Rereading qahal as Deuteronomist history works: Literal and ideological criticism approach

Pieter Anggiat Napitupulu[1], Agus Santoso[2], Bobby Kurnia Putrawan[3]
[1]Sekolah Tinggi Teologi STAPIN, Majalengka
[2]Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Reformed Indonesia, Jakarta
[3]Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Moriah, Tangerang
Correspondence: pieternapitupulu@gmail.com

Abstract: Some biblical scholars understand Deuteronomy to be the end of the Pentateuch. Before the nation of Israel became a confederate system, the socio-political reality could usually be seen in the composition, interaction, and behavior of relationships in society, which were assumed to be political elements. The Israeli confederation which is like the ambition centered on Yahweh is what the author refers to as Israel's "Qahal". Martin Noth explains Qahal Israel in Deuteronomist Historical Works, which began with a period of wandering under the leadership of Musa, then became an immigrant in the Land of Canaan, followed by Saul's leadership where Israel asked the king to directly lead the Israelites. In the leadership of David and Solomon, which originally had 12 tribes, eventually split into two nations. With this monarchical system, God hates, because he does not reject God as the government in their life. The purpose of this study was to find the location of the Deuteronomy and Eating Qahal books in the book of laws. The research method uses critical research with a study of literature and ideological sources using Martin Noth's theory which is an early thesis in Deuteronomic History Works. The novelty of this research is the existence of a new meaning where the main message of Deuteronomic history works, namely Israel is forced to turn to God, confess His sins, and return to submit and obey His word because they have been chosen to be God's people (2 Ki 17:13).

Pendahuluan

Today, the people of God and the church faces problematic issues and global challenges. Issues of race, gender, violence, economy, politics, education, and others hit the church at this time. The people of God and the church sometimes misdirects decisions and acts. The church has not been able to find its true self in the world. The people of God and the church moves according to their will, without God's guidance.[1] In this context, there is the word Qahal in the book of Deuteronomy which relates to the understanding of God's people and the church, as well as how their existence reflects in the present.

The phrase, "*qahal*", appears to be used to describe God's people gathering locally and without any reference to gathering. "Usually, the people of God are a translation of qahal (assemblies), after the exile, the use of qahal parallels the previous use of edhah. First-century

---

[1] Reginald Alva. "The Spirit-led Church: Mission in Action in the Contemporary World." *International Review of Mission*. Vol.108, Iss.1 (2019): 164-177. DOI: 10.1111/irom.12270; Cheryl M. Peterson. "Who is the Church?." *A Journal of Theology Dialog*, Vol.51, Iss.1 (2012): 24-30. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6385.2011.00651.x; Babane Morris Thembhani. "Church Interpreting: Its Sociolinguistic Challenges in Some Vatsonga Charismatic Churches." *Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol.47, Iss.2 (2016): 111-118. DOI: 10.1080/09718923.2016.11893550.

Jewish Christians, having heard the expression *he ekklesia tou theou*, "would think of God's people without the necessary reference to localization and certainly not to the organization.

Several passages of the Old Testament are evidence of the claim that *edhah* can be used to describe people, assembled or not: Numbers 31:16 (*edhah, sunagoge, synagogue*) and Exodus 12: 6 (*qahal* describes the assembly of the Israelites, *edhah*). A comparison of Numbers 27:21 with I Chronicles 28:8 is then used to prove the shift in meaning is qahal. The first uses edhah for the church - for Israel. In the latter 'all Israel, the assembly of Yahweh' (ie, *qahal*) (ekklesia in LXX). Other examples include Deuteronomy 31:30 and Micah 2: 5 (*qahal*, ekklesia, "all Israel"), Nehemiah 7:66 (*qahal, ekklesia*). "All who return from Babylon respond to one qahal or ekklesia." In short, *qahal* and *edhah* are used the same, like *sunagoge* and *ekklesia* (compare Numbers 20: 4 with Deuteronomy 31:30; Micah 2: 5). Qahal Yahweh becomes in the Septuagint *he ekklesia tou theou*.[2]

Before the Exile, *qahal* was used to describe Israel assembling, but after the Exile it could describe Israel gathering or not. The usual translation for qahal is God's people. Qahal has a more complete meaning in Deuteronomy which refers to the postexilic period, namely people who are loved and fully trust in God. This change in meaning will be seen in the Deuteronomist Historical Work, which is the name given by critical Bible scholars for the legal books after the Tetrateukh, namely Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 & 2 Samuel and 1 & 2 Kings.[3] According to the opinion of some scholars, the books were thought to have been compiled in around 400 BC, where the Tetrateukh as a result of the composition by the Editor P was re-edited, and the Book of the Testament was inserted into it (Ex. 20: 22-23: 33). Tetrateukh was later expanded by adding several books, namely from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings. The result of the editing done by the Dtr editors is Eneateukh which is a very large historical work called "Deutronomical Historical Works" (DtrG).[4]

Deuteronomist theology is anti-syncretic and is thought to have originated in the Northern Kingdom. D's most prominent theological views are God's call to the nation of Israel to become His chosen people. This source of D apparently influences historical books, from Genesis to 2 Kings, including the theological meaning of Qahal.[5] A. N. Radjawane wrote in the book Deuteronomist History (KSD), which mentions several critical studies of Martin North's Deuteronomist Historical Works. In this book, Martin Noth's understanding of Deuteronomic Historical Works is described in relation to qahal.[6] Thus, this article aims to find the meaning of Qahal in the Deuteronomist Historical Works from the point of view of Martin Noth's theory and how to implement it in God's people today.

---

[2] Louis Jonker, Was the Chronicler more Deuteronomic than the Deuteronomist? Explorations into the Chronicler's Relationship with Deuteronomic Legal Traditions, *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, Vol.27, Iss.2 (2013): 185-197, https://doi.org/10.1080/09018328.2013.839107; Agus Santoso, "Perceraian dalam Tradisi Tawarikh dan Tandingannya." Ed. Robert Setio, Daniel K. Listijabudi. *Perceraian Di Persimpangan Jalan: Menelisik Perjanjian Lama dan Tradisi Abrahamik*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2015), 115-140; Pieter Anggiat Napitupulu, Agus Santoso, Bobby Kurnia Putrawan. "HISTORY OF CHRONICLES AS AN EDITORIAL WORKS: Editorial analysis of the Book of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah." *Voice Of Wesley: Jurnal Ilmiah Musik dan Agama* 5, no.1 (2021): 24-35, https://dx.doi.org/10.36972/jvow.v5i1.98.

[3] David A. Bergen, The Heart of the (Deuteronomic) Matter: Solomon and the Book of the Law: 213-230.

[4] Gary N. Knoppers, Jonathan S. Greer, *Deuteronomistic History*, Oxford Bibliographies (2010). DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780195393361-0028.; David A. Bergen, The Heart of the (Deuteronomic) matter: Solomon and the book of the Law, *Journal of Studies in Religion*, Vol.35, Iss.2 (2006): 213-230, https://doi.org/10.1177/000842980603500202; Agus Santoso, *Tafsir Alkitab Kontekstual-Oikumenis: 1 Tawarikh*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2017), 1-10.

[5] Thomas C. Römer, The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences. *Humanities* 46 (2015): 43-66; David A. Bergen, The Heart of the (Deuteronomic) Matter: Solomon and the Book of the Law: 213-230.

[6] A. N. Radjawane, *The Deuteronomic History*, (Ambon: PPsTAK UKI Maluku, 2011), 9-116; Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOT Supplement, (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Pr, 2002).

METHOD

This study uses biblical research with a literal criticism and ideological criticism approach. This literal critical study seeks to find dividers in the theoretical study of *Qahal* as the source of the essay writing Deuteronomy Historical Works (DHW).[7] While ideological criticism is a criticism that analyzes the ideological reality of society. In other words, ideological criticism is an attempt to liberate and heal people who are languishing in the confines of a certain ideology.[8] The author uses and analyzes Martin Noth's theory of Qahal in the editorial history work in the book of exams, both in terms of its advantages and disadvantages by comparing it with other theories. After analyzing, the author provides a synthesis of this discussion as a form of a new offer to Qahal in the historical work of the book of Deuteronomy.[9]

The Deuteronomist History work as a theory was first put forward by Martin Noth which is the development of the source theory from Wellhausen. According to Wellhausen, in the Pentateuch literature (Genesis to Deuteronomy) there are 4 main sources of writing which he calls the source Y (Yahwist), E (Elohist), P (Priest or Imamat), and D (Deuteronomy) which are sourced from the book of Deuteronomy. These sources are from the Pentateuch manuscripts to the historical books of Joshua, Judges, I and II Samuel, 1 King. In practice, the application of the four source theories to Deuteronomy to II Kings presents difficulties, and the application of the four source theories would be an impossible compulsion.[10]

Martin Noth with his theory of Deuteronomy Historical Works (DHW) argues that the theology of Deuteronomy contains his view of life, and his vocabulary is the main and only source for the birth of the manuscripts of Deuteronomy and Joshua to II Kings, all of which are one literary unit. According to Noth, the books of Deuteronomy to II Kings were written by an author who lived in Israel as a theologian and historian who wrote with a historical theological approach, who wanted to provide a foundation or theological answer for his people, why until Israel in its history had to experience the catastrophe that was so painful was the Babylonian exile.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

History of Deuteronomy (HD)

God has chosen the Israelites to be His people. With that choice, God Himself asks that His people live in obedience and submit to Him. If it is found that the Israelites turned out to be sinful, then God also sentenced them.

Regarding the Deuteronomic historical work presented by Martin Noth, I agree with that delivered by Weiser, Fohrer, and Kaiser who acknowledge that Martin Noth's theory of HD is an important and decisive stimulus in the field of literary research from the Old Testament books. The author agrees with their general argument as follows: The book of Joshua is materially inseparable from the Pentateuch. In every book of the HD complex, Deuteronomist writers intervene in different ways and intentions. That the historical-theological view of the book of Judges is clearly different from the book of Kings; Each book from the corpus of Joshua to 2 Kings was born at different times and stages, there was a pre-Deuteronomic phase, a Deuteronomic

---

[7] Bernard M. Levinson. "The Hermeneutics of Tradition in Deuteronomy: A Reply to J. G. McConville." Journal of Biblical Literature 119, no.2 (2000): 269-286, https://doi.org/10.2307/3268487; Eben Scheffler. "Criticising Political Power: The Challenge of Deuteronomy 17:14-20." *Old Testament Essays* 20, no.3 (2007): 772-785, https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC85892.

[8] F. Budi Hardiman, *Kritik ideologi menyingkap pertautan pengetahuan dan kepentingan bersama Jurgen Habermas*, (Yogyakarta : Kanisius, 2009), 209.

[9] Noth, Martin. *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOT Supplement, (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Pr, 2002); see Mark A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. Freiburg, Switzerland/Göttingen, Germany: Universitätsverlag / Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1989, https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-152171.

[10] Thomas C. Römer, *The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences*: 43-66.

stage, and a post-Deuteronomic stage, so it is worth questioning that this corpus (especially the book of Judges) be classified as a source theory. In this connection, the single author theory of HD is questioned, especially with the striking discrepancies (differences) such as pro and anti-monarchic texts in the book of 1 and 2 Samuel and the literary differences in certain fragments in one book. In the end, Noth's theory, especially Jepsen who argues that the author of the book of Kings is also the author of the whole HD is questionable truth, is here right people talking about one single author or is it more accurate about 2 or more editors.[11]

Central to the news of Deuteronomic history is that the Israelites were forced to turn to God, confess their sins and submit to and obey His words again because they were chosen to be God's people (2 Kings.17: 13).

Understanding Qahal in the History of Deuteronomists
Israeli Confederation or Tribal Society League
Before the Israelites became a confederation system, the socio-political reality can usually be seen in the composition, interaction, and behavior of relations in society, which is assumed to be a political element. In ancient Israel, the household, called *beth abboth* (*father house*) could be considered the smallest form of social organization. This community is a sub-section of family, clans, or family names called *sib*. Above *sib* there is *mishpacha,* and the whole parts are united in the *shebet* (*tribal*). However, although there has been a division of small groups, it does not mean that a neat social structure and structure is available in Israeli society.

According to Weber, among the types of associations *sib* is a community that has a strong attachment (*Gesellschaft*). To better understand its image, Weber's explanation is quoted, such as this:

> The sib head the sheik was the one, normally permanent, authority beside the Mouktar, the head of the family (i.e. tent community). The sib comprises the complex of tent communities that, rightly or wrongly, trace their descent to a common ancestor and whose tents, therefore, stand side by side. The sib, with his duty blood revenge, is the most firmly closely knit association. Community form out of a number of sibs, through joint migration and encampment for mutual protection. Thus, emerges the "tribe", which rarely comprises more than a few thousand souls. It has a permanent leader only when a man through feats of warfare or judicial wisdom has gained such distinction that by virtue of his charisma he is recognized as a Sayid.[12]

The family is the smallest community, consisting of individuals, are husband, wife, all children, both married and unmarried, servants, relatives who do not have their own families, including all travelers who happen to be living for some time together with them. In Ancient Israel, the family had quite an important role. One of them is in law. The head of the family or father has legal responsibility and authority over the whole household, including his sons who are married and have their own house but live on land owned by their ancestors. We can see this for example from the story of Gideon in the book of Judges. Even though Gideon was married and had a teenage son (Ju 8:20), he was still afraid of his "father's house" and his family (Ju 6:27), so he was protected by his father Joas (Ju 6:30-31) from the possibility of capital punishment without protection. In addition, the father as an individual is considered the origin and source of life, so as in the story of Gideon, the existence of a child depends on his father.

A group of families united and interconnected to form a clan, which is a community larger than the family. When they settled the group formed a village. The family's name is led by family heads who are called elders. In laws devised by Deuteronomists (D), they

---

[11] Noth, Martin. *The Deuteronomistic History*; Gary N. Knoppers, Jonathan S. Greer, *Deuteronomistic History;* Louis Jonker, Was the Chronicler more Deuteronomic than the Deuteronomist? Explorations into the Chronicler's Relationship with Deuteronomic Legal Traditions: 185-197.

[12] Max Weber, *Ancient Judaism,* (Ilionis: The Free Press, 1952), 11.

can determine a person's life and death (Deut. 21: 18-21). One of the specialties of a clan is its solidarity. Within this scope, we know the term *go'el* which is translated as "redeemer". Because of group or community solidarity, the crime committed against one of the residents is a crime against the whole group. Therefore, retaliation is not carried out against the person concerned, but his relatives who are known as "blood avengers" (Nu 35:19).[13]

Larger communities of clans are tribes, formed by several clans from the same ancestors. The same ancestors were a strong foundation for their solidarity. Ancestors are also used to explain relations between tribes. The twelve tribes of Israel that formed a nation under David based their unity on the twelve tribes of the sons of Jacob. Solidarity within the tribe is very close to equality in the clan. For example, Abimelech asked his blood brothers to support his efforts to become king (Judges 9). The responsibility does not lie in the person, but in the family. If the problem is large, then the responsibility lies with the tribe and even the next generation. For example, when Achan violated harsh laws and stole in the destroyed city of Jericho, it is said that Israel sinned (Josh. 7: 1, 11).

According to Saut Sirait, in the Old Testament, the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings contain quite a variety of terms that refer to a social order that contains political authority. Some of these include (a) *anashim*, which means citizens or residents of the country (Jo 9: 3); (b) *gibborim*, which means warrior, but often also interpreted as rich people. There is a term that has a parallel, namely (c) *bne chail* (*sons of property*) which can be referred to as *gibbore chail* (wealthy) against Boaz (Ruth 2:1). The terms contrasting with this are (d) *am*, which means common people (*ordinary men*); (e) *bne chamor*, is clan (*sib*) rich with their leader called (f) *nasi* which means emperor or *prince* (Judges 9:28); (g) *am hamil-chamah*, which refers to a trained military (Jo 8:11; 10: 7 and 2 Kings 25: 4), with its commanders called (h) *sare ha chayalim* (2 Ki 25:23) with fortification security units called (i) *millo* (cf. Judges 9:20) and some are called (j) *zekenim*, namely the Heads (*elder*).[14]

The ancient Israeli social instruments above can give an idea of the conditions and political atmosphere. The pattern of *primus inter pares,* the division of authority with the principle of mutual respect, not hierarchical and containing an agreement, was still characteristic of them in the early period. In the next interval, the power of *roshi Beth abboth*, especially from the circle of clan (*sib*) nobility began to dominate and even overcome the others. That gave rise to a form *oligarki roshi* from noble siblings (*sib*) in the cities. The term patriarchs is a designation that refers to certain periods in the history of Israel that cannot be separated from the *oligarkis* political pattern. So, the term patriarchs do not only have a religious connotation but rather is more about the time connotation of a period of validity of the political system.[15]

Israel's political arena then entered an increasing stage through the formation of a confederation. This confederation system had been seen since in the wilderness, when Jethro the priest of Midian, who was the father-in-law of Moses, gave him advice on how to administer the justice system amid the Israelites (Ex 18: 19-26). The advice was given after Jethro saw the exhaustion that occurred in Moses in trying Israel with many people. Jethro gives input so that Musa appoints representatives who will help him oversee 1000,

---

[13] Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History;* Brian Neil Peterson, "The Deuteronomistic History since Martin Noth." *In The Authors of the Deuteronomistic History: Locating a Tradition in Ancient Israel*, (Minneapolis: 1517 Media, 2014), 7-36, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt9m0v1j.5.

[14] Saut Sirait, *Politik Kristen di Indonesia*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2012), 87-88.

[15] Saut Sirait, *Politik Kristen di Indonesia*, 87-88.

100, 50, and 10 people. Thus, it will be easier for Moses to do his job. Moses listened to his in-laws' words and did everything he said (Exodus 18:24). Out of all the Israelites, Moses chose capable men and appointed them to be the head of the nation, to be the leader of a thousand people, the leader of one hundred people, the leader of fifty people, and the leader of ten people (Ex 18:25). They are judging among the people from time to time; cases that were difficult for them to confront with Moses, but small matters were brought to their own judgment (Ex 18:26).[16]

Although the division of this group is not per family, clan, or ethnic group, the division of tasks and authority from small groups to one nation is already seen in the system. Thus, the concept of confederation has begun to be applied through this justice system. The book of Deuteronomy up to 2 Kings is a complete historical work, written by an author who uses written and oral material with the aim of showing his generation that, since the people of Israel entered the land of Canaan, they continued to violate treaties and laws given by God with the supervision of Moses. That is why the sentence fell with the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 before AD. To those who complain "God forgets us" and "God's hand is too short to save us," he warns, that Israel alone is causing havoc.

The work of History of Deuteronomic (HD) as a theory first put forward by the Old Testament expert Martin Noth is an extraordinary important breakthrough from the source theory from Wellhausen, which since it was put forward in the early 20th century for the following decades has become the classical axiomatic theory, which dominated the science of the Old Testament advisors especially at the Pentateuch.[17] According to Wellhausen, in the Pentateuch literature (Book of Genesis to Deuteronomy) there are 4 main sources of writing which he refers to as sources of Y (Yahwist), E (Elohist), P (Prist or Priesthood), and D (Deuteronomist) sourced from Deuteronomy. Since then, the experts of the Old Testament tend to analyze and trace these sources. Each source has certain characteristics. The sources are from the Pentateuch manuscript up to the historical books of Joshua, Judges, I and II Samuel, 1 Kings. In practice, the application of the four source theories to the book of Deuteronomy up to II Kings invites difficulties, and the application of the four source theories would be an impossible imposition. Just imagine how we can analyze the sources Y, and P in Deuteronomy whose literary features are more monolithic than the books of Genesis to Numbers. Not surprisingly, the imposition of Wellhausen's source theory brings the Old Testament research process, trapped in a dead end, which is very difficult to find a way out.[18]

Martin Noth with his theory of Historical Deuteronomy (HD), was the first to provide a precise and needed solution to these needs. Martin Noth for the first time put forward his review of HD in 1941 in his book that was not very popular in the world of *Angel Saksis*. The point is that the book of Deuteronomy: its theology, its outlook on life, and vocabulary are the main and only source for the birth of the manuscripts of Deuteronomy and Joshua up to II Kings which are all one literary unit. According to Noth, the book of Deuteronomy up to II Kings was written by an author living in Israel as a theologian and

---

[16] Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*; Gary N. Knoppers, Jonathan S. Greer, *Deuteronomistic History*; Louis Jonker, Was the Chronicler more Deuteronomic than the Deuteronomist? Explorations into the Chronicler's Relationship with Deuteronomic Legal Traditions: 185-197; Agus Santoso, *Tafsir Alkitab Kontekstual-Oikumenis: 1 Tawarikh*, 1-10.

[17] Mark A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*; Thomas C. Römer, *The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences*.

[18] Juha Pakkala, *The Monotheism of the Deuteronomistic History,* 159-178; David A. Bergen, *The Heart of the (Deuteronomic) Matter: Solomon and the book of the Law*, 213-230.

historian who wrote with a historical theological approach, who wanted to provide a theological foundation or answer for his people, why until Israel in its history had to experience The *Katastrofe* is so painful that it is the disposal into Babylon.[19]

According to the author of the HD, banishment is a consequence that cannot be avoided by Israel because it is a result of Israel's violation of Yahweh's will which Israel does repeatedly from one historical stage to the next. So, exile is the proper punishment of Yahweh against Israel because of Israel's own manners or actions.[20] Thus, according to Noth, HD does not contain any hope going forward. So, HD is absent from eschatological vision. Related to confederations, the term that is used is *cheber,* which comes from the word *chaber* with the meaning of brotherhood or *comrade*. They are bound by a spirit of brotherhood called *achem* (*brother*). The basis of this *cheber* is an oath between them and is common in the Canaanites. The name used for confederations based on the oath of brotherhood is Israel. They withdrew, retreating into the legend of Jacob, which was named *Jesorel* or Israel, which means God's wrestler.[21]

The definition of Confederation according to the big Indonesian dictionary is, a combination of several countries formed to regulate common interests, such as defense, but each of them remains fully sovereign; A combination of several organizations, for example labor organizations.[22] The function of the confederation according to Norman K. Gottwald is:

> Cultic celebration and production of ideology; Propagation of cultic and moral categorial law in the centralized cult and projection of a jural matrix for religious sanctioning of institutional behavior enforced through case law; Military self-defence through cooperating tribal levies.[23]

The activities of the tribes in Canaan are described as a confederation of twelve tribes which are often called amphykthyony. The definition of amphykthyony is as below:

Amphictyony was the Greek name for an association of tribes or city-states in a single cult at a central shrine (kuil) which is reported from Greece and Italy before the Hellenic and Roman worlds had any single overarching political rule. The Greek amphiktuonia is generally understood to have derived from amphiktiones," inhabitants of the neighboring district "or" dwellers around" (i.e., in the instance,' around" the common sanctuary).[24] Noth identifies three attributes of Amphykthyony in Israel according to the biblical account, that is: first, a central temple; secondly, Amphytyous Officers from tribal representatives; third, the permanent members consist of 12 tribes.[25]

According to Vriezen Th. C, the role of Amphykthyony is a symptom that immediately appears in this new situation is the unification of the tribes, under the guidance of the influence of Yahwism, into an Amphykthyony. Amphykthyony establishment means that the influence of Yahwism is increasingly felt in the field of organization, namely through the coordination of cults

---

[19] Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*; Thomas C. Römer, *The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences*, 43-66.

[20] Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*.

[21] Saut Sirait, *Politik Kristen di Indonesia*, 89; Gary N. Knoppers, Jonathan S. Greer, *Deuteronomistic History*; Louis Jonker, *Was the Chronicler more Deuteronomic than the Deuteronomist? Explorations into the Chronicler's Relationship with Deuteronomic Legal Traditions*, 185-197.

[22] Tim Penyusun, *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia,* (Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 2001), 586.

[23] Norman Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh,* (New York: Orbis Books, 1975), 338.

[24] Norman Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh*, 347; Thomas C. Römer, *The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences,* 43-66.

[25] Norman Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh*, 348; Thomas C. Römer, *The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences*, 43-66; Jusak Pundiono Wonoadi and Ester Agustina Tandana. "THE TABERNACLE AS THE PLACE OF GOD'S PRESENCE AMONG HIS PEOPLE: A Tripartite Approach on Temple". *QUAERENS: Journal of Theology and Christianity Studies* 3, no.2 (2022): 135-54. https://doi.org/10.46362/quaerens.v3i2.75.

and legal regulations in Amphykthyony, and thus Yahwism is very influential in the field of religion and community life structure. It is difficult to imagine that Yahwism could progress so quickly that within a hundred years it would become dominant in the spiritual life of the clan of the Israeli tribes, without the help of any organization.[26]

During the conquests, the confederation was still fragile and unstable. In it there is no political instrument, both legal unity and administrative organs that are commonly found in each political community. Often the binding factor which is based on the oath of brotherhood is covered by self-rescue motives, especially the mutual desire and enthusiasm to face the enemy in battle. This temporal spirit is often not accompanied by loyalty. This is very evident in the song of Deborah (Ju 5) which shows the real situation, that even during the war that is raging, there are still tribes who behave just consider like the tribe of Reuben (5:15), or just wait like a tribe Dan (5:17) and some even remain as the Asherites (5:17)).

However, departing from that sole foundation, namely belief in Yahweh, the tribes of Israel composed or formed themselves into political alliances. That league of tribes later became the Israeli confederation. Political ties based on religious beliefs make the Priests as leaders, consciously or not become a political instrument in the social order of Israel's religion.[27]

Social dynamics, especially tribal primordialism, which is common in very loose political confederations, also plagued Israel. That fact was later reformed in a public assembly, which later became known as the 'Joshua reform' in Shechem (Josh. 24). The traditions and conceptions which were originally characterized by primordialism and attachment to the family (*beth abboth*) and to their people (*mishpacha*), were changed in the tribal league's grand trial. Political unity based on blood lines (tribes) is broken with a new concept of territorial power sharing. They were united, but at the same time were made into sub-sections of villages or cities through Joshua's divisions.

Joshua became a pioneer of political structuring which, until modern times, is still in use. That was agreed in Shechem, as a new form through the division of sub-villages and cities. Joshua, who had appeared in the leadership ranks of the liberation generation from Egypt, became the continuation of the leader of the confederation. In addition to his combat and military skills, authority as part of a generation of liberators is a determining factor for Joshua's acceptance.[28]

The dominance of the military is an irrepressible need, due to the war situation with the surrounding nations. In the middle of that military domination, the term *qedah*, emerged, a military decision-making body or a meeting of soldiers throughout the country. The body can issue decrees or decisions of a general.[29] However, in the midst of military domination, the role of the priest still has broad space. It is not solely due to the privileges of the behavior and attitudes of the priest but also concerns the understanding of war, which is not merely considered social, territorial, political, and economic, but has a religious dimension. Yahweh was also believed to be the leader of the war which was crucial for victory and defeat. Here, the role of the priest will clearly be needed. The military does not always dominate power. The leadership of the confederation can also be transferred to the judges (*shofetim*) and was very prominent in Samuel's period. This does not mean that the role of the military is extinct, because stories that highlight heroes, such as Samson and Ehud, and against military leaders such as Otniel, Samgar, Barak, Gideon, and Jephthah, also color the Old Testament Bible.[30]

---

[26] Vriezen Th. C, *Agama Israel Kuno*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2016), 165.

[27] Juha Pakkala, *The Monotheism of the Deuteronomistic History*, 159-178.

[28] Thomas C. Römer, *The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences*.

[29] Marthin Steven Lumingkewas, Jenry E.C. Mandey, and Antonius Missa. "GOLDEN CALF NARRATIVE: Deuteronomist Ideology of Jeroboam Reformation." *MAHABBAH: Journal of Religion and Education* 3, no.1 (2022): 67-85. https://doi.org/10.47135/mahabbah.v3i1.24.

[30] Louis Jonker, *Was the Chronicler more Deuteronomic than the Deuteronomist? Explorations into the Chronicler's Relationship with Deuteronomic Legal Traditions*, 185-197.

However, the interesting thing is the transition of power from the sphere of "empire" or elders of the (*zekenim*) o the royal system turned out to show a liquid reality. That might be due to the appreciation of the role of the "palace" that the average landlord had never eliminated. The role of *zekenim* and *mishpacha* elders at certain limits is still possible in Israel's political and value system. That role cannot be eliminated, even when power is in the hands of a powerful king.[31]

The system that showed the tidiness of the Israeli government occurred when Solomon came to power. Differential division of power is carried out, to religious, legal, financial, and regional (I King. 4). This can be done because the situation is relatively safer. The concentration of confederations for war can be diverted to self-stabilization. The administrative process that began to be organized made the centers of power divided which rests on *melekh* (king), *zekenim*, *roshi*, *shofetim*, *gibbore chail* and *scrim* (civil but military functions are then more included in it). The process of good administrative structuring turned out to have positive political implications in the following periods. Political succession, for example, is no longer linked to the origins of *beth abboth* or *mishpacha* or blood ties. During the time of the Northern Kingdom of Israel, it was evident that there were kings who did not have a family name (*father's name*) and even King Omri did not smell like Israel.

When referred to Tylor's progressive historical assumptions about borrowing and finding independently, Israel is a very strong indicator of proof. All forms, social systems, politics, leadership and even forms of rites, are loans and external. They absorb and adopt while making various improvements.[32] If at the beginning the presence of the Israelites in the land of Canaan was very similar to a dull and messy picture. Weber did not even hesitate to analogize this initial existence with the condition of the lowest strata in the social stratification of Hinduism: "Sociologically speaking the Jews were a pariah people, which means, as we know from India, that they are guest people who where ritually separated, formally or de facto, from their social surroundings."[33] The exception to Israel is its religious doctrine that does not recognize the stratification of society. So, the term pariah (cf. caste in Hindu society) which is applied to Israel is to show Israel's social devices, whether religion, social system, politics and culture are still empty and mixed.

As immigrants wandering past, the Israelites are aware that their religious and cultural achievements are far behind compared to those of the old cultures in the Middle East, the pariahs, newcomers, and students who are not counted begin to advance and push inward global cultural, religious and political currents. When compared with the reality of Egypt, Iran, Babylon, and others in their time, there was nothing new and special about Israel. The only peculiarity is that of Yahweh the confederate. But that is precisely what makes it unique and extraordinary. The principles of the Confederation's Yahweh are put at the heart of all the forms of culture, religion, politics, and rites they borrow. The implication is certainly strange, changing, and thrilling. The principles, philosophies of conceptions, and fundamental propositions that exist in the borrowed system and form that they turn and break. Van Leeuwen's explanation is very fitting to illustrate this point:

But that dependence only reaches a certain point, where Israel's irresistible creativity radically changes the material that is taken over, based on his own soul and outlook. The general view of the universe was accepted, but at the same time, its backbone was broken, because the universe was seen as the work of God in Israel's own history. In this way, Israel unhesitatingly took over the microcosmic symbolism of pagan temples, but at the same time released upon it every magical meaning that was considered to represent the divine totality of the universe.[34] In

---

[31] Thomas C. Römer, *The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences*.

[32] Saut Sirait, *Politik Kristen Di Indonesia*, 90-91; Gary N. Knoppers, Jonathan S. Greer, *Deuteronomistic History*; David A. Bergen, *The Heart of the (Deuteronomic) Matter: Solomon and the book of the Law*, 213-230.

[33] Max Weber, *Ancient Judaism*, 3.

[34] Arend Th. Van Leeuwen, *Agama Kristen Dalam Sejarah Dunia,* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1997), 15.

this creative way, then it could be said that Israel became the new world order at that time, especially regarding the basic conceptions of God, man, and nature.

Qahal in Deuteronomic Historical Works

In the Israelite community in the Old Testament, before becoming a nation, the smallest unit in its community was the household, which was called *beth abboth* (*father house*). This community is a sub-section of family, clans or family's name called *sib*. Above *sib* there is a *mishpacha,* and the whole parts are united in the *shebet* (*tribal*), the tribe.[35] Tribal community alliance where all members live in harmony, as a family. The term "people" is indeed derived from the root of the word which is found in all Semitic nations (Heb. `amn), which means none other than"family", "kinfolks", "relatives", and `amn YHWH is the oldest and most ordinary designation of Israel.[36]

The tribes of Israel who allied themselves for a certain purpose finally created a system of confederations that began when Jethro (Moses' father-in-law) advised Moses how the new system was in trying the people of Israel. The League of tribes of Israel is similar to the Amphykthyony in Greece. These people who form a league characterized by belief in Yahweh is what the writer refers to as "*Qahal*", where belief in Yahweh greatly affected all aspects of their lives. The principles of the Confederation's Yahweh are put at the heart of all their cultural, religious, political, and rite forms.

Qahal in Deuteronomic Historical Works Starting from the Period

This belief also gives encouragement in war, even the role of Yahweh is very decisive victory or defeat in holy war. Thus, in addition to their need for elders and even kings, but they greatly appreciated the role of the priest who linked them to Yahweh. The spirit of confederation similar to that of Amphykthyony turned out to have tremendous strength, because all the best people of the tribes formed a league that was able to complete all tasks and responsibilities in social life, as a state, worship, etc.

It was the spirit of the league that was influenced by belief in Yahweh that made those who were originally migrants to the land of Canaan, eventually become a strong and advanced nation in all aspects of life. If during the wanderers until when they became immigrants in the land of Canaan, they were far behind those of old cultures in the Middle East who were described as "pariah" caste, but with the league strength of the tribes with a distinctiveness in Yahweh owned by the confederation, that is what make it unique and extraordinary that brings them surged into the flow of world culture, religion and politics.[37]

As long as they are in a theocracy system in which Yahweh is the center and who rules in all aspects of their lives, extraordinary achievements have been achieved in the fields of culture, religion, politics, and so on. But when they want to be like other nations that have a king and have a monarchical system, where they ask a king to God through Samuel, it makes the heart of God sad because it is considered that they reject God's rule over their lives.[38]

---

[35] W. H. Williams. "A Look Within the Deuteronomic History." *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol.25, Iss.3 (1972): 337-345. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930600028283.

[36] David A. Bergen, *The Heart of the (Deuteronomic) Matter: Solomon and the book of the Law*, 213-230; Louis Jonker, *Was the Chronicler more Deuteronomic than the Deuteronomist? Explorations into the Chronicler's Relationship with Deuteronomic Legal Traditions*, 185-197.

[37] Gary N. Knoppers, Jonathan S. Greer, *Deuteronomistic History*; David A. Bergen, *The Heart of the (Deuteronomic) Matter: Solomon and the book of the Law*, 213-230; Thomas C. Römer, *The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences*.

[38] Juha Pakkala, *The Monotheism of the Deuteronomistic History*, 159-178; W. H. Williams, *A Look Within the Deuteronomic History*, 337-345.

When the monarchical system occurred in which the 12 tribes of Israel were ruled by David and Solomon, at the end of King Solomon's reign the kingdom of Israel was split into two kingdoms. Israel's "Qahal" in Deuteronomic Historical Works begins with Israel's wandering period, then the Canaanite occupation period, until the time they asked for the king through Samuel. The life of the people of Israel is not getting better with this monarchic system. That is why God hates the monarchic system because the Israelites reject God's rule over their lives. Israel is forced to turn to God, confess His sins and return to submit and obey His word because they have been chosen to be God's people (2 Kings 17:13).

CONCLUSION

Israel's Qahal in the Deuteronomic History of Work, which began the wandering era in the leadership of Moses and then became an immigrant in the land of Canaan, continued in the leadership of Saul where Israel asked the king to directly lead the Israelites. In the leadership of David and Solomon, which were originally intact 12 tribes, eventually split into two nations. With this monarchical system, God hates, for rejecting God as the government in their lives. After seeing the entire description above, then in the concluding section, this can be concluded that Qahal in the thought of Deuteronomist Historical Work means that the Israelites are God's chosen people, they must obey and obey all His words. If the Israelites as His chosen people violate His commands, they will be punished. Restoration can occur if His people repent.

REFERENCES

Alva, Reginald. "The Spirit-led Church: Mission in Action in the Contemporary World." *International Review of Mission*. Vol.108, Iss.1 (2019): 164-177, https://doi.org/10.1111/irom.12270.

Bergen, David A. The Heart of the (Deuteronomic) Matter: Solomon and the book of the Law, *Journal of Studies in Religion*, Vol.35, Iss.2 (2006): 213-230, https://doi.org/10.1177/000842980603500202.

Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 2001.

Hardiman, F. Budi. *Kritik ideologi menyingkap pertautan pengetahuan dan kepentingan bersama Jurgen Habermas*, Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2009.

Gottwald, Norman. *The Tribes of Yahweh*. New York: Orbis Books, 1975.

Knoppers, Gary N., Greer, Jonathan S., *Deuteronomistic History*, Oxford Bibliographies (2010), https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780195393361-0028.

Leeuwen, Arend Th. Van *Agama Kristen Dalam Sejarah Dunia*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1997.

Levinson, Bernard M. "The Hermeneutics of Tradition in Deuteronomy: A Reply to J. G. McConville." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119, no.2 (2000): 269-286, https://doi.org/10.2307/3268487.

Lumingkewas, Marthin Steven, Jenry E.C. Mandey, and Antonius Missa. "GOLDEN CALF NARRATIVE: Deuteronomist Ideology of Jeroboam Reformation." *MAHABBAH: Journal of Religion and Education* 3, no.1 (2022): 67-85. https://doi.org/10.47135/mahabbah.v3i1.24.

Napitupulu, Pieter Anggiat, Agus Santoso, and Bobby Kurnia Putrawan. "HISTORY OF CHRONICLES AS AN EDITORIAL WORKS: Editorial analysis of the Book of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah." *Voice Of Wesley: Jurnal Ilmiah Musik dan Agama* 5, no.1 (2021): 24-35, https://dx.doi.org/10.36972/jvow.v5i1.98.

Noth, Martin. *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOT Supplement, Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Pr, 2002.

O'Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. Freiburg, Switzerland / Göttingen, Germany: Universitätsverlag / Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1989, https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-152171.

Pakkala, Juha. The Monotheism of the Deuteronomistic History, *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, Vol.21, No.2 (2007): 159-178, https://doi.org/10.1080/09018320801896500.

Peterson, Brian Neil. "The Deuteronomistic History since Martin Noth." in *The Authors of the Deuteronomistic History: Locating a Tradition in Ancient Israel*, Minneapolis: 1517 Media, 2014, 7-36, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt9m0v1j.5.

Peterson, Cheryl M. "Who is the Church?." *A Journal of Theology Dialog* 51, Iss.1 (2012): 24-30. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6385.2011.00651.x.

Radjawane, A. N. *The Deuteronomic History*. Ambon: PPsTAK UKI Maluku, 2011.

Römer, Thomas C. The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences. *Humanities,* Vol.46 (2015): 43-66, https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234720008.pdf.

Santoso, Agus. "Perceraian dalam Tradisi Tawarikh dan Tandingannya." Ed. Robert Setio, Daniel K. Listijabudi. *Perceraian Di Persimpangan Jalan: Menelisik Perjanjian Lama dan Tradisi Abrahamik*, Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2015.

Santoso, Agus. *Tafsir Alkitab Kontekstual-Oikumenis*: *1 Tawarikh*, Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2017.

Scheffler, Eben. "Criticising Political Power: The Challenge of Deuteronomy 17:14-20." *Old Testament Essays* 20, no.3 (2007): 772-785, https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC85892.

Sirait, Saut. *Politik Kristen di Indonesia*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2012.

Th. C, Vriezen. *Agama Israel Kuno*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2016.

Thembhani, Babane Morris. "Church Interpreting: Its Sociolinguistic Challenges in Some Vatsonga Charismatic Churches." *Journal of Social Sciences* 47, Iss.2 (2016): 111-118, https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2016.11893550.

Weber, Max. *Ancient Judaism*. llionis: The Free Press, 1952.

Williams, W. H. A Look Within the Deuteronomic History. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 25, Iss.3 (1972): 337-345, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930600028283.

Wonoadi, Jusak Pundiono, and Ester Agustina Tandana. "THE TABERNACLE AS THE PLACE OF GOD'S PRESENCE AMONG HIS PEOPLE: A Tripartite Approach on Temple". *QUAERENS: Journal of Theology and Christianity Studies* 3, no.2 (2022): 135-54. https://doi.org/10.46362/quaerens.v3i2.75.