

“Sin of the Fathers upon the Children to the Third and Fourth Generation”: An Appraisal of Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 in Relation to an African Theological Understanding of Original Sin

**Dissertation submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Old Testament at the Faculty of Theology, Stellenbosch
University**



**By
Zachariah Bulus Takore**

***Promoter*
Prof. H.L. Bosman**

March 2017

Declaration

By submitting this thesis electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Signature _____

Date _____ March 2017 _____

Copyright © 2017 Stellenbosch University

All right reserved

Abstract

Although the second commandment takes a stand against idolatry, it raises the issue of sin of the father being transferred upon the children to the third and fourth generation as a form of divine retribution. The first chapter presents the hypothesis that the Decalogue has provided a primary literary context for comparing two versions of it. Social rhetorical analysis was applied as a multidimensional methodology to appraise both texts for their relevance in Africa.

Chapter Two presents a research survey on sin and original sin. Comparison of both concepts revealed that sin of the fathers upon the children is a method of indicating original sin. Just as one man's sin affects all, sin of the fathers also affects their children. The ancient treaty proposed that one is blessed on the condition that one obeys, and cursed or punished for sin. This is traceable in the Decalogue and has been adopted among the Tyap in the southern Kaduna context, in the view that what affects one, affects all, whether that be dignity or shame. Africans believe that those who obey will be venerated as ancestors, and enjoy a mark of inter-generational honour from the ancestor to the living.

The third and fourth chapters appraise the Decalogue using social rhetorical analysis. Chapter Three focused on Deuteronomy Five while Chapter Four was on Exodus 20. These chapters provided the literary context for comparing and analysing the concept of sin of the fathers upon the children. I argued that the covenant context fits the first Decalogue and the ancient treaty context, while the holiness context fits the second Decalogue and the Second Temple era. The theory of corporate and individual responsibilities was applied in an appraisal of sin of the fathers for African understanding of original sin.

In the final chapter and conclusion, I argue for the etiological nature of sin and the reasons for its continuation across generations of humanity. This research discovered that divine justice was not administered first corporately and later individually, as alleged by Ezekiel and Jeremiah; one form did not exist before the other (dispensationally). This study concludes that both responsibilities co-existed. Where scholars like Miller, Propp, Dozeman, Kaminsky, Duke and others were implicit, I have argued explicitly for the co-existence of corporate and individual responsibility. The two existed side by side and were applied simultaneously. This finding regarding the co-existence of both forms of divine retribution is the contribution of this thesis to Old Testament biblical research.

In like manner, the Sabbath co-existed in both contexts; one did not replace the other. While *Exodus/liberation* served as motivation for the Sabbath in the covenant context, *creation* served as the motivation of the Sabbath in the priestly context. The priestly-holiness context influenced the Second Temple period; and without holiness, one can neither see God nor relate with him or enter the temple to worship God. The Sabbath identity of the Israelites was renewed by the theology of creation. Creation gave access to all human beings, including Africans from southern Kaduna, to participate in the worship of God.

Opsomming

Hoewel die tweede gebod standpunt inneem teen afgodery, belig dit ook die vraagstuk van „sonde van die vader“ oorgedra aan die kinders, tot die derde en vierde geslag, as ‘n vorm van goddelike vergelding. Die eerste hoofstuk bied die hipotese dat die Dekaloog primêr ‘n literêre konteks verskaf om die twee weergawes van die Dekaloog te vergelyk. Sosio-retoriese analise is aangewend as ‘n multidimensionele metodologie om beide tekste te evalueer in terme van hul relevansie in Afrika.

Hoofstuk Twee bied ‘n navorsingsopname oor sonde en erfsonde. In hierdie hoofstuk word beide begrippe vergelyk, en word bevind dat die sonde van die vaders wat besoek word aan die kinders, dui op erfsonde. Soos een mens se sonde almal raak, raak sonde van die vaders ook hul kinders. Die ou verbond het voorgelê dat mens geseën word op voorwaarde van gehoorsaamheid, en vervloek of gestraf word vir sonde. Die idee kan herlei word na die Dekaloog, en is so opgeneem onder die Tyap in die suide van Kaduna, in die opvatting dat wat een mens raak, almal raak, hetsy tot eer of tot skande. Afrikane glo dat gehoorsame mense na afsterwe vereer word as voorvaders, en ‘n dat eer tussen geslagte toegeken word tussen die lewendes en die voorvaders.

Die derde en vierde hoofstukke beoordeel die Dekaloog deur middel van sosio-retoriese analise. Hoofstuk Drie fokus op Deuteronomium 5, en Hoofstuk Vier op Eksodus 20. Hierdie hoofstukke verskaf die literêre konteks vir vergelyking en analise van die konsep van „sonde van die vader“ oorgedra aan die kinders. Ek het aangevoer dat die verbond toepaslik is op die eerste Dekaloog en die antieke verbondskonteks, terwyl die heiligheidskonteks toepaslik is op die tweede Dekaloog en die Tweede Tempel-era. Die teorie van korporatiewe en individuele verantwoordelikheid is aangewend om ‘n Afrika-begrip van „sonde van die vader“, en erfsonde, te ondersoek.

In die laaste hoofstuk en die gevolgtrekking, word betoog vir die etiologie van sonde en die rede van die voortsetting daarvan oor menslike geslagte heen. Hierdie navorsing het bevind dat Goddelike geregtigheid nie éers korporatief, en later individueel, toegeskryf word, soos Esegïël en Jeremia beweer nie; die een bedeling het nie die ander voorafgegaan nie. Hierdie studie kon tot die gevolgtrekking kom dat beide vorms van verantwoordelikheid gelyktydig geldig was. Waar geleerdes soos Miller, Propp, Dozeman, Kaminsky, Duke en andere hierdie gedagte impliseer, het ek die gelyktydigheid van korporatiewe en individuele verantwoordelikheid eksplisiet aangevoer. Albei bestaan naas mekaar en is gelyktydig

geldend. Hierdie bevinding, nl. die gelyktydigheid van beide vorms van vergelding is die bydrae van hierdie proefskrif tot Ou-Testamentiese Bybelnavorsing.

Op soortgelyke gronde het die Sabbatsvoorskrifte in beide kontekste bestaan; die een het nie die ander vervang nie. Terwyl *Eksodus/bevryding* dien as motivering vir die Sabbat in die verbondskonteks, dien die *Skepping* as die motivering vir die Sabbat in die priesterlike konteks. Die priesterlike/heiligheidskonteks beïnvloed die Tweede Tempel-periode; en sonder heiligheid kan mens God nie sien of met God in 'n verhouding tree nie, nóg die tempel binnegaan om God te aanbid nie. Die Sabbatsidentiteit van die Israeliete is hernu deur die Skeppingsteologie. Die skepping bied toegang aan alle mense, ook die Afrikane van suidelike Kaduna, om deel te neem in aanbidding van God.

Dedication

This research is dedicated first to God for his grace upon my life, second to my parents, late Elder Bulus Takore and Mrs Rhoda Bulus Takore, (my father who died in 1997 and my praying mother at home) and third to my promoter, who supervised me like a father and a mentor.

Acknowledgement

Praise God for his sufficient grace that pulled me through the period of my studies at Stellenbosch University. The Creator who had a plan for my life has made it possible to finalize this work and I remain grateful.

My gratitude to the University and the Faculty of Theology for giving me an “atmosphere of hope” in which to do my PhD. The “Hope Bursary” was very helpful: it motivated me in various ways to concentrate on my studies. Thanks to the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) support bursary it always assisted me to register, hence its significance to my studies. God will bless back and restore the purse of the DRC. Another helpful support I receive was the HB Thom Theology Bursary. Lastly, I appreciate the significant support of *Scriptura*: your financial support pulled me through the days and years I spent in school. May God use you to bless more people and may he sustain your project continuously.

Permit me to show gratitude to my incomparable promoter whose illustration with lenses always reminded me of what to do, and how research ought to be done. Your supervision taught me a lot and I hope to do likewise unto others. I appreciate the relationship where I was corrected and encouraged to do more; today I feel like a better researcher. I see the change you have wrought in me and I have started using this knowledge to help my friends, even in the postgraduate programme. Appreciation to Mrs Daléne Bosman and Professor Hendrik L. Bosman for their immense support, there is no way we will forget you.

Others that made this journey a success were the faculty members whose papers challenged me to work hard, Prof. L. Jonker, Prof. J. Claassens and Dr. N. S. Cezula thank you all for your imputes to my studies. The same appreciation goes to my colleagues in the Old Testament seminar, God bless you. The secretaries who were there to plan and facilitate all communication, like Rev. Liena Hoffman, Estelle Muller (I call her assistant professor) and Marieke Brand - may God bless you all. I do appreciate my experienced editor Mrs Felicity Grové who went in between the lines to look at my work. May God bless the Library staff for being helpful: the librarians Beulah Gericke, Heila Mare, Annemarie Eagleton and Theresa Jooste. Appreciation to my elders whose work may not be recognized, Minnie, Jenny and Howard; God bless you, I will miss you all.

My acknowledgement to the Evangelical Church Wining All (ECWA), especially my DCC leaders who permitted me to proceed on study to South Africa, and to ECWA Mounted Troop

Kabala Doki for your prayers and moral support. To my father in the Lord and chairman of the DCC, Rev Yunusa S. Nmadu and the rest of the leaders, I say thank you. I am better equipped to serve now than I was previously. Thanks to my ECWA fellowship and family in South Africa, I remain grateful for having you around and for spending time with you. To my friends in school, Kurginam's, Ogidi's, Tagwai's, Bwala's, Garba's, A.B. Makama, J. Stanley, M. Hassan, D. Silas N.D. Pele, K. Cephas and the rest, God bless you all. Friends in Stellenbosch, the family of Dr Ayo Oyewumi, the Chota's and the Nkabyo's and families, thanks for being there for us. To Easter, Damilola, Nangura, Achille, Tobi and Craig, you meant a lot to us.

I cannot forget the support of Elder and Mrs John Saidu and family at various instances when we were in need; our good God will bless you in return and do more for your children. Thanks to Elder and Mrs Johnson Akoka for their support as well. Baba Karma Mairafi and Mama Esther Karma, my senior pastor who took me like his child, "na gode, na gode" (Thank you).

My family cannot be left out, for their prayers and all other forms of support. Sometimes I go into tears for your hardship and how I would have stayed back to help, but it was more important that I go ahead. See the fruit of your sacrifice and patience. May God bless you all and grant your hearts' desires; may he compensate your losses during this project. Thanks to my parents, Elder Bulus Takore who could not live to see how much I have grown and to my mother Mrs Rhoda Bulus Takore who prays day and night for my success, Nma ngwai (thanks to my mum) for being alive while I was away. Thanks to Nehemiah and Emmanuel, my elder brothers and their wives, and to my younger sisters Lydia, Salome (Laraba) and Deborah for your moral support. Thanks to my parents-in-law for their support, Baba Momba Jatau, Mama Saratu Momba, to Joe who always represented us, Nom and the rest, God bless.

Lastly, to my mentor and spiritual father, Rev Yunusa Sabo Nmadu and Mummy Mrs Alice Darin Yunusa Nmadu, I remain your child. To my beautiful wife, Martha Zachariah Bulus, and to my lovely children, Eltsadiq Jonah, Elbaruch Nathaniel and my daughter Alice-Delene Shekniel who were there to make all the sacrifices, I say, God bless you. If we must succeed, we must share the pain as well, and see how the result turns out well in the end. God will crown you with joy and I will continue to love you all. It is important for me to thank all those I couldn't remember, who made it possible for me to embark and conclude this research.

Abbreviations

AB – Anchor Bible

ABC – African Bible Commentary

ABD – Anchor Bible Dictionary

ANE – Ancient near East

AOTC – Apollos Old Testament Commentary

BBC – Blackwell Bible Commentary

CTJ – Catholic Theological Journal

HCOT – Historical Commentary of the Old Testament

ITC – International Theological Commentary

JTS – Journal of Theological Studies

JPS – Jewish Publication Society

JSOT – Journal of the Study of Old Testament

LXX – Septuagint

MT – Masoretic Text

NAC- New American Commentary

NCBC – New Commentary of Bible C

NET – New English Translation

NIBC – New International Bible Commentary

NIDB – New International Dictionary of the Bible

NIDOTTE – New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis

NIV – New International Version

NRVS – New Revised Standard Version

OTE – Old Testament Essays

RPP – Religion Past and Present

SBL – Society of Biblical Literature

VT – Vetus Testamentum

VTE – Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon

WBC – Word Biblical Commentary

YHWH – Yahweh

Table of Content

Declaration	ii
Abstract	iii
Opsomming	v
Dedication.....	vii
Acknowledgement	viii
Abbreviations.....	x
Table of Content	xi
Chapter One.....	1
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Primary Research Question	2
1.2 Secondary Research Questions	2
1.3 Hypotheses of the Research.....	3
1.4.1 Research Design, Methodology and Theoretical Framework.....	3
1.4.2 African Biblical Hermeneutics.....	5
1.5 Background to Previous Studies and Research History	5
1.6 Background of Social Rhetorical Criticism Methods	10
1.6.1 Methods in Socio-Rhetorical Criticism	10
1.6.2 Intra-Textual Analysis.....	10
1.6.3 Inter-Textual Analysis.....	13
1.6.4 Socio-Cultural Analysis	14
1.6.5 Ideological and Theological Analysis	15
1.7.1 Background and Lexical Constructions of Sin.....	16
1.7.2 A Brief Survey on the Perception of Sin	20
1.8 Research Design and Structure of the Study	22
Chapter Two	25
Research Survey on Sin and Original Sin according to the Old Testament	25
2.1 Introduction.....	25

2.2 The Models and Theories of Original Sin.....	28
2.2.1 Pelagius on Original Sin	29
2.2.2 Augustine on Original Sin	30
2.2.3 Catholic Theology on Original Sin	32
2.2.4 Protestant Theology on Original Sin.....	33
2.3 Theory of Corporate and Individual Responsibility.....	36
2.3.1 Theology of Corporate Responsibility in the Decalogue.....	37
2.3.2 African Understanding of Corporate Responsibility and Ancestors.....	39
2.4 The Theology of Sin of the Fathers in the Decalogue	44
2.5 Preliminary Conclusion.....	46
Chapter Three.....	50
Socio-Rhetorical Appraisal of Deuteronomy 5:8-10.....	50
3.1 Introduction	50
3.2 Demarcation of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5:1-21	52
3.3 Text Translation for Deuteronomy 5:1-21.....	54
3.4 Intra-Textual Analysis.....	58
3.4.1 Repetition.....	58
3.4.2 Progression	60
3.4.3 Narration	62
3.4.4 The Opening, Middle and Closing Units.....	72
3.4.5 Argument.....	74
3.4.6 Sensory-Aesthetics	76
3.5 Inter-Textual Analysis.....	79
3.5.1 Oral-Scribal Intertexture	80
3.5.2 Recitation	81
3.5.3 Re-contextualization	84
3.5.4 Reconfiguration.....	86
3.5.5 Narrative Amplification	86
3.5.6 Thematic Elaboration and Inter-text with Deuteronomy 5:12-15.....	95
3.6 Socio-Cultural Analysis.....	99
3.6.1 The Social Background of Israel's Society.....	99
3.6.2 Specific Social Topics.....	104
3.6.3 Common Social and Cultural Topics	106
3.6.4 Social Roles and Institutions in Israel.....	108

3.6.5	Social codes of Conduct	120
3.6.6	Social Relationships	121
3.6.7	Cultural Intertext	121
3.6.8	Israelite and Ancient Near East Treaties	122
3.7	Inter-text with Ancient Near Eastern Treaties.....	123
3.7.1	Ancient Context and Deuteronomy 27-28.....	127
3.7.2	Ancient Context and Joshua 8:30-35.....	127
3.8	Ideological and Theological Analysis	130
3.8.1	Location of Ideology in the Society.....	130
3.8.2	Action Set in Relation to the Decalogue	130
3.8.3	Corporate Group and Deity	131
3.8.4	Theology of YHWH in the Community	138
3.9	Preliminary Conclusion.....	146
Chapter Four		152
Social Rhetorical Appraisal of Exodus 20:1-17.....		152
4.1 Introduction		152
4.2	Textual Demarcation of Exodus 20:4-6.....	153
4.3	Translation and Textual Criticism of Exodus 20:1-17.....	156
4.4	The Ten Commandment of YHWH	158
4.5	Intra-Textual Analysis of the Text	158
4.5.1	Repetitive Textual Pattern	159
4.5.2	Progression in the Account.....	159
4.5.3	Narrative Aspect of the Text.....	160
4.5.4	Opening-Middle-Closing Pattern	178
4.5.5	Argument and Rhetorical Structure	180
4.5.6	Sensory-Aesthetic Texture	182
4.6	Inter-Textual Analysis for Exodus 20:1-17.....	182
4.6.1	Oral-Scribal Intertexture	183
I.	Re-contextualization	183
4.7	Socio-Cultural Analysis.....	185
4.7.1	Social Background and Intertexture	185
I.	Category of the Conversionists	189
II.	The Reformist Category	189
4.7.2	Metaphor-Proverb for Transgenerational Sin	190

I.	The “Sour Grapes” in Ezekiel 18:2	190
II.	The “Sour Grapes” in Jeremiah 31:29.....	191
4.7.3	Common Social and Cultural Themes	192
I.	Honour, Guilt and the Right Culture.....	192
II.	Covenant of Holiness in Israel’s Society	193
III.	The Covenant and the Golden Calf.....	195
4.8.1	Intertexture with Ancient Near Eastern Treaties	196
4.8.2	Ancient Context and Leviticus 26:1-5 and 14-16	199
4.9	Ideological Texture	200
I.	Ideology of YHWH and Individual Location	200
II.	Ideology of Groups in Modes of Discourse	202
a.	A Corporate Group.....	202
b.	Ideology of the Sabbath Motivation	203
c.	The New Religious Community of Israel	204
4.10	Theological Texture	205
4.10.1	Theology of Exodus.....	205
4.10.2	Salvation History and the Wilderness Experience.....	207
4.10.3	Theology of Sabbath Motivation	209
4.11	Preliminary Conclusion.....	211
Chapter Five	216
	Summary, Conclusion and Suggestions for Possible Future	
	Research	216
5.1	Summary of the Research	216
5.2	Existing Research and Consequences of Sin of the Fathers	218
5.2.1	Theology of Retributive Justice in the Old Testament	221
5.2.2	Theology of Consequences and Sin of the Fathers	225
5.3	Contributions to Old Testament and Conclusion of Research	228
a.	The Etiological Nature of Retributive Justice	228
b.	Idolatry and Divine Jealousy	232
c.	Comparative Analyses to the Decalogue.....	235
d.	Conclusion of the Study.....	239
I.	Literary Perspective.....	240
II.	Socio-Cultural Perspective	241
III.	Theological Perspective	244
IV.	Legal Perspective.....	245

V. African Perspective	247
5.4 Relevance of Research in African Context	252
5.4.1 Social Relevance: Ancestors/Living Dead as Family	254
5.4.2 Political Relevance: Colonialism and Coloniality	256
5.4.3 Theological Relevance: Inter-Generational Curse	258
5.5 Further Suggestions for Studies	260
I. Health Relevance: Inherited Diseases and Stigmatization	261
II. Economic Relevance: Nepotism and Inherited Corruption	262
Bibliography	265

Chapter One

Introduction and Background of the Study

1.0 Introduction

Although this classical theology of “Original Sin¹” has been studied from diverse western theological perspectives in the past, this study investigates Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 from the understanding of “Sin of the fathers upon the children²” with a view to determining how it reflects a West African/Nigerian or Southern Kaduna theological experience for later generations. History entails looking back to remember the past, in this case we are investigating the recollection of the impact of sin in the society. It could be that sin of the fathers³ emerges as a heavy missing mark by parents in the past, which affects the theological perception of their progeny. The narrator may be referring to the history of infidelity as an exilic memory for the Israelite; but the question may be asked, is “sin of the fathers” the reason for the exile? And in what way is this issue related to “our fathers ate sour grapes and children’s teeth were on edge” in Ezekiel 18:2 and Jeremiah 31:29? Perhaps this problem forms a hermeneutical development that began with the knowledge of trans-generational curse in the African/Nigerian as well as the Southern Kaduna context. The concept of original sin may in turn serve as a helpful lens for understanding “Sin of the Fathers upon the

¹Sin of the fathers” is considered as a reciprocal description of “Original sin”, nonetheless, this research is etiological in nature. The word appraisal is important for both Decalogue and their different context to be studied. Appraisal indicates the analyses and interpretation of the text with the other context of the Decalogue, see footnote 12 and 13 in chapter 1.5 for details.

²The title presupposes the New International Version (NIV), and it is consistently applied in the research, except for certain clarity. Hence for the purpose of this research, this translation concurs and is easy to understand, which is much closer to the Hebrew Bible. This translation is better for this research when compared with others. This extension in the second commandment, may provide reasons to respect God and human beings in Israel, and indicate the Sabbath motivation, or why the Decalogue was repeated? The question of human dignity and the sin of the fathers has to do with its stigma on the innocent and is imputation on the family or clan. It is important that we look forward else the penance and reparation of the sins continue to increase in other generations.

³Fathers are known to be the head of family units, in most cases what affects the father, affects every member of the family, it mostly applied as house of the father also “ancestral household” אֲבוֹתָא see 3.6.4 for detail. Selman (1980:668) refers to household and the father’s house as associated with the biblical concept that a family or an ancestor or a leader could derive its name. The “Fathers” that sinned were not mentioned according to the text (see 5.3, d under II in the conclusion, pp. 237-238), nor a specification as to the type of sin that YHWH frowns at. In like manner, the reference to the fathers in these texts was not alluded to a particular generation. Instead it refers to the future, from the moment YHWH spoke to Moses. This research considered the text as a warning to the fathers, both present and future. Though the address was made to the generation of Moses, who were parents, fathers and mothers then, but this appears to be applicable to the present generation in the same way that Scripture is useful and applicable to the modern era. The issues are, whether such theology is relevant in modern African contexts like Western Africa and Southern Kaduna?

children” in this research. Thus the concept of the original sin can be a useful tool in understanding generational retribution.

This development forms the **Research Problem**: *To explore the understanding of generational consequences as a result of “sin of the fathers [being visited] upon the children” according to the Decalogue (Exodus 20:4-6 and Deuteronomy 5:8-10) and other parts of the Old Testament, as an attempt to analyse the hermeneutical development for understanding original sin from a West African/Nigerian or southern Kaduna context.* In other words, this is an attempt to evaluate the perception of “Sin of the Fathers upon the Children to the Third and Fourth Generation” for an African, Nigerian and specifically a southern Kaduna theological awareness of the “sin of the fathers”. Perhaps the idea of the sin of the fathers could clarify the past situation of Africa/Nigeria or southern Kaduna, as the lenses for referring to parents’ irresponsibility not just fathers. This may be understood within the contexts of the Decalogue, (covenant and priestly traditions); and possibly in Old Testament research.

1.1 Primary Research Question

The primary question for this research is: *“How does the understanding of “Sin of the Fathers upon the Children to the Third and Fourth generation” according to Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9, helps a West African/Nigerian or specifically a southern Kaduna theological perception of generational sin? In other words, how can this offer an understanding “sin of the fathers upon the children” and the theological implication of original sin⁴ within the Decalogue for African/Nigerian conception?”* This paves way for making sense of the Decalogue’s “sin of the fathers” in an African context of generational suffering as sin committed by progenitors. The transference of the “sin of the fathers” as depicted in the Decalogue can be likened with the sins that were committed by the ancestors, which later haunt other generations.

1.2 Secondary Research Questions

Certain supporting questions become significant in determining how original sin relates to the way in which “God punishes the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth

⁴The question could be rephrased thus: “How does the appraisal of sin of the fathers in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 explain the inheritance of sin or being *born in sin*? This research will explore a trans-generational understanding of the consequence of “the Sin of the fathers being visited upon the children” in the Old Testament.

generation of those that are unfaithful to the covenant relationship,” according to Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9. Others are:

- First, how do African scholars understand the sin of the fathers upon the children?
- Second, in what way(s) are these passages related to each other and to the society?
- Third, what is the possible relationship between the two passages from an African theological understanding of the sin of the fathers being visited upon the children?
- Fourth, can sin of the fathers in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 illustrate the theological understanding of original sin for the conception of human dignity in African, West African, Nigerian or even southern Kaduna contexts? These questions are marked to help the process of the research, not necessarily like the main question.

1.3 Hypotheses of the Research

There are four assumptions and premises that could help guide this research to achieve its goals:

- ❖ Firstly, the Decalogue already provides a primary literary context for comparing Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 with regard to the issue of the sin of the fathers. Other Old Testament references to this may be relevant for achieving the hypotheses.
- ❖ Secondly, the historical contexts of the Decalogue (social, cultural, economic and religious) are all significant for interpreting the implication of “sins of the fathers being visited upon the children” in the form of human rights infringements.
- ❖ Thirdly, undertaking a theological analysis of Exodus 20 forms part of the priestly tradition, while Deuteronomy 5 is embedded in Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic tradition. This will lead us to delve into the analysis of the sin of the fathers and investigate how this helps Africans to conceive of original Sin. Perhaps this Priestly and Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic traditions will form an important background for interpreting the sins of the fathers.
- ❖ Lastly, the significant presupposition is that African theological understanding of “sin of the father upon the children” can provide a different perspective from the western or conventional theological thinking about the original sin, which can also help to redefine the self-worth of African civilization.

1.4.1 Research Design, Methodology and Theoretical Framework

The research is designed to take the form of a literature and exegetical study of the periscopes in question. In this study, part of the literature study will include first, a historical review of

existing literature in monographs and related articles in journals and dictionaries in order to clarify conceptually and historically how most Africans⁵ perceived and continue to understand the concept of the original sin in relation to the sins of the fathers. Then the study will attempt to clarify how such understanding affects the dignity of innocent persons. Interrelated sources, possibly social anthropological sources on the understanding of original sin in the Old Testament could also be relevant for this part of the research.

The second phase will incorporate the social rhetorical⁶ analysis of the social contexts in which these passages were written and understood, and the findings will be applied to the exegetical study of the passages in Exodus and Deuteronomy. The theological analysis will be made possible in light of the hypothesis that Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 are related in social, historical and literally contexts, as will be seen from the repetition and reformulation of both texts. In line with the differences in their respective audiences, inter-textual studies will also be done for a better understanding of the context of their reception.

Thirdly, it will involve a multidimensional exegetical study and social rhetorical analysis of the relevant texts to the subject matter in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9, viz. the sins of the fathers and their consequences in related references such as Jeremiah 31:29 and Ezekiel 18:2, which state that: “The fathers eat sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge”. This is a kind of gross human rights infringement in which the innocent is punished instead of the culprits, and it may be compared to the story in Genesis 6:1-3.

Finally, an ideological critical exploration of the Priestly and Deuteronomic traditions will be one of the lenses through which the research on the passages under discussion will be carried out. It is hoped that this study will be an additional voice in the field of biblical studies. By

⁵ The terms “Africa” or “Africans” indicate a wide range of contexts or cultures, and it cannot be discussed in these few pages. “Afric”a is not a village with five streets and fifteen houses. The use of term “Africa”, should not be generalised knowing that Africa consists of many different cultures and various language groups. It is neither a single locality nor a homogenous people’s group, instead there are about 54 countries in Africa and numerous ethnic groups. As a Nigerian, I am aware of about 300 different languages apart from dialects and in Southern Kaduna alone there are about 60 languages and dialects. Hence the use of Africa at certain points should not be interpreted as a place with similar people and the same culture and practices. Bosman (2015:255) states that Africa ought to be recognised as a context with about one billion people, living on more than 30 million sq. km; the second largest continent in the world after Asia. Though there are frequent generalizations, the use of the term must always recognise a wide of variety of people with various beliefs and customs. UNESCO recognises about 2000 spoken languages with diverse cultures in this populous and multilingual continent.

⁶A systematic method of persuading the audience to understand an idea that needs to be passed across. This is the main methodology, as such it will be defined in detail later in this chapter.

providing a platform to appreciate the concept of original sin from an African scholarly perspective, one may come to terms with how it is understood in certain African cultures.

1.4.2 African Biblical Hermeneutics

This method of interpretation takes the context of the audience seriously to analyse the scriptures. Nyiawung (2013:3-4) observes that African biblical studies have developed as a result of the lapses of the 'traditional' approaches. It focuses on the context of the audience as well as the contexts of biblical writings, before emphasising the relevance of the 'message' to the African people in a context such as Southern Kaduna. It is about how issues raised in the Bible can be interpreted and addressed within the social, cultural and religious contexts of places in Africa. Adamo (2015a:59, 62) believes that African biblical hermeneutics is a procedural resource that makes African social cultural contexts the subject of interpretation. This is a methodology that reappraises ancient biblical traditions and African world-views, cultures and life experiences, with the purpose of acknowledging the effect of the cultural, ideological conditioning to which Africa and Africans have been subjected in the business of biblical interpretation. He added that African biblical hermeneutics is the point of departure for transformative biblical interpretation in Africa. Adamo (2015b:33) refers to African biblical hermeneutics as the biblical interpretation that makes “African social cultural context a subject. It can also be referred to as African biblical transformational hermeneutic(s). This is because there has never been an interpretation without references to or dependent on a particular cultural code, thought patterns, or social location of the interpreter. This method uncovers issues related to ancestors, witches, wizard, poverty, economic underdevelopment, corruption and all lingering forms of colonization that exist amongst them. This is re-evaluating the Christian scripture from a premeditated Afrocentric point of view by unveiling the peoples’ experience.

1.5 Background to Previous Studies and Research History

The research on “sins of the fathers upon the children” and the African understanding of “Original Sin” was informed by the author’s previous research⁷ on “*Narrating the Culture of Honour and Shame from Stories of the Beginning in Genesis 6:1-4*”. The emphasis in the study was on the behaviour that brings shame or honour in a traditional African society.

⁷Zachariah Bulus Takore, “Nurturing Honour and Shame in Stories of the Beginning in Genesis: Biblical Perspectives on Human Dignity According to Cultures in Southern Kaduna” A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Theology. University of Stellenbosch (Unpublished, March 2013).

According to Genesis 6:1-4, the Sons of God (בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים) took the daughters of men, not *against their will*, and they later gave birth to giants identified either as נַפְלִיִּים or גְּבֻרִים. While it was experienced as honour by the so-called “Daughters of Cain” to have the giants as husbands, it was concluded as sinful and shameful to the well-behaved sons of Seth. However, the mythical story served as a warning call to the exiles, who were returning from Babylon to their promised homeland, to act with dignity towards one another and to guard against appearing of a godless generation in the future. If they refused to heed God’s counsel, the likelihood of intermarriage between the exiles and the other non-Israelites could cause idolatry and a godless generation.

In taking the above research further, the current investigation will reflect upon how past sin/shame⁸ is viewed in African/Nigerian society, especially with regard to the conception of sin of the fathers upon the children. Biblically this subject of wrongdoing/ disobedience in Genesis 3:6⁹ (Adam and Eve disobeyed God) is connected to Genesis 4:7 (Cain sinned by killing Abel) and also to other Pentateuchal passages like Genesis 6:1-8. Interestingly, Genesis 6:5-6, tells us that “The Lord saw how great human wickedness on earth had become, and that every inclination of his [the human’s] heart was only evil. ... The Lord was grieved in his heart on how human sin on earth was spreading, and his heart was filled with pain” (vs.6, NIV). Thus, sin is now inherent in all human beings. Martens (2003:765) consider original sin – as inherited sin the link or tie that encompasses all peoples¹⁰ without exception. Fretheim (2005:79) is of the opinion that the effects of sin and its aftermath are

⁸ These are concepts about wrongful behaviour that is sanctioned by the community, which has hereditary implications, though they are synonymous but refer to different behaviour. The honour and shame study was conducted from the viewpoint of a culture of respect; where honour and shame were related to sin or evil in the form of consequence in African perception. The two will be used concurrently in some instances.

⁹ It is important to note that as an older text about the “Sons of God who intermarried the daughters of men” Genesis 6:1-4 was used for the discussion on the original sin. The theory by Augustine of the original sin that focused on Genesis 3 was a later development. The above experience of the Daughters of Cain resulted in either respect or disrespect, which contributes to or undermines human dignity; it goes to show that humankind should strive for respect and dignity by all means to make the ecosphere (and society) a better place of habitation for all living organisms. According to Fretheim (2005:77) the effects of this story on family and community life then follow in the story of Cain and Abel. He adds that the story of violence (Gen 4:23-24, 6:11-13) portrays how the effects of sin cut across generations, with afflictions in the form of family conflict and sibling rivalry. In this regard, it was discovered that immoral or malevolent acts are shameful not only to the person in question but also to the members of his/her community (family, clan or village). On the other hand, it was found that a person is appreciated based on their honourable and valued participation in the activities of the community in this particular African setting.

¹⁰Michael (2011:168-173) notes that a person in Africa is considered or defined by those around the person, that is, by his/her spectators. It means personhood is attributed. It is a state attained by fulfilling certain obligations or responsibilities as stipulated by the community in the form of customs or attainments. Though the personality of an individual is recognized, it becomes complete after the expectations of the people are met.

now extended to the cosmic sphere in Genesis 6:1-4; while chapters 3-6 of Genesis serve as a witness to an original sin and wickedness that began a process which intensified.

The tie¹¹ is that, just as sin is emphasized as shame in the honour and shame studies, it is likely that an inter or intra-textual study of “the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation” in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 will shed more light on the African/Nigerian view of original sin, since human beings are either born with sin or inherit it from their parents. This study can be mapped out from various units of the Scriptures, especially in the Old Testament. The first appearance of sin is in Genesis 4:7 and 4:13, but Genesis 3:1-15¹² already indicates a deteriorated relationship between God and humans in the form of disobedience. Its impact is felt later and interpreted to have been inherited in all humanity even to our generation, meaning that sin began from an individual and now translates its consequences onto groups (on the family, clan or tribe). This is stated at the reception of the Decalogue.

Although the reason is that, the third and fourth generation already indicates the involvement of an extended family, which also guarantees that in the future children will suffer for the faults of the grandparents and great grandparents who sinned in the past. It is as if Yahweh does not forgive the sinners, but transfers their punishment to their offspring. This issue is attested in most traditional West African and Nigerian communities; for this reason, sin is resolved in peculiar ways owing to the distress and grief of its repercussions. This debate of individual and corporate sin however is not a new idea. Both responsibilities have existed from the beginning, prior to the times of Pelagius and Augustine, yet remains the subject of

¹¹Sin is considered as shame – not only to the person involved but also to the people in the community to which the wrongdoer belongs. Thus shame indicates unwanted behaviour.

¹²The fall of humankind in Genesis 3:6 is regarded as the origin of sin, evil or better shame in African view, otherwise referred to as the “Original Sin”. It is the parent’s sin that has been coined in Christian doctrine as original sin. It can be described as the violation of fellowship between God and humankind. In other words, it is an attitude of disloyalty to God by human beings found in all humanity and it affects the innocent generation as well. This natural sin in all humans is referred to in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 as “the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation...” (NIV). It means human beings, including the new-born, have inherited sin. It has ancestral links to forefathers and mothers and so is the consequence for future generations. Remarkably, in Deut. 5:9, remarks that God is jealous over his children who sin by worshipping other gods apart from him. This penance is later repeated in Exodus 20:5 as “...punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those that hate him” (NIV). As a result, He visits the punishment even on the great-grandchildren of those who sinned (the extended family אָבֹתָם וְבָנָם). This is a kind of human right infringement that is further re-contextualized in Jeremiah 31:29 and in Ezekiel 18:2: “The fathers eat sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge?” It becomes personal by being a transferred penalty (Ps.51:5, 58:3, 14:3; Job 15:14). The mystery of sin in Ezekiel 28:11-19 is marked by uncertain reference to the beginning of sin in the form of rebellion. Moreover, it is imperative to consider how sin of the fathers transmits the perception of human dignity.

an on-going debate. It is interesting that the issue of original sin can be compared to the supposition of the “sin of the fathers upon the children” in the African context¹³.

Importantly, the children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren, as well as those to come after so many epochs will account for the sins they never committed. According to Work (2009:78) the cultural norm is that children and grandchildren are the eternity of parents. Only apostate parents disinherit their children, but heeding God’s instruction secures blessings on children. It implies that if a generation would not be faithful for its own sake, it would do so for the sake of its descendants who are likely to inherit it. It implies that instead of securing a bright future for their offspring, the acts of members of that generation could result in curses on those who will inherit them in the future. This does not presume just a genetic trait that reappears in families, but is embedded as a spiritual nature that affects humanity. This again raises questions; what about the right to life of the innocent children and why should their dignity not be considered as innocent souls? How and why are they affected? These answers are given in Chapters Three and Four: due to the corporate nature of humanity and the nature of sin, all are now responsible. The family does not include just the living but the unborn, as well as the dead ancestors; are all responsible¹⁴. It is important at this point to consider briefly the systematic¹⁵ perceptions of the original sin. Besides, there are three¹⁶ views of the original sin in the history of Christian dogma. One understanding is

¹³There have been cases where being *born in sin* and *the sin of ancestors (fathers)* have been confused to mean the inheritance of sin. In this study, attention will be drawn to how the pericope on the sin of the fathers depicts being born in sin as in Psalm 51:5. Being born in sin is a greater degree and perspective of the original sin, because it became a nature that human beings inherited even before birth, in that at birth, they are born in it. In the same way Ezek. 18:2 and Jer.31:29 emphasize that “The fathers eat sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge?” This means that the sinful nature is inherited, for the reason that there is absolutely no reason why a child should be judged for his/her parent’s misdemeanours. Once more, the gap is that in the past the original sin was studied from the perspective of Genesis 3 in various contexts, but in this research, the focus will be on how the original sin can be understood from the analysis of the “sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation” in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9, and its relevance in scholarly perspectives in most African cultures.

¹⁴See contributions and research relevance in Chapter Five 5.4.

¹⁵Guthrie Jr. (2005:222) explains that this sin is both universal and inevitable and that Adam’s sinful nature has been passed down to other generations and to all humanity as a hereditary disease with which infants themselves are infected before they are born, right from their mother’s wombs. Human beings do repeat this same act due to our resemblance and nature of Adam. Leith (1993:105) notes that sins of society and of parents precede those of their offspring and corrupt the latter. These sins affect the child and are passed down mysteriously to the next generation. Hence, “Original Sin” is the source, not only of corruption, but also of all guilt such for which a group in one generation may be held accountable by another group in a different generation. This exaggeration seems to suggest a call to dignity in a society.

¹⁶First, *Pelagianism* says Adam and Eve’s sin had no effect on the souls of their descendants other than their shameful example that influenced the rest of humanity. It is believed here that humankind has the ability to live a sinless life if they are committed to God. On the contrary, Matt. 15:18-19, says mankind is defiled from the heart (cf. Rom. 7:3; Eph. 2:1-2; Heb. 9:14). The second is *Armenianism*: Leith (1993:106) states that no child is born into a situation of innocence, but one in which sin already exists and limits the probability of a better life.

that there is a stage at which a person becomes conscious of sin and then can be accountable for the original sin. In this case, we are looking at how sin of the fathers indicates the prevalence of wrongdoing everywhere in the society.

Several studies have been conducted on the Decalogue and on original sin, though most scholars and commentators did not delve deeply into the idea of “sin of the fathers upon the children”; nor have they compared this phrase with the African theological interpretation of “Original Sin” (inherited sin or being born in sin). Rather, most of the studies were under the rubric of the second commandment (Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9). On this note, Childs (1977:405-407) alludes that in the Old Testament, Yahweh’s zeal did not tolerate other gods. His judgment extends across four generations, upon the perpetrator’s grand and great-grandchildren. For this reason, the worship of idols¹⁷ is an encroachment on the prerogatives of God. The sin manifests as idolatry. Dozeman (2009:482) confirms that the idol may not be a deity but represents a channel by which the deity is present in the community.

From an African orientation, Mbiti (1970:82-83) confirm that God is not the creator of evil, sin and misfortune; rather it is the spirits, divinities or spiritual beings created by God, which are ready to cause evil among humans. There are also agents or spirits of evil which are not hidden from God. Pobee (1979:100) states that evil is the confluence of anger from the spirit-world and human waywardness by action and inaction, which made humankind guilty of the sin of omission. Hence sin entered the world of humanity (Genesis 3:5-7, 6:5-6). Michael (2011:260) notes that the concept of the fall of Adam is silent in the traditional African belief but there is the need for protection from evil spirits which cause evil, or victory over an enemy; deliverance from poverty indicates a good relationship with God. It is believed that ancestral sin is implicative and could affect the self-worth of humankind. To this end, most Africans scholars feel that we should be careful of our behaviour, since disobedience will definitely result in punishment whether now or in the future.

This view proposes that humankind cannot overcome sinfulness unless by the grace of God; again, it is contrary to Rom.5:12-18; I Cor. 15:22. See details of these theories in Chapter Two (Literature survey on original sin).

¹⁷According to the second commandment Yahweh hates the worship of idols. Numerous passages in the Old Testament prohibit the sin of idolatry. Moreover, most commentaries do not emphasize the impact of sin in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9; rather, they emphasise idolatry. , for which God visits the iniquity נֶפֶשׁ of the fathers on the future generation (Exod. 3:16; 4:31; 13:19). This third and fourth generational punishment could be taken literally. Jealousy may be בְּזַד a synonym found in Josh 24:19; Nah. 1:2 says “upon a third generation” and “upon sons and upon son’s sons, and upon a third” as in Exod. 34:7.

1.6 Background of Social Rhetorical Criticism Methods

Social rhetorical criticism will be an appropriate methodology for analysing such an important text. Robbins (1996:1) initially explores the literary objects in the text, and eventually looks for the meaning of a text which incorporates the social class, the social system, the community's belief and their values. This methodology also focuses on society and its environment, as well as the art of constructing the language in a text, and probing its meaning to the people in the world of the text. Social rhetoric is an analytic way of interpretation that stresses a story, speeches and the argument in a text. Tate (2008:338) added that it consists of cultural the text as a literary object that could be studied, also socially as an artefact that must be opened in terms of the past, present and future of the text. Robbins (2010:282) writes that it is not only a literary focus but also a textual criticism that centres on the social, cultural, historical, psychological, ideological, aesthetical evidence and theological information that surrounds the world of the text.

1.6.1 Methods in Socio-Rhetorical Criticism

This study presents an exercise in integrating multidimensional techniques of studying a text. It is an interdisciplinary strategy of doing exegesis or engaging a particular text from different standpoints. It aims at probing the inner textual reasoning and digging into various kinds of arguments that produce logical meaning. For both Robbins (1996) and Tate (2008) socio-rhetorical analysis provides a strategy that involves aspects like intra-textual, inter-textual, socio-cultural, and ideological-theological manners of reading a text, which serve significant rhetorical functions.

1.6.2 Intra-Textual Analysis

It requires literary engaging a particular text. Robbins (1996:37) refers to it as inner texture, and further explains that it resides in features like repetition, alternation of speech, use of words in a text and the arguments in a story. It analyses various aspects of words or sentences as tools for communication and sets the stage for the actual interpretation. It considers the use of the words in text and various trends, like repetition, progression in the narrative, a careful sequence of the terms and the aesthetics of the text. Callahan (2001:163-164) observes that we cannot understand the text without the literary text itself. Jonker and Lawrie (2005:59) say that intra-textual analysis focuses on the textual structure itself, and helps in getting into the main text itself. It deals with texture of language used in undertaking analysis towards

reaching the meaning. Treier (2008:40, 82) adds that this method draws meaning from the text, in a form of critical exegesis. Intra-textuality requires that we pay attention to the original literary context as well as the contemporary understanding of the text, following how language and the story of a text shape meaning within the text. In this sense meaning can be found within the text without necessarily comparing it to other similar texts.

Agreeing with Robbins (1996:37) the purpose of such analysis is to gain an intimate knowledge of the word, their pattern use, voices, structure, devices and the mode of use in the text. This is what Tate (2008:338-339) expands upon as “inner texture”, referring to it as the “rhetorical literary aspect of the text”. According to him, it is the entry level of analysing a text. This takes to account the mixing of the speech in a narrative. Robbins (1996:37) explains this by using six steps:

- I. **Repetition:** It is a manner of using words or phrases in sequence and in different levels or instances within a text, found as multiple occurrences of many kinds of grammatical, syncretical, verbal or typical phenomena that produce repetitive texture of the text. Such repetitions appear clearly when an interpreter marks the word and later exhibits them in a systematic format diagram. Jonker and Lawrie (2005:59) focus on the repeated words/phrases in a text which reveal how the text is structured to shape the themes concerned. This feature provides an overall view for the interpreter to come to terms with the details of the text and helps to drive across a better picture
- II. **Progression:** This involves the stages in the discussion or the development in terms of sequence of words or phrases in a unit, like movement in the form of alternation of word chains and changes in the use of a word. They are mostly used to indicate the various levels of the discussion in a new manner and to emphasise significant ideas in a text (Robbins 1996:9). Jonker and Lawrie (2005:59) indicate that it concerns the movement of words/phrases created through the sequence in the text unit. Similarly, Tate (2008:338-339) finds that progress emerges out of the repetitive occurrences of words in a text. It is an advancement seen in the text and the forward movement that adds the dimension of the text. It displays the phenomena that act as the foundation for another word or subunit of the text. This could be used to emphasize the message of the text.
- III. **Narration:** Robbins (1996:15) says the narrator may introduce characters/actors to describe an act, speakers and their speeches. Sometimes particular types of speech

alternate with each other. For Jonker and Lawrie (2005:59) it refers to the way the story develops and progresses to other stages. This is what programmes and moves the discourse onward to its climax, suspense and reason. It encompasses the various voices used in a text as reported speech, narrative voice character and written text (Tate 2008:338-339). The passage is not a narrative/story but a compilation of rules and regulations that should guide a holy community of God's people.

- IV. ***The Opening, Middle and Closing of a Unit***: Robbins (1996:19) and Tate (2008:338-339) distinguish the beginning, the main body and the conclusion of the text. In this case we observe a repletion, the progressive development and the narration in the unit. There may be variations in the text due to the difference in the opening-middle-closing texture. An end may be a beginning in some instances and the middle may introduce a subhead or a topic opening another section. This includes the use of words from the beginning to the end of a unit in a text. Jonker and Lawrie (2005) explain that it is the structure of the text that shows where it starts the discussion, its continuation and the ending.
- V. ***Argument***: Robbins (1996:21) refers to various kinds of inner reasoning in the narration. The discourse may present and substantiate an, or present a counter-dispute. In Tate's opinion (2008:338-339) this would include analogies, examples, citations of the ancient testimonies which function persuasively in the text. In this sense, an argument in a text is analysed in terms of modern and ancient rhetorical theories. This involves the dialogue and the discourse in the text.
- VI. ***Sensory-Aesthetics***: According to Robbins (1996:29-30) an interpreter identifies different types and forms in the literature (like proverbs, riddles or parables) in various aesthetic textures. Such dimensions lead to tones, and colours the discussion, using images, symbols, feelings, hard fact or abstract and logics that leads to sensory aesthetics texts. Jonker and Lawrie (2005:59) locate aesthetics in the range of sensory experiences evoked by the text by reasoning, intuition or humour and the like. It is concerned with the way and manner in which the language of the text evokes the senses, emotions and thought pattern of the readers or the listeners. This involves the genre in the text that makes a subtext important (Tate 2008:338-339). It is also important to note the style of the writing, the selection of words and how particular words were repeated in sequence to nail the point across.

1.6.3 Inter-Textual Analysis

The art of comparing texts with others according to Robbins (1996:40) presents references for the similar use of the text outside the world of the text. It could be the interaction of language in a text with other material, like the physical objects, historical events, customs, values and rules, institutional and systematic usage. He adds that the main goal of intertextuality is to ascertain the nature and process of configuration of phenomena in the world outside the text. In addition, Jonker and Lawrie (2005:59) state that examines the interactive world of the texts in reference to how it is used and applied within the surrounding passage and outside the main text. This focuses on textual formation and the world of its construction. Brown (2007:225-226) is of the opinion that texts are mutually interdependent, and form part of a network of texts from which meaning is derived. Callahan (2001:208) says such analysis offers a model of reading that attempts to understand the text in a multifaceted way, by challenging inter-textual autonomy.

This theory has it that meaning can be discovered when correlated with other similar texts. According to Robbins (1996:40) it deals with the representation of references and the use of phenomena in the world outside the text that is being studied. It could also be the interaction of the language of the text with outside materials and physical objects, historical events, text, customs, values, role, institutions and systems. Tate (2008:339) affirms that it is concerned with the manner the author interprets and presents the material outside and in the text itself. Furthermore, Robbins (1996:40-58) explains the basic aspects of intertextuality thus:

- a. **Oral-Scribal Intertexture:** Robbins (1996:40) and Tate (2008:339) note five ways of using language outside the text such as recitation, re-contextualization, reconfiguration, narrative amplification and thematic elaboration.
 - I. **Recitation:** This involves the replication of the exact words that were received, either oral or written form, by either the exact words or different words. He adds that recitation involves firstly the replication of the exact words duplicated in another written text; secondly it may present the exact words with some variation; and thirdly it may omit certain words to make the statement brief (Robbins 1996:41).
 - II. **Re-contextualization:** This presents biblical words without the explicit statements or the implication that the word “stand written” anywhere. It sometimes occurs in narratives or in attributed speeches. Re-contextualization is possible by virtue of its placement, attribution or by re-wording the context and can take place without

really showing that the words are similar or borrowed from another text (Robbins 1996:48).

- III. **Reconfiguration:** Robbins (1996:50) indicates that this is a form of recounting a situation in a manner that it becomes a “new” event. The previous event and the new become similar but the recent one replaces or “outshines” the previous one. This kind duplicates an event by the change of circumstances narrating the situation.
- IV. **Narrative Amplification:** extends the composition of a narrative by certain recitation, re-contextualization and reconfiguring what happens or the end result of the three observations. It has been amplified or extended beyond the original.
- V. **Thematic Elaboration:** an alternative to narrative amplification, not just an extension or expansion of narrative, but other theme or issues may emerge. Hence the meaning and its effects are felt all over the argument.

1.6.4 Socio-Cultural Analysis

According to Robbins (1996:71, 75) this approach takes cognisance of the people living in the world of the text by addressing both their social and cultural aspects. It is concerned with the capacity of the text to support or withdraw support for cultural perceptions of dominance, subordination, difference or exclusion (Jonker and Lawrie 2005:60). It explores the range of social orientations and location in the discourse. Brown (2007:189-193) adds that such analysis involves understanding the information and experiences shared by human beings generally, covering the entire spectrum of political, social, and religious practices of a community.

This is both a sociological and an anthropological enterprise (Tate 2008:340). This presents the lived background of the society and the shared knowledge developed through their day-to-day interaction. It raises the question of the response of the world, the social aspects of people, the institutions and the cultural system evoked by the text (Robbins 2010:305). In simple terms, it focuses on the social life and kind of cultural practices of the people. It can be subdivided into two important categories:

- a. **Specific Social Topics:** Substantive religious texture that contains specific ways of addressing the world. Such topics relate to religion establish a relationship to the text’s world in a significant manner.

- b. *Common Social and Cultural Topics*:** According to Robbins (1996:75-86) the people living in an area have their common familiar topics. To be an adult in a place, means the person knows and understands the common socio-cultural values, pattern or codes of the environment. Understanding the common socio-cultural topics in an environment (text) helps an interpreter to avoid ethnocentric and anachronic interpretation. That is to avoid basing interpretation on the central values of the people. On the other hand it could be the presupposition that something can be present at different times and periods of history. Common topics here include; honour, guilt, and right cultures, dyadic and individual personalities, agricultural and economic or industrial base system etc.
- c. *Cultural Intertextuality*:** This second kind of intertexture according to Robbins (1996:58-59), concerns the interactive relationship of the text to other cultures and texts. Cultural knowledge is an insider understanding known only to the people of the particular culture or those that have learned the culture. It is revealed in words or conceptual patterns and configurations, like values, scripts, codes, systems or myths. It is in the form of reference or as allusion and echo in the text. References are words or phrases that points to a person or the tradition of the people, while an allusion here presupposes a tradition that exist in the textual form but does not attempt to recite the text.
- d. *Social Intertextuality*:** This analyses the social knowledge of the people through continual observation of the behaviour and public material objects produced by the people. It delivers knowledge that could be found in all communities through general knowledge and regular interaction. At times it is taught through a careful use of language and transmission of tradition (Robbins 1996:62).
- e. *Historical Intertextuality*:** Concerns events that have occurred over time at specific places. This encompasses history, society, culture of the people or the passages as events that surrounds them (Robbins 1006:63-64).

1.6.5 Ideological and Theological Analysis

While theological analyses seek to understand the divine relationship with humanity and their environment, the ideological approach is people-centred. Robbins (1996:95) indicates that the main subject of this method is people. The text serves as the object, and is simply an argument by various people that dialogue and disagree with one another, with the text as a guest in the conversation. Ideology is the way the text/interpreters position themselves in

relation to other individuals and groups. This analysis focuses on the teachings and beliefs of the people that may be developed from the account of the text and from the characters in the text, to shape meaning. This type of analysis is understood as complex system of ideas, values and perceptions held by a particular group. Byron (2008:7) describes it as a framework for the members to understand their place in the social order. The term was first used to describe the science and art of ideas, to determine the different social, political and economic power structures that are operational at the time the text was written and the type of power discourse employed by particular authors that of the text.

Accordingly, Robbins' (1996:4) theological analysis probes the dynamic spectrum of relationship between humankind and the divine. The biblical text certainly relates YHWH to Israel. Theological analysis indicates a sense relating to how God desires things to be, a standard that is God's and an attempt to demonstration how mankind ought to appreciate the teachings of God and the Scriptures.

On this note Tate (2008:325) added that ideological analysis attempts to uncover the ideology of the text and its influence in history. Ideological criticism examines a text and asks the readers to be aware of the account, not just for the ideological framework of the author and the text, but also to take account of their own ideology. There are three areas it directs attention to; (a) the ideological context of the author when the text was produced, (b) the ideology within the text and (c) the ideology of readers within the text. It explores the text by focusing on self-interest of those involved, and discusses the ideology, point of view and theology of those involved (Robbins 2010:315). The task of unmaking the injustices of father upon children will be by socio-rhetorical criticism and will focus on the people, their social life, and other oppressive structures that emerge in the text.

1.7.1 Background and Lexical¹⁸ Constructions of Sin

In attempting to survey and describe sin¹⁹, Kaufman (1968: 353) confirmed that humans became sinners after they ate the fruit of the "tree of knowledge of good and evil" as

¹⁸Semantic fields are useful methods of finding the meanings of related words, fitting together the meaning of words and their derivatives; in other words, a study of the different correlations between meanings of words and the scrutiny of vocabulary into a series of basic identifying features or constituents of meaning. They allow us to find. This sort of verbal and linguistic skill can assist one become aware of the inclination of terms related to the concept of sin as we delve into this research. Certain synonyms of Sin may perhaps be cheating, corruption, deceit, depravity, dishonesty, dissidence, evil and immorality; furthermore, we have mischief, to rebel, treachery, and wickedness.

¹⁹See 2.1 and Addendum A, at the end of the Bibliography for other detail descriptions and etymologies of sin.

described in Genesis 2:17. Thus, if human awareness and understanding of good and evil came about as a result of disobedience, then human beings are able to separate good and evil. Luc (1997:89) elucidate that after Adam and Eve sinned, they “hid from the Lord” due to shame (Genesis 3:9), and where “banished ...from the Garden of Eden” for they did what is not right before their Creator (Genesis 3:23). For that reason, we are confronted with the reality of their guilt and shame in the African perception as we miss the mark(s) of God. It shows that sin is falling short of the mark, or a deliberate shameful act that violates God’s will; this might be an overriding character of a person, thus leading to alienation of relations. Kaiser (1998:110) concludes that the Old Testament concept of sin and most of the vocabularies fall under three categories as digression, transgression and direct affront. In that sense, Adam and Eve transgressed the law and digressed from Yahweh’s will and thence directly to what they will, or that of their tempter.

Porubcan (1963:412) says, the man and his wife did not experience any sense of shame or guilt until they sinned, and then they sensed an impulse contrary to the reasonable state of mind as it had been before they went wrong. Their innocence was compared to that of a child prior to the fall; it was after their sin that they felt different and knew their guilt, then shame dawned on them. In most African cultures such feeling is what indicates sin, the wrong/evil; the sin that people owe their relations. This shameful feeling is more painful than the act of wrongdoing, because the community disregards the person. Likewise, the illicit desire to sin leads to sin and subsequent judgement. To this Von Rad (1963:87) supplements that disobedience is not the will of God. Hence it dawns on Adam that it is better to be an outcast than being labelled rebellious and disobedient before God. Erickson (2001:118-188-189) reveals that sin is an inherent disposition that inclines humans to wrong acts; it is a sort of rebellion against God’s authority. This could entail a spiritual disability which alerts our inner condition or character. McGrath (2001:445-446) clarifies sin as that which contaminates our lives right from birth and dominates our being thereafter. It is a state beyond our own control, but conveys on us a judicial guilt. It is described as an inherited disease that is passed down through generations which have the power to hold us captive.

According to Von Rad (1963:87) this guilt feeling of shame, tore the unity of the body and spirit that existed between God and humankind. In view of that Peters (1994:8) illustrates that when human beings fail ‘to love God and love their neighbours’ for instance, the evil is “the

refusal to love” while the sin²⁰ is “the violation of the laws” agreed upon by the community. This means the moral unit lies not on an individual but on the people who are related to the guilty person. It is in this regard that Adam’s sin became the sin of the human race and hence “all have sinned²¹”. Similarly, one feels that the conception sin in this situation is linked to the notion of corporate responsibility²². Grund (2012:23) expounds that the awareness on the disaster of sin was widely spread among the cultures of the ancient times. This does support the fact of corporate responsibility or common image and likeness in all humankind as understood by most African cultures. Thus the universality of human sin was not unique to Israel and most of the cultures traced it back to the ancient creation narratives.

Biddle (2005: xii) views sin as a much more complex phenomenon than a judicial model of breaking the law. On an individual basis, it manifests itself in a person’s failure to attain and maintain a balance of humanization of being in God’s image and likeness. This is to say true humanity reflects God’s nobility, personhood and creativity with autonomy, and likewise his interest in relating with humanity. He added that the crime/sin metaphor utilizes a twofold logic either as individual guilt of the committer or as innocence of those affected, while the biblical model operates on a more complex logic of an organized system. Turaki (2012:43) cited Augustine who said “evil is not a substance” and explained that evil is not created by

²⁰The sin of murder could produce the evil of unjust death; moreover, the sin of pursuing short-term gain may leave the future generations with a planet that is polluted by toxic waste and robbed of its life-sustaining fertility. It means sin is the cause while evil is the effect of the act. Likewise, M. Shuster (2004:102-103) believes that sin is a positive moral evil that violates God’s order. Again, it is one’s action which deliberately or unconsciously infringes on the laws of the community where one lives. This is similar to the Decalogue (Ten Instructions) that were given to Moses in Exodus and re-emphasized to Israelites in Deuteronomy, for the purpose of regulating their lives and their community. Peters (1994:31) said this uneasiness is widely shared as we think of it universally. This imputation on the rest of humanity even to future generations, serves as a reference to describe the beginning of human sinfulness on earth. As a consequence, Exod. 20:5 and Deut. 5:9 supposed that “... God will visit the sin of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation...” Martin Noth (1962:163) noted that his punishments and rewards are far beyond an individual – rather, it speaks of extension of punishment upon generations of those that disobey/sin/hate Yahweh or do not love God by keeping his commandments. As a result, mankind must suffer for the reason that the first couple sinned from the beginning (Gen 3; Ps 51:5).

²¹ Romans 3:23, 5:12-19; Thus it could be summed up as being lawless or intentionally refusing to abide by given standards of a group or a locality or an organization which governs us. More so, the effect of sin is evil in the form of insensitivity, uncaringness, injustice, cruelty and destruction aimed at our fellow creatures (human and non-human). In like manner most societies spell out laws to govern their lives and penalties are mapped out for rebels/violators. This serves as a standard of judging anyone who breaks the law. In Westermann’s (1984:277) view, sin means a breach of law that leads to a consequent fear before God; it could be guilt or a sense of liability to punishment. In other words, this could be seen as consequences of violating the laws and non-compliance with the requirement of the society which guides the people. Accordingly, this kind of socio-religious responsibility and relationship was flawed by the first human creatures in Genesis 3:1-7, which landed generations of humankind in shame and guilt. Peters (1994:8) expresses it as character traits which influence our actions against God. He added that it is the failure to trust God and the unwillingness of human beings to acknowledge our creativeness and dependence upon the God of grace. This is to help human beings in taking care of their environment and hence attain the image and likeness of God.

²² Being involve/affected by what happens to family member/group, makes them responsible and guilty.

God, but a perversion of a nature that is essentially good. It means evil is a distortion of the good works of the creator. This perception helps most Africans to come to terms with the teaching of original sin without tampering with their dignity²³ or rights.

There is a whole semantic²⁴ field of the Hebrew concepts for “sin” in the Old Testament. This is how the idea of original sin emanated. The Hebrew understanding of **חַטָּא** far outweighs what is seen below. **חַטָּא** is used generally for sin from the root **חָט** but could be interpreted to mean quite a number of ideas¹. As stated, there are integers of Hebrew expressions that can be used to describe sin; nonetheless we will consider four that are significant for this study. The meaning of **חָט** missing the mark, **אִינִי** iniquity, **רַע** evil and **עֲפָשׁ** breach of law, and many more even in other ancient languages like Akkadian, Ugarit, Phoenician, Sumer, Greek, Arabic etc. (See Addendum A for details on the lexical analyses of the words for sin.)

By and large the Pentateuch did not use a particular term for sin, but from the four prevalent terms; **חָט** as missing the mark, **אִינִי** as iniquity/guilt, **רַע** evil and **עֲפָשׁ** breach of law, reveal some differences. In the pre-exilic era, it could have been used to emphasize and direct reverence to Yahweh, thus to direct people to holiness, righteousness and faithfulness. In some occasions it is iniquity **אִינִי**, at some point it is a breach of Yahweh’s laws **עֲפָשׁ** and still at other points, sin is a reference to being guilty. Obviously Exodus 20:5 is more or less reformulated in Deuteronomy 5:9, which was done by means of **אִינִי** iniquities in other words, guilt of that which could be considered as the shame of the fathers passed on to the children. There is the possibility of inheriting the iniquity and guilt of parents. Hence in attempting to correlate these terms above, **חַטָּא** is considered the key term and the most commonly used in the Pentateuch before the exile. **חַטָּא** is also closely and frequently used in-between **אִינִי** and **עֲפָשׁ**. As such **חַטָּא** appears to be the wider context of Sin from which other meanings are derived, including **רַע**. It must have been used also as a post-exilic priestly call for orderliness,

²³Human dignity is the act of respect you give to people or receive from them, especially those of your community or family. Dignity begins with them; there you learn it and there you begin to display how it will be when you find yourself among others.

²⁴The concern for social dignity is important. The question is, how it can be seen from the effects of the guilt or the evil that is being inherited from the ancestors? Most African intellectuals have related this issue to the corporate nature of human depravity and animosity, to the community’s responsibility. This sense of guilt and shame takes place from the inside and affects everyone who is affiliated to the community. It is what has been referred to, in other words as the original sin. It could be redefined in other terms to be “original guilt of the ancestors” that affects the innocent family, their clan and the neighbourhood of the guilt-ridden in a “corporate sense”. The dignity is corporate and so is the guilt on the people, where wrong done is shamed but understood not only in the negative but also in the positive sense of shame. Different dimensions of shame/sin are reflected, not only in the Hebrew words for “sin” but even in an African perception of shame and honour. It will be good to do a lexical and linguistic study of the terms.

human dignity and respect for one another. Everyone is encouraged respect the other as a sign of obedience to Yahweh, especially as they Israel settles in their promised land.

1.7.2 A Brief Survey on the Perception of Sin

Although Chapter Two details the survey²⁵ on sin and original sin research, this section opens the description and conception of sin in the Old Testament. Luc (1997:87-88) confirms that **חַטָּא** (sin) is used with a wide range of meaning, most of which describes a situation of being against God or living in disobedience to his Word. It is related to **אִיִּצְרָת** (iniquity/guilt) as a term translated in the social and political arena to mean erring, fault, guilt, offense or crime; which is similar to the meaning of shame. Nonetheless in the Decalogue, **אִיִּצְרָת** is the most prevalently used word for sins of the people in relation to the call to holiness, though these words were used interchangeably. It was a priestly call to keep the land from impurity such as foreign gods, from dishonouring one another, from stealing, murder, covetousness etc. In this study, **אִיִּצְרָת** is an intentionally act (iniquity) to displease God. This is similar to African idea of the stigmatization of shame/guilt. Oduyoye (2000:111) clarifies that we Africans come to grips with the biblical covenant from a living experience of our context and emphasis of our own covenants. Turaki (2012:7) says that since sin is committing offense by doing or touching forbidden things, it could also refer to a general state of evil or going beyond a limit to trespass and transgress against the law²⁶. The consequences of the fall were placed on human off springs by nature. It estranges us from the way we ought to be, and from the initial plan²⁷ of conforming to the image of God.

²⁵Kaufman (1968:354-355) says whether articulated in religious rules and customs, or codes of moral laws or as spiritual ideas, a barrier is created. They became their own gods instead of responding to God's directives continuously. They fell and since their moral ideas were corrupted, shame came in and now they are guilty. This became the original sin in the sense that it is the first rebellion that created a sense of disobedience for humanity. Peters (1994:26-27) put in plain words that it has to do with their choices in life; the problem arises when we were not able to make decision between good and evil. When we place ourselves in God's position, the one who should decide what is good; we end up with a definition of what is good. There are other details of the survey of sin explained in Addendum A and B after the Bibliography.

²⁶ Correspondingly, to break any part of the law is to be guilty of bridging the whole laws of the people. This means the law has unity to will of the one who gave the law (Yahweh). Likewise, breaking any of these laws or a part of it implies the person is relating wrongly to the law (James 2:10). However, this being committed against the relationship with God (Shuster 2004:104) sends signals of the dangerous consequences such as corruption and indignity in the society.

²⁷ Genesis 1:26-31: He provided a favourable atmosphere for human co-existence. The first appearance of sin could be traced to Genesis 4:7 and 4:13 but already in Chapter 3, there is a bridge of relationship with God by the first couple in the Garden of Eden. Thus Adam and Eve sinned and the impact of their sin is felt on all humanity. This means that the sin of an individual could have a telling effect on others in a family, clan or tribe, just as the Israelites that disobeyed Yahweh when they were on their way to the Promised Land caused an innocent generation to suffer the consequences of their wrongdoings. Such stigma could spread into the community.

The power and consequences of sin²⁸ are not really contentious following the reflectiveness of its effects in most contexts. Since all humans created in God's image and likeness were affected by sin, which distorted their being at its root, the effects of sin are found in every aspect of human existence (Sherlock 1996:234). Human beings are therefore responsible for their actions, and liable for their values. In Shuster's (2008:817) opinion **חַטָּאת** (iniquity) has been used predominantly in religious and ethical functions, especially visibly in the Pentateuch, with about 231 occurrences in the Old Testament (Gen. 4:6, 15:16, 19:15; Exod. 20:5, 34:7, 9; Num. 14:34; Deut. 5:9) though the term is used also for punishment. In the Pentateuch it refers mostly to God's forgiving the iniquities, guilt or punishments given for disobeying Yahweh's commands (Lev. 26:18-28, 44-45; Exod. 23:30, 33, 24:4; Num. 14:34, 41; Deut. 28:36-37, 64, 30:2-4). It goes to show that the power of sin was also recognized in every part of the Scriptures. Furthermore, Grund (2012:23) expands:

- a. The worship of foreign gods was a perversion of the law of Yahweh that counted as Israel's cardinal sin in Deuteronomy.
- b. The Pentateuch responded by blaming the exile on Israel's breach of the covenant, with a theology of punishment and mercy.
- c. In the post-exilic period, there were tendencies towards the understanding or the sense of sin and its consequences (Neh. 9; Dan. 9; Ezra 9).

Then **חַטָּאת** fits better for sin in the Pentateuch. It could be a rebellion and refusal to carry out an obligation in a context of religious and ethics of human morality which looks priestly. Thus the transfer of sin to four generations refers to disobedience, lawlessness and moral decadence as **חַטָּאת** is used by religious leaders to caution Yahweh's followers. Sin is behaviour that leads humankind into compromising commitment toward others rather than Yahweh. It could also be a refusal to act well, or breaking the code of conduct that serves as an indicator of virtue and religious zeal. To clarify this, it is significant to note that **חַטָּאת** fits better into the translation in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 – a term used in social and religious arena for guilt. It is this same context where laws are used to regulate the society that God punishes the children for their parents' sins.

²⁸ According to Luc (1997:92) Sirach in 19:4 warns that "one who acted wickedly does wrong to himself". The inherent punishing power of sin is reiterated. The three commonly used words for sin **חַטָּאת** and **חַטָּאת** also appear frequently in the Qumran texts in the community rule 1Qs 3:8.

It means sin has many faces, it could be individual or universal, and as in Hebrew there is no singular way of describing sinfulness in African cultures. Nonetheless the concept of “missing the mark” seems close to the African understanding of the sin. Shame and guilt happens when one misses the set marks of his community, where a person could not meet up to the agreed norms of his or her culture. It is a state or situation where people strive to present themselves as completely obedient and compliant to the rules and conducts to avoid shame and guilt, but then fail to live up to is required. Significantly, the argument is that sin has been viewed from a prism by various scholars to mean different things. Nevertheless, in the context of this research, one considers sin as failure or violation of set standards that could lead to shame, and leaves a mark of guiltiness for humankind living in the same community.

Likewise, sin is touching what is forbidden or that which is not for the general public. In other words, it is the guilt that shatters goals and leads to insolence; in this context, rebellion is considered as having great consequences not just to the perpetrator but also to his cohorts. In other word due to the corporate nature of life and communalism in Africa, sin is like a species of evil characters, or conduct that can be inherited from parents/ancestors. The significant focus is to look at how sins of the fathers, or ancestors (in Africa) relates to the future generation.

Those involved are unequal to the task of their traditions, creating a sense of inferiority before Yahweh (Gen 40:1; Exod 5:16, 9:27; I Sam 6). On the other side, the guilt of sin leads to shame and thus makes the culprit indebted to the community. There are various indications of sin or disobedience in the Old Testament as considered below, but whenever the sin of the fathers is mention the children are scared. Haven seen the various ways in which sin have been defined, below is a further explanation of examples of where God related with his people and warned them to desist from sinful lives. In this section, we will see sin in the Pentateuch/Torah, in the prophetic books and in the Historical writings and how it relates to the African understanding of sin.

1.8 Research Design and Structure of the Study

This research is geared towards understanding the conceptual analysis of the doctrine of Original Sin from the perspective of the sin of the fathers, in an African context. It is believed

that a person is valued based on their duties, but it is important to understand the purpose of human dignity in this context. The study furnishes a conclusion²⁹ within five chapters.

Chapter One: Background of the Research

The first chapter of the research present a theoretical framework for the study using Vernon K. Robbins' (1996) methods of social rhetorical analysis. This was done following the format of problem statement and the question of the research, hypothesis and methodology for achieving the answers/findings. It provided a brief background and definition of certain terminology that will be employed in the research.

Chapter Two: Research Survey on the Original Sin

In Chapter 2 the aim is to survey the research history of "Sin" and "Original Sin" from various monographs and general articles in dictionaries, encyclopaedias and journals. The works of several authors will be considered, also to discover any gaps that should be addressed in this study and how it relates African perception of shame, guilt and original sin. Other facts about original sin will be gathered from the works of Church Fathers and systematic theologians.

Chapter Three: Socio-Rhetorical Reading of Deuteronomy 5:8-10

In Chapter 3, the study focused on a multidimensional analysis of Deuteronomy 5:8-10 using socio-rhetorical analysis. This involved both intra-textual, inter-textual, socio-cultural and ideological/theological methods of reading a text. Like the next chapter, the text is studied toward understanding the reason/background to the sin of the fathers in the Decalogue and the motivation of the Sabbath for the deuteronomic society.

Chapter Four: Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Exodus 20:4-6

The fourth chapter examined the meta-narratives in Exodus 20:4-6, and simultaneously applied social-rhetorical analysis to understand the context of sin of the fathers in the second Decalogue and what motivated the Sabbath. Due to the different contexts of both texts, the

²⁹In conclusion, Israel was chosen and loved by YHWH, but they failed to live up to the will of their God. It could be that what started with Adam and Eve, later affected the corporate group. Therefore, the phrase "sin of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation" will serve as a frame of reference to clarify the African/Nigerian understanding, and explain the research problem. Equally, social rhetorical criticism will serve as a good methodology for studying the Decalogue text. This method will help examine the texts to test the hypotheses.

researcher similarly analysed from various perspectives, to interpret the consequences of wrong behaviour of the past as transferred to grand and great-grandchildren.

Chapter Five: Summary, Recommendation and Conclusion

This chapter will summarize the findings of the study and then provide a conclusion with specific suggestions on the relevance of the study of sin of the fathers and original sin in biblical scholarship and the African society. It will be important to indicate the way forward in addressing the challenge and implication/interpretation of sin and lawlessness in society, in the West African as well as Nigerian contexts.

Chapter Two

Research Survey on Sin and Original Sin according to the Old Testament

2.1 Introduction

The existing classical theology of original sin serves as the model for understanding sin of the fathers in African viewpoint. Unfortunately there is neither a specific Hebrew word for “sin³⁰” nor a distinct term/concept that clearly refers to the doctrine of “*Original Sin*” or “*Sin*” in the Old Testament. Various terminology³¹ stemming from אֵינָה, אָיִן and עָשָׂה (iniquity, wrong doing and transgression) and many more have been used to explain the subject of “Sin” either as missing the mark, wrongdoing, committing evil, transgressing societal norms, lawlessness, being guilty of an act, acting in a rebellious manner towards God or behaving wickedly towards another fellow. In the Old Testament these terms refer mostly to the manner of life YHWH desires of his people, though in the context of this work, it is perceived and applied with regard to the Covenant and Holiness theologies in the Decalogue.

Given the difficulty to describe the spectrum of human sinfulness, Sherlock (1996:234-235) provides a web and network toward this end. It extends to various aspects of human life among the living but leaves scars upon the living, dead and the unborn members of a family/clan. Henceforth humanity cannot avoid being affected by the nature of sin, whether as original sin or as the inter-generational sin transferred from ancestors to their children at conception or birth. Similarly, Grund (2012:23) reveals that ancient Israel used an array of words that constituted the semantic field of terms related to the concept of sin, reflecting elements of individual or corporate responsibility in an African perception.

It is imperative to understand how sin of the fathers can serve as the lens from which original sin can be conceived in African theology. Even acknowledging the inherited or inherent sin

³⁰The Covenant Code in Exodus and the Holiness Code in Leviticus became important elements of the priestly traditions which highlight the value of honour/respect to God. The main goal is to present a holy people Lev. 19; the Sabbath and the sanctuary and a series of prohibition which are similar to the Decalogue. The congregation of Israel was taught not to defile the land. Likewise, the Covenant Code in Exodus was a whole order to purity and dignity among the Israelites unto Yahweh. Attridge, H.W. 2009 “Sin, Sinners” in Sakenfeld et al. (eds.) *NIDB (S-Z)* Vol.5 Nashville: Abingdon Press, 268.

³¹These terms and roots will be explained later, but the distribution and correlation can assist in perceiving the trends of sin in terms of the African theological and social context sin of the fathers upon the children. Sin distorts God’s plan for humanity right from the beginning of human existence.

already serve as the background for original sin, the doctrine of original sin could be extended to inform the African perception of sin of the fathers. Although this thesis focuses on sin of the fathers upon the children and its resonance from the idea of original sin, it will be investigated as either corporate or individual responsibility. The mutual existence of these responsibilities in Israel may be debated as well, but at some points in their socio-religious and historical life, emphasis may shift from one to the other. Grund 2012:23) analysed incident of the original sin, the Eden experience in Genesis 3, as observed below:

It is noteworthy that sin started from the beginning; in Genesis 2:17 an instruction was issued, but you must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat of it you will surely die. The rebellion and transgression of the edict was committed by the first couple in Genesis 3:5-6; For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil. When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eyes, and also desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.

Von Rad³² (1963:86-87) suggests that the serpent insinuated that man and woman might become like God, possibly semi-divine beings אֱלֹהִים who may distinguish “Good” from “Evil,” which would allow humanity to gain wisdom (“gaining experience” and “become acquainted”), possessing the intelligence and having the power of. The half-truth from the serpent came glaring through the entire range of the woman’s emotions when she saw the fruit as “good for food” and “delightful to the eyes”. In this manner, she was stimulated by the ‘lust of the eyes’ and ‘lust of the flesh’. According to Speiser (1964:26) “gaining wisdom” or attaining the ability to “[know] good and bad,” describes both the process and the result. Interestingly, as long as Adam and Eve abstained from the forbidden fruit, they were not conscious of their nakedness. This is why House (1998:64) laments that eating the forbidden fruit is what led to the sin of the first couple. They disobeyed the prohibition from the tree of good and evil. This plan was hatched by the serpent, whose intension was to confuse God’s creatures into comparing him and God (Isaiah 14:12-17; Ezekiel 28:2-5) thereby breaking the rule of God. The argument here is that sin started with an individual couple and later affects their future generations corporately, by intergenerational³³ transfer of sin. Possibly the ideas all existed.

³² The 1960s witnessed a shift in theology in which the works of Von Rad and his likes are noteworthy. It is significant that he is not just an authority in Old Testament studies but also and an older scholar whose thought and theology have made great impact, and have been built upon by many. In this context, his work is used as a starting point.

³³ Intergenerational transfer of sin will be discussed further in Chapters Three and Four where the reason for the transfer will be analysed using the Decalogue (first in Deuteronomy 5:9 in Chapter Three and Exodus 20:5 in the fourth chapter). Intergenerational transfer of sin is simply how sinful nature affects generations yet unborn, from parents or ancestors to their offspring.

According to Von Rad (1963:88) Adam and Eve reacted when their sense of innocence was lost and a feeling of guilt encompassed them, then a bodily shame took control. To this J. T. Wills (1979:117) describes this individual sin as a selfish desire coupled with a lack of confidence in God's goodness. We cannot be sufficient to ourselves, but live according to the will and purpose of the one who gives and commands life; God who hates sin. In addition, Grund (2012:22) clarified a notion that Israel's idea of the effects of transgression extend beyond the act itself, just as it is with the rest of the ancient Near Eastern context. An evil deed leads to more corporate disaster, sickness and even death. Yahweh influences this result and visits or inflicts the consequences on the culprit and their future generations. It was popularly acknowledged that sin does affect not just an individual, but also groups. Gen 12:17; Lev 26:39; II Sam 24:10ff; Josh 7:1ff; I Kg 21:28f; Job 13:26; Ps 25:7; Lam 5:7). Notably, individual sin could lead to the transfer of punishment and entail corporate repercussions.

In the same way, House (1998:131) indicates that Israel's past life shows the inability to understand sin, and was unable to demarcate what sin is. One could say sin is doing what God has prohibited/forbidden that may affect others. Perhaps when sin is unattended to; it has adverse effect upon humankind corporately, Wills (1979:117) agrees that sin is a problem of the heart in an individual that becomes a symptom of a corporate group. One agrees with how he has taken the point further using the garden story in Genesis 3:4-6, as illustrated in six stages:

- a. Firstly, the woman as deeply disturbed by God's commands not to eat the forbidden fruit; she wonders whether God was not depriving her from improving her life in some manner (vs.5).
- b. Secondly, the serpent enforces the woman's desire to eat the fruit, tells her about the advantages that comes from the tree. In vs.4 the snake whispers "You will surely not die, your eyes will open and you will be like God."
- c. Thirdly, the woman's mind dwells on the desirable aspect of the fruit (3:6a, she looks and imagines that it is not poisonous but attractive, and remembers that the tempter said it could make one wise). Since God said we should not eat, it may be for great reasons and the snake could be right.
- d. Fourthly, in vs.6b she stretches her hand to pick the fruit, "she took (plucked off)" some of the "fruit," perhaps just to test and be sure of the impression she got from the serpent. In her mind it may be to test and prove a point.

- e. Fifthly, vs.6c she begins to eat the fruit, and beholds that there wasn't any trouble or danger signs. She becomes convinced that the fruit has benefit and doesn't kill a person, just as the serpent suggested in vs.4-5. In her mind the serpent is now a hero, telling the truth while God on the other hand seems to be the false speaker.
- f. Lastly, since the woman does not die (physically) after eating from the forbidden tree, her husband also concludes that it is not harmful. Vs.6d Adam joins his wife on seeing the immediate result, i.e. that she did not die (physically). They both eat from the tree. Perhaps the woman did not likely persuade him; Adam was comfortable to join his wife in eating the forbidden fruit.

A wrongdoer may prefer company, especially when another person joins in the wrongdoing. Unfortunately the shame of the sin³⁴ and the fear/guilt of being in the presence of Yahweh, drove them to seek cover for their physical nakedness; to solve the problem of their spiritual nakedness and death (NIV). This indicates that what began in an individual family with individual responsibility later affected groups of families and became corporate responsibility. There are other examples of sin from the Old Testament that can help clarify the argument as will be discussed below.

2.2 The Models and Theories of Original Sin

Original Sin is a classical doctrine that has undergone various arguments. This theology emanates for the reason that humanity needs justification; it still remains an on-going debate among scholars. In this case, it is applied as model for interpreting the African idea of corporate sin by using the concept of "sin of the fathers upon the children" in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9. It could be compared to "sin of the ancestors" in African awareness. Although ancestors are often considered as good, there is seldom any reference to bad ones and their sins. In this case, it goes to show that what makes sin original can be debated; this debate however has often been discussed even before the times of the church fathers, probably starting with Pelagius to Augustine and later by other patristic scholars³⁵. Yet it

³⁴Humanity inherited the sin of Adam and Eve. It is Adam's history and bloodline in the Old Testament that form the context of being born in sin Psalm 51:5. In this case, we should not only look at the guilt or transgression of one person affecting others, rather how the guilt and shame that lingers, leaves a scar on other people. To an extent this is not just an African issue as explained in the contributions in Chapter Five. Instead, a wider perception of how sin indignity ought to be understood in Africa, and other third world, right compartments of human dignity.

³⁵In modern times, the argument of original sin cannot be reconstructed on specific grounds due to the several changes and developments that have taken place in the course of the study. Perhaps both Catholic and Protestant

remains an on-going issue for this thesis, if the sin of the fathers can easily be related to the concept of original sin. This doctrine of original sin³⁶ argues, for instance, that we are by nature sinful, though it is understood in various perspectives. We shall consider three traditions that link all human sinfulness as sinners³⁷, being affected by the so-called “Adamic” sinful nature:

2.2.1 Pelagius on Original Sin

These theories stand in opposition to each other. This British monk (CE 360-420), viewed Adam’s individual³⁸ sin as separate from the corporate relationship with the rest of humankind. The primary concern of Pelagius is that people ought to live good/decent lives, for the reason that human beings are created without the influence of the universal fall. Sin was there before the activities of humankind. At birth infants are baptized to keep them holy.

In this regard, Erickson (2007:207) explains in reaction to Pelagius, that our souls are not contaminated by any supposed corruption or guilt, except the wrong example that parents laid for us before birth. There is no connection between the sin of the first couple and the rest of the human race. Based on this theory, there is no need for a special saving grace for individual beings. Instead, the grace of God is found everywhere at all times; we just need to make effort to attain it by obeying God’s commands. Sin is therefore not present from the beginning, but follows the later experience of people. Since there is no need for salvation from the beginning, we need to maintain our right status by pursuing good character. Furthermore, McGrath (2001:444-448) explains that it shows how humanity possesses total freedom of will, and are totally responsible for their own sins. Hence human nature was created without being compromised or incapacitated by some human weakness, thus there is

views have undergone various alterations in meaning and application. Although it is true that it refers to justification from the sin that human beings either inherit at birth or one into which they are conceived. The gap between the first proponents of the view to recent debate has seen various developments and consensus may be impossible to discuss here. In the 1990s during the second Vatican council changes were made to the Catholic view of Original sin. For instance, the Catholic view is not only that of Thomas Aquinas, but a Neo-Thomas views have also been introduced, others include Karl Rahner, a German Catholic’s view which has also been debated in recent times. A Dutch scholar, G. Vandervelde, 1975. *Original Sin: Two Major Trends in Contemporary Roman Catholic Reinterpretation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi N. V. Views range from Catholic to Protestant Augustinian views. Modern Vatican formulations as well as suggestions from World Council of Churches cannot be discussed here.

³⁶On this, Martens (2003:774-775) believes original sin is the nexus of sin which embraces all people without exception. It is a sin that adheres to nature and is transmittable to others and even unto other generations. Shuster (2008:822) said it is a natural condition of sinfulness in which all mankind are born (Ps.15:5), while R. Saarinen (2011:380) considers it as a burden inherited by human beings prior to anything they did, from infancy and the early stages of life. Humanity is represented in a single ancestor, in all generations.

³⁷See also McGrath (2003:445-446).

³⁸It is the individual’s sin and a single act that impacted upon generations of humanity.

no need for divine grace. Humanity is justified on the basis of its merit, and human good works will result in the exercise of total autonomous free will for obeying God. Failure will lead to eternal punishment.

2.2.2 Augustine on Original Sin

On the other hand, St. Augustine, the bishop of Carthage, stands in opposition to the view above; he clarifies that there is a universal fall of humankind. In addition, Saint Augustine³⁹ (1962:26) said infants are not guilty of any sin, there is no need to baptize them, but the inherent human nature is in them as well. In “The City of God” he submits that:

It was God’s pleasure to propagate all men from one, both for the keeping of one human nature in one sociable similitude, and also to make their unity of origin the means of their concord in heart. They ...incurred this punishment by their disobedience. In committing so great a sin their whole nature, being hereby depraved, was so transfused through their offspring in the same degree of corruption and necessity of death; whose kingdom hereupon became so great in man, that all would have been cast headlong into the second death, that has no end, by this due punishment, had not the undue grace of God acquitted some from it. Whereby it comes to pass that, whereas mankind is divided into so many nations, distinct in languages, discipline, habit, and fashion: yet are there but two sorts of men that do properly make the two cities we speak of; the one is of men that live according to the flesh, and the other of those that live according to the spirit, each wishing, when they have attained their desire, to enjoy own particular peace.

To clarify this concept, McGrath (2001:445-446) spells out extensively how corporate humanity is universally affected by an individual’s sin, through the universality of the fall. Moreover, the heart of humankind has been weak and dark as a result of the fall; as such we cannot know or understand the deeper truth of spirituality. Although, our will to choice is not eliminated, but is weakened by this sin; this has made humankind ill, hence we cannot know or cure ourselves. It is only by God’s grace that our illness (sin) can be diagnosed and the healing will be made available. This is to say, it is not possible for humanity to control their sinful state, the human contamination on us right from birth dominates our nature. For this reason, sin has pushed us to a state of indecisive control. The corporate effect of sin originates as a consequence of our sinful nature. This is the state of sin that leads from the individual act of sin to impact on the group. Migliore (2004:155) elucidates further that the theory of original sin is not a clue to the origin of sin, but rather an understanding of the universal effect of sin. It claims that the whole humanity finds itself in a condition of captivity in sin. According to him there is a difference between individual transgression of God’s will and the radical universal sin in the human condition.

³⁹In the fourteenth book of “The City of God”, Saint Augustine led North Africa and part of France in the then Roman Province. His view in this regard was more widely understood and acceptable to most Protestants believers.

In addition, McGrath (1997:429) clarifies that Augustine understood the original sin in three ways, as “disease,” as “power” and as “guilt”.

- (a) First of all, sin in his opinion is a “hereditary disease” passed down from generation to generation. This disease weakens humanity, and there is no cure from human agency except through Christ, the divine physician by whose wounds Isaiah said we are healed (Isa. 53:5). Healing comes by God’s grace, so that we may recognize God and our will may respond to the divine grace of God.
- (b) Secondly, sin is figured as “power” that holds us captive and we cannot free ourselves. Our free will is kept captive by the power of sin and can only be liberated by God’s grace, with Christ as the liberator and source of grace that can break the power of sin.
- (c) Thirdly, sin is viewed as a judicial and forensic concept “guilt,” which is inherently transferred to other generations by the prior one. The law of the society fosters the understanding of sin and guilt; and Christ grants forgiveness to the willing humanity, as in John 15:5 “Apart from me you can do nothing”.

Perhaps the contention just needs clarity and balance. In this case, Andrews (2011:240) acknowledges that Augustine used Pelagian idea to clarify his argument. According to the Pelagian perception, infants encountered sin after birth and not as an inherited trait. On the other hand, Augustine said that at infancy humankind are not guilty of any sin, but inherit sin by nature, hence the need for their justification. If infant baptism is thought of as a mode of remission, there is no need to have infants baptized. While Pelagius refers to personal sin at infancy, Augustine refers to Adam’s sin as inherent in all humanity. Pelagius seem to have contradicted himself in this regard when he said that infants are born sinless but should be baptized to newness of life for their justification. While Pelagius may have certain elements of the truth when he presumes that sin was committed wilfully against God was neither inherently embedded in humanity at creation nor bestowed at birth. In this view it was possible for humanity to discharge their responsibility towards God and humankind faithfully. The reason is that, if humans are born sinless, it clearly defines sin is a wilful act, meaning humans transgress by deliberate actions. It is in and through our daily accomplishments that we find ourselves missing the mark, falling into sin and engaging in wrong acts. The problem with this theory is that it fails to consider human sinful nature from

the corporate nature of human responsibility, although it expresses the fact that sin is an act of will and choice of human beings.

Significantly, Augustine clearly linked the beginning of humanity to the socio-religious life of humans in corporate perspective. He portrays individuality as not the only aspect of human responsibility; there remains the corporate aspect. In corporate social life, human beings and their society are considered as a united entity: a community of people that exists for the good of one another. For this reason, God created the earth and gave humankind the responsibility to take care of it. All that is in it has been given to humankind either for food or for their good. Therefore, when their ancestor Adam fell, they all became guilty of his disobedience, even when they were not directly involved. Since they operate as an entity, they are all guilty and need to be saved. God now comes in as the faithful saviour and loving deliverer of his creatures. We need each other to attain good life, especially in the African concept of single humanity, “We are, and therefore I am”. I exist in the midst of other human beings, not as individual.

2.2.3 Catholic Theology on Original Sin

This category only builds on the views of Pelagius and Augustine above. However, it is important to refer to what Porubcan (1963:592-593) calls the prohibition given to Adam. Sin began with Adam, which led to many deaths and the penalty of his sin was laid upon later generations and unto the world. This means Adam’s sin⁴⁰ affected all his posterity in a corporate sense, including the righteous and the wicked, and without sin there wouldn’t have been death. Hereafter Adam was individually guilty of one sin, but in him humanity corporately became guilty of his iniquities⁴¹; for they deserved it in lieu of their human nature. Moreover, Vandervelde (1975:44) notes on the Catholic view that sin is taken away through baptism for the justification of human beings. Baptism suggests that human guilt present in humankind.

⁴⁰The devil only employed the serpent as the tempting instrument and appealed to their desires and ambitions inherent in the human nature; as a consequence, humankind yielded to the impulse and contravened God’s commands (Porubcan 1963:593). The consequences of Adamic sin should have been the consequences of the devil’s work to destroy God’s order of creation and distort the plan for the dignity of the earth.

⁴¹McGrath (2001:452) says by the time of Thomas Aquinas humans cannot claim salvation, sinners were enabled by God through their achievements.

The Catholic view from the founding father Thomas Aquinas⁴² is not very clear, marked as it is by some diverse indications in his works. Aquinas (1945:671-672) seems to agree that original sin is transmitted by the first parents, if the person is the begetter of his/her children. As such if anyone is materially of human flesh, they would not contract original sin. Hence original sin is not contracted from the mother but from the father. This suggests that if sin comes from Eve, then not all are sinful; but if it comes from Adam then all have sinned, including their unborn children. Original sin is not a habit but the absence of original justice. Furthermore, Aquinas (1952:163-166) indicates in articles 1-5 of the first part of the second part of Q. 81, Articles 1-5 that the sin of the first couple is not contracted by others. For the Catholic faith, Aquinas believes the sin of the first man is transmitted to his descendants. He explains further that for this reason children must be baptized after birth for their cleansing and justification. Thus original sin comes from the origin of man's semen as infected and will infect other generations, due to the same inborn aptitude. In general, Aquinas supports the notion of inheritance of sin and upholds his idea with human baptism as the way of justification.

The search for human justification continues with Bottingheimer's (2011:381) view, arguing that human evil was instigated at the dawn of history, freely and contrary to the will of God. All humans are therefore involved in guilt from the first moment of their existence, and as such they need baptism and cleansing. The nature of guilt and sin of all humanity represents an abuse of finite freedom. Bottingheimer emphasized sin as relational and not personal. It is a state of want of the God-given *institia et sanctitas* that humanity owed God, which also led to self-glorification and mysterious loss of secrecy. Thus the universality of the sin constitutes an internal contradiction: first, the fall and original sin resulted from self-contradiction of freedom during its transcendental process. Second, pre-personal evil is initiated into the structure of human existence, which leads to sin. Original sin profoundly determines human existence before one is able to decide individually.

2.2.4 Protestant Theology on Original Sin

On the other hand, Augustine, a fifth century theologian, gave a detailed and clear explanation of the issue of the original sin, which seems to be taken further by John Calvin.

⁴²Aquinas explain his view in *Summa Theologica* of Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. II/20, part 1 of Second part Q. 81. Articles 1-5, (163-166): Original sin can be transmitted from parents to their posterity, who are members of the same body.

According to Erickson (2001:208) Calvin saw a connection between the sin of Adam and the relationship with all humanity; that his sin afflicted and made us all sinful, hence we are guilty of the same act as Adam. Human beings participated in this sin even before their conception, making them corrupt. This consequence of sin was inherited from our ancestors. Thus where Pelagius shows that God bestows neither a corrupt nature nor guilt on humanity, the Arminian⁴³ says God imputed only the corrupt nature without any form of guilt (culpability). Calvin is of the opinion that God impute both the corrupt nature and the guilt upon humanity just as propagated by Augustine, from Romans 5:12-19: “Sin entered the world through Adam and death came through sin.” The argument is that, since our human representative before God sinned, the consequences of their act were placed upon the rest of the human race. We are declared sinful, guilty and corrupt, as though we actually participated in the act collectively. Secondly, because we are naturally connected, we are present in our ancestors in a very real sense. Their act of disobedience becomes our act as well, and nothing is unfair about our oneness in regard to the corrupt nature or guilt we inherited. It is on this note that Augustine developed his concept of the original sin⁴⁴.

Although various expressions have been used to describe original sin, it would be weighty in an African conception to say our ancestor sinned⁴⁵ or did evil in the past; it will be shameful

⁴³James Jacobus Arminius, a Dutch reformed pastor and theologian, modified this theology in his own understanding. McGrath (2001:446) explains from the theory, that human disposition has no place. Sin in the garden was a wilful desire committed against the will of God; they have no excuse for their sins of disobedience. We are born sinless but sin came exclusively by our deliberate violation. It was possible for humankind to discharge their obligation towards the God and humanity. In the Old Testament there are references to various human figures that died sinless, like Enoch who walked with God, Elijah who was taken to heaven for his righteousness, and Job who was upright and faithful, and many more. Erickson (2007:207-208) alleges that we are corrupt by nature and cannot be righteous; rather, all humanity need God’s help to fulfil his commands. Whatever culpability and condemnation that might have occurred through Adam’s sin is removed through a prevenient grace of God. This grace is given through the universal atonement of Christ; it nullifies the judicial consequences of Adam’s sin upon humankind. Hence humankind is no longer condemned for the depravity of our own nature but for degeneracy and corruption through sin. Its responsibility was removed by the free gift of Christ. This prevenient grace is extended to everyone and in effect it neutralizes the corruption from Adam.

⁴⁴In taking this further, Saarinen (2011:381) details that the Protestant Churches adopted the Augustinian conception. The denial of any human contribution to the process of salvation resulted in a dark picture of the consequence of original sin. The operative expression is *peccatum hereditarium*, translated in German as *Erbsunde*; since the enlightenment period, most Protestants found the theology of original sin problematic to the extent that some abandon it. An example is Kant, who rejected the notion of inherited evil, and instead thought of a personal inclination towards evil. According to him, until after the Freudian theory that a psychoanalytic parallel to the Christian doctrine was re-conceivable from the question of collective guilt. Barth, Tillich, Ebeling rejected the term “inherited sin” and introduced a deeper engagement with the significance of the sin as sin in general and how it relates to the rest of humanity. Thus all Christians that have been justified by the cross of Christ. “All have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:23).

⁴⁵Peters (1994:24-25) says we woke up and found ourselves in the state of sin. When we commit sin, we are not the first to introduce evil into the innocent world. Sin was there, we were drawn into it by the force of nature

to associate with such acts. Furthermore, Shuster (2004:172) notes that the Old Testament supports the original sin doctrine. Ecclesiastes 7:2 says surely there is no one righteous to do good without ever sinning. Isa. 53:6 declares that all like sheep have gone astray; and Psalm 14 indicates that all alike have gone astray and there is no one who is blameless, and the inclination of human heart is evil from a young age (Gen. 8:21; Jer. 6:7, 17:9). Thus *Original Sin* can be described as the wilful and selfish violation of God's relationship with which became chastisements of the human race. In other words, it is an attitude of disloyalty to God which affects the innocent/later generation either by nature or from birth. Sherlock (1996:233) says:

The basic concept of original sin is... that we sin because there is a fundamental flaw at the centre of our being, the 'origin' of sin. Sins are the fruit of sin, not discrete act of evil independent of each other. Given the amount of suffering, pains, injustice and moral evil present in the world as we know it, the fact of each human's having a radical flaw, a corrupted 'root' at the core of his or her being...

Current debate shows that the appropriate awareness on the seriousness of the power of sin must not be accentuated. It is the core problem around the existence of humanity which points to the social inability to achieve the purpose of our being. The starting point of sin which possibly led to the theology of the doctrine of original sin, may be helpful in interpreting this doctrine for Africans to come to terms with the whole ideology. It could be an allusion to any of the biblical views below:

1. Firstly, Adam sinned and therefore we all have sinned⁴⁶ by inheritance or by the similarity of our human nature (Gen. 3:5-6; 4:7-9).
2. Secondly, we are born in sin and by nature are sinners (Ps. 51:5).
3. Thirdly, it was after we were born that we became sinners (Gen. 3:5-7; Prov. 22:15). It is a reference to sin and deprivation right from the beginning of creation.
4. Fourthly, it is said that humans are wholly and generally unrighteous, in other words righteousness became a characteristic of human nature after the fall (Job 15:14-16; Ps. 14:2-3; Jer. 17:9; Eccl. 9:3; Eph. 2:1-3).
5. Fifthly, "the sons of God" perhaps sinned before the sin of Adam, in other words Genesis 6:1-4 is possibly the beginning of sinfulness. It was not humankind that first went wrong but the sons of God sinned from the beginning.

that surrounds us. Evil is bigger than we are, we participate in it, but it is to some degree produced through our wilful decisions.

⁴⁶ The New Testament contains popular verses indicating how everybody is a sinner, directly or indirectly; cf. Rom. 3:23, Eph. 2:2-3.

In this regard, Peters (1994:25), refers to the stories of the fall of Satan and that of Adam as parallel, and that the former was an extrapolation based on the later. Adam and Eve are significant ancestors to all humanity, and as their heirs, their guilt was also passed on congenitally just as the Psalmist says, “Indeed I was born guilty, a sinner when my mother conceived me” (Ps.51:5). However, Peters argues that the devil fell first, then human beings followed. This reference is rather a contagion that has been passed down to us even before the generation of our parents. Eve was invited to sin but she wasn’t the initiator. This is more of the Augustinian hereditary theory of transmission of disease which exemplifies the sins of the fathers. Agreeing with Sherlock (1996:234), the reality of sin(s) is not difficult to grasp or defend, but how it was transmitted is the complication with which to come to terms. The idea of sin of the fathers upon the children may sound like a huge wickedness upon the innocent, but understanding the corporate nature our human responsibility will clarify the argument.

2.3 Theory of Corporate⁴⁷ and Individual Responsibility

In African theological interpretation, ancestral legacy forms part of the connection between sin, original sin and sin of the father. The problem here lies on the individual understanding of sin which informs the meaning given to original sin as well as sin of the fathers. The phrase is not new to African theologians but its meaning depends on who is looking at it, because Africa is broad and diverse; hence there will be various interpretations. In this context, intergenerational transfer of sin from parents to their children according to the Decalogue (Deuteronomy 5:9 and Exodus 20:5) depicts the concept of corporate responsibility. Equally, one understands the sin of Adam easily when compared to how our parents sinned from the beginning. The reason is that YHWH is jealous when he is compared with other deities, and when allegiance is given to others.

Although there are various aspects relating to inheritance, either cultural, religious, social or according to the law⁴⁸ of the state. In the same way, society and culture practice the law of inheritances as a standard way through which transfer is observed from one party to another. In an African socio-cultural and religious setting, one may inherit ancestral curse, family properties or even their shame/honour. In this manner most Africans may come to terms with the theology of inheritance of the sin of our ancestors (Adam and Eve). Consequently, it is in

⁴⁷ This section intends to give an idea of the discussion in Exodus 20:4-6 concerning the relationship of the original sin and corporate personality and how human dignity is portrayed by scholars.

⁴⁸A law governs the way and manner in which people conduct their selves, and entails their way of life, religion and social interactions.

this sense that we are alienated and now existing with corporate guilt. This estrangement points to the reality of an alienated race, a reality that gave rise to the teaching of inherited sin – otherwise, original sin. Although we are born with the sin, we inherited it before birth. It is any form transgression that affects other relations. YHWH called Israel to guard against God’s jealousy by being loyal to him. Hence, it will be important to consider the theology and ideology of corporate and individual responsibility in an African perception from the Decalogue.

2.3.1 Theology of Corporate Responsibility in the Decalogue

Several scholars have studied the jealousy of God from a corporate perspective. Noth (1962:163) states that the ‘jealousy’ of God based on strict exclusiveness to divine worship; not just breaking the instructions but the shift of allegiance is what leads to jealousy and punishment upon generations. Childs (1977:405-407) suggests that Yahweh’s zeal is closely related to his holiness. He does not tolerate gods nor share reverence with them. Thus his judgment does not rest with the perpetrator but extends across four generations to their great-grandchildren, who inherit the curses of the sinners. The reference to the prohibition of images is directed to all forms of images, such were rejected in Yahweh’s court. However, Childs concludes that the jealousy of God is to all strange gods. It was deduced that the worship of images is an encroachment on God, hence Yahweh is jealous and will punish violators of his laws into their future generations. Besides, the one who made human life possible is holy and jealous. Humans are dependent creatures; created for obedience. The category of sovereignty and obedience is crucial; it serves as an ultimate mark of humanness.

In attempting to find out and argue why God will visit the sin of the fathers to four generations of the sinners Exodus 20:5-6, Enns (2000:415-416) says it is due to God’s jealousy. He wants his people corporately to remain truly faithful to him, but when that jealousy is aroused by sin its consequences is punishment, and if they respond in obedience the result is blessings and prosperity. It is in this context that God will visit **אָוֶן** the sin of the fathers on the future generation (Exod. 3:16, 4:31, 13:19). God will punish Israel for their disobedience, and children will inherit the discipline meant for parents to the third and fourth generation. Hence, generational punishment could be taken literally, Propp (2006:111-112, 171) adds that “jealousy” in the MT is vocalized as **אָוֶן** and in Nash Papyrus is *qmw* a synonym found in Josh. 24:19; Nah. 1:2. Upon “a third generation” could be “upon sons and upon son’s sons, and upon a third” as in Exodus 34:7. This is probably the original meaning

of Exod. 20:5 and Deut. 5:9, though Exodus seems more original. Although Yahweh is jealous to share reverence/glory with other gods, he is also zealous in ministering vengeance on the disobedient followers.

Meyers (2005:171-172) supposes that since antiquity, the idea of punishment till the fourth generation has been troubling scholars. How can the misdeeds of a person/generation affect others? She believes we can only wonder whether this is used hyperbolically to emphasize the significance of obedience, rather than that the innocent generation will suffer in what they did not do. This is a declaration of hatred which creates guilt **יָנִי** and vengeance from YHWH over four generations, Dozeman (2009:485-486) compares the “jealousy of Yahweh” **אֵל קָנָא** to unfaithfulness in a marital relationship. Anyone who worships other gods has divorced Yahweh. Just as God does not allow a sinner to go unpunished that is how the African ancestors never condone wrongdoers. Due to God’s zeal for righteousness, Yahweh punishes the culprits who refuse to keep his commands, as well as their relations. To this end most Africans feel that we should be careful of our behaviour, because our guilt and insubordination will result in punishment⁴⁹ and curse. The ancestors are likewise jealous of sharing in the shame and guilt of the living; though they are in the spirit world, they hate evil and corruption. On this note, Rogerson (1992:1156-1157) assumes that corporate personality is an idea that refers to a group that is legally regarded as an individual, possessing rights and responsibilities. Like Africans, Robinson (1981:28) surmises that a man is within a family bond. Hence the corporate personality includes the entire family and clan in a united form.

Robinson (1981:28) alleges that Jews believe in the extension of the family name, it is proper through the birth of male children who will in turn inherit it to sustain the family name. Westermann (1984:277-278) affirm that a person separated from God is a person limited by death, suffering and toil. The phenomenon of sin and evil in the early period of humanity cannot be separated from the understanding of oneself as a person in opposition to a divine power. Martens (2003:765) considers original sin as the nexus of sin which embraces all people without exception, which could also be regarded as the inherited sin just as sin of the fathers. Regarding the issue of corporation and personality, it is related to how one person’s sin and guilt have an emotional, social and religious impact on the rest of humanity.

⁴⁹According to H. Wheeler Robinson (1981:9), who first used the term in 1907 and in 1911 introduced it into biblical studies where he cited Joshua 7, the story of Achan’s sin and how it affected his household and Psalm 44:5-9 where the psalmist spoke with corporate and inclusive speech. It is the body whose members are bound and who share a common fate.

The concept of a collection of persons⁵⁰ with human responsibility probably developed out of such theory, where the group is regarded as an entity known as corporate personality. Similarly, Robinson (1981:25) says the Hebrew idea of corporate personality is that the larger and smaller collections were accepted as a united body related with the ancestors. The group included the past, present and future members, that all function as a single individual relation. Kaminsky (2000:285-286) uses it as corporate responsibility, not personality, to indicate liability for the action in their community in relationship with the whole group. He links it to Israelite culture and religion, where a person's sin led to the punishment of the innocent. In another opinion Wieland (2007:495) saw it as corporate culture, and explained it as an acquired knowledge of a community that unites its members affectionately. This tends to shape their behaviour, and creates the atmosphere for family interaction and oneness of belief; as a result, creating value and dignity toward one another, as in most African cultures. It is a sense of cohesion and solidarity of perception of a group or community to which one belongs. It is based on shared culture and social beliefs toward common responsibility.

2.3.2 African Understanding of Corporate Responsibility and Ancestors

Apparently, the African perception is that since one man's sin affect all, then all have sinned, following Calvinistic⁵¹ view. This serves as a good point of departure for most Africans to understand the theology of original sin. It shows that Sin of the fathers may perhaps be directly interpreted as sin of the ancestors, and answers the fourth hypothesis in 1.3. Sin in Africa is not disobedience to God, but it springs from violating family rules of honour or doing that which is forbidden by the community. Oduyoye (2000:110) clarifies that Africans have their roots in the same soil, drink from the same river and recognize the same divinity, hence an unbreakable bond is created. This bond imposes a corporate personality/responsibility that everyone strives to fulfil. With this, Turaki (2012:177) illustrate that in African societies even if an act is not seen⁵² as wrong or sinful in the eyes of the culprit, such an individual will still experience the shame of the sin in the eyes of his/her observers. It indicates therefore that sin is not just attributed to an individual but to the corporate group of the transgressor. Similarly, the guilt is not pronounced as the state of shame that comes with the wrong deed, but a painful sense of wrongdoing. A person feels the

⁵⁰Notice how old this topic has been, Machen Jr. (1911:258) explain the nature and personality of corporation as having two basic presuppositions, first as a distinct entity from other members and second as a person.

⁵¹Interestingly, Calvin serves as the proponent of what Augustine taught the Protestants. This view informs the African perception of Sin of the father, or better, sin of the ancestors.

⁵²To judge between right and wrongdoing by one who belong to the community.

guilt of his/her immoral behaviour just as the shame is felt by their relations and everywhere one belongs. Shame is more powerful than guilt in some African context”, though both are the weight of wrongdoing. Importantly, the Augustinian and the Calvinistic views slot well into the African Ideology of original sin.

Mbiti's (1969:108-109) deep thought “I am, because we are; and since we are, therefore I am” becomes the reality of the context of African communities. This is the African philosophy of corporate personality in which the conception of original sin is easily understood as sin of the fathers. Community sense of life is a strong norm that is observed in almost all parts of Africa due to corporate personality. Kwesi Dickson (1984:62) notes that:

A society is in equilibrium when its customs are maintained, its goals are attained and the spirit powers given regular and adequate recognition. Members of society are expected to live and act in such a way as to promote society's well-being; to do otherwise is to court disaster, not only for the actor but also for society as a whole.

Given this, one agrees with Turaki (2012:176-177) that the concept of sin in traditional African community is understood in relation to touching what is forbidden. Breaking such taboos leads to great inter-generational curse, not just on the one involved but to the group with which he/she aligns. Thus it becomes the family's or clan's responsibility. In the same way, Dickson (1984:175-176) adds that the sense of a community required the Israelites to be responsible citizens. Again, shame is not just felt by the one who engages in the forbidden act, but extends to the household as well as one's clan. Certain examples include the story of David in II Samuel 11-16 where, after the king's sin he and his children faced several consequences and inter-generational punishment. Similarly, Achan in Joshua 7:1-26 sinned and saw the consequences spread to his entire family. Equally, Gehazi's greed led to a generational curse and strong leprosy that affected his entire generation in II Kings 5. Such behaviour brought serious shame on the relations of the perpetrator. In this way a person is held responsible not only as an individual, but as a member of his group, which becomes corporately responsible to the wrongful act. Thus the Old Testament and African cultures share great similarities with regard to this practice.

Most African cultures/traditions sanction that “what affect one, affects all” with great impact. In this respect, Mbiti (1969:108) said there is no place for individual responsibility in the existence of a community. The person cannot exist alone, one's real existence is only in corporate terms. Everyone owes his/her existence to others, including those of the past generation and those of the next generation, (the ancestors and the unborn). An incorporation

rite leads to integration. Appiah-Kubi (1987:70) adds that a person is truly a person in the presence of others within a community, not as an individual. Thus corporate personality is central to African sacredness as well as for human dignity within a socio-religious community. Moreover, Mpagi (2002:224) clarifies that individual plays a central role in all African thinking. A person's identity, success and well-being are all dependent on being in tune with one's community. Many of the cultural practices like initiation rites, age grade systems and other forms of interactions are geared towards the sustainability of the corporate community, not a person. It is on such grounds that most Africans express their religious experiences like righteousness and human dignity. The socio-religious life of the community is expressed deeply so that sin, wickedness, evil and disobedience become taboos, shame and dishonour to all; hence they are put into proper check.

A member of a group is regarded as a representative of all; a person represents both the living, the dead, as well as the unborn members of the family/clan. This is to say a person can live forever. This is similar to the African perception of corporate responsibility as noted by Mbiti (1975:117, 119), J. Pobee (1979:91-92), Bediako (1995:218-220), Healey and Sybertz (1996:211) as well as Turaki (2012:154, 119). This underlines the resemblance between the Hebrew and African views of personality and human corporate responsibility. Similarly, Michael (2011:168-173) notes that human personality in Africa is defined by spectators. It is attained by fulfilling certain customs, obligations or responsibilities as stipulated by the community. It is believed in most African cultures that there is great danger in inter-generational curse, so everyone tries to avoid such consequences.

In like manner, Byang H. Kato (1975:39) brought this idea of common ancestors and a corporately responsible home, that the Jaba (Hyam) people of southern Kaduna believe death is not the end of life. Life extends beyond here and now, although it is also not a circle of birth-death-birth in the form of reincarnation. Instead when someone dies, the immaterial part of the person (like a chief) goes to stay in the tree temporarily, and after about 3-6 months the person selects a womb to enter and be born again. In another belief from their neighbours, the Gwong, a person dies and goes to the city of the dead and lives like they were prior to death. They enjoy community life as good people, if they were noble. If one was bad, he/she will be isolated and will have to beg for everything, including food, from the community. Thus this

belief in life after death was very strong among our people⁵³ the Tyap, Jju, Akurmi and many others in southern Kaduna. Oduyoye (1995:115) describes the Akan view that people consider life in relation to blood relationship. The blood⁵⁴ is not just a physiological substance; it is also a theological substance, imbued with meaning for one's being.

In this regard, Mbiti (1969:108-109) explains that only in terms of others does an individual become conscious of his own being in their corporate group. When a person suffers or rejoices such person is in it with the rest of the corporate body, including the dead, the living and even the unborn. Turaki (2012:19, 172) adds that people do not live in a state of independence; they are part of the community life. Communal morality counts more than individual dignity. An individual's attitude is judged as good or bad solely in accord to their corporate group or tribal values, regardless of their universal, national or institutional ethics. For this reason, a person is regarded based on his/her participation with others; as such he/she is respected and dignified only in the eyes of his/her relationship with respect to others. In an African understanding, this is the means through which the sin of the fathers bring clarity to original sin as inherited sin. On this ground sin of the fathers becomes sin of the children.

In an African context, Mbiti (1975:117-119) refers to ancestors as the living dead. They are the departed members of the family that remain a part of the family even after their death. They hover around as members of the community or neighbourhood, and likewise the family feels their presence as close ones, especially where the dead are buried around them. The departed could live with the living for a period of four to five generations at most. According to Bediako (1995:220) in some African cultures ancestors are considered the heads of the living community even in the future. Olupona (2014:28) said the veneration of a deceased parent in a lineage constitutes a key aspect of African traditional belief. Ancestors are regarded as equal or even superior to certain deities within. Ancestral veneration is central for its significance to the family, and clan. They are believed to bestow blessing and dignity on the living even in future. Although Africans do not plan for the future, there is a belief that a person can be both punish or reward in the future, depending on how one lived before death.

⁵³ See my MTh thesis: Zachariah Bulus Takore-2013 on www.sun.ac.za for more on tribes and dialects around the Tyap people of Southern Kaduna. For more on tribal orientation and traditions of Southern Kaduna people, see Meek, C.K. 1978. *Tribal Studies in Northern Nigeria*. Vol. II New York: AMS Press. This is where the term Kataf and their neighbours was first coined and others use it in different ways. Kataf is another name for Tyap.

⁵⁴ Among the significant taboos in African tradition is the belief that a woman in her menstrual period is a symbol of continuity and blessing. Her blood is a theological symbol indicating life and potentiality of reincarnating the ancestors through her preparation for pregnancy (conception) and possible child birth. Women of child-bearing age are the symbol of human and community development (Oduyoye 1995:116).

God will always intervene at the right time, hence, one does not have to take action, for God knows and will act at the right time.

In attempting to clarify further, Kato (1975:36) noted that people believe the world is filled with spirits. The good ones come back as ancestors through birth. As such the cemetery is filled with spirits of the dead who are roaming about. This instils fear into people, especially for those that bury the dead beside their houses⁵⁵. This is a similar belief to that of the Tyap, Jju, Hyam and the rest of their neighbours. The spirits of the ancestors bring benefits such as favour, security, communalism and unity amongst the people. Pobee (1979:91-92) explains that goodwill and well-being of the living depends on how they please the spirit world (ancestors). A person's account is given to the "Supreme Being" and the ancestors are considered in the place of helpers (gods/God). He says humankind does not depend only on God but also on their ancestors. Healey and Sybertz (1996:211) say ancestors⁵⁶ are like divinities or associates of God/gods - not just ordinary spirits that aid the relationship between the dead and the living. Turaki (2012:119) says the ancestors Adam and Eve sinned due to self-centredness and pride. Their sin led to the recognition/awareness of our sinful nature, hence our tendencies to act wrongly. They made a choice to follow their heart; thus we are connected to their shame and guilt. This is what is regarded as inherited corruption, though one could refer to it as inherited shame/guilt. This answers the fourth hypothesis in 1.3. Inherited shame and guilt alienated humanity in their relationship to their ancestor who was guilty and shameful.

Ancestors are personalities in the African conception, living between the material world and the sacred, indicating nature and deity (Bediako 1995:218). The deceased can be released from the land of isolation into the land of the ancestors (Healey and Sybertz 1996:210). This way they are reinstated to life but live invincibly. So the dead are no longer dead but living. They provide counsel, help or grant prosperity to those who dignified and respect others; those who observe the community's rules and customs. They possess the power to inflict the living with sickness, infertility, poor yield in their farms, or they can turn things around for the good. In Turaki's (2012:154) analysis, if our African ancestors were to be given the

⁵⁵Personally my father died in 1997 and was buried in our family house, but not because we believe he will return as an ancestor but because we desire to live close to him (family grave).

⁵⁶Coming from a non-African, Robinson (1981:27) said the extension of the living family includes its ancestors. This is best expressed in a familiar phrase like, "gathered to one's father" or "to one's kindred", in Gen.49:29 Jacob said I am gathered to my kindred; bury me with my family. Olupona (2015:28) finds a reciprocal relationship linking the living and the dead. Thus ritual offerings are giving in exchange for blessing by the ancestors.

opportunity to be in the Garden of Eden, their instruction would have been instructed in terms familiar to us; for instance, not to touch the tree of the knowledge of spirits and power. The promise and temptation from the Serpent then will be, “you will not die,” “your eyes will be opened” and “you will be like God knowing and discerning spirits and powers”.

It is imperative to validate that Africans comprehend corporate responsibility in relation to community life. This bond is vital to Africans, and provides the measure of their misbehaviour/sin/evil. We understand the ideology of original sin as ancestral across generation of human beings. In this regard, humanity must strive for social dignity and religious holiness, to make this world a better place of habitation for the living. Ancestors are role models and examples to imitate for the family, the clan as well as the society. They serve the purpose of revealing to the physical world what is forthcoming and alerting to dangers that may befall the family. Although they are dead, the living members of their relations believe in their role and power. They are seen as gods, divine intercessors as well as caring parents who have gone ahead to prepare the way and good place for their relations.

2.4 The Theology of Sin of the Fathers in the Decalogue

Sin of the father's theology appears more often in the Decalogue and within the Pentateuch than any other part of the Scriptures. It is in this same context that YHWH rejects all forms of rival deities or images of himself. But the “images of God” or images in the form of “constructed deities” cannot be compared with YHWH. African syncretism has numerous such gods and accept the habit of polytheism, while YHWH hates polytheism. The contrast is that Israel's cultic life does not accommodate polytheism, while African religions worships God through other smaller gods. In recent times African Christian theology distanced itself from such religious practices to total commitment to one supreme God, a monotheistic worship and loyalty to one God, just as YHWH proposed a loyal covenant-fellowship, where faithfulness and respect is required by Israel's God. Although the worship of other gods has great consequences in upon the generations to come, YHWH gave Israel the opportunity to choose between idols לִפְסֵלִים and the living God who saved them from Egypt. There is a legal conception of the covenant which binds Israel and their God. The authors of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic tradition were familiar with certain ancient treaties where taking an oath was involved, which would render the treaty binding, like YHWH and Israel.

Thus the covenant is defined by the fidelity of God's people and keeping the covenant to grant the assurance of the land and other possessions (Genesis 15:8, Deuteronomy 7:1-11). The covenant and the law were thus put in place to save God's people. Though the priestly record does not emphasise the covenant, focusing instead on holiness, the Mosaic legislation is made to protect Israel, and thus upholds the first hypothesis in 1.3. Refusal to keep the law and the covenant entails exclusion from God's holy community, as occurred with the exile⁵⁷. Amusingly, Shuster (2004:105) says that to be human is to relate to God and humanity; the more we confine ourselves, the more we will lose our humanity. Thus the feeling of shame before others is greater than the guilt of sin, and can be extended even to children and grandchildren. In this context, Anderson (2009:3) considers sin to be more than the violation of moral norm, but its effects outweigh the feeling of guilt. This shows an enduring legacy⁵⁸ of sin that is left with the perpetrator. This legacy in the Pentateuch could be sin of the fathers (Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9). The psalmist in 51:9-10, pleads with God to turn his face from his wrongdoing and not to visit the consequences upon him.

Sin is a social as well as spiritual enslavement that includes all relatives. Therefore, sin not just an individual act, but a collective responsibility, as a condition of bondage for human beings. Sin of the ancestors has kept humanity in bondage, enslaved with our future generation, hence the need for justification. This ideology is in keeping with the principles of corporate responsibility inbuilt on communal life in the African belief. Since all are affected in one man's guilt/shame⁵⁹, it is evident that humankind was present in their ancestor Adam in an unidentified form. Granting that humanity needs to be justified, it will be important to look for solutions⁶⁰ for the self-punishment of the sins of our ancestors, else it will continue

⁵⁷Exile was caused by disobedience just as original sin was caused by disobedience. This may be the reason YHWH desires faithfulness to their relationship and holiness on the part of the parties involved.

⁵⁸ Like the terrible legacy of slavery in the 19th century in America. Another is the division of the Middle East after the close of the First World War, prior to 1917 when the Arab world, from Egypt to Iran was ruled by the Ottoman Empire. They suffered a German defeat as a consequence of their support during the First World War. Later the British and French took over the ruler-ship and over time divided the land into various factions as Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Iraq and others. See Anderson G. A. (1955) 2009. *Sin: a History*. New Heaven and London: Yale University Press, 3-4.

⁵⁹Furthermore, Kaufman (1968:374-375) buttressed sin and evil as developed in various forms like murder, strife, dishonesty, terrorism, corruption, racism, imperialism, war, economic and social inequality and many more have sprung up to distort humanity. Thus instead of developing a context and community of free beings who are living in love and trust, we end up with the opposite. We have become increasingly destructive, fragmentary and disharmonious, filled with evil, wickedness and sin. See Addendum A, for detail of sin.

⁶⁰ The affected family/clan/village at times calls the attention of everyone, or the family involved, to meet together and discuss and seek succour. At times elders or leaders of the community or family come together to deliberate on the cause and the punishments the culprits deserve. Those involved could consult their traditional gods or shrines for help, depending on one's faith and how they plan such redemption from ancestral curse.

to increase and the goal of human dignity may be thwarted. In the light of the Torah, iniquity/sin means doing what God/society hates/forbids, in other words, rebellion or disobedience. In this sense, priestly activities demand holiness, while the Mosaic call was towards covenant commitment; there was no room for being lukewarm. In the next two chapters, we will attempt to study the second commandment in detail from both contexts of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9, indicating that an African idea of sin of the ancestors is another way of perceiving original sin.

2.5 Preliminary Conclusion

This chapter analysed the relationship between “original sin” and “sin of the fathers”. It established a circle of relationship regarding how Africans perceive sin of the ancestors in the form of sin of the fathers; in turn it informs an African understanding of original sin. In the other way round, original sin helps to explain the concept of sin of the fathers upon the children as compared to sin of the ancestors. The chapter further discussed the models of understanding original sin; Pelagius and Augustine were engaged as representatives of the Early Church, while the later Catholic and Protestant views were also considered. Interestingly, Pelagius differs from his contemporaries with the idea that humans are sinless at birth but need to be baptised and cleansed from the sin that affects the human soul. Human beings have all inherited the sin of their father Adam, hence the misbehaviour of our ancestors has been transferred upon us, but the treaty and covenant practice of ANE shows they are punished based on the treaty. Although the sin is not individualistic, everyone needs to understand their sin and seek forgiveness to cure and control inter-generational sin transfer. Similarly, Africans are aware that what affects one, affects all, which is why the sin of the fathers has great adverse consequences for their children.

Sin started with a single human personality but by nature affected all, leading to an understanding of corporate sin, giving rise to sin of the fathers upon the children, as well as the “parents eat sour grapes and children’s teeth were on edge” in Ezekiel 18:2 and Jeremiah 30:29. The African understanding depicts unity in wrongdoing and communality in God’s judgement. Individual sin has become corporate sin. This does not discard the individuality of sin, instead a co-existence of corporate and individual responsibility comes to bear. In this regard, sin is analysed in the Old Testament from the Pentateuch, prophets and the writings to

Nevertheless, reconciliation and forgiveness is possible in an African background. Humanity must be justified by getting back to God through baptism and building a personal relationship with God.

establish the nature of sin. Interestingly, the dominant root are **אִי**, **חַטָּא** and **עֲפֹשׁ** (iniquity, sin and transgression) explains sin, but sin as guilt, iniquity and transgression is **אִי** (iniquity) though **עֲפֹשׁ** and **חַטָּא** were significant and useful for understanding the context of sin – both original sin and the sin of the fathers. **אִי** appears more often than others within the Pentateuch, especially in places where the idea of sin of the fathers surfaced. It has been used in reference to transgression and iniquity of the people, to refer to what YHWH prohibits among his Deuteronomistic covenant people; as stipulated for the priestly holy community. This connection serves as the stepping stone for exposing the preceding Chapters Three and Four of this research.

Affirmatively, just as one man's sin affected others, that is how their shame/guilt is universally considered. God hate sin⁶¹; he placed corporate consequences to it, Ndjerareou (2006:110-111) observe the similarities in the second commandment⁶² to the first; possibly as an extension to clarify the first. To him, YHWH can only be imagined, he is invisible in nature, has no form, no shape, hence cannot be idolized⁶³, neither by portrayals/representation/images (Deuteronomy 4:12). Furthermore, idols were for manipulative reasons; they served as a channels of pleasing the supreme divine being in African traditions, YHWH has no room for such practices. It was considered among the forbidden activities considered taboo among God's people. Again the reason is that, they could end up sharing the glory that is due for YHWH. Levinson (2008:50-51) says it is a revelation of God's zeal for an intimate relationship with his people. Israel's monotheism did not recognize other deities apart from YHWH. The option of bowing down before cultic objects or duplicating them as personal idols was not an alternative to holiness. In the third and fourth chapters we study further to understand the broader context of the texts.

To this end, sin has been defined in corporate terms; it is doing what is forbidden by the community, which comprises ancestors as well as the unborn. Consequently, sin could be any

⁶¹Although it may be said that the sin prohibited is idolatry and the rejection of any kind of representation of God, others sins were not condoned by YHWH. YHWH hated disobedience just as he detests other images and gods. It shows that with all he put in place, he was ready to purge his people of any kind of impurity.

⁶²The commandment according to him, describes the nature of Israel's God and how YHWH's cultic relationship ought to be. This is informed by other styles of worship existing in the ancient Mediterranean world, using carved images or sculptures. YHWH hates such, and having offered total allegiance to Israel according to their agreement, they must in turn pay back by responding in obedience and love.

⁶³YHWH frowns on whatever will take his glory in any way. Although God is a deity, many Africans/Nigerians, including the clergy, have attempted to replace allegiance to Him with things like success, wealth, titles, power, etc. In his image he created all, for his glory. Eminently, this declaration in the social context of the second commandment in Exodus 20:5 is priestly and pre-exilic, while Deuteronomy 5:9 is covenantal, possibly early post-exilic prior to their settlement.

form of transgression that has consequences upon the perpetrator and their relations. The argument put forth is that, since sin came through an individual and affected every human being that is how the sin of the father has prodigious and unlimited consequences upon the family/clan/tribe. In an African perception, sin is corporate in nature; there is no place for individualistic responsibility, one person's wrongdoing does not just smear the shame on the person but affects their relations and also leaves its scar upon its future generations. For this reason, "Sin of the Fathers upon the Children" is clearly perceived by Africans as a weighty burden. This is the reason that generations of Israel were taken captive by the Assyrians and Babylonians when fathers disobeyed YHWH. The sin was of their parent, the generations that were ahead of the Exodus and Decalogue generation. In Chapters Three and Four, we shall consider the Decalogue in details to see more reasons for the Decalogue⁶⁴, and reasons for the covenant theology as well as the purpose of enacting the holiness code. This is also reflected in the establishment of the temple and the organization of Israel. The reason was that God loves them and wants remain in the relationship, on condition that they keep on being loyal.

"Sin of the Fathers" is another way of clarifying the sins of our ancestors, which helps the understanding of original sin. The add-on is that in the past others might have proposed original sin to be as a result of the *inherited sin* or that *human beings are born in sin* or the view that *we are sinners even from our mother's womb*. In this research, the lens indicates that ancestral sins (sin of the fathers) is the best way most African conceives the magnitude of original sin/shame. The statement "the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation" (Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 etc.) is scary to most Africans that have experienced curses or the consequences of wrongdoing. Likewise, shame affects people through four generations. This is not just the problem of those who committed the act but it follows one's ancestral lineage and is trans-generationally transferred. In this case, good and honourable ancestors help with a good inheritance, which remains a part of the honour to their family even after their death. This assists to clarify human dignity in the community. This answers the last hypothesis and provides a background to understanding the third hypothesis in 1.3. The next phase of this research will shift to the context of the Decalogue, using social rhetorical analysis. However, the diagram below indicates the development of sin in the Old

⁶⁴ In this research, the Decalogue serves as the frame of reference for the "sin of the fathers" theology. These phrases are re-contextualized in other parts of the Scriptures like "parents eat sour grapes and children's teeth were on edge". It will be examined further in the subsequent chapter to reason why the exile or the priest made use of "sin of the fathers" within the Decalogue.

Testament from Individual Adam to corporate as original sin by Augustine, which is equated to sin of the fathers in this research.

Chapter Three

Socio-Rhetorical Appraisal of Deuteronomy 5:8-10⁶⁵

3.1 Introduction

Social-rhetorical reading/criticism offers a persuasive way of searching for meaning which involves the literary details of a text and its socio-cultural context. In accord with Robbins (1996:1) it initially explores the literary objects in the text, and eventually looks for the meaning of a text. This integrates the social class, the social system, the community's beliefs and values. This methodology focuses on the society and its milieu, as well as the art of crafting the language in the text, and what it means to the people in the world of the text. Social-rhetorical reading is an influential analytical way of interpretation that stresses a story, devices/speeches and the argument in a text. Tate (2008:338) reflects on it as comprising the cultural aspect of the text which serves as a literary object that could be studied; and socially as an artefact that must be open to the past, present and future for textual interaction. This chapter will focus on how the covenantal deuteronomistic theology forms the background for interpreting sin of the fathers in the Decalogue, as a reflection on the exilic experiences.

Besides in ANE treaties, curses were used to punish the disobedient. Similarly, the Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon (VTE)⁶⁶ serves as a significant example for the covenant context. Robbins (2010:282) frequently reads between the lines from literary and textual perspectives, centring on the social, cultural, historical, psychological, ideological and aesthetical evidences which provide theological information of the world in the text. This approach shows the beginning of the text and how it connects by the use of persuasive phrases to various plots within a story. It will be an appropriate methodology for exploring a classic text such as the "Ten Commandments". The text in this case begins with אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ "I am the Lord Your God" a statement showing how Moses convinced Israel to assemble and pay attention as God speaks (Deuteronomy 5:1). They were called to remember how they stood

⁶⁵ The reference above forms part of the immediate context of "Sin of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation" however, it extends to the whole chapter (Deuteronomy 5:1-3) and captures the larger story of the context. Inscriptions could be made on clay, stones, metals, wood, or even on animal skin and later clothes (Miller 2009b:517-518). Moses' name is mentioned as the speaker and mediator between God and his people. The narrator started his speech on the highland of Moab in vs.6 where he introduced the monotheistic God YHWH. The argument seeks to sustain the dignity of their God and create respect in their society.

⁶⁶ The Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon is an example of ancient Assyrian treaties of kings as existed in the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian and Hellenistic period.

beneath the mountain in fear before YHWH, while Moses communicated the words of God in making their covenant/treaty. Thus the Decalogue was constructed in two tablets, the first proclaiming “I am the Lord your God,” and the second, “You shall not...”. By heeding YHWH’s instructions⁶⁷, you will be blessed. This matches the provisions in ancient treaties, where the parties take an oath of faithfulness and attach certain consequences for transgressors.

Miller (1990) observes it as a theological structure meant to please YHWH. The treaty that relates to legal matters, such as the Decalogue in the Pentateuch, fits into the redemptive activities of God, and serves as divine instruction backed by the theology of “cause and effect”. The condition is, “If you obey you will be blessed, and if you transgress you will be punished”, so when it is mentioned: “sin of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation”, it is neither new nor scary, but familiar speech based on ancient treaty. Series of treaties⁶⁸ existed in the ancient Mediterranean in the 15th to 8th centuries BCE. Hagedorn (2004:61-62) affirm that the law codes in the form of treaties were meant to teach the principles of obedience, as was popular in the ancient cultures. It was similar to the biblical codes, Deuteronomic and Priestly codes, which equally shared certain legal conceptions with Greek sources. Though this chapter focuses on the covenant theology, it indicates agreement, on certain conditions, viz. love, obey and respect, just as the covenant between YHWH and Israel. For scrutinizing the text properly, it will be translated first, and then demarcated, followed by socio-rhetorical analysis.

⁶⁷The ceremony was popular among the Assyro-Babylonian societies though the treaties existed in the form of the VTE during Iron Age II. This treaty was similar to the “Decalogue” as a unique document for Israel (See McCarthy 1963). Clement (2001:19-21) notes that the Decalogue dealt with matters that pertain to ethical and spiritual dignity which can be classified as basic law, covenant law and to some extent, criminal law. It contains unique speeches that exert authority as a basis for legislation. This was important to Israel right from the birth of the nation. Perhaps these laws emanated from a covenant context where treaties were invoked in the ANE Mediterranean around 15th to 8th Century BCE. Oath taking was significant way to obey God or the king.

⁶⁸In a letter, *Burniburiash II* speaks of Tabutu between him and Egypt, demanding to be loved by Pharaoh. In Assyria, *Adad-niraril* sought “brotherhood” for a treaty on commercial terms with *Hattusilis III*. It is said in the Tukulti-ninurta epic that, *Kashtilash* of Babylon broke *rikiltu* and his *mamitu* with Assyria. An agreement between *Karaindash* of Babylon and *Ashur-bel-nisheshu* called a *riksu*, which is applied on oath (*mamitu*) and results in (*tabtu*) a good relationship and (*salummu*) peace. Standard treaty terms included partnership, with stated intention to protect one another’s legitimacy. It is an obligation laid down in a treaty, a clear example is depicted by an early king: “I made the kings of Nairi... swear an oath by the great gods of the heavens and earth.” In the 9th century BCE the last one hundred years of the Assyrian empire of Ade took the same oath. They put down their enemies and installed new princes. In this context the Assyrians developed the concept of “obey and be blessed, transgress and be punished”, as a condition, just as in the second law of the Decalogue (McCarthy 1963:104-105). These princes were bound to obligation under oath and administered leadership through a system of treaties.

3.2 Demarcation of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5:1-21

The purpose of demarcation is to limit the context of a text for the purpose of focused interpretation. Over the years, scholars have attempted to demarcate the text and various ideas emerged, as explained below. In a 1966 discussion of the text of the Decalogue, for instance, Von Rad demarcated it from Chapter 4:44-6:3, where he divided Chapter 5 into three parts as 5:1-5, “the beginning of Moses’ speech”, 5:6-21 “the Decalogue” (demarcated as 5:7-10, 5:11, 5:12-15, 5:16-21). The last segment had variances: either 5:22-33 or 5:22-6:3, as “the concluding event on the Sinai”. Interestingly, in the 1990s, Patrick D. Miller (1990) followed and explained a similar manner to Von Rad. Moshe Weinfeld (1991) chose to somewhat in his demarcation, viewing 5:1-5 as the “prologue”, 5:6-18 as “the Decalogue”, and 5:19-6:3 as “epilogue to the Decalogue”.

Equally in the mid-1990s, Eugene H. Merrill (1994) wrote a different title for Chapter 5:1-11:32,⁶⁹ viz. “The principle of the covenant”, in chapter 5. She considers 5:1-5 an “opening exhortation”, 5:6-21 as “the Ten Commandments”, and 5:22-33 as “narrative relating the Sinai revelation and Israel’s response”. Furthermore, she separates 5:22-27 as “rehearsal of the theophany” and 5:28-33 as “preparation for the covenant stipulations”. Christopher J.H. Wright (1996) considers “the Decalogue” from 4:44-5:6 as “introduction to Israel’s covenant”; 5:7-21, as “the Ten Commandments”, 5:7, 5:8-10, 5:11, 5:12-15, 5:16-21 and 5:22-6:3, as “Moses the mediator of the people”. It is important to note that most scholars discussed 5:16-21 as a separate section, with various titles to the text, which is why this study will build on the text from the same demarcation. The speeches of Deuteronomy⁷⁰ were aligned with the covenant.

In like manner, the 2000s witnessed a revision of scholarly demarcation of the text. Duane L. Christensen (2001) separated Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9 as one section, titling 5:1-22 as “theophany and covenant” at Horeb, the giving of the ten words. Furthermore, 5:1-11 (the first three laws) pertain to “our relationship to God”, 5:12-15 as “observing the Sabbath” (fourth law). In 5:16-21 the last (six commandments) refer to the relationship with the

⁶⁹The scholar probably chose to leave out the later part of her demarcation in connection to the Decalogue, and in agreement with her, I will not pursue the details of 6-11:32 of the text.

⁷⁰ Deuteronomy was established as law. Schmid (2012:17-18) observes an explanation of the Sinai legislation and regards it as divine Sinaitic law which is interlinked with the subsequent books. The Decalogue was first brought into interpretive relationship with Deuteronomy 5. Hagedorn (2004:60) suggests a trace of oriental laws in the law code of ancient Greek-Rome. There is evidence of a certain awareness of western Palestine. In the late 7th century BCE, there was mention of Kittim and names of Greek origin to indicate Greek-Hebrew contact.

community. He sees 5:22 as “YHWH’s theophany and covenant”, and the last section 5:23-6:3 is titled, “God’s desire for his people to fear him and keep the Torah”. In 2001 Brueggemann demarcated the text as 4:44-5:33, according to him 5:1-5 is “the beginning of speech and summons to embrace the commandments”, 5:6-33 as “Moses’ address and significant words of YHWH”. J.G. McConville (2002) demarcates the text from 5:1-33. He outlines Chapter 5:1-5 as “prologue to the Decalogue”, 5:6-21 “the Decalogue”, 5:22-31 as “Moses the mediator” and 5:32-33 as “further exhortations to obey the Lord God of Israel”. Mark E. Biddle (2003) delimits the text from 5:1-33, hence giving an outline as 5:1-5, “Moses summons the people to learn the covenant”; 5:6-21, “the Decalogue” and 5:6 is “preamble”; 5:7-15 as “the principles of relationship with YHWH”; and in the last segment 5:16-21 as “principles of social relationship”. Section 5:22-27 as “people’s relationship to the theophany”. Surprisingly he omits 5:28-33 and does not deliberate on it.

In the references above, Moses spoke on the plains of Moab, persuading Israel to listen to God’s message. The convener started with אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ indicating a call to pay attention to what YHWH is about to reveal. YHWH, the reveller, sends his message through Moses, his servant. Thus he gave divine instructions; eight were negative prohibitions and two were positive persuasions. It was a call to hear God’s commands and comprehend the content of the two tablets⁷¹, (“The Ten Words or Decalogue”). It shows that the demarcation of the text, where Deuteronomy 5:9 appears, must be noted in its immediate context as the second commandment 5:8-10. The intensity of the commandment stems from אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ “I am the Lord your God”, emphasising a monotheistic theology, and emphasizing the jealous God who hates the company of other gods, and dislikes the proliferation of divine images or his images. Even the carbon copying of god’s likeness or duplicate of a deity causes his jealousy. One whose love is conditional to people’s obedience, also conditions himself to bless them and not to curse/punish his partners. For this reason, disobeying God earned so much chastisement and reparation, a sample of what is engraved in Deuteronomy 5:9; “YHWH will visit the consequences/penalties of the father’s sins, due for their rebellious acts upon their innocent children, even to the third and fourth generation.” Importantly, it is only this second commandment and that of the Sabbath that seem to have been given further explanations. The reason still points to the significance of אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ.

⁷¹See Exodus 34:28, Deuteronomy 4:13, 10:4 for reference to the two tablet, either stone tables or of any kind of material. The emphasis is the Decalogue.

Most scholars agree with the demarcation of the “Ten Commandments” from vs. 6-21, which is not really a debated issue, they differ only in titles. This study finds that the segment could be divided into three parts: vs. 1-5 as the opening address, vs. 6-21 is the middle segment (the Decalogue) while vs. 22-33 is considered the final remarks. Yet vs. 6-21 has three subdivisions, viz. v6-11: theophany, vs. 12-16: the Sabbath and vs. 17-21: various laws. The first and the last sections contain negating words in which “You shall not” recurs to caution Israel about their relationship. In the middle section, positive words like “observe the Sabbath” and “Honour your father and mother” appeared to calm down the tempo of the scene. Although the text for study is 5:9, it falls within the context of 5:8-10, which forms the framework of the “Sins of the Fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation”. The table below indicates demarcations of selected scholars briefly.

SCHOLAR	YEAR	DEMARCATATION
Von Rad	1966	5:6-21
Miller	1990	5:6-21
Weinfeld	1991	5:6-21
Merrill	1994	5:6-21
Wright	1996	5:7-21
Christensen	2001	5:1-21
Brueggemann	2001	5:6-33
McConville	2002	5:6-21
Biddle	2003	5:6-21

Table 1 Demarcation⁷² of the text in Deuteronomy 5.

3.3 Text Translation for Deuteronomy 5:1-21⁷³

Vs.1 Moses summoned⁷⁴ all Israel and said: Hear⁷⁵, O Israel the decrees⁷⁶ and laws I declare⁷⁷ in your hearing today. Learn them and be sure to follow⁷⁸ them. Vs.2 The Lord our

⁷²(Von Rad, 1966 5:6-21; Miller 1990 5:6-21; Weinfeld 1991 5:6-18, 5:19-6:3; Merrill 1994 5:6-21; Wright 1996 5:7-21; Christensen 2001 5:1-21; Brueggemann 2001 5:6-33; McConville 2002 5:6-21; Biddle 2003 5:6-21.) Both older and modern scholars agree that demarcating the text from 5:6-21 is appropriate, especially for the Exodus motif. This research will follow the same demarcation in analysing the Decalogue, and the reasoning around the phrase “Sin of the Fathers upon the Children,” also in relation to original sin in an African conception.

⁷³ Although the immediate context of the research is the second commandment 5:8-10, it cannot be discussed in isolation. Reading the whole Decalogue, (Deuteronomy 5:1-21) will give clarity to the context of the discussion. There are three versions of the Holy Bible use concurrently above for translation: NIV, NET and NRSV. The NET Bible is a more recent version, while NIV and NRSV are used alternatively to indicate the similarities and differences in the text. The NIV is much closer to the *SBL* Hebrew in the Logos 6 program, which is used for translation in this work, hence NIV will be the focus while the others will serve as alternatives for comparison.

⁷⁴ Vs.1 use “called” in NET; “convened” in NRSV. Although they look similar, “convene” and “summoned” implies an order to gather or assemble. In a context as persuasive as this, Moses seems to have called them together as in NET.

⁷⁵ NET uses “Listen” differently from others, showing a need to pay attention, to give their ears and mind to what God is about to say through his servant.

*God made a covenant with us at Horeb. Vs.3 It was not with our fathers⁷⁹ that the Lord made this covenant, but with us, with all of us who are alive here today. Vs.4 The Lord spoke to you face to face⁸⁰ out of the fire on the mountain. Vs.5 (At that time I stood between the Lord and you to declare⁸¹ to you the word of the Lord because you were afraid of the fire and did not go up the mountain.) And he said: Vs.6 "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land⁸² of slavery. Vs.7 **You shall have no other gods before⁸³ me. Vs.8 **You shall not⁸⁴ make for yourself an idol⁸⁵ in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below. Vs.9 **You shall not bow down⁸⁶ to them or worship them; for I, the Lord your God, am a jealous⁸⁷ God, punishing⁸⁸ the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate⁸⁹ me, Vs.10 but showing love⁹⁰ to a thousand generations of those who love⁹¹ me and keep my commandments. Vs.11 **You shall not misuse⁹² the name of the Lord your God, for the Lord will not hold⁹³ anyone*********

⁷⁶ The "statutes and ordinances" (NET/NRSV) seem lighter than NIV's "decrees and laws" which suggests forceful imposition or an order with legal command.

⁷⁷ NET: "That I am about to deliver to you"; NRSV: "that I am addressing to you": the words are "declare," "deliver" or "address." Of these the more appropriate word may be "to deliver" the message, as in NET, which indicates service; while "address" may have to do with sorting out issues among people, and "declare" may be to state the final decision. It seems to go beyond just passing information to helping them to grasp what is being said.

⁷⁸ With the options, "Learn them and be careful to keep them" (NET), "you shall learn them and observe them diligently" (NRSV), NET seems to continue in the spirit of persuasion. Not command from above. Interestingly vs.2 is the same in all three translations.

⁷⁹ The use of "ancestors" in NET/NRSV could be easily misinterpreted by African traditionalists.

⁸⁰ It is better in NIV, "from the middle" as in NET it seems exaggerated, even the specific position of God at the time of the speech. It is also different with face to face, as best seen from comparison to other translations.

⁸¹ To reveal to you the message in NET, is preferable. Indeed, it was a revelation from YHWH on the mountains.

⁸² "Place of" in NET and "house of" in NRSV refer to different things, however "land of" in NIV translates well, since they were not living in a specific place or a confined building.

⁸³ "You shall not" ("You must not" as translated in NET), appears about eight times with one "you shall have no." These are all negating phrases used to show YHWH's readiness and intensity as well as desire to bless his people if they keep the laws. They were used in the first two commandments and the last six, and could be interchanged but the use of "must" may show force rather than persuasion, as seen in other places.

⁸⁴ "Beside" in NET, differs from the other two. "Beside" indicates YHWH's jealousy and hatred towards other gods. The point is that only the monotheistic God YHWH should be honoured or worshipped.

⁸⁵ "Image" as in NET, or idol could be a material gods while an image may be a shadow or picture of the real idol/god. In this regard it may be better to use "Image" as in NET.

⁸⁶ "You must not worship or serve them" in NET, could be interchanged with others. "Bowing down" which may be a sign of respect in certain cultures; as such, "serving" seems more appropriate.

⁸⁷ נִקְדָּשׁ "jealous" God, the God that hates other gods, idols and images of worship, hates them taking his place.

⁸⁸ "I punish אֶת־בְּנֵי הַבְּרִית the sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons" in NET, may not be different but is clearer to the reader. The generation to suffer is not just of those that sin but includes their children yet unborn.

⁸⁹ "Who reject me" in NET, suggests "substituted for other gods" or things unlike to hate, it does not imply an option.

⁹⁰ "I show covenant faithfulness" in NET; "steadfast love" in NRSV, the reference to the covenant they made with YHWH which makes NET better assumed. The main point is that whoever obeys and listens to God will enjoy the covenant faithfulness from God.

⁹¹ אֲשֶׁר־יִבְחַרְנִי "Who choose me" as used in NET. God's Love encompasses more than making a choice and goes even beyond obedience to the fear of God, honour and respect to YHWH. It has to do with determination to do only what will please their faithful God. On the other hand, choice is relevant in the context since they have to decide between their idols and their faithful God. Hence anyone who "chooses me" will save his innocent generation from calamity.

⁹² "Make use of the name of the Lord your God for worthless purposes" in NET; "make wrongful use" in NRSV, but "to misuse the name" of YHWH means wrongful use or using for irrelevant reasons. As such NET considers the phrase and says it in simple terms to clarify the meaning.

guiltless who misuses his name. **Vs.12** “Observe⁹⁴ the Sabbath day by keeping it holy, as the Lord your God has commanded you.**Vs.13** Six days you shall labour⁹⁵ and do all your work, Vs.14 but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your sons or daughters, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your Ox, your Donkey or any of your animals, nor the aliens⁹⁶ within your gates, so that your manservant or maidservants may rest as you do. **Vs.15** Remember⁹⁷ that you were slaves in Egypt and that the Lord your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched⁹⁸ arm. Therefore the Lord your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day. **Vs.16** “Honour your father and mother as the Lord your God has commanded you, so that you may live⁹⁹ long and that it may go well with you in the land the Lord your God is giving you. **Vs.17** “You shall not¹⁰⁰ murder. **Vs.18** “You shall not commit adultery. **Vs.19** “You shall not steal. **Vs.20** “You shall not give false testimony¹⁰¹ against your neighbour. **Vs.21** “You shall not covet your neighbour’s wife¹⁰². You shall not set your desire on your neighbour’s house¹⁰³ or land¹⁰⁴, his manservant or his maidservant, his ox or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbour.”(NIV)

105 אֲנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית

עַבְדִּים:

7 לֹא יִהְיֶה-לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עַל-פְּנֵי:

8 לֹא-תַעֲשֶׂה לְךָ פֶסֶל׃ כָּל-תְּמוּנָה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל

⁹³ “Exonerate (free or pardon) anyone who abuses his name that way” in NET; “acquit anyone” NRSV, “using God’s name for purposes is another way of misusing the name”, NET puts it better as anyone who abuses his name, but it is clearer in NIV: to hold anyone responsible for misusing the name.

⁹⁴ “Be careful to observe” as used in NET, is a translation in context of celebration or a religious ritual that can be observed periodically, like the Sabbath observation.

⁹⁵ “You are to work:” as in NET, “work” could be interchanged with “labour” but work involves anything you do, or that which entails effort; it is more appropriate in reference to the Sabbath. It prohibits all kinds of work as far as Sabbath observance is concerned. NET also translates “work” later as “task”.

⁹⁶ “Foreigner” in NET; “resident alien in your towns” as in NRSV, they are all terms that describe non-residents but the use of “foreigners” best fits the context and passes across the intended message.

⁹⁷ “Recall” in NET, is another word for “remember” in terms of past events. You must go back to history/the past in order to recall or remember life in Egypt.

⁹⁸ “There by strength and power” as in NET; “a mighty hand and an outstretched arm” in NRSV, the issue seems to refer to deliverance from bondage, better said with outstretched arm. Again this part is not found in Exodus 20, which is why it is underlined in the translation above.

⁹⁹ “Your days may be extended” in NET; “your days may be long” in NRSV, still NIV is clearer and contextual.

¹⁰⁰ Notice again how it is repeated for emphasis and to indicate the progress of the text. “You must not” in NET; “neither shall you” in NRSV is used from vs.17-19 playing some negating functions.

¹⁰¹ “You must not offer false testimony against another” in NET, “neither shall you bear false witness” in NRSV, but NIV remains outstanding here. False testimony is lying and breaking of oath.

¹⁰² “Another man’s wife” as in NET fits well, “friend”, “neighbour” or “enemy,” do not go near another person’s wife for she belongs to her husband alone.

¹⁰³ “Nor should you crave his house” in NET, that is his property, but a wife should not be considered property. She is not a thing, rather human being like the man, created in God Image, not lesser being but equal, and should be dignified in the language.

¹⁰⁴ “Field” NET/NRSV, it seems better as “land” rather than “field”; “land” could be country or people’s nation.

¹⁰⁵ *The Lexham Hebrew Bible*. (20 12). (Dt. 5:1–21). Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press. It contains the SBL fonts of the Hebrew words, one feels it is better for this project. The immediate context of the research is marked in blue.

- וְאֵשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ מִתְחַת וְאֵשֶׁר בְּמִים מִתְחַת לְאֶרֶץ:
- 9 לא- תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם וְלֹא תַעֲבֹדֵם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל קָדָם פֶּקֶד עֲוֹן אֲבוֹת עַל-בָּנִים וְעַל-שְׁלֵשִׁים וְעַל-רִבְעִים לְשָׁנָיִם:
- 10 וְעֵשָׂה חֹסֵד לְאֱלֹהִים לְאֹהֲבֵי וּלְשֹׁמְרֵי מִצְוֹתַי: ׀ מִצְוֹתַי:
- 11 לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת-שֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׁוּא כִּי לֹא יִנְקֶה יְהוָה אֶת אֲשֶׁר-יִשָּׂא אֶת-שְׁמוֹ לְשׁוּא: ׀
- 12 שְׁמֹר אֶת-יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקֹדֶשׁוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ:
- 13 שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וְעֵשִׂיתָ כָּל-מְלֹאכְתֶּךָ:
- 14 וַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שָׁבְתוּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כָּל-מְלָכָה אֲתָה וּבִנְךָ-וּבִתֶּךָ וְעַבְדְּךָ-וְאֹמְתָה וְשׁוֹרְךָ וַחֲמֹרְךָ וְכָל-בְּהֵמָתְךָ וְגֵרְךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ לְמַעַן יָנוּחַ עַבְדְּךָ וְאֹמְתֶךָ כָּמוֹךָ:
- 15 וְזָכַרְתָּ כִּי-עָבַד הֵייתָ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וַיִּצְאֶךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִשֵּׁם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה וּבְזֹרֵעַ נְטוּיָה עַל-פְּנֵי צוּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת-יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת: ׀
- 16 כַּבֵּד אֶת-אֲבִיךָ וְאֶת-אִמְךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְמַעַן יֵאָרִיכוּ יָמֶיךָ וְלִמְעַן יֵיטֵב לָךְ עַל הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לָךְ: ׀
- 17 לֹא תִרְצַח: ׀
- 18 וְלֹא תִנְאַף: ׀
- 19 וְלֹא תִגְזֹב: ׀
- 20 וְלֹא-תַעֲנֶה בְרֵעֶךָ עַד שְׁוֹא: ׀
- 21 וְלֹא תִקַּח אִשָּׁת רֵעֶךָ ׀ וְלֹא תִתְאַוֶּה בֵּית רֵעֶךָ שָׂדֵהוּ וְעַבְדּוֹ וְאֹמְתוֹ שׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ: ׀

Just as explained in Chapter One, socio-rhetorical criticism/analyses involve intra-textual, inter-textual, socio-cultural and ideological/theological approaches which serve significant rhetorical functions. Below is further explanation of these rhetorical devices:

3.4 Intra-Textual Analysis

We need to pay attention to the original story which builds the context as well as modern thoughts about the text. In this sense meaning can be found within the text without necessarily comparing it with other texts. Further steps include:

3.4.1 Repetition

It is a manner of using words or phrases in sequence and in different levels or instances within a text, in order to contribute to its progressive and narrative function. The Decalogue can basically be divided into two under the most repetitive words, “You shall not” לֹא יְהִינָה־ and לֹא־ is used more than ten times to show the essence of what YHWH forbade and his desire not to have to exile his people again. The use of “I am the Lord your God” אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ also has similar reasons as the other key word outlined in Table 1¹⁰⁶ below and will be considered further later in the research. Repetitions vary in format, with either the same words used severally or their synonyms being used together with the key word (as in the case of the name of their God). In this case, repeating some of these words adds beauty and organization to the composition of the Decalogue. Again depicting the narrator as an articulate writer even in combining the words, “I am the Lord your God” indicates authority, while “You shall not” points to command and the requirements of the law. What the law requires is in line with YHWH’s will, and that will help God’s people live with dignity if they obey.

¹⁰⁶ Table 1 contains major key words repeated in the Decalogue לֹא יְהִינָה־ (you shall not) and אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ (I am the Lord your God) and they surround the main message of the text “fear YHWH and be blessed”. Other words or phrases that recur in the text include; Commanded or commandments vs.10, 12, 15-16; generation vs.9-10; זָכַר Observe/remember the Sabbath day vs.12; vs.14-15; Egypt vs.6, vs.15, Manservant and Maidservant vs.14, 21 etc. Brief Analysis of Certain Words in Deuteronomy 5:6-21. Vs.6 אֲנִי (I am) 1st Pers. Sg. Personal pronoun, a formula use for introduction. יְהוָה (The Lord) אֱלֹהֶיךָ (Your God) is use as proper noun, Masc. Sg. Absolute of יְהוָה (YHWH). Vs.7 *There shall be no*, used 3750 times, 3rd Pers. Sg. Masc. Other/beside me is adjective, Masc. Pl. absolute. Other gods, common noun, Masc. Pl. absolute used for deities other than יְהוָה. Vs.8. **You shall not** in various forms for different references or prohibitions. לֹא־תַעֲשֶׂה־לָּךְ (you shall not make use) 2600 times as a verb, *qal* imperfect *yiqtol* and 2nd Pers. Masc. Sg. In reference to all Israel, as regards to יְהוָה they should not manufacture gods for their use. Vs.9 לֹא־תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה־וְלֹא־תַעֲבֹד־ (you shall not bow down nor serve them) is - suffix, pronoun 3rd Pers. Masc. Pl. referring to idols/gods and their like, that are prohibited before YHWH’s presence. אֱלֹהִים is a very ancient Semitic term for deity often used in compound form with proper names? A common noun Sg. absolute for God. קַנְיָן (Jealous) an adjective Sg, absolute to qualify his hatred towards other gods. פָּקַד (punishing) verb, *qal*. Participle Masc. Sg. absolute used 230 times for visiting or an ongoing state of judgement. For the עוֹן (guilt) of the fathers upon the children, used for wrongdoing or activities that are crooked. Vs.10 וְעִשְׂתָּה־ (showing) verb, *qual* participle Masc. Sg. absolute indicating continuity. חֶסֶד, (Loyal love) as common noun, an obligation of the whole community. וְיִשְׁמְרֵי (those who keep) a conjunction and a preposition, used together in the word, *shamar* שָׁמַר (to keep or observe) the laws, verb *qal*, participle, Masc. Pl. construct. It is seen in מִצְוֹתַי (my commandments) and laws, 180 times common noun, Fem. Pl. construct, to guide the people’s lives towards יְהוָה (YHWH). In the subsequent verses the directive is toward how people should conduct their lives in the community.

אֲנִי יְהוָה יְהוָה ¹⁰⁷ אֱלֹהֶיךָ	אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ ¹⁰⁸
You shall have no other vs.7	The Lord our God vs.2
You shall not vs.8	The Lord vs.3, 4, 5 (2x) &11
You shall not vs.9	I am the Lord your God vs. 6
You shall not vs.11	I the Lord your God vs.9
You shall not vs.14	The Lord your God vs.11
You shall not vs.17	The Lord your God vs. 12,
You shall not vs.18	The Lord your God vs. 14
You shall not vs.19	The Lord your God vs. 15 (2x)
You shall not vs.20	The Lord your God vs. 16 (2x)
You shall not vs.21 (2x)	

Table 2. The most repeated words in the Decalogue.

This feature has a rhetorical function of emphasising either the main lesson or containing a word of caution to which the society must adhere to in order to remain in a relationship with YHWH and to avoid exilic experiences again. The cluster(s) that refers to “I am the Lord your God”, “Lord your God” as were repeated, help in providing initial insight to the world and picture of the discourse. The use of “I¹⁰⁹” (the object) in the passage is a reference to YHWH (the predicate in the text) and his presence with his people. The “I” is also used in vs.6 and 9 respectively as references to YHWH their God, making God their possession, a personal God and a God that is part of their society. In his part, we see indications of commitment on the part of their God, who wants the same dignity to be required.

The essence of repetition is to outline how the story progresses and highlight certain theological ideas that ought to be learned, which could be the central lesson in the text like the purpose of the exodus. The negating statement “You shall not” is used 9 times in the Decalogue concurrently with references to “I am the Lord your God/the Lord” a positive statement that appears frequently; particularly the phrase “the Lord your God” has the highest frequency; in vs.15 and vs.16 it is mentioned twice for its significance. Thus reiterating it indicates the desire that they should serve him. This seems to portray an order of importance on how YHWH desires holiness from them as taught by the priests. In this trend, we find that

¹⁰⁷Repeated verbs and phrases in the text.

¹⁰⁸Repeated nouns and phrases in the text.

¹⁰⁹ Is a first person personal pronoun אֲנִי “(I am)” I use in reference to אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה “(the Lord your God).” The God of Israel a proper noun, masculine singular both emphasising the vital and relevant place YHWH in their life.

in between the sections of “You shall not”, there are positive comments like “Observe the Sabbath day” and “Honour your father and mother”. This might have been used to reduce the tempo of the voice, to reduce the intensity and to serve as an encouragement in the midst of chastisement; it also functions to tone down YHWH’s harsh words. God’s voice may look harsh in his speech but on the other hand we see his passionate and tender use of “I am the Lord your God”. It emphasizes his jealousy¹¹⁰ of being compared to other gods and his animosity towards idols, on one hand. On the other hand, it shows how much he cares and loves his people.

On another level of repetition in the passage, one observes the dual or more uses of words like remember, commandments, Sabbath 3 times, generations, Egypt etc. These are important points to note, for instance it will be good not to forget the memories of Egypt, the tears and suffering, the humiliations and living as foreigners etc. They ought to remember that the Lord is slow to anger and just in his love. This may be referring to YHWH’s past help. His love encompasses discipline as well. Hence their sins may affect the generations to come.

3.4.2 Progression

This involves the various stages in the discussion or the development in terms of sequence of words or phrases in a unit within a story. Phrases of progression - indicate the number of levels in the discussion in a new manner. At the first level of the text, Merrill (1994:141) points out that here the relevant phrases present firstly, a call to listen, “Hear, o Israel” 5:1 to pay proper attention. They are to use their senses of hearing, listening and understanding, to grasp the message of God. The narrator refers to the event at Horeb (5:3), when God made the covenant with Israel, with those who were alive, not their patriarchs. Another beginning starts in the text with “I am the Lord your God”, in vs.6, opening with an introduction and a reminder of what God did in the past to Israel. Brueggemann (2001:66) comments that Moses introduces the Lord as the One who caused the exodus, to remind them of the kind of God YHWH is and the community he intends to establish as Israel. Similarly, the author notes three characters in the text, YHWH the convener, Moses the leader of Israel and the Israelites, those in exile and those at home. They were commanded to make YHWH their God, to keep the laws and be blessed, to respect him and succeed; for both humanity and YHWH to be dignified in a master-servant relationship. This is why the Decalogue is divided

¹¹⁰ The emphatic use of “the Lord” occurs about 10 times indicating him as the centre of their life and their daily worship. Notice the variances in “I am the Lord your God”, “the Lord your God”, “the Lord our God” “the Lord God” as repeated all over the passage.

into two, with the first four laws directed toward relationship with God, while the last six focus on human dignity and ethics.

These are apodictic laws. Deuteronomy 5:6-21 can also be divided into three as **3-2-5**: the first section has three negative commandments that show the significance of YHWH as their only deity and his mighty name in the society. The next two are positive laws that emphasize the ceremony of their history, worship to YHWH and the significance of parents (elderly). In the last category there are five negative commands, but this segment deals with their dignity and relationship within the community. After strong warning where YHWH used “You shall not”, for Israel to develop a “fear for God”, both physical apprehension and spiritual respect emerge as fear. They were literally afraid of YHWH’s presence, which is why they asked YHWH to speak through Moses. Notice that while the first three negative commands at the beginning serve as pointers to YHWH, the two positive commands in the middle function for the rhetorical purpose of calming down the fearful situation before the people. This high tempo, “You shall not” in the text indicates a graphic high and low in the Decalogue. In the middle section, the Sabbath is inserted as a celebration of festival to the Lord their God. The last five commandments negate, but focus on helping humanity to respect one another in order to create a society that will honour their God. These five (vs.17-21) deal with capital offences, which remain a challenge to humanity

The first three laws are directives that will lead to the exodus and the need for covenant faithfulness before YHWH. Repeatedly the author uses “you shall not” in many instances to emphasize the status of YHWH and to convey why he is jealous towards other gods. Furthermore, he explains how holy his name is and how it should be revered among the people, followed by the requirement for **הַשְּׁבֻתָּה** (the Sabbath) and its significance. Suddenly there is a digression into family affairs. Another phase then develops, this time progressing towards their behaviour in society and toward one another. At this point some religious laws are emphasized, like “You shall not¹¹¹” kill, neither commit adultery nor steal and you should not speak falsely nor covet what belongs to another but allow the truth to prevail in all situations.

The Opening Speech of Moses	The Decalogue	The Exhorting Conclusion
-----------------------------	---------------	--------------------------

¹¹¹ These are strong apodictic negating words to challenge Israel to know the intensity of covenant לֹא יְהַרְגֶה לֹא יִזְנוּ לֹא יִגְדֹל

5:1-5 An Introduction to the delivery of the Decalogue, as an announcement to prepare the people before the reception of the Law.	5:6-21 An Intra-Demarcation of the Decalogue; Vs. 6-Introduction, 7-11-negative, 12-16-positive, 17-21-negative.	5:22-33 The concluding remarks about the Ten Commandments and exhortation to obey YHWH.
---	---	---

Table 3. The progression in the Decalogue (Deuteronomy 5).

It gives us an indication of how the narrative developed from one stage to another with the characters involved. Notice also the middle has an outline with few positive commands and majority negative instructions as drawn above.

3.4.3 Narration

A narrator uses characters (role players) in the text to describe various acts in the text, the speakers and their speeches. The Decalogue presents a meta-narrative as a compilation of rules and regulations that serves to guide a holy community. They were collected as a code of conduct for the society, but also contained implicit issues. It began with calls, as forewarnings, turning into persuasion. Throughout we see the use of strong negating words. Deuteronomy chronicles events in history and relates the development of proceedings in a sequence. It indicates statutes and ordinances meant for the society in the midst of storylines of the exodus narrative. This illustrates the incidence of insertion in Exodus 20, though the fact that the reference to the exodus and the Sabbath confirms the unity of the story, means the Decalogue is a level or step in the narrative.

In as much as YHWH wants them to respect one another, YHWH also requires their obedience, and fidelity following the sin of the fathers in the past that led to the exile. Miller (1990:75) observes that the one who saved them now requires their allegiance and exclusive loyalty. All other gods are now forever ruled out of their cultic life and affection except YHWH. Tigay (1996:63) holds that YHWH alone created and freed them from Egypt, so he alone is God.

This Deuteronomistic theology began with the speech of Moses to God's people on the plains of Moab in vs.6. In vs.1-5 he started by reminding Israel of the covenant they made at Horeb vs.2. Moses was the intermediary who told them the words of YHWH because they were terrified of God's presence. They received the commandments from YHWH and later passed it on during and after the exile. In vs.6 "I am", "the Lord your God" serves as the prologue to

the commandment where he introduces himself in a loving manner. This is portrayed by Weinfeld (1991:243) in the use of “I am YHWH” to confirm that the Lord God who brought them out of exile is their God, so there will be no other god beside him. Affirmatively, Christensen (2001:113-114) says YHWH meant that they should not have any other god apart from him, in an exclusive call to total loyalty on their part.

The commandments begin in **vs.7**. Von Rad (1966:56-57) considers vs.7-10 together, viz. the first and the second commandments of the Decalogue. While the first prohibits serving other powers, the second is concerned with the chief idea of monotheism. Only Yahweh is God, others are idols, especially in the face of Israel. Although the society was aware of polytheism, the charge is for them to abide by the strict order for monotheism. The reason given is that Yahweh is zealous for their loyalty and love. All forms of idols, gods and images as manifestation of deities must be abolished; from that point onward, pure monotheism is the condition of their relationship. According to Von Rad, Israel stand to benefit more than in the deliverance from Egypt: interestingly, Von Rad is silent about the sin of the fathers; his concern was the bigger theme of monotheism, thus he did not distinguish the commands.

Vs.7 starts with an indication that this same fear for YHWH ought to continue, אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים לֹא יִהְיֶה לְפָנָי¹¹² “You shall have no other god before me”. The statement explains the second commandment further, as an extension of the first commandment. Due to its significance, a detailed explanation is given. It looks as though YHWH repeats himself only in **vs.8**, saying “You shall not make for yourself an idol”, as a supplementary step to the next level. Miller (1990:75-76) finds that the second commandment links the prohibition of images of other gods and objects of worship. YHWH disallows images of all kinds, he is jealous, in that way, it shows his perfect and absolute character as distinct from others.

In like manner, Craigie (1976:153-155) says of **Vs.7-10** that the obligation of the first commandment was their relationship to their God as a community of brothers. The second disallows the use of images intended to represent YHWH and others physically. The commandment stresses two things, first is the expression of faith and worship which should not be compromised to the cultic images of other ANE religions. Second is the reason that their faith and worship will be confined to the greatness and transcendence of their God. God

¹¹² Although they are both negating, notice the difference in the apodictic law, first as, “You shall have no other” and then “You shall not”. It seems as though the prior phrase is a persuasion to focus on YHWH.

is presented with human imageries and tendencies, while humanity is in God's image. Perhaps they could be tempted to visualize him. Creatures representing the Creator in that manner, Israel must have a limit in their cultic life, cultic objects could function as portrayal only, but there are tendencies of relying on them. In such situations God is jealous, when they succumb to a rival god. Commitment of loyal love always leads to zeal expressed in the form of the jealousy of God. The jealousy results in punishment in the form of discipline, not hatred. פְּקֹדַי עֲוֹן "Punishing the iniquity", not sin or transgression, means their children will also go astray in the ways of their fathers, leaving the covenant relation to suffer.

Although their neighbours were polytheistic, this law draws their attention to quality of worship YHWH requires of his people and the kind of faithful commitment due to their God. The true Creator is made known all over. A promise of long life and blessing is added to the warning. He will preserve the relationship by honouring his people without limit on condition of their loyalty and positive response. This is why Thompson (1974:115-116) said "the second commandment of the Decalogue is almost identical with the form in Exodus 20:4-6". This might have been included as a directive to resolve the problem of polytheism between them and their neighbours; especially as they relate, some may be tempted or lured into it. The verb is used against having other gods with Yahweh עַל־פְּנֵי (before me) could be used in various ways: "near me", "at my side", "against me", "in defiance of me" and "to my detriment," all expressing Yahweh's rejection of other deities. In like manner, the second commandment continues, "Do not bow down to them nor worship them", because Yahweh is the only God. Furthermore, do not have any form of cultic representations apart from YHWH. They are forbidden from creating images of the creator from the sky to the earth and beyond the waters.

According to Merrill (1994:146-148) other gods must be kept away from YHWH's company, for he exists alone as Israel's god. Other nations accepted the existence of gods and images but Israel prohibited their worship alongside YHWH. In other nations such deities existed in various forms and shapes such as animals, birds and fish. Failure to heed YHWH's warnings is what invokes his jealousy **vs.9**, and the repercussions could impact on generation(s) **vs.10** and turn him from Israel. The Mono-Yahwism of Israel does not like his aniconic type. Wright (1996:70-72) says Yahweh was specific to his images but allowed the use of other images, although one could debate this idea. Since Israel was aware of other gods, idols and cultic images, it shows such prohibitions included all idols, images and statues. The faith was

to be imageless, the use of an image or bowing down to it suggests cultic manipulations, taking God's glory to idols.

Another view indicates that God is invincible while human beings are visible and material, hence YHWH cannot be represented by lifeless objects and images. They can't represent God who is able to do everything. No image of God can represent God, even less some idol. There are certain unique characteristics of Yahweh; first, he is invisible but his voice is loud enough to be heard, he cannot be turned into a voiceless idol. Yahweh is the one who freed Israel from Egyptian oppression, and he is the God of justice. Second, Yahweh is an incomparable God, so in no way can he be compared to any image. The reason is that the Lord their God is a jealous God, and the function of his covenant demands exclusive loyalty. His love commits him to his people, rendering God's love a form of jealousy to protect them. On one hand, there is the threat of punishment, to the third and fourth generations, but his love extends to a thousand generations

The first and second commandments serve as the foundation of all other commandments. Fretheim (1991:75-76) titles this the commandment of "the jealous God", saying it links the prohibition of other gods and the representation of their God in images and objects of worship. This law depicts God first as jealous, appealing not to his character but to his judgement and anger. It is an expression of his attributes as a perfect God; absolute and holy, set apart from others. Distinguished from all realities, he is the jealous God who cares for his people. This jealousy could as well imply a covenantal claim, showing positive and proper exclusive behaviour in the nature of their relationship. This confirms that God is both jealous for Israel's full and exclusive worship as well as zealous for a greater commitment from those who are his partners (Exodus 20:5, Deuteronomy 32:16, 21, Psalm 78:50, Isaiah 9:7, 26:11, 37:31-32, 59:17). In situations where God is battling for justice, the dimension of God will not punish beyond third and fourth generations. He will forgive due to his ardent love and commitment with his people. In this manner, Tigay (1996:66) says a polytheistic people may hate, our mix gods or even ignore him as God and follow other deities. Nevertheless, YHWH describes God haters as idolaters and rebellious people, who caused the exile. They are members whose relationship is cut off by disfavour, divorce or rejection because they are enemies of YHWH. McConville (2002:125-127) adds that this statement is a step in the dialogue which relates to the manner of worship, and shows God's desire to check their faithfulness, as a way to avoiding future punishment upon their generations.

The first and second commandments may seem like copies, one building logically upon the other (Merrill 1994:147-148). The issue is the invisibility of Yahweh and the impossibility of representing him in any form on portraits. Likenesses of deities in shapes conforming to things on earth and in heaven should never be applied to YHWH as it is in the cultic practices of ANE Mediterranean world. An image might take the place of the Creator, assuming the God's sovereignty on earth and in heaven, attracting people to bow down to it in worship. YHWH cautioned his people not to bow down to idols in whatever situation, nor to conceive of them in any way as able to act like he would. Such commitment must be ascribed to YHWH alone as their one and only deity/God. This research supports Wright (1996:68-70), who finds that these commands did not deny the existence of other gods nor the validity of polytheism in theory which was known by the people, but not practiced in Israel. The primary purpose of the law here is to protect the covenantal sovereignty of YHWH their God after the exile. It started with "You shall have no other rival gods to me like those of the exile" other than faith in the existence of "one ultimate divine reality, 'YHWH'".

Also Christensen (2001:114) views the second commandment **Vs.8-10**, in the light of the first, as a reference against all forms of portrayal of YHWH in images. According to him, these prohibitions later had great effect on art work in both Judaism and Islam, especially in recent world religious crisis where historical images are sold or destroyed in the name of monotheism. The commandment is noted by historians as contrary to the near ubiquitous tendencies in other Near Eastern representations of deities through art, advocating for only linguistic expressions of God's reality, or verbal worship.

God claims divine worship; for his unwavering loyalty to his people, he expects that they reciprocate his love (Brueggemann 2001:67). This desire is towards an exclusive monotheism, a relationship dependent on mutual. Thus God refused any form of mimicry, suggesting that the prohibition of the images is to safeguard the freedom YHWH gave them. To be fully person, relational and fully involved in covenantal transactions, this God is jealous enough to punish, faithful enough to show steadfast love, capable of extreme and surprising engagement with this God's partner. Biddle (2003:108) considers the second commandment an enunciation of biblical religion and distrust for iconographic representations of YHWH. "To bow down" and "serve" could be perceived as synonymous to worshipping and serving other gods. Israel is not to manufacture any image (hewn/carved or

build), their cultic life requires no image or pictorial representation of their God or any other gods (since God cannot be rival to his image).

Regarding vs.10 Miller (1990:77) is of the opinion that "third and fourth generations"¹¹³ presupposes further punishment of those that hate him, Jer.31:29 and Ezekiel 18:2 seems to say the contrary as we shall see later. It indicates the God of mercy, who loves his people and the accent is less on his haters than on those who are faithful. He is the God of love and of wrath as well, of mercy and judgement as well. Tigay (1996:66) explains that visiting the parents' guilt on their children, implies God's passionate jealousy, which leads to punishment upon the idolater. The joy of the generation to come is now being denied and taken away due to the unfaithfulness of their fathers. Rather the shame lasts for generations.

McConville (2002:127-128) observes that the meaning of third and fourth generation has been taken to mean God's wrath and consequent judgement, which will actually fall on the three following generations as a result of idolatry. Biddle (2003:109) affirms that YHWH is not just jealous of attempts to portray his image but jealous as well when his name is used for vanity, empty and light purposes. This is one of the major things that affects YHWH's position

The third commandment in 5:11, "You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God" is a continuation to develop the prohibition of false worship. To do what will amount to uttering YHWH's name in emptiness or as a manipulative way of praise, will not be tolerated Miller (1990:78) points out that images are forbidden and the name of YHWH stands as substitute for himself, it is a revelation through which they could lay hold of him. It is wrong to swear or lie in his name; only the truth should be told in his name. Wright's (1996:71) adds that "you shall not lift up the name of YHWH your God to worthlessness" Leviticus 19:12, indicates that this name should be considered the greatest gift entrusted to Israel. In addition, judicial proceedings included swearing in the name of YHWH to tell the truth (Deuteronomy 6:13), it was perjury to take YHWH's name on oath and lie. Work (2009:79) agrees that "in vain" means abusively, falsely or empty in an insincere oath. It is a blasphemy for people who claim to be religious. In trading God's reputation, the blasphemer (Pharaoh) mistreated God's people and refused to fear God, he hardened his heart. Giving this commandment now

¹¹³ The theology of numbers is found in various biblical texts, Amos emphasizes the three and four ideology prevalently in Amos 1-2, as indications of the length of time within which punishment can spread in the extended family.

draws the path of respect and honouring God clearly enough, just as keeping a day holy and devoting time for their God.

Vs.12-15 is clearly the first and highest peak of the negating words. From the dramatic appearances of YHWH, they feared him and now at the zenith of the dialogue, they misunderstand the inkling were literally afraid, from “fear as respect” to “fear as being terrified or scared”. Vs.12-15 introduces a digression which comes serves to calm the tempo of the speech in a persuasive manner. The fourth commandment says, “Observe the Sabbath¹¹⁴ day by keeping it holy” as a picture of celebrating the day and a festival of worship, to celebrate YHWH’s kindness. Miller (1990:80-81) lists three ways of Sabbath observation: (a) they should all rest and refresh regularly; (b) the day should be set aside for God, for divine worship; and (c) during the rest, they should recall the redeeming works of YHWH in the past. Tigay (1996:68) mentions typical Sabbath activities –they might visit sanctuaries and prophets, perform special sacrifices and other Temple activities such as recitation, psalms etc. It is an evaluation of God’s activities as the Creator of humankind, hence they must honour YHWH. McConville (2002:128) states that a Sabbath day is treated as a festive day that needs to be “observed,” a time they remember their bondage in Egypt and their deliverance as Israel. The Sabbath תַּשְׁבּוּת law is mindfulness of a festival calendar (Lev. 23), according to a pattern of feast (daily, weekly, monthly or annually). Brueggemann (2001:73-74) describes the Sabbath festival in several ways:

- a. The Sabbath is to be an occasion of distinctive memory of the exodus.
- b. The Sabbath is a courageous public act of identity.
- c. The Sabbath is an act of resistance.
- d. The Sabbath is an occasion for alternative community.
- e. The Sabbath is inescapably an act of hope.

In addition, the key characteristic of the Sabbath was not the worship but the rest. Christensen (2001:118-119) analysed the use of Sabbath in the text thus using the form of steps:

- a. Keep the Sabbath by making it holy as YHWH commanded: 5:12.
- b. In six days you shall labour and do all your work: 5:13.
- c. The seventh day is the Sabbath (rest) unto the Lord: 5:14a.

¹¹⁴ In contemporary times, Sunday has been made the Christian day of worship in which we are to remember the resurrection of Christ Jesus. Similarly, the Sabbath day/rest or worship should be to remember the works of God and his love towards his people. Sunday is another form of modern-day Sabbath since God demonstrated his favour upon humankind, loving all who believe as the new Israelites.

- d. You and your household are not to do any works on the Sabbath: 5:14b.
- e. Remember your past, to observe the Sabbath: 5:15.

Conspicuously, the first four commandments emphasise YHWH's supremacy, while the last six refer to humans and their society. This construction of the Sabbath law is drawn beyond the people to their domestic animals¹¹⁵ (ox and donkey), their maidservants and male servants and even the aliens in their midst. A careful look shows that on one hand, the Sabbath is emphasized as commandment in vs.12, 14a and 15 to point toward its significance. On the other hand, the sixth day is regarded as the day of rest as indicated in vs.13 and 14b. The result points to another level of the description and dialogue in the passage. Fundamental to all levels/stages of the narrative is that the story points to YHWH, to whom belongs all glory and honour.

One feels that the use of all these devices is a system of sequencing in a narrative dialogue of this nature. In such cases of "don'ts" and "do's", where the narrator speaks with high tone/voice, it is equally important to use persuasive language. On the other hand, it is adopted in order to calm the tempo of the dialogue in the text, just as in the remaining six commands. Hence after speaking of what God requires of his people, he turns to issues that concern the people, like crime, family interest and community matters. In **vs.16-21**, we notice another beginning of a small section; although this time not all start with negative words, the section ends with strong negating words. Of the fifth commandment, "Honour your father and mother as the Lord your God has commanded you" Weinfeld (1991:309-312) notes that the one who reviles his father or mother shall be put to death. In like manner, YHWH promised to dishonour the child that fails to respect its parents. Lack of observing good behaviours towards our parents reflects a lack of fear before Yahweh. They are to serve their parents with respect, that way God will reward them better than how their parents would have rewarded.

Although our parents have sinned, Tigay (1996:69) states that respect is still due to them. Children should respect their fathers who taught them the Torah and their caring mothers who

¹¹⁵ Although one may not agree with part of this, Adamo (2015c:20-21) indicates that the book of covenant in Exodus 20:22-23:33 is the oldest code in the Old Testament that emphasizes ecological right. It contains various cultic stipulations and socio-ethical demands (Exodus 21:28-29). The text shows that animals also belong to the community. For this reason, their right must be respected according to the law. In Exodus 23:4-5 and Deuteronomy 22:1-4, there are references to animal dignity just as there are in the Decalogue.

gave birth to them. Indeed, honouring parents ranks high among the commandments. This law also links to honouring or observing the Sabbath day just as we will honour our parents. In view of this, let's give reverence to them as it is due unto YHWH. Reverence takes account of how we care for the physical needs of our parents. Those who honour their parents will themselves be cared for and be blessed, they will grow older and enjoy a long life. One notices another extension or level of the dialogue that links the fear of parents with the fear of YHWH, as respect. By implication, anyone who cannot respect his parents who are visible, y, might find difficulty with respecting YHWH, who is not visible. Wright (1996:77) considers it not a "household code" but a covenantal law for the whole community, the Israelite family. Honouring parents was broader than just children's responsibility and it goes to show that the community should respect elders as well. This is a form of traditional education through the transmission of characters.

Honouring parents involves a lifetime of respect, according to McConville (2002:129), who confirms that the list progresses and ends with social issues that concern humanity – most of which are in the form of negative speeches, **vs.17-21**. In **Vs.17** the dialog begins with "You shall not [commit] murder", murder differs from killing in the process of ending life. According to Weinfeld (1991:314) it was a general warning that comprised all humans who have the potentials to kill, murder, slay, commit suicide, homicide or genocide etc., showing that taking lives was not among YHWH's agenda. In the covenant community the standard to be observed (McConville 2002:129) was that killing included all forms of humans taking another human life. This was to promote the well-being of all members of the community. The larger Israel's family were instructed not to exterminate, eliminate or assassinate people, God's creatures. The commandment says, "Do not kill" generally, not a child nor an elder, not woman nor man, not a slave nor free person, not rich nor poor, all human beings are equal before YHWH.

Vs.18 states that the commandment "You shall not commit adultery" refers to keeping the dignity of the husband and the wife. This latches onto the previous command, which urged people not to kill, but rather to respect human life. The extension is now seen in the prohibition of adultery which serves as a call to respect the husband. Refusing to take advantage of the wife shows respect for her husband and her marriage. Likewise, the law against adultery does not address only sexual promiscuity among the married but also prohibits people from extra-marital affairs such as having sex with a woman who is not your

wife, or infidelity; others include rape (incest), and the likes of adultery (McConville 2002:129). Wright (1996:80) explains that the fifth commandment gave support to parental leadership and trans-generational respect, while the seventh protects the sexual integrity of marriage¹¹⁶ and the family as it was from the beginning (Man and Woman¹¹⁷). As such we should remember family in the land, and its extension to three or more could be affected. Thus the law is to protect the immediate and the extended family as well.

The eighth commandment says, “You shall not steal” in **vs.19**, which is similar to **vs.21**: “You shall not covet your neighbour’s wife”. Weinfeld (1991:314-315) observes that stealing is placed on the same level as murder and adultery by the Rabbis. It will not be wrong to see another peak in this verse where fear is instilled into the people not to steal, nor to commit adultery nor murder. Notice the gradual progression in the order of these commands. Wright (1996:81-82) added that the theft of a person like, kidnap or abduction attracted capital punishments. Stealing in Israel unlike other ancient countries, had death and mutilation as penalties. Hence human life was valued and although not comparable to property, there could be social breakdown and cracked relationships which affect human dignity. The law now contains reference to capital crimes and social relationships, which seems like a device to encourage Israelites to seek the good of others. McConville (2002:130) notes that the offence of theft is related mostly to poverty and lack of contentment. Hence the economy of the land should be used for the common good, to better the life of the community.

The good of the community is portrayed in the final level of the text as it develops. The indication “You shall not give false testimony against your neighbour”, in **vs.20** is another way of showing the community respect. The process of justice for all is now a major concern in Israel. Agreeing with Wright (1996:83) the commandment was not just on testimony, it extends to testifying sincerely where it counts, like in the court of law. Everyone became responsible for establishing a just legal system. This is a nation founded on YHWH’s rule of righteousness. Hence false accusation was tantamount to transfer of punishment of the accused. Perversion of justice by conspiracy was categorised as a great offence. God sanctions equity and parity at this concluding level of the text. The passage now emphasizes justice, dignity, equality and sincerity in their daily interactions. McConville (2002:130)

¹¹⁶ The question is, what about the unmarried, and other kinds of sexual relationships today? How can they be categorised in this command?

¹¹⁷ It is important to note that contemporary marriage is not only between man and woman but could be between man and man or woman and woman.

affirms that sustaining the life of the community is illustrated in the concluding commandments. Thus the Decalogue shapes the legal system of the land and makes it binding on all citizens. The people are encouraged not to carry false rumours, nor join hands with the guilty, to keep a distance from falsehood Weinfeld (1991:315).

Vs.21: “You shall not covet your neighbour’s wife.” Here we sense conclusions and exhortations right from the eighth to the tenth commandments. Wright (1996:85) considers these commandments as making up the climax of the narrative. At this stage the Decalogue sets out standards for good behaviour for the covenant people. They are to love one another instead of kidnapping people’s wives and engaging in immorality. McConville (2002:130) adds that the last commandment operates at the level of desires of the heart, temptation and lust which could be a procedure of stealing, killing or committing adultery.

3.4.4 The Opening, Middle and Closing Units

This includes the use of words from the beginning of a text to the end of the unit. The nature of the opening, the middle section and the concluding phase of the text is the device being studied. This helps the interpreter to demarcate the introduction, main body and the end of the text. In this case we observe the progressive development in the unit, which may have certain variations in the text. A passage may have sections in one manuscript or several books in one, it could also be divisions that indicate the sections. The beginning, the middle and the end are otherwise the opening, middle and closing units of a text; in some texts it may be an introduction to a subhead or a topic opening another section. Divisions are part of the reconstructions to which a text can be submitted. See table below:

An Intra Demarcation of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5:6-21	
6 - I n t r o d u c t i o n	
	7-11-negative – 3 Laws
12-16-positive – 2 Laws	
	17-21-negative – 5 Laws

Table 4. Another level of demarcation within the Ten Commandments.

The passage indicates three sections to the whole reference from 5:1-32. The opening section 5:1-5 was not part of the ten commandments (5:6-21) as it is in Exodus 20:1-17, but serves as a background for the people to understand what Moses was about to say when he had

summoned them. First the speaker drew their attention “Hear, o Israel” the covenant, decrees and laws using your external and internal ear; your sense of hearing to hearken unto the words of the covenant. Thus the opening may be taken from vs.1-5, depending on where one starts; it ends with an emphasis about the Lord their God. Tigay (1996:63) alleges that by adding ‘the one who led you out of Egypt, out of the land of bondage’ it establishes a basis for why they must accept his authority. Hence “You shall have no other gods before me, apart from YHWH; no other god or deity should be upheld above YHWH.” Moses introduced the entire Decalogue using an oracular utterance from God, “Hear, O Israel”, in another point “You shall not”. Usually he will introduce himself which is why he says “I am the Lord your God...” again, the God who made covenant with you, your faithful God, the one who led Moses during the exodus from slavery in Egypt.

In the middle, 5:6-21, we see the Ten Commandments as given by YHWH. The section opens with an emphasis and affirmative statement “I am the Lord your God,” seeking attention and devotion to what he will say. Notice the miracle worker who loved you while you were in exile and suffering. This is followed by “who brought you out of Egypt” to remind them of the past, appealing to reasons to focus on YHWH in the future. He also reminds them of the covenant he made with them at Horeb. In this middle section, we see then, the Ten Commandments¹¹⁸ and the ten words of YHWH. It starts with references to God and ends with references to humanity. The opening, middle and ending are visible within the commandments (5:6-21¹¹⁹). It serves as a call of YHWH their God.

The whole story centres on their being reminded of the exile and their parents’ sins in the past. This last section of the text, Deuteronomy 5:22-32, is now an exhortation about what has been said in the commandments, and includes an explanation on the commands. The priests emphasised the commands generally and the covenant between them. In this section, the dialogue points to YHWH as their God. יהוה אלהינו denotes “The Lord your God,” repeated more than six times with various syntax and semantics, as well as serving as a call to listen, and to hearken unto God’s words, as the way to save their land from the wrath of YHWH. Most of the devices are used to support the main teaching regarding the call of the exile on the foundation of the sins of the fathers, who were unfaithful to “the Lord God” of

¹¹⁸ The commandments will not be discussed here again, in order to avoid repetition.

¹¹⁹ There are three divisions as 3-2-5, the first three vs.7-11 (opening), the middle two vs.12-16 and the last five (ending) in vs.17-21.

Israel – the one who did wonders in the past¹²⁰, whose wonders are remembered in the text. See below the divisions of the Decalogue, also called the words of YHWH that came through Moses on the Moabite plains just before entry into the Promised Land. It has been divided analogically into three-formation **3 – 2 – 5**, that will be clarified below in the diagram.

The Ten¹²¹ Words of YHWH

1.	You shall have no other gods before me vs.7		
2.	You shall not make for yourself an idol vs.8-10		
3.	You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God vs.11		
1.	Observe the Sabbath day by keeping it holy vs.12-15		
2.	Honour your father and mother as the Lord your God commanded vs.16		
1.	You shall not murder vs.17		
2.	You shall not commit adultery vs.18		
3.	You shall not steal vs.19		
4.	You shall not give false testimony against your neighbour vs.20		
5.	You shall not covet your neighbour's wife vs.21 (NIV).		
3 - Negative Warnings Related to YHWH's		2 - Positive indicating Holiness and Respect for Humanity & God	5 - Negative Related to Growing Relationship

Diagram 1 above shows a demarcation of the Decalogue.

3.4.5 Argument

Any dispute, divergence, argument or differences could result from different analyses of the text, as analysed in terms of modern or ancient rhetorical theories. Such instances could be used to clarify the issues involved through comparison of contrasting and divergent notions and concepts. Hence, it arises when the parallels or illustrations as well as references of the evidence for or against a text are applied to function convincingly in the passage historically and contemporarily. This passage is neither an argument nor a story format, though a story can be seen between the lines. They are requirements in the form of codes that exist to guide human social or religious activities in their society. The argument behind the text is that if you keep the commandments YHWH will not send you into exile again, but if the faithful people refuse or trample on the covenant stipulations, they may end up in a fresh exilic involvement.

¹²⁰ God's wonders were felt not just in Egypt but also in Babylon and Assyria before their gods and their kings in the presence of the people of their land.

¹²¹ The table above indicates the Ten Words יהוה ידבר אל ישראל of Israel and their demarcations. Yellow means warning and caution from God's wrath, Blue means holiness requirements and the need for respect to YHWH and to humankind and the green stands for the spiritual growth and the physical development YHWH requires from Israel, they need a growth horizontally with humanity and vertically with their divine Father.

The commandments serve as decrees that ought to be obeyed; a declaration in words that are not presented, and as points of view in the form of an argument. Though the passage is exposed by comparing and contrasting YHWH the Lord their God and warnings in the form of do's and don'ts like "You shall not," the concern stems from the "sins of the fathers" before the exile. As such there may not be a clear argument¹²² stated in the passage, yet a dialogue exists which points the society toward the past unfaithfulness of their fathers and mothers. Nonetheless, one could still argue that there were differences of opinion concerning the laws in the Decalogue¹²³ of Exodus and the one here. Tigay (1996:61) says the commandment does not refer to the Decalogue alone (4:17) but to the relationship God established with Israel at Horeb. People like kings, judges, priests and elders who lived among the Jews, were not above the law. God is the author of the laws, as opposed to most ancient societies where the law was initiated by the people for their consumption. According to Wright (1996:62) it indicates how the community of covenant had agreed with YHWH for a lasting relationship based on faithfulness to the laws; any form of unfaithfulness was to be punished. It might have been this post-exilic emphasis for keeping the covenant, that made YHWH refer to the "Sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation"; on the other hand, YHWH is showing mercy and kindness to the thousand generations of those that love him and keep his commandments. The wrongs of the fathers in **vs. 2-3** were probably of the immediate past generation who stood to represent the generations of children to come. They sinned and YHWH will now reprimand their progeny for their wrongs. It was accepted then; but later on the community held that everyone must suffer for their wrongs. Ezekiel and Jeremiah both affirm that no longer will parents eat sour grapes and children's teeth will be the edge.

Mann (1995:12-131) notes that in the covenant community, every person's personal acts had a social consequence, so also every act of sin contains the potential for national disaster. As such this corporate personality appears in the law as affecting the blood of the innocent. The guilt is for all, not just left to a person or a local village, but on the entire people of the land (tribe, state or country) 13:5. The society here embodies the saying, "*one rotten apple spoils*

¹²²Nevertheless, there are disputes surrounding laws like the first two and the last two, such as whether they are the same or different, whether they are laying emphasis on the other or serving different purposes. Another point is breaking one commandment means breaking all.

¹²³ The Decalogue exists in two major copies and other minor or incomplete copies which all refer to the fathers' and mothers' sins in the past. One main difference lies in the Sabbath regulation, where in one occasion, it is to be observed and in the other, it is to be remembered. Notwithstanding, the messages are passed across to the audience, on the need for the faithful generation to remain loyal and truthful to their God.

the barrel". In Deuteronomy 29:18-18 Moses warns the irresponsible who think their rebellion will go unpunished. In 5:21 the entire people will be engulfed by a curse and subsequently be driven to exile. It shows that this reality is visible in the Decalogue where YHWH threatens to punish the innocent children 5:9. The obligation is to worship YHWH alone because he single-handedly delivered them from bondage in Egypt (Tigay 1996:63). McConville (2002:158) finds that the covenant is for "faithful love to be returned by faithful people to their God", a corporate picture of the pledge and promises between YHWH and Israel after the exile. A good look at the Decalogue reveals the idea of threat on Israel for the great consequences of refusing to obey YHWH. No wonder 5:6-12 starts with "I am the Lord your God" and then continues, with "You shall not." However, one may choose to do as he/she wills, and risk the subsequent result. Base on this, discipline and reward are requirements in the relationship.

I agree with Miller (1990:66-67) that Deuteronomy is a call to pay attention, as well as an exhortation to obedience. Again 5:1-5 opens with the call of Moses to the people for obedience to the laws and things that are prohibited by YHWH. The covenant stipulations determine that all these will grow into a better relationship when they keep or observe the laws, using present and future voice. Brueggemann (2001:64) believes it was an urgent appeal for them to remember the past covenant they made, which is also here and now, not only there and then. The laws were not given as choice, to obey or not, rather a condition for their future. "You shall not" is used severally to indicate the urgency of respecting both parties involved. McConville (2002:123) is of the opinion that the opening address was a reference for all Israel (1:1) to take these "laws and statutes" to heart (4:1, 5). It is best to consider these references in Deuteronomy as the teachings of Moses on the plains of Moab, and the words of Moses at Horeb. It could be argued that they are precepts of training for right living. The respect developed for YHWH will help build the community that will further respect one another.

3.4.6 Sensory-Aesthetics

The "Decalogue" is among the beautifully stratified passages of the Old Testament. It involves the reasonable classifications within the environments of the text. There are diverse "forms" in the literature which encompass various appealing textures (such as proverbs, riddles or parables and the like). It consists of the etiquettes of using the sense organs to

appreciate a passage in a dialogue. In like manner, God spoke through Israel's leader¹²⁴ to use their minds and ears; first to pay attention, second to listen, third to understand God's message by submitting their heart and lastly to obey his words. Equally, sensory aesthetics centres on ideas that a role may perhaps appeal to feelings, sensation, life principles and tones in the dialogue. It involves the use of descriptive symbols, emotional states and common senses to clarify the sensory beauty of/in a text. They were urged to use their senses carefully in entering this treaty, knowing that their parents disobeyed in the past and ended in exile.

There is a deep urgency for faithfulness that runs through Moses' address in this text, which is motivated by his knowledge of their exile. It evokes a feeling among his listeners to be tender and to fear God (Deuteronomy 4:46). In addition, Wright (1996:62) says the mediator called on Israel to literally use their outer ears, to help them respond in obedience to their God. This is similar to YHWH's character, who is not seen (eyes to eye) but can be heard in voices; he speaks and they are to hear (with their ears) and see through nature¹²⁵. Vs.1 "Moses said: Hear, o Israel, (use your ears) in your hearing... learn and be sure to follow" accentuating the laws to be conveyed. Painting a society that is just coming out of bondage and moving into freedom, it is significant for them to remember the mighty deeds of their God in the past. Note how beautiful the arrangement of the laws is, in a 3 – 2 – 5 arrangement as explained earlier, as opposed to the popular 4 – 6 pattern in the main sections that divides the Decalogue into two, four relating to God while six relate to human society. Similarly, at all levels of the text there seems to be a sense of beckoning Israel to avoid God's wrath.

Miller (1990:67-70) agrees that Moses was going to teach them to learn from their historical past, spanning the time gap, and their generational gaps that are now dissolved in the claims that the covenant revealed the creating work of YHWH. The enduring relationship between Israel and their God, and a claim on the relationship of the past which is also of the present remains a cornerstone of Moses' teaching, intercession or prophesy. According to

¹²⁴ Israel's leader seems to play several roles, including that of a judge, mediator and an intercessor between Israel and YHWH. In the Decalogue, the appeal is made in a different sense, with Moses calling on everyone to listen and pay attention – in this case, the character of a mediator, urging Israel to make use of their ears properly. There are three things in this appeal that is why he gathered the people so that they hear from their God and to persuade them not to only listen with their ears but to obey God's voice and his message. No one sees YHWH face to face and remains alive, which is why Moses was only allowed to see his back, not his face. Israel, in like manner, pleads for Moses to go on their behalf, not to allow them to face God.

¹²⁵ The God who shows his presence through nature, speaks in a voice. His presence is felt in the pillar of fire at night, in the pillar of cloud during the day, in the rainbow that comes as a sign to stop the rain, and at the moment when God speaks through the cloud, the mountains tremble at Sinai. It would result in terror if God himself should appear physically before them.

Brueggemann (2001:64) the one who spoke through Moses was the one who commanded the nation of Israel to pay attention with their ears to the words that constitute the Torah (4:44). The verbal call in 5:1 was for them then and now. Thus the covenant generation was the generation of the living Israelites, referring to Deuteronomy 5:3 & 5. Making of a covenant was an ancient tradition that deals with the remembrance. They were to protect their lives and families by obeying YHWH's statutes. The commandments follow a progression, as shown below:

Command	Remarkable Ten Words of YHWH
First	Against Polytheism
Second	Against Image Worship
Third	Against the Misuse of God's name
Fourth	To Observe the Sabbath
Fifth	To Honour Parents
Sixth	Against Murder
Seventh	Against Adultery
Eight	Against Stealing
Ninth	Against False Witness
Tenth	Against Covetousness

Table 5 various remarks from the Ten Words of YHWH.

The beauty of the commands extends across the text. Work (2009:74) observes that hearing, learning, respecting and doing were all required of Israel. They received it by hand, ears and their hearts, taking it to heart as they recite it daily to save themselves and their future generations. Miller (1990:70) summarises the Decalogue as laws against particular behaviour in the society, as seen in the table above. In the dialogue, each of the laws¹²⁶ stands against certain behaviour with which the priestly class did not agree. This shows that people did not just live to please God, but to respect one another towards a dignified society. Dignity in contemporary society requires not just obeying God, but observing the laws of their

¹²⁶The dialogue shows another level of beauty in the Decalogue from the table above; See how each law concerns a specific item. With the use of phrases like "I am the Lord your God" in the first segment, and "You shall not" in the second segment, we see the division that emphasizes social responsibility. Similar to the honour and shame culture, they must show the commitment by honouring their God and observing the commandments, non-observance indicates sin/shame, disobedience and disrespect before YHWH and before the covenant people.

community as well. Community life to the Jews was significant for achieving unity and respect, just as it is in Africa. To emulate such, we must go back to the root of community life, where everyone loved and lived as relations.

Intra-text requires the interpreter to analyse various literary features within a particular text to find meaning. To do so in this Decalogue, repetitive texture was first used to analyse the words that reoccurred severally in the text, like “I am the Lord your God” and “You shall not”. These are apodictic laws where people are prohibited from certain things. The narrative progresses from one law to another, and appears to be a meta-narrative that contains stipulation, not story, yet the meaning has to be sought for each law, and also a theme behind the laws. The text is divided into two, four for YHWH and six for Israel, but one saw opening-middle-closing within the Decalogue as 3-2-5, based on negative-positive-negative utterances. The Argument in the text is believed to portray respect for YHWH, Israel’s God from the laws. Last is the sensory aesthetics, which calls for how the text made use of human sensory organs in the text to pass its message. There was the use of voice by mouth calling for attention through the use of their ears, for listening leads to obedience. You can’t be human alone or without relating with others in most African contexts. Although this text has been studied by several scholars, one believes that sins of the father could impact on the future unborn/innocent generations. Sin sustains itself among families in the form of curses,¹²⁷ especially in the African appreciation of wrongdoing or guilt/shame and living with the perpetrators or law breakers.

3.5 Inter-Textual Analysis

Inter-textual¹²⁸ analysis illustrates various locations, where the text uses similar texts outside the world of a particular text. In this respect, Robbins (1996:40) says, it traces textual links within the Scriptures that have reciprocated reliance of words, phrases, sentences or verse etc. It focuses on the relevance of the text in its world. This analysis will compare some verses of the Decalogue and its kind in other parts of the. In this case, reflecting on the Decalogue with

¹²⁷There is always a way out for anyone seeking for solution to his/her wrongdoing. It might have begun with the fathers’ wrong doing, but it can be cleansed by asking for forgiveness or speaking to elders of the land.

¹²⁸ The inter-text to be considered is based on themes found within the Decalogue and not on other similar textual forms. Although the priestly Decalogue in Exodus 33-34 may be an older form of the text, other forms of it exist as well in the Scriptures, like Lev. 20, but may not be referred to in this inter-text analysis. The reason is that they did not specify the transgenerational sin or what one refers to later as sin of the ancestors. One has decided to avoid Numbers 14:18 from the intertextual analyses for various reasons as limit, context and other textual details.

regards to the Sabbath, is an important theme for the exile. This reflects how parents' unfaithfulness, necessitated the need for re-commitment and the Sabbath. The late post-exilic life gave birth to a significant practice for the covenant people.

3.5.1 Oral-Scribal Intertexture

According to Robbins (1996:40) "Oral Intertexture" is the manner in which the language of a text is used outside the text. This device is used to compare several versions of text. Robbins lists five rhetorical devices for using language outside the text, viz. recitation, re-contextualization, reconfiguration, narrative amplification and thematic elaboration. Though not all of these features of "Oral Intertexture"¹²⁹ are found in a classical passage like the Decalogue, two rhetorical devices occur in the text under study: recitation and re-contextualization. Schiffman (2009:336) says the "Oral Torah" existed as an authoritative interpretation of the copy written later. The Torah was transmitted orally and preserved, until it was written as literature for future use by God's people. Both the written and the oral versions served as complementary Scriptures which the Rabbis used to teach. What Moses heard and learned from YHWH was passed unto the people; these texts both had equal authority and status in the society. Later it was taught from scroll while the law was recited orally in the Tannak. It is these oral laws that gave rise to the Pharasaichal Judaism, rabbinic tradition and the Talmudic practice to develop to written law, even in the face of numerous beliefs of rabbis.

Avery-Peck (1992:34) adds that the law revealed to Moses came in two parts, the oral and the written aspects. The oral was a formulation, memorized for oral transmission. Judaism believes the oral was first given/taught through Moses, who repeated to Joshua and to the elders, then to the prophets and it was transmitted to others. The Torah, on the other hand, was observed as God's law. Niditch (1996:117-118) explains the composition of the classical prophetic corpus and the oral performances which originated through oral composition, distinct from the style of those written by the prophets, and proof that the documents were the works of those familiar with such formulation. Again, the most important thing was that the written copy was not considered superior over the oral version in terms of authority. It was word of mouth transmitted by Moses' generation, Verhoef (2009:284) observe it was a

¹²⁹The Words of the Decalogue are carefully crafted in various styles, tones and language. The emphasis is that the law seems to have been narrated (story-like form) before its documentation as canon. One notices the declarations, apart from the preceding and succeeding verses, are a meta-narrative. Perhaps YHWH's hatred for sin now comes as the reason for the Decalogue. The emphasis at this era was obedience to God and to the emperor.

repetitious teaching done by reciting the collection of traditions or legal rulings. They are orally transmitted to other generations by the rabbi just as in the Mishnah. Similarly, the story in Deuteronomy was first narrated orally from the exile to post-exilic life; the words were known but hereafter existed prior to the transcription for religious and social purposes. Thus Decalogue¹³⁰ developed in the post-exilic period and was used to live in the way of YHWH their God.

3.5.2 Recitation¹³¹

The title could be ‘Recital’ orations; it encompasses the replication of exact words that were received. This is either in spoken (enunciated) or written forms. Such features of narrative are portrayed in the Decalogue¹³² as receiving from YHWH what is recounted to the people after the exile. For instance, in Exodus 20:1-17, the account shows the words were recited in a different context, as though they are copied and certain additions made. Houtman (2000:16) says God spoke/announced the ordinances that are to be the basis of the agreement between him and his people. YHWH first introduced himself, as “I am Yahweh, your God, who...” and Moses translated to Israel, showing that YHWH demands respect and obedience. He loves you and wants you to reciprocate by making him your only God. Biddle (2003:101-102) affirms that Deuteronomy 5:4 claims that God spoke face to face with Israel on mount Horeb to confirm their covenant. Nevertheless, they preferred Moses to intercede/mediate¹³³ for them before God. They were afraid of making direct contact with YHWH their God. A clear example of recitation between Deuteronomy¹³⁴ 5 and Exodus 20 serves as the foundation of this thesis, and for understanding “Sin of the fathers upon the children”.

¹³⁰The argument is, which version of the Decalogue came first and which should be regarded as the second law in the Torah? The one that refers to exodus and Sabbath, or that which is motivated by creation?

¹³¹It is a transmission of speech from God through Moses to Israel, so that they knew the law by oral means. They were retold in order to remember their God. The way YHWH made use of the law indicates commitment and urgency.

¹³²Although part of the Decalogue was also recited in Exodus 34, but not in details like Exodus 20.

¹³³YHWH is a consuming fire. It is better to speak through Moses than to hear him directly. His presence may cause calamity, just his voice thundered and caused many to tremble, not to talk of hearing his voice directly. For this reason, they cried and pleaded with their leader to stand for them before their God. It could either be due to respect/shame or possible guilt feelings, but they feared God’s presence.

¹³⁴Deuteronomy will be abbreviated as (Dt.) in some instances while Exodus will be (Ex.). In Dt.5:1 Moses summoned all Israel and said: Hear, O Israel the decrees and laws I declare in your hearing today. Learn them and be sure to follow them. Dt.5:2 The Lord our God made a covenant with us at Sinai/Horeb. Dt.5:3 It was not with our fathers that the Lord made this covenant, but with us, with all of us who are alive here today. Dt.5:4 The Lord spoke to you face to face out of the fire on the mountain. Dt.5:5 (At that time I stood between the Lord and you to declare to you the word of the Lord because you were afraid of the fire and did not go up the mountain.) This section is only found here, nothing of this sort appears in the Exodus account. Interestingly, this section indicates the details of how everything began, a detail that points to Deuteronomy’s originality. In these verses, Moses gathered the people, with the purpose of informing them or teaching them what YHWH desired

The recitation incorporates the imitation or copying of the exact words in the text as they were received. Notice the similarities in words between both texts, it is obvious that one them copied the other. It was spoken to Israel as a people and the written copy given for Israel as well. It started thus; **Dt.5:6** “I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery. **Ex.20:2** “I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery. See other instances of recitation as the narrative progresses from vs.6-11. ¹³⁵אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבְּיַת עַבְדִּים:

Dt.5:7 “You shall have no other gods before me.

Ex.20:3 “You shall have no other gods before me. לֹא יִהְיֶה לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עִלַּיִן:

Dt.5:8 “You shall not make for yourself an idol in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below. **Ex.20:4** “You shall not make for yourself an idol in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below. לֹא-תַעֲשֶׂה-לְךָ פֶסֶל כָּל-תְּמוּנָה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל וְאֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ בְּאֶרֶץ מִתְּחַת וְאֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם מִתְּחַת לָאָרֶץ

Dt.5:9 You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, **Ex.20:5** You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, לֹא-תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם וְלֹא תַעֲבֹדֵם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל קַדָּא פֶקֶד עוֹן אָבוֹת עַל-בָּנִים וְעַל-שְׁלֵשִׁים וְעַל-רְבָעִים לְשִׁנְאֵי

Dt.5:10 but showing love to a thousand generations of those who the love me and keep my commandment.

Ex.20:6 but showing love to a thousand generations of those who the love me and keep my commandment. וְעֲשֵׂה חֶסֶד לְאֲלֵפִים לְאֹהֲבָי וּלְשֹׁמְרֵי מִצְוֹתַי: ׀

Dt.5:11 “You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God, for the Lord will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name. **Ex.20:7** “You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God, for the Lord will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name. לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת-שֵׁם-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׁוּא כִּי לֹא יִנְקוּהוּ יְהוָה אֵת אֲשֶׁר-יִשָּׂא אֶת-שְׁמוֹ לְשׁוּא: ׀

Dt.5:12 “Observe the Sabbath day by keeping it holy, as the Lord your God has commanded you.

Ex.20:8 “Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy. שָׁמֹר אֶת-יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְשׁוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ

Dt.5:13 Six days you shall labour and do all your work,

Ex.20:9 Six days you shall labour and do all your work. שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וְעָשִׂיתָ כָּל-מְלַאכְתֶּיךָ:

of them in the covenant. It was therefore an arrangement made before the agreement with all those that were present and alive, not ancestors. It was a covenant of urgency and determination. It is where Moses spoke according to what YHWH instructed him. This is also recited and re-counted in other parts of the Scriptures as seen below.

¹³⁵Van der Merwe, C. (2004). *The Lexham Hebrew-English Interlinear Bible* (Dt. 5:6). Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press. Since the Decalogue in Deuteronomy is earlier, one will use only the words of the Deuteronomist to show the Hebrew of the text of the other. There is no Dt.5:15 and Ex.20:11 for the reason that it was not recited.

Dt.5:14 but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your ox, your donkey or any of your animals, nor the aliens within your gates, so that your manservant or maidservants may rest as you do.
Ex.20:10 but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your animals, nor the aliens within your gates. **וְיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּתוֹ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כָל־מְלָאכָה אַתָּה וּבִנְךָ וּבִתְּךָ וְעַבְדְּךָ וְאִמְתְּךָ וְשׁוֹרְךָ וְחֲמֹרְךָ וְכָל־בְּהֵמָתְךָ וְגֵרְךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעְרֵיךָ לְמַעַן יָנוּחַ עַבְדְּךָ וְאִמְתְּךָ כָמוֹךָ:**

Dt.5:16 “Honour your father and mother as the Lord your God has commanded you, so that you may live long and that it may go well with you in the land the Lord your God is giving you. **Ex.20:12** “Honour your father and your mother, so that you may live long in the land the Lord your God is giving you. **כְּבֹד אֶת־אָבִיךָ וְאֶת־אִמְךָ** כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לַמַּעַן יֵאָרְיֶכָּ וְיִלְמְעוּ יְיָיִךָ וְלִמְעַן יֵיטֵב לָּךְ עַל הָאָדָמָה אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לָּךְ: ס

Dt.5:17 “You shall not murder. **Ex.20:13** “You shall not murder. **לֹא תִרְצַח:** ס

Dt.5:18 “You shall not commit adultery. **Ex.20:14** “You shall not commit adultery. **וְלֹא תִנְאָף:** ס

Dt.5:19 “You shall not steal. **Ex.20:15** “You shall not steal. **וְלֹא תִגְנֹב:** ס

Dt.5:20 “You shall not give false testimony against your neighbour. **Ex.20:16** “You shall not give false testimony against your neighbour. **וְלֹא־תַעֲנֶה בְרַעְיָה עַד שָׁוְא:** ס

Dt.5:21 “You shall not covet your neighbour’s wife. You shall not set your desire on your neighbour’s house or land, his manservant or his maidservant, his ox or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbour.”
Ex.20:17 “You shall not covet your neighbour’s house. You shall not covet your neighbour’s wife, or his manservant or maidservant, his ox or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbour.” (NIV) These are recitations¹³⁶ of one another between texts. **וְלֹא תַחְמֹד אִשְׁתׁ רַעְיָה ס וְלֹא תַחְמֹד בַּיִת רַעְיָה שְׂדֵהוּ וְעַבְדּוֹ וְאִמְתּוֹ שׁוֹר וְחֲמֹר וְכָל־** אֲשֶׁר לְרַעְיָה: ס

One feels that there are reasons why the same words were repeated and recited; it may be for remembrance purposes, and historical transmissions. It could be a teaching method for the generation unborn, and possibly recited to indicate the significance of their God, YHWH. The method is adopted for the future of the land and their dignity. Their ignominy and shame points to what YHWH warns; to save national and socio-religious pride that was once snatched from them. These references connect to the context where children lamented over

¹³⁶Note that **Dt.5:15** and **Ex.20:11** are not recited in the other, hence they are absent for they do not fit here.
וּזְכַרְתָּ כִּי־עָבַד הָיִיתָ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וַיִּצְאֶךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִשָּׁם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה וּבְיָמִינָה עַל־כֵּן * צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת: ס

In this chapter we compared only the two references for this research, in the next chapter we shall see recitation that entails most of the Old Testament. There are other verses in both Old and New Testament that either referred to these or reconfigured it to explain certain teachings in the Scriptures. Due to the limit and space of this work, only these verses were considered, although there are still many verses of the Scriptures that copied word for word what is written here but not the whole, as happens in these two passages.

the sin of their fathers and the consequences upon them. Prophets Ezekiel and Jeremiah made use of similar proverbs/metaphors in their “Sour grapes¹³⁷” theology.

3.5.3 Re-contextualization

It is obvious that the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5 has been re-contextualized¹³⁸ in Exodus 20 and other Scriptures. The context changed from exile to wilderness, a place where they experienced pain, difficulty in decision making and the choices they had to make to follow Moses, YHWH’s servant or YHWH their loving God. Likewise, there is perhaps the orally related account in Deuteronomy 5 while they were living in exile as brothers, in families, clans and tribes, a communal life prior to the exodus, the one that later became necessary to be repeated by reciting the law before they entered the promised land. It was probably for the sake of the younger generation that had not been present at Horeb/Sinai when it happened. These commandments are also found in other parts of the Scriptures and the ancient socio-religious books. It is significant to know that these rhetorical devices are employed to paint the great picture of YHWH’s sovereignty. The author used re-contextualization to showcase God’s attributes, which include his almighty power to create, recreate and to destroy. One will enjoy protection if they obey, or be chastised if they sin. God’s love includes justice.

The text seems personal and propositional according to Wright (1996:95): the Lord your God, the Lord that hate idol/images or rival deities, is the only God. You should have no other apart from Him, have nothing to do with idols/rival deities or any form of religious image. This means the monotheistic YHWH should be understood as one God, greater than any deity¹³⁹. Hence Israel should not compare him with any other idol in their neighbourhood. This emphasis in Leviticus 26:1 differs from the multitude of gods around Israel, or from the manifestation of forms of Baalism among the Canaanite cults. Though YHWH is one God, and YHWH is his personal name, he is the only one that should be referred to by that name. Merrill (1994:416) asks, should the gracious God be angry with Israel if they rebelled against him? He is the one who created them, and also saved them out of bondage and captivity. This is the one who blessed Israel throughout their national existence, and Israel now needs to

¹³⁷Both prophets made use of certain devices to delve into the issues that affect the exiles. It will be detailed later to show their relationship and how it helps the understanding of the context.

¹³⁸As noted above, the intertexture is not based on forms, but instead on themes related to transgenerational sin.

¹³⁹YHWH introduced himself while in other instances he contextualizes himself as their God, “the Lord your God”. “You shall have no other god before me”. YHWH shall be your only deity. YHWH who is duty-bound to love Israel has no option but to punish his elected children to their third and fourth generation because of their rebellion against his laws. This same God was divorced by his precious possession, by his covenant partners and by his committed children, wife and partner, creating a picture of shame before their Creator.

reciprocate. Deuteronomy 32:17-18 indicates that their only God exists alone. His loving kindness towards his people made him fight on their behalf. Yet God disciplines and corrects those who reject him, if they choose idols or foreign gods over him.

Due to the fear of being tagged with shame, a highest negative value that runs among them, they should serve no other gods apart from YHWH. This perhaps is what their fathers did, that led to the exile. In Deuteronomy 32:17, they sacrificed¹⁴⁰ to demons which are not God. This is contrary to the agreement they had entered with Yahweh, people that expect YHWH's fulfilment of promises. Brueggemann (2001:279-280) says they responded to YHWH as irresponsible, ungrateful and stupid people. They were no longer are ready and hence forgot how they depended on him. They violated the first commandment of their Creator, who is merciful, who had been transposed to a devouring fire, betrayed by his people. They became infidels and betrayers who deserved the treatment due to sinners. Similarly, in Leviticus 26:1, they were forbidden from idols. Koole (1997:236) explains that while Isaiah 42:6a said "I am the Lord", and 42:8 added "I am the Lord, that is my name! I will not give my glory to another," the Lord must be distinguished from other gods; this was made clear by YHWH himself unto his servants. The mention of His name reminds Israel of his faithfulness, and simultaneously of his hatred towards other gods, that have never proven themselves before Israel. In addition, Isaiah 42:21b says, "Was it not I, the Lord? And there is no God apart from me, a righteous God and saviour; there is none but Him".

According to Levinson (2008:57-58) this is an indication that the Jews who are seeking for shelter from Yahweh, ought to be duty-bound to his terms and condition. YHWH their loving God is able to act beyond assistance. He saved his love once and kept promises to those that obeyed him. The social life of the people should be better organized now; alternatively, they have more religious allegiance to pay with greater rituals to perform for YHWH. Psalm 31:7 points out that God hates those who trust in idols or worthless images as their object of worship, objects that need human help and support; they cannot speak nor provide for the needy. It reflected a series of exilic and post-exilic textures with grumblings, which confirms the historical and theological conditions raised by the Decalogue. To advance this argument,

¹⁴⁰ This is a pre-exilic problem where they engage with God, in a place where sacrifice was a way of pleasing YHWH. Instead they made sacrifices to demons; this was a practice prior to the Decalogue, one that their God prohibited. Gods they had not known, those that recently appeared to them, these are gods their fathers did not give respect to. The intention is to solve the problem of their object of worship and to pay respect to YHWH who alone delivered them from Egypt. Then the implementation of the covenant curse upon his chosen generation will not be. This shows how Israel is now in danger of forgetting their God.

we should notice the use of the names of God repeatedly, to re-contextualize the text for their understanding. He guarantees his trustworthiness before his people, as one who is mighty in battle, fighting kings and nations. Deuteronomy 6:5, 32:17-18, Isaiah 42:8, 45:21, Jeremiah 4:1, Ezekiel 8:9-12.

3.5.4 Reconfiguration¹⁴¹

Robbins (1996:50) indicates that this device duplicates an event by recounting a situation in such a manner that it becomes a “new” event. This is visible in the Decalogue where the text is stepped forward from emphasis either on YHWH alone as God, or on his name alone as holy, or for a day set aside for him alone. This is used to emphasise the significant place of God in Israel’s history. Hence topics like monotheism, the significance of YHWH’s name to the society, the holy Sabbath observance, the respect for parents and others civil duties have been reconfigured to emphasize the place of YHWH their God in the Scripture.

3.5.5 Narrative Amplification

The question to ask in this regard is, what necessitates the amplification of a texts? Gunn and Fewell (1993:1) explain narratives¹⁴² as stories from parts of the human life in the biblical world, as influenced by cultures, genre and various experiences of their past. This feature according to Robbins (1996:51) extends the composition of a narrative by recitation and re-contextualization. Similarly, Rhoads (2009:222) feels that narrative amplification implies a methodology of analysing a story-like text to clarify the main idea. In the Decalogue narrative¹⁴³ could be considered absent from the main part, or the Decalogue¹⁴⁴ in itself being

¹⁴¹ Reconfiguration is noticeable within the text, but not as the other two above. As such less time is given to issues that are reconfigured. In the future one will look at issues that are reconfigured in other texts.

¹⁴²This device (narrative amplification) has been used to explain certain topics, though it is not the main rhetorical device in the Decalogue. Narratives shape people’s lives and re-order understanding of life in a specific context. They use characters, time, sequence, plot, suspense until they reach a climax of the story, as features that aid understanding.

¹⁴³Narrative criticism in Old Testament, arose from the analyses of narratives like the exodus of Israel from Egypt (Rhoads, 2009:222). Furthermore, Amit (2009:223) explain that narrative is the main genre in Old Testament and biblical literature. It is used to describe the real past which took place in history. They are mostly in a continuous form and sequence, describing an issues or experience. The authors who were mostly scribes and members of the intellectual circle, knew that stories were the best way of spreading a message to appeal to the various class in the society. Seidl (2010:713) affirm that narratives form the most part of the Bible stories; they express the means of social communication in genre. They are analysed by examining the various aspects of the story, its locations, the people involve and the scenes created. Hence, the Decalogue has been quoted at various times by leaders, prophets and priests, including Christ himself in the New Testament as in Matthew 5. In this study, neither Exodus nor Deuteronomy will be a superior law or inferior law. Rather, one will argue focusing on both as laws that existed (documented) and later attempt to show which is before the other.

¹⁴⁴It can be seen that the neither Exodus nor Deuteronomy have been concluded to come first, but from all indications Deuteronomy precedes in setting the foundation. In Deuteronomy the exodus served as motivations for the Sabbath, while creation was the reference for motivating the Sabbath in Exodus.

the story. On the other hand, it may be seen as part of the continuous story. This is understood from the use of the שָׁמַע to refer to the Sabbath in the exodus story. Hence the Decalogue must have been amplified beyond the original story of the exodus from Egypt unto the purpose of obedience and faithfulness to God on weekly basis.

a. שָׁמַע as YHWH's Supremacy in Deuteronomy 6:4-5

The command שָׁמַע (hear) formed part of the narrative context where the Decalogue was revealed to Israel. Perchance “Hear, O Israel” (vs.3) is related to the need to listen¹⁴⁵ to God. The opening verse indicates the oneness of YHWH, “Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one” (vs.4). In this sense, the context points to YHWH as a personal as well as relational God¹⁴⁶ of the land. In this relationship, the writer says to Israel, “Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul and with all your strength” (vs.5). Deuteronomy 6:12 whispered to Israel, not to forget the Lord their God who had brought them out of Egypt, the land of slavery. In addition, Miller (1990:97) observes that the שָׁמַע is the central part of the words in Deuteronomy. It is illustrated in the teaching to “hear” and to “love” the Lord their God. This is the bridge that connects YHWH and his people for appreciating Deuteronomy 12-26, the commandments and statutes of the Lord. This was not legalistic, but rather a true realization that those who live under the rule of YHWH in the land should set their hearts daily on God’s injunction. This struggle is an effort to experience the confession of the שָׁמַע as a reality that will achieve blessings and prosperity for Israel”. Weinfeld (1992:170) adds that the Esarhaddon treaty dated to 672BCE, provided new materials to better their understanding of the functioning of the covenant. The VTE has stipulations of a political nature which refer to the vassal and the suzerain. In VTE and Deuteronomy there are assembly and mutual obligations that tie the parties under the theology of cause and effect: Deuteronomy 27-28 contains blessing and curse just as in Joshua 24, during the ceremony of the re-commitment to YHWH. This oath of loyalty imposed by YHWH demands their commitment and obedience.

¹⁴⁵Listening is one way of using ones’ ears in order to pay attention to God’s message at the beginning of the Decalogue. Although it serves as a good teaching method of the ancient times, perhaps it is adopted to effectively teach the younger generation. At this moment one observe the seriousness and the urgency of avoiding the sin of the fathers among God’s people. History at times is good memory, but this time it reminds them of various bad times and painful moments. שָׁמַע (listen) is significant for the covenant generation and the Decalogue recipients.

¹⁴⁶In it we see again, an assumption of one God while acknowledging the existence of others gods/deities, in which Israel must make their choice to worship only YHWH their God.

It was a daily practice that should aid obedience among the younger ones, Niditch (1996:100) said the עֲמֻנָה is to be taught to one's children literally by memorization and repetition. They are to speak them at home, when they sit, when they lie down or when they wake up, while walking on the way and in all situations; the status quo allows room to memorise the word of God. This is fashioned to guide the way Israel conducted its life and society. The law¹⁴⁷ was spoken in the context of the oral tradition as symbolic and iconic witness of YHWH. Equally, Leviticus 26:3-13 constitutes varying enumerations of blessings that come with the condition of obedience. The use of "I will give" and "I will look" with favour, suggests that vs.4, 6, 9 and 11 correspond to ancestral promises for possessions of their own, such as land, offspring and the fact of YHWH's presence, as he said "I am with you and will watch over you wherever you go, and I will bring you back to this land. I will not leave you until I have done what I promised you" (Genesis 28:15). Exodus 29:45-46 indicates his promise to dwell among Israel, to be their God, and them, his people (Willis 2009:222).

b. YHWH as Conditional Lover אֱהָבָה in Exodus 34:7

In keeping with this, YHWH is considered a conditional lover, for his relationship with people is based upon certain conditions, to "bless or to curse". Exodus 34:7 says "*maintaining love to thousands and forgiving wickedness, rebellion and sin...*" indicates that YHWH is compassionate; he demonstrates his judgement justly (Exodus 32:14). His slowness to judge or be angered is now attested to from Israel's complaints (Exodus 14:11-

¹⁴⁷Concerning the עֲמֻנָה Bosman (nd:2) comments that it can be interpreted as the summary to the Torah/law, and also serves as an introduction to the Ten Commandments. The emphasis in Deuteronomy 6:4-5 "YHWH your God, YHWH is one" is one of utter commitment to love their God, to remember that YHWH is their God in Israel and that He is the only one. The translation shows a statement that portrays Israel's allegiance to "their God and only him, YHWH" (4:35, 39, 32:39) which fits into the context of loving God with the whole of their heart, soul and body. In another instance Bosman (nd:4) explains that the choice of Israel to love God is equally entrenched in God's promise to their fathers. Hence from the אֱהָבָה (loyal love) of YHWH for his people comes the mystery of one God, as well as the mystery of his election upon his people. Similarly, Bosman (nd:3) notes the עֲמֻנָה forms part of the opening verses of the Decalogue as a positive restatement of the law. In the text under question, Deuteronomy 5:1 states: "Moses summoned all Israel and said: Hear, O Israel the decrees and laws I declare in your hearing today. Learn them and be sure to follow them." In the case of Deuteronomy 6:4-5, it is repeated for emphasis and recounted to depict monotheism in this text. עֲמֻנָה in Deuteronomy 6:4-5 states "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God the Lord is one." Brueggemann (2001:83) affirms that the substance of the address draws Israel's attention to know that YHWH is fully their God. YHWH cannot be divided into pieces or images; He alone is to be God in Israel. This is a post-exilic background to the inkling of "sin of the fathers" whose consequences fell upon their grandchildren. Henceforth "I am the Lord" God who first loved you.

¹⁴⁸ אֱהָבָה "loyal love" is used synonymously with $\text{אֶהְבֶּה$ (dear love) to indicate a conditional lover. In this case אֱהָבָה could be translated as lover. This is not the same love that prophet Hosea talked about, but a form of loyalty that comes from the chosen people of God, with whom he decided to go into relationship and a lasting covenant. To YHWH, this love is unconditional, but to Israel, God requires their fidelity. Though he disciplines those who derail the agreement, yet He loves them if they repent and return to him. אֱהָבָה is love indicating both parties' commitment to the covenantal marriage and not the human type. This is why YHWH is a conditional/restrictive lover, who hates rivals and craves the loyalty of his people only to him, else they will be punished. The God who hates images, idols, gods, carvings and all forms of deities, could take his place in his people's heart.

12), but his unending love shows reliability (Durham 1987:454). He maintains his love upon thousand generations and removes their guilt, committing himself as God in the deal. Concurrent idolatry means disaster upon the land and a provocation of God's anger as well as judgement and pain upon their progenies. It is a treaty, about which Houtman (2000:708-709) points out that he uses his lips/mouth to speak and to make the declaration of the covenant, marking his zeal to extraordinary love¹⁴⁹, to guarding the relationship for a "thousand generations". This recalls his hatred of idolatry as in the covenant requirement. This kind of punishment comes with ancestral shame upon the children, due to past guilt. The honour of loving God is being contrasted with the shame of the idolatrous parents.

God's grace is conditioned on obedience, says Fretheim (1991:302), and his grace functions to indicate that God's wrath is not a continuous aspect of his nature, but a response to a breach of the covenant agreement. He is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love. He is faithful and willing to forgive their iniquities/guilt, however it is on condition of their loyalty. His jealousy is now informed by this conditional love; and their lack of respect is shame toward God. Meyers (2005:264) holds that God's attributes of love, justice, forgiveness and grace indicate the requirement of Israel's accountability for their doing wrong. The scar¹⁵⁰ of their past sins requires that they be disciplined in the new society. Dozeman (2009:736-738) indicates that the gracious character of YHWH is a reflection of divine grace and his punishment. In the non-priestly history, grace is unconditional. This nature of God reveals the divine passion conveyed in the imagery of conditional marriage. The focus is on the violent emotion of the offended lover that results in visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children.

God is capable of hating the violators of the covenant and his vengeance is leashed upon God's haters. Interestingly, even in hatred Yahweh acts slowly in his vengeance, up to the third and fourth generation. The desire to chastise his people and not throw them away indicates his willingness to withhold immediate anger. Steadfast love in the Decalogue is

¹⁴⁹The LXX puts it maintaining justice and mercy. The part of the sentence shows a contrast, that the guilty will not be cleared, though they may be forgiven, but a day of judgement awaits those that refuse to turn to Him. Hence the Lord visits the sin of the fathers upon the children and generation of those that hate him.

¹⁵⁰ Even before the exile, the service to idols and images were prohibited in the rabbinic era, even before they were incorporated into the Jewish liturgy or into the Creedal document. Again, the notion is, though they returned and received forgiveness, they bore the stigma of their parent's sin, and the "sin of the fathers" still lingers. YHWH's love is conditional to obedience, but the fact that it lasts for a thousand generations contradicts the condition.

shown to his faithful followers. Thus the offended lover is patient to act! God's hatred is just for a short time and is accompanied by an opportunity to forgive his obedient followers and grant them the grace to return to him. On the other hand, when he loves, he does so for a thousand generations, a period that cannot be equated with the period of his anger. It shows that he is both a conditional lover and a God of mercy/grace.

c. YHWH as Conditional Lover יְהוָה in Deuteronomy 7:9

“*But showing love to the thousand generation that love and keep my commandments*” יְהוָה isn't a metaphorical expression but rather a reality of God's ability to love or give hope to those that love him. Just as he created the world and said it was good, that is how he loves the world/creatures. In this vein he is able to love a thousand generations. Craigie (1976:180) observes that sin of the fathers is a reference to the world's behaviour in the past, just as in modern times. The faithful were known by their love for God and their commitment. God's love is evident from his act of delivering his people. This testifies to his claims to be their only God, not just the one to be worshipped, but in all their life in exile and after exile (Merrill 1994:181). Tigay (1996:87) observes that the laws are essential to Israel, that YHWH wants them to know and have it written in their hearts that he is a faithful God, their promise keeper, yet jealous. Deuteronomy 32:16, shows he doesn't tolerate compromisers that mix deities. Deuteronomy 4:24 and 6:15 pictures God as a jealous God who hates other deities and covets the loyalty of his people.

YHWH proved his claims to be faithful in the past, (Wright 1996:116-117) and because he is God, his character is seen in his faithfulness to keep covenantal love¹⁵¹. By contrast the polytheistic Canaanites and their neighbours should in no way influence their lives or loyalty to YHWH. There is a parallelism here between the lovers of God and his haters: each chooses a result, but the consequences may affect their future. Moreover, Brueggemann (2001:96-97) observe that YHWH has set his heart on Israel, and expects them to do likewise, seeing that he is faithful. He has made a commitment to love his people, his intension is not to punish; his intension is rooted in his willingness to enter into a covenant with them and to sustain the ancient covenant he made with their forefathers. Christensen (2001:156-157) affirms that

¹⁵¹It is either love/bless or hate/punish in relation to God, leaving no room for compromise; the responsibility remains the people, knowing there are consequences for their choice. Although he doesn't forget his role or promise, he desires them to be responsible to their oaths.

God is faithful in maintaining steadfast love¹⁵² to those who keep his commandments, up to a thousand generations. God's here is not a hater or punisher but rather one who loves.

d. Imagery of YHWH as a Restrictive Lover¹⁵³ in Jeremiah 18:7-10

The imagery of a lover is not only conditioned but restricted to the obedient. Just as the potter's imagery depicts the lover and the loved. This reflection helps Brueggemann (1988:160-161) in demarcating this prophetic text as starting from 18:1-12, a section where trends of retribution are prevalent. Jeremiah observed that the potter has control over the clay. This indicates a device of conditioning the relationship. The Creator still sustains his people, both sinners and the obedient. This metaphor of the potter is evoked in vs.7-10, where retributive¹⁵⁴ "Ifs" are used in double sequence (18:7-8 and 9-10). The ability of the potter to play with the clay and the inability of the clay to react on its own is significant. Huey, Jr. (1993:181) said the symbolism of the potter indicates YHWH, while the clay could be applicable to any other nation of the earth. This is to say, if at any time a nation responds to God, he will alter his plans, especially regarding those he plans to uproot. God's standard is to be followed, YHWH blesses one who shows him love and reverts his punishment upon those that repent. Interestingly, he allowed Israel (his clay) the privilege of making him change his decision, depending on their behaviour towards him.

In the same way, divine sovereignty precedes all human response that triggers his response to their need. Allen (2008:213-214) considers 18:1-12 as prose that symbolizes God's way of love. There is a disparity between vs.2-6 and 7-10 with regard to the message and style of the text. The activity of uprooting and demolishing, parallels with the planting and building; one is on the positive while the other is on the negative. According to Longman III (2008:139-140) who seals it in simple terms, the text addresses the house of Israel and challenges them to reconsider their ways. The potter (God) calls on the clay/Israel to make things right, and YHWH reserves the right to select whether to build/plant or to uproot/destroy.

¹⁵²Indeed YHWH chose to love his elected people, Israel, and he will continue to shower them with love.

¹⁵³אָהַבָה has been defined as unconditional love of God or the loyal love God expects from his people. In this text, the love is represented using the image of a potter and clay he potter is seen as the creator who can also smash [the clay cannot be the "up-rooter"] the clay (Jeremiah 10:16).

¹⁵⁴ It is repeated severally to indicate YHWH's sovereignty over humanity. YHWH is ready to show justice, in a new dimension, to respond according to Israel's behaviour, he used "four Ifs" to indicate a condition that is accompanied by a promise to pluck, to build, to plant and to tear down (Brueggemann 1988:161). This is a clear portrayal of his conditional love based on a positive response from the other party.

e. An Illustration of the Restrictive Lover¹⁵⁵ in Jeremiah 31:29-34¹⁵⁶

A new covenant, and a new beginning is being illustrated from an agrarian perspective with the “sour grapes”. Brueggemann (1991:69-72) notes that it indicates a new (post-exilic) beginning for Israel and Judah, after the old (exilic) community was destroyed by God. YHWH intends good for the exile, which is why he uses vocabularies like “plant and build”, in the form of positive commands to suggest rebirth. Huey, Jr. (1993:279-286) explains that while they were in exile, they seem to have concluded that they were being punished unjustly, since they were not the ones who sinned, they did not “eat the sour grapes”; their fathers did. The proverb was an assurance that people ought to suffer for their sins (II Kings 14:6). Jeremiah 31:31-34 indicates a better future for Israel: a new covenant will announce a new beginning in their lives. The text proclaims a new freedom from the crippling shackles of the past, i.e. from the guilt that was either inherited or transferred upon the next generation from their parents who “ate the sour grape before they were exiled” (Allen 2008:355). Though consequences¹⁵⁷ are due, and whoever sinned ought to blame himself/herself. Breaking the covenant means national disaster and a collective responsibility upon the people, not merely individual obligation. Instead of the people breaking the covenant again, YHWH now gave them a Torah as a form of written revelation, viz. the Decalogue in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5. It is an analogous text to the Scriptures, but in a better form.

¹⁵⁵ יְהוָה the issue of YHWH’s jealous love ought to be replaced by loyal love in comparison to the covenant relationship. His intention is to build a family and a community of godly followers, from his people who listen to and keep the law. The love and blessing are embedded in the covenant stipulations, not the laws his people must keep, but rather the fact that God cares and plans good for his chosen people Israel.

¹⁵⁶ *Jeremiah 31:29-34* states that (29) “In those day people will no longer say, the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children’s teeth will be set on edge. (30) Instead, everyone will die for his own sins; whoever eats sour grapes, his own teeth will be set on edge. (31) “The time is coming,” declares the Lord “when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with house of Judah.”... (NIV). Brueggemann (1991:68-72) says God intends good life for the exile, that he is able to “plant and build”. Note that the destruction was already accomplished in 587BC and Israel’s restoration was still being anticipated. The destiny of the people is to an extent in their hands, depending on their choice and decision. Note the planting and building as indications of God’s to bless his people, as an intention of a loving God to his exiled people, especially the corrupt parents who neglected to care about their children. In vs.31-34 old and new covenant is not a reference to the Old and New Testaments, rather to the renewal and transformation of the new covenant community (the exile) as a type of Christian community that turned back to God. It indicates the Sinai community who were expelled to serve in obedience. They now show genuine solidarity, in line with his desire to bless he will break the viscous circle of disobedience and consequences. Grace/favour and blessings from YHWH have come to stay as result of their obedience. Allen (2008:355) agrees that the text proclaims a new freedom from the past bondage. Instead of the people breaking the covenant again, YHWH will give them the Torah in the form of written revelation.

¹⁵⁷ Unfortunately, even the miraculous revival could not turn the tide of the punishment for their parent’s transgression and the wrath they deserve. The revival was too shallow for them to change, they needed a transformation of character and understanding of God, not a new covenant tradition (usual agreement). It requires the right behaviour to be inculcated into the people, this is the picture of the agreement in the Decalogue Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 (Huey, Jr. 285-286).

f. Nature of the Restrictive Lover¹⁵⁸ in Lamentation 5:7

It is repeated again, “*Our fathers sinned and are no more, and we bear their punishment.*” According to Hillers (1992:164) the writer expresses sadness over sufferings his generation endures owing to the guilt of the fathers. As a form of judgement in terms of the new covenant stipulations, the sins of their fathers are visited upon them, as their sin and their parents’. Longman III (2008:390) observes that it is an acknowledgement that sin is the reason for their current tragic experiences in Judah. The praying community laments over what happened in the past to separate themselves from their father’s lineage, so that God will be compassionate to them. Salters (2010:350-351) affirms that the poet kept confessing and speaking about the mistakes of the past generation. According to him they are bound up in the sin with the past generation, which is why they could suffer for one another’s sin. It could be a way of humiliating them to do what YHWH desires. He detests sinners, so he permitted them to be forced into exile (586 BCE to Babylon). Once the wrong has been committed, the repercussion could be transferred to another generation for the reason that they bear the same custom and corporate nature of their society. Fathers in this context incorporate all the mothers and children in the land, indicating that when they sin, all have sinned. In their tradition, all who sinned were later punished through their offspring. This is why the lamenting children cried and said, “We and our parents have sinned against the covenant, both past and present.”

Furthermore, Huey Jr. (1993:486) blames the people for remembering their past alliances to foreigners and implies that their ancestors sinned by such relationships. The present generation is now bearing the consequences. Parry (2010:150) notes that it was the grumbling of the exiles which refers to their fathers as sinners, in a complaint that they do not know why they are being punished. “Our fathers sinned”, shows they deny their irresponsibility in their present predicament. Their fathers comprise their elders, leaders, religious and secular (priests, scribes and kings) and parents. The judgement is now laid upon the children as their lineage, by visiting retribution upon the community for what happened in the past. They feel

¹⁵⁸ It is a reflection of the corporate nature of human beings and how one’s behaviour can have an impact on others. We are one with our parents, and our grandparents or ancestors, whose behaviour is significant for the rest of the family. Thus, whatever affects the fathers has an impact on the children. It could be that no one will be punished for his parent’s misdeeds. However, in South Africa, the British children were not destroyed after the Afrikaners defeated them and took over leadership, similarly, the children of the Afrikaners are blamed for the apartheid regime. Unfortunately, some of them were not born during apartheid. Nonetheless they must bear the consequences whenever they see the scar of the past, how human beings suffered and died in pain, and honour the remembrance days that will remind them of the past. This explains a scar of a healed wound, not painful but the mark can be seen.

innocent of the charges laid against them. However, the issue is that in trans-generational corporate understanding of sin, the impact goes beyond the guilty to the innocent¹⁵⁹. It may be that they too did evil in the sight of YHWH, and their sin did not just impact the past.

g. The Impact of YHWH's Conditional Love in Ezekiel 18:2¹⁶⁰

As discussed in Jeremiah above, the prophet asks “*What do you people mean by quoting this proverb about the land of Israel: “The fathers ate sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge? “Fathers sin and their sons are smitten”*”. Greenberg (1983:327-328) finds that the statement conveys some unpleasant sensation transported by “teeth on edge” because fathers ate sour¹⁶¹ grapes. The issue here is the evil consequences of the fathers’ action being transferred to their sons; though sin deserves punishment the culprit should get it and not the innocent child who did nothing to deserve YHWH’s wrath. Brownlee (1986:282) notes that the proverb was related to people of Palestine in their destiny. It is probably placed to mark the regular alteration between city and land in Jerusalem and Israel. He added that inciting the older form of the proverb, Ezekiel deals with the pre-exilic situation, to caution parents about their action, lest they bring harm upon the generations to come.

It is an important moral choice which must be made by Israel. Cooper (1994:188) supports that the proverb was used by people to disavow personal responsibility as emphasized in both Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Block (1997:558) says the exile disposition towards their own involvement in Judah’s fate is encapsulated in the proverb cited by Ezekiel. Two things are essential, the unripe fruit of grapevine and the effects of the unripe grapes on the teeth. A description of the sensation¹⁶² of the unripe fruit in the mouth could be an idea of mockery of the system of divine righteousness. Recently, Tuell (2009:107-108) added that the proverb reflects the attitudes of the exile in their community. God pointed out their behaviour by using the proverb, so that the wise will reflect upon their post-exilic lifestyle. It shows our suffering could be a result of our parents’ misdeeds before YHWH our God. In like manner, it is important to know that there will be justice from God on the wrong-doer, while the

¹⁵⁹A simple illustration could be how young innocent white Africans in South Africa are blamed for the apartheid regime. A rule that took place when the teenagers weren’t born, now affects them as they are being told “they maltreated the blacks”. It is annoying and painful to be accused of something of which you know nothing, but the issue here is that since you are related to the culprit, you will be affected in some ways.

¹⁶⁰The idea in this verse is basically a proverb for the wise to learn, though it raises some concerns as to reasons why fathers should not receive the punishment for their sins, instead of its bearing upon the children.

¹⁶¹He adds that this means since the fathers ate up the unripe grapes, their children had nothing left to eat, and the question again is, why will it be so? It is clear that it was a popular culture with Palestine-Syria in spite of the unpleasant taste in the mouth.

¹⁶²According to Block (1997:558) the LXX is inconsistent in its reading on the proverb by translating it to “set on edge” as in Jeremiah 38:29. It could carry other meanings as well.

righteous will enjoy love and. The address is not just about punishment, but rather on the blessings that await the obedient. YHWH is willing to bless but on the condition that they will follow him as their God. He is concerned with what pleases him before he blesses Israel. In like manner African cultures believe any child who obeys will receive their parental blessings. It is not their pleasure that matters in such traditions but what will be considered good in the eyes of other observers. More so, such themes make most African people strive towards blessing and honour, to please their community.

3.5.6 Thematic Elaboration and Inter-text with Deuteronomy 5:12-15

Robbins (1996:52) explains this rhetorical device as one which serves as an alternative to narrative amplification above. Thematic elaboration¹⁶³ uses argument from opposite, rational analogies and testimony to elaborate a text. It operates not just by extension or expansion of a text, but as a situation where other themes emerge, and are argued further thematically. There are few thematic developments in the Decalogue and other passages of the Old Testament. The text began with a prologue referring to God hating idols or images as deities, then emphasis was laid on his name followed by a special day set aside to remember God's past acts as a Sabbath, and others. The Sabbath **Vs.12-15** and its occurrences is an important correlation for this study.

In **Dt. 5:15** the community is requested to “Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the Lord your God brought you out of there with an outstretched arm. Therefore, the Lord your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day”. According to **Ex.20:11** “For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day. Therefore, the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy”. Among some notable aspects of this passage, are firstly, it is as a result of the need to worship YHWH alone that the Sabbath is created for worship; secondly, it is a day to remember YHWH's acts upon Israel; and thirdly, the Sabbath was a celebrations of the victorious liberation from Egypt through the mighty works of YHWH through the wilderness to Canaan. These three events appear in various parts of the Scriptures as we shall see.

In the Decalogue vs.12-15 is an important section that reflects Sabbath observance and regulations. This is so significant that a day of 24 hours is set apart to rest,¹⁶⁴ to take time to dwell in God's presence and to worship him. In this moment they reflected on their history and life journey, which enabled them to remember their faithful God. Exodus 16:23-30 and Deuteronomy 5:12-15 indicate that Sabbath observance was a crucial topic in Judaism. Childs (1977:290) notes that planning for the Sabbath came from YHWH as an essential

¹⁶³This device is used in a few instances and is hence not the main rhetorical device. It is important how it is used to expatiate on the worship and Sabbath observance. This section includes some intertextual analysis of the Sabbath from Deuteronomy 5:12-15, though only a handful of verses referring to the Sabbath will be mentioned here.

¹⁶⁴ Sabbath rest of the day starts from 6pm on Friday, a day before the Sabbath and ends at 6pm on the day of the Sabbath, as such the rest is 12 hours of night and 12 hours of day. This rest could be compared to the Sabbath rest in Genesis 2 where God rested after the creation. He also requires of us to take time to rest and reflect on what he did for us as our Creator.

socio-religious structure. Moses also elucidated the nature of the Sabbath rest as unto the lord. According to him, even though manna continues to fall on other days, the Sabbath is expected, so that Israel had to prepare well before the day. Durham (1987:255) confirms that “two omers per person” were to be collected, i.e. double those of other days, on the sixth day¹⁶⁵.

This indicates that Sabbath points to both their spiritual and communal life. God rested after the works. God rested after creation and saw how beautiful his works were; likewise Israel must rest to behold the beauty of the Lord their God. The rest is possibly the reason YHWH made the Sabbath day “a cessation period” to eat the manna he had provided. The Israelites observed the Sabbath as a holy day, sanctified by/for YHWH. Thus the message is for Israel to know that YHWH alone deserves to be God, especially as they remember the exile, slavery and suffering (Leviticus 23:3, 24, and 32). Hence the Sabbath was not just a religious activity during the post-exilic era, but a festival with cultural and socio-religious duties for the community.

a. *Deuteronomy 5:12-15 and Exodus 31:13-17*

There are various references to the Sabbath in the Scriptures, indicating its significance. Thus the theme of the seventh¹⁶⁶ day runs through the Old Testament, suggesting the quality of worship that must be given to YHWH (Durham 1987:412). Desecration of the day also meant desecration of their God. There was also the penalty of exclusion from community (Exodus 16:14-15), because YHWH has said the covenant is a sign of a continuous relationship. Stuart (2006:653) observes that the Sabbath is mentioned repeatedly to emphasize its significance in the land. On weekly basis, the Sabbath is to be kept, hence it appears here with the tabernacle of the Lord. There was honour, the Priestly and Levitical services, and all efforts put in to please YHWH their God.

¹⁶⁵The disobedient Israelites who went to collect manna on the Sabbath, found nothing. The day is to be set apart and be dedicated to the Lord. It is a day to celebrate. Enns (2000:325) agree that the Sabbath is the motivating factor why there is twice as much bread and manna falling on the sixth day. In preparation for Sinai.

¹⁶⁶In Fretheim’s (1991:270) opinion there are seven divine speeches that parallel with the seven days of creation and hence the significance of the seventh day of the Lord. These seven features are:

- I. Tabernacle and Sabbath preparations.
- II. God’s decision to review his covenant with Israel.
- III. God’s gracious response to Israel by means of the tabernacle.
- IV. God’s promise to dwell among them.
- V. The keeping of time in tune with the created order compared to Israel.
- VI. The hallowing of a place for YHWH.
- VII. Harmony, rest and preparation to serve only YHWH.

b. Deuteronomy 5:12-15 and Nehemiah 13:15-22

The Sabbath¹⁶⁷ שַׁבָּת remains an important aspect of the Israel's life after the exile. Nehemiah visited Judah, the Jews were not keeping the sacred day unto the Lord, but continued their daily tasks of making wine, carrying loads of grains on donkeys into Jerusalem and attending to their daily business (Fensham 1982:263-264). Nehemiah found out that they were engaged in various tasks even on the Sabbath to prevent the gentile traders from disrupting the day. In this way, the merchant was reminded of YHWH through the Sabbath new regulations. Allen and Laniak (2003:163) observe that it is because traders from other nations did not observe the Sabbath that people were asked not to sell in the Jerusalem market nor convey goods on the Sabbath. The guards were to stop them from coming in and to scare them away too.

According to Breneman (1993:272) the people were warned about the repercussions of not keeping the Sabbath, and apparently they were taken captive for not complying. Levering (2007:206-207) points out that Moses couldn't stop Israelites from their activities such as collecting manna on the Sabbath; God did, by not making it available, YHWH could see the difficulties leaders were going through in trying to control their followers. People such as the nobles of Judah were also involved in desecrating the law of the land. Another perspective to this is that, if Israel kept the Sabbath, the temple would be a thriving centre of worship for all nations. However, their disobedience amounted to destroying the image of YHWH and the dignity of their religious community. Nehemiah's solution was to close the gate, yet the foreigners were selling outside the gate. They could corrupt the people to stray from loving God. YHWH is jealous of his people's love, hence they should focus on their master and God, YHWH the "I am of Israel".

c. Deuteronomy 5:12-15 and Isaiah 58:14-16

In this context, Brueggemann (1998:193) says that one aim of the Sabbath was to display a public sign of faithfulness. The rest was for all members of the community, household and workers, the oppressed and the slaves to be given equal rest. They were to delight in the Lord and truly worship him as God, thereby witnessing to eunuchs and foreigners in the community about their God. Oswalt (1998:508) says the point is to focus their worship or rest

¹⁶⁷It was instituted to acknowledge that human existence as God's handiwork is more important than the struggle for survival. This is what will differentiate God's people from other nations. Nehemiah had to close the entrance gate to the city, Friday evening to Saturday evening. He appointed Levitical guards to each gate and all merchant had to sleep outside the gate with their goods, until after the Sabbath (Fensham 1982:264).

period on their God. It not just the religious activities that aims at celebrating a Sabbath, but worshipping YHWH. The purpose should be to bring people to the point of adoring God and expressing joy and dignity in them. Hanson (1995:206) says proper religious observance is the motif of the prophets as well. Since the Sabbath is a devotion to YHWH, Israel should strive to achieve the right status before YHWH. This called for a special concern in Jerusalem, where practice became popular and was known all over places that did business with Israel (Blenkinsopp 2003:181).

d. *Deuteronomy 5:12-15 and Jeremiah 17:21-24*

One of the aspects of covenant concerns concerning the Sabbath was to make the Israelites adhere to their God as a sign of their fidelity (Craigie, *et al.* 1991:239). If the new Israelites were to disregard the Sabbath as their fathers disobeyed God, there would be further captivity. Similarly, Huey, Jr. (1993:178) says the people were warned to prepare well for the weekly worship. This law contains most elements of the other laws to enable them serve their God, including for instance, buying and selling on the Sabbath, which appear in the pre-exilic prophecy of Amos 8:5 (Allen 2008:208).

It is against this background that Lundbom (1999:806) alleged this is among the easiest laws to keep, since it requires just observing the day's celebration and resting. Here Jeremiah was only concerned with how they prioritise their daily business over God's business. It looks as though the rich who want to do business did not like this idea as opposed to the poor, who like to rest from daily work. Moreover, Longman III (2008:137) affirms that God challenged his people through his prophet, pointing to them to remember how good and loving he has been. Their Kings, Priests, Levites, scribes and the rest of the people ought to be sure that everyone obey by keeping the Sabbath. The theme of the Sabbath appeared in almost every section of the Scripture, these are just few that were highlighted.

There appears to be continuity from the oral texture used to teach younger people by recitation. This text is among the most recited in other part of the Old Testament, at some point it is re-contextualized in a new setting and at another place it is reconfigured to fit the context. Most of all, the narrative is amplified in some occasions concurrently with elaboration of themes. There are other themes in the Decalogue, which appear in the

concluding¹⁶⁸ section of the text. They are cultic and social responsibilities related to YHWH, Israel and their community (Vs.16-21). These are criteria used in the society to correlate texts which raise social issues that relate to its ancient context.

3.6 Socio-Cultural Analysis

This type of analysis focuses on the social life, language and cultural practices of the people in the community where the text was/is found. Two important characteristics shall be analysed here, which show YHWH's love for his people¹⁶⁹. McConville (2002:19-20) says this book captured the story of Israel's journey through the wilderness, during the late exile to early post-exilic period when Israel was going into monarchic rule. The story was found in the Transjordan context. The commandments at Sinai/Horeb versus the agreement to keep the law/covenant were among the main issues. Although at this time their welfare needs became secondary to the law; this thesis noticed that their lament referred to the sin of the fathers. Not only God alone, but also the Assyrians and Babylonians were demanding obedience. Moses' speeches addressed a new generation that sprang up and reached adulthood in the wilderness, perhaps the first recipients of the law during the late exile to early post-exile (Walker 2009:121). Their first dialogue was basically a historical review of their parents' past. Moses had to persuade the people to pay attention, which is why we see various levels of repetition and recitation used for emphasis.

3.6.1 The Social Background of Israel's Society

The quest for the centre¹⁷⁰ of the Old Testament is an interesting study that led to various proposals on Deuteronomy. From the layers in the book one might accept "One God, YHWH", as the central message of this book. Conceivably the practice of "One God"

¹⁶⁸They include social and life ethics that any right-thinking human would avoid, like adultery, stealing, killing, false accusation and others. Importantly, the laws were to regulate the community with regards to their God and to one another. The community needed to keep their eyes on their Maker and Creator, to remember him as their only God, to achieve the purpose of the covenant. The covenant serves as a guide for attaining their role as servants of the living God. Other themes include, monotheism, respect, love and dignity to YHWH.

¹⁶⁹The words were those of YHWH and Moses was his instrument of communication. The speaker started in such a manner that he would capture their attention to their God.

¹⁷⁰See social roles and institutions in Israel. This idea stems from the belief that YHWH could be the central message and that faith traditions believe Moses wrote what YHWH told him (Deuteronomy 1:5). The Torah/Law as legal document, was the book of YHWH. Tigay (1996: xii) adds that the book consists of the life journey of Israel, the poem of Moses concerning Israel and the story of the farewell speech of Moses. It captures the commissioning of the next leader of Israel who superseded Moses. The book is organized in three form speeches of Moses; the narrative on Moses' death, the commission and taking over of Joshua and Israel's future after their sojourn in the wilderness (Brueggemann 2001:17). Joshua took over from Moses and had similarities with him. The book reports the journey, speeches and the death of the leader of Israel, on the way to the land of promise (McConville 2002:18-19).

emanated during the late exilic to early post-exilic period, in the course of Israel's sojourn, prior to their evolution. God designed their development, organizing a holy society under his authority. Merrill (1994:22) says Israel's society emerged from the Moabite plains in the wilderness, at the close of their journey from Egypt, prior to the conquest of Canaan (Deuteronomy 4:44-49, 34:1-4). Though they knew God before the monarchy (pre-exilic), they believed in his leadership but lost touch with him before the exile, and were invaded by the Assyrians and Babylonians (722BCE and 586BCE respectively). Until their deliverance (exilic), and early post-exile they became organized under one God "YHWH" whose laws guided the people. Deuteronomy falls within the Deuteronomistic history and Schmid (2012:8-10) demarcates the literary layers, historical context and literary core of the book, and the relationship between Deuteronomy and the covenant context. The Pentateuch has been widely accepted over the Tetrateuch as linking Joshua-II Kings without Deuteronomy. The narrative development from Genesis-II Kings had a break which lies around Number and Deuteronomy, in a pre-priestly context possibly prior to the second temple.

Moreover, McConville (2002:18-22) saw the "Law" in Deuteronomy as important, post-exilic reflecting their deliverance from exile and the plan to remain in relationship with God. Though reasons have been advanced to the purpose and meaning of Deuteronomy¹⁷¹, it is interesting that worship is centralized on YHWH in Jerusalem's Temple to show cultic significance. Investigations into idolatry practices indicate syncretic activities around Israel. Israel's society developed over time with a central idea of corporate life. They were to refuse rivals gods in order to dignify their God. Walker (2009:121-124) supposes that the farewell message of the book has the purpose of promoting religious reformation and focusing on their deity. This could be the reason that they abolished the high places and local sanctuaries of foreign gods. Worship was propagated in Jerusalem during the 8th-7th centuries BCE, in opposition to ancient patriarchal henotheism, the opposite of monotheism that was practiced.

¹⁷¹There are various meanings to the title of "Deuteronomy," from translations like the Latin Vulgate and LXX. Merrill (1994:21-22) quotes the first two words from Deuteronomy 1:1. In this sense the ancient writers referred the book as the second law, not from the title. It had been given to Moses and Israel about 40 year earlier. It is so rich in content and texture that Wright (1996:2) gave four approaches to the book; the speeches of Moses, the covenant forum, concentric literary pattern and the expanded Decalogue. The idea of the "repeated law" may be derived from the concept of LXX (Deuteronomy 17:18) (Walker (2009:121). This shows the long debate over the placement of the book. Walker (2009:124-125) adds that the traditional claim is that the book of Deuteronomy was first published in 626BC, when Hilkiyah found a law book in the Temple (II Kings 22:13) during the time of King Josiah. However, Jewish and Christian traditions point to Moses (about 40 time), mostly in the first person (Deuteronomy 1:16-18, 3:21, 29:5). In (4:5, 14, 5:31). Moses categorically taught Israel God's statutes, see Deuteronomy 31:9.

The teachings of Deuteronomy helped to organize Israel's faith and social life. It has set in motion a covenantal ethics that continued as a generative force in the revolutionary process. Brueggemann (2001:17-18) considered the book a formulation of the covenant theology, where Israel's God pledges exclusive loyalty and a relationship of fidelity towards his people. Moses addresses Israel in various ways in order to build a sustainable covenantal tie immediately during the early post-exilic event, after the wilderness sojourn. Both Moses and YHWH desired to see Israel acting with loyalty, especially in a new land. In this regard, YHWH was to ensure the well-being of Israel and on the other hand, Israel ought to trust and pay total allegiance to their God. It is likely during the Assyrian domination of the 8th or 7th centuries, prior to the exile, that they initiated the covenantal structures.

The exile described in Deuteronomy has great socio-religious significance for Israel, comprising Israel's history from Exodus to exile, beginning from Genesis to II Kings, or alternatively, from Israel's deliverance to the end of their independent state (Gertz 2008:376-377). This background of the origin of Israel introduces their situation in exile. Similarly, Bosman (2014:243-244) says this is the period of no-temple as a result of the exile¹⁷² imposed by Assyrian and Babylonian invaders (722 BCE and 586 BCE respectively), adding to the period of destruction of Jerusalem in 583 BCE, as well as 515 BCE, at the time of the second temple. The temple was destroyed in 70 AD causing great political and religious loss to God's people. Jeremiah and Ezekiel confirmed both deportations, although they differ in certain realities like the number of years spent in exile (70 or 40) (Jeremiah 25:11-12, 29:10 and II Kings 25 as in the deuteronomistic history). These explain how late exilic and early post-exilic life impacted on Israel's life. Though the exile depicts shame and disgrace for God's people, the Decalogue appears as a law to restore their dignity as human beings and answers hypothesis 1.3.

This indicates the significance of the Decalogue through covenant faithfulness. McConville (2002:19-21) stresses the end of Israelites' wandering when they were established as a nation. Their covenant helped in ordering Israel's life towards their God. It first brings to fore, unto the heart, the שמעו "Hear O Israel," Deuteronomy 6:4. Second, it emphasizes God's love and the injunction to 'love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul and might' (10:12). This differs from אהב (being dear): hence there are two important duties of the heart as covenant

¹⁷²Bosman (2014:243) describes the exile as a condition or feeling of homelessness while being under foreign rulers. It is a tough experience for a nation to endure and depicts shame and humiliation. YHWH allowed his people to experience this for the purpose of a lasting relationship.

loyalty, as echoed in Jeremiah 4:4 and Amos 5:21-24, and obedience to God, in consideration of God's grace in restoring the lasting relationship. The possibility of restoration follows from their repentance, as the way out of God's jealousy/punishment. Gertz (2007:528) clarifies that despite the "covenantal silence" in ANE, the 8th and 7th century marked certain differences when the prophets acted as spiritual mediators. They urged Israel to relate well with their national deity, clarifying the social context for the second hypothesis in 1.3. They are married to YHWH (Hosea 2:4-15, 3:1-4) through a legal contract that binds them in the covenant deal. This implies that the treaty had parallels to Deuteronomy, and Deuteronomistic¹⁷³ phraseology to a Neo-Assyrian treaty (Deuteronomy 13 and 28). Deuteronomy did not only relate the prophetic speeches of Moses and YHWH, it also presumes a certain relationship to the Torah and contains other features that urge obedience.

Biddle (2003:8) observes that in Moses' speech the narrative framework functions to set the Deuteronomistic code in two contexts, first Moses' address motivated by the concerns of transmission to future generations, and second, it relates the manner of the narration to the history of Israel's wandering and the early stages of the conquest of Canaanites. Now God is dealing with them as a nation established with various institutions. The treaty of blessing and curse emphasises a testimonial character that functions as call for obedience, applicable to the future generations. This could serve as an introduction to the Deuteronomistic history from Joshua to II Kings. Gertz (2007:528) shows that with the concept as YHWH's self-imposed fidelity on his people the covenant offers a good perception of their relationship: even while they were in exile, they understood YHWH as their God. Israel was aware of consequences, especially to their corporate society, incurred by disobedience; breaching the covenant was infidelity before YHWH.

Brueggemann (2001:20) considers the idea of entering the land from the plains of Moab as re-entry of Israel after their deportation. This accent upon "your little ones" (Exodus 1:39) and the future generations (Exodus 29:22), constitute the context of children to grandchildren of the deportees. The generation who sinned caused the exile (Deuteronomy 24:16);

¹⁷³Deuteronomy helped the exiled community in the 6th century after Jerusalem might have been lost. This informs the theological corpus of the Deuteronomistic history from Joshua – II Kings. Moreover, McConville (2002:19, 22-23) presumes the reforms of Josiah (II Kings 22-23) led to the discovery of D, a new law book in the temple similar to Deuteronomy (22:8). The book aims to centralize worship in the Jerusalem temple by abolishing all forms of rival deities/sanctuaries. It forms the beginning of priestly bureaucracy and religious control which was generated as P (exilic-priestly affairs). The exilic/early post exilic experience did not allow freedom, and no longer could they offer sacrifices nor feasts at these places. The reform led to the reduction of cultic activities, priestly control and the "sacral" religion at large.

to this the covenant is now indicating a faithful people. Ezra uses Deuteronomistic material to depict covenant and faithfulness, in developing his theology of restoration and new beginning in the Torah. Ezra emerged as a force in early post-exilic times (Nehemiah 8:1-8), while Josiah represents the older revolutionary reformers. Now Moses became the older tradition of change through the use of the Decalogue, Sabbath and the covenant. The Deuteronomist presents a theological growth that continues in exile as well as in post-exilic period (McConville 2002:25-26). The Assyrian treaty continues to influence Deuteronomy¹⁷⁴ strongly, and has been thought to have a decisive influence on the development of covenant theology. The background of their crisis came from the Assyrian threat in the 7th century, and the reform is often considered a response to ruling Assyrian powers. Biddle (2003:9) understood Jeremiah as similarly presenting another discovery of Deuteronomy, to an extent bearing the marks of Deuteronomic theology, and calling for obedience to YHWH. It would not be unreasonable to claim that, if proto-Deuteronomy had not been discovered, major parts of the Old Testament would have been difficult to interpret.

According to Brueggemann (2001:21) this informs why the Levitical priests who are heirs of Moses, became the designated keepers of the Torah and a force behind Deuteronomy. The prophetic movements became alive with Amos, Isaiah, Micah, Hosea and later Jeremiah, as both Deuteronomy and the prophets had influence on the Torah. This indicates a Levitical, prophetic as well as scribal influence in the book. The exclusive gifts and demands of YHWH insist on a single covenant loyalty. Significant for all aspects of Israel's and YHWH's social relationship is a justified economic order, viable public power, and faithful conduct in war as well as sustainable ordering of family life. Such institutional functioning defers to the normative memory of the Genesis patriarchs (?), the traditions of Moses and Israel's canonical history. McConville (2002:40) describes one of the dominant voices of Old Testament relating to "Zion" theology, as celebrating the Yahwistic choice of Jerusalem with the Davidic kingdom. God is to be worshipped in particular places; Jerusalem is now the destination God, unlike Baal at mount Ziphon. If Deuteronomy indicates for Israel what Yahweh seeks, Zion¹⁷⁵ theology reflects what actually became of the people.

¹⁷⁴Deuteronomy has set the background for understanding Israel's socio-religious development. The experience of the exile provided a ground for juxtaposing the experiences of post-exilic monotheism in Judaism. The polytheistic Canaanite's religion and the aniconic monotheism were part of the reforms of exilic Judaism, over the tradition of the post-exiles.

¹⁷⁵Most kings of Judah were unfaithful to their God, according to Deuteronomistic history, while Zion theology shows Yahweh is now dealing with Israel and causing their difficulties, leading to the exilic laments for "sin of

3.6.2 Specific Social Topics¹⁷⁶

In this category there are topics and groups that deal with substantive religious textures which contains specific ways of addressing the world. Such topics relate to religion and establish a relationship to the world of the text in a significant manner. Robbins (1996:72-73) lists possible responses of groups with different orientations who believe there are various ways of bringing about change in a society. These features were prevalent in the late exilic and early post-exilic era, at the beginning of the monarchy, perhaps immediately after the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles ended. It was around 722 BCE that both north and south were captured, and then some protest groups arose in opposition to the powers that enslaved them., The socio-cultural texture is analysed according to certain ideologies that include the ones below, though not all are relevant for this study (see footnote).

- a. **Conversionist¹⁷⁷**: They believed that the world is corrupt because of human corruption. The only way out was for humans to change their behaviour by assuming a new orientation; hence they strove to convert everyone. This group adhered to their belief despite difficulties. Nave (2006:728) explains conversion as “turning to” or “returning to”, in this sense the ideology was to return to a better life by obeying God. This group endeavoured to persuade everyone to obey their God, instead of the kings that were ruling. According to Brischofberger (2007:469) this is a religious process of total re-orientation in which an individual or group return to a new life.

the fathers” transferred “upon the children”. Deuteronomy is immersed in covenantal ideas, and it becomes clear that the covenant theology in the Decalogue is Deuteronomistic and early post -exilic.

¹⁷⁶ It appears that not all responses were relevant at this time. Other options include: **Revolutionist**: This response believed the world could only be saved by general destruction. In their opinion, supernatural powers had to intervene because humanity lacked the power to change the world. It shows Believers themselves can only be instruments of God but cannot influence the society. This assumption is not what the Decalogue presumed. **Introversionist**: They consider the world as an irredeemable evil, and unless one were removed from the world, one could not be saved. The means insulating YHWH’s society by observing the laws, not by introversion. **Gnostic-Manipulationist**: It says salvation is possible in this world if humans learn the right means of living, by such knowledge improve their techniques, and then deal with their problems of evil. They seek a transformed set of relationships with others. Similarly, the Decalogue shows that YHWH wishes to see his people become acquainted with him through the laws, both by learning and deeds. **Thaumaturgical**: This kind of response shows that human salvation is individualistic, while Israel is seeking for collective salvation of their land. Salvation to them requires personal involvement, comparable with a healing process or restoration from disaster. In this context it is not just personal but corporate, addressing not only the individual but the whole community of YHWH.

¹⁷⁷ They believe humans must change their behaviour, in order to achieve positive change in the human world. The philosophy here is “cause and effect”: if they change, the world will change, since they are the occupants of the society. It can be compared to the covenant which is geared to changing the society. The covenant between Israel and their God. Deuteronomy 5:2-5. “...it was not with our fathers, but with us that the Lord made the covenant”. Everyone must understand YHWH as their God to obey him for a change to be. Note that these approaches were described by Robbins 1996:72-73.

Conversion in theological terms it means “to take a new turn” (Deuteronomy 30:2, Hosea 14:2, Joshua 22:16, Jeremiah 3:19). The rationale is the belief that if they re-establish their present and future, they will establish a new social order to please YHWH. These regulations were used for serving their God thereby cause change in the land. Commitment to religious community influenced the process of change for those that like to see change through conversion. This inkling favoured the priests whose allegiances were to YHWH not the King as a religious and social obligation for Israel (Exodus 12:43-49, Numbers 15:11-16). Deuteronomy 5:7-21 used negating words like “you shall not”, to show the essence obedience to God.

- b. *Reformist*:** This category is a response to the social structures that are corrupt. Human beings cannot avoid evil nor be saved in this world unless by being reformed. Agreeing with Lotz (2005:510), the term refers to religious protest of the 16th century where the church wanted change. They believe social organizations must be accessible for the divine to take control of people’s hearts and so change the society. Their goal is to reform the society, not to follow another belief. Kopf (2011:697) said it denotes transformation to a better life, a form of restoring the lost human condition in a moral sense. Kopf (2011:701) adds that though reformation¹⁷⁸ entails a lot more than this, in this context it means moving to the opposite direction. It focuses on renewal to the tune of evangelical faith. Thus the kind of deliverance available for them is that which they choose to serve and obey the lord their God. Similarly, Israel must submit to YHWH who holds the key to their salvation from foreign oppressors, one who has the ability to save the children and their parents. The decision to be reformed lies with humanity, especially those that commit their hearts to God. Similar to the ideal of YHWH, a good society will emerge if they abstain from worshiping idols and all form of deities, abstain from murder, adultery, stealing and dishonesty, observe the Sabbath, and protect one another’s interests.
- c. *Utopian*:** This kind of response seeks to reconstruct the social order according to divine principles to please their God. Utopians¹⁷⁹ emphasize a new social

¹⁷⁸ The 16th century church leaders and Catholic priests discovered some misbelieve in the way and manner the Bible was being interpreted and they moved out of the papacy to champion a protest against their leaders, which led to reformation. Josiah had his kind of reform, a form of development plan for the land of Israel.

¹⁷⁹ Heesch (2013b:250) noted the term is coined to mean improving human life base on rational or religious principles. These group worked at reshaping the society.

organization that can eradicate evil from the society, and aim at a complete replacement of what exist in the society (Robbins 1996:72-73). Here people move to replace radically what is in existence, as the complete opposite of Zionism, according to which people are waiting for God act on their behalf. Bender-Junker (2008:653-654) says Utopians appear mostly in political and social arenas during dialogues, trying to balance extreme ends of an argument and attempting to strike a balance by adjusting both sides of the dialogue, especially in religious discussion. In addition, Heesch (2013a:250-251) says they present their ideas by frequently using theological and philosophical dialogue to tolerate one another, co-exist beyond national boundaries. The aim of the Decalogue is to recreate a priestly obedient society with faithful followers, as opposed to the Zionists, who are relaxed in Zion, waiting for YHWH to act. The effort of the Utopians is part of the change process. They should be determine to obey the stipulations of YHWH. The people are agents of change, hence they can be the change they desire.

3.6.3 Common Social and Cultural Topics

A community living in a locality shares common social and cultural topics¹⁸⁰ and have common familiar issues. To be an adult means knowing and understanding the common socio-cultural values, patterns or codes of the location. Common topics here include; honour, guilt, and right cultures, dyadic and individual personalities, agricultural and economic or industrial base system etc., of which not all will be illustrated in this discussion.

a. *Honour, Guilt and Right Culture*¹⁸¹

The fifth law of the Decalogue says “honour your father and mother”, that way you will honour God. God created human beings so that they respect the authoritative members of society, especially the elderly. Their fidelity is checked on a balance of honour, shame and developing the right culture in their land.

The Decalogue emphasized that Israel must develop the right culture to life, an attitude that will lead to their honour. They are to please the Lord their God, who desires their respect. On the other hand, they will incur shame if they displease YHWH, by failing to honour the covenant. Hence to obey is honour¹⁸² to him, while

¹⁸⁰ See V. K. Robbins (1996:72-74).

¹⁸¹ The Decalogue itself is a code of honour, geared towards re-establishing the honour of Israel and their God. In the next chapter there are more details on this.

¹⁸² Honour is dignity, a kind of community respect that is practiced in most traditional societies. In my MTh I wrote extensively on “Honour and Shame”, see www.sun.ac.za/ZachariahBulusTakore for more.

being disobedient means shame, again to be faithful indicates honour while unfaithfulness is a sign of shame, guilt feeling and wrong values. This is how the Decalogue¹⁸³, in the first and second commandments pointed humanity to the need to show respect for YHWH.

b. Dyadic and Individual Personality

The personalities of YHWH and Moses feature in this dialogue, where both play significant roles in passing on the message to their audience.

YHWH is the saviour and deliverer of his people, the one who liberated them from bondage and slavery in Egypt, an event they wish not to experience again (Deuteronomy 5:6). The covenant partner, who desires their commitment (5:2). The God that rested and hallowed the day as Sabbath day unto the Lord. YHWH urges Israel to observe the Sabbath. The judge that hates false swearing by his name. One who created and made, he is the potter who fashions humanity. The African understanding, depicts YHWH as freedom giver and alleviator of poverty.

YHWH chose Moses to complete the task of leading them. He serves as the leader and vessel of Israel's deliverance from Egypt (5:6) and the one who collects the Decalogue, and who mediates for them in the presence of YHWH. He serves the role of a mentor figure as their teacher, advocate and priest who persuades them to pay attention and keep the laws (5:1). He is the convener that assembles them, who organizes them under their God's leadership as Israel, their ambassador and representative before YHWH.

c. Dyadic and Legal Contract Agreement

The covenant was a legal agreement¹⁸⁴ and contract between YHWH and his people, as is described in Deuteronomy 5:2-5, when the Lord makes a covenant at Horeb. De Vaux (1997:143) explains some legal contracts such as the law/Torah referred to as teachings or a theological collection of rules that guide human relationships with their Creator.

d. Challenge-Response (Repost)

The Lord challenges Israel to observe all the laws. In the second commandment they are given a challenge¹⁸⁵ to obey on one hand, and be blessed, else they disobey and are punished for three to four generations. Interestingly, if they obey they will be blessed for a thousand generations (Deuteronomy 5:9-10). Hence the challenge is that they must keep all commandments and uphold the covenant between them.

¹⁸³Do not worship other gods nor make idols for yourself, except YHWH. His name is to be glorified above other names, it should be respected even in court and public places. His name represents his person. They must not falsely take oaths, or be witnesses to liars in his name. As such Israel must guard against the vain use of his name in public or religious places. These principles are for the people and their God in their relationship.

¹⁸⁴The agreement: Firstly, the instruction or the Decalogue or the 'Ten Words' of Israel's God. These words are the instructions his people must observe for moral and religious responsibility. Secondly, it is the covenantal code that guides the community in the form of an agreement which binds the people with their God (Exodus 22:1-6, Deuteronomy 27:15-26, Joshua 8:30-35).

¹⁸⁵Merrill (1994:148) says the divine reaction shows YHWH's craving for his people's loyalty. This is what causes him to discipline those he loves. Punishment for those who disobey was an indication of the future consequences, not yet upon them. Another important challenge according to Biddle (2003:108) is that Israel is not to fabricate idols or images in the form of deities, which would make their God jealous when God's people pay attention to them. He shows kindness to those that keep the covenant. According to the stipulations, keeping nine is failure and shame.

e. *Purity Code*

In this text, there are two codes that relate to purity, possibly invented by the priest to sustain their office in the society. These code include first the Decalogue, i.e. a purity code¹⁸⁶ for the Jews, which observes purity through their faithfulness. The second is the covenant as a purity code which likewise emphasizes faithfulness. It is an agreement that requires both parties involved to remain faithful to their words, on one hand to expect blessing and on the other, to be obedient. In both cases YHWH set it as a standard for measuring his people. He promises to play his part with the expectation that his people Israel will keep their word. Hagedorn (2004:78-79) states that keeping the stipulations was significant for the contemporary generations, and it connected to the future. These code and collection of laws remain valid even for the future (Deuteronomy 4:2, 9, 40).

3.6.4 Social Roles and Institutions¹⁸⁷ in Israel

Various social roles and institutions existed in Israel which facilitated daily and constant interaction in public places. These were customs, but in some instances they are objects that are put in place to regulate the populace. In this case, the covenant is to facilitate relationships. Israel was not just identified as the people of covenant because they had roles and responsibilities toward one another. These roles could be classified into categories to include characters like the priests, Levites, kings, prophets and institutions like family, monarchy, religion etc. They emanated from the need for unity, for the purpose of serving one another. Such roles and institutions can be found in most local communities through general knowledge as in Africa. At times they are taught through a careful use of language or transmitted through traditions.

a. Family and Clan/Tribe

Israel evolved over time to become a nation, from the development of a family¹⁸⁸ into a community of brothers with nuclear or extended family/clans serving as the centre of

¹⁸⁶Merrill (1994:299-300) observes that Deuteronomy 22 contains various laws of purity, though the laws seem to be built on the seventh law of the Decalogue, which forbids idolatry/adultery. Israel's idolatry and covenant violation are referred to as adultery, a sort of betrayal of their lover. De Vaux (1997:143) refers to some bodies of the holiness code in Leviticus 17-26, indicated by rules and confirmed with blessings or curses. The priestly code contained in Leviticus 1-16, takes the form of laws of sacrifice, purity and of holiness. Purity here is emphasized as pertaining both to the spiritual and physical bodies.

¹⁸⁷Social institutions are significant pillars of their society for the Jews. In this group, social institutions make up a special aspect of the society in Israel, as in the empire, temple, trade, families etc. They did not just emerge but were developed over time as a result of interaction with others. Institutions included civil, family, military and religious groupings. The family of twelve sons of Jacob, otherwise referred to as Israel, was later called the twelve tribes of Israel. Note, there were Canaanites dwellers among the people in the early stage of the society.

brotherhood. Furthermore, Stolz (2007a:229) says brotherhood is a special form of community that emerges through covenant. In this sense, the family¹⁸⁹ enjoys fellowship and protection of other members of the unit. White Jr. (2009:681) noted that it consists of siblings from the same parents, mostly male relations, and is applicable to cousins and close relations. In the Tell El-Amarna and Mari ancient texts, a family/clan is design in the form of a nation.

Stienstra (1993:74-75) observes that family is not just a small conjugal unit but consist of male head and wife(s), it also has children and their grand-children as well as the unmarried daughters/sons of the family. The childless widow and the divorced daughter are not left out of the family network. They are close relatives who support and protect one another. Lexically, tribes שָׁבֵט family/clan מִשְׁפָּחָה and father's house¹⁹⁰ בֵּית־אָב are related to the עִיר city. Bendor (1996:118) states that Clan is identical to עִיר "city". There are several families/clans in one city, for the protection of inheritance, redeeming portions of inheritance from being taken by strangers. It helps in maintain the threshing floor, to take care of unpossessed lands and land distribution. Importantly they are obligated to organize monarch taxes, labourers and the army. The מִשְׁפָּחָה were established upon the elders of the land who are the council of the city and they help maintain the place of worship, rituals and sacrifices. One clan comprises several בֵּית־אָב the small units of the society that are responsible for

¹⁸⁸ Timothy M. Willis 2007. "Family" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB(D-H)* Vol.2. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 427-430 explains family as a circle based on three things; (a) Biblical records. (b) Archaeological evidence (c) Ethnological analogies. Post (2001:285) describes a family as the joining of a man and a woman together by God. According to him, the concept started in the Old Testament in Genesis 1:26-28, according to which a man shall leave his father and mother and be united to his wife and the two shall become one flesh. The community accepted marriage as sacred institution binding on those involved, and it was also considered a willing covenant entered into by two people and obligatory on them.

¹⁸⁹ Family, clan and tribe could be divided but personally their relationship and significance developmental stages led me to discuss them under one section. Willis (2007:427,430) uses key terms to analyse the idea, like מִשְׁפָּחָה meaning "family or clans" or house of someone, בֵּית־אָב was denoted as "father's house" incorporating Israel's lineage/family structure. The "ancestral household" as בֵּית־אָב which includes שָׁבֵט tribes, is part of the family hierarchy that make up their national division. Perhaps the address was to the fathers who were present and those that will be fathers in the future. Others synonyms were *akin* "brother" and *zera* "seed". In addition, Kessler (2008:50) confirms that the formation of Israel can be traced back to the stories of nomads who escaped from slavery in Egypt and settled in Canaan. It took place in the 8th century BCE, as found in Shasu Bedouins and Apiru sources. Israel evolved over time to become a nation, from the journey started with a family of 12 brothers that grew from nuclear families into clans; as their generations increased they were called tribes, which are the 12 tribes of Israel. Tribes are differentiated by the variance in tones, words and etymology of the language, but in this case, tribe may not take such characteristic. In the LXX, *adelphos* is used for the 12 brothers (twelve sons of Jacob), rendered as relatives (Psalm 22:22-23).

¹⁹⁰Family serves the function of buying back the honour of a family member by taking revenge; they judge and mediate, as well as assist in marriage arrangements. The land was also a property of the family and could be inherited by their offspring (Genesis 4:3-8, Deuteronomy 21:15-17, Ruth 1:16-17, I Samuel 8:11-17, 20:27, Ezra 10, Nehemiah 13:23-31, Psalm 133:1). In this sense, it is a reference to the 12 sons of Jacob, the later 12 tribes of Israel. It is root of social institutions and culture which makes up the primary unit of a society.

passing knowledge from one generation to another. Similarly, Dearman (1998:117) suggests that a family had no particular description in the Old Testament, but “father’s house” evokes a multigenerational household and a basic kinship unit. Three factors that shaped marriage, as the beginning of family, are patrilineal succession, inherited customs and endogamous union of couple.

The small visible kinship unit of humanity is regarded by Meyer (1997:1, 13-14) as consisting of villages where people live in their clans, especially in early Israel. These were mostly nomads and farmers. Though she considered *הַבְּרִיחַ* as village, it is regarded as a household of related people who are living together in an environment. It may include servants or war slaves and aliens within their gate. Witte (2001:285) adds that in the case of Israel, family is a reference to their extended family, involving relations in a circle up to the third and fourth generation. Various forms of families existed and not in opposition to individual life. Gerstenberger (2009:44-45) notes that the merger of families into clan and later as tribes is clear in Joshua 7:16-18. They had 5-30 members in a family, indicating the third and fourth generation. Family in Hebrew is the “father’s house” to show the patriarchal authority (Jeremiah 35:6-10, Proverb 19:18), comprising parents, children, grand and great grandparents (ancestors of Israel) including their slaves. Other metaphors of family include engaged partner¹⁹¹ this time engaged to God. Others may be adulterous nation, harlot, divorced nation and a separated people from their God YHWH.

Sin is transmitted through generations, sometimes to the third and fourth generation that exist together. Meyer (1997:22-25) notes that it is by collective identity that individual roles and characters are modified in families. It functions for continuity through sexual reproduction, educational development, oral transmission and teaching of the law or judicial and normal

¹⁹¹Declaring a man and a woman as married in Genesis 2:23-24 is important to other institution and came as great honour. Dearman (1998:119, 121) says that giving birth to children even to third and fourth generation indicates both biological and social progress as well as blessing upon human beings. In Ruth 1 & 4:1-11, Boaz redeemed the family of Elimelech by taking Ruth as wife to continue the lineage. In II Samuel 9-20 & II Kings 1-2 we see a court history about David’s family succession which is summarised as “household” family, “political race” (dynasty) and “kingdom” (nation). Family relationship became an influential metaphor of Israel in the Old Testament cultures, to the extent that God is said to be married to Israel, the father of the people or their mother at various occasions (Deuteronomy 24:1-4, Isaiah 50:1, Jeremiah 3:8, Ezekiel 16:36-38, Hosea 2:3, 10). Pfoh (2009:91) draws our attention to reasons why states might have been established in Iron Age Palestine, and they are: (a) The size of the land. (b) Socio-ecological stratification. (c) Institutionalized political governance. (d) The ability to produce surplus and sustainable distant trade systems. (e) Monumental art and architecture. (f) The great uses of writing. Importantly archaeology shows that Israel existed and Jerusalem was an urban centre which was also the capital city of the state. They either metamorphosed from community to Israel or they are the former nation of Palestine.

codes. Agrarian activities were part of the daily curricula, others were shepherding and military mobilizations. Economic activities were flowing but not all could afford trade textiles, ceramics, etc., to increase family capacity. According to Kessler (2008:40-41) Israel was built of variety of elements, in a process that took about 200 years, that began as a kinship base, and later developed into a nation. In summary, before the state, they were first an agricultural society, (farming and grazing). Second, the leadership was a later development, elders of the city were the decision makers. As such there is virtually no evidence for leadership in Israel. Rather they had judges who served on special occasions. Third, the wealthy, mostly farmers, governed the economy.

Household in the Old Testament occupies a key place in the theology and ethics of family according to Perdue (1997:225). Thus family is a collective institution that shapes what God's activities involve, especially human morality. Other significant institutions that emanated from them include the monarchy, the theocratic priesthood and the Temple. The majority of the metaphors used in reference to God were related to family and household. It shows how Israel, their land, possession all relates the theological reflection of their God and his will for them. This period of national development is summarised by Blenkinsopp (1997:85-86) in the biblical records in I King 3-11 that describe certain details and administrative plans that took place two centuries earlier under the regime of Solomon, to unite and develop Israel¹⁹². White (2009:535) notes that it embodies a relationship of families in a circle, marrying and bearing generations of children. Important to note is that the covenant people began as families, then tribes and later a nation. This same institution is important for maintaining their relationship.

b. Tribes of Israel

There are various list for the שְׁבֵט "tribes"¹⁹³ of Israel, though they were more or less the same people indicated on it. De Vaux (1997:4-5) spell out that שְׁבֵט as an autonomous group

¹⁹²Perhaps, when the state opened offices for lay, clerics as priests, scribes, military, supervisors and others I King 4:1-6, this time king Solomon strengthen relationship with other states, to fortified his territories and trade system (I King 9:15-10:29). He visited queen Sheba possibly for trade mission and other relationship matters. He also organized Israel's taxation and services for the populace. The greatest achievement is the administrative division of twelve colonies, chiefdoms or tribal districts (I King 4:7-19). A redirection of allegiance from kinship system to tribal territories later develop into a state called Israel. The centralization of military, political and economic services of the land impacted the family (badly). Oppression and all forms of struggles were indirectly imposed on the people including the rural dwellers Blenkinsopp (1997:85-86).

¹⁹³ Significant of all are the two that one does contain Levi and Joseph, and others were replaced by Manasseh and Ephraim the sons of Joseph. They could indicate different languages spoken by the same/similar peoples group or entirely different groups. In such cases they could have similarities in their speech, construction or certain pronunciations. It looks different since they all spoke the same language. The tribes of Israel emanated

that emanated from families, who are descendants of a common ancestor. The unit may not have direct blood relationship as brotherhood in a wider sense of kinship society, but the uniqueness of their communications is clear. Israelite tribes are corporate confederations that incorporated their families as one. McNutt (1999:75-76) explains that they have no specific evidences to geography boundaries of each of the tribes (Joshua 13-19, Judges 5). Nonetheless, at the dawn of the monarchy, all tribal regions were transformed into administrative districts which eased tax collection, the recruitment of labour force as well as military service for the land. It has also defined the socio-political and economic relationship within the land which was used to keep track of the people. In like manner, Matthews (2007:124) commented that in such societies, everyone associated in a network base on family relationships. One feels they were social units that had certain responsibilities. Tribes are segments or kinship units of the society that comprises families. It is a stratification of genealogical and hereditary relationship which shows how the people developed. Probably, a way they identified and differentiated one another.

It is profound that Jagersma (1982:56) described tribal alliance as a primary religious organisation for the community. It indicates a communal development of the language of Israel that happened from diverse perspectives of the people's civilizations. Dearman (1998:117) clarify that מְשִׁפְּחָה could be rendered kingship units of the father's household. It may perhaps be אֲשֶׁר the people's language or the people as a group. It goes to show that Israel¹⁹⁴ describe family in corporate terms to include everyone who belong to the clan/tribe not as individualistic membership. Kessler (2008:55) said tribes seem to be the connecting point and the highest social unit of the society, though organized under family and clan. Personally, it was the bonding of one people under one Jewish culture, one nation, one God YHWH. They had no kinship gods nor separate family deities apart from their God. However, there was polytheism among their Canaanite neighbours which could have influenced their religious life. Several factors held them together as a family.

c. Priest and Levites

The religious institutions were peculiarly organizing for the family of Israel to commune with *YHWH* their God. Both priests and Levites were leaders who worked to fulfil religious

from the same ancestor Jacob, who was also called Israel. On this background their tribes may not differ from the other, apart from names of ancestor as the names of the tribes. In this regard, Bendor (1996:118) added that אֲשֶׁר "tribe" indicate a non-active territorial demography, otherwise a district in royal administration.

¹⁹⁴Later Israel appeared on the Merneptah's stele, then the naming of the tribal units or people as "Israel", possibly an invention of the 10th to 11th century.

purposes in Israel. The office of the priest later receives more power and precedence that surpassed the Levitical office. In this sense, Gerlitz (2005:346) sees priest as a servant, in charge of sacred and holy activities in Israel, who observe cultic rituals of purity and strove to live blameless life. In the other hand, Levites served as musicians/singers in terms of worship. They were assistants at the temple, who led in temple worship. In addition, Kugler (2009:596) captures both as ritual experts and special mediators between God and his people; especially in Israel's religion during early Judaism to the second temple period. Priests¹⁹⁵ *Kohen* means "to bend low as sign of humility" or "to show reverence". Though in certain thoughts it could be "to stand upright" as faithful people. They are mostly priests of YHWH in the Old Testament, in the other hand, Levites come from Levi¹⁹⁶, "to turn, to twizzle" indicating that Levites were "to attach or accompany" mostly priests in serving the people. Friedly (2011:364-365) considers priests as derived from "*presbuteros*" a term for "elders". They were religious ritualists who pointed the people towards YHWH. This clergy institution confers special dignity upon the consecrated person who were interpreters of the word. Their consecration came with sanctity and virtue, which was shown in the public through garments and head cover. Traditionally, they served in temple courts making sacrifices, offerings and utter prayers, as well as scriptural interpretations.

Matthews (1990:182-184) noted that priests and Levites¹⁹⁷ were considered as preservers of the law. This is possibly why the first returnees from exile were numerous priests (Nehemiah 7:39-43). It could be due to the significance of their roles that is why they had to come, or because of their connection to the kings. De Vaux (1997:376) explain that the Temple in Jerusalem was a state sanctuary and the priests were civil servants under the king (II Kings 2:27, 35, 4:2). The head of the priests was an official in the king's palace. He oversees the affairs of the Temple, worship and priest. Feinberg and Fee (2009:963-964) assert that Levi was a priestly tribe, though only descendants of Aaron were ordained priests. Levites had various duties as attendants or assistants of the priests to support the work (Deuteronomy

¹⁹⁵ Priests were later co-opted as part of the empire saddled with various responsibilities including translations, and perhaps they used the chance to their favour.

¹⁹⁶ Levi was the third son of Jacob, his mother was Leah and his tribe had no material form inheritance in Israel. Gershon, Kohath and Merari were 3 Levitical families and descendants of David. Levites were basically sanctuary servants with the sons of Aaron serving as special priests. Importantly, in the days of Abraham (pre-mosaic) era, there were no priests, the family head, the father, performed the priestly duties like sacrifices and leading worship Feinberg and Fee (2009:964-965). Though one is not insinuating they worship YHWH at this era but still not concluding who their God was or the one who sanctified their sacrifices.

¹⁹⁷They improved their work after the exile. Both offices were subordinates to the sons of Aaron, the priests. They enhanced roles include, cleansing of holy objects and chambers, preparation of showbread, central offerings and worship choir.

17:9, 33:21, Jeremiah 33:21). Thus they both ministered at the altar, burning incense, singing and praying, teaching the Torah and making sacrifices on behalf of the nation. They did so in the struggle for independence after exile (Exodus 19:5-6, Leviticus 11:44-45, Numbers 15:40, Isaiah 61:6).

Priesthood was more important, that they were considered teachers of the Torah in Israel, just as Kings served as judges as well. De Vaux (1997:345, 348, 353) affirmed that officially, there were no priests nor Levites during the patriarchal era, instead family heads were used like Abraham offered their sacrifices on behalf of their families. Until at exile that priests were mentioned, the Arabs called them “*Sadin*” guardians of the Temple, who took care of the Temple and welcome visitors. Stolz (2005:347) observe that they were mediators between God and his people, Israel. Priests are close to elders in function, זקני elders played the role of offering sacrifices just as the priests¹⁹⁸ in Israel (I Samuel 1-4). The Levites in corresponding manner, worked as assistants to the priests during religious tasks in Israel. These were put in place to avoid sin of the fathers and to help Israel focus on their God, to keep the covenant.

Interestingly, the issues of roles became a struggle between kings and priest at this period. Matthews (1990:143, 252) noted that the idea of kings as political and religious leaders developed with David and his son Solomon during the age of monarchy in Israel. Since the established the Temple priesthood, they also had access to perform sacrificial rituals (I Kings 2:35, I Chronicle 15:1-24). This practice continues even after their children took over the throne. Unfortunately, their children built altars to idols and foreign gods and promoted non-Levitical priestly roles in their worship (I Kings 11:6-8, 12:28-33, 13:33). Kugler (2009:599) sustain that in Deuteronomy 18:6-7, Levites were invited to central sanctuary to serve before their lord God but not all responded II King 23:9. This dates their traditional role back to exile as oldest passage in the Old Testament that addressed the priests and Levites in Deuteronomistic history. It therefore indicates that at the early post-exilic era, there were

¹⁹⁸During the monarchy, cultic activities increases in the society and were manned by priests who were also custodians of the king. Hence the king was regarded as the leader of the cults and supreme priest (Psalm 110:1). In trying to build the holy order they differentiated clean from unclean in the society and they were looked upon as prophets too. In the course of the exile, there were rural priests who served in rural cults to represent the king and the state as well. Like prophet Ezekiel, he served both as priest and a prophet. In the postexilic era, they were temple ministers with the Levites. Furthermore, the postexilic Temple of Jerusalem was later reconstructed and the Zadokites priesthood took over control of the second Temple. These priests were saddle with responsibility of sacrifices, cultic activities, observing religious calendar of festivals and orchestrated the Temple worship together with the Levites (Ezra 9-10, Nehemiah 13:15-22). See Stolz (2005:347) and Matthews (1990:252).

priest and Levites serving in the society. This is to say at Sinai/Horeb after Decalogue era, that priests emerged. Agreeing with Friedly (2011:365), both priests, Levites and prophets all served different religious purposes as experts in ritual. Priests were trained in a particular order of priesthood. Some were administrators, others served as legal, political and economic mediators in the society who are otherwise known as public servants. Israel was organized that everyone had particular duty they give back for the progress of their community, for their unity and all towards the monotheistic dignity of YHWH their God.

d. King and Palace

The institution of the monarchy is significant to Israel as a community and it was the centre of their leadership and worship. Israel had kings who rule the land at various times, and their God as the King of all kings. Spieckermann (2003:124) argues that the theological idea of the kingdom of God was pre-exilic theology that concerns the Temple and Jerusalem. YHWH is now the protector of the Davidic dynasty, the city of God and the land or kingdom¹⁹⁹ of God (Psalm 2, 24, 29, 48, 93, Isaiah 6:3) their monotheistic God. For that reason, Israel desired an earthly king (Judges 8:22-23, I Samuel 8:5-7, 12:12) which seem contrary to their heavenly king. It became evident in the postexilic era the second Temple community in Jerusalem that repented and opened the door for kingship in the postexilic era, the time of their political independence. Conrad (2008:504-505) indicates that God is identified as the reigning king of Israel. In psalms, there are several indications of their rulers, kings either as god or as in reference to Israel's king Saul, David, Solomon and others as gods. YHWH wants to be the only one bearing God in Israel, which makes him jealous. Monarchy became significant unifying institution, Albertz (2009:355) buttressed that Israel's monarchies were regarded as chiefdoms, looking at how the society was classified into families and tribes to unite them.

¹⁹⁹As such kingdom is understood concurrently as divine kingship. In priestly theology, Israel is a priestly kingdom, a holy nation (Exodus 19:6). Now the rule of God is realized on earth through the kingdom on earth. Davidic kingdom to Solomon's were God's kingdom on earth represented by his chosen/anointed people to rule (I Chronicle 17:14, II Samuel 7:16, II Chronicle 13:8). In the Hellenistic period, God's kingdom was no longer with people due to rebellion and disobedience of the priest, their father's Spieckermann (2003:124). Hazeal referred to the south state (Judah) as "house of David" while the Assyrians called the north "house of Omri". They had problems within the land due to their corruptions in economic, judicial, commercial and administrative issues. Internally they had agricultural problems, and externally they had military and trade related problems. Saul came in at the time of need and was able to lead Israel to defend their territory. Most of all, they fought the Philistines who fought to destroy them. Like Deborah and Gideon, Saul served the people who needed a king. According to Pixley (1992:27-35) the 11th century BCE marks the emergence of lifelong leaders for Israel who popped out of the tribes and took honourable titles as מֶלֶךְ (King), a well acknowledge institution of the ANE. This happen after the judges could no longer define the thin line of corruption in the presence of their faithful and covenant keeping God (I Samuel 8:5). In I Samuel 11, Saul was made king, the first king of Israel and their military leader. David appeared as a fighting soldier among Saul's army and defeated the great Goliath, the defence chief of Philistine (I Samuel 13:2-3, 18). Yahweh remain their great king, whose laws were superior over other king's. Samuel served as the prophet of YHWH while Saul was the king.

There had been variety of attempts to install a leader²⁰⁰, until at Ramah assembly (I Samuel 8). Pixley (1992:30) explain that Samuel first rejected the proposal of the זְבִי elders to have a king, and like Gideon an earthly king will mean rejecting YHWH or not recognizing YHWH's kingship (I Samuel 8:6-9). In I Samuel 12:1-5, 14, it was sin of the people that made them reject their God for other gods (I Samuel 8:10-17). The prophet noted that it may go well with them if they fear YHWH and serve him alone. Kessler (2008:59, 72-73) said these farming families in Iron Age I saw the absence of an organized hierarchical leadership. Their judges had degenerated in morality and compromised standards (Sukkoth and Penuel, Gilead, Gibeah and Jabesh-Gibeah Judges 8-9, 11, 19-20, I Samuel 11). The primary state was perceived with a central government in place that has no external influence. Secondly, the state had been achieved with the tribal organizations within the land. Jonowski (2010:202) added that God's throne or God's kingship as divine was an integral element of Israel's society. A royal title given to God (Isaiah 6:1-5), in the mid-20th century, they celebrated God's kingship in close connection to the ark. The nation in exilic and postexilic times became popular, God is now described as the king of Israel.

Saul was later rejected as king According to De Vaux (1997:97) the principles of heredity became recognized and Omri ruled for forty years. After which six kings four of whom were assassinated succeeded each other in twenty years, and the kingdom was later conquered by Assyria and taken to exile (Israel). McNutt (1999:143-145) purports that the transition from tribal chiefdoms to centralized state is thought to have arisen with the court culture, along with oral transmission of traditions. The event is viewed through Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic lenses, possibly due to the editors who had access to various materials. There are the independent traditions about Samuel, Saul, David and Solomon. Other materials about the administration of the united monarchy include the royal archives of the divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah, the Jerusalem Temple and the cycles of prophetic tales. Samuel and Kings contain records of the kings of the land. The conclusion that obedience to YHWH would lead to blessings upon the land prompted the central worship of God in Jerusalem, against polytheistic activities. Kessler (2008:74) says cities consisted of dwellers who were members of the various families that lived in Israel. They had זְבִי elders

²⁰⁰The purpose was first to face the outside attack from (Philistines and Ammonites) I Samuel 4:7-11. Secondly, the internal corruption YHWH detested. Elites priests in Shiloh stole offerings, slept with women who were their servants. The sons of Samuel, supposed judges, collected bribe and perverted justice. Hence, the need for king to govern the land see Kessler (2008:72-73).

who were representatives of the families, the structure that created the atmosphere for monarchical government. The power of the government lay within the community who were being ruled, who had to obey, respect and dignify their leaders. In this regard, Saul ruled, David took over and later Solomon continued with the throne, on the basis of obedience.

Ohler (1985:282-284) reports on priestly²⁰¹ materials covering from creation to the death of Moses. Its target is to impress the commandments of YHWH upon the hearts of his people, hence the priestly opinion can be seen from its soberness and persuasive nature, calling the people to gather, warning with love and religious declaration. It bears the mark of proclamation of the law unto the people of God during worship. Kessler (2008:67) affirms that according to Joshua 1:4 the city of David extended from Lebanon to Euphrates and up to the Mediterranean. Archaeological evidence supports this finding. At this period the land grew and stood united among all its tribes and territories. During the reign of Solomon, the son of David, the empire²⁰² became illustrious, but it broke after down due to many selfish reasons. The history of Israel should not be treated as having no evidence. Brettler (2008:508) purport that kingship in Israel began as rulers for the land, a people living closely now needed rulers like their ancient neighbours. Kings were chosen by YHWH, but most of them inherited the throne from their royal family, as children born into royalty and heirs to the palace. Kings were servants of the people, serving with elders as advisors. They also had courts and royal palaces were judgements were conducted for fair hearing. This is a part of the purity process for the people of God. Their kings were to point them to YHWH and hence a king was expected to be faithful to YHWH.

e. Temple and Worship

The Jews enjoyed the privilege of worshiping in several places at different times either because of persecution, exile or migration. The Temple services, led by the priests, remained an outstanding institution for them. Matthews (1990:111-112) says the palace and the Temple provided the ground for new kinds of governance, where people are under organized, particular and homogeneous kinds of leadership. It created space for advisers who were chosen from the elders of the land (II Chronicles 22:26, 11:23). They assisted the king in tax collection, recruiting of manpower for the army and battalion of labourers for economic

²⁰¹The priests present themselves by revering YHWH in all details of their ministrations. From the religious institution, it points to the faith of Israel as embedded in the assurance of their God and his kingdom.

²⁰²In 930BCE Pharaoh Shishak I (I Kings 14:25-26) campaigned but could not penetrate Israel. During the divided monarchy Omri the son of Ahab was among the kings inscribed by other kings in the Shalmanezar III of the Assyrian empire, an opposition in the battle of Qarqar 863BCE. Pharaoh Menepthah named Israel in his stele, Mesha maintained Omri and his son hence biblical records were popular in other literature in the ANE.

development. In that the economy of Israel expanded, similarly the ark had a place in the Temple under the care of the priests and Levites. A building constructed for the purpose of worship²⁰³ of YHWH. It comes from *hekal* “great house” or בֵּית־יְהוָה “house of the Lord”.

Matthews (1990:109-110) is of the opinion that the significant structures represented the power and prestige of Israel’s monarchy. YHWH’s worship was significant in the land, as much as the palace was also important. Both were marks of transition from a tribal to a state system, the village system or chiefdoms now translating into districts under the monarchs. II Samuel 5:7-9 indicates that the city of David was recognized by the wonders of the Temple and the palace (I Kings 7:1-12). These were among the things that made Solomon popular and created friendship between him and his neighbours. This is how the king introduced the Canaanite and Egyptian architectural decorations on the buildings. De Vaux (1997:312-320) notes that David’s purpose for transferring the ark was to make Jerusalem the religious centre of Israel – the vision became a priority of King Solomon, to build a Temple for God, from his fourth to his eleventh year as king. The Temple was well-planned from the beginning to the end, the construction of the 1st and the 2nd Temple follow the same pattern of construction (I Kings 6-7, II Chronicles 3-4). Roberts (2009a:494) affirms that Israel had numerous temples built for worship of YHWH their God, as also sanctuaries and other places where YHWH could be praised or given sacrifice/offerings. Temples are for cultic purposes in the land, mostly manned by priests and the Levitical order.

In addition, Matthews (1990:112, 141-142) observes that the Temple had two courtyards that led to an inner area, the “Holy of Holies”, which is the place of the ark of YHWH (I Kings 6:23-28). At the entrance of the Temple were two pillars, symbolizing the presence of God. Festivals and sacrifices were held in Jerusalem’s “High Places”. The next generation could not maintain such unity and holiness. Both the Temple and the Palace became symbols, due to the sin of the fathers. Isaiah related his messages to the glory that was yet to come upon the “house of David”. De Vaux (1997:322-323) explain that Ezekiel had a vision of an idealized Temple in Jerusalem (Ezekiel 40:1-44:9). Although this vision was never realized, it served as encouragement for the second construction by Zerubbabel. Kessler (2008:88) says the

²⁰³Temples were constructed as places for worship; some were named after those that built them while others are referred to by historical designation. The latter include the temples of Solomon, Ezekiel, Zerubbabel and Herod. The temple on the contrary is believed by some scholars to be the chapel of the palace, probably a private Temple of the King and his Israelite household, like the Bethel sanctuary (Amos 10:13). This Temple worship was in opposition to the several temples and shrines of the Canaanites that were in the land before the monarchy.

unity of the state was symbolized by the unity of the religion in pre-modern societies. The worship of YHWH started during the monarchical period. The worshipers approached the deity with their gifts of sacrifices, first fruit, tithes and freewill, though some of these were in practice in the land (Genesis 28:22, Exodus 23:15, 34:20, Deuteronomy 16:16, II Kings 12:5-17, 22:3-9, Amos 4:4). The Temple²⁰⁴ was not just a building, but an institution in Israel.

f. Prophets and their Messages

The prophets acted as messengers as well as mediators between God and humanity. They²⁰⁵ were men of honour who brought the people a message from God, messages that stood against the persistent evil that swayed and flooded the community of YHWH. Redditt (2008: xiii) defines prophets as people who foretell God's mind to his community. Most of their messages were not predictions, but rather explained past and present events. They exhorted the people to live honourably and honestly, encouraged the priests to teach properly, of the rulers they desired fairness and justice and to fear God and the judges were to administer justly to all classes. Prophets indicated that God revealed his secrets to his servants (Amos 3:7): they come with the voice of YHWH and the pain of his heart.

Prophets were members of the society and were familiar with the problems and the people. The community accepted them as coming from God, respected them and hearkened to their messages (Rofé 1997:74-75). They functioned in public worship while some served at the king's court as consultants and advisers to the king, who often referred to them before embarking on war (II Samuel 7:1-7, 18-19, I Kings 22:1-18, II Kings 3:11-19, Jeremiah 21:1-7, 37:3-10, 38:14-23). Prophets appeared very early in the Old Testament (Genesis 20:7, Exodus 15:20, Judges 4:4). Three references were made to the prophets in the Old Testament; first as *ro'eh* "to see", as seers of the future, who saw what was hidden to humanity. Second is *hozen* again is "to see" meaning visions seen by the prophets (Ezekiel 13:16, 23, Numbers 24:4, Amos 7:1-9). Third is *nabi*²⁰⁶ which is used mostly in prophetic books like Samuel,

²⁰⁴Restoring purity, holiness and spirituality to the society. Accordingly, the Temple will stand in the post exilic reformed era and there will no longer be an "Ark of the Covenant", rather the glory of YHW will radiate all over the society (Ezekiel 41:3-4, 21-22, 44:4).

²⁰⁵In this regard they preached, righteousness and prayed for the forgiveness of the people. They foretold why Jerusalem would be destroyed, in an attempt to persuade the society to return to God. The option for rebels was exile according to their messages, but there was always time for restoration, which portrays YHWH as loving and kind and forgiving. The righteousness of YHWH will not allow him to punish them for long, which is why he expects righteousness from Israel and Judah (see Sweeney 2005:15-16).

²⁰⁶These were seers who predicted the future. Kings consulted them on important decisions and they were the custodians of Israel's religion. Several of them work and served the people at different era. They were people's prophet נביא who had particular messages, some called them "men with a message" who spoke without fear or favour. In contemporary times some neo-charismatics use the office for titles of their clergy.

Kings, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. They were speakers who uttered “Thus says the Lord” as an indication of a message from YHWH to his people, as a sign of authority and clarity. Though there were some who pretend to come from God but they were false seers, who quoted the Lord when he had not spoken (Redditt 2008:1-6).

Rofé (1997:76-78) observes that during the time of the monarchy the prophets functioned more as Temple servants together with the priests, to guard the house of the Lord, and to maintain its honour and future (Jeremiah 26:7-16). Sweeney (2011:165) sees prophets as the institutional identity of leaders²⁰⁷ in Israel’s Deuteronomistic history. Samuel resembles servants like Elijah and Elisha, both of whom feature in the book of Kings. In I Chronicles, Samuel and Elkanah are included among the Levitical class.

3.6.5 Social codes of Conduct

There are various codes in the society. Social code are stipulations of rule and conducts for the society²⁰⁸ but also means of honour, respect, hospitality and dignity for the society. These codes are ethical regulations that help humanity to focus on their God, and on a positive moral life. In this text we shall look at just two issues, covenant stipulation and the practice of honour/shame in the society.

a. Covenant – A covenant in general terms is a formal commitment made by two or more willing parties or groups. The covenant²⁰⁹ is related to the Decalogue, and aims to overcome the issue of sin and disobedience. Perlitt (1999:710) explain covenant בְּרִית in the Old Testament as a “contract or an agreement,” a bilateral commitment entered into with another person, mostly humanity and God, usually undertaken with seriousness girded by oaths or rites before God and his people, who serve as witnesses to the agreement. Payne (2009:1051) added that it is a legally binding obligation that focuses on

²⁰⁷There were major and minor prophets, depending on how they work and the length of their oracles in terms of time, vision and durability. They conducted prayers in the Temple and interceded before, during and after the exile, a task probably continued by the Levites.

²⁰⁸Social analysis of the society includes its history or the events in memory that have taken place at specific places, settings or periods. It the culture of the people in the passages. The records involve the nature of the data and multiplicity of the data, as indicated by Robbins (1996). Unfortunately, the text in question is not history, but rather codes of conduct or ethics for a society.

²⁰⁹This is why Wright (1996:62-63) says that before Moses could declare the voice of Yahweh, he made three prefatory points; first the continuity of the covenant is not with our fathers...but with us (vs.2-3), a statement that included the future generation in the covenant. Secondly he stressed the personal nature of the covenant: “The Lord spoke to you face to face” (vs.4-5), in this regard relating to his people. It was a matter of personal address that required personal response to their personal God. Thirdly, it was God’s initiation of redemptive grace which served as the foundation of the law. Hence, God is “The Lord their God” who is being testified through their history.

human redemption. On certain occasions, it involves sharing meals in alliances that are mutually binding. The solemn commitment between God and his people was to bless them if they obey, and to love them for a thousand generations. It was not in his plans to punish, until parents sinned. The option is not punishment but discipline in order to bring them back on track.

- b. Honour** –Smedes (1993:9-11) explains honour from the perspective of shame, as a feeling experienced by a person as a result of his/her misbehaviour in society. Honour is considered on the other hand, as the feeling of being right, faithful or doing what is expected by the society or by God. Social dignity and respect are accorded to one who acts honourably, and in some African contexts, a person could be given a title²¹⁰ based on performance and contribution to social development. Doing what is abominable and forbidden in a community invokes dishonour. Turaki (2012:176-177) refers to gaining honour as being responsible in relation to a society, while shame is a feeling of being involved or caught in what is forbidden.

3.6.6 Social Relationships²¹¹

Social relationships emanate in society with patrons, parents, friends, enemies and many more. The relationship exhibits what taking pains to realize a legal equality of humankind (Von Rad 1980:185). Israel became a brother that makes up the community, the poor, orphans, strangers, slaves, free or widows all enjoyed the benefits of the society. It became a place where people lived as one, united as human beings and dignified as Israel. There would be no life if relationships are not established between the people in their society, God and the people of Israel, and Israel and their environment. See 3.6.3 for details to social relationships.

3.6.7 Cultural Intertext

According to Robbins (1996:58) cultural intertext involves the interactive relationship of the text to other cultures and texts. Cultural knowledge is an insider understanding, known only to the people of the particular culture or those that have learned the culture of the people by interacting with the members of the community. It appears in words or conceptual patterns and structures like values, scripts, codes, systems or myths. Pixley (1992:12) says when male Israelites come before YHWH in the confession ritual with their first fruit of harvest, he

²¹⁰Such titles come as coronation and prayers of the community upon their person, while others may bless or reward positive acts in various ways. Similarly, it is dignity, respect or glory given to one who deserves it

²¹¹ See Social roles/Institutions in Israel and Socio-Cultural Inter-text.

accepts it, knowing that they are the liberated people (Deuteronomy 26:6-9). It creates an awareness that YHWH as the true God who loves his people, who value their lives and plans to free them from slavery.

The celebration is what Dozeman (2009:287-295) titles “Mosaic instruction on the feast of unleavened bread and the firstborn (Exodus 13:3-16)” with regard to the feast of the unleavened bread in Non-P History. This feast was a general instruction in remember/memory זָכַר of their deliverance. The ritual is detailed in Exodus 13:4-9, and took place during the month of Abib, for seven days at a stretch. This was to be taught through generations, especially in the Promised Land. This feast can be found in both P History and Non-P History, but the detail is not our focus. According to Leviticus 26:13, the Lord their God brought them out of Egypt from slavery, and for that reason they ought to serve him.

3.6.8 Israelite and Ancient Near East Treaties

There may not be a fixed reason to say the exodus took place. Even though the exodus of Israel has virtually no support outside the Bible, it forms part of the background to their covenant treaty. In the same way, Robbins (1996:58) states that cultural intertext appears in words, concepts, patterns, values, scripts, codes, system etc. It appears in the form of references, allusions or echoes. Meyers (2005:2) assert that for generations, biblical scholars, have argued on the story lines of the exodus journey. They assumed that the oppression, deliverance, the wilderness experience and the theophany, the Sabbath as well as the covenant at Sinai were ancient indications. She believes that pieces of the stories were first read in isolation before they were later put together as the record of the exodus²¹². The exile, the priestly activities before YHWH and, after the leadership of Samuel, Judges, and especially Moses were additional realities of the history of the YHWH-Israel relationship. It remains difficult to authenticate a record from such sources²¹³. Kessler (2008:19) refers to

²¹² According to Vos (1983:55) the exodus of Israel was a major event. In I Kings 6:1, the Bible indicates that the exodus took place about 480 years before the fourth year of king Solomon’s rule, the time they started building the temple, and the end of Solomon’s rule as king was 967BCE, which means the exodus most have been between 1447-1438BCE. There are arguments that the exodus was a reality from the evidence of the Bible to Ramses III, Thutmose III or Amenhotep’s reign. Davids (1983:254-255) adds that the Israel stele was found in Menepthah mortuary temple of Thebes. Armerding (1983:254) locates the earliest reference to Israel in the stele of the Egyptian pharaoh Menepthah (1230BCE), and Israel refers to Ahab. In the late 9th century BCE comes the Mesha stele, the king of Moab and there was reference to Israel were Omri ruled. In (744-727BCE) Israel was considered a house/land of Omri. In 721BCE, an Assyrian record referred to Hezekiah.

²¹³ Interestingly, in Kessler’s (2008:26) opinion, various sources of information are available, including: *Annals of History*: they provide detailed information regarding the exile of Israel and Judah, the siege of Jerusalem, a list of kings that ruled Israel, Israel’s trade partners and various killings in the land (I Kings 14:25-26); *Fictional Stories* which have connections that are flexible or mythical (I Samuel 10-I Kings 11, Jeremiah 32); *The Legal*

categories like their geographical setting, historical environment, archaeological findings and artefacts that were discovered after ages of their existence, to furnish their social context. Leading figures provided supporting evidence of characters like Moses, the judges, priests, kings and other exilic/post-exilic prophets like Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, Ezra, Esther etc. and many more.

The prophet gave this report to his fellow returning Israelites who were not sure what would happen to them as they settled down after the exile. It called for a covenant treaty like Deuteronomy. In this regard Levinson (2008:60-61) says Ezekiel was among the upper echelon of the Judean society who were deported from Judah to Babylon in 593-573 BCE. Their hope was to be restored in Jerusalem; Ezekiel now reassured them that both fathers and the children belong to Yahweh their God, but there will no longer be situation where fathers will eat sour grapes and the children's teeth will be affected. Nonetheless, the issue of faithfulness/obedience is applicable if both parties observe their role, respecting their cultic and social codes. Their relationship brought their smallest social unit, the family, and all the tribes of the land, under priests/Levites who lead the temple worship. There are various bases of information²¹⁴ found in and outside the land, but support the second hypothesis in 1.3. It calls for understanding the nature of the data²¹⁵ for the exodus, following that the spectrum of the data are significant for interpreting the society and the theme of the covenant/treaties.

3.7 Inter-text with Ancient Near Eastern Treaties

The Decalogue serves as a late literary creation by a group of post-exilic priests, possibly in the mid-6th century to late 5th century BCE. It contains the blessings and curses in the second commandment. Weinfeld (1992:171) said oaths of loyalty portray the theme of condemnation and consequences in a relationship. Violators or transgressors often suffer certain punishment

Texts containing the descriptions of Leviticus, and part of I Kings. *Poetic Information* reporting activities that concern worship, deity, society in Psalms, Songs of Songs, and the Prophetic writings; *Wisdom Writings* which concern families, marriage, children and their responsibilities to the society (Job, Ecclesiastes and Proverbs).

²¹⁴ Though they are regarded as later development records of the annals of Israel is a record of the daily history of the people as noted by Kessler (2008:25); David and Saul are speculated to be outside Judah or Jerusalem in the 10th Century BCE. Dozeman (2009:27-28) indicates that the events took place long ago (Exodus 12:40-41), and the tabernacle erection followed (Exodus 40:1-2, 17). According to scholars Israelites were enslaved in the year 430 in Egypt. It follows that Jacob and his family settled in Goshen later (Genesis 46:28, 47:11, Exodus 8:22, 9:26).

²¹⁵The canonical "Old Testament" Hebrew Bible, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and other ancient manuscripts of/from Israel's neighbours are considered by Kessler (2008:21). The material remains of excavation by archaeologists are primary, they include houses, temples, ancient coins, pottery, ancient tools, graffiti and other inscriptions. Other are socio-ethnological analogies, theories derived from modern sociological and anthropological findings like the segmentary lineage, a cephalic rule, regulated anarchy and tribal class society, etc.

for their act, and most of the punishments were directed upon their children. This motif with regards to the breach of the oath, was prevalent in the Noe-Assyrian texts. However, the idea of kingship of God was involved in the Israel-YHWH relationship, in which God was the superior partner who was willing to bless. This reflects the form of political treaties of the Assyrian empire then. Brueggemann (2001:19) says the self-conscious Israelites community could have made covenant an option for alliance with YHWH, as well as an alternative for relating with Assyria, although it conflicted with their leadership in Jerusalem, in the late monarchical era, late pre-exilic and early post-exilic. The commitment was politically motivated, economically disadvantaged and still theologically unwelcome for Yahwism (II Kings 22-23). Aaron (2006:1-2) notes that the legal agreement recorded in the Pentateuch contains three versions of the Decalogue in Exodus 20, 34 and Deuteronomy 5, with the purpose of establishing strong socio-political unity among God's people. This could as well have been coined by the priests to exert power and responsibility during the second Temple era, to emphasize the covenant and the holiness code. The 7th to 6th century BCE seems better as the period of composition prior to 6th century.

Although ancient treaties²¹⁶ were drawn up at different times, Weinfeld (1992:170) remarks that the covenant scene in VTE and Deuteronomy involved two parties, agreement and consequences (Deuteronomy 29:9-11, II Kings 23:1-3, versus the Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon) Iron Age II. Accordingly, they are to love their suzerain with "all their heart and all their soul", to fear, follow, seek him and hearken to his voice. Love and loyalty from the vassal expresses respect and dignity to the sovereign Lord. They are involved as equal partners in a mutual relationship. For Schmid (2012:19-22) the story of Israel is accumulated in their sins; the northern kingdom did not depart from the transgressions of Jeroboam, while the southern kingdom did not abolish their multitude high places. Not all kings did evil before

²¹⁶This ideology of cause and effect is quite ancient, especially in the treaties between kings, like the "Agreement between Ir-Addu and Niqmepa (AT 2) (2.128)" Middle Bronze Age by Richard S. Hess (2000). There were stipulations but they noted a treaty from the middle Babylonian period of Alalakh (level IV). Second millennium law codes such as Ur-Nammu 17; Lipit-Ishtar 12-13; Eshnuna 5; Hammurabi 16-20, were marked by seals from the parties involved (the great king Abban, son of Sharran, servant of Addu, favoured of Addu, possession of Hebat) are witnesses. There was a seal of Ir-Addu, the king of Tunip, the text of the divine oath of Niqmepa, king of Mukis and of Ir-Addu who had an agreement. They had various "stipulations" in line 5-9, Merchants or Sutean Troop, line 10-16 Protest, line 17-19 Migration, line 20-21 Captives, line 22-32 slaves and fugitive, line 33-38 Domestic, line 39-47 Custody, line 48-54 a Thief, line 55-59 Protection for Migrants, line 60-68 Arrest of Criminal Migrants, line 69- 72 City Life, line 73-76 Respect for Kings, and line 77-79 Curses etc. McCarthy (1963:106) indicates that it is an obligation laid by ancient kings of Nairi... to swear (*utammī*) an oath (*nisilantī*) by great gods of the heavens and earth, and make tributes to the future. Tributes involved oath taking and invocations. According to Sargon, transgressors suffer for consequences. Similarly, the *Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon* (VTE) of 672BCE Iron Age II was an oath of loyalty that expressed respect for the parties involved.

God (II Kings 21-24). The sin of Manasseh increased the ire of God, in that Josiah's intervention could not avert their disaster. Thus YHWH rejected Israel and Judah, allowing them to be taken captive. This forms the context Joshua-II Kings, the larger context of the story.

This structure resembles Deuteronomy, although these are school texts that were copied again and again by students for practice purpose, hence the repetition. One chose treaties like Old Babylonian text from Alalakh level VII to begin with "Abbael's Gift of Alalakh (AT 1) (2.127)" Middle Bronze Age by Richard Hess (2000:329). This appears in AT 456 like Joshua 8:30-35, 24:1-28. There was (blessing and) curse in line 13b-20, where it says that whoever changes the world that Abbael has made for Yarimlin and does evil to his descendants, may Addu dash him in pieces with the weapon in his hand, may Hebat Ishtar break his spear, may Ishtar give him up to the hands of his conquerors, may Ishtar impress femaleness into his maleness, (Deuteronomy 5:32, 17:20, 28:19, Joshua 1:7, 23:6, Isaiah 30:21, Leviticus 26:36-39). Hess presents another curse in "The Agreement between Ir-Addu and Niqmepe (AT 2) (2.128)," which says whoever transgressed, "Addu the L[ord of divin]ation, Shapash the lord of judgement, sin, and great gods, will destroy him. [Let] his name and seed [per]ish from the land. Let them make him forsake his throne and his sceptre..." similar to Deuteronomy 28:49-68. It takes into consideration blessing and curse (Leviticus 26) in the context of the covenant (Hess 2000:329).

This section took into cognisance the laws, and Martha Roth (2000:335-353) notes "The Law of Hammurabi (2.131)", which contains 282 laws and then concludes with blessings and curses. The Amorite and other nomadic groups were integrated to the Mesopotamian urban politics and social life in the 2nd millennium (ca. 1894-1881 BCE Middle Bronze Age) and settled in Babylon at the time of the rival cities of Isin and Larsa in the south. In (ca. 1792-1750BCE Middle Bronze Age) Hammurabi took the throne and focused on developing Babylon as the central power that included Sumer and Akkad. These laws emphasised gods and kings, using praises like:

"I am Hammurabi, the Shepherd, selected by the god Enlil (lines i.50-v.13) ...the pious provider of the Enkur temple; ...the capable king, the restorer of the city Eridu, the purifier of the rite of the Eabzu temple; the onslaught of the four regions of the world who magnified the reputation of the city Babylon, who gladdened the heart of his divine lord Marduk, whose days are devoted to the Esagil temple; ... seed of royalty, he whom the god sin created, enriched of the city of Ur, humble and talented,... the discerning king, obedient to the god Shamash, the mighty one ..." (2000:336).

This can be compared to the beginning of Deuteronomy 5:1-5, where YHWH exclaimed, “I am the Lord your God” just as “I am Hammurabi” repeated as “I am the king preeminent among kings”, then blessings follow after 282 laws in (lines xlvii.79-xlix.17); “may my name be remembered in Esagil’s temple which I love;” “I am Hammurabi, king of justice”, may the god Shamash lengthen his reign as he did to me, may he shepherd his people with justice.” The use of conditional word “May” in the blessing appears severally. On the other hand, the curses appear (in lines xlix.18-li.91) using “may” in rendering the curses. “May the god Enlil, the lord of destinies magnifies my kingship, may the great god Anu, father of the god who proclaimed my reign, deprive him of the sheen of royalty, Shamash his sceptre and curse his destiny.” These curses appear in different lines on conditions to heed his laws, inscribed upon the stela. It uses “if”, in reference to certain punishments in the 282 laws, though not same as the Decalogue. Pritchard (1955:289) notes a similar trend from Esarhaddon (680-669BCE Iron Age II) in “The Fight for the Throne”. Just as praises were rendered to Esarhaddon the great king, legitimate king, king of the world, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of the four rims of the earth, the true shepherd, favourite of the great god ... that is how YHWH is praised: “I am the lord your God” calls the attention of the audience to obey and respect God.

Oath taking was put in place to guard the partners in the covenant/treaties of the ancient times. Weinfeld (1992:169) observes that that change of leadership in ANE requires other back-up agreements and pledges. These were vassal treaties like the Assyrian treaty of Esarhaddon in 672BCE Iron Age II that provided opportunity for all parties to be faithful by referring to their agreement. This was common to Deuteronomy, to take oaths by partners. Retiring kings or leaders often observe this practice in regard to their successor, where loyalty is pledged toward good governance or followership. In the case of Horeb/Sinai covenant, faithfulness to YHWH was required by Israel to keep their word in the covenant. It also applied when Moses was to hand over to Joshua (Deuteronomy 3:23-29, 31:1-8).

In Deuteronomy 21:1-9 elders were involved in the treaty. The curse²¹⁷ in the covenant involves the loss of land and seed (Deuteronomy 28:49-68). In line 77-79, the “curses” say

²¹⁷Possession (*Sikiltu*) of God and Israel is a special relationship (Exodus 19:5), as in Alalakh. The “*Custody*” in line 39-47 states that if you hold a man in custody ...with another man, he will go (free). If (they break) his fetters, then shave off his slave mark... and someone captures him, then he is a thief. If he declares ...then he will state with an oath; if he does not agree to an oath, then he is a thief and (shall be treated) like a thief. If criminal, whether man, woman or child, goes from his house (and) he (the owner) seizes him, he is a thief and so his owner shall swear it; “surely I did not seize him on a journey of his own doing”. Though these treaties co-

whoever transgresses in these matters, (Middle Bronze Age) Addu, “the Lord of divination sharpsh the Lord of judgement/sin and the great gods will destroy him. (Let) his name and seed perish from the lands. Let them make him forsake his throne and his sceptre...” This is concluded by various seals from the parties involved as marks of loyalty and respect. The seals include 1. Seal of the great king Abban, 2. Son of Sharran, 3. Servant of Addu, 4. Favoured of Addu, 5. Possession, 6. Of Hebat. These were organized in the forming of treaties, though older than the Israelite stipulation, but depict covenantal issues.

3.7.1 Ancient Context and Deuteronomy 27-28

Mann (1995:143) explains that the ancient context of treaties presents the text as looking into the future (26:17-19, 27:9) for the Levites to instruct the people about the blessings as well as the curses that lie ahead. Again the condition is their loyalty to their God. Deuteronomy 28 depicts lists blessings and curses, and often the blessings come before the curses, perhaps to indicate the benefits. McConville (2002:404-405) outlines the condition for blessing as listening or hearing what God commands. There is a connection between covenant blessings and curses and the blessings and curses of ANET. Deuteronomy might have reinterpreted the treaty informing of the covenant and reinterpreted it. Most Mesopotamian rulers like Esarhaddon and Hittite kings engaged in such treaties.

Miller (1990:193) recalls the content as setting forth sanctions of the covenant and encouraging obedience to divine instructions. Regarding the blessing and curses in Deuteronomy 27-28, 11:26-31, and 30:15-20 Wright (1996:280-281) draws attention to the list of blessings and curses, and mentions that Deuteronomy modelled its events on the treaty format. Brueggemann (2001:254-255) considers the recital of blessings and curses in the closing of the historical covenant sanction. The partners have equal benefit connecting YHWH and Israel in the “stipulations”. The system remembers good and bad, based on the sanction, with evidence that applies to those involved in a treaty.

3.7.2 Ancient Context and Joshua 8:30-35

Butler (1983:91-92) recognizes that when Joshua leads Israel in covenantal fidelity at Gilgal, the altar plays a minor role, but the Deuteronomist notes the legitimacy of the sacrifice and worship in Jerusalem’s central sanctuary. The altar of YHWH had been destroyed, and now mount Ebal serves as the altar of God, also as the place of curse. The people of God who

existed, the Assyrians and Babylonians initiated them, like the Israelites did later. They copied each other’s cultures from the school texts as neighbours.

broke the law arrive at the place of the covenant where God chooses to renew their relationship and commitment. Joshua takes care to observe the law and Mosaic commandments. This worship now meets the requirement of the Deuteronomist, with the ark and the Levite priests at the centre of renewal. Nelson (1997:118) adds that everything here goes back to Deuteronomy 27:2-13, where the altar signifies cultic activities and blessings upon the participants. The twelve tribes had no active role but the Levites and priests were associated with the ark. Thus blessing dominates the cursing in Deuteronomy 11:26-29 as contained in the law in Deuteronomy 28. Joshua portrays a royal figure that leads the covenant renewal. In this he fulfils the obligation of the king, following the law and covenant mediation. The community is now liable to the law, slave or free, men, women or children.

Howard (1998:215-218) finds that Joshua 9-11 indicates the coalition of cities of six kings that came against Israel. Israel's impressive victory over the Canaanites, Ai and Jericho caused hearts to melt. Joshua singled out the curses and blessings to the people of Israel, to make them ready for a battle of sanctity. This highlights the degree and significance of obedience to God's instructions from everyone including women, children and slaves. Pressler (2002:64) shows the conquest at Ai and Jericho was a renewal and restoration for those loyal to YHWH. The text depicts Israel moving to worship at Ebal, possibly six hundred years after the event. Archaeological findings reflect an Iron Age II installation, to Joshua's altar. The story points to faithfulness to the Torah by providing good examples and careful obedience as instructed by Moses. Worship and sacrifice/altars are inseparable from the theology of obeying and be blessed, or otherwise, sin and be cursed.

Creach (2003:80-82) refers to a covenant renewal ceremony before two mountains, Ebal and Gerizim, with Israel. The city of Shechem has historical importance that points to memory and past (Genesis 12:26, 34; Joshua 24:1). This place of בְּרִית (covenant) was also called Gilgal, as the place where Israel arrived after the crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 9:6). According to him, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי בְרִית "Lord of the covenant" (Judges 9:4) and אֱלֹהֵי בְרִית "God of the covenant" were mentioned as participants playing a role. Joshua 8:30-35 describes the place as a spot for ceremony, reaffirming an agreement between the monotheistic God and Israel, through Moses. MacDonald (2003:13-14) notes that primeval religion was pure and spiritual, but that polytheism and idolatry resulted from human degeneration. Monotheism existed in the ancient Mediterranean and Egypt, and Moses grew up in this knowledge and belief, but most kings were polytheistic. McConville and Williams (2010:44) see Joshua as representing a new king figure for Israel, in contrast to the dethroned Canaanite king. Joshua secured the

central highlands for Yahweh. The first commandment after the crossing of the Jordan was to “proclaim on mount Gerizim God’s blessing and on mount Ebal the curses”. This ceremony of blessings and curses is performed (?) upon entry to the “Promised Land”. Central to the Shechem and occupying a position close to the middle of the land, is the place of covenantal renewal (Joshua 24).

Note that these stipulations and ideologies were similar to covenant stipulations of the Israelites as contained in Deuteronomy. In the past, failure to keep the treaty entailed great punishment, so also in Israel it entails great punishment to the third and fourth generations as a consequence of their corporate sin. Thus it is important to note that the complexity of the ancient Mediterranean legislation appears in the context of Deuteronomy (Aaron 2006:166-167). The 8th to 7th centuries BCE, the period of the divided monarchy until the exile in the Iron Age II, relates to certain materials from the northern kingdom, to prophet Hosea and the *Elohist*. The 8th to 7th centuries coincided in many ways with Josiah’s reforms (II Kings 22:11). These features are notably reminiscent in idea and language of the Assyrian loyal treaties (Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon, 672 BCE in Iron Age II). In it idols were supreme deities that were never disobeyed; their treaties confirm and seal the contract, making cultic oaths binding on all. Significantly, a covenant relationship serves as reminder of their treaties, and informs the background to the ideology, “obey and be blessed”.

When sin of the fathers upon the children ends in punishment, it is informed by the covenant-like treaty of the past. It insinuates the Golden Calf as bridge of covenant which brings a similar nuance with regards to the purpose of the Decalogue. This is not just a reference to the idol but lenses through which Israel must see what God hates and the cause of his jealousy. Although it may be the speeches of Moses, their mediator; the theophany shows God’s involvement in the agreement process which ought to be respected. Now allegiance has shifted from YHWH to the calf of gold, just as they raised the issue of בְּעִלְבָּרִית covenant with Baal, not with YHWH. This is a shift of priority that made YHWH jealous in the Decalogue and led to his judgement upon their third to fourth generations. Breaking an agreement entails great punishment and all parties were familiar with these conditions. It can be a lens for modern humanity to reconsider the significance of respect and dignity for God and other human beings.

3.8 Ideological and Theological Analysis

The main ideology of the covenant text is “cause and effect” though not in all occasions, it is otherwise “obey and be blessed”. Besides it could be reconsidered as “disobey and be cursed”, depending on what is observed in our actions within the society. This quest seeks a divine relationship between humankind and their surroundings. A theological reading centres on the deity but remains open to debate, while an ideological approach centres on people and powers that be, and is undebatable. Robbins (1996:95) says it provides a framework for the members to understand their place in the social order. This determines the different social, political and economic power structures that are operational at the time the text was written and the type of power discourse employed by particular authors of that text. The major aspect of this approach is unmasking the injustices and biases of oppressive structures in the text.

3.8.1 Location of Ideology in the Society

Certain aspects of grouping may not be clear in the text. The Decalogue contains a series of speeches attributed to YHWH, with the possibility (?) of having been altered by Moses, their intermediary. Moses, the third character in the text, was chosen as their leader, to deliver God’s enslaved/exiled society from Egypt. He is their arbitrator and negotiator, leader of the society, their prophet as well as priest in Israel. Gathered around Moses, Israel does not see YHWH yet they believe what Moses reports. Moses here is their representative before their God (first as their elder in the family, then then as priest, prophet and mediator). The text puts him at the centre as a leader of God’s people, and YHWH is at the centre of the mountain bestowing the law on his people.

3.8.2 Action Set in Relation to the Decalogue

Israel was gathered before YHWH, under Moses, and whatever Moses reported, they would accept. Pixley (1992:12-13) says YHWH will not refuse to give a helping hand, to give his ears, to open his eyes to see the poor and oppressed. This is why the exodus refers to Egypt as a master-slave relationship, and YHWH as an able king who can dethrone kings. Milgrom (2004:319) refers to “The one who broke the bars of their yoke” and freed them from slavery (Ezekiel 34:27), the ancient yoke²¹⁸. The covenant treaty was to seal the deal and to help remember what had taken place in the past when they were in bondage, and that it could happen again and they could be punished for their disobedience or blessed for their loyalty.

²¹⁸The yoke rest on pairs of animals, like pole of wood, a bars that consist of pieces of wood placed on the neck by thongs (Jeremiah 2:20, 27:2). Israel was bearing such a burden in Egypt before YHWH freed them.

The intercessory role of Moses in the treaty helped Israel listen to God giving the Decalogue directly to them. In I Samuel they requested a king, against the Kingship of YHWH, to whose kingdom they belong. Thus the King and the Decalogue came to Israel with their collective consent. This same group that began as a family, בֵּית־אָב that is the (father's household of twelve brothers), later grew in number and became clans/chiefdoms, מְשֻׁפְּתֵהָ and later regrouped as twelve טַבְּוֹט (tribes), who are now an organized state called Israel. Their leaders were chosen or called from their midst like the Elders, Judges, Levites, priests, prophets and Kings, who function as servants of YHWH their supreme leader.

3.8.3 Corporate Group and Deity

The relationship of a group and its deity was significant in ANE; deities were obeyed based on certain treaties²¹⁹. From the context of the covenant Weinfeld (1992:169) reads the ideology of the treaties through the covenant speeches in Deuteronomy. Oaths were taken by leaders in order to maintain the relationship. This practice continued in Israel's history of the second Temple period, like chronicles were put in the mouth of Abijah, the son of Rehoboam. These speeches emphasized the eternity of the Davidic dynasty and the sole legitimacy of the Jerusalemite Temple in II Chronicles 13:4-12. This relationship is what led to individual and corporate responsibility that existed to ensure faithfulness and blessings, although emphasized by Assyrian culture, it was also significant for this covenant. Hagedorn (2004:111-113) indicates that the priesthood role is reflected in Deuteronomy 17:8-13, and 18:1-8; the priests in Deuteronomy and Greek priests all offered sacrifices. They were honoured for their role in society, but seem to symbolize individuals that are far removed from the general concerns of the society. Deuteronomy 16:18-20 addresses individuals and their responsibilities towards their God. Human fidelity depends on the person, not his group, but since it is an accepted ideology in the society it stands accepted.

Israel existed as a corporate society with one responsibility, whose collective right was embedded together in the contract. Corporate personality was encouraged and there was no place for individualistic lifestyle; what affected one affected all in this regard. This nation was the kingdom of God where God was their supreme King and called the עִיר־דָּוִד "city of David". They believed in corporate responsibility in the society just as most African

²¹⁹It indicates the objection of the northern kingdom to the Davidic kingdom with regards to the Jerusalemite Temple, as rebellion against God (I Maccabees 2:48-67).

communities do, especially in western Africa. It means that “whatever affects one affects all”. In this manner, their interest was collective²²⁰, as salvation of the land/people and not merely individual survival. Perdue (1997:224) finds Israel’s theological understanding hidden in their story, an idea of “house of the father”. The idea rendered God metaphorically as having a social role in the society. Similar roles could be drawn from the Torah, like “Redeemer of Israel”, “Helper of his people”, “fair Judge”, “great Provider” and “covenant Keeper”. In Turaki’s (2012:26) opinion God is revealed to human societies in the same way, but may be perceived differently. Our African concept of God clarifies our biblical perception of who he is and what he is able to do. The Creator sees, he knows his own, but God stands far from us whenever we wrong him; however, he is willing to bring back his love ones. For this reason he offers conditional love²²¹ to discipline the children for the sins of their fathers, in order to redeem them to himself.

I. Ideology of Monotheism of YHWH

The text started with theophany, “I am the Lord your God” (Deuteronomy 5), qualified by their deliverance from the land of Egypt, the house of slavery. Perhaps this is why Wright (1996:105) logically articulates the formulation, Yahweh is our God; Yahweh is one, Yahweh is our God; Yahweh is alone, Yahweh our God; Yahweh alone, Yahweh our God; Yahweh is one. Yahweh our God is one Yahweh, is use to explain the monotheistic nature of YHWH. Later MacDonald elaborated on the logic. This means that YHWH is the only one they must love and worship, and thus should not be compared to idols/images. Apart from Deuteronomy 6:4 quite a number of references in Deuteronomy discuss the topic of monotheism from diverse contexts. MacDonald (2003:59-60) enumerates ‘the Lord your God; there is no other beside him’ (4:35), ‘The Lord is in heaven, there is no other beside him’ (4:39), ‘You shall have no other gods before me’ (5:7), ‘The Lord your God is God’ (7:9), ‘The Lord your God is the God of gods, mighty and awesome’ (10:17), ‘See now I, even I, am he; there is no god beside me’ (32:39), and ‘There is none like God, O Jerusalem’

²²⁰This is how they are obligated as a post exilic covenant community that entered into the covenant with God. They are responsible for everybody, and everybody’s sin means collective sin. Their sin is against YHWH, the deity of Israel. The central message of the Decalogue can hence be presumed as “YHWH, who hates sin, must be pleased.

²²¹ Conditioned his love by being jealous whenever his loved ones deviate and follow other gods. Levinson (2008:85) explains YHWH’s jealousy and reasons for visiting the guilt of fathers upon the children, if children continue in the ways of their fathers (sinning). It is not only the guilt that makes children culprits but also the corporate nature of the society of God’s followers. Though even non-followers can testify that the scar of their wrong does not fade in their lifetime, but remains visible even on their children. One considers this punishment as discipline, not hatred, love not punishment, chastisement not rejection. YHWH’s love is conditioned on “cause and effect”, obey and be blessed, an intension of Love hidden under the speech, not an idea of rejection or hatred.

(33:26). The references point to one God of Israel, the one and only true God of the universe, rendering the יְהוָה central to Jewish and Christian traditions. It is a daily confession of faith and regular prayer in Judaism.

The יְהוָה is used to revive and maintain focus on the God of Israel, the only God who was at the beginning, and is still mighty to his people. In this periscope, the characters involve YHWH and Israel as important to each other. Mann (1995:47-48) submits that though describing God²²² as multifaceted, metaphors employed in the attempt suggest identifiable objects, such as comparing God to a rock, an eagle, a soldier, a father, husband, wife/woman in child birth or labour, the healer, provider, deliverer etc. In all, notice how God is pictured metaphorically as a person who acts and speaks to show his God-ness. McConville (2002:20) says distinct features of the book points to a covenant God. Moses emphasized the need to focus their worship on YHWH their God, to be dependent on him and most of all, obey him knowing his mighty deeds in the past. The Torah remains their regulatory principle which indicates how the covenant will help them to remember their God.

Mann (1995:50) says that the story of Mono-Yahwism, emphasizing one God, one people and one cult, captures the imagination at the beginning of the law. The יְהוָה was made to tell and re-tell their children this history with the purpose of drawing their attention and increasing their love for God. The idea is to instil the concept of monotheism, to accept the fact that there is no God except YHWH, the only God of Israel, who opposes other gods, idols and images alike. Wright (1996:45-46) explains that the purpose of their fidelity is to prosper in their new land. Their faithfulness will motivate God in Zion to bless them, as it was agreed. Obeying the law was not a mere practice, but aimed to fulfil destiny. They are to please their God, not their self; their happiness is conditional to his love. MacDonald (2003:64-67) refers to a four alternatives interpretations of monotheism. One considers these four premises to a logical conclusion; if YHWH is our God; and YHWH is one it means, our God, is one YHWH; which goes to show that, YHWH our God is one and YHWH alone. On

²²²In the Ten Commandments, God spoke to humanity in words, telling them what he wants them to do in the covenant. The requirement for the society created by God himself was a law code for the regulation of the society (the heart of biblical records). One who is faithful, who keeps promises to Israel's ancestors, desires faithfulness from his people, his creatures. This is one point of emphasis that emanated from the confusion of polytheism when they got mixed up with the Canaanites.

the other hand, the four interpretations may differ but they all point to the monotheistic nature of YHWH. This רַמָּה draws them to their one and only God who dwells in Zion.

II. Zion Ideology

The term Zion²²³ צִיּוֹן according to Kraus (1986:80-81), is the centre of the universe, which is decided by God's election in history. This metaphor represents the dwelling of God surrounded by water and streams, related to cultic traditions of "God Most High". The hints are in service of the assertion that concern the loftier power of Israel's God, the one enthroned in Zion, who intervenes for his people (Psalms 46:1, 3, 7, 11). Their safety lies with Yahweh in his holy mountain, a city surrounded by mighty armies, kings, kingdoms and princes, to protect the holy inhabitants, making it a place of peace that secures fruitfulness and security. It is understood by Ollenburger (1987:152) as containing two traditions. The first is the Mosaic belief, historical in nature and containing Israel's story regarding their liberation from Egypt. It relates their covenantal character and the relationship to the Torah as well as Yahweh. Second is the Jerusalem tradition, which is cosmic in nature; it contests on creation and establishes Zion as the site of YHWH, stressing the covenant with Israel and their unconditional election, thus emphasizing the promise to defend Jerusalem from foreign attacks and to maintain the Davidic dynasty.

This idea made Kraus (1986:152) portrays Jerusalem as the sanctuary on Zion, the city of God (Psalm 46, 48, 76). Mount Zion is located in the northern Israel, believed to be a point of connection to heaven (Isaiah 14:13-14). The mountain of the gods is located above the clouds and the stars, the sacred mountain which is considered the throne of "God Most High". Universal pre-eminence was accorded to Zaphon, the place where God dwells above, as God's chief's sanctuary²²⁴. Ollenburger (1987:15) identified a cluster of motifs in Zion theology from the psalms: Firstly, it is the peak of Zaphon mountain (Psalm 48:3-4).

²²³The place of comfort made Israel relaxed and lazy to their commitments, making their God jealous, hence he punished them. Robertson (1990:207) mentioned that heathen piety must be viewed as worthless worship, and human fabrications that can never be a substitute for Yahweh (Habakkuk 2:18). The idolatry of Babylon may be the source of their atrocities that perverted their moral standards. They created gods that can't speak, and lived life different from YHWH's. They carved idols that mocked their very existence. Brueggemann (2000:532) further says it is Manasseh's failure to maintain holiness that stoked YHWH's jealousy. II Kings 21:3-4 provides an explanation to non-Yahwistic worship prohibited by God, a religion of high places, altars, poles and Asherah; others are divinations, passing a son through fire. In II Kings 23:4-5, he reflected on the carelessness and compromises done using symbols, images and emblems in the practice of religious loyalties that are contrary to God's covenantal requirements. In the rule of kings, Zion is the place of leadership and ruling. It is not free from sin nor able to escape judgement (Lamentation 2:1), Zion expresses the coming judgement, the place of salvation, where Yahweh will restore his people (Jeremiah 30:17-18, Isaiah 1:11) Bellinger (2009:986).

²²⁴Accordingly, in Syro-Phoenicia north of ancient Ugarit stood the holy mountain where ancient Syria believes was the throne of Baal, the highest god, an equivalent of Olympus Mountain in Syria and Canaan (Isaiah 2:2-3).

Secondly, it is the river of paradise that flows from Zion. Thirdly, Yahweh triumphs over the flood at Zion's chaotic waters (Psalm 46:3). Lastly, Yahweh triumphed over other nations and their kings (Psalm 46:7, 48:5-7, 76:4-7).

Bellinger (2009:986) says it could be the Temple or dwelling place of YHWH, enthroned in Jerusalem (Psalm 9, 76:2, 132:13-14). In Isaiah 30:17-19, mount Zion is the city of God, a specific meeting place between Israel and their God for fellowship. This is the place where God will bring vengeance upon his enemies. To Roberts (2009b:988) YHWH was called *Elyon*, "The Most High" or "Great King" (Psalm 47:2, 48:2). This explains his supreme rulership over his people. Davidic²²⁵ rule was respected all over the world. The Zion tradition now emphasizes a stable reign of God and YHWH is now a resident God with his people. It describes the place of dwelling where the protection and safety of Israel radiates continuously. It is assumed that God will act, meaning they have no part in righteousness, but can allow him to perform.

III. Ideology of YHWH's Religious Community²²⁶

Various metaphors are used to refer to the relationship of God and Israel or with community groups. In this context such groups include cliques, gangs, action teams, corporate groups²²⁷ and traditional alliances²²⁸ in the society. The religious community has an obligation to observe the laws and to be faithful as covenant partners. Brueggemann (2001:128) notes that the motivation at the beginning of the Decalogue relates what YHWH has done. It appeals seriously for willingness to obey. This indicates that YHWH is not willing to punish anyone, he is the one who loves them. These were laws of worship applicable to today's setting as

²²⁵ They respected the Davidic rule in Edom, Moab, Aramea and Amon and consider them as native and corrupt while Yahweh is the national and holy deity. Davidic rule represented YHWH (Psalm 78:67-72, 89:19-20), the son of Yahweh, heir of God, imperial possession, first born of *Elyon* (Psalm 2:7-8, 89:3-4, 27, II Samuel 7:12-16, 23:1-5), God that establishes justice on earth and reigns forever.

²²⁶ **Clique:** Israel is not a clique though there are sense of cliques within them. YHWH is their God, who they must strive to please. They must do their best to remember what happen in the past, which will help them to obey YHWH their God. **Gang:** Israel in not a gang, but a group of people related to one another as brothers dwelling together as one, chosen people of God who must strive as a gang to please their God. They have no other motives of gang than what will God. On the contrary Israel is a gang with Moses as their gang leader, they must work hard to clean the land of any kind of impurity and keep themselves to the covenant agreements in the Decalogue. These are colloquial terms; I do not think they have any place here, but ask your supervisor.

²²⁷ Refer to specific social topics, to see more on groups and beliefs with regard to the world of humankind.

²²⁸ **Traditional Alliance in Society:** Israel exhibit special alliances to interpretations of theology in regard to the world. Israel is called the people of God, the covenant people and the family of God; also the Church that needs deliverance by YHWH. In contemporary times the church is the family of God. However, the Catholic Church and the Protestant Church wrestle on issues of understanding, such as salvation of humankind, eschatological events, Trinity of the Godhead, and nature of human sin. Others are the fact that the Church, the body of Christ, was governed under the leadership of the Catholic Church as one universal ecclesia. The Protestants are reformers that came out of the Catholic Church.

well. According to Levinson (2008:58) this is why God sets himself as the judge who is transferring the punishment of the fathers onto the children. The terminology of the lament alludes to the Decalogue's theology of trans-generational consequences of sins.

On this note, Pixley (1992:11-13) indicates that the exodus from the land of bondage wasn't an event like any other in Israel, but heralded the beginning of Israel's nationality (Deuteronomy 9:7, Judges 19:30 and Jeremiah 7:25). They ought to know that YHWH is their deliverer, who can do what he did in the past. Milgrom (2004:319) stresses that a deity bestowing blessings upon his people is capable of doing greater miracles. Levinson (2008:61) added that they disobeyed YHWH in the past is now being recounted and the consequences are now traced to the present postexilic generation. This is reminiscent of a scar that may not disappear even when the wound is healed.

IV. Sabbath Motivation in Deuteronomy 5

“Observe the Sabbath” or “keep the Sabbath” or “remember the Sabbath by keeping it holy” are various translations of the command. Von Rad (1966:57-58) says no clear explanation of the celebration has been found regarding keeping the Sabbatical year as sacral fallow period, which would demonstrate Yahweh's right of ownership over the land. Clearly however it is required to keep the day free from human benefit. There are cultic activities on the day, which hand the day back to YHWH. The Decalogue here based the celebration of the day upon Israel's deliverance, so that they remember God's mighty deeds in their relationship. Merrill (1994:149-150) affirms that the שָׁמַר functions in imperative voice, expressing a command, the word זָכַר suggesting a reminder to keep the Sabbath as the Lord has commanded. שָׁבַת means rest or stop or cease; the ideological implication indicates a reference to Genesis 2:2-3, where God rested at the end of the creation process. Just as God ceased work on the day, we must do likewise, stop all forms of work except what is related to worshipping on the Sabbath. The day is holy day, sanctified by YHWH himself, though the day cannot be holy without the people making/keeping it holy. Creation now serves as the motivation for which the Sabbath ought to be remembered and kept. Ideologically, it states the essence of the day as a holy rest day.

Holiness is possibly a priestly addition, but the day itself is a rest day. The day is to be consecrated as a holiday for heads of families, the family members, their slaves, their animals and their visitors. It indicates that even the non-covenant community member who found

themselves in the land had to keep the Sabbath day (to rest); the focus has shifted from worship to rest, when everyone is included and forced to observe the day. In the post-exilic times, the reason for the Sabbath was that God had saved them from Egypt, and not just creation/rest. The Deuteronomic story refers to the new great event, another form of re-creation through a new peoples' exit

Thompson (1974:116-117) underlines certain differences like “remember” and “observe” (the Sabbath) from the two Decalogue accounts. The Seventh²²⁹ day is very important for the three strata of Israel's society to the family, the natives, the aliens/sojourners and the slaves. It shows that the Sabbath created an atmosphere of equality among the dwellers of the land. On equal ground everyone would see and experience the love of God as they rest; it would also allow them to worship on equal grounds and it is the day of freedom from labour, providing opportunity for the lowly to meet the higher strata of the society. According to Wright (1996:74-75) the rhythm of the seventh day of the week presents a unique institution of the Israelites. The day is given to humanity for a particular purpose, “to rest” and “to worship” their God, on a special moment of the week. The same day God rested after the creation, the pattern of the day follows after God's design for the seventh day being a valuable day, while the six days of the week remain available to humankind for economic and social affairs. It was in those six days of the week that God visited his people to show his presence through food provision, and on the seventh day all supplies stopped. Six days presented the period of double blessings for the land, time they could use to their benefit. God created in six days and blessed them to make use of the days for their advantage, but the seventh is reserved for the deliverer.

²²⁹ In the next chapter, we shall see that creation and rest has open the door for the Christian era and in the conclusion (chapter five) it is clearly indicated that this Sabbath motivation has given all humanity equal standard before God and calls on everyone to worship him. Thompson (1974:117) notes that Christians use “Sunday as the rest day”, not to commemorate the Sabbath but to worship in regards to the salvation of all sinners. The Sabbath being the seventh day, Christians took Sunday being the first day of the week when Christ was resurrected after the crucifixion, granting salvation to everyone who believes. Mark 2:27-28 states the Sabbath is made for humanity, not humanity for the Sabbath, speaking of possible changes. The resurrection on the first day of the week follows from the day Christ rose from death. The Sabbath is God's rest day while Jesus' resurrection day is Sunday. We have gone beyond the boundaries of Saturday as the only holy day to making every day a Sabbath unto the Lord. Similarly, while worshiping God is observed in various styles, it is no longer a cult but a way of life for all who believe. The Jews still keep the Sabbath but the Christians keep Sunday worship as the day for God.

3.8.4 Theology of YHWH in the Community

The faithful community places their trust in their God, not wanting to behave like their fathers who sinned in the first place. God hates sin just as he hates and judges' sinners; in contrast the holiness of his people brings him closer. God is now present with the faithful generation, he is in Zion doing miracles and answering the prayers of his loyal servants. God's presence with Israel can no longer be contested which is why they were asleep in Zion.

I. The Theology of Israel's Deity

Studying God is vague and general, on this note Tarazi (1991:121-122) explains that in ancient Near East the fate of deities was understood to be linked to their city and their king. This is why the fall²³⁰ of Jerusalem and its Temple became a signal of failure for the Mosaic and Davidic covenants. In response, Matthews (2007:117) remarked that God created the universe, the sun, moon and stars, but they were not created as deities. There are no sun gods, river gods nor sea gods etc. Only YHWH exists, even in the midst of polytheistic practices in the society, with gods that need human helpers, showing they are worthless man-made gods. Frame (2009:784-785) proves that when talking about God, we should focus on his attributes²³¹ to clarify who God is. Others suggest we should focus on his acts of wonders in history. It indicates that there may be no clear approach to understanding God. God's attributes are part of his characters and his love. Similarly, there are various kinds of gods in human history, but YHWH stood out as Israel's God who is able to deliver and save.

Referring to God's characteristics, Turaki (2012:26-27) compared the features and power of God in terms of prayers, songs and ritual incantations with the oral history of African traditional religion and found certain similarities. It shows that God can be revealed in certain ways in most human societies. This indicates why Africans have certain similarities with the Jews. Furthermore, God is one referred to as יהוה in Deuteronomy 6:4 which showed the supreme God is the one and the same God that is present everywhere Israel goes. He is YHWH, the only God of Israel who saved them and will save those who believe in him even

²³⁰Consequently, if YHWH is in Zion and they were taken captive, it shows his power is not up to the Babylonian and Assyrian gods, like Marduk, or possibly destroyed by other gods like Baal or Amon Re. Unless YHWH shows his power physically, he cannot be respected. The Babylonian and Assyrian kings and their gods seem stronger since they prove more powerful in battle.

²³¹Certain attributes of Israel's God include: first supremacy and ability to control the universe, secondly, exercising supreme authority (Exodus 3:14, Leviticus 18:4-5, Deuteronomy 6:4-9). Thirdly, God's presence is all over with his people, to bless, judge and discipline those he loves (Leviticus 26:12, Genesis 17:7, Jeremiah 7:23). Most of all, his steadfast love endures through generations for those who love him (Frame 2009:785).

today. Furthermore, Frame (2009:793) state that polytheism refers to gods of all kinds and events which are personalized around deities, though not absolute in nature, but YHWH is both personal and absolute. The biblical God is able to enter into a relationship with his followers. This God created the universe, made humanity and grants meaning to human life. Interestingly, he delivered them from Egypt and is powerful over other gods.

II. Voices of Holy Personalities in the Text

There are three personalities/characters that stood out in this text. To start, in Exodus 13:3 Moses conveyed the message of YHWH and began with human consecration. Their leader was Moses while YHWH is their God. They both stand holy before the people which is why Israel asks Moses to go before YHWH on their behalf. Moses had conformed to God's standard. Ohler (1985:15) explains that God spoke to Moses, and Moses spoke to God, conversing as holy personalities. Exodus 3:10-15 pronounces the "I am", spoken by YHWH, the God of their fathers, the holy one of Israel. The priests emphasized YHWH to keep leading the community. Turaki (2012:31) says it is difficult to define holiness when referring to YHWH²³². God is pure and sinless, perfect in judgement, able to know all that concerns humanity. In Judaism, certain cleansing rituals are observed before YHWH. Likewise, in African Traditional Religion a purification process is performed before the gods. It includes that "a man should not lie with his wife or a woman, as preparation for successful hunting". On the contrary, human beings are inherently sinful and no washing of body can purify, except we obey God.

Hawkins (2007:858) states that *kadosh hagios* is the holy one of Israel. It is generally used for God in the Old Testament, mostly in Isaiah. It could be the holy one of Jacob, my holy one or his/your holy one. The one who rules the divine council is the holy one, he is in the midst of his people to lead, provide for them and bless them. Milgrom (2007:850) added that in Semitic polytheism the realm of gods is never completely separated from the world of humankind. They considered trees, seas, river, wind, sun, even animals as objects of worship. The holy one is unapproachable unless by certain rituals or through holy people like Moses who stands before God and Israel. YHWH is the source of holiness, and holiness is God's

²³²Seow (2007:588-594) list various names of God, viz. *Elohim, El Roi, El Olam, Adonai, El shadday, El Berit* etc. Other include metaphors like Holy One, Mighty One, husband to the people, jealous God, shield, rock of ages etc. These are labels applied to his person, to explain his identity, existence and character to humanity. YHWH could plan the future of his people, speak to them and guide them. Other characteristics are that He judges, loves and delivers from bondage.

nature, distinguished from all creatures. On the other hand Otto (2010:568) portrays Moses²³³ as the designer of the judicial system of the Jews, the founder of their religion, who led them out of Egypt through the exodus (Exodus 5-15). Moses was an ancestor who worked as a priest propagating the law and the covenant. In the exilic period Deuteronomy and P adopted Moses's narratives and emphasized him as a prophet who saw the future and one who mediates/intercedes for the people, as well as explaining the Deuteronomic laws in the history of Israel.

III. Salvation History from the Wilderness

The journey of a thousand miles started with a step in the right direction. This history began with "I am the Lord your God who brought you out of Egypt out of the land of slavery" and serves as reminder. Later it became a call to commemorate that they were delivered out of bondage in Egypt. Jones (2009:849-850) clarifies that the wilderness²³⁴ refers to the trajectory of the wandering Israelites to Canaan. It was a place north of the Araba at the northwest of the Dead Sea. Giacomakis (2009:110) described it as "a desert waste land, a barren and desolate area, *midbar*". It was located on the plains of Moab, south to the Jordan in the Negev. Significantly, the wilderness was YHWH's dwelling, where God stands closer to the people, a place they made commitment with regard to the covenant and the laws of their God.

According to Thompson (2009:382-383) the history of Israel can be traced to Abraham, their patriarch and Jacob, whose name was later used, "Israel". The nation was constituted after the exodus when they became a kingdom, in the year 1000 BCE in the Iron Age. The exodus²³⁵ event has been dated variously; some scholars surmise that it could be 1450 AD in the late Bronze Age, after their deliverance from Egypt to nationhood. God had been with Israel and

²³³Moses was their leader in the journey up to the land of Moab, where he died. He had recorded the Torah and was permitted to peep into Canaan, the promised land (Exodus 19-Numbers 10, Numbers 10-Deuteronomy 34). He mediated Yahwism during the journey in the desert (Otto 2010:568).

²³⁴The wilderness signifies a movement from chaos to an organized cosmos, from human sinfulness which led to the exile. The wilderness was a place of wandering, testing, toiling, recreation and reordering their life. They were saved and prepared for a garden city life, in a process of restoration to shape human purpose and give them hope about the future. In the wilderness God showed his power over other gods of Egypt (Deuteronomy 8:15, 32:10). On the other hand, it is described as vast and terrible, a wasteland full of poisonous snakes and scorpions. In Jeremiah 51:43, it is a land where no one lives, a place of thick darkness, aimless and scourging wind, indicating judgement and discipline from their God (Exodus 14:3, Job 24:2-9, Isaiah 30:6, 34:9-15, Hosea 13:15)see Jones (2009:849-850).

²³⁵Jethro advised Moses to delegate certain responsibilities and involve the people in their problems. Their main goal was the mountain of God where Moses started the journey. It was the same place he received the Ten Commandments and prepared the people for Canaan. The journey was a move to show the mightiness of YHWH at the crossing of the Red Sea, when the pillar of fire went ahead of them, the pillar of cloud was above to cover them from the heat of the sun; see Thompson (2009:382-383).

promised to abide with them on their journey. God shows that he is their God. God lives in Zion, the city of the living God and place of comfort. The Sinai²³⁶ experience implies they actually crossed the Peninsula along a route unto Kadesh. They enjoyed miraculous provision of food (manna) and sweet water when they were exhausted (Exodus 17:3-6, Numbers 20:11). They had hostile contact with some nomadic dwellers of the wilderness on the way, while others were friendly to them.

IV. Ethics of a Sacred Community

Israel's history was to be preserved if they established an ethical community. The ethics were established to guide them as they settled into their own land. The entire Decalogue presented part of the ethics of Israel. Keenan (1999:37, 43) comments on the Decalogue that behind every "don't" there is a "do". According to him, the first three commandments place the sovereignty of God before humanity, the next five call for respect in various ways, and the last two summon us to contemplate our deepest desires and to respect our neighbours. The foundation of these commands is respect for human life, consideration of the human body as important and promotion of justice and truth in society. Failure leads to falsehood and deceitful testimonies by witnesses. Barton (2002:98) affirms that the vast details of moral teachings and the post-scriptural ethical tradition in Judaism and Christianity developed from the Bible. It requires a commitment to certain visions of human dignity bestowed by God upon the human race. In like manner, modern readers often direct their concepts of morality and dignity as motivated by the Scriptures. In this way, we will be upright before God and live as brothers who respect and love one another.

The community practiced brotherhood as a new type of life. Daiber (2007:328) stated that membership to the community depended on religious association. They re-organized and assessed their people inside and outside their tradition along the lines of moral obligations. The violation of the legal position of the community is the same as violating the overall order and constitutional relationship that is upheld. Furthermore, Otto (2008:580-581) explains how biblical ethics reflects upon good behaviour and examines its justification. According to him, it is descriptive and scrutinizes the understanding of good customary acts within one's society, and reflects on the consequences of one's acts. This includes the authority of the Sinai collection to justify their norms, which involves reference to the book of the covenant and the Decalogue, the priestly document and the holiness code that stands as an ongoing

²³⁶The number of the people in the wilderness is estimated to be about six hundred thousand in regards to "clan" or "family" (Exodus 12:37).

process of developing inner-biblical interpretation. The emphasis is on corporate love, which stands against sin and disobedience to YHWH or disrespect toward humanity.

The commandments opened with God's sovereignty, progressed to the prohibition of certain human actions, followed by the check on the deepest emotional desires of humankind, and ended with calls to consider one another in the presence of God (Keenan 1999:49). These were priestly persuasions to draw the post-exilic community back to their God and to discern between right and wrong in the society. Kirkpatrick (2001:2) adds that the truth of Scripture is the reliability of reality where actions are produced. It eventually leads to a corporate community, characterised by love among all, peace efforts and justice to all. Greenman and Larsen (2012:17) consider the Decalogue a bill of rights which seeks to protect a person's rights against violation. Nonetheless, humans are God's image and God's covenant partners. The dignity of one another must be their priority in their local community. However, the community determines the interpretation of right or wrong, especially the household-heads. Their focus²³⁷ is to build a people who will obey God and eschew wrong behaviour, thus upholding human dignity. As a result, community ethics are built out of the Scriptures, teaching everyone to recognize and live by the rules of YHWH.

V. Zion Theology

The tradition of Zion holds that God is ever present with his people, hence they should not fret. Ollenburger (1987:152) notes a few contrasts between Mosaic and Zion theology. First, Mosaic theology conceives God's presence as invisible, while Zionism presents the Jerusalem Temple as a constant indication of YHWH. Second, while Mosaic theology shows liberation as the purpose of the defeat of Israel's enemies, the Zion²³⁸ tradition focuses on creation through YHWH's conquest of powers. Third, while Mosaic theology emphasizes theological notions and historical traditions peculiar to Israel, Zion theology owes its character to Canaanite society and its mythologies. According Bellinger Jr. (2009:985-986), "the city of Jerusalem", which describes "the inhabitants of the city as people of God" recurs in a number of ways in the Bible. The seat or throne implies "a cultic centre," a centre of deities, perfect and beautiful in nature. Roberts (2009b:987-988) refers to Zion as the old name of Jerusalem which encompasses three beliefs: first, Yahweh is the imperial deity who rules over the cosmos, the divine and humanlike God. Second, Yahweh chose David's

²³⁷ According to Greenman and Larsen (2012:26) we are to **read -> hear -> fear -> obey -> live ->** in this trend you may understand God's ethics that you are to do.

²³⁸ Zion is described as the dry place, in Arabic as *tsahweh* denoting "hill top" or "mountain ridge" as in the time of David at war, see Bellinger 2009 above.

dynasty to serve as God's earthly kingdom with David as the ruler. Third, Yahweh lives in Zion, his earthly dwelling and imperial capital where he sees and knows what is happening to his people. Zion is now the place of comfort, security and relaxation, where God is ever available to help his people. The covenant was not understood due to their Zionist acuity that God's presence is forever in their city, making them safe from enemies.

The term Zion occurs about 150 times in the Old Testament, mostly in the Psalms, picturing personal lamentation and prophecies. Payne (2009:1234-1236) stresses that the name applies to the entire city where God's people dwells. He describes it as Yahweh's glorious dwelling and centre of his sanctuary in Isaiah, Amos and Hosea. Only Yahweh had the power to bring back the returnees to the land 537 BC, of which the Psalmist says, it was like dream (Psalm 126:1, Isaiah 10:24, 51:16). Again, God is ready to redeem Israel, his people who live in Zion; he is a protector and watchman, for Mount Zion cannot be shaken, it endures forever and serves as a point of compassion for those that trust in their God. According to Bellinger (2009:985-986) the Bible itself terms Zion as the city of Jerusalem and its environ, the holy city where God dwells and will reign with his holy followers. The reestablishment of the Temple, where god dwells, proves YHWH as true God, and Zionism²³⁹ as true VTE of Iron Age II provides a significant example for the covenant context. Sin of the fathers reprimanded the exiles and now they do not desire their past mistakes to be repeated. Hence the covenant draws the attention of the vassals to obey the suzerain. This awareness was significant for the narrators.

²³⁹ The practice of believing in Zion is Zionism, a movement of the Jewish people towards the coming of the Messiah and their national independent state. Rudin (2008:586-588) notes Zionism as a national movement for the Jewish sovereign holy city. It has hopes of being remembered by God at all times. This was later applied to the restoration of a Jewish independent state, with Jerusalem as its capital (Psalm 137:1). Zionism believes there will be a future homeland of their own that is recognized and legally secured in Palestine; their focus is Messianic as well. Some believe the vision of a movement towards a meeting place of God's people was fulfilled in 1948 during their national independence, while others are still expectant. Furthermore, see, Payne (2009:1234-1236) on the city that stood tall and beautiful, YHWH has blessed his own on the basis of their remembrance (Sabbath). He will be merciful on them that sin, while those that praise him are blessed (Psalm 48:10-14, 74:2, 78:68, 87:2, 125:1, 128:5). On the negative side the relationship may be destroyed at Zion, if they fail on their part, hence the statement, "Woe to Zion..." (Jeremiah 4:21, 6:23). The sinner is in Zion trembling with grips as the godless (Isaiah 33:14). This is where salvation is found and the hope of the future is confirmed. Its inhabitants will return home and everyone will be judged by YHWH in the future. Thus future glory in Zion is greater than the present suffering. God's love abides forever, though he punishes by discipline to third and fourth generation, which is upon the children, their parents, grandparent and great grandparent. On the other hand, He loves steadfastly for a thousand generations. Hence YHWH loves his own and will do all to bring them back to himself (Bellinger 2009:985-986).

VI. Theology of the Sabbath Motivation

Theologically, the Sabbath has further meaning, not just a weekly day to cease from all forms of labour. The motivation of the Sabbath indicates that since God delivered you from bondage, you are his people, you must rest on the seventh day and observe the Sabbath day. In this case, God was referring to the Jew, but creation is of all humankind not just of the Jews. Christensen (2001:118-119) saw a repetitive pattern in the text from Deuteronomy 5:12-15. Firstly, in vs.12 they are to keep the Sabbath holy; in vs.15 they are to remember their God. Secondly, they should labour and do all thing within six days; and in vs.13, everyone who is in the family could do work except on the Sabbath. Vs.14. Thirdly, in both instances vs.14a, shows the seventh day as Sabbath rest/worship unto YHWH their God. Hence, it is in remembrance of how God saved them and in appreciation of their deliverance from bondage that they are to observe the Sabbath. Brueggemann (2001:68) explains the Sabbath commandment in Deuteronomy as repeated from Exodus 20, without any discontinuity between the two. But the Deuteronomic setting does bear some reflection. Importantly, the reason for Sabbath lies between creation and the exodus of Israel from Egypt. In Deuteronomy 5, we see an established community that is willing to live according to Yahweh's will and dictates, to keep the day full of priestly activities and maintain sanctity. The Sabbath was not applied in Deuteronomy 5 separately from Exodus 20, they were both use simultaneously due to their differences in motivation. It is repeated for the post exilic settlers to maintain what was and continue with what is now given (co-used). This implies that God requires this from all creations, all humanity for the sanctity of the community where we live and not destroy it, to preserve it and to maintain ourselves as God's possession.

In elucidating further, McConville (2002:128) affirms that the Sabbath is treated like a festival. The Exodus and the land occupation inform the whole festival calendar, also guards the Jubilee (Leviticus 25). It is conceived as the restoration of the society. Biddle (2003:110-111) said YHWH (used in the third person), called Israel to keep the day holy by abstaining from all manner of labour, being devoted to him entirely; Israel should be involved as a corporate community to worship in observing the day. With this motivation, the call extends to other human beings and will open the door for the Christian era in the future. The Sabbath is a day at the heart of God, which must be remembered and observed by all creatures to maintain their relationship²⁴⁰. Their relationship relies on the oath of faithfulness they have

²⁴⁰According to Ohler (1985:281) "curse and blessing" are part of the liturgical calls during the communal or overall reading of the laws. It brings to mind the issues of causality and God's discipline upon the disobedient.

taken and the implication of disloyalