] footnote R. W. L. Moberly, 'Toward an Interpretation of the Shema' in ed. C. Seitz & K. Greene-McCreight, *Theological Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Brevard S. Childs*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1999) p. 126.

reforms 'competently' or 'strongly'. This point will be explored in more detail below.

Vang, like Moran, assesses the long-held view of movement from Hosea to Deuteronomy specifically in terms of love, noting that almost two-thirds of the occurrences of אהב in the Old Testament are in either Hosea or Deuteronomy.[532] He states that God's love for his people Israel is one 'of the strongest thematic parallels' between Hosea and Deuteronomy.[533] But unlike Moran, rather than arguing that there is no connection, he argues instead that the flow of influence actually goes from Deuteronomy to Hosea. He states that the lack of a marriage metaphor in Deuteronomy supports this direction of influence, arguing that Deuteronomy would not have removed all trace of marriage metaphors if it had been influenced by Hosea.[534] It is possible that Hosea was influenced by Deuteronomy in terms of the focus on love, and this would account for both the predominant occurrences of the word being in either of the two texts and the lack of love imagery in Deuteronomy. What this does not provide, however, for this particular discussion is any insight on whether אהב in Deuteronomy should be understood as an emotional term or not. Further, if Deuteronomy is not borrowing from Hosea, then this could well lend support to the argument that Deuteronomy has borrowed the term from the treaty tradition.

Interestingly, having dismissed any borrowing from Hosea or from marriage-analogies, Moran argues further that Deuteronomy's depiction of love, in borrowing from a treaty source, has nothing to do with the book's originality. 'It is doubtless better accounted for if no radical transformation need be supposed'.[535] This is a fundamental flaw in his argument. At the beginning of the paper, Moran highlights the general consensus of Deuteronomy's

[532] C. Vang, 'God's Love According to Hosea and Deuteronomy: A Prophetic Reworking of a Deuteronomic Concept?' in TynBul 62.2, 2011, p. 174.
[533] Vang, 'God's Love According to Hosea and Deuteronomy', p. 173.
[534] Vang, 'God's Love According to Hosea and Deuteronomy p. 193.
[535] Moran, 'Ancient Near Eastern Background', p. 78.

distinctiveness and originality,[536] but this then becomes the very thing he states is not present in Deuteronomy's depiction of love. The way in which the treaty pattern has been adapted in Deuteronomy will be examined in more detail below.

Lapsley

Lapsley writes an important article in this debate which questions Moran's conclusions. She acknowledges that both Olson and Brueggemann assert that love for God in Deuteronomy is also emotional, but argues that 'these claims remain largely at the level of intuition and assertion, not argument.'[537] Lapsley, however, sets out to explore Moran's argument and demonstrate that it is not as strong as has been previously supposed, but has remained relatively unchallenged.[538] Whilst not denying the presence of the treaty form as an influence on the text, Lapsley argues that this does not mean an identical use of the word from one context to the other.[539] Instead, she argues that the immediate context of other uses of אהב in Deuteronomy as, for example, expressing God's love for Israel have not been fully explored. [540] Lapsley goes on to highlight that implicit within 'Moran's argument, and made explicit by later interpreters drawing on his work, is the conviction that love does not entail a particular emotional response to the deity.'[541] It is this aspect of emotion that she then focuses on as her argument against Moran.

Lapsley makes use of Anderson's 1991 study exploring emotion within Israelite religion to support her argument.[542] She writes that Anderson's primary focus it to show that whilst in contemporary society the presumption is that action flows out of feelings, this order is reversed in ancient Israelite culture.[543] It is the behaviours and rituals that the people go through which

[536] Moran, 'Ancient Near Eastern Background', p. 77.
[537] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 351.
[538] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 352.
[539] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 353.
[540] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 353.
[541] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 350.
[542] G. A. Anderson, 'A Time to Mourn, A Time to Dance: The Expression of Grief and Joy in Israelite Religion' (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Uni Press, 1991).
[543] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 356.

generate the internal feelings.[544] By using Anderson's article, Lapsley argues for the need to recognise that emotions are an inherent part of ritual, and in 'positing emotions as emergent from particular ritualized behaviours, he assigns an affective role to these experiences that Moran's legal definition of love denied them.'[545] Lapsley concludes her article by stating that her aim was to begin to show that there is sufficient room within Deuteronomy's use of the language of love to deserve further study.[546] She adds, that an approach is needed which 'does not perpetuate the modern propensity to privatize feelings and separate them from action.'[547]

Lapsley's study undermines the assumed strength of Moran's argument. Her article is the beginning of a wider on-going scholarly discussion on this specific subject. She states that this is an important topic for further study[548] and that 'the embeddedness of the language of love within the larger story of the relationship between Israel and God also shaped the meaning of love.'[549] This 'larger story' is clearly emphasised through the liturgical reading of Deut 6, as seen through the liturgical collapse of time, which draws together the story of the past rescue with the future gift of the land, as well as the importance of worship and mission, with the people of God living out their identity which is based in this relationship that Lapsley indicates. It is by means of picking up on points such as 'the larger story of the relationship between Israel and God' that a liturgical reading of the text can contribute significantly to this on-going discussion, and hold together a view of love that is more complex and multifaceted than Moran has presented.

Moran bases his interpretation of love on the understanding and influence of ANE treaty forms, and this is not something that Lapsley challenges. If, however, this form has been adapted and there is actually a different form

[544] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 357.
[545] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 357.
[546] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 363.
[547] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 365.
[548] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', p. 355.
[549] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way', pp. 355-6.

that is underlying the use of the treaty type, then this is important, as wrong assumptions about form may have a direct impact on interpretation. It will be helpful to examine the relationship between Deuteronomy and ANE treaty documents in more detail, to show whether Moran's assessment of the close relationship between them is valid.

Treaty documents

Moran draws parallels to Deut 6 with 2nd millennium BC examples of treaty documents from Egypt, showing the Pharaoh being expected to love his vassal and the vassal who must love the Pharaoh,[550] and also 1st millennium BC examples from the Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon.[551] Having previously established his criteria, Moran then concludes from these parallels that he has found an example of love that is like the example in Deuteronomy. 'This profane love is also one that can be commanded, and it is a love too that may be defined in terms of loyalty, service and obedience. It is, like the love of God in Deuteronomy, a covenantal love.'[552]

Comparison with ANE treaty documents is aided by the fact that nearly 'sixty treaties from the ancient Near East are extant. More than half are Hittite treaties from the mid-second millennium, and there are a handful from Syria and another handful of Neo-Assyrian exemplars.'[553] Given that most of these are vassal treaties,[554] this provides a good range of material for comparison between these texts and Deuteronomy, and specifically the idea of Yahweh can be seen as the 'suzerain' with Israel as the vassal. This similarity has been used to argue that a similarity in form must mean a similarity in use of language, in other words because 'love' in a vassal treaty would mean 'obedience' it must also mean this in Deuteronomy.

---

[550] Moran, 'Ancient Near Eastern Background', p. 78.
[551] Moran, 'Ancient Near Eastern Background', p. 80.
[552] Moran, 'Ancient Near Eastern Background', pp. 81-2.
[553] J. H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2006), p. 69.
[554] Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament:'*, p. 69.

It would be foolish to attempt to argue that there is no similarity between Deuteronomy and the ANE documents, as several scholars have demonstrated clear parallels.[555] But what some scholars, and Moran in particular, have overlooked is the question of whether Deuteronomy simply copies what is found in the treaty documents or actually demonstrates adaptation. The assumption is often that there is a direct borrowing of style, structure and language, and therefore what is observed in one setting is directly transferable to the other. But a detailed examination of the evidence shows that this argument is not sustainable. So, for example, Braulik, in describing Deuteronomy as a treaty document, details the way in which, according 'to the structure of ancient Near Eastern treaty formulas, the covenant contains a sequence of curses - the sanctions against the faithless partner in a covenant. They are found (expanded and variegated) in 28:15-68.'[556] The point being, that Braulik shows that Deuteronomy's version of the curse section is different from that of the ANE documents. Frankena also notes that there are similarities and differences between the curse sections in Deut 28:20-57 and the curse sections of vassal treaties.[557] From this comparison of the curse sections, Frankena notes that the 'compiler, however, did more than merely copy the Assyrian parallels by using these as a starting-point for his own expositions'.[558] Again, he states that vv. 38-57 have a similarity to 'a curse of Adad', 'but the Hebrew text has again long

[555] For example, de Vaux who argues for clear similarities between Deuteronomy and Hittite documents (R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel Its Life and Institutions*, trans. J. McHugh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961) pp. 147-8.) and Kitchen, who, like de Vaux also argues for a closer affinity to late second-millennium covenants than with first-millennium covenants (K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*, (London: The Tyndale Press, 1966) p. 99.) In a later work, he expands on this by demonstrating the relationship between not only treaty documents but law codes as well, 'the *overall* framework format and main range of contents is drawn from the treaty format of the fourteenth / thirteenth centuries; second, the law content of the stipulations derives from law, not treaty, and the Sinai covenant's use of short blessings plus longer curses (not the roughly equal curses and blessings of the Hittites) goes back to the older law collections' usage; third, use of interim epilogues before the final sanctions likewise goes back to the older law collections, not treaty.' K. A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003) p. 289.

[556] Braulik, *The Theology of Deuteronomy*, p. 34.

[557] Frankena, 'Vassal-treaties of Esarhaddon', pp. 146-7.

[558] Frankena, 'Vassal-treaties of Esarhaddon', p. 149.

elaborations.'[559] What this small sample immediately demonstrates is that Deuteronomy does not copy a pre-existent form *in toto* but shows clear freedom in extending and adapting for its own purposes.

Rüterswörden argues that on closer inspection of the text, the commandment of love in ANE treaty documents is under the specific rules and not in the initial position that it is found in Deuteronomy.[560] Greenberg, similarly, also argues that Deuteronomy is adapting the treaty form and that this changes the use of the word 'love' within the text.

> Acceptance of the covenant is no mere declaration of infatuation or allegiance. It embodies a most serious commitment, that of wholehearted observance of the law. Two things are unusual about this connection of law and covenant: One is that the law was subsumed under the covenant altogether. This is in sharp contrast to other ancient covenants of suzerainty treaties that were almost exclusively declarations of fealty or testaments of political allegiance. The second is the continuous coupling of love and law.[561]

Thus observance of the law is still important in Deuteronomy, but this is very much about a covenant agreement which is ultimately a theological rather than an entirely political construct. Walton draws attention to this fact that Deuteronomy is a religious document rather than a political document and states that the similarities between it and the treaty documents then are not 'carried into the details.'[562] In other words, there is notable adaptation of the form to suit the particular social and theological agenda.

The presence of adaptation is not only noticeable when comparing Deuteronomy to other ANE treaty documents, but when viewing the tradition as a whole. There is variety from one group of treaty texts to another, for

---

[559] Frankena, 'Vassal-treaties of Esarhaddon', pp. 149-50.
[560] U. Rüterswörden, 'Die Liebe zu Gott im Deuteronomium' in ed. M. Witte, K. Schmid, D. Prechel & J. C. Gertz, *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus" - Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*, (de Gruyter: Berlin | New York, 2006), p. 238.
[561] B. Greenberg, 'Deuteronomy 1-34: Hear, O Israel: Law and Love' in ed. F. C. Holmgren and H. E. Schaalman, *Preaching Biblical Texts: Expositions by Jewish and Christian Scholars*, (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1995) pp. 151-2.
[562] J. H. Walton, *Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels Between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1990) p. 230.

example a comparison of Hittite treaties with Assyrian treaties shows an omission of the historical introduction and blessings section.[563] This indicates that there was not one set pattern by which all treaty documents were governed, and shows that adaptation to context was not unusual. What Deuteronomy does is borrow from a general tradition rather than one specific example.[564] As Fuhrmann states, the 'adaptation of the treaty form is a way of speaking into the ancient Near Eastern environment.'[565] The text borrows from a general 'type' of document, that was available in and relevant to its context, but then adapt it for its own theological purposes.

Moran highlights similarities between the VTE and Deut 29. He argues that there are 'only insignificant differences' between the two passages, but goes on himself to describe these differences as 'the question is asked and answered by future generations, not by those suffering from the curses; the biblical answer, though basically identical with the Assyrian, is considerably expanded and of course is a statement of deuteronomic theology.'[566] It is difficult to equate a 'considerable expansion' which now states deuteronomic theology as simply 'insignificant differences'. They are a clear example of Deuteronomy adapting what is found in the covenant document, making significant changes in terms of expanding the curse section, and ensuring that it represents deuteronomic theology.

Moran is right in his conclusion that he has demonstrably questioned the previously assumed connection between the concept of love in Hosea and in Deuteronomy. He is also right to detail the similarities between the use of the term in covenant documents and in Deuteronomy. Where he is mistaken, however, is to deny that any adaptation has taken place in transferring the term from one context to the other. It is not that Moran is wrong in his basic assumption, which is why his paper has been so significant and gained much

[563] Frankena, 'Vassal-treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy', p. 135.
[564] Walton, *Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context*' p. 107.
[565] Fuhrmann, 'Deuteronomy 6-8 and the history of interpretation', p. 46.
[566] Moran, 'Ancient Near Eastern Background', pp. 83-84.

support since publication. It is that he has not allowed deuteronomic adaptation to be permitted in his understanding of the word in its new context and has thereby limited the interpretation of אהב to simply meaning loyalty to an over-lord.

The importance of grace

It is clear that there is support for Moran's position and that his argument has remained relatively unchallenged,[567] but this has not meant all scholars have accepted it without question. One particular area of questioning has been the role of grace within Deuteronomy and how an interpretation of love may fit within this. Jenson for example, though not responding specifically to Moran, argues that the interpretation of the *Shema* needs to be placed within the deuteronomic framework of grace. It is God's act of grace, he argues, that is emphasised in the verses leading up to the Decalogue and that is returned to in some of the verses that seek to motivate Israel's behaviour and it is this that shows the 'primacy of gift over command excludes any kind of legalism or mere external obedience.'[568] Here Jenson highlights the significance that Deuteronomy places on attitude as well as action, a point that both Welch and Barker have made before him.[569] This deuteronomic emphasis on attitude is demonstrated through the only two references to circumcision in the entire text (Deut 10:16; 30:6). For this particular discussion, Deut 30:6 is especially interesting given the near repetition of Deut 6:5. As Barker describes, the 'significant development from chapter 6 to 30:11-14 is that whereas in the earlier chapter the people are commanded to put the commandments on their heart, in chapter 30 Yahweh does it for them.'[570] The direct connection in this verse between the concern for internal attitude

[567] Lapsley, 'Feeling our way: Love for God in Deuteronomy', p. 352.
[568] Jenson, 'Snakes and Ladders', p. 198.
[569] Welch, 'The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter vi.' p. 550. P. A. Barker, *The Triumph of Grace in Deuteronomy: Faithless Israel, Faithful Yahweh in Deuteronomy*, (Bletchley: Paternoster, 2004) p. 103.
[570] Barker, *The Triumph of Grace in Deuteronomy*, pp. 189-90.

and the command to love God further undermines the argument that 6:5 is simply concerned with demonstrating loyalty and acting out of duty.

Herrmann argues that v.4 and v.5 have to belong together and should not be treated separately.[571] The main focus of his argument is the need for v.4 to be understood within the wider deuteronomic theology and that this clearly points to an affective understanding of the commandment to love God.

> Vielmehr ist er her emotionalen Gottesbeziehung entsprossen, welche konzentriert die *religio* in Form der Gott zugewandten Liebe zum Ausdruck bringt, einer Liebe, die keine anderen Sicherungen sucht, nur von Jahwe alle Lebensmöglichkeiten erwarte und ihm dankbar zugekehrt bleibt.[572]

In his criteria of loyalty, service, and obedience, that he has adopted for his paper, Moran has overlooked an important aspect of love within Deuteronomy, that of love for the poor, vulnerable and marginalised in society. The love that both God declares and expects Israel to show to the weaker in their society cannot simply come under this three-fold description of loyalty, service, and obedience. As Herrmann argues, the loving devotion of God towards Israel should draw from them the same exclusive loving response.

> Der in sich geschlossenen Ganzheit auf göttlicher Seite solle totale Hinwendung auf der menschlichen gleichen. Israel hat alles Gute allein von Jahwe empfangen, der sich ihm in Liebe zuneigte. Von daher kann es nicht anders sein, als daß sich die menschliche Seite ihm ebenso ausschließlich zuwendet. Es ist das hier ein außergewöhnlicher Gedanke, die keiner anderen himmlischen Größe zustehende Verehrung damit zu begründen, daß das göttliche Gegenumsetzende Liebe mithin das ganze Herz und alle Lebensregungen erfüllen sollte.[573]

Placing this argument within the deuteronomic concept of grace more than suggests that the idea of Deuteronomy perceiving אהב as simply obedience,

[571] W. Herrmann 'Jahwe und des Menschen Liebe zu Ihm zu Dtn. VI 4' in VT 50, 1, 2000, p. 53.
[572] Herrmann 'Jahwe und des Menschen Liebe zu Ihm zu Dtn. VI 4', p. 54.
[573] Herrmann 'Jahwe und des Menschen Liebe zu Ihm zu Dtn. VI 4', p. 51.

in the same way as a vassal to an overlord, is not taking sufficient account of the deuteronomic context.

Can emotions be commanded?

One of the fundamental points raised in this discussion against reading 'love' as having emotional aspects is the arguments that it is not possible to command an emotion, but only to command a behaviour or action.[574] In response to this line of argument, Moberly points to the way in which Hebrew verbs do seem to have the capacity to combine both emotion and action.

> Hebrew verbs depicting mental and emotional states typically envisage actions commensurate with the state - thus to "remember" (*zākar*) includes acting upon a particular awareness, to "hear" (*shāmaʿ*) includes acting upon what one heard through obeying, and to "love" (*ʾāhēv*) includes actions that express one's orientation towards another.[575]

Tigay, similarly, cites Lev 19:17-18 to defend his point that the Torah does at times command particular feelings, arguing that this 'is in keeping with the fact that Hebrew verbs for feelings sometimes refer as well to the actions that result from them.'[576] He goes on to point out that Deuteronomy introduces the concept of loving God, unlike the rest of the Pentateuch which focuses on 'reverence'.[577] This change of language in Deuteronomy could well suggest, however, that these verses are doing something particular and distinct from the preceding four books. This change from 'reverence' to 'love' is a clear choice to move to a more affective term, which undermines the strength of the argument that this has nothing at all to do with emotion, as a choice has been made to move away from a less emotionally filled word.

---

[574] G. Wallis, 'אהב' in ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and H. Ringgren trans. J. T. Willis, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament Vol. I*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1977) p. 115.
[575] Moberly, *Old Testament Theology*, p. 22.
[576] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 76-77
[577] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 77

Rüterswörden[578] cites Braulik in order to demonstrate that a reliance on ANE tradition as a way of understanding love within Deut 6 is over-valued.[579] He goes on to look at five examples of love being used as an imperative (Am 5:15; Zech 8:19; Ps 31:24; Prov 4:6; Hos 3:1.)[580] arguing that there is clearly an emotional aspect to commandments of an abstract nature.

> Manches lässt sich unter die von Zobel genannte, wenn dann auch erweiterte, Kategorie subsumieren, so das Gute, die Wahrheit, den Frieden, die Weisheit, alles Abstrakta, aber die Anordnung, den Nächsten oder Fremdling oder gar eine Frau zu lieben, weist auf eine emotionale Komponente; אהב ist hierbei mit personalem Objekt konstruiert, und in diese Kategorie würde man die Liebe zu Gott einordnen.[581]

Christensen, in responding to Moran, states that McKay has shown that the language of loving God does not come straight from an ANE vassal-treaty document.[582] But rather 'that God's actions in the historical events that make up the exodus-conquest provide the motivation for a covenant relationship between God and his people.'[583] Hirschberg, suggests a shared root relating love to something particularly physical.

> The use of the root in Ugarit proves that it originally denoted "to love" in a sexual sense 5). Thus it may be related to arab. *'ihāb* which means both "(human) skin" and "(raw) leather". In the latter sense it appears in Hos. xi 4 and certainly in Ct. iii 10; Solomon's litter is not inlaid with "love", but with leather, as a matter of course, which makes the emendation הבנים unnecessary.[584]

This is similar to the earlier argument made by Driver,[585] and it is from this that Wallis goes on to state that if 'this supposition is correct, then the emotional experience is the germ cell for the development of the concept of

[578] Rüterswörden, 'Die Liebe zu Gott im Deuteronomium'.
[579] Rüterswörden, 'Die Liebe zu Gott im Deuteronomium', p. 231; see also N. MacDonald 'Deuteronomy and the Meaning of Monotheism' FAT (*Forschungen zum Alten*) 11/1, 2003, who also argues that the parallel between a treaty and Deuteronomy is not a perfect match.
[580] Rüterswörden, 'Die Liebe zu Gott im Deuteronomium', p. 231.
[581] Rüterswörden, 'Die Liebe zu Gott im Deuteronomium', p. 232.
[582] Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, p. 143.
[583] Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, p. 143.
[584] H. H. Hirschberg, 'Some additional Arabic Etymologies in Old Testament Lexicography' in *VT* 11.4 (1961) p. 373.
[585] G. R. Driver, 'Supposed Arabisms in the Old Testament' in *JBL*, 55.2 (1936) p. 111.

'ahabh.'[586] If an emotional aspect was at the heart of the root then this would naturally be a challenge to the strength of Moran's argument.

This is clearly related to the third of Gittoes' liturgical strands, that of the link between worship and mission. It is the repetition of the story of rescue by God of the Israelites that becomes the motivating factor for the way in which they should then be responding. This is to continue Jenson's argument of grace within the text, and begins to show that a liturgical reading can draw attention to certain aspects within the text that may have been overlooked and in this instance lend weight to Christensen's argument against Moran. It may well be that liturgy and worship become precisely the place where response, expectation of behaviour or attitudes, and emotional response are drawn together, and may well show that a separation between love and loyalty is creating a false dichotomy.

How is אהב to be interpreted?

One of Moran's arguments that Deuteronomy is borrowing from treaty documents and not from Hosea, is the lack of direct marriage-analogies in Deuteronomy as a metaphor for love between Israel and Yahweh. This has led some scholars to attempt to find a different origin for the word אהב one that is neither borrowing from Hosea or treaty documents. For example, McKay argues that in using the term אהב the writer of Deuteronomy is reliant on wisdom tradition, more than the treaty tradition,[587] supporting this by examining examples of the father / son and teacher / pupil relationship in Proverbs and comparing this to Deuteronomy.[588] He concludes by arguing that this use of wisdom adapts the covenant idea of love in this new context,[589] but he also adds that the proper response of Israel as 'son' or 'pupil' is 'that of filial obedience, reverential love, or *pietas*.'[590] McKay's

[586] Wallis, 'אהב', p. 102.
[587] J. W. McKay, 'Man's love for God in Deuteronomy and the Father / Teacher - Son / Pupil relationship' in VT 22, 1972, p. 427.
[588] McKay, 'Man's love for God', pp. 429, 431-2.
[589] McKay, 'Man's love for God', p. 435.
[590] McKay, 'Man's love for God', p. 435.

argument shows an awareness of the adaptive nature of Deuteronomy for interpreting אהב and posits a possible alternative origin sphere of influence other than just the treaty tradition. This is helpful to an extent, but despite this his conclusion still leans towards a response that emphasises obedience and reverence, which, in the end, is not far removed from Moran's conclusions.

Malamat examines the four occurrences of the word אהב that are not followed by an object marker but 'by an indirect object, introduced by the particle *l* (ל), usually translated "to."'[591] He argues that the specific use of *ahab* in these four examples has a meaning of '"to be of use to," "to be beneficial to," "to assist or help."'[592] This he argues shows a more concrete than abstract meaning of the word. He then looks at 2 Chr 26:10 (for he loved the soil), which does not have a (ל) but his idea of love as being beneficial to the object does not seem unreasonable in this instance. This does suggest another way of interpreting this word, but because of the focus of his article, he does not then go on to show whether this meaning of אהב can be found in places that are marked by the object marker, as at 6:5. Also, given that the four examples he examines are not in Deuteronomy (Lev 19:18, 34; 1 Kgs 5:1 [Eng]; 2 Chr 19:2), it is difficult to know whether this meaning could be present in 6:5, or is simply a specific use found only in these four verses.

Ackerman, through examining the use of the word אהב in the Old Testament, concluded that although it is used in the context of parent/child or husband/wife relationships, the one described using the terms *ʾāhēb* or*ʾahăbâ* is always the 'hierarchically superior party in the relationship'.[593] She also maintains a distinction between political love, as seen in

[591] A. Malamat, '"Love your Neighbor as Yourself" What it Really Means' in *Biblical Archaeology Review* vol. 16, no. 4, 1990, p. 50.
[592] Malamat, '"Love your Neighbor as Yourself"', p. 51.
[593] S. Ackerman, 'The Personal is Political: Covenantal and Affective Love (*ʾĀHĒB, ʾAHĂBÂ*) in the Hebrew Bible' in VT LII, 4, 2002, p. 447.

Deuteronomy, and emotional love, as seen for example in Hosea, Ezekiel or Jeremiah. [594]

Arnold sees Ackerman's work as valuable, but disagrees with her idea of different types of love.

> One of the fundamental principles of lexical analysis is that theological language often exhibits special semantic developments. Words are often assigned particular and technical meanings in the Bible, and the danger is that we will disassociate the particularized meaning from the semantic field generally, yielding a lexical distinction foreign to the Bible itself.[595]

He argues that the use of love as meaning loyalty is a nuance or a way of understanding love, but it is not a different type of love.[596] He goes on to state that he disagrees with the consensus that has followed Moran's argument, 'Love for YHWH in these contexts is certainly more than affection, but not less than affection.'[597] In this he is arguing that a political use of the word in one context does not negate an affective meaning, an argument that Brueggemann also makes. [598]

Arnold examines the word אהב in this verse through a comparison with its wider use in Deuteronomy. Arnold argues that the words 'love' and 'fear' have been deliberately chosen in Deuteronomy to demarcate the boundaries of the relationship between Israel and God, and that the two words have both emotional and behavioural aspects.[599] He goes on to state that until Deuteronomy, these words were not brought into such a close relationship, and that by doing so, Deuteronomy is creating something new for a 'new covenant ethic.'[600] It is this new antinomy between the two terms that, Arnold argues, creates a balance 'so that love prevents terror and fear

[594] Ackerman, 'The Personal is Political', p. 457.
[595] B. T. Arnold, 'The Love-Fear Antinomy in Deuteronomy 5-11' VT 61, 4, 2011, pp. 555-6.
[596] Arnold, 'The Love-Fear Antinomy', p. 556.
[597] Arnold, 'The Love-Fear Antinomy', p. 560.
[598] W. Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*, 'Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997) p. 420.
[599] Arnold, 'The Love-Fear Antinomy', pp. 564-6.
[600] Arnold, 'The Love-Fear Antinomy', p. 567.

prevents irreverent familiarity.'[601] His work shows that when examining the use of the word within Deuteronomy itself, before drawing on external influences, the word does have an emotional aspect. Not only this, but he argues for innovation through the creation of a new linguistic relationship between the two words 'love' and 'fear' in order to bring this about.

Whilst Moran is right to highlight the absence of any direct 'marriage-analogy' in Deuteronomy as a metaphor for love between Israel and Yahweh, to state that there is no trace at all is to overlook three particular, but subtle aspects of the wider text. The first, is the use of חשק in Deuteronomy 7:7; 10:15; 21:11, a rare word used only 11 times in the Old Testament. Vang makes two points about the unusual use of this word; first that this word clearly conveys deep emotion and longing, and second that it is only in Deuteronomy that it is used with God as the subject, whereas every other occurrence has a person as the subject.[602] This clearly affective word used to convey God's choice of Israel above any other nation (7:7; 10:15) makes it difficult to maintain the argument that God is being portrayed in exactly the same way as a suzerain in a treaty document.

The second is simply to note that three occurrences of the word אהב in 21:15-16 are instructions concerning a man who loves one of his wives and hates the other. This is not to say that this is an analogy for love between Israel and Yahweh, but highlights that the word is used in Deuteronomy in a specifically marital context, showing אהב used in an affective context. This could mean that the writer is using the same word in a different context, using a different connotation, or it could imply that the removal of emotion from the word when used in the context of Israel loving God is to claim too much when compared with this use of the word in its wider deuteronomic context.

[601] Arnold, 'The Love-Fear Antinomy', p. 567.
[602] Vang, 'God's Love According to Hosea and Deuteronomy', p. 188.

The third point is the use of the word דבק which 'is relatively rare in OT-biblical usage'.[603] Olson uses the occurrence of this word to argue for an emotional and passionate depiction of love in Deuteronomy, stating that 'Israel's "love" of God in Deuteronomy involves both "obeying" *and* "holding fast" (11:22; 30:20).'[604] This idea of 'holding fast' is often used in passages to show romantic or sexual attraction and enables Olson to state that obedience '*and* passionate relationship characterize the full love of God in Deuteronomy.'[605]

Whilst Olson is right that this word can indicate romantic or sexual love, he overstates his case when his evidence is examined in detail, as the use of דבק in a romantic context is by far the minority of occasions. In fact only 3 out of 54 uses of דבק are in connection with romantic love, which are the three references he includes to support his argument that this word 'often denotes passion, romantic love, and sexual attraction.'[606] Even of these three verses, two are more complex than simple positive romantic love (Gen 34:3 and 1 Kgs 11:2.[607] Rather than in a romantic context, the more common usage of this word is associated with either cleaving to the Lord or to his decrees. Further

[603] G. Wallis, 'דבק' in ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and H. Ringgren trans. J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley and D. E. Green, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament Vol. III*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1978) p. 80.
[604] Olson, *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses,* p. 51.
[605] Olson, *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses,* p. 51.
[606] Olson, *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses*, p. 51.
[607] Further uses of the דבק are as follows. Cleave to the Lord, 9 times (Deut 10:20; 11:22; 13:5; 30:20; Josh 22:5; 23:8; 2 Kgs 18:6; Jer 13:11 used twice in one verse; Ps 63:9), cleave to the Lord's decrees, once (Ps 119:31). A positive clinging to a person or people 5 times (2 Sam 20:2; Rut 1:14; 2:8, 21, 23). A negative association with a disaster, threat or battle, 9 times (Ge 19:19; Deut 28:21, 60; Jud 20:42; 1 Sam 31:2; 2 Sam 1:6; 2 Kgs 5:27; Jer 42:16; 1 Chr 10:2), also being pursued 4 times (Gen 31:23; Jud 18:22; 20:45; 1 Sam 14:22). A negative clinging depicted through physicality, e.g. tongue to roof of mouth 10 times (Eze 3:26; Ps 22:16; 44:26; 102:6; 119:25; 137:6; Job 19:20; 29:10; 31:7; Lam 4:4). Clinging used in natural imagery, 5 times (Eze 29:4, twice; Job 38:38; 41:9, 15). Retaining inheritance, twice (Num 36:7,9). Clinging to sin, once (2 Kgs 3:3). Sin not clinging, once (Ps 101:3). Clinging to the nations who were in land before Israel, once (Josh 23:12). Clinging to a sword in battle, once (2 Sam 23:10). Not clinging to articles devoted to the ban, once (Deut 13:18).

to this, the word is used in a negative sense slightly more than in a positive sense.[608]

There are seven occurrences of this within Deuteronomy. Four of these encouraging the Israelites to cleave to the Lord, with the other three being negative. These four occasions follow a similar pattern of placing דבק within a sequence 'e.g. "to serve", "to fear", "to swear by his name", and also verbs to do with following the law, "keep" his commandments, "walk" in his ways, "obey" his voice.'[609] This sequential pattern is mirrored once in Joshua (Josh 22:5), but unlike the other four times the word is used in association with the Lord (Josh 23:8; 2 Kgs 18:6; Jer 13:11; Ps 63:9).

This could suggest that Olson's claim that this could contribute to an affective interpretation of love in Deuteronomy is unfounded, but closer examination reveals that this is not actually true. דבק is a predominantly deuteronomic and deuteronomistic word, occurring seven times in Deuteronomy and 19 in the Deuteronomistic history.[610] Unlike the rest of Pentateuch which does not use דבק frequently (only 6 times: Gen 2:24; 19:19; 31:23; 34:3; Num 36:7, 9). It is a term that is 'commonly used metaphorically to express a state of loyalty, affection, or close proximity'[611] and can convey strong emotions, both positively and negatively, and affection or threat. Brooke furthers this point by stating that Ps 63 could be seen as a 'meditation on the full spiritual significance of the term'.[612] If Ps 63 really is a meditation on this term, then this would support a general perception of this word as carrying with it emotional meaning, given that Ps 63 could not be considered to be a non-emotional psalm.

[608] There are 26 negative settings of this word and 22 positive, excluding 6 uses which are neither strongly one nor the other.

[609] Wallis, 'דבק', pp. 81-82.

[610] G. J. Brooke, 'דבק' in ed. W. A. VanGemeren *NIDOTTE* Vol. 1 (Paternoster: Carlisle, 1996) p. 910.

[611] Brooke, 'דבק', p. 911.

[612] Brooke, 'דבק', p. 911.

It is also interesting when considered alongside אהב. The two words are closely linked in Deuteronomy, where the four 'cleave to the Lord' occurrences are always either in the same, or neighbouring verse to one containing the word אהב. In the wider OT context, the two words occur closely together (same verse or adjacent verse) 8 times (Gen 34:3; Deut 10:20; 11:22; 13:5; 30:20; Josh 22:5; 1 Kgs 11:2; Job 19:20). Gen 34:3 and 1 Kgs 11:2 are clearly about romantic love, whilst Josh 22:5, although not an exact repetition, is very similar to Deut 10:20; 11:22; 13:5 and 30:20. There is, though, a marked difference in Job 19:19-20. In these verses there is almost an ironic reversal of the positive and affectionate connection between the two words. In other words, where the expectation has been established that אהב and דבק occurring in close proximity to one another should usually indicate a positive emotional affection, in Job it becomes the complete opposite. This ironic reversal could then lend support to the argument that where the two words are found in close relation to one another there is an indication of something both positive and emotional. Ultimately it may well mean that Olson was right in his conclusion that this word is used to indicate affective love, but not accurate in his examination of the detailed evidence.

Moberly explores the idea of love through the use of the word אֶחָד, seeing it in context with the demands of the response of love in v.5. He argues that to 'say that YHWH is "one" is not to say something about God that is separable from its human counterpart of "love", but rather designates Yhwh as the appropriate recipient of unreserved human "love".'[613] He quotes Song of Songs 6:8-9 to support his argument, showing that אֶחָד there is used to describe the unique one, the one who enjoys special favour. He states that this description would not stand up to scientific investigation of 'the woman', but comes from a context of love and relationship.[614] This clearly is appropriate within the context of Song of Songs, given that the lover is

[613] Moberly, 'Toward and Interpretation of the Shema', p. 132.
[614] Moberly, 'Toward and Interpretation of the Shema', p. 133; Moberly, *Old Testament Theology*, p. 20.

declaring their love for the unique beloved. But this does not mean that in the different context of Deuteronomy, this same use of 'unique' would automatically denote an affective intention. For example, for those people bound up by the VTE, there would have only been one, 'unique' suzerain for them, but in this context the desire is strictly for obedience. Ultimately, arguing from what is coherent in another context simply raises the possibility for this interpretation in Deuteronomy, but cannot definitively be used to show that this understanding is the one intended in Deuteronomy. So, it is helpful for showing that this could be the way that Deuteronomy is using this particular word, and adds to the questioning of Moran's assumptions that it is a direct lift from a treaty context, but cannot provide absolute proof.

Interestingly, Lohfink and Bergman cite Moran in their article as they describe the association of the love motif in ANE treaties.[615] Despite this, they then argue that there is an affective association, stating that because of its 'direct connection with the love motif here, *ʾechādh* probably suggested emotional connotations, which this word can have in love lyrics when one refers to his sweetheart as the "only one": Cant. 6:8f.'[616] But at no point do they explicitly comment on the contradiction between Moran's perspective and their argument that the word has affective connotations.

Conclusion to a liturgical response to whether love can be commanded

Moran's article is significant and important. He is right to challenge the assumption of a connection between Hosea and Deuteronomy and to highlight the differences in the way that both texts present the concept of love. He is also right to assert a strong connection between Deuteronomy and the ANE treaty tradition. What he has overlooked, however, is the actual way in which the text relates to the treaty tradition, as well as some of the closer detail of the text. A close examination of the text reveals continuity,

---

[615] N. Lohfink & J. Bergman אֶחָד *ʾechādh* in ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, *TDOT* vol. 1 trans. J. T. Willis revd. edn. (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974) p. 196.
[616] Lohfink & Bergman, אֶחָד *ʾechādh*, p. 196.

adaptation and innovation, traits of liturgical practice. When read as a liturgical text, the chapter clearly adopts rhetorical technique to encourage and persuade the people of Israel to focus their worship on YHWH, not to be distracted by the worship of other nations, and to ensure that their communal identity as those chosen and rescued by YHWH continue to remember and communicate their identity to the following generations. The text is clearly using language and style that was culturally and contextually relevant, but adapting it for its own purposes, and if the treaty form is being adapted, then there must be something else to which it is adapting.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided the opportunity to apply the liturgical hermeneutic to a specific text and examine the extent to which it is a useful approach. It was clear to see that previous scholarship had suggested that there were liturgical elements within Deut 6, but this was never specified nor was a link made between any of the criteria and an understanding of liturgical practice. Applying the three strands of this liturgical hermeneutic showed clearly that all three were present within the text, and reading the text through this approach revealed new things about the coherence of the structure of the chapter as a whole, which have in general been overlooked through other hermeneutical methods. What this liturgical approach revealed was a greater sense of coherence of the chapter as a whole.

The application of the liturgical criteria then allowed the opportunity to examine the text for the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation. These were particularly helpful in approaching the question of whether it is possible to command love. It was helpful to examine Moran's argument in detail, comparing those who agreed and disagreed, and the strength of their argument for doing so. What this reading argues is that whilst the text is undeniably 'treaty-like', this can only be understood

alongside the text's adaptive and innovative approach in order to communicate the particular theology.

This reading also emphasised the importance that arises out of the chapter of passing on the faith to the next generation, and the significance of drawing faith into every part of life. Both of these, along with other notable features of Deut 6, have been particularly helpful in forming a paradigm with which to respond to the initial question.

The next chapter will apply these liturgical criteria to Deut 26, another chapter that has frequently been described in scholarship as demonstrating liturgical features. As with this chapter, prior scholarship will be explored first before applying this hermeneutic, and then examining key features of the text in order to expand the paradigm that will respond to the initial question.

Chapter four: A liturgical reading of Deuteronomy 26

Introduction to Chapter Four

Deuteronomy 26 has long been described as exhibiting liturgical features and characteristics. As such it is, like Deuteronomy 6, an important choice of text to examine through the liturgical hermeneutic outlined in this study. The first part of this chapter will set out points of textual and critical concern through translation and accompanying notes. The next section will examine how scholars have used the terms 'liturgy' or 'liturgical' when writing about Deut 26 in order to show that this has been done inadequately, with particular attention given to von Rad's work, given the significance of his contribution to this discussion. Having demonstrated that there are important weaknesses with previous uses of these terms, the next section will employ the three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic to examine the text in detail, using the criteria to show clearly whether the description of the text as liturgical is appropriate or not. The three strands are first, the importance of remembrance, or anamnesis, second the liturgical collapse of time, and third the connection between liturgy and mission. After this, the text will be further explored to see whether the three liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation are present.

It will be argued that an important part of the adaptive and innovative nature of this chapter contributes towards a reading of the wider book as demonstrating radical democratisation, particularly in its approach to cultic matters. This will be set out in more detail, with support drawn from parallels in Deut 12 in particular, as well as from other chapters. This exploration, as well as wider work from the chapter, will then be drawn together as part of the paradigm in the final chapter that was described in Chapter One as a

creative response to the current deadlock in discussions of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context.

Translation

26:[1] And when you enter the land that the Lord your God is giving to you as an inheritance and you possess it and you dwell in it, [2]you will take from the first of all the fruit of the earth which you bring in from your land, which the Lord your God has given to you, and you will place it in a basket and you will go to the place which the Lord your God will choose for his name to dwell. [3]You will go to the priest, who will be present in those days, and you will say to him, 'I declare today to the Lord my God that I have entered in to the land which the Lord swore to our ancestors to give to us'. [4]And the priest will take the basket from your hand and will set it down before the altar of the Lord your God, [5]and you will state before the Lord your God, 'My ancestor was a wandering Aramean, he went down to Egypt and he sojourned there, few in number, but became there a great nation, strong and numerous. [6]But the Egyptians mistreated us, they afflicted us and they set harsh servitude upon us. [7]Then we cried out to the Lord the God of our ancestors and the Lord heard our voice, and he saw our affliction, our trouble and our oppression. [8]The Lord brought us out from Egypt by his strong hand and stretched out arm with great terror and with signs and wonders, [9]and he brought us to this place and he gave to us this land, a land flowing with milk and honey. [10]And now, behold I bring the first fruit of the earth, which the Lord has given to me.' Then you will place it before the Lord your God and worship before the Lord your God, [11]and you will rejoice in all the goodness that the Lord your God has given to you, and to your household, you and the Levite and the sojourner who is in your midst.

[12]When you finish paying all the tithe of your produce in the third year, the year of the tithe, and you have given it to the Levite, to the sojourner and to

the widow and have eaten in your gates and they are satisfied, [13] then you will say before the Lord your God, 'I have removed what is holy from the house and also I have given it to the Levite and to the sojourner, to the orphan and to the widow, according to all your commandments which you have commanded me, I have not transgressed your commandments and I have not forgotten. [14]I have not eaten of it in mourning, and I have not removed any of it when unclean, and I have not given any of it for the dead. I have obeyed the voice of the Lord my God and I have done everything that you have commanded me. [15]Look down from your holy habitation, from the heavens and bless your people Israel and the land which you have given to us just as you swore to our ancestors, a land flowing with milk and honey.' [16]This day the Lord your God has commanded you to do these statutes and judgements, you shall be careful to do them with all your heart and with all your soul. [17]You avow this day that the Lord will be to you your God, that you walk in his ways, keeping his statutes and his commandments and his judgements, and obeying his voice. [18]The Lord avows that you this day will be to him a treasured people, just as he promised to you, to keep all his commandments, [19]and by setting you above over all the nations that he has made, for praise and for renown and for honour, that you will be a people holy to the Lord your God, just as he promised.

Notes

These notes will focus on the need for clarity over questions of translation and interpretation for textual issues that are directly relevant for the discussions in this chapter on liturgy and worship. As such, a few minor points, for example in verse 18 will not be considered here, nor the interpretative questions in verses 2, 8 or 12.[617]

[617] **v.2** Both the LXX and SamP omit the phrase 'which you bring in from your land'. (McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 375; Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, p. 631.) This may be due to haplography, for further discussion see Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 724. **v.8** *'and by great terror'*. 'The LXX here and in 4:34 has … "and by great visions," misreading the verb יראה as ירא.' (Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 728; see also Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, p. 632). **v.12** 'LXX has a significant variation, designating the third-year tithe as a "second

26:3

וּבָאתָ אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלָיו הִגַּדְתִּי הַיּוֹם לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ כִּי־
בָאתִי אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה לַאֲבֹתֵינוּ לָתֶת לָנוּ׃

The literal translation of the first words of this verse are 'and you will go to the priest who will be in those days'. This needs clarifying when translated into English and for this reason McConville adds the words 'in office'.[618] As this is not found in the Hebrew text, I have used, as does Lundbom,[619] the word 'present', although this also is not in the original, but does provide both the clarity needed and maintains a more direct association with יְהוָה.

There is debate as to whether this verse should read 'your God' or 'my God'. BHQ argues, following the rule of *lectio difficilior*, that as the Masoretic text represents a more difficult reading, '*your* God' is more likely to be the original. It further supports this by arguing 'that T^{NF} illustrates a parallel tendency to simplify.'[620] Lundbom also argues that this should be read as 'your God', as he states that it is the individual addressing the priest. He addresses the fact that the LXX has changed from the Masoretic text to make it first person, but argues that this can be accounted for, as 'the *Vorlage* of the LXX could have lost a כ due to haplography'.[621]

The rule of *lectio difficilior* is important, but in the case of this verse, the evidence from within the verse and the importance of the wider context means that 'my God' is the more appropriate reading. The focus of the chapter is on the individual as they identify personally with the past struggles and following deliverance of his people ('the Egyptians mistreated us', v.6; 'we cried out to the Lord', (v.7). From this personal identification with his

---

tithe", a concept that became important in Jewish harmonization of the various tithe commands.' (McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 376). See also Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 290-291. **v.18** '*as he promised you, so.* One MS and some LXX witnesses (G^B and Papyrus 957) omit "you, so," which can be attributed to haplography'. (Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 735, see also Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, p. 644).

[618] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 375.

[619] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 719.

[620] *BHQ* Third Fascicle, *Deuteronomy*, prepared by C. McCarthy (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 2007) p. 120.

[621] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 724.

ancestors, he then goes on to make his own response and offering ('I bring the first fruit of the earth', v.10). Whilst an error of haplography is possible, it is equally possible that the error in the Masoretic text is due to dittography, and that the LXX would represent the right reading.[622]

26:5

וְעָנִיתָ וְאָמַרְתָּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲרַמִּי אֹבֵד אָבִי וַיֵּרֶד מִצְרַיְמָה וַיָּגָר שָׁם בִּמְתֵי מְעָט וַיְהִי־שָׁם לְגֹוי גָּדֹול עָצוּם וָרָב׃

אֹבֵד in the Qal is normally translated as 'to perish, to vanish or to stray',[623] but several commentators claim that 'wandering' is a better translation here.[624] Both Lundbom and McConville argue that this choice is more reflective of both 'the nomadic lifestyle of the patriarchs in Genesis'[625] and also the idea of homelessness[626] which is carried on through the rest of the verse. The verb occurs 174 times in the Old Testament and the vast majority of times it does carry the meaning of perishing or destroying, but there is an important minority of times where this is not the case. For example, 2 out of 20 occurrences in Deuteronomy have a sense of 'loss' rather than 'perishing' (Deut 22:3; 32:28). Similarly, 13 times in the wider Old Testament the word is used to mean being 'lost' or a 'refuge'.[627] This provides evidence from the wider Old Testament and, importantly, within Deuteronomy itself that although less common, this verb is used to indicate something other than perishing or destroying.

Unlike Cairns[628] and Merrill[629] who both see this verse as pointing to Jacob, Machiela argues for an interpretation that sees Abraham as the alluded to

---

[622] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 375-6; D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10 - 34:12*, Word Biblical Commentary (Thomas Nelson: Nashville, Tennessee, 2002) p. 631.
[623] F. Brown, S. Driver and C. Briggs, *The BDB Hebrew and English Lexicon*, (Hendricksons: Peabody, Massachusetts, 1906) p. 1.
[624] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 725; Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, p. 631; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 303; McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 375; D. Machiela, 'Who is the Aramean in Deut 26:5 and what is he doing?' in *Revue de Qumran* 23 (2008) pp. 395-403.
[625] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 725.
[626] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 376.
[627] 1 Sam 9:3, 20; Job 11:20; Ps 119:176; 142:4; Eccl 3:6; Jer 4:9; 25:10, 35; 50:6; 51:55; Ezek 34:4, 16.
[628] Cairns, *Deuteronomy: Word and Presence*, p. 223.
[629] Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, p. 334.

ancestor.[630] Nelson, in a similar vein, although assuming Jacob as the primary referent, argues use of language in v.5 that is 'typical of Abraham (cf. Gen 12:10; 18:18, both J) expands the Aramean Jacob so that he grows into a collective representative of all the patriarchs.'[631]

If this is true, and given that there appears to be ambiguity within the text allowing scholars to interpret the ancestor differently, this may well be a deliberate way of broadening out the reference to include more than one ancestor. This ancestor then becomes, in some way, a representative of the ancestors who went down into Egypt and suffered, just as the 'farmer' (v.3) bringing the offering is representative of those in the future who will be in the land that God has promised to the people he has rescued. This concept of representation and what it might mean for interpretation will be explored in more detail below.

26:14

לֹא־אָכַלְתִּי בְאֹנִי מִמֶּנּוּ וְלֹא־בִעַרְתִּי מִמֶּנּוּ בְּטָמֵא וְלֹא־נָתַתִּי מִמֶּנּוּ לְמֵת שָׁמַעְתִּי בְּקוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהָי עָשִׂיתִי כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתָנִי׃

The word בְאֹנִי is derived from the verb אנה meaning 'to mourn'.[632] The verse makes a clear distinction between what is acceptable ritual expectations for Israel as compared with other ANE cultural funeral practices. These may well have included special family meals and the supply of food and water left at the grave for the dead to use in the afterlife.[633] This verse clearly prohibits participating in these type of activities, as the use of the ל in לְמֵת could mean either 'for' the dead, 'that he has not contributed to mourning feasts',[634] or 'to' the dead, as in an offering given up for a dead person. Several texts demonstrate that fasting was associated with mourning in Israelite culture (2 Sam 1:12; Ezra 10:6; Neh 1:4; Esth 4:3; Ps 35:13-14; Joel 2:12). Other texts

[630] Machiela, 'Who is the Aramean in Deut 26:5 and what is he doing?', pp. 395-403.
[631] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 309.
[632] Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, p. 336; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 731.
[633] Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament*, pp. 319, 322 – 324. See also Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, p. 336; Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, p. 323; Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, p. 642.
[634] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 732.

also support this by contrasting feasting with mourning (Neh 8:9-10; Esth 9:22; Eccl 7:2; Is 22:12-13; Amos 8:10). Further to this, Dan 10:2-3 gives the detail that when in mourning for three weeks, Daniel did not consume rich food, meat or wine. Similarly, David refuses to eat when mourning for Abner (2 Sam 3:35) and in 2 Sam 12:20-23, David creates confusion by fasting when the child is alive but not fasting when the child dies. This evidence strongly suggesting that the cultural norm was to fast as part of mourning. What is seen is this verse is fasting being contrasted with the funeral practices of other surrounding nations. This verse exhorts them to ensure that Israelite worship, including funeral practices, is to be conducted in a way that remains distinct from the surrounding cultures.

26:17

אֶת־יְהוָה הֶאֱמַרְתָּ הַיּוֹם לִהְיוֹת לְךָ לֵאלֹהִים וְלָלֶכֶת בִּדְרָכָיו וְלִשְׁמֹר חֻקָּיו וּמִצְוֹתָיו וּמִשְׁפָּטָיו וְלִשְׁמֹעַ בְּקֹלוֹ

Verses 17 and 18 are the only two occurrences of the hiphil form of אמר in the Old Testament. This scarcity makes interpretation more difficult,[635] with the Targums struggling to find an adequate translation.[636] Nelson translates this verb as a causative ('You have caused Yahweh to agree today to be your God'), [637] but he does acknowledge, though, that an alternative translation of the verb could be as an intensive,[638] and several scholars opt for this alternative reading.[639]

Three particular points support an intensive rather than causative reading of the verb here. First is the acknowledgment that an intensive rather than causative understanding of the hiphil, although less common, is a legitimate way of interpreting the hiphil.[640] Second is the evidence that Tigay has drawn

[635] D. I. Block, *Deuteronomy*, The NIV Application Commentary (Zondervan: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2012) p. 614.
[636] BHQ, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 121-122.
[637] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 304.
[638] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 304.
[639] For example, Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, p. 646; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 245; Williamson, 'Covenant', p. 153; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 734.
[640] ed. E. Kautzsche, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd edn. (Oxford University Press: London, 1910) p. 145 §d.

upon from Job 35:9 and Ps 32:11 to argue that an intensive translation of the hiphil is used elsewhere in the Old Testament[641] Whilst it could be argued that in the case of Job 35:9, an intensive understanding of יַזְעִיקוּ is not impossible, with Ps 32:11 it would be difficult to argue for anything other than an intensive interpretation of וְהַרְנִינוּ. The verb is being used as an encouragement – there is no-one to cause someone to do this – and it also intensifies the expression of rejoicing in the final verse of the psalm. The third point that supports an intensive reading is that this particular use of language could arise out of a covenant or treaty context,[642] and it is clear that Deuteronomy does adopt both language and concepts from these forms throughout. This last point is particularly important given that the verse, and the wider rhetoric of Deuteronomy, is seeking to persuade the people to commit to the law and commandments, and the covenant with God. A causative verb here would have a sense of coercion, whereas the wider context of the book as a whole is about persuasion.

The use of 'liturgical' as a description of Deuteronomy 26 in wider scholarship

Many scholars writing about Deut 26 draw attention to the elements of worship, prayer and tithing that are clearly present in the text. As was noted in the previous two chapters, where use is made of the terms 'liturgy' or 'liturgical' there is often no explanation as to the specific characteristics of the text they are using to support this analysis, or how this relates to wider liturgical studies and definitions.[643] This section will begin by focusing on von Rad's analysis, given the impact that his work on Deut 26 has had, before then

[641] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 393.
[642] Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, p. 325; Williamson, 'Covenant', p. 147.
[643] See for example R. L. Christensen, 'Between Text and Sermon: Deuteronomy 26:1-11' in Interpretation 49 (1995) p. 59.

examining how other scholars have also used the terms 'liturgy' or 'liturgical' in their analysis but without sufficient definition.

Von Rad and the 'little historical credo'

One of the most significant commentators to make a connection between Deut 26 and liturgy has been Gerhard von Rad. At the beginning of his essay, von Rad argues that Deut 26:5ff has all the 'characteristics and attributes of a creed, and is probably the earliest recognisable example'.[644] He is keen to stress that this must have been linked to an actual 'cultic occasion'.[645] He supports his point by quite rightly stating this could not simply have been a statement freely composed in the moment, concluding therefore that it must have been an existing statement of the faith of Israel.[646] Whilst agreeing with his first point, it is difficult to say with certainty whether this really was an existing statement of faith, or the product of a writer or later editor. Von Rad acknowledges that it is not possible to be certain that Deut 26:5ff is the earliest example of its genre. He does argue, however, that 'both its concise, simple form and its intimate connection with a cultic act of great antiquity justify our belief that it is among the examples of the *genre* which approximate most closely to the original.' [647]

It is this basic creed, von Rad argues, that shapes the whole of the Hexateuch,[648] the events in the 'creed/s' are the events that appear in the wider Hexateuch, and there is nothing in the 'creed/s' that is not expanded upon and developed in the Hexateuch. He acknowledges that the events at Sinai are present in the Hexateuch but do not appear in the 'creed/s',[649] and after exploring this strand, concludes that the Sinai tradition is 'essentially an independent entity within the hexateuchal tradition.'[650] He then draws a

[644] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 5.
[645] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 5.
[646] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 5.
[647] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 55.
[648] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 8.
[649] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', pp. 5-7.
[650] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 14.

distinction between the Exodus tradition which he argues shows the 'redemptive history' as Israel travel from Egypt to Canaan, as opposed to the Sinai tradition which concentrates on the revelation of justice and law to the nation.[651]

Von Rad is right in identifying a 'type' or 'genre' that has some attachment to a 'cultic occasion' and that does summarise the major events of the Hexateuch, minus the Sinai tradition, although whether it predates or postdates the wider Hexateuch is a matter of some debate. What is more important for the discussion here, however, is how these verses are being defined as 'liturgical' and, in particular, how the word 'creed' is being used and defined. Although von Rad introduces the word 'creed/s' into this wider discussion about the origins and development of Deut 26, he does not provide a clear definition for the term and this creates confusion not only in his own work but for scholars engaging with his work subsequently.

At the time he was writing, the widely held scholarly opinion was that the two 'liturgical formularies' in Deut 26 were 'late embellishments'.[652] Von Rad argues strongly however, with a particular focus on 26:5b-9, that these are genuine liturgical prayers used in practice and already in existence before the Deuteronomist.[653] He supports this point in a footnote, stating that the 'rhythmical and alliterative character of the opening phrases in particular reveals its antiquity.'[654] This is very similar to a point he raises in discussion of Deut 6, where again he argues that the passage is older because of its poetic quality. However, both Weinfeld and de Moor argue that the poetic language present in 26:5-9 is not ancient but actually demonstrates the presence of later deuteronomic[655] or deuteronomistic language,[656] although they do both

[651] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', pp. 18-19.
[652] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 3.
[653] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 4.
[654] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 4, footnote.
[655] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 33.
[656] J. C. de Moor, 'Poetic Fragments in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History' in ed. Martínez, A. Hilhorst, J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, A. S. van der Woude, *Studies in Deuteronomy: in honour of C. J. Labuschange on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, (Brill: Leiden | New York, New York, 1994) pp. 188-89.

acknowledge that there is some relationship to older material.[657] If poetic quality is an indication of age it is difficult to know whether this quality is there because the passage is genuinely old, or is a technique adopted by a later author or editor in order to present the material as older or original. Ultimately, neither the poetic nature of the text nor its relative age help to further how a 'creed' is to be defined.

Another response to von Rad's work by scholars has been to argue that the form itself is not a 'creed' but something else, but given the lack of definition provided by von Rad himself, these have the potential to become rather circular arguments. For example, whilst acknowledging the useful insights that can be gained from von Rad's work, Craigie argues against reading it as a creed as the words that were to be said were connected to the particular celebration at the beginning of the settlement in the land.[658] Whilst this is true, it is difficult to know why this in itself would rule out these verses from being a creed, given that they could have used a creed for this purpose, especially when he does state that these words almost certainly were used in later worship.[659] He goes on to argue that the focus of the words are on the land and that therefore it cannot be a creed because it 'does not recount *all* the major events in Israel's past history, but selects those which most naturally highlight God's gift of a land to his people.'[660] But again it is difficult to maintain the argument that this reason by itself would rule out these words being a creed. For example, a comparison with some of the Church of England's authorised creeds and statements of faith[661] shows that some are much shorter than others, and have a narrower focus, not recounting every single significant part of redemption history. The wider lack of definition from

[657] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 33; de Moor, 'Poetic Fragments in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History' pp. 188-89.
[658] Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, p. 321.
[659] Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, p. 321.
[660] Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, p. 322. Emphasis original.
[661] These are authorised creed-like statements that can replace a creed in an order of service.

von Rad and also from Craigie makes comparison and definition more difficult.

Similarly, in his response to von Rad, Lohfink has argued that this is not a creed but has as its basis an 'offering prayer', arguing that what appears in these verses is not the root of the Hexateuch, but a later systematic summary of it.'[662] Lohfink goes on to argue that this text was probably built up from a pre-existing offering prayer, along the lines of "My father was a wandering Aramean, but see now I bring here the first fruits of the fruit of the earth which you have given me, Yahweh".[663] The historical aspects were then placed in between these two statements, and the conquest of the land was added.[664] The text was then 'further adapted to public recitation.'[665] Given the setting of an offering, Lohfink may well be right in stating that this appears to be an offering prayer rather than a creed. As both Mayes[666] and Daniels[667] argue, however, attempting to separate out verses to discern an older source overlooks the context in which they are currently set, and would otherwise leave a lack of logic between v.5 and v.10. Ultimately, though, the lack of definition of either 'creed' or 'offering prayer' makes it difficult to know the criteria that are being used to make these decisions.

In his analysis of von Rad's thesis, Hyatt also challenges this idea from the position of the development of later tradition. He questions the likelihood of these verses being an established ancient creed, given that Judaism appears to look to Deut 6:4-9 as a 'confession of faith' and not 'any of the so-called historical Credos.'[668] Later historical use cannot prove categorically that these verses were not an original creed, but as Hyatt points out, that these verses

[662] Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology', p.14.
[663] Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology', p. 14.
[664] Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology', p. 14.
[665] Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology', pp. 14-15.
[666] Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, p. 333.
[667] D. R. Daniels, 'The Creed of Deuteronomy XXVI revisited' in ed. J. A. Emerton, *Studies in the Pentateuch*, (Brill: Leiden | New York, New York, 1990) pp. 237-38.
[668] J. P. Hyatt, 'Were there an Ancient Historical Credo in Israel and an Independent Sinai Tradition?' in ed. H. T. Frank and W. L. Reed. *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament*, (Abingdon Press: Nashville, Tennessee, 1970) p. 168.

do not appear to feature more prominently in later Israelite and Jewish religious practice does raise important doubts over von Rad's claims.

Having outlined von Rad's basic argument and some of the subsequent scholarly critique, it is clear that the fundamental problem lies in the lack of clear definition and criteria. So, for example, some scholars argue that what von Rad identifies as a 'creed' is liturgical in some way, but just not a creed. But at the same time there is little or no external reference provided to defend their argument and provide support in defining whether a text is liturgical and what it is that demonstrates this.

Wider analysis of the liturgical nature of Deut 26

As was highlighted through the section above complications arise through a lack of definition as to what is meant when people use particular liturgical terms such as 'creed' or 'offering prayer'. This section will show that a lack of adequate definition also affects the way in which wider scholarship has analysed this chapter.

In describing Deut 26, Woods states that the chapter is setting out the way in which the Israelite, once settled in the land, is to make 'two liturgical declarations'.[669] Woods describes the first of these as being made in front of the priest and containing a response to both the promise of the land that had been given to their ancestors and the actualisation of that promise in the present.[670] Drawing the promise of the past into the 'present' moment of the offering is an aspect of the liturgical collapse of time, part of the liturgical hermeneutic, and this will be explored in more detail below. This is not something to which Woods makes any reference and he then goes on to describe the second declaration as being in the form of a 'confessional short credo', vv.5-10.[671] As has already been discussed however, von Rad's definition of these verses as a credo is not without criticism and therefore

[669] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 261.
[670] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 261.
[671] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 261.

someone wanting to use this term would need to articulate how these verses constitute a creed in light of those who argue against this point of view. Fundamentally, Woods has not set out a clear definition of either 'liturgical' or 'creed' and this makes it difficult to know what textual features he is using to support his viewpoint.

Rather than viewing Deut 26 as part of the deuteronomic law code, Cairns argues that the code finishes at 25:16. He states that 'covenant ratification follows at 26:16' and what occurs between these verses includes 'liturgies expressing gratitude and heartfelt acceptance of the code's essence'.[672] What he does not provide is an explanation of why a statement expressing gratitude should be regarded as liturgy, so it is unclear whether he is assuming that gratitude has to be a part of liturgy or whether any expression of gratitude is liturgical in nature. Further, although he is right in that the second half of the chapter (vv.12-19) does make strong statements about the commands that God has given to his people and their commitment to keep them, this theme is entirely absent in the first half of the chapter (vv.1-11) where there are no words for law or commandment and the focus is upon rescue, deliverance and provision.

Making a similar point about the theme of gratitude, Mann argues in his discussion of the two 'liturgies' in this chapter, that in Deuteronomy, 'gratitude, like love, has a dual orientation. It is the basis for worship – for allegiance to the Lord alone – and it is the basis for stewardship – for equitable distribution of the bounty of the land.'[673] Whilst it is clear that elements of thanksgiving do feature in liturgy, it cannot by itself be the sole characteristic that defines something as liturgical, given that there are many liturgies in contemporary use that do not focus on gratitude. This theme, as Mann describes it, does bear some resemblance to the liturgical strand of 'worship and mission', but this is not a point that he draws out. Instead,

[672] Cairns, *Deuteronomy: Word and Presence*, p. 221
[673] T. W. Mann, *Deuteronomy*, (Westminster John Knox Press: Louisville, Kentucky, 1995), p. 140.

whilst Mann's idea of gratitude as a liturgical feature is not necessarily incorrect, his use of it here is too broad and undefined and he does not demonstrate how this relates to wider liturgical practice.

Brueggemann is the only scholar, in discussion of Deuteronomy, who comes close to stating that the liturgical collapse of time is an important feature of liturgy in this text. He demonstrates this through what he describes as 'liturgical time' in vv.6-8 in which 'the gap between past time and present time is overcome, and present-tense characters become involved in remembered events.'[674] He also notes that 'while the recital of verses 3-10 looks to the *past*, the recital of verses 13-14 looks to the *future* and the blessing for which fidelity qualifies Israel and its land.'[675] This is very similar to the liturgical collapse of time from the hermeneutic, but although Brueggemann has observed a genuine feature of the text he has not made a formal connection to liturgical studies.

Noting the words and instructions that accompany the tithe and in addition to earlier instructions surrounding this, Tigay states that vv.1-15 'prescribe liturgical declarations that the farmer is to recite when he brings the first fruits to the Temple (vv.1-11) and after he gives the poor-tithe every third year (vv.12-15).'[676] He goes on to argue that the focus of attention, despite the context being an offering of food by a farmer, is switched from the natural world, to the role of God in the history of his people. This type of prayer, he argues, is important in Jewish liturgy and he relates this particularly to the *Birkat ha-Mazon*.[677] What is interesting in his analysis, however, is that he describes this emphasis on history as 'one of the most important and original features of the Bible', which, he argues, then has a knock-on effect on liturgy.[678] Whilst the importance of remembering and also a liturgical collapse of time are part of the liturgical hermeneutic being used to define

[674] Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, p. 247.
[675] Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, p. 248.
[676] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 237.
[677] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 238.
[678] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 238.

'liturgical', Tigay sees this as a biblical characteristic, of which liturgical texts would be a part, rather than a specific characteristic of liturgical texts.

Like Tigay, Weinfeld also picks up the point that the prayers of the farmer are not focused on asking for a good harvest in return for the offering, but rather asks for a blessing on the people and land as a whole.[679] He goes on to argue that it is this lack of direct relevance to the farmer that has 'transformed a ceremony into a liturgical oration. It is this liturgical oration giving national and historical significance to the ritual act that is of central importance to the author.'[680] Weinfeld is clearly right in stating that what could have simply been personal prayers have been given a much broader content. He also argues rightly that Deuteronomy is not concerned with prescribing the rites that took place in the temple but is much more focused on prayer.[681] What he does not then go on to demonstrate is why this broader national perspective is a defining characteristic of liturgy.

Nelson also highlights the way in which the wider significance of these verses is more than simply the ritual act they are describe.[682] He goes on to argue that the focus is more on the opportunity to promote deuteronomic theology, than on questions of liturgy and ritual.[683] It is too simplistic, however, to create a dichotomy between theology and liturgy in Deuteronomy, a text in which the two are so intertwined at times as to be distinct yet inseparable.[684] To relegate worship beneath theology is also to ignore the importance and emphasis that the structure of Deuteronomy as whole places on worship, seen, for example, how worship surrounds the deuteronomic law code itself. This will be explored in more detail below. Nelson goes on to support his argument by stating that theology was more important that initiating

[679] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 32-33.
[680] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 33.
[681] M. Weinfeld, 'The Emergence of the Deuteronomic Movement: The Historical Antecedents' in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven University Press: Leuven, 1985) p. 87.
[682] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 306.
[683] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 306.
[684] For example, Deut 6:4-9; 11:13-28; 27:1-8; 29:10-15.

liturgical systems, and this can be seen by the way that 'a certain amount of liturgical imprecision was acceptable.'[685] He makes this argument by highlighting the ambiguity surrounding the location for the presentation of the third-year tithe.

Nelson is right in suggesting that there does appear to be a lack of clarity about the third-year tithe and scholars disagree about this point. For example, both Tigay and Christensen argue that the lack of the phrase 'the place where Yahweh chooses to establish his name', which is included in instructions regarding the three annual pilgrimage festivals, means that the third-year tithe is to be presented at a local assembly.[686] It is difficult to argue, though, that the lack of a phrase is firm proof of a particular point, and Wilson, who acknowledges this absence, argues that a central location could be implied by the fact that all cultic activity has been centralised or that if there was an understanding of the special presence of God then this too could mean the central location.[687] He supports this by arguing that Deut 19:16-21, the 'case of a malicious witness', is an example with no mention of the central sanctuary but an assumption that this would be the location, given that the case was too difficult to judge 'within your towns'.[688] This could well be right, and the verse that he uses does support his interpretation, but again it is based on implication rather than the specific detail within the text of this chapter.

Even if there is a certain amount of ambiguity in the instructions for the third-year tithe, as Nelson has argued, this does not in itself mean that the text is not liturgical or does not contain within instructions for liturgical practices. It simply means that for contemporary readers, there is not sufficient information in order to discern where the third-year tithe was to be taken.

---

[685] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 307.
[686] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 243; Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, p. 642.
[687] I. Wilson, 'Central Sanctuary or Local Settlement? The Location of the Triennial Tithe Declaration (Dtn 26, 13-15)' in *ZAW* 120 (2008) p. 326.
[688] Wilson, 'Central sanctuary or Local Settlement?', p. 327.

Conclusion to the use of liturgical as a description in wider scholarship

This section has examined the way in which various scholars have used the terms 'liturgy' or 'liturgical' in their analysis of Deut 26, or in the case of Nelson, have argued that the chapter is not predominantly focused on establishing liturgical practices. What has been demonstrated is that the lack of clarity over these terms causes problems as each person is defining the words according to their own understanding, which is not made explicit for anyone else to follow. The next section will now take the three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic in turn and apply them to the text, which gives the clarity of definition that has been lacking up to now.

A liturgical hermeneutic

Having demonstrated that the terms 'liturgical' and 'liturgy' have been frequently used in imprecise ways by scholars to describe Deut 26, I will now use the liturgical hermeneutic drawn from Gittoes' three liturgical strands to explore Deut 26. If the three strands are present in the chapter then it provides a more coherent definition for the description of the text as 'liturgical', and will confirm whether or not this is an appropriate term to use in describing this text.

The importance of remembering

Remembering is vital to the thrust of Deut 26. Although the root זכר or a derivative does not appear in the chapter, almost every verse in the first half of the chapter (vv.1-11) deliberately seeks to ensure that God's actions in the past and the promises he made to his people are recalled. In the first three verses, the people are reminded that the land that they will live in, or are living in from the perspective of the farmer, is a gift that God swore to their ancestors to give to them. Following from this, vv.5-7 then recount the suffering of the people in Egypt; v.8 recalls the deliverance of the people by

God; v.9 speaks of the provision of the land again and v.10 brings the attention to the present moment of the farmer by speaking of the offering being brought in thanksgiving. This creates a 'liturgical' type pattern, not dissimilar to the broad outline of an Anglican Eucharistic service, in that the realities of suffering are recalled through confession, followed by a reminder of God's deliverance and his provision, and then opportunities to respond through the offering, as well as other opportunities. The theme of joy through remembering is introduced in v.11, where remembering leads to thanksgiving and rejoicing, which includes the word שמח a term used repeatedly in Deuteronomy but only twice in the wider Pentateuch.[689]

In vv.13-14 the farmer states that he has remembered to act according to the laws and commandments, reinforced in v.13 by the phrase וְלֹא שָׁכָחְתִּי. In v.15 the ancestors are again remembered as the recipients of the original promise of the land and the speech of the farmer is responded to in vv.15-17. These verses encourage the people to continue to remember, shaping the identity of the people as those who will call to mind the laws and commandments and will commit to live by them. This, in turn, leads to blessing from God, vv.18-19.

The last 5 verses refer to remembering the commandments in order to keep them, and the reiteration of the promises that God has been making to his people. The importance of these actions and declarations, and how they reinforce the corporate memory of the story of the people, is underlined by the fact that this occasion was to be celebrated annually. This was not something that would happen once, just at the first harvest in the first year that the people entered the Promised Land, but was to be continually repeated and brought to mind, year after year.

Food is central in this chapter and is intrinsic to this specific act of remembrance and offering. As MacDonald argues, the link between the past

[689] Exod 4:14; Lev 23:40.

and the present is forged at the moment when food is offered as the speech recounts the promise of the past with the present fulfilment.[690] He adds that the text contrasts the transition from the lack of land as a slave or wanderer, which would have meant 'lack of food security', with God's promise of land through which he would bring about food security.[691] It is out of this security that has been provided by God, that the Israelite has food to offer back to God. The food offered becomes a tangible, and edible, enactment and realisation of the historical promises and deliverance of God. It physicalises the memory, the promises of the past becoming something that the people in the present could touch, smell and taste, in the context of joyful communal celebrations.

It is not just through food and touch, however, that this chapter creates a physical association with memory. The farmer is expected to speak out the words that have been provided and through this recitation the individual 'rehearses the journey of Israel's ancestors into Egypt and slavery, and their deliverance by Yahweh.'[692] This is a unique provision in the Pentateuch that sets out words to be spoken by an ordinary Israelite and not a priest or leader. This is not simply speaking in order to remember, though, but remembering becomes a means to transform the speaker through the active and enacted connection with the community's story. The first statement (v.3) recognises the fulfilment of the promise of land that was made to the person's ancestors, by stating that they are now residing in that land. The speaker then recounts the history of nomadic life, settlement in Egypt, followed by persecution, slavery and rescue, before returning again to the theme of being in the land of the promise and bringing the produce of that land as recognition and proof of this. The declaration then leads to feasting and celebration for the farmer as part of the wider community. The produce of the land becomes the representation of the fulfilment of the story that is

[690] N. MacDonald, *Not Bread Alone: The Uses of Food in the Old Testament*, (Oxford: OUP, 2008), p. 77.
[691] MacDonald, *Not Bread Alone*, pp. 77-78.
[692] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 377.

spoken about, and through the recital of the history, the individual and the wider community are continually reminded of their story and identity.[693]

> A mere enunciation of God's saving actions in the past would be discourse only, but by reciting them anamnestically in connection with the act of offering, the offeror accepts or "owns" them. Thus, the enunciation becomes performative. Moreover, the grateful person offering the firstfruits identifies himself with those who actually experienced those actions in an age long past.[694]

The important role of remembering in this chapter goes beyond simply calling something to mind, but is remembering in order to shape and influence the individual and through this the wider community. Remembering is vital to this chapter as the people are encouraged to remember the story of their ancestors, the promises that God made to them and then to commit to remembering the laws that have been presented in the deuteronomic law code. This remembering is enhanced through physicality, first that of the food offered as the 'first fruits' offering and the third-year tithe, second the physicality of speaking aloud, third of travelling to the place that God has chosen, in order to present the offering itself.

Liturgical collapse of time

Deut 26 epitomises the idea of a liturgical collapse of time and, in a similar way to the previous liturgical strand, this appears vital to the nature of the chapter.

In the setting of the chapter, Moses addresses the people who, in their narrative present, are yet to enter the Promised Land. They receive instructions about what they will do in the future by bringing the first fruit of the land as an offering to the place which God will choose. They are provided with the words that they will say as they present their offerings which recount

[693] See also, Christensen, 'Between Text and Sermon: Deuteronomy 26:1-11', p. 61; Mann, *Deuteronomy*, p. 140.
[694] A. O. S. B. Cody, '"Little Historical Creed" or "Little Historical Anamnesis"?' in CBQ 68:1, Jan 2006, p 9.

the past, the story of slavery and rescue. There is then a transition from recalling the past to moving to the present.

וְעַתָּה הִנֵּה הֵבֵאתִי אֶת־רֵאשִׁית פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר־נָתַתָּה לִּי יְהוָה

V.10's opening two words emphatically draw the focus back to the present of the offeror, which is simultaneously the future of Moses' audience as well as the past of the readers of the text. This verse also shows direct and personal identification with the gift of the land as the speaker declares that God has given it 'to me', rather than 'to us'. This is similar to the use of the first-person plural (vv.3-9; 15) which helps to create a direct personal connection between the generations.[695]

The liturgical collapse of time enables personal identification with the gift of the land and also the duty to present the offering. As von Rad states through participating in the liturgical act described here, the person praying acknowledges 'himself to be a direct recipient of the act of salvation which was the gift of the promised land.'[696] The individual is then not just recounting something that happened in the past, but finds themselves within the narrative of promise and actualisation, and responding to this provision. This, then, is no longer just a story of what happened in the past and the promises God made to their ancestors. As Brueggemann puts it, 'the gap between past time and present time is overcome, and present-tense characters become involved in remembered events.'[697] By drawing into the present both what has happened and what will happen, the individual becomes the one who, by the end of the chapter, is choosing to keep the commandments that have been given and becomes a part of the treasured people.

Added to this is that, regardless of when the text was originally written, it is set out for each generation to read and to enact the instructions regarding

[695] See Block, *Deuteronomy*, p. 603; Biddle, *Deuteronomy*, p. 384; Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 262.
[696] von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 159.
[697] Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, p. 248.

the offering of the first fruits and the third-year tithe. This creates multiple layers of past, present and future, the one of the original setting of in the narrative as well and the ones of the proceeding generations of readers. Through collapsing these different time-frames into the perspective of the narrative world of the text, each successive generation is drawn into the moment of making the declaration, committing to keep the commandments and becomes part of the treasured people.

There are several textual features that further aid this process. First, the significance in v.10, that the promised land is given 'to *me*' draws in each generation. A second feature is the importance of הַיּוֹם in vv.16, 17 and 18. The opening words of הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה in v.16 brings the hearers attention 'back to the present moment of decision on the plains of Moab.'[698] The cumulative effect in these verses, and the continuation of thought through v.18 to v.19 means that the emphasis on 'today' continues right up to the important declarations found in the verses at the end of the chapter. As Clements argues, emphasising this word is 'a means whereby past, present and future generations are bound together in a shared experience of encounter with God.'[699] The people are simultaneously drawn back into the 'today' of the narrative setting, and through this taking on the meaning of the statements of identity and purpose in vv.17-19. The 'today' of the text then becomes the 'today' of each new generation.

McConville draws a connection between the repetition of 'this day' / 'today' and the return to the phrase 'laws and statutes' which also marks a connection between the beginning and end of the law code, returning the people to 'the Mosaic present.'[700] The importance of the law is underlined in v.16 where the words חֻקִּים and מִשְׁפָּטִים form an inclusio with 12:1[701] around

[698] Block, *How I Love your Torah, O Lord!*, p. 142.
[699] Clements, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, p. 117.
[700] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 382.
[701] חֻקִּים and מִשְׁפָּטִים appear in close proximity a number of times in the first 11 chapters (4:1, 5, 8, 14, 45; 5:1, 31; 6:1, 20; 7:11; 11:32) but from their use in 12:1 they never appear in the same verse again until 26:16. It is also interesting that although מִשְׁפָּט occurs as both plural

the deuteronomic law code, reaffirming both the need for the people to hear and to keep the commandments, but also the promises that God has made to his people. By placing this at the point of 'today' this also ensures that each subsequent generation realises the need to commit to the statues and judgements as set out in the law code.

The third feature is the idea of representation. As was discussed in the notes on v.5, the ambiguity surrounding the identity of the 'ancestor' means that they can become representative of the ancestors who have formed the story of God's people in the past. In the same way, the 'farmer' bringing the first offering, is representative of all those who in subsequent years will also bring their own offerings and stand before the priest making this declaration. There is a further complex play on time-frames within this idea of representation. The farmer of the narrative future of the text will become an ancestor of those who read the text and perform the ritual in later generations. But at the same time, the narrative of the text through the use of הַיּוֹם pulls the later generations back to the point of the narrative's first hearers, who are then those who precede the 'farmer'. By being drawn back to the narrative setting of standing on the edge of the Promised Land, the later generations become the 'ancestor' of the farmer who will go in and bring the first offering, while simultaneously the farmers who make the first offering are the actual ancestors of the later generation. They both embody the future that is being spoken about whilst being drawn into participating in the past through reciting the words as if they themselves were the first generation brought out of slavery in Egypt.

It is clear that significant features of this chapter demonstrate liturgical collapse of time, and this is used by the author to reinforce the importance for each generation to make a commitment to keep the commandments and

---

and singular in the first 11 chapters, it only appears in the singular between 12:1 and 26:16, (16:18,19; 17:8, 9, 11; 18:3; 19:6; 21:17, 22; 24:17; 25:1).

also to take on the identity of the people of God, shaped by the story that they recount in the act of offering.

Worship and Mission

There are three particular aspects of the text that demonstrate the third liturgical characteristic, the importance of the connection between worship and mission. The first is the way in which the focus of the declaration accompanying the offering of the first fruits is wider than simply a blessing for next year's harvest; the second is the importance of providing food for the poor, vulnerable and marginalised in society; the third is the commitment to keep the commandments and through this to be formed as the people of God.

The first point will simply be noted here as it has already been commented on above, that the farmer focuses his words not on his desire for blessing on his own crops and harvest for the coming year, but instead seeks the blessing of the whole community. Suffice to say here that the very words from this act of worship ensure that this cannot become a solitary, private or individualised act of worship. Instead the mind and eyes of the worshipper are orientated towards both the history and the on-going needs of the wider community.

The second point stresses the importance of providing for the poor. Through placing the instructions of the third-year tithe in the middle of this significant chapter, the need for care of and provision for the poor is brought into the centre of the Israelites past, present and future identity. The recollections of the past experiences of wandering, slavery and homelessness move straight into the instructions for the third-year tithe. As McConville argues, the past identity serves as an impetus to ensure that a key part of their on-going identity includes provision for the vulnerable around them.[702] By placing the instruction directly after the recitation of the people's history, the connection between the two appears to be deliberate. It is, therefore, no surprise that

[702] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 384.

the third-year tithe is included, given that it provides a very practical and tangible way of living out their identity as the people of God and as those who have heard and decided to keep the commandments. This would also explain why vv.12-15 are a part of this chapter, given that otherwise it could appear to be an interruption in the flow of the text. Vv.1-11 are about the offering of first fruits and not about instructions regarding tithing, and if vv.12-15 were not part of the text, then v.11 would connect seamlessly to v.16. It could well be that vv.12-15 are part of an editing together of two texts, or the insertion of verses into a pre-existing text, either of which could be possible. In the final form of the text, though, care for the vulnerable is an integral and non-negotiable part of the identity of the people of God.

The third point is the commitment and formation of the people of God. The historical story recounted in vv.1-11 draws the people towards the point of agreement between them and God in vv.17-19 and through this 'they reactualize their identity.'[703] As was mentioned in the previous section, the repetition of the word הַיּוֹם is significant in drawing each generation of people to the point of commitment. Biddle argues that by repeating this particular word, the text is emphasising the importance of participation by the people.[704] The recounting of the nation's history, and the urgent repetition of הַיּוֹם then draws the subsequent generations to the point of decision-making. The decision is not just to bring the first fruit of their fields, and not just to provide for the poor, but to be formed and shaped by all the statutes and judgements contained within the deuteronomic law code in order to become God's 'treasured people'. The 'mission' as such, in this context, is therefore to follow the law and become the example to the other nations, mentioned in v.19.

In the liturgical setting of Deut 26, the people are being formed in three particular ways: to pray for the well-being of the whole nation, to provide for

[703] Robson, *Honey from the Rock*, p. 45.
[704] Biddle, *Deuteronomy*, p. 392.

the poor and marginalised, and to commit to keep the judgments and commandments that make up the deuteronomic law code. This brings with it the responsibility of drawing the homeless within their midst into a place of celebration and belonging (v.11), which is also related to the third-year tithe (v.12).[705] This again shows the importance that care for the vulnerable and marginalised is written into the liturgical text of this chapter.

Conclusion to the liturgical analysis

This section has clearly demonstrated that not only are the three liturgical characteristics of the importance of memory, the liturgical collapse of time, and the link between worship and mission, present in this chapter but are so to a significant extent. The memory of the past is crucial to the formation of people in the present, at the same time as different time frames collide together, mixing past, present and future from different perspectives to draw each new generation to the point of decision. All of which is done so that the people commit to keeping the laws that have been set out in the deuteronomic law code and that through this, their individual and corporate identities will be formed.

This liturgical hermeneutic has provided a definition for the term and demonstrated clearly the relationship between this definition and contemporary liturgical scholarship. This work gives clarity to a term that is used frequently but in a mostly undefined way. It also shows that Deut 26 clearly demonstrates the three liturgical characteristics that make up the hermeneutical approach, and that therefore this is not an incorrect term to use in describing and working with this chapter.

Continuity, adaptation and innovation in Deut 26

The previous section used the three liturgical strands from the hermeneutical approach to assess whether there was enough evidence provided by using

[705] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 265.

these three strands to support a description of the text as liturgical. It was clear that all three were not only present, but fundamental to the text. Having demonstrated this, this section will now explore whether Deut 26 also demonstrates the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation, and if so, how they are being used and to what effect.

Continuity

While there are new and adapted practices articulated in Deut 26, it is also clear that this chapter is working within certain frameworks and patterns that are present elsewhere in the Pentateuch. For example, Deuteronomy continues the pattern of covenant renewal as observed in Exod 34 and Lev 26. Similarly, instructions to bring the first fruits of the land as an offering are also found in Exod 23:19; 34:26; Lev 23:10 and Num 28:26. Whilst this does demonstrate continuity between Deut 26 and these other passages, it is a little surprising that the offering of the first fruits is not mentioned in Deut 16:1-17, a more natural continuation of the pattern found in the above passages, but rather is found in 18:4[706] and here in 26:2.

The context of the covenant renewal in Exod 34 is the reaction against the golden calf incident when Moses received the first stone tablets. Having recounted the breaking of the covenant in Exod 23 with the associated disloyalty shown to Yahweh, the focus in Exod 24 is its restoration.[707] In Exod 34:6-7 are statements about the nature of God, which then precede the issuing of the commandments and instructions. These are not dissimilar to the declarations made at the end of Deut 26 although, unlike in Exod 34, these are placed after the issuing of the instructions, forming a conclusion to the wider deuteronomic law code. There are, however, two noteworthy points of discontinuity between the two passages. Exod 34:22, 26 uses a technical word for firstfruit, בִּכּוּרֵי, but this does not appear in Deut 26, nor anywhere else in Deuteronomy. Furthermore, the focus in Exod 34 is on the

[706] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 377-78.
[707] Childs, *Exodus*, pp. 610-11; Durham, *Exodus*, p. 464.

encounter between God and Moses, and in Exod 34:31-32 it is reported that Moses then communicates the commandments, first to the leaders and then to the rest of the community. In Deut 26 the entire chapter is the speech of Moses to the people, there is no mention of Moses' private conversation with God, almost as if Deuteronomy is the recorded speech referred to in Exod 34:31-32.

As the covenant is renewed in both of these passages, the emphasis is particularly on God's initiative and instruction, with both chapters also concerned to communicate the right way in which Israel is to carry out its worship of God. Deuteronomy then takes these parallels and moves them into the recorded speech of Moses to the people, rather than an individual encounter with the rest of the community appearing almost as an after-thought in the Exodus version. This is an important example of Deuteronomy's focus on radical democratisation, where all are drawn into hearing the words of God and are invited to respond. This theme will be developed further below.

There is also a connection between Deut 26:1-11 and Lev 23:9-14, in that both issue instructions about the offering of the first fruit of the harvest.[708] The Leviticus passage provides details as to the specific content of this offering, whereas Deut 26 characteristically does not specify the details of the actual offering. Unlike Deuteronomy, the relevant passage in Numbers, (Num 28:26-31) also provides a list of the offerings made for the day of the first fruits, but some of the details of amounts are different from the Leviticus passage. This may be because some of the offerings in Leviticus are considered 'private' and therefore do not need to be listed.[709] The Leviticus passage, having depicted the offering being made to God, then records that 'God, in turn, releases the rest of the harvest for his people's use.'[710] Both the

[708] M. Noth, *Leviticus*, trans J. E. Anderson (SCM Press: London, 1962) p. 170.
[709] T. R. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, TNICOT (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1993) p. 567.
[710] J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus* Word Biblical Commentary (Word Books: Dallas, Texas, 1992) p. 385.

Deuteronomy and Leviticus passages record that the offering of the first fruits of the harvest was to be part of a wider communal celebration where food is consumed. The role of the wider community being drawn together is emphasised, and in Deut 26 this is placed alongside the constant, repeated concern for the marginalised in the community.

The reference to the 'wandering Aramean' (26:5) also provides a point of continuity for the people. This particular continuity is not through reference to a particular text, but, as was stated above, through a figure who becomes a representative figure of the ancestors of the people and so provides continuity for each generation to the story of their ancestors.

Through the points of continuity, Deut 26 emphasises particular, significant, theological themes. For example, stressing the importance of following correct worship practices whilst rejecting and avoiding the practices of surrounding nations. The text also makes important declarations about God's character and emphasises the importance of communal eating and celebrating. However, as noted, there are adaptations made here to emphasise the two points of radical democratisation and concern for the vulnerable: two vital points for deuteronomic theology.

Adaptation

The previous section illustrated ways in which Deut 26 demonstrates similarities and points of continuity with other texts showing a covenant renewal and offering of first fruits. At the same time as noting these, it also became clear that there were particular points of adaptation. These were first, the change in Deuteronomy to have Moses speaking to the community, rather than conversation between Moses and God; second, the loss of specificity in terms of what the offering of the first fruit was to contain, which could explain the lack of the specific term for first fruit; and third, the inclusion of the vulnerable in the celebrations after the offering. Added to this is the way Deut 26 demonstrates adaptation of the covenant formula. Rofé argues that a covenant does not have to be monotheistic, it does not

have to deny the presence of other kings merely forbid the people to serve them. In contrast, Deuteronomy, he goes on to argue, is monotheistic, as seen through the adaptation of the basic covenant formula to include language associated with election (בחר) and that speak of a special identity (סְגֻלָּה).[711] It is important to note, however, that this adaptation of form is also something that occurs elsewhere in scripture.

As mentioned above, the instructions regarding the first fruit offering do not appear as part of the instructions regarding festivals and offerings in Deut 16. This is unlike Exod 23:14-19, Lev 23:1-14 and Num 28, all three of which include mention of and instructions for first fruits as part of the wider offerings and festivals instructions. First fruits receives a passing mention in Deut 18:4, but only as part of a list of offerings that go to make up the provision for the priests, given that they are not to be provided with an apportionment of land of their own. The deliberate placing of this offering separately from the other offerings and tithes means that this passage does not just become the conclusion of the law code, mirroring as it does the commands about worship at the beginning of the law code, but it becomes a profoundly theological statement. The offering of first fruits of the land can only be possible once the people of God have not just gone into the Promised Land, but are settled enough in it to be secure enough to plant and harvest crops. This, then, is not just about setting foot into the land, this is about settlement in the land. The promises that God made to their ancestors will have been fulfilled. This message is reinforced in v.1 through the use of particular words associated with the land as a gift from God, הָאָרֶץ, נֹתֵן, נַחֲלָה, וִירִשְׁתָּהּ, and וְיָשַׁבְתָּ. This is followed in v.2 by the phrase אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נֹתֵן לָךְ. The first declaration that the farmer makes in v.3 repeats this theme through reference to the promise of land by God to his ancestors. Bringing the crops as an offering will be a sign of the fulfilment of the promises of God.

[711] A. Rofé, 'The Covenant in the Land of Moab (DT 28,69-30,20): Historico-literary, comparative, and formcritical considerations' in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven University Press: Leuven, 1985) p.319.

Repetition of this by future generations will embody and enact this for them making it more than something that is just recited but is physical and tangible as well.

This future delayed fulfilment of a promise of God has echoes of the beginning of Moses' calling from God. In Exod 3:12, God reassures Moses that the sign confirming it is God calling him to bring the people out of Egypt will be the people worshipping God on the mountain where Moses currently stands. Before witnessing this confirming sign, Moses will have first to return to Egypt, convince his own people, confront Pharaoh, bring the people out of Egypt and then lead them to the mountain. In a similar way, before the people are able to realise the fulfilment of the promise, they will have to conquer the promised land, settle in it and produce crops in order for them to then take the produce of the land as an offering and make this declaration. This delayed fulfilment, and its mirroring of Moses' calling, could have a dual function. First, seeking to ensure that the people's trust in and following of God is continued for the long term, and second, that Moses' character and his persistence in believing in the fulfilment of God's promise is dispersed and transferred to the people as a whole. This too becomes a potential pointer towards a radical democratisation.

The settlement into the land also connects to the adaptation of the third-year tithe to include provision for the vulnerable. As McConville writes, 'deliverance from homeless slavery into "place" and home brings with it the responsibility to draw the homeless fully into the experience and celebration of rooted belonging (11).'[712] The people's experience of slavery and homelessness is not something to be forgotten once they are settled, but their memory of it is to drive their care of and provision for the marginalised and homeless that are in their community.

[712] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 384.

The adaptations in this chapter are used clearly and effectively to reinforce key, deuteronomic, theological concerns. The active and enacted memory emphasises the fact that the land is a gift from God that he promised to their ancestors. They then live out the fulfilment of this promise, bringing their offerings of the produce of the land and participating in an active remembering of God's promise and fulfilment. Simultaneously, their memory of when they, too, were homeless serves as a prompt to care for others in the community. The promise and fulfilment of the promise, as well as the responsibilities of it, are no longer just for Moses, but are for the whole community.

Innovation

Deut 26 does not just continue or adapt previous practices or concepts, but also demonstrates innovation. For example, as has been noted above, the instructions regarding the provision of the third-year tithe for the poor is something that does not appear anywhere else.[713]

The offering of the first fruit of the harvest would have been a 'new religious institution in Israel' that only makes sense for the people once they are settled in the land and have produce from it to offer.[714] This is reinforced by the future orientation of the first two verbs in 26:1. This celebration through offering is ensuring that a connection is made between the history of the people and their present, albeit a 'present' that is itself constantly moving, through finding a way of connecting this in a manner that reflects the now settled, agricultural lives of the people, in comparison with the nomadic lives in the wilderness. This does not demonstrate 'innovation' in terms of comparison with other passages as there is clearly mention of 'first fruits' in other passages, including in Deuteronomy (see also Exod 23:16,19; 34:22, 26; Lev 2:14; 23:10, 17, 20; Num 18:13; 28:26; Deut 18:4). The reason for drawing attention to this here, however, is that this passage provides the

[713] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 242; McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 377.
[714] Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, p. 320.

details for a celebration that will be new to the people once they are settled in the land, as they transition from a nomadic to agrarian society. This raises an interesting point to consider in the next chapter of the study in terms of the contrast between the Anglican liturgical calendar, which has remained predominantly agriculturally and rurally bound, as compared with the dramatic growth of urban populations in England over the last two centuries. This is perhaps because the Old Testament calendar itself is also largely rural and has influenced the pattern of Christian worship and celebrations.

As has been mentioned above, the concept of representation is important in this chapter. In terms of innovation, the most significant point in this chapter is the provision for and the requirement of the individual to speak out words in a ritual context. This is the only occasion that the Old Testament specifies the actual words an individual worshipper is to say.[715] Tigay highlights Deut 21:7-9[716] as also providing specific words to recite in a ritual context. But although those verses have a ritual setting, the words are spoken only by the elders and not by members of the wider community, making it a different type of instruction than the one found in Deut 26. Equally, there are recited words recorded in Num 10:35-36, but again the context of these is different from Deut 26. Num 10:35-36 provides words to be uttered when moving from camp or setting up a new camp, rather than a liturgical context. They are also spoken only by Moses and not by anyone in the wider community. Equally, there is no indication in the text that this is an on-going command of words that are to be said ritualistically. Rather they are part of the narrative recounting something that was taking place. The uniqueness of this provision is further underlined by 26:5, 13, the only places in the Old Testament that have the phrase וְאָמַרְתָּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ. This is not an instruction for the solo leader, or for the elders, but for each individual to speak before God.

[715] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 32; McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 384.
[716] Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 237.

The contrast between this passage and Exod 34 could not be greater. In Exod 34:3, no-one is allowed anywhere near the mountain as Moses meets with God, let alone has the ability to speak before God. The focus is on Moses as the leader, responsible for meeting with God and becoming the conduit for all communication. In Exod 34:31-32, Moses speaks first with only the leaders of the community before speaking to everyone else. This reinforces a hierarchy in the community which does not feature at all in Deut 26, in fact by the end of Deut 26, the only distinction is between God and the people, rather than distinctions within the people themselves.

In Lev 23:9-14, the instructions are given to Moses to tell the people to bring a sheaf of the first fruits of the harvest. This sheaf is then passed to the priest who raises it up to God. The verses also detail the offering that is to be made alongside this first sheaf. Moses is addressed directly by God here, unlike in Deuteronomy which focuses on Moses' delivery to the people. Also in Leviticus, the offering is made in silence and the priest carries out the ritual actions. 'Während die Opfer der Priesterschrift in absoluter Stille dargebracht warden, ist für das Deuteronomium offenbar das Gebet wichtiger als das Opfer'.[717] This is in definite contrast to Deut 26 in which the individual speaks and also carries out actions themselves, although there is involvement by the priest as well. Num 28:26-31 similarly focuses on the details of the offering that is to be made on the day of the first fruits, but unlike in Lev 23, there is no specified direction given for the priest. Interestingly in both the equivalent Numbers and Leviticus passages, the offering receives more attention and focus than does the offeror.

The individual Israelite is given here the opportunity to speak out the history of the people for and by themselves and by speaking these words, they intentionally place themselves within this story and are shaped by it. For example, their concerns are taken from their own need to grow crops and to

[717] N. Lohfink, 'Opfer und Säkularisierung im Deuteronomium,' in *Studien zu Opfer und Kult im Alten Testament mit einer Bibliographie 1969-1991 zum Opfer in der Bibel* (ed. A Schenker; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] 1992) p. 21.

pray for the whole nation, and in the second liturgical declaration, they only make the declaration once they have fulfilled the criteria of sharing the tithe with the poor and vulnerable. Whilst this could sound overly utopian, it must be acknowledged that it is almost certainly just the male farmer who is making this declaration, a person who has land and the ability to bring an offering from it. So, for example, the recipients of the tithe here are silent, as are almost certainly the women, children and slaves of the household. Despite this, this text still presents a marked difference in comparison to the instructions in the equivalent passages in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. In Deuteronomy, the individual is addressed directly, given specific words and actions to say and the focus is on these rather than the detail of the offering itself.

Conclusion to continuity, adaptation and innovation

This section has clearly shown the presence of continuity, adaptation and innovation in Deut 26 in comparison with other Pentateuchal texts. The use of continuity ensures that Deuteronomy is to be found within the historical stream of Israelite worship and is promoting and encouraging practices that are coherent with how the faith has been seen and understood. Yet at the same time, the text shows clear examples of adaptation and innovation in order to forward the particular theological concerns that are central to the book as a whole. An important idea that was referred to on more than one occasion in the above analysis was that of radical democratisation, and this will be discussed in more detail below.

The importance of liturgy as a framework for the law code

Having clearly demonstrated the presence of the liturgical strands and the liturgical characteristics, and having begun to draw out some of the implications of these for interpretation of the text, it is also important to show how liturgy frames the deuteronomic law code. This is important

because the connection between chapters 12 and 26 demonstrate the importance of liturgy for the book as a whole, while drawing attention to the connection between these two chapters is also significant for the discussion about radical democratisation in the section that follows.

Clear and intentional links are made between Deut 26 and Deut 12 through the deliberate repetition of words and phrases that ensure this connection. The phrase חֻקִּים וּמִשְׁפָּטִים is one significant way in which this connection is made,[718] and stylistic and thematic links are also reinforced through 'the verbs שָׁמַר, "to keep," and עָשָׂה, "to do, practice"'.[719] The deuteronomic law code thus begins in Deut 12 with an instruction to keep and do all the statutes and judgments that are about to be expounded. It similarly ends with this same reminder in respect to all the laws that have been set out. In Deut 26, however, the return to the words 'keep' and 'do' are then drawn into the highly significant declarations at the end of the chapter that articulate the vital relationship between Yahweh and his people. Vv.16-19 form an intentional and formal conclusion to the law code of chapters 12-26, and provide a transition from this section to the final chapters of the book.[720]

One important way which in which the *inclusio* is created between Deut 26 and Deut 12 is through the repetition of similar instructions about worship.[721] In 12:5-7 the instruction to the people is to go to the place that God will choose in order to bring their offerings and tithes. This is then repeated, with further detail, in 26:1-2. It is clear that both of these chapters are focusing on worship, though McConville does not draw attention to the fact that in Deut 12 the context is very much the unacceptable worship practices of the people who currently live in the Promised Land. As has been mentioned above, however, it could be argued that the declarations in 26:14 are also made in

[718] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 376; Block, *How I Love your Torah, O Lord!*, p. 614. S. J. De Vries, 'The Development of the Deuteronomic Promulgation Formula' in Biblica 55 (1974) p. 303.
[719] Block, *How I Love your Torah, O Lord!,* p. 614.
[720] Block, *Deuteronomy*, p. 598; Mann, *Deuteronomy*, p. 141.
[721] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 376. As does Woods, see Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 265.

comparison with other neighbouring religious practices, but this is not clarified by the text and the focus remains on enacting the right worship of Yahweh in the way in which he has set it out. If this is what occurs, then the two chapters at the start and end of the law code would be emphasising the acceptable way of worshipping God in contrast to the practices of the surrounding nations. Deut 12 is setting out the warnings about the reality of entering the land, needing to conquer it and avoid the temptations of the worship practices of those already inhabiting it. Deut 26, on the other hand, envisions a time when the land is conquered, settled and the people no longer have the same immediate concerns.

As well as providing a conclusion to the law code, Markl argues that Deut 26 has a double function within the structure of the book through repetition of themes and phrases from Deut 6-11, not just Deut 12. He highlights particularly the repetition of 'commandment, the statutes, and the judgements' (Deut 6:1), and also the use of 'texts of profession' in both chapters 6 and 26.[722] This, he argues, shows the transition between the child who is motivated to obey Torah in 6:25,[723] that becomes the adult who makes the profession of faith in Deut 26:13-15 which demonstrates the process of education from prescription to fulfilment.[724] Whilst it may not be possible to prove categorically that what Markl suggests is what the writer of these two passages intended, his analysis does draw attention to the emphasis placed in the two chapters on both learning about the law and commandments and, from that, committing to live accordingly.

The presence of the three strands of the liturgical hermeneutic, as well as those of continuity, adaptation and innovation have shown that Deut 26 clearly demonstrates the characteristics of a liturgical text. The strong parallels drawn between this chapter and Deut 12 show the significance of

[722] D. Markl, 'Deuteronomy's Frameworks in Service of the Law (Deut 1-11; 26-34)' in *Deuteronomium – Tora für eine neue Generation*, ed. G. Fischer, D. Markl & S. Paganini (Harrassowitz Verlag: Wiesbaden, 2011), pp. 271-2. See also p. 274.
[723] Markl, 'Deuteronomy's Frameworks in Service of the Law (Deut 1-11; 26-34)', p. 273.
[724] Markl, 'Deuteronomy's Frameworks in Service of the Law (Deut 1-11; 26-34)', p. 273.

worship to the book as a whole, shown by the deliberate placing of these two chapters as frameworks around the deuteronomic law code. This shows the importance being placed on worship, underlining the right way to worship God in contrast with the practices of other nations. As Block puts it, this delivers 'a profound theological message: meaningful and acceptable cultic worship provides the framework for life.'[725] This is further evidence that, as was argued in Chapter Two, liturgy and worship are dominant themes through the book.

This stress on the importance of worship in the framework of the law code, Rofé argues, makes it the ruling theme of the collection.[726] He supports his point by drawing Deut 25:17-19, with its reference to wiping out Amalek, into the same section as Deut 26, following the wider concentric arrangement that he identifies within the law code. This then becomes part of the fulfilment from God that Israel will be safe from all her enemies (12:10).[727] He is not alone in arguing that the frame begins in 25:17. Braulik also supports this by arguing that the return to themes from Deut 12 begins here. 'Mit 25, 17 beginnt schon die Rahmung des Gesetzeskorpus, die auf Themen aus Dtn 12 zurückgreift, wobei die zwei Rituale in 26, 1-15 bewußt als Abschluß des Gesetzeskorpus gedacht sind.'[728] The mention of Amalek in 25:17 is a definite disjunction from the summary of various laws in the preceding verses, and a break is marked in the text between 25:16 and 25:17.[729] This refers, in part, not only to the instructions in Deut 12, but also back to the theme of the first four chapters, which contain details of Israel's interactions with other nations, although the focus there is more on the Amorites, and Amalek is not mentioned. This also explains why the prohibitions regarding the copying the worship of other nations is present overtly in Deut 12 but not Deut 26. As

[725] Block, *Deuteronomy*, p. 598.
[726] A. Rofé, *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation*, OT Studies (T & T Clark: London | New York, New York, 2002), p. 67.
[727] Rofé, *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation*, p. 66.
[728] G. Braulik, 'Die Abfolge der Gesetze in Deuteronomium 12-26 und der Dekalog' in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven University Press: Leuven, 1985) p. 260.
[729] *BHQ* Third Fascicle, *Deuteronomy*, p. 72.

Vogt states, if 'the entire legal section is seen as the means by which the people respond to Yahweh's blessings and gracious acts on their behalf, Deut 12 makes explicit that proper worship is at the heart of this response.'[730] This is not simply about ensuring that provision is made for instructions for worship, but this has a clear and direct influence on the structure of the book as a whole.

In his comparison of the similarities between Deut 12 and Deut 26, Clements draws attention to the way that these two chapters provide the framework that has been noted above.[731] But significantly, he also goes on to argue that the 'framework of religious understanding' seen in these two chapters is also seen 'in much the same way that the laws themselves are modified and infused with a host of religious features calling for compassion and commitment to the welfare of the entire nation.'[732] In his comment here, Clements misses out on including the instructions for Israel to show care and consideration to those who are not Israelites, for example instructions regarding the גֵּר as well as instructions such as those concerning captive women (Deut 21:10-14). Despite this oversight, Clements still makes an important point here as he draws a parallel between the priority of worship in the law code and how this is manifested in the importance placed on demonstrating care for others. Although he does not define it this way, what he describes is the liturgical characteristic of the connection between worship and mission. The importance of worship for the book as a whole is shown not just through texts with an overt focus on liturgy and worship, but also through ensuring that the rest of life is governed by the principles enshrined in Deut 26:16-19. That Israel will commit to keeping God's laws not just in terms of liturgical practice, but in how they live their whole lives, is a reflection of their identity as God's people. The presence of this liturgical characteristic thus

[730] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 203.
[731] Clements, *Deuteronomy*, p. 114.
[732] Clements, *Deuteronomy*, p. 114.

described, reveals the influence of liturgy on the structure of the book as a whole.

Radical democratisation

Since the work of De Wette, there has been an association in scholarship between Deuteronomy and the reforms of Josiah. The acceptance of this can be seen in the work of scholars such as Weinfeld, who argues that Deuteronomy pushes an agenda of centralisation, secularisation and demythologisation.[733] This view, also, has gained much support through subsequent scholarship. Other scholarship however, for example Vogt,[734] has begun to argue that this is not the only, or even the right, way of interpreting the deuteronomic material. The point argued here, is that what takes place in Deut 26, and in other places throughout Deuteronomy, is a push not to centralise the cult, but rather to bring about a radical democratisation of the cult and, further, of the Israelite society in general. This flows naturally on as a continuation and development of the work examining the liturgical characteristics of adaptation and innovation, and looking at the reason behind these developments. Evidence from this chapter, but also importantly from Deut 12, will lend support to this argument, showing that this is not an isolated occurrence, but is to be found throughout the book as a whole.

The rhetorical focus in Deut 26 is on the responsibility of the individual, and by extension the people as a whole, put in terms of their response to God's provision of land once they have settled in it. The central character is the individual worshipper as he presents his offering, the words he is to say and the actions he is to perform. In contrast, the priest is silent throughout, and described simply as the one who happens to be in office at that time. The focus of attention is then not on the cult and the priests, even the specific

[733] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*.
[734] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 4.

details and quantities of the offering are not listed, but rather on the individual's response to God and the words that they say as they declare the history of the people and affirm their keeping of the law. This then clearly shows that the cult at the 'centre' and its rites and rituals are not of primary importance in this chapter. Rather, it is representative individuals making their offering, and through this recounting and identifying with the story of the people as a whole. This culminates with the call for the people to commit to keeping the commandments and to become the people of God. The focus is on the people, the land, the promises that God made and the fulfilment of them.

The beginning chapters of Leviticus also portray Moses addressing the people about bringing offerings to God. The focus in Leviticus is on the food offering being a 'pleasing aroma' to God, whereas in Deut 26, the focus is taken away from the detail of the offering as such and is broadened to the history of the people and the commitment to keep the whole of the law and commandments that have been detailed in the previous chapters. The focus then becomes about the identity of the people, shaped by their history and committed to following the law, rather than God being pleased with the meat or grain that has been brought for a particular type of offering. In Leviticus, having told Moses to address the people, he then addresses the priests with further instructions about offerings. There is no such further instruction following Deut 26, and the reference to the priests' and Levites' shares of offerings found in Deut 18:3-8, is very limited in comparison. Although obviously, Deuteronomy exhibits little interest in the detailed role and function of the priests throughout, so it is consistent with its focus that there is little instruction found here.

Democratisation of power, Deut 16, 18 and 29

Support for this idea of radical democratisation is found throughout Deuteronomy, for example in the appointment of leaders, the restrictions

placed on the monarchy and in Deut 29, where all the people stand equal before God in the covenant renewal ceremony.

In his discussion of the 'altar-law', McConville argues that what he describes as 'the ambiguity' of Deuteronomy's attitude towards the cult is seen also in the attitude towards the monarchy, as well as wider political leadership.[735] He supports this by arguing that what is seen in Deut 17:14-20 restricts and limits the monarchy to the extent that the role of the king as described here is 'virtually unrecognizable in terms of ancient Near Eastern expectations.'[736] McConville had developed this argument in an earlier book, where he states that Deuteronomy chooses not to use language that promotes difference between the people. Instead they are called '"brothers"; tribal distinctions are played down; and it is a single and unified nation that is brought into the land.'[737] He also continues this argument in his later commentary on the text. Here he argues that the lack of hierarchy is continued through the lack of a primary representative, neither a priest or king who leads the worship and sacrifices in Deut 12 but all the people, and there is no sense of mediation.[738] 'This integrity of the people is no light or sentimental thing, but makes demands. It involves the inclusion of slaves, or servants, in the big picture of the people of God, as well as the Levites, who have no substance of their own.'[739]

This democratisation of power can also be observed in Deut 16. Vogt argues that in this chapter, Deuteronomy gives power to the assembled people rather than restricting it to the rulers and leaders. The gathered audience is addressed corporately through the use of the second person singular and they, as the people, are the ones commanded to appoint judges and officers. This, argues Vogt, 'stands in remarkable contrast to ANE conceptions of

[735] McConville and Millar, *Time and Place in Deuteronomy*, p. 107.
[736] McConville and Millar, *Time and Place in Deuteronomy*, p. 108.
[737] J. G. McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*, JSOTSup 33 (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1984), p. 32.
[738] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 231.
[739] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 231.

political power, in which the monarch wielded tremendous power.'[740] The responsibility for appointing others to positions of authority is not given to the king, but rather is delegated to the people. As well as this, the king's power is restricted and limited in terms of the expectations of his duty and role, especially when examined in comparison with royal expectations from surrounding nations.

Deut 12 and centralisation

If Deuteronomy is promoting a vision that is about democratisation and not the restriction and centralisation of power, one of the most significant texts to examine is the altar-law in Deut 12. It seems apparent from a first reading that the focus of the text is destruction of places of idol worship and establishment of the one focal point for worship of Yahweh. But this traditional interpretation has also been challenged, and when considered in relation to other passages in Deuteronomy and beyond, looks increasingly questionable.

The contrast presented in this chapter, as Craigie has argued, is between the places of worship of the Canaanites, which 'the Israelites were to avoid', and the place that God would choose.[741] The stress on destroying these places is shown through the emphasis of the first two words in v.12 אַבֵּד תְּאַבְּדוּן and the categorical 'all' that follows אֶת־כָּל־הַמְּקֹמוֹת. Similarly to Craigie, Woods also argues that the focus in chapter 12 is on Yahweh's choice of location rather than centralisation,[742] as does Niehaus who states that the 'real thrust of the chapter is not so much to centralize worship as it is to eliminate idolatry and guard against syncretism.'[743] The contrast, therefore, is between the place that God has forbidden and the place that God will choose[744] and, as Niehaus argues, the emphasis on choice of place means that this place

[740] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 68.
[741] Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, p. 217.
[742] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 193-94.
[743] J. J. Niehaus, 'The Central Sanctuary: Where and When?' TynBul 43/1 1992. p. 14.
[744] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 4.

could be transient[745] rather than being a veiled reference about Jerusalem. McConville also argues for the importance of the instruction being about God's choice of place. He connects this to significant deuteronomic themes of blessing and the land as God's gift to his people, arguing that this makes the idea of God's choice much more central to deuteronomic theology than simply seeing it as a demand for a sole sanctuary.[746] The idea that Deut 12 is an oblique reference to Jerusalem is further undermined by Deut 27. In this chapter, Moses commands sacrifices to be offered on Mount Ebal, which conflicts with the idea that Deut 12 is arguing for centralisation and a sole sanctuary for sacrifice.[747] Further, as McConville has argued, Mount Ebal is almost certainly not intended to be seen as the one, main place of worship.[748]

A slightly different perspective is put forward by Pitkänen who argues that vv.10-11 show that the instructions about the altar law are an ideal that are to be carried out only when Israel is safe in the land.[749] He supports this by arguing that Deut 26:1-2 shows that the Israelites are to bring their offering to the chosen place only once they have taken possession of the land and settled in it.[750] He also adds that this is further supported by Exod 34:23-24,[751] and that Deut 7:22, as well as Exod 23:29-30 both demonstrate that a length of time will pass before Israel are able to defeat their enemies in the promised land.[752] He argues that this all means that there is permission, additionally supported by Deut 16:21-22, for local altars to be used in the interim between beginning and achieving conquest, so long as they do not put up a symbol of another god beside them.[753] There is clearly textual evidence to support his argument that the central location would only become operative once the

[745] Niehaus, 'The Central Sanctuary', p. 7.
[746] McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*, p. 32.
[747] G. J. Wenham, 'Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary' TynBul 22 (1971) p. 115.
[748] McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*, p. 29.
[749] P M A Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and the Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: From the Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple* (Georgias Dissertations Near Eastern Studies 5; Piscataway, NJ: Georgias, 2003) p. 100.
[750] Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and the Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel*, p. 99.
[751] Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and the Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel*, p. 100.
[752] Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and the Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel*, p. 101.
[753] Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and the Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel*, p. 103.

people were settled in the land. This argument, however, still ends up with the idea that the focus of the chapter is, ultimately, on the central place of worship.

What Vogt argues effectively, is that what this chapter emphasises is not a call to one centralised place, but rather the comparison between the idol worship of the Canaanites, which was to be destroyed, in contrast with the acceptable way of worshipping God. What Deut 12 sets out is that the right way of worshipping God is 'only when it is carried out in accordance with his instructions and at the place of his choosing.'[754] This is about establishing and ensuring God's sovereignty as he sets out the way in which he is to be worshipped, in contrast with the false worship of the nations that surrounded them.[755]

Profane slaughter

This process of radical democratisation can be further observed in Deut 12 where the instructions for sacrificing meat away from the central sanctuary are significantly changed. The restriction of sacrifice to one location would make it impractical for those from further away to travel regularly in order to sacrifice meat and consume it.[756] As the sacrifice of animals was restricted to one location, legislation is introduced to permit non-religious sacrifice of meat in order to avoid limiting people to a primarily vegetarian diet, with only wild game permitted.[757] This permission is 'radically new',[758] and, everyone within the community would have been able to participate, including those who may have been otherwise restricted, for example due to temporary uncleanness.[759] The practical implications of this are then considered, and changes are made to the way in which meat can be eaten outside of bringing offerings to the one place that God will choose. This change does not,

[754] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 176
[755] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 203.
[756] Woods, *Deuteronomy*, p. 191.
[757] Block, *Deuteronomy*, p. 316.
[758] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 226.
[759] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 226.

however, mean a descent into anarchy, with permission to do anything, anywhere.

What is presented here could be seen as simply a pragmatic solution to having one place to sacrifice animals, as Cairns sees it, permission for people who live further away to eat meat, so long as the blood of the animal is poured out on the ground.[760] Doubtless there is pragmatism within this concession, but if that is the only consideration, then the presence of the instruction regarding the blood would appear as an unnecessary addition, introducing a factor into the instructions that contain an element of sacrificial ideology.

The possible presence of sacrificial overtones is further invoked through the use of the verb זבח in these verses. Lundbom argues that although the word זבח usually indicates a sacrificial slaughter, it is used in vv.15, 21 to indicate non-sacrificial slaughter, and that the term has been 'divested of its sacral meaning'.[761] It is difficult to know, however, on what grounds Lundbom is able to decide that the use of the word here does not carry any of its normal sacrificial meaning. He argues that two other passages, 1 Sam 28:24 and 1 Kgs 19:21, support his point of view that the term can be used in a non-sacrificial way.[762] Examining the language of these further two passages, however, throws doubt on the fact that these can be used to support his argument of non-sacrificial slaughter. In 1 Sam 28:24, the witch kills and cooks a עֵגֶל. This word occurs 35 times in the Old Testament and, if Lundbom is correct that this supports a non-sacrificial understanding of זבח, then this would be the only עֵגֶל to die in the Old Testament as a non-sacrifice. Other than the 9 occasions where the term is used to describe a literal calf or is used as a metaphor / simile,[763] every other occasion is directly related to

[760] Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 129-31.
[761] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 435.
[762] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, p. 435.
[763] Isa 11:6, 27:10; Jer 31:18; 46:21; Ezek 1:7; Amos 6:4; Mal 3:20; Ps 29:6, 68:31.

either sacrifice or idol worship.[764] Given this connection to sacrifice and idol worship, it seems all the more unlikely that the use in 1 Sam 28:24 is the only anomalous non-sacrificial killing of a calf, but rather the word's connection to idol worship could even be seen to further underline Saul's descent into apostasy.

Vogt argues effectively that the 'word זָבַח is used consistently throughout the Old Testament in connection with sacrifice. Of the 134 times the word appears, all but 8 are indisputably related to sacrifice and, therefore, have sacral connotations.'[765] In Deuteronomy the word is used 12 times, and of the other 10[766] each occasion is directly related to sacrifices, which would mean that 12:15, 21 would be the only use in Deuteronomy not associated with religious sacrifice. Vogt also adds that the word טָבַחcould have been used instead if the desire was to show clearly that this was deemed to be secular slaughter, as this is what the term always indicates,[767] and this word is present elsewhere in the book. Vogt goes on to argue that this instruction is not profane at all. He points to the instruction regarding the pouring out of the blood on the ground, which has a clear religious association.

> It is hard to conceive of secularization in the context of the blood prohibition that is grounded on the uniquely Israelite religious association of blood and life, particularly since the author(s) of Deuteronomy could easily have purged any elements of earlier theology that did not conform to their thinking, as has been argued in the case elsewhere in Deuteronomy.[768]

He argues instead that holiness was not being restricted to some single, central sanctuary but was, instead, being extended into the whole of the land itself.[769] Rather than being seen as something profane this, he argues, is demonstrating religious significance and loyalty to Yahweh, showing that all

[764] 'Calf' image used as an idol: Exod 32:4, 8, 19, 20, 24, 35; Deut 9:16, 21; Ps 106:19; Neh 9:18; 1 Kgs 12:28, 32; 2 Kgs 10:29; 17:16; 2 Chr 11:15, 13:8; Hos 8:5, 6, 13:2. 'Calf' used as a sacrifice or offering: Lev 9:2, 3, 8; Jer 34:18, 19; Mic 6:6.
[765] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 181.
[766] Deut 15:21; 16:2, 4, 5, 6; 17:1; 18:3; 27:7; 32:17; 33:19.
[767] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 183.
[768] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 191.
[769] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 185.

'of the actions of the people of Israel in the land have covenantal and religious significance.'[770] This idea of the sacred being spread out into the rest of life rather than being preserved at the centre is something that Lohfink also argued for in an earlier text.

> Diese Wirklichkeit ist für das Deuteronomium das eigentliche Sacrum. Vom bisherigen, gewissermaßen archaisch-kultishen Verständnis des Sacrum her gesehen mag das, was das Deuteronomium entwickelt, wie eine Auflösung des Sakralen erscheinen. Für das Deutonomium selbst ist es die Überführung der gesamten Welt-Wirklichkeit der Gesellchaft >Israel< ins Sakrale hinein.[771]

As Lohfink argues elsewhere, the idea of 'profane slaughter' is one that is based on a pre-deuteronomic concepts of holiness, whereas for Deuteronomy nothing is left any longer as profane. Instead, what occurs is a broadening out of the sphere of the sacred.[772] If holiness is something that is being transferred onto the land as a whole, and by association the people, then this is the opposite from a centralised view where holiness and religiosity are located in only one place, which is also the place of the priesthood who carry out the sacrifices. Instead this shows the way in which ordinary citizens are able to conduct their lives themselves in a way that demonstrates their commitment to God and his commandments.

Even at this point of surprising innovation, Deuteronomy still maintains a sense of continuity with what has gone before. This is not a rejection of what has gone before but an integration with and adaptation of pre-existing laws to create something new and surprising. Neither is this simply innovation for the sake of it, or driven purely by pragmatism without consideration for the wider theological implications. The roots for this new instruction have their basis within a pre-existing law, that of hunting wild animals. V.22 shows that this instruction is not to be extended to include domestic animals as well. But, as Vogt has argued, there is also adaptation and extension of the pre-existing sacrificial laws and instructions. Innovation, therefore, can be seen to

[770] Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, p. 203.
[771] Lohfink, 'Opfer und Säkularisierung im Deuteronomium,' p. 35.
[772] Lohfink, 'Opfer und Säkularisierung im Deuteronomium,' p. 36.

contain both continuity and adaptation within itself and so, ultimately what can be observed here is the drawing together of continuity, adaptation and innovation. At this point in Deuteronomy, innovation is used to continue this process of radical democratisation as ordinary people gain the permission and responsibility to cook and eat meat away from the usual place of sacrifice, pouring out the blood in keeping with the instructions given to the priest, and demonstrating their commitment to God.

Conclusion to Radical Democratisation

The work arising from the liturgical hermeneutic and characteristics drew attention to certain aspects of Deut 26 which focused on the importance of attention given to the individual worshipper and the community identity, as opposed to the role of the priest, the nature of sacrifice and the detail of the offering. This led onto the possibility of Deuteronomy promoting an agenda of radical democratisation. Clearly this concept stands in opposition to the long-held ideas of centralisation, secularisation and demythologisation. This section has explored the work of Vogt, alongside key chapters in Deuteronomy, to see how far the concept of radical democratisation can be supported. It is clear that there is significant support, that particularly comes to light through the way in which Deuteronomy adapts texts and practices from other contexts. For example, the unusual restrictions placed on the king and other political leaders in the community which stand in direct contrast as compared to those from other Ancient Near Eastern communities. The argument was also raised that the focus in Deut 12 is not on the centralised location as such, but rather on the priority of God to choose the place of worship and the insistence that Canaanite worship practices and locations are avoided. This idea is continued into the analysis on the idea of 'profane slaughter' in Deut 12, which has been shown to be closer to sacrificial practice and language than is sometimes understood.

This work then leads back to Deut 26, lending support that what has been raised through this reading in this chapter is not isolated, but is also found

elsewhere throughout the book. Other particular points in Deut 26 are also important for this reading, for example, the point about representation raised in the textual notes on v.5, where the farmer represents those who will come after him. By the end of the chapter, the focus is on the whole people of God becoming the treasured people who keep his commandments. This has strong similarities with the covenant renewal ceremony (Deut 29:10-15) where the entire community, including women, young children and resident aliens, stand equally as one before God, recommitting themselves to keeping God's commandments. Similarly, this has a representative element to it as there is reference made to those who will commit themselves to this in the future.

Conclusion

This chapter, as with the previous one, has taken a specific chapter of Deuteronomy that has long been understood as demonstrating liturgical characteristics, in order to examine it in detail according to the liturgical hermeneutic as set out in Chapter One. It was clear that although the concept of liturgy and the description of 'liturgical' is widely used by scholars in analysing this chapter, the reason supporting this analysis is lacking. The use of the liturgical hermeneutic, arising out of liturgical theory, gives a much clearer understanding of the use of this word. It was also very apparent that when analysed through this hermeneutic, the presence of liturgical characteristics was clear.

This liturgical reading also revealed the radical democratisation that is at work both in this chapter and in the wider text. This concept was supported from work stemming from a number of significant places in the wider text, particularly chapter 12: an important choice given the direct relationship between chapters 12 and 26 in the overall structure of the book and the way in which liturgy is important in both of them. This reading revealed the way in

which the text is seeking to flatten out depictions of hierarchy and reduce the power of authority figures, as for example seen in the depiction of the role and rights of the king. It is important to note, however, that even through this process, the text is not seeking to disregard the importance of the need for positions of authority and order in society.

The next, and final, chapter will draw together the key features from this chapter together with the previous chapters, in order to expand and develop the paradigm that will respond to the initial question.

Chapter Five: Continuity, adaptation and innovation as a liturgical paradigm for Anglican mission

Introduction to Chapter Five

The work in Chapter One focused on the remarkably widely-received Church of England report, *Mission-shaped Church*,[773] and how it strived to encourage members of the Church to adapt practices to changing contexts. It was pointed out that despite its significant impact on the Anglican Church, the report had not been received without criticism,[774] with concerns have been raised over its theological methodology. Also, the relatively speedy response from the Church of England nationally to promote and encourage fresh expressions of church has left some in parish based ministry feeling disenfranchised.[775] It was equally clear however, that despite being the most prominent and lengthiest critique of *Mission-shaped Church,* the book *For the Parish* was also not without criticism. It portrays an idealised image of parish life and ministry, and does not sufficiently acknowledge the degree of societal change in the country.[776]

Up to this point, the primary methodological approach in these on-going discussions has been ecclesiological.[777] What this has frequently meant in practice is that those supporting fresh expressions of church have sought a reductionist ecclesiology. The section exploring 'inculturation' in Chapter One

[773] Church of England Mission and Public Affairs Council, *Mission-shaped Church*.
[774] See especially Hull, *Mission-Shaped Church*; Davison & Milbank, *For the Parish*.
[775] Gittoes, Green & Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology*, p. 1.
[776] Goodhew, Roberts & Volland, *Fresh!*, pp. 43-44.
[777] Croft, 'Fresh Expressions in a Mixed Economy Church', p. 14.

argued that this approach actually risks diminishing opportunities for innovation in a new context. This is because it is based on a 'translation' approach, where pre-existing concepts and ideas are transferred from one context to another and dressed in different language, rather than setting out parameters to enable innovation of something truly new in the new context.

As well as the use of ecclesiological methodology, the first chapter also set out how the issues of liturgy and worship have been intentionally side-lined in the practical advice given to those seeking to develop something new.[778] In fact, worship is often reduced to descriptions of 'style' in the literature that supports fresh expressions of church, rather than any deeper recognition of the primary value of worship as an integral aspect of mission and discipleship. Equally important, given this study's intentional focus on fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context, the lack of focus on worship and liturgy in the literature has meant that the fundamental importance of liturgy for Anglican self-understanding has not been acknowledged or discussed. This point led to the historical review that demonstrated the significance of liturgy to Anglican identity whilst at the same time revealing how liturgy has continually changed and adapted over time. This section also examined the ways in which, for example, rural and urban concerns about worship that were raised in several Church of England reports throughout the 20th century, had not been brought effectively into dialogue with the developments of fresh expressions of church. An important result of this survey was in providing a response to the assumptions within *For the Parish* that presented Anglican liturgy as a constant, unchanging acultural phenomenon.[779]

A liturgical methodology

The liturgical hermeneutic, as set out in Chapter One, was taken to the text of Deuteronomy to provide a clear definition for the description for the term 'liturgical', in contrast to previous uses of the term in wider scholarship.

[778] Archbishop's Council, *The Fresh Expressions Initiative*, p. 2.
[779] Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism*, p. 160.

Having used this methodology to demonstrate that the text is liturgical, these chapters then went on to look further for the liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation. What was revealed through this work will now be summarised here to provide a liturgical paradigm that will begin to form a response to the original question.

Continuity

As was demonstrated throughout this study, Deuteronomy makes repeated links with the preceding narrative, through recounting significant themes, narrative incidents and theological concepts. Remembering in Deuteronomy, though, is not just an act of recalling information, but an active engagement with both the story and the law that is accompanied by a decision to commit to it and pass it on to the next generation. Moses addresses the people as if they had direct experience of events at which they had not actually been present, for example Deut 4:9-13 and 11:2-7. The rhetorical impact of this device brings the story of the nation into the present,[780] and actualises the faith for the current generation by drawing together past, present and future into one moment.[781] As was argued, if the later generation about to cross into the Promised Land were not addressed 'as if' they were a previous generation, then the text may well not have the power to draw subsequent generations back to the moment of decision that faces those about to enter the land. These significant foundational stories are repeated not only to encourage but also to warn against and to curb inappropriate practices.

Deuteronomy makes frequent mention of slavery in Egypt. This is used to influence the people's behaviour, particularly in providing care for the vulnerable and the marginalised in society.[782] This can be observed, for example, in Deut 26 where the placing of instructions to care for the poor directly after the recitation of the people's history appears deliberate. The third-year tithe then gives a practical and tangible way of living out their

[780] Ellman, *Memory and Covenant*, p. 65.
[781] von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', p. 29.
[782] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 384.

identity as the people of God and as those who have heard and committed to keeping the commandments.

The text stresses the importance not just of continually communicating and repeating the fundamentals of the faith, but ensuring that there are intentional opportunities provided for people to learn, commit to and pass it on to others. This theme is highly significant for those involved in fresh expressions of church, as part of their *raison d'être* has been seeking new ways to share faith and pass it on to the next generation. Deuteronomy sets out the importance of providing means for people to learn about faith, for example through celebrating festivals, participation in renewing the covenant, and through space to ask questions. Learning is closely linked to remembering the laws and committing to live according to them, not dissimilar to the promises affirmed by Anglicans in confirmation. The final step in the process is then passing this on to the next generation, something of great importance for Deuteronomy.[783] In some way, the next generation is always in view throughout Deuteronomy given how it plays with a liturgical collapse of time in the narrative setting. This pattern encourages those involved in fresh expressions of church to examine how they provide intentional opportunities for people to learn, remember, commit to and pass on the faith to the next generation.

Deuteronomy uses innovation and rhetorical technique to present to Israel a vigorous call to re-engage with their national identity. Whether read as instilling an identity prior to conquest, or re-energising flagging morale after the exile, Deuteronomy's rhetorical innovation calls each new generation of the people of God to the point of decision.[784] What is crucial from the perspective of Deuteronomy is that national identity is utterly interwoven

[783] See Firth, 'Passing on the Faith in Deuteronomy', pp. 157-176.
[784] Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 6; Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah*, pp. 1, 6-14.

with care for the vulnerable and marginalised, and importantly includes the foreigner in the midst as well.

Adaptation

In Deuteronomy the whole of life is drawn into the orbit of worship. Faith was not to be either cerebral or occasional, but rather the foundation of all aspects of life.[785] The laws and commandments Moses teaches the people, that he expects them to remember and commit to, cover many routine aspects of life, such as building houses, farming the land, and regulations surrounding clothing. What is important is that, as Reeder describes it, 'the covenant is preserved by being woven into the daily life of the family, firmly placing Israel's relationship with God at the very centre of social existence.'[786]

The child's question in Deut 6 is significant to the overall chapter, emphasising as it does listening to the commandments and learning them. The child's question here adapts the Exodus text and changes a question that is centred around ritual practices to one focused on learning the story of God's deliverance of his people from slavery and the subsequent giving of law to the people. There is a strong emphasis on encouraging the next generation to participate in the communal identity of the past, not simply to preserve it but to be shaped by it so that life in the future will bring blessing. It is also clear that the children are not simply told about a list of rules, but they are engaged by the story that lies behind them. This is particularly important as it demonstrates two vital things, first that the tools of the past should not be neglected simply because they are old, but also second that there is a model for adapting past practices to suit changing contexts. The importance of being able to ask question and to engage in the story of salvation rather than simply recite information is particularly vital in responding to a point raised in Chapter One. As a counter to an assertion from Davison and Milbank, it was argued that simply attending worship and reciting liturgy, even regularly, may not be sufficient for developing individual's understanding of the theology

[785] Biddle, *Deuteronomy*, p. 124.
[786] Reeder, *The Enemy in the Household*, p. 20.

contained within the words they were saying. What the textual study from Deuteronomy shows is that as well as simple recitation, other means such as questioning, discussing and participating in the action of the story are all significant ways of enabling participation and understanding.

A further point of adaptation was the shift in focus from the leadership role of the priests, Levites and elders, as seen in the wider Pentateuch, to the whole community in Deuteronomy. It is particularly important to note that this gathered community specifically includes women, children and resident aliens. Whilst there is a clear flattening of the hierarchical structure in society (and this will be focused on in more detail in the following section exploring radical democratisation within the wider section on innovation), this is not setting out a model with a lack of leadership and authority. Rather, the roles of leadership are re-defined, albeit in a more limited way, whilst the whole community receives both the same invitation and takes on the same responsibility that was previously just reserved for the leaders. In terms of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context, this point raises particular and important questions around issues of defining roles of leadership clearly and, significantly, stressing the importance of invitation and responsibility for the whole community.

Although there is dependence on the wider treaty tradition, the text clearly shows that the pattern has been adapted and extended to suit its theological purposes. Deuteronomy makes use of something that is culturally contemporary in order to express its theology but does not in any way imply that ANE treaty documents or concepts were to be considered sacred or even by themselves particularly significant.

Innovation

The offering of the first fruit of the harvest would have been a 'new religious institution in Israel' that only makes sense for the people once they are settled in the land and have produce from it to offer.[787] As was noted in

[787] Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, p. 320.

Chapter Four, it is not that 'First Fruits' as recorded in Deuteronomy innovates in comparison with the wider Pentateuch, but rather does so in terms of a new celebration appropriate for the new context of settling in the land. This brings out an important argument to address the point raised in the first chapter that both *For the Parish* and *Mission-shaped Church* did consider points raised by the earlier national church reports 'Faith in the Countryside'[788] and 'Faith in the City'.[789] What Deuteronomy shows is the potential for innovation in terms of festivals and community celebrations that break out of the predominantly agrarian mind-set of the Church of England, as well as opportunities to respond particularly to new context and immediate situations that arise in both the city and the countryside.

The celebration of 'First Fruits' is marked in a tangible way through bringing the produce of the land and speaking aloud the prayers that are set out. The food can be touched and smelt, the words are spoken aloud, and all of it is located within a wider context of joyful communal celebrations which involved eating, drinking and celebrating together. The individual has also had to travel to the place God has chosen to present the offering. All of this acts to physicalise the memory of God's promises, helping to make them real and present to the individual and the wider community. The Church of England has had an often largely cerebral focus for worship: the focus in services is predominantly on singing, speaking and listening to words. Other than standing and sitting, physical responses are confined to receiving a small piece of bread or wafer and a sip of wine, and possibly smelling incense or seeing candles and other decoration in some Anglican traditions. The vision set out in Deut 26 is much more expansive, with harvesting and transporting the food, standing and speaking out the words of faith individually rather than as part of the wider congregation, and then feasting and celebrating. This is a significant encouragement to those involved in fresh expressions of church to think about how faith and worship can be encountered in a more physical,

[788] 'Faith in the Countryside' Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Rural Areas.
[789] Church of England Archbishop's Commission on Urban Priority Areas *Faith in the City*.

immediate and direct way. The inclusion of feasting and celebrating together could also be a very positive and welcome addition.

The strong connection between the work that the farmer does and its immediate relationship to worship, forming as it does the literal worship offering, also creates a strong link between the realm of daily work and the realm of worship. The world of work and employment can be an area that is overlooked or neglected in Anglican worship, be it contemporary or traditional. This can add to the potential disconnect between people's experiences of their daily lives during the week and worship at church whereas Deuteronomy encourages an integration of all aspects of life. As noted above, the later prophetic critique of the community often arose when a separation occurred between worship and the rest of life.

The textual connection between work and worship is seen not only through the example of the farmer bringing his offering but through the semantic connection between the word for 'work' and the word for 'worship'. When appearing without 'an object, *'ābaḏ* usually means "to work."'[790] Similarly when occuring with 'inanimate objects, *'ābaḏ* means to "work on, develop, cultivate," and its object is usually *'ᵃḏāmâ*.'[791] At the same time, the figure

> *'ābaḏ 'ᵃbōdâ*" is frequently used when referring to particular religious acts, for example 'the presentation of an offering (Josh. 22:27), the adherence to certain customs (Ex. 13:5, the Passover celebration), or the various activities at the tent of meeting (e.g., Nu. 3:8; 4:23,27; 7:5; 8:22).[792]

Whilst these examples arise from Joshua and the wider Pentateuch, it is particularly interesting to note that in Deuteronomy, and carried through into the wider Deuteronomistic History, the term is used differently. It occurs with Yahweh as its object in a way that is not limited by solely cultic settings, but rather describes 'a religious and ethical disposition encompassing a person's

[790] Ringgren, *ābaḏ*, p. 381.
[791] Ringgren, *ābaḏ*, p. 382.
[792] Ringgren, *ābaḏ*, p. 383.

entire life, one coming to expression especially in the obedient keeping of the commandments.'[793] This semantic connection between the two words then in Deuteronomy further emphasises the importance of a lived connection between worship and the rest of life.

Speaking out

In Deut 26, the individual Israelite speaks aloud the history of the people and through this takes on the identity of this story; the words focus outwards from their own particular concerns to prayers for the people as a whole. This shows the opportunity for the individual to voice their faith, regularly if not frequently. It must however be stressed, that this is not about individualism as such, given that the words are about identifying with both the past deliverance and future needs of the wider community. Through participating in the liturgical act described here, the person praying acknowledges that they are 'a direct recipient of the act of salvation which was the gift of the promised land.'[794] The clear encouragement here for fresh expressions of church is to think about ways of enabling individuals both to share in the wider communal story and to give voice to their faith publicly.

Radical Democratisation

In Deuteronomy the role of the king is particularly limited as compared with practices in the wider ANE. Restrictions are placed on the king, and the power and authority is given to the assembled people, not just the king, leaders, elders or priests. Deuteronomy also lacks language that could be seen as promoting any difference between the people. Instead, they are called '"brothers"; tribal distinctions are played down; and it is a single and unified nation that is brought into the land.'[795] As was noted, McConville argues that the lack of hierarchy is continued through the lack of a primary

[793] Ringgren, *ʾābaḏ*, p. 386.
[794] von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, p. 159.
[795] McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*, p. 32.

representative: neither a priest nor king who leads the worship and sacrifices in Deut 12 but all the people, and there is no sense of mediation.[796]

Another significant part of this process of radical democratisation occurs when the wider community is given permission to kill, cook and eat meat in their local vicinity in awareness of the fact that once settled in the land, the main place of sacrifice could be a long way from some of the towns and villages. They were, however, required to pour out the blood on the ground and not eat it, in keeping with the instructions given to the priest, and demonstrating their commitment to God. As was demonstrated though, these 'new' instructions for 'profane slaughter' still find their roots within pre-existing laws, so even at this point of significant innovation there is still a connection back to existing practices.

The point about flattening out of societal structures has been discussed above in terms of how this may relate to fresh expressions of church. What this section as a whole provides, is the encouragement to release, encourage and enable. 'Holiness' was no longer to be bound at the one site, but was spread throughout the land, empowering each member of the community and permitting 'profane slaughter'. As was noted, this is not anyone doing anything, anywhere, and it is crucial to remember that this does not represent an end to the priesthood and the monarchy. Deuteronomy still depicts a society with leaders and authority figures, but it is their function and relationship to the wider community that is different. The text presents a picture of the community as a whole taking on the responsibilities to keep God's commandments, to continue sharing the story of rescue and redemption from slavery with the next generation, and to worship God in the ways that he has instructed. Further to this is also, as was shown above through the permission to eat meat locally, the approval to do some things at a local level that were once the preserve of the central structure.

[796] McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 231.

In the light of this, it is interesting to begin to think tentatively how radical democratisation may relate to the Church of England and to the role of fresh expressions of church within it. As was stated above, it is important to remember in this discussion that Deuteronomy does not present a picture of a community without leadership, but rather one that places particular limits around certain roles and encourages a more egalitarian view of the community as a whole. One way that this could be seen to relate to current practices in the Church of England is the presence of synodical governance means that at every level of the church. This means that there is the mechanism for collaboration and shared decision-making, from each local PCC up to the national church's General Synod. There is also the potential for any member of the congregation to go forward to be part of both Diocesan and General Synods, as well as numerous other working groups and committees. This means that decision making is not the preserve of the clergy and, whilst it is not congregational in the sense that every individual is directly part of the process, every individual could be involved and could contribute to national church decisions.

The question that fresh expressions of church raises, in terms of the themes of radical democratisation, are particularly to do with the extent to which authority and permission flows from the centre to the edges. This relates to the permission in Deuteronomy to sacrifice some animals in local areas rather than being restricted to the centre. Where this appears in Deuteronomy, the new permissions are an expansion of the existing rules, and although this was an innovative application of those rules it was not completely without any reference to anything that had gone before. It is, therefore, important to underline that this is not about arguing for the right of anyone to do anything, anywhere. This does not mean, then stepping outside of episcopal oversight,

but using existing rules to create new ways of working, such as have been seen through things like Bishop's Mission Orders.[797]

One important question that relates to this area is that of sacramental presidency, especially in terms of growing numbers of fresh expressions of church which are lay led. It could be argued that lay presidency may be seen in the same light as the localised slaughter of animals in Deuteronomy, and that it could therefore become an expansion of existing Anglican theology. In terms of the perceived spread of 'holiness' from the centre to the edges, there is a development of loosening centralised control and enabling localised discernment. But equally it would not be right to argue that the changes observed in Deuteronomy in any way watered down the understanding of important concepts such as priesthood or holiness through the changes that were brought about. This is not about diminishing but rather redefining terms and enabling a greater sharing in responsibility. This may then provide some encouragement, as well as comfort, that exploring ways in which the ritual of worship is 'decentralised' does not automatically have to mean a lesser understanding of priesthood, sacrality or liturgy.

Forming a response to the original question

The work of this study has argued that a liturgical paradigm of continuity, adaptation and innovation is more reflective of both Anglican self-understanding and the realities of liturgical development over time. The liturgical hermeneutic developed from Gittoes' work as described in Chapter One, was used as an approach to Deuteronomy, drawing out significant textual points which in turn can now be used in response to the question of continuity, adaptation and innovation in fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context.

[797] For further information about Bishop's Mission Orders see www.churchofengland.org/clergy-office-holders/pastoralandclosedchurches/pastoral/bmos.aspx

The textual study has shown repeatedly that all three points of this liturgical paradigm are important, and it is when one point is privileged over the others that creates a distortion. For example, Davison and Milbank are right to challenge the *Mission-shaped Church* report's lack of theological depth, especially considering the way it has been used to support the level and speed of change that has happened in response to the report's publication. They are also right to challenge the lack of connection with Anglican tradition and the missional potential of the parish system. By failing to address, however, any of the missional concerns about changes in society and the lack of connection between church culture and contemporary culture, even to the point of regarding this as a positive thing, they present a case for continuity of practice that is out of step with the realities of continual liturgical development. Effectively, their focus on continuity at the cost of innovation means that they have failed to respond to significant parts of the argument that is presented in *Mission-shaped Church* and related literature in terms of culture change and the effect that this has always had on church practice.

This presents an important challenge to the theological position of *For the Parish*, which promotes a 'removed' approach to culture, instead preferring an 'acultural', idealised understanding of Church culture that was to be distinct from that of the surrounding nations. Deuteronomy is very clear that there is to be no copying of foreign worship practices and underlines this repeatedly, but it also shows that borrowing, and then adapting, from cultural forms and practices in order to promote and communicate its theological focus does not risk religious compromise. It has to be remembered however, that the focus of Deuteronomy is communicating theology and persuading the people to commit to the law and live by it. There is not a push for 'relevance' in order to communicate to those outside the current community, in the same way as is felt by those currently involved and exploring fresh expressions of church. It is primarily a document for those inside the community of faith and not those outside. At the same time, however, it does have to be remembered that the text is clear that part of the people's

'mission' to the other nations consists of being those who are to live according to God's law, so that the other nations will reflect on the nature of God through what they observe. Continuity alone is not reflective of the history of Anglican liturgy, and attempting to present an acultural model of liturgy is equally not reflective of historical practice and adaptation. Fundamentally, continuity alone does not equip the church to express its Anglican identity in mission.

This is not to suggest, however, that points raised by *For the Parish* should be overlooked, or that everything within *Mission-shaped Church* should be accepted without analysis. Whilst clearly seeking to address the needs of equipping the church to respond to the missional context of a changing society, the report does so to the extent of risking any sense of continuity with the historical Anglican church. This is an understandable response to church infrastructure that is often seen as being overly cumbersome and slow to change, but a focus on innovation to the extent that loses sight of any continuity means a significant risk of losing connectedness with the wider Anglican Church and history. This perceived detachment from both the wider Church and the past, could be seen as the root of many of the criticisms of the book.

The biblical paradigm represented by this study provides a response to the challenges raised by both *Mission-shaped Church* and *For the Parish*. All the examples seen in Deuteronomy showed elements of all three of the liturgical characteristics, continuity, adaptation and innovation, but tended to emphasise one more than another. For example, the history of the rescue from slavery in Egypt was noted as a continual, repeating theme, reminding people of their identity, but this was being expressed in ways to forge connections with the new context of life in the promised land. Rhetorically this was seen through continual calls to decide 'today' to commit to God and to keep his laws.

This was also seen through the encouragement to place reminders of the law on the gates and doorposts of their houses. In terms of adaptation, this was seen in one way through the adaptation of the child's question in Deut 6. No longer was this about the story of rescue, but became adapted in order to teach the child about the statutes and commandments of the law. This adaptation is rooted in previous practice and is used to recite the laws of the community. Equally, even examples of innovation which show continuity and adaptation, such as the permission to slaughter animals away from the one place that God will choose, finds their roots in earlier sacrificial instructions.

Both *Mission-shaped Church* and *For the Parish* show awareness of adaptation, even though they prioritise either innovation or continuity respectively. Adaptation can then act as a bridge between these two positions and begins to show how this liturgical paradigm provides the means to break the deadlock in the current and on-going discussions. The work in Chapter One set out the historical development of Anglican liturgy up to the present day. As was set out in the discussion, the *Alternative Service Book*[798] and *Common Worship*[799] have demonstrated continuity, adaptation and innovation building on from the *Book of Common Prayer*[800] and the liturgical work in the 60s and 70s. This is a further extension from that and from the work demonstrated in the first chapter which articulated liturgical change and adaptation to context. Fundamentally, this is about a means to articulate Anglican identity in mission, particularly in response to rapid changes in culture and society. This is to argue that liturgy has a significant contribution to make to this important discussion. By taking note of the liturgical paradigm, fresh expressions of church can seek to hold on to continuity, adaptation and innovation, finding new ways to connect with changing culture whilst at the same time continuing in the story of the people of God. It should also be noted, that although the focus here is exploring continuity,

[798] *Alternative Service Book 1980: together with the Liturgical Psalter*.
[799] Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship*.
[800] *The Book of Common Prayer*.

adaptation and innovation within fresh expressions of church, the practical outworking of the biblical study may also provide insights for those within traditional parish settings.

The next section will take two points and provide worked examples of liturgical continuity, adaptation and innovation in a missional context, but first it is worth noting another way in which this work can respond to a point of disagreement noted in the first chapter. In Chapter One, it was pointed out that Hull, quite rightly, critiqued *Mission-shaped Church*'s use of McGavran's 'homogeneity principle'.[801] The *Mission-shaped Church* report raised the very real concern that the poorest and least well educated are at risk of being dominated by those who are richer and better educated. As stated previously, Hull is right to raise questions about the possibility that following this approach could lead to segregated, interest-based groups that are then seen as potential fresh expressions of church.[802] What he does not provide, however, is a constructive response as well as his critique. As noted above, responsibility that had been previously given to the leadership was now being passed on to the community, limiting the leadership at the same time as empowering the whole community. What this point about community responsibility begins to provide is a step towards limiting the leadership and empowering the whole community. Preventing potential domination by one group means stressing that each person has the same responsibility to learn, commit to, remember and pass on the faith. This is seeking after a way to empower all participants within a fresh expression of Church, not simply something that is done *for* the poor or marginalised, but something that expects each person to take on responsibility. The next section will explore two specific worked examples of how two particular points drawn from the

[801] Hull, *Mission-Shaped Church*, p. 14.

[802] For a discussion community inclusivity during the Covenant renewal, Deut 29, which counters a view of homogeneity in the worshipping community see J. Corcoran, 'The Alien in Deuteronomy 29 and Today' in ed. D. G. Firth and P. S. Johnston, *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2012) pp. 229-239,

detailed textual work on Deuteronomy could begin to be applied in a missional Anglican context.

Missional liturgical examples of the paradigm

The purpose of this thesis has always been to explore ways of providing a means for dialogue between opposing parties in the Fresh Expressions of Church debate in the Church of England. The aim in this section is to begin to demonstrate how the key points raised through the textual work of Chapters 2, 3 and 4 can be applied or thought-through in a practical context, with an awareness of the missional themes of participation and service. This work was never intended nor designed to be a piece of practical research, given the already not insubstantial volume of work that collects data on Fresh Expressions of Church.[803] It was not, therefore practical in terms of time or space in the thesis, to conduct field research, nor was it the primary aim of this work. Rather, this piece of research is intended to explore potential theological support and vocabulary for the work of fresh expressions of church and to see if they can be part of the Church of England in a coherently Anglican way. This was why a liturgical methodology was adopted rather than an ecclesiological one. Having established and defended this view, it is important to begin to show how this paradigm can contribute through actual

[803] For example, the research that was captured in *Encounters on the Edge*, a series of booklets published by the Church Army Research Unit between 1999 and 2012, with a total of 56 issues. These specifically focused on the work of church plants and fresh expressions of church within the Anglican Church over that time. This was then followed by the production of *Snapshots – Stories From the Edge*, a downloadable booklet produced three times a year which either set out the background of a particular fresh expression of church or explored a relevant theme within the work of Anglican fresh expressions of church. See also Church Army's Research Unit, *An analysis of fresh expressions of church and church plants begun in the period 1992-2012 : report on strand 3b of the Church Growth Research Project.* (Sheffield: Church Army/Church of England, 2013); G. Lings, *The day of small things: an analysis of fresh expressions of church in 21 dioceses of the Church of England*, (Sheffield: Church Army, 2016).

missional, liturgical examples to show how continuity, adaptation and innovation can be used to extend Anglican liturgy as a response to the changes and developments in contemporary society.

As was set out in Chapter One, the two important points that were drawn out of the discussion of *missio Dei* were participation and service. This section will begin to explore ways in which the textual work from Chapters Two, Three and Four could be applied in practical settings. This means applying the particular themes from the biblical work into practical scenarios, demonstrating how the liturgical concepts can be used in liturgical settings which create missional opportunities in line with participation and service. This is seeking to find ways of encouraging and enabling people to participate in the people of God, in other words to become integrated as part of a worshipping community, and as part of this belonging to serve as participation in God's mission.

An important reflection on worship and mission, particularly in terms of serving the poor, vulnerable and marginalised arises from Cottrell's reflection on the vital link between mission and Anglo-Catholicism. He argues that the importance of responding to and serving the poor and the marginalised which has often been historically a traditionally Anglo-Catholic approach, for example the slum priests.[804] As the key terms of participation and service imply, mission cannot just be understood in terms of conversion, although this is an aspect of mission as a whole, but mission has to be concerned with 'issues of justice, peace, and the integrity of creation'.[805] The themes that arose from Deuteronomy clearly also emphasised the importance of caring for the poor, vulnerable and marginalised in society, and the way in which the society was encouraged to draw this service into the midst of both their

[804] S. Cottrell, 'Letting your Actions do the Talking: Mission and the Catholic Tradition' in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) pp. 66-71.
[805] S. B. Bevans, 'A Theology of Mission for the Church of the Twenty-First Century: Mission as Prophetic Dialogue' in ed. S. B. Bevans & K. Tahaafe-Williams, *Contextual Theology for the Twenty-First Century*, (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2011) p. 102.

everyday lives and their particular acts of worship. It is also seen in Deuteronomy and in wider Old Testament texts, that God criticises the people in the strongest of terms when they neglect issues of justice and care for the poorest in the community.

Nygaard is right when he raises concerns that some of the 'missional' attempts across denominations in Europe can be described in terms of '*mission as marketing*'[806] and that the focus is on gaining 'more customers, in order to keep it all going.'[807] The potential for fresh expressions of church to fall into this category and subsequent criticism is clearly present, but the focus on participation and service, and seeking to shape liturgical worship in order to enable and encourage this would help significantly in avoiding this.

The argument in this thesis is that adaptation, and even innovation of liturgical forms, furthers the inherent missional identity of the church. As Maclaren rightly argues, if the church understands 'apostolic' not as a called out to be separate and superior, but called out to be equipped and sent in mission then 'the Church becomes inherently adaptive and flexible, shaping its forms and activities around mission rather than convention.'[808] As was demonstrated in Chapter One, the idea of a constant liturgical pattern throughout time does not reflect the reality of Anglican history. A continuation of missional adaptation, therefore, is simply continuity and contextual adaptation that has historically always been a feature of practice. Therefore, liturgical adaptation in order to better equip communities to participate in *missio Dei* becomes even more significant.

This section will focus on two particular examples, drawing from the biblical work undertaken on Deuteronomy, showing how this paradigm can provide a

[806] B. Nygaard, 'Strategic Reflections Coming Out of the Present Predicament for Christian Mission' in ed. V. Mortensen & A. O. Nielsen, *Walk Humbly with the Lord: Church and Mission Engaging Plurality* (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010) pp. 49-50. Italics original.
[807] Nygaard, 'Strategic Reflections Coming Out of the Present Predicament for Christian Mission', pp. 49-50.
[808] Maclaren, 'One, Holy, Catholic and Fresh?', p. 24.

liturgical response for fresh expressions of church in a missional, Anglican context. There are numerous ways in which Anglican liturgy demonstrates continuity, and therefore these two examples will focus on adaptation in the first example and innovation in the second. The first example will pick up on the points raised about the importance of integrating children and passing on the faith to the next generation, specifically exploring the adaptation of the child's question in Deut 6 from the Exodus context. The second example will explore the innovation of the celebration of first fruits, examining the ways this could influence a liturgical celebration of harvest, in an urban, missional setting.

Before focusing on these two worked examples, the following table sets out some ways in which wider points from the textual work may begin to be applied to current church contexts.

Applications for local church contexts of the findings from the textual work	
Textual point	**Potential area for church application**
The importance of God's deliverance of his people from slavery in Egypt was drawn into everyday practices.	Prayers and liturgies that focus on God's deliverance and provision for individuals, families and groups to use at different times of their everyday lives. For example, before going to work or school; when travelling; before sharing a meal; before going to bed; moving house; starting a new job; going on holiday. Acknowledging and making provision for important points of regular life into corporate worship in an intentional way, for example, start of new school year; retirement; exams; new job; redundancy. Symbols, objects or short Scripture passages that can be placed around the house as a reminder of God's deliverance.

Passing on the faith to the next generation and the urgency of enabling the subsequent generations to participate in the communal story of past deliverance.	Intentional provision for times of intergenerational engagement, to ensure that different generations interact with one another rather than being kept segregated. This could then also include times of sharing individual stories of faith to encourage people. Opportunities for sharing stories, reading together, asking questions and encouraging each other.
Right treatment of the poor and vulnerable in society based on memory of own experience of slavery	Active engagement with issues of justice both at home and abroad. Where is the poverty and marginalisation in the parish? How can the church community enable and equip people to respond? How can church and worship be something that is done with vulnerable and marginalised people rather than something that is provided for them? How can the poor, vulnerable and marginalised be intentionally included in times of celebration? What is the impact of lifestyle choices and decision-making particularly on the poor and vulnerable in communities abroad?
Remembering God's love and the importance of loving God	Using liturgy and worship to emphasise God's love for his people and the people's response of love towards God. This can be particularly stressed at Christmas and Easter, but also at Pentecost given that it demonstrates participation in the missional love of God in that God send his Spirit on his people in order for them to be sent into the mission of God. Intentional reflection on the story of the particular parish and local area to

	demonstrate where God's love can be seen in action and creating specific ways of responding.
Providing opportunities to remember and continue to commit to 'keeping the law'	Regular opportunities to restate promises of commitment. Obvious choices for this would be the beginning of the calendar year or Easter Sunday as a type of recommitment of baptismal vows. Another option could be Advent Sunday, the beginning of the liturgical year which could then lead into a time of renewal and recommitment during Advent and in the lead up to Christmas and Epiphany.
Food as a means of providing a tangible link between God's promises in the past and their present fulfilment	There are numerous opportunities for church communities to eat together and many do this regularly. It could be that these occasions are used more intentionally to recount God's promises during the time of eating, possibly in a way similar to the Jewish Passover meal in which the story is interwoven with the different aspects of the meal.
The opportunity for the individual to speak out the promises of God.	Most of the spoken liturgy in churches is either corporate or spoken only by a leader. The smaller the gathering or church community, the more opportunity there is for individuals to be able to say something about their own faith journey. This might be in terms of speaking about what has brought them to baptism or confirmation, or at an anniversary of their baptism or confirmation. These opportunities could also be used to encourage members of the church to speak about their life during the week, whether this is paid employment or otherwise, and during

	this to share what difference faith makes to their weekly work and life. Space could be provided regularly for any individual to speak about the impact of faith on their life that week. It could also be a more structured activity, where specific liturgy is provided for people to say individually when they want to speak out the promises of God. This might be a regular part of the service, or it might be appropriate, for example, during a service that commemorates the church's Patronal Festival or founding, or possibly during a service at the beginning of the year.
Worship is not just an individualistic act, for example the farmer prays for blessings for the whole community not just his own farm and prosperity	Encouraging members of the congregation to pray for local, national and international concerns. This can easily take place during regular times of intercession. It could also be encouraged by sharing particular points of prayer through regular church tweets, facebook posts, Instagram photos or emails; use of church notice sheets or bulletins to raise different areas and focuses for prayer for the coming week. These could provide information and encourage people to commit to pray for a set amount of time, a week or month for example, for a particular area of the world, local community, area of government, aid agency, business community, education establishment etc.

It is worth noting here that up to this point there has been very little published material to help people think through issues of adaptation and innovation of Church of England liturgy. In one of the few books that does

address this discussion, Earey states that whilst the response to *Mission-shaped Church* has provoked changes in church structures, for example through the bringing about of Bishops' Mission Orders, [809] there has been no suggestion of a 'parallel "principled and careful loosening" or adaptation of the liturgical rules of the Church of England.'[810] This in turn also reinforces the point from Chapter One that argued that the primary focus of these discussions up to now has been on ecclesiology to the neglect of liturgical matters and questions. Earey does go on to argue for a model of change in liturgical adaptation, but he does this by introducing the concept of 'set theory', which is originally a mathematical modelling theory, rather than the biblical paradigm that is being presented here.

Integration of children

One of the significant points that was raised in several ways throughout this work has been the importance placed on children within the worshipping community. This can be seen in two particular ways, one being the significance of the question the children ask in Deut 6; the other the specific inclusion of children in the gathering of the community to hear and respond to the law and also to commit to the covenant at the covenant renewal ceremony in Deut 29. Both points demonstrate adaptation of previous practices. The child's question adapts what is found in the related Exodus passage and the community inclusion adapts the practices found elsewhere in the Pentateuch. As well as this, the inclusion of the children touches on points raised by the section on radical democratisation. This emphasised the involvement of the whole wider community, adapting the pattern from previous law codes which focused on the roles and responsibilities of the community's recognised leaders, specifying the inclusion of women, children and resident aliens among those who are both to hear and respond to the law. This section will explore adaptation of current practice to include

[809] M. Earey, *Beyond Common Worship: Anglican Identity and Liturgical Diversity*, (London: SCM Press, 2013) p. 54.
[810] Earey, *Beyond Common Worship*, p. 55.

children more fully as part of the worshipping community. This particular example explores ways of adapting practices to demonstrate intentional integration of children into the worshipping community for a celebration of Holy Communion.

The Church of England has already begun to think through liturgical adaptation to include children more fully in worship through the production and publication of two Eucharistic Prayers that are 'suitable for use on occasions when a significant number of children are present or when it is otherwise pastorally appropriate to meet the needs to children present.'[811] The rubrics are clear that this is intended for 'occasions such as a school Eucharist, not for use on a weekly basis at the main celebration of Holy Community in the parish church.'[812]

The two prayers as set out are not significantly shorter than some of the original Common Worship Eucharistic prayers, and although care has been taken to modify language, some traditional phrasing has been intentionally maintained to form a basis of continuity with existing practice. It is understandable why choices that emphasise continuity have been made, but this has produced two prayers that are still reasonably long and contain words that would not be immediately accessible to children. It is also true that, despite being deliberately written to include children in worship, their actual direct participation is quite limited, either saying corporately the repeated refrain 'holy, holy, holy' or 'amen, amen, amen' in Prayer One, or asking three short questions in the 'seder-style' adopted in Prayer Two.

In terms of providing liturgy for an adapted service of Holy Communion in order to include children more fully, only Eucharistic prayers have been provided. There are no extra provisions for the rest of the service, although there is encouragement to think through other parts of the service that 'allow

[811] The Archbishop's Council, *Additional Eucharistic Prayers with guidance on celebrating the Eucharist with children*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2012) p. 1.
[812] The Archbishop's Council, *Additional Eucharistic Prayers*, p. 1.

for the composition of fresh material. Such texts include: The individual lines of a Kyrie confession; Prayers of intercession for the Church and the world; Introductions to the Peace; Short prayers for use at the preparation of the table; Short proper prefaces; The seder-style questions and answers in Prayer Two.'[813] This is encouraging to think through areas of adaptation, but the further guidelines suggest that while children could be involved in helping to develop these parts of liturgy, this inclusion is only a suggestion.[814] Equally, although this presents areas for potential further adaptation and involvement, these are all texts or spoken words, and no guidance is provided in terms of movement or anything sensory, as compared with the provision in Deuteronomy as has been noted through this study.

The two new Eucharistic Prayers are a move towards exploring adaptation within Eucharistic services to include and involve children more in the liturgy of the service, but, building from the work of the previous chapters, there are important points that encourage creative adaptive practices. For example, the importance of including movement and engaging the senses in worship; enabling each person to have the opportunity to respond in some way; the opportunity for each child to ask a question, rather than a representative child or small group asking on behalf of others; the importance of hearing the story, committing to it, living by it and passing it on to the next generation. There are opportunities where these points could be picked up in adaptations throughout the whole service and not just in the Eucharistic prayers. These points will be explored in more detail below.

Movement and sensory involvement

If a service of Holy Communion is taking place in a school there is potential for using space beyond the hall or classroom to introduce movement. For example, the liturgy could begin in classrooms or other points of initial gathering before joining together in the place where the service is to be held. It might also be possible to locate sections of the service in different parts of

[813] The Archbishop's Council, *Additional Eucharistic Prayers*, p. 10.
[814] The Archbishop's Council, *Additional Eucharistic Prayers*, p. 10.

the hall or the wider school building, especially if the reading includes themes of movement or travelling. If the service takes place in a building other than the school, then a sense of pilgrimage could be created as the children travel to a church, for example, for the service. This could by aided by using a version of one or more of the psalms used by pilgrims coming to Jerusalem for a festival, or items that represent different aspects of the school community or parts of the liturgy being gathered from the school building and taken to the church.

In a church building the physical space could be used to explore and walk through the story of the communion service. Anglican churches often reflect their theology through their buildings, for example having the font near the door to show an entrance into the faith or the shape of the cross reflected in the larger architectural structures. It would not be difficult, especially in a more traditionally shaped Anglican church, to make use of these architectural features as part of the service and to conduct or lead particular sections from different areas. These different areas could be used, for example, drawing attention to particular points of welcome, confession, sung worship, prayers, communion and dismissal. Thinking through movement and the use of the physical space has to be something that is very much adapted to the local situation, as it relies entirely on what is available locally.

There are further ways in which senses can be engaged in worship, beyond the usual candles and incense of some churches, and bearing in mind that lighting candles may not be allowed in some school buildings or community centres. Battery powered 't-lights' could be used during confession to represent darkness of sin and the light of forgiveness. Time can be spent creating with the children images that depict their prayers and concerns, or important features of their immediate and wider local area and community. These could be brought up as part of an offering, used as a focus for prayers during the service, or placed around the school for the rest of the week as a reminder of what took place. The children could be involved in making bread for the service, or a bread-maker could be used so that the children can smell

the bread baking throughout the service. Children could participate in making and decorating a chalice and paten for use in the service, thinking through themes and images that reflect their local area. This could be done at the beginning of the new community in a more permanent way, or through use of disposable cups and plates for other times of worship. Play dough, or something similar, could be used at various points in the service to encourage the children to create shapes or models of an aspect of the reading, how they feel about being forgiven, or a person or place that they want to pray for. The children could be taught how to fold a boat out of a piece of paper if the reading includes a reference to one. There are also many opportunities to bring in something physical that relates to an item from the reading, for example a sheep's fleece, a shepherd's crook, incense or anointing oil to smell, grain, roasted meat, sand and so forth. All of these would engage the body more fully in worship and prevent services being focused almost entirely on words.

Speaking out loud

The actual amount that the child or children say aloud during the new Eucharistic prayers is minimal, and although the question in Deut 6 is not substantial either, the impression given is that each child would have the opportunity to ask this question within their own family. One way that this could be adapted is that the 'seder-style' questions of Prayer Two could be extended to other parts of the service, so that there are questions at other key points. This could be used to introduce new sections of the service, for example the prayers of confession or the Bible readings. This could also develop into a way of encouraging the children to engage with the service through having the opportunity to ask questions. This might be providing the opportunity for children to think through their questions before the service, or to having space to enable spontaneous questions either throughout or at specific points. An opportunity for engagement through questions would provide the time for the community to think together about what Gittoes calls the 'source event', in terms of what this means for the individuals and

the community, how is it lived out and what difference it make in people's day to day lives. This then provides the opportunity for each child to ask a question if not in front of the whole group then in smaller groups, or for smaller groups of children to work together or develop their own question for the wider group. This would not necessarily need to be a lengthy discussion, but could be contained within specified parameters.

Opportunity to commit and re-commit

One of the important themes throughout Deuteronomy is the call to commit and recommit to the laws that are being given, to commit to live according to them and to pass them on to others. The point in the service where a 'creed' is normally used could be a natural point of commitment, but using the time to be more specific about what faith is and giving the opportunity to reaffirm people's commitment to God, something not dissimilar to the covenant renewal ceremony in Deut 29.

Prayer

Times of prayer and intercession are opportunities for introducing points of adaptation into services. It can be a point in the service for people to move around and provides the opportunity for encouraging personal involvement, conversation between people and active, physical engagement with what is taking place. One possible approach would be to use different parts of the building as prompts for prayer. This might simply be a way of using the space and introducing a time of movement, but it might also encourage a reflection on different parts of the building. For example, in a church building the space used for children's or young people's groups could be a place for praying for vulnerable children around the world. Similarly, an area that serves tea and coffee could be used to focus prayers on welcome and hospitality to others. In a school building, it might be that rooms are multi-purpose and so the same room may be used for teaching, assemblies and eating. These three areas can then provide lots of input in terms of praying for children who are unable to go to school, praying for people who are in positions of leadership, and praying for those who face hunger and poverty. It is important, though,

that this is not simply seen as setting out little activities to keep the children entertained, but engaging with liturgy through the inclusion of children as a way of ensuring that all present participate together.

This section has set out some ways in which adaptation could take place in the specific context of a school's or children's Eucharistic service. This is not to imply that this type of service is the only situation in which liturgical adaptation could take place, nor that the above list is exhaustive in containing all the possibilities. Instead, this has begun to demonstrate that the paradigm developed through the work of this study has a genuine, practical application in terms of thinking through liturgical adaptation in a missional context.

Innovation of first fruits

One particular point of innovation that has come out of this study was the need to introduce a new festival, namely the harvest festival of 'First Fruits', into the annual worshipping calendar of the community on settling into the Promised Land. As was noted previously, this is not to suggest innovation in comparison with the wider Pentateuch, but innovation in view of the narrative setting at a point of transition between a nomadic and a settled lifestyle in a new context. It is also important to note that the 'First Fruits' celebration was an example of adaptation, in that it was not found in the expected position in the text in comparison with similar passages in the rest of the Pentateuch.

The key point from this, then, becomes the question of how to innovate and adapt a 'new' festival for a new cultural context. As was mentioned before, the festival calendar of the Jews has had an influence on the Christian community's practice of festivals and celebrations and this can be observed through the continuing agrarian focus of worship. For the purposes of this exploration, the focus here will be to consider the role of Harvest Festival particularly in social contexts where a rural celebration of crop production no longer has any meaningful relevance for the community. This picks up on important questions about the relevance of a harvest festival celebration for a

particularly urban environment where people have no contact with crops or agriculture. Equally, what does a harvest festival mean for those who are suffering from poverty and hardship themselves, and may find it difficult to bring extra food to give away? The further question of community integration is raised in areas where much of the literal 'harvesting' of produce is carried out by migrant workers who may not participate in the wider community, and where there are tensions around race and employment. These are important questions given the repeated emphasis that is found throughout Deuteronomy on the importance of providing for the poor, the vulnerable and the marginalised, and each raises questions about how they might influence a service of harvest celebration.

What is being celebrated?

If the argument that a rurally-focused harvest festival loses any sense of meaning and connection in an urban, deprived setting, then a primary question should ask what it is that is being celebrated and how closely this relates to traditional concepts of harvest. Clearly, there is still much potential in exploring where food comes from and how it ends up in shops. But rather than focusing on local fields, this could lead to exploring issues of food sustainability, understanding concepts of 'food miles' in terms of how far food has been transported, and for thinking through issues of fair-trade and trade impact on producers around the world. This would need to be led sensitively in an area of high poverty where there may be a lack of resources to fund buying different products.

Underlying part of the celebration of First Fruits in Deut 26, is the recognition of God's promises and provision of the land alongside the deliverance of his people from slavery to freedom. An area of focus for thanksgiving could be the local area more generally with particularly with positive things that can be celebrated that have happened that year. This might be, for example, a redevelopment of the children's playground, the local shops that have opened, the new sensory garden in the local old people's home and so forth. It might also be that there are specific issues of housing that can be

celebrated together by the worshipping community. For example, someone who lived on the streets, or on friends' sofas, who has moved into accommodation for the first time in years; a time to celebrate a step-family coming together and creating a new family community; a refugee family who have been given right to remain; or the provision of specialised equipment that has allowed an elderly or disabled person to remain in their own home.

Something that could be particularly appropriate, and would maintain a stronger link with the idea of harvest, would be to start a community allotment or similar type project at the 'Harvest Festival' one year, with the commitment to celebrate together with what has been grown by the community at the same event in a year's time. This provides the opportunity for children in an urban setting to learn about growing and producing food, it provides opportunities for local people to be involved in a church-based project, and it could also be linked to a local foodbank or help to provide food for struggling local individuals and families.

Moving the timing of the celebration

As noted previously, the instructions for the celebration of 'First Fruits' were not found in the same location as compared with the wider Pentateuch, and it was argued that it was moved to fit in with the wider theological and rhetorical aims of Deuteronomy. This gives scope for asking about the timing of a 'harvest' festival in an urban setting. If there is no longer any real connection with the literal harvesting of products in a field in that particular local community, a 'harvest festival' does not necessarily need to take place in autumn. It could be that there is a particular time for that specific local community that would be much more appropriate for a celebration of offering, rededication and thanksgiving. One possibility would be to link this with the church's patronal festival to connect with the story and history of the church in serving the local community. This can be a service that is ignored or over-looked in many churches and would provide a way of also giving more identity to this celebration as well. A further alternative would be to think through how different times of the year might affect the local community. A

seaside parish may be affected by seasonal fishing or the impact of seasonal employment reflecting the influx of visitors over the summer, or it might be that seasonal employment around Christmas has an important effect on the local community and this could be a time of particular thanksgiving alongside Christmas celebrations. Some communities already have existing times of annual celebration or community days or events in local parks that are organised by local councils and community groups. These could also be occasions to connect with, thinking through how the Church can celebrate the gifts of the wider community.

Communal eating and celebrating

An important point from Deut 26 that is significant here is the way the community celebrated together through eating with each other, but importantly how this also included those who were most vulnerable and marginalised in the community. It may be possible to organise a celebration meal for the Church but to encourage them to think through how this can also include the vulnerable members of their community. This might be people who are homeless, refugees, elderly, single parents, those with long-term health concerns, or the struggling who have needed to use food banks to feed their families. There are several ways in which the church could include people in their communal eating and celebrating. It could be either that food is taken out to people as part of the act of worship and communal celebration, or that those who are able, join in with communal eating and celebrating.

Employment and immigration

The basic idea of the First Fruits celebration in Deut 26 was that the farmer brought along the produce of his work as an offering. Whilst not only is the concept of harvest potentially complicated for people living in a very urban setting, in some parishes levels of unemployment can be very high, and the connection between work and productivity is, to a large extent, minimal. A very local example of this reality, according to the work published by the Church Urban Fund in 2016, is Broxtowe parish which is ranked as the 13th

most deprived parish in the country. In this parish, working-age poverty is put at 32%, based 'on the proportion of working-age adults who experience income deprivation. This includes those in receipt of Job Seeker's Allowance, Employment and Support Allowance, Incapacity Benefit, Severe Disablement Allowance and Carer's Allowance.'[815] A further problem for those who are employed can be the issue of working contracts that do not guarantee any employment or pay. According to the Office for National Statistics, in October – December, 2016, 905,000 people were on so-called 'zero hours' contracts. A massive increase in the space of ten years from 168,000 in 2010.[816] Care then needs to be taken to think though ways in which a celebration of offering, in an environment where working patterns are limited and complex, can be used to affirm and support the local community.

Bringing an offering

One way in which offerings can be reimagined for areas of deprivation arises out of Deut 16:16-17 and the instructions found there. It is an open description, not specifying what it should be or the amount, or that it needs to be the same as anyone else, but the importance is that it reflects the individual's ability to give. This would introduce the opportunity to invite people to bring something that represents a gift, skill or ability that they have, rather than focusing on work. This could remain associated with food in some way, possibly baking or cooking, or bringing produce that has been grown in gardens, tubs or on a windowsill. But there is also the opportunity to recognise and celebrate gifts and skills beyond just the limits of the food that is normally associated with a harvest celebration. So, for example, someone could bring up an item that has been made by hand, either through knitting or sewing, or through painting or woodwork. There could be an encouragement to bring a picture, word or object that represents someone's place of work, or if they are a carer something that represents their work and service. This

[815] The diocesan report for Southwell and Nottingham diocese produced by the Church Urban Fund. https://www.cuf.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=5598a48c-8bf8-4478-aa10-9ad2e2f19fe7

[816]https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/datasets/zerohourssummarydatatables

then provides an opportunity to help people think through their own value and gifts. This becomes a significant piece of ministry by working hard to recognise everyone's gifts, talents and the difference they make in other people's lives, and to recognise and celebrate that together as part of the wider community.

In Deut 26 each person had the opportunity to speak out the story of God's salvation and provision and to pray for the wider community. In light of this, a short, simple summary could be provided for people to read as they bring up their offering. Similarly, there could be encouragement for each person to pray for a particular place in the wider community. Again, simple wording could be provided enabling people to pray for God's blessing on particular streets, the local school, the community centres, shops or areas that are known to be problems at night, for example.

Celebrating the harvest also raises issues of immigration and migrant workers for some local communities, given that some harvesting of produce in this country is undertaken by workers travelling in for a short-time from other countries and then returning home. Harvest could be an opportunity for allowing people to share about the issues of employment, migration and work opportunities. To acknowledge issues that may not otherwise be talked about much in church services, but to find a way to do this constructively, provides space for people to share their experiences and to find a way in which to create a positive environment.

Not just innovation

It is important to note that even with the focus on innovation in this section, this does not occur with an absence of adaptation and continuity. It was noted that the instructions for 'First Fruits' are adapted away from the expected location. As well as this, the concept of bringing offerings in worship to God as an expression of thankfulness, meeting together as a community and so forth is clearly in continuity with wider Pentateuchal texts. In the light of this and the context of the wider discussion of fresh expressions

of church in an Anglican context, it is deeply significant to note that throughout this study of Deuteronomy the three liturgical characteristics of continuity, adaptation and innovation are inter-related. Although at times one is emphasised, this is not to the complete absence of the other two strands. Pure innovation loses any sense of continuity with what has gone before, whilst continuity alone does not recognise the reality of continued adaptation and innovation to context that is observed through liturgical history. As a liturgical paradigm for Anglican mission, the three strands enable a continued connection with what has gone before whilst simultaneously encouraging cultural and contextual adaptation and innovation. The ultimate purpose behind this, as is seen throughout Deuteronomy, is to form the people of God and to prioritise care for the poor, vulnerable and marginalised.

Conclusion and Summary

This study has addressed the important question of why there is deadlock in current discussions of fresh expressions of church in an Anglican context. A liturgical hermeneutic was developed in order to create a liturgical, biblical paradigm of continuity, adaptation and innovation. This final chapter has shown that the two fundamental positions, as demonstrated by *Mission-shaped Church* and *For the Parish*, both have important contributions to make to this on-going conversation, but emphasise innovation or continuity respectively, to the detriment of the other. What the work from Deuteronomy illustrated, was the importance of holding continuity, adaptation and innovation together, and that although at times one was emphasised over the other two, all three were always present to some degree. This chapter has taken this liturgical paradigm and sought to provide two worked examples that begin to demonstrate how a liturgical response that holds together continuity, adaptation and innovation could function in an

Anglican missional context, with a particular emphasis on participation and service. There is not space in this current work to continue developing these worked examples, but there is clearly potential for engaging with other significant points arising out of this work and exploring how these could develop in a liturgical and missional setting. This would include, for example, developing the work from the points raised about radical democratisation and the importance of loving God and God's love for his people, and exploring what this might look like in an Anglican liturgical and missional context.

This work has intentionally responded to the lack of thorough exegetical and also liturgical work missing thus far in this important discussion as both are important for Anglican theological tradition and practice. This also responds, in part, to important questions raised about the use of the Bible, and particularly the Old Testament, in contemporary Anglican theology, reflection and church practice.[817] Seitz, for example, has argued that what was needed was a 'via media' between either a solely 'propositional' approach or a solely 'biblical critical' approach. As he describes it, holding together what both of these positions have to offer, 'but then to move beyond both toward a recovery of a method for interpreting Scripture not antagonistic to "traditional" readings from earlier age, capable of reasonably assessing literary "repugnance," but finally concerned to find larger unitary purpose and theological synthesis in a book on whose interpretation the life of the church depends.'[818] The paradigmatic approach used in this study begins to responds to this need, but is obviously not a complete answer to all the issues Seitz raises in his article.

There is also potential for further study that arises out of significant points raised through this approach to the text that could not be explored here. For example, a clear point that arose was the importance placed on passing on the faith to the next generation. A significant liturgical question in response

[817] C. R. Seitz, 'Biblical authority in the late twentieth century: The Baltimore Declaration, Scripture-reason-tradition, and the Canonical approach' in ATR 75:4, 1993, pp. 471-487.
[818] Seitz, 'Biblical authority in the late twentieth century', p. 479.

to this is to challenge the level to which children are actively engaged in wider current Church of England liturgy, and how, or even if, they are being provided with opportunities to participate and contribute.

Further to this was the important point of 'radical democratisation' that arose from the study of Deut 26 in Chapter Four. It is clear that there is further work to be done in this area as only a sample of texts contributed to this particular theme, therefore there is scope for examining this theme in Deuteronomy more fully. As well as this, there is also the potential for exploring what this would look like in a missional, Anglican context in terms of implications for practice. This concept would also have much to contribute to current discussions of Church, leadership and participation.

As well as the potential contribution that on-going work from this study could make to Anglican discussions, there is also potential arising from the biblical studies work that has, thus far, focused on Deuteronomy. Given that this has arisen initially from an overview of the text as a whole, followed by a focused case-study of two chapters, there is clearly scope for further study of other chapters in Deuteronomy where this hermeneutical approach could be fruitful. It would be interesting to explore further chapters that have been previously described as 'liturgical' and chapters that have not, to see whether using this liturgical hermeneutic supports or challenges these assumptions. Using this approach to the text has raised significant points not only about the internal structure of the text, for example the inclusio in Deut 6 as set out in Chapter Three, but it has also drawn attention to important points that have been taken back to the initial question.

There is also potential to take the hermeneutic beyond Deuteronomy and apply it to other texts. This could then provide a further contribution to this particular question or explore what arises from these texts when this approach is adopted and to see how these further readings might contribute to other areas of church life and areas of practical theology. This approach would also provide a clearer liturgical definition for these passages, as has

been shown through this study. An obvious starting place would be to move from Deuteronomy to the other books within the Pentateuch, given the sharing of narrative incidents between these books. Possible texts could include, for example, Exod 23:10-19, given the instructions provided for both the Sabbath as well as the three annual pilgrimage festivals; Exod 29, the instructions provided for the consecration of Aaron and his sons; Lev 16, the instructions given for the Day of Atonement; Lev 23-25 which contains instructions for a number of significant liturgical occasions, Sabbath, Passover, offering of the First Fruits, the three Pilgrimage festivals, and the Day of Atonement. Similarly, Num 28-29 which contain detailed instructions regarding a variety of offerings. Wider Old Testament passages that it would be interesting to explore through this hermeneutical approach could also include a comparative study of 1 Kgs 8 and 2 Chr 7 exploring the themes of continuity, adaptation and innovation.

Bibliography

Achenbach, R. 'Review of *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah: A Reappraisal*' in ZAW 120:1, 2008, pp. 162-3.

Ackerman, S. 'The Personal is Political: Covenantal and Affective Love (*ʾĀHĒB, ʾAHĂBÂ*) in the Hebrew Bible' in VT LII:4, 2002, pp. 437-58.

Alter, R. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, revd edn. (New York, New York: Basic Books, 2011).

Alternative Service Book 1980: together with the Liturgical Psalter, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press | London: William Clowes Ltd. | London: SPCK, 1980).

Anderson, G. A. 'A Time to Mourn, A Time to Dance: The Expression of Grief and Joy in Israelite Religion' (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Uni Press, 1991).

Archbishop's Council, *The Fresh Expressions Initiative*, GS 1766 (London: Church House Publishing, 2009).

Archbishops' Council and Trustees for Methodist Church Purposes, *Fresh Expressions in the Mission of the Church: A Report of an Anglican-Methodist Working Party*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2012).

Arnold, B. T. 'The Love-Fear Antinomy in Deuteronomy 5-11' in VT 61:4, 2011, pp. 551-569.

Ashley, T. R. *The Book of Numbers*, TNICOT (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1993).

Assman, J. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Atkins, M. 'What is the essence of the Church?' in ed. S. Croft, *Mission-shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today's Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2008) pp. 16-28.

Atta-Bafoe, V. R. & P. Tovey 'What does Inculturation mean?' in ed. D. R. Holeton, *Liturgical Inculturation in the Anglican Communion*, Grove Liturgical Study 62 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1990) pp. 14-16.

Avis, P. *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology*, (London: T & T Clark, 2007).

Avis, P. *A Ministry Shaped by Mission*, (London | New York, New York: T & T Clark, 2005).

Avis, P. *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: An Introduction*, (London: SPCK, 2000).

Baldovin, J. F. 'The Liturgical Movement and Its Consequences' in ed. C. Hefling & C. Shattuck, *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, (Oxford: OUP, 2006) pp. 249-260.

Balentine, S. E. *The Torah's Vision of Worship*, Overtures to Biblical Theology (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1999).

Barker, P. A. *The Triumph of Grace in Deuteronomy: Faithless Israel, Faithful Yahweh in Deuteronomy*, (Bletchley: Paternoster, 2004).

Barker, P. *Deuteronomy: The God who keeps promises*, (Melbourne: Acorn Press, 1998).

Bascom, R. A. 'Adaptable for Translation: Deuteronomy 6:5 in the Synoptic Gospels and beyond' in ed. R. D. Weis & D. M. Carr, *A gift of God in due season: Essays on Scripture and Community in Honour of J. A. Sanders*, JSOTSup 225 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) pp. 163-183.

Bayes, P. & T. Sledge, *Mission-shaped Parish: Traditional Church in a Changing Context*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006).

Beckwith, R. T. 'The Jewish Background to Christian Worship' in *The Study of Liturgy*, revd. edn. ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright, E. Yarnold S. J. & P. Bradshaw (London: SPCK, 1992) pp. 68-80.

Berman, J. 'Supersessionist or Complementary? Reassessing the Nature of Legal Revision in the Pentateuchal Law Collections' JBL 135:2, 2016, pp. 201-222.

S. B. Bevans, 'A Theology of Mission for the Church of the Twenty-First Century: Mission as Prophetic Dialogue' in ed. S. B. Bevans & K. Tahaafe-Williams, *Contextual Theology for the Twenty-First Century*, (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2011) pp. 99-108.

Bevans, S. B & R. P. Schroeder *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission*, (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2004).

BHQ Third Fascicle, *Deuteronomy*, prepared by C. McCarthy (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).

Biddle, M. E. *Deuteronomy*, Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary (Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys, 2003).

Bishop, P. 'Worship' in ed. P. E. Fink, *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1990) pp. 1331-1332.

Blair, E. P. 'An Appeal to Remembrance: The Memory Motif in Deuteronomy' in Interpretation 15:1, Jan 1961, pp. 41-47.

Block, D. I. *Deuteronomy*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2012).

Block, D. I. *How I Love your Torah, O Lord: Studies in the Book of Deuteronomy*, (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade, 2011).

Bosch, D. J. *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1991).

Bradshaw, P. F. *Eucharistic Origins*, (London: SPCK, 2004).

Bradshaw, P. 'Services and Service Books' in *Companion to Common Worship*, vol. 1, ed. P. Bradshaw, (London: SPCK, 2001) pp. 1-21.

Braulik, G. *The Theology of Deuteronomy: Collected Essays of Georg Braulik*, trans U. Lindbald (North Richland Hills, Texas: BIBAL Press, 1994).

Braulik, G. 'Die Abfolge der Gesetze in Deuteronomium 12-26 und der Dekalog' in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985) pp. 252-272.

Brooke, G. J. 'דבק' in ed. W. A. VanGemeren NIDOTTE vol. 1 (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1996) pp. 910-912.

Brown, F., S. Driver and C. Briggs, *The BDB Hebrew and English Lexicon*, (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendricksons, 1906).

Brown, L. W. *Relevant Liturgy*, (London: SPCK, 1965).

Bruckner, J. K. 'A Theological Description of Human Wholeness in Deut 6' in Ex Auditu 21, 2005, pp. 1-13.

Brueggemann, W. *Deuteronomy*, Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 2001).

Brueggemann, W. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*, (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1997).

Butler, P. 'From the Early 18th Century to the Present Day, in ed. S. Sykes, J. Booty, J. E. & J. Knight revd. edn. *The Study of Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1998) pp 30-51.

Cairns, I. *Deuteronomy: Word and Presence*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1992).

Chapman, M. *Anglican Theology*, (London: T & T Clark, 2012).

Childs, B. S. *Exodus*, (London: SCM Press, 1974).

Childs, B. S. *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, Studies in Biblical Theology no. 37 (London: SCM Press, 1962).

Christensen, D. L. *Deuteronomy 21:10 - 34:12*, Word Biblical Commentary (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, 2002).

Christensen, D. L. *Deuteronomy 1:1 - 21:9*, Word Biblical Commentary 2nd edn. (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, 2001).

Christensen, D. L. *Deuteronomy 1-11*, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1991).

Christensen, R. L. 'Between Text and Sermon: Deuteronomy 26:1-11' in Interpretation 49, 1995, pp. 59-62.

Chupungco, A. J. *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2006).

Church Army's Research Unit, *An analysis of fresh expressions of church and church plants begun in the period 1992-2012 : report on strand 3b of the Church Growth Research Project*, (Sheffield: Church Army/Church of England, 2013).

Church of England, *The Canons of the Church of England: Canons Ecclesiastical promulgated by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1964 and 1969 and by the General Synod of the Church of England from 1970*, 6th complete edn. (London: Church House Publishing, 2008).

Church of England Mission and Public Affairs Council, *Mission-shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context*, GS 1523 (London: Church House Publishing, 2004).

Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2000).

Church of England Liturgy and Ritual, *Patterns for Worship*, (London: Church House Publishing, 1995).

Church of England Liturgical Commission, *Patterns for Worship: a Report by the Liturgical Commission of the General Synod of the Church of England*, GS 898 (London: Church House Publishing, 1989).

Church of England Archbishop's Commission on Urban Priority Areas *Faith in the City: a Call for Action by the Church and Nation*, (London: Church House Publishing, 1985).

Clements, R. *The Book of Deuteronomy*, Epworth Commentaries (Peterborough: Epworth, 2001).

Cocksworth, C. *Holy, Holy, Holy: Worshipping the Trinitarian God*, Trinity and Truth Series (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2004).

Cocksworth, C. J. *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Cody, A. O. S. B. '"Little Historical Creed" or "Little Historical Anamnesis"?' in CBQ 68:1, Jan 2006, pp. 1-10.

Corcoran, J. 'The Alien in Deuteronomy 29 and Today' in ed. D. G. Firth and P. S. Johnston, *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2012) pp. 229-239.

Cottrell, S. 'Letting your Actions do the Talking: Mission and the Catholic Tradition' in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) pp. 66-80.

Cresswell, R. *An Investigation into the Levels of Recollection and Comprehension of Themes within Common Worship Eucharistic Prayers Amongst the Laity in the Church of England*, (Unpublished Master's Dissertation: University of Chester, 2017).

Craigie, P.C. *Deuteronomy*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1976).

Crichton, J. D. 'A Theology of Worship' in ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright & E. Yarnold, *The Study of Liturgy*, (London: SPCK, 1978) pp. 3-30.

Croft, S. 'What Counts as a fresh expression of church and who decides?' in ed. L. Nelstrop and M. Percy, *Evaluating Fresh Expressions: Explorations in Emerging Church*, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008) pp. 3-14.

Croft, S. 'Fresh Expressions in a Mixed Economy Church: A Perspective' in ed. S. Croft, *Mission-shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today's Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2008) pp. 1-15.

Croft, S. (ed.) *Mission-shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today's Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2008).

Croft, S. & I. Mobsby, (eds.) *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009).

Daniels, D. R. 'The Creed of Deuteronomy XXVI revisited' in ed. J. A. Emerton, *Studies in the Pentateuch*, (Leiden | New York, New York: Brill, 1990) pp. 231-42.

Davies, P. N. *Alien Rites?: A Critical Examination of Contemporary English in Anglican Liturgies*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

Davison, A. & A. Milbank, *For the Parish: A Critique of Fresh Expressions*, (London: SCM Press, 2010).

de Moor, J. C. 'Poetic Fragments in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History' in ed. Martínez, A. Hilhorst, J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, A. S. van der Woude, *Studies in Deuteronomy: in honour of C. J. Labuschange on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, (Leiden | New York, New York: Brill, 1994) pp. 183-96.

de Vaux, R. *Ancient Israel Its Life and Institutions*, trans. J. McHugh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961).

De Vries, S. J. 'The Development of the Deuteronomic Promulgation Formula' in Biblica 55, 1974, pp. 301-316.

Dix D. M. *The Shape of the Liturgy*, (London: A & C Black ltd., 1945).

Dozeman, T. B. *Exodus*, Eerdmans Critical Commentary (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009).

Driver, G. R. 'Supposed Arabisms in the Old Testament' in JBL 55:2, 1936, pp. 101-120.

Driver, S. R. *Deuteronomy*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1895).

Durham, J. I. *Exodus*, Word Biblical Commentary, (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, 1987).

Dyrness, W. A. *A Primer on Christian Worship: Where we've been, Where we are, Where we can go*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009).

Earey, M. *Beyond Common Worship: Anglican Identity and Liturgical Diversity*, (London: SCM Press, 2013).

Eising, H. *zākhar*, in ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and H. Ringgren trans. D. E. Green *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament Vol. IV*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1980) pp. 82-87.

Ellman, B. *Memory and Covenant: The Role of Israel's and God's Memory in Sustaining the Deuteronomic and Priestly Covenants*, (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2013).

'Faith in the Countryside' Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Rural Areas (Worthing: Churchman Publishing, 1990).

Fenwick, J. & B. Spinks, *Worship in Transition: The Twentieth Century Liturgical Movement*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995).

Firth, D. G. 'Passing on the Faith in Deuteronomy' in ed. D. G. Firth & P. S. Johnston, '*Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2012) pp. 157-176.

Firth, D. G. 'Review of *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah: A Reappraisal*' in EJT 18:2, 2009, pp. 168-9.

Firth, D. G. 'Ambiguity' in ed. D. G. Firth & J. A. Grant, *Words and the Word: Explorations in Biblical Interpretation and Literary Theory*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2008) pp. 151-186.

Fishbane, M. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

Fishbane, M. *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts*, (New York, New York: Schoken Books, 1979).

Fischer, G. SJ 'Eigenart und Bedeutung des Deuteronomiums in der Tora' in *Deuteronomium - Tora für eine neue Generation*, Herausgegeben von G. Fischer, D. Markl und S. Paganini (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011) pp. 15-36.

Flett, J. G. *The Witness of God: The Trinity,* Missio Dei*, Karl Barth, and the Nature of Christian Community*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010).

Foster, P. 'Why Did Matthew get the *Shema* wrong? A Study of Matthew 22:37' JBL 122:2, 2003, pp. 309-333.

Frankena, R. 'Vassal-treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy' in OTS 14, 1965, pp. 12-154.

Fretheim, T. E. *The Pentateuch*, (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1996).

Friedman, R. E. *Commentary on the Torah*, (New York, New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2003).

Fuhrmann, J. M. 'Deuteronomy 6-8 and the History of Interpretation: An Exposition on the First Two Commandments' in JETS 53:1, March 2010, pp. 37-63.

Gaze, S. *Mission-shaped and Rural: Growing Churches in the Countryside*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006).

Gerbrandt, G. 'Review of D. L. Christensen *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*' in Bulletin for Biblical Research, 14.2, 2004,

Gibson, P. 'International Anglican Liturgical Consultation: A Review' in SL 29:2, 1999, pp. 235-250.

Giddings, P. 'Foreword' to *Mission Shaped Church: A mixed Economy for Mission*, report from the Mission and Public Affairs Council GS 1761 (London: Church House Publishing, 2010) pp. 1-2.

Gittoes, J., Green, B. & J. Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology: Church, World and the Kingdom of God*, (London: SCM Press, 2013).

Gittoes, J. 'Where is the Kingdom?' in Gittoes, Green & Heard, *Generous Ecclesiology: Church, World and the Kingdom of God*, (London: SCM Press, 2013) pp. 98-119.

Gittoes, J. *Anamnesis and the Eucharist: Contemporary Anglican Approaches*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

Gooder, P. & M. Perham, *Echoing the Word: The Bible in the Eucharist*, (London: SPCK, 2013).

Goodhew, D. A. Roberts & M. Volland, *Fresh!: An Introduction to Fresh Expressions of Church and Pioneer Ministry*, (London: SCM Press, 2012).

Gray, D. C. 'Liturgy and Society' in ed. K. Stevenson and B. Spinks *The Identity of Anglican Worship*, (London: Mowbray, 1991) pp. 135-143.

Greenberg, B. 'Deuteronomy 1-34: Hear, O Israel: Law and Love' in ed. F. C. Holmgren and H. E. Schaalman, *Preaching Biblical Texts: Expositions by Jewish and Christian Scholars*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1995) pp. 149-158.

Griffiths, J. (ed.), *The Two Books of Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859).

Grisbrooke, W. J. 'Anaphora' in ed. Davies, J. G. *A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, (London: SCM Press, 1986) pp. 13-21.

Halbe, J. '"Gemeinschaft, die Welt unterbricht": Grundfragen und -inhalte deuteronomischer Theologie und Überlieferungsbildung im Lichte der Ursprungsbedingungen alttestamentlichen Rechts' in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985) pp. 55-75.

Hardy, D. W. *Finding the Church*, (London: SCM Press, 2001).

Hartley, J. E. *Leviticus* Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1992).

Haugaard, W. P. 'From the Reformation to the Eighteenth Century' in ed. S. Sykes, J. Booty, J. E. & J. Knight revd. edn. *The Study of Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1998) pp. 3-29.

Hauerwas, S. 'Beyond the Boundaries: The Church is Mission' in ed. V. Mortensen & A. O. Nielsen, *Walk Humbly with the Lord: Church and Mission Engaging Plurality* (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010) pp. 53-69.

Hefling, C. 'Introduction: Anglicans and Common Prayer' in ed. C. Hefling & C. Shattuck, *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, (Oxford: OUP, 2006) pp. 1-8.

Herrmann, W. 'Jahwe und des Menschen Liebe zu Ihm zu Dtn. VI 4' in VT 50:1, 2000, pp. 47-54.

Hilborn, D. 'From Performativity to Pedagogy: Jean Ladrière and the Pragmatics of Reformed Worship Dialogue', in ed. S. E. Porter, *The Nature of Religious Language: A Colloquium*, (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1996) pp. 170-200.

Hirschberg, H. H. 'Some additional Arabic Etymologies in Old Testament Lexicography' in VT 11:4, 1961, pp. 373-385.

Holeton, D. & C. Buchanan, *A History of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations [IALCs] 1983- 2007*, Grove Joint Liturgical Studies, 63 (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2007).

Holeton, D. R. 'Introduction' in ed. D. R. Holeton, *Liturgical Inculturation in the Anglican Communion*, Grove Liturgical Study 62 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1990) pp. 6-7.

Holeton, D. 'The Formative Character of Liturgy' in ed. T. J. Talley *A Kingdom of Priests: Liturgical Formation of the People of God*, Grove Liturgical Study no. 53 (Nottingham: Grove, 1988) pp. 8-14.

Hope, S. *Mission-shaped Spirituality: the Transforming Power of Mission*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006).

Hull, J. M. *Mission-Shaped Church: A Theological Response*, (London: SCM Press, 2006).

Hunt, J. H. 'The Deuteronomists as Loyal Opposition' in AsTJ 56:1, Spring 2001, pp. 7-16.

Hwang, J. *The Rhetoric of Remembrance: An Investigation of the 'Fathers' in Deuteronomy*, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2012).

Hyatt, J. P. 'Were there an Ancient Historical Credo in Israel and an Independent Sinai Tradition?' in ed. H. T. Frank and W. L. Reed. *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament*, (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1970) pp. 152-70.

Irvine, C. *The Art of God: The Making of Christians and the Meaning of Worship*, (London: SPCK, 2005).

Janzen, J. G. 'On the Most Important Word in the Shema (Deuteronomy VI 4-5)' in VT 37:3, 1987, pp. 280-300.

Jenson, P. 'Snakes and Ladders: Levels of Biblical Law' in ed. K. Dell, *Ethical and Unethical in the Old Testament: God and Humans in Dialogue*, (New York, New York | London: T & T Clark, 2010) pp. 187-207.

Johnson, M. E. *Praying and Believing in Early Christianity: The Interplay between Christian Worship and Doctrine*, (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2013).

ed. Kautzsche, E. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd edn. (London: Oxford University Press, 1910).

Kavanagh, A. 'Liturgical Inculturation: Looking to the Future' in SL 20:1, 1990, pp. 95-106.

Kirk, J. A. *Mission under Scrutiny: Confronting Current Challenges*, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2006).

Kirk, J. A. *What is Mission?: Theological Explorations*, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1999).

Kitchen, K. A. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*, (Cambridge | Grand Rapids, Michigan | Eerdmans, 2003).

Kitchen, K. A. *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*, (London: The Tyndale Press, 1966).

Kline, M. G. *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1972).

Ladrière, J. 'The Performativity of Liturgical Language' trans J. Griffiths in ed. H. Schmidt & D. Power, *Liturgical Experience of Faith*, (New York, New York: Herder & Herder, 1973) pp. 50-62.

Lambeth Conference, *Lambeth Conference, 1968: Preparatory Information*, (London: SPCK, 1968).

Lapsley, J. E. 'Feeling our way: Love for God in Deuteronomy' in CBQ 65:3, July 2003, pp. 350-369.

Lings, G. *The day of small things: an analysis of fresh expressions of church in 21 dioceses of the Church of England*, (Sheffield: Church Army, 2016).

Lloyd, T. 'Inner City England' in ed. D. R. Holeton, *Liturgical Inculturation in the Anglican Communion*, Grove Liturgical Study 62 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1990) pp. 41-45.

Lohfink, N. 'Opfer und Säkularisierung im Deuteronomium,' in *Studien zu Opfer und Kult im Alten Testament mit einer Bibliographie 1969-1991 zum Opfer in der Bibel* (ed. A Schenker; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] 1992) pp. 15-43.

Lohfink, N. 'Culture Shock and Theology' trans. R. Kugelman in BibThBul VII:1, Feb 1977, pp. 12-22.

Lohfink N. *Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungs-fragen zu Dtn 5-11*, (Rome: E Pontifico Instituto Biblico, 1963).

Lohfink N. & J. Bergman אחד *ʾechādh* in ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, TDOT vol. 1 trans. J. T. Willis revd. edn. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1974) pp. 193-201.

Lundbom, J. R. *Deuteronomy*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013).

MacDonald, N. *Not Bread Alone: The Uses of Food in the Old Testament*, (Oxford: OUP, 2008).

MacDonald, N. 'Deuteronomy and the Meaning of Monotheism' FAT II:1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

Machiela, D. 'Who is the Aramean in Deut 26:5 and what is he doing?' in RdQ 23, 2008, pp. 395-403.

Madden, L. J. 'Liturgy' in ed. P. E. Fink, *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1990) pp. 740-742.

Malamat, A. '"Love your Neighbor as Yourself" What it Really Means' in BAR 16:4, 1990, pp. 50-51.

Mann, T. W. *Deuteronomy*, (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995).

Markl, D 'Deuteronomy's Frameworks in Service of the Law (Deut 1-11; 26-34)' in *Deuteronomium – Tora für eine neue Generation*, ed. G. Fischer, D. Markl & S. Paganini (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011) pp. 271-283.

Mayes, A. D. H. *Deuteronomy*, (London: Oliphants, 1979).

McBride, S. D. 'Polity of the Covenant People: The Book of Deuteronomy' in Int41:3, July 1987, pp. 229-244.

McBride, S. D. 'The Yoke of the Kingdom: An Exposition of Deuteronomy 6:4-5' in Int 27:3, July 1973, pp. 273-306.

McConville, J. G. 'Deuteronomy, Book of' in ed. T. Desmond Alexander & D. W. Baker, *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, (Downer's Grove, Illinois | Nottingham: IVP, 2003) pp. 183-4.

McConville, J. G. *Deuteronomy*, Apollos Old Testament Commentary (Downer's Grove, Illinois | Nottingham: IVP, 2002).

McConville, J. G. *Grace in the End: A Study in Deuteronomic Theology*, Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1993).

McConville, J. G. *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*, JSOTSup 33 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984).

McConville J. G. & J. G. Millar, *Time and Place in Deuteronomy*, JSOTSup 179 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

McGavran, D. A. *Understanding Church Growth*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1970).

McKay, J. W. 'Man's love for God in Deuteronomy and the Father / Teacher - Son / Pupil relationship' in VT 22, 1972, pp. 426-35.

McKenzie, S. L. 'The Theological Legacy of Deuteronomy' in ed. C. Bultmann, W. Dietrich & C. Levin, *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik. Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002) pp. 28-43.

Maclaren, B. 'One, Holy, Catholic and Fresh?' in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) pp. 16-26.

Meyers, C. *Exodus*, The New Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Merrill, E. H. 'Review of D. L. Christensen *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*' in JETS 46:4, 2003, pp. 720-722.

Merrill, E. H. *Deuteronomy* (Nashville, Tennessee: B & H Publishing Group, 1994).

Millar, J. G. *Now Choose Life: Theology and Ethics in Deuteronomy*, (Leicester: Apollos, 1998).

Miller, P. D. 'That the Children May Know: Children in Deuteronomy', in gen. ed. M. J. Bunge, *The Child in the Bible*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2008) pp. 45-62.

Minette de Tillesse, G. 'Sections "tu" et sections "vous" dans le Deutéronome' in VT 12:1, 1962, pp. 29-88.

Mission Shaped Church: A Mixed Economy for Mission, report from the Mission and Public Affairs Council GS 1761 (London: Church House Publishing, 2010).

Moberly, R. W. L. *Old Testament Theology: Reading the Hebrew Bible as Christian Scripture*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2013).

Moberly, R. W. L. 'Toward an Interpretation of the Shema' in ed. C. Seitz & K. Greene-McCreight, *Theological Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Brevard S. Childs*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1999) pp. 124-144.

Moberly, R. W. L. *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34* JSOTSup 22 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983).

Moran, W. L. 'The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy' in CBQ 1963, 25:1, pp. 77-87.

Moynagh, M. 'Do we Need a Mixed Economy?' in ed. L. Nelstrop & M. Percy, *Evaluating Fresh Expressions: Explorations in Emerging Church*, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008) pp. 177-86.

Neill, S. 'Liturgical Continuity and Change in the Anglican Churches' in ed. D. Martin and P. Mullen, *No Alternative: The Prayer Book Controversy*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981) pp. 1-11.

Nelson, R. D. *Deuteronomy*, (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002).

Neusner, J. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*, (New Haven | London: Yale University Press, 1988).

Nicholson, E. W. *Deuteronomy and Tradition*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967).

Niehaus, J. J. 'The Central Sanctuary: Where and When?' TynBul 43:1, 1992, pp. 3-30.

Noble, P. R. 'Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Biblical Interpretation' JLT 7:2, 1993, pp. 130-148.

Noth, M. *Leviticus*, trans J. E. Anderson (London: SCM Press, 1962).

Noth, M. *Exodus*, trans J. S. Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1962).

Nygaard, B. 'Strategic Reflections Coming Out of the Present Predicament for Christian Mission' in ed. V. Mortensen & A. O Nielsen *Walk Humbly with the Lord: Church and Mission Engaging Plurality* (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010) pp. 43-50.

Oliver, J. M. C. 'Worship, Forming and Deforming', in R. Meyers & P. Gibson, *The Worship-Shaped Life: Liturgical Formation for the People of God*, Canterbury Studies in Anglicanism (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) pp. 1-25.

Olson, D. T. *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses,* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 1994).

Pecklers, K. F. *Worship*, New Century Theology (London: Continuum, 2003).

Percy, M. 'Old tricks for new dogs? A critique of fresh expressions' in ed. L. Nelstrop & M. Percy, *Evaluating Fresh Expressions: Explorations in Emerging Church*, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008) pp. 27-39.

Percy, M. 'Many rooms in my Father's house: The changing identity of the English parish church' in ed. S. Croft, *The Future of the Parish System: Shaping the Church of England for the 21st Century*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006) pp. 3-15.

Perham, M. *To Tell Afresh*, (London: SPCK, 2010).

Perham. M. 'Introduction' in ed. M. Perham, *The Renewal of Common Prayer: Unity and Diversity in Church of England Worship*, *Essays by the Liturgical Commission*, (London: SPCK, 1993) pp. 3-8.

Pitkänen, P. M. A. *Central Sanctuary and the Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: From the Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple*, Georgias Dissertations Near Eastern Studies 5 (Piscataway, NJ: Georgias, 2003).

Polzin, R. *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary study of the Deuteronomic History, Part One: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1980).

Popovic, A. 'The Bible as a Book of Memory' in Antonianum LXXIX, 2004, pp. 411-43.

Price, C. P. and L. Weil, *Liturgy for Living*, revd. edn. (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Morehouse Publishing, 2000).

Propp, W. H. C. *Exodus 1-18*, The Anchor Bible (New York, New York: Doubleday, 1999).

Reeder, C. A. *The Enemy in the Household: Family Violence in Deuteronomy and Beyond*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2012).

Rendtorff, R. 'The Paradigm is changing: Hopes and Fears' BI 1:1, Feb 1993, pp. 34-53.

Rienstra, D. & R. Rienstra, *Worship Words: Discipling Language for Faithful Ministry*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2009).

Ringgren, H. '*ābaḏ*' in ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, H. Ringgren & H-J Fabry, TDOT Vol. X (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1999) pp. 376-405.

Robson, J. *Honey from the Rock: Deuteronomy for the People of God* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2013).

Rofé, A. *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation*, OT Studies (London | New York, New York: T & T Clark, 2002).

Rofé, A. 'The Covenant in the Land of Moab (DT 28,69-30,20): Historico-literary, comparative, and formcritical considerations' in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985) pp. 310-320.

Routledge, R. *Old Testament Theology: A Thematic Approach*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2008).

Rundell, S. 'Blesséd: A Sacramental Perspective of Alternative Worship with Young People' in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) pp. 132-139.

Rüterswörden, U. 'Die Liebe zu Gott im Deuteronomium' in ed. M. Witte, K. Schmid, D. Prechel & J. C. Gertz, *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus" - Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*, (Berlin | New York, New York: de Gruyter, 2006) pp. 229-238.

Sachs, W. L. 'Plantations, Missions and Colonies' in ed. C. Hefling & C. Shattuck, *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, (Oxford: OUP, 2006) pp 153-165.

Sæbø M. 'יוֹם *yôm*' in ed. G J Botterweck and H. Ringgren, trans D. E. Green TDOT vol. VI (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990) pp. 7-32.

Sanneh, L. *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*, (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1989).

Schiffman, L. H. 'Phylacteris and Mezuzot' in ed. L. H. Schiffman & J. C. VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) pp. 675-677.

Seitz, C. R. 'Biblical authority in the late twentieth century: The Baltimore Declaration, Scripture-reason-tradition, and the Canonical approach' in ATR 75:4, 1993, pp. 471-487.

Sherwood, S. K. *Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2002).

Soggin, J. A. 'Kultatiologische Sagen und Katechese im Hexateuch' VT 10, 1960, pp. 341-347.

Spinks, B. D. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day*, SCM Studies in Worship and Liturgy (London: SCM Press, 2013).

Spinks, B. 'Not So Common Prayer: The Third Service' in ed. M. Perham, *The Renewal of Common Prayer: Unity and Diversity in Church of England Worship, Essays by the Liturgical Commission*, (London: SPCK, 1993) pp. 55-67.

Stevenson, K. 'Anglican Identity and Church of England Worship Today: An Historical Reflection' in ed. M. Perham *The Renewal of Common Prayer: Unity and Diversity in Church of England Worship, Essays by the Liturgical Commission*, (London: SPCK, 1993) pp. 9-17.

Stone, B. 'The Ecclesiality of Mission in the Context of Empire' in ed. V. Mortensen & A. O. Nielsen, *Walk Humbly with the Lord: Church and Mission Engaging Plurality* (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010) pp. 105-112.

Sudworth, T. *Mission-shaped Youth: Rethinking Young People and the Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2007).

Sykes, S. W. *Unashamed Anglicanism*, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1995).

Sykes, S. W. *The Integrity of Anglicanism,* (London & Oxford, Mowbrays, 1978).

Sykes, H. M. 'The Eucharist as Anamnesis' ExpT 71, 1960, pp. 115-118.

Tate, W. R. *Handbook for Biblical Interpretation: An Essential Guide to Methods, Terms, and Concepts* 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2012).

The Archbishop's Council, *Additional Eucharistic Prayers: with Guidance on Celebrating the Eucharist with Children*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2012).

'The York Statement: "Down to Earth Worship" Liturgical Inculturation and the Anglican Communion' Finding of the 3rd IALC, York, 1989. in ed. D. R. Holeton, *Liturgical Inculturation in the Anglican Communion*, Grove Liturgical Study 62 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1990) pp. 8-11.

Thompson, I. R. ‘Gospel Message or Gospel Manifestation’ in ed. D. Martin and P. Mullen, *No Alternative: The Prayer Book Controversy*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981) pp. 23-35.

Thompson, J. A. *Deuteronomy*, TOTC (Leicester: IVP, 1974).

Tigay, J. H. *Deuteronomy*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996).

Tilby, A. ‘What Questions does Catholic ecclesiology post for contemporary mission and fresh expressions?’ in ed. S. Croft, *Mission-shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today’s Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2008) pp. 78-89.

van Goudoever, J. ‘The Liturgical Significance of the Date in Dt. 1, 3’ in *Das Deuteronomium Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985) pp. 145-148.

Vang, C. ‘God's Love According to Hosea and Deuteronomy: A Prophetic Reworking of a Deuteronomic Concept?’ in TynBul 62:2, 2011, pp. 173-194.

Vogt, P. T. *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of the Torah: A Reappraisal*, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2006).

von Allmen, J.-J *Worship: Its Theology and Practice*, (London: Lutterworth, 1965).

von Rad, G. *Deuteronomy*, trans. D. Barton (London: SCM Press, 1966).

von Rad, G. ‘The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch’ in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken (Edinburgh | London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966) pp. 1-78.

von Rad, G. *Old Testament Theology: Volume One, The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*, trans. D. Stalker, (Edinburgh | London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962).

Wainwright, G. ‘The language of Worship’ in *The Study of Liturgy*, revd. edn. ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright, E. Yarnold S. J. & P. Bradshaw (London: SPCK, 1992) pp. 519-527.

Wallace, S. ‘Alternative Worship and the Story of Visions in York’, in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) pp. 9-15.

Wallis, G. ‘דבק’ in ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and H. Ringgren trans. J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley and D. E. Green, TDOT Vol. III, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1978) pp. 79-84.

Wallis, G. 'אהב' in ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and H. Ringgren trans. J. T. Willis, TDOT Vol. I, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1977) pp. 99-118.

Walls, A. F. *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*, (New York, New York: Orbis | Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996).

Waltke, B. K. *An Old Testament Theology: an Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2007).

Waltke, B. K. & M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990).

Walton, J. H. 'The Decalogue Structure of the Deuteronomic Law' in eds. Firth, D. G. and P. S. Johnston *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2012) pp. 93-117.

Walton, J. H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2006).

Walton, J. H. *Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels Between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1990).

Webber, R. E. *Ancient-Future Worship: Proclaiming and Enacting God's Narrative*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2008).

Weil, L. *A Theology of Worship*, The New Church's Teaching Series vol. 12 (Lanham, Maryland: Cowley, 2002).

Weil, L. 'The Gospel in Anglicanism' in ed. S. Sykes, J. Boots and J. Knight, *The Study of Anglicanism*, revd. edn. (London: SPCK, 1998) pp. 55-83.

Weinfeld, M. 'Deuteronomy's Theological Revolution' in BibRev 12:1, 1996, pp. 38-41, 44-45.

Weinfeld, M. *Deuteronomy 1-11*, Anchor Bible (New York, New York: Doubleday, 1991).

Weinfeld, M. 'The Emergence of the Deuteronomic Movement: The Historical Antecedents' in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, ed. N. Lohfink (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985) pp. 76-98.

Weinfeld, M. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972).

Welch, A. C. 'The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter vi' in The ExpT 41, 1929/30, pp. 548-551.

Welker, M. *What Happens in Holy Communion?*, trans. J. F. Hoffmeyer (Grand Rapids, Michigan | Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000).

Wellhausen, J. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, trans. W. R. Smith (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1973).

Wenham, G. J. 'Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary' TynBul 22, 1971, pp. 103-118.

White, J. F. *Introduction to Christian Worship*, 3rd edn. (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 2000).

White, J. F. *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition*, (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1989).

White, S. J. *Groundwork of Christian Worship*, (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1997).

Williams, R. 'Address to the Fresh Expressions National Pilgrimage, Coventry Cathedral, December 2008' in ed. S. Croft & I. Mobsby, *Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition*, Ancient Faith, Future Mission (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2009) pp. 1-8.

Williams, R. D. 'Imaging the Kingdom: Some Questions for Anglican Worship Today' in ed. K. Stevenson and B. Spinks, *The Identity of Anglican Worship*, (London: Mowbray, 1991) pp. 1-13.

Williams, R. J. *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, 2nd edn. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976).

Williamson, P. R. 'Covenant' in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, ed. T. D. Alexander and D. W. Baker (Downer's Grove, Illinois | Leicester: IVP, 2003) pp. 139-155.

Wilson, I 'Central Sanctuary or Local Settlement? The Location of the Triennial Tithe Declaration (Dtn 26, 13-15) in ZAW 120, 2008, pp. 323-340.

Withers, M. *Mission-shaped Children: Moving Towards a Child-centred Church*, (London: Church House Publishing, 2006).

Woods, E. J. *Deuteronomy*, TOTC (Nottingham | Downer's Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2011).

Wright, C. J. H. 'Mission as a Matrix for Hermeneutics and Biblical Theology' in ed. C. Bartholomew, M. Healy, K. Möller and R. Parry, *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation*, Scripture and Hermeneutic Series (Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press | Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2004) pp. 102-143.

Wright, C. J. H. *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God*, (Nottingham: IVP, 2004).

Wright, C. J. H. *Deuteronomy*, New International Biblical Commentary Old Testament Series, 4 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996).

Internet resources

https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/datasets/zerohourssummarydatatables. Accessed 16th March 2017.

https://www.cuf.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=5598a48c-8bf8-4478-aa10-9ad2e2f19fe7. Accessed 16th March, 2017.

https://www.churchofengland.org/clergy-office-holders/pastoralandclosedchurches/pastoral/bmos.aspx. Accessed 16th August 2017.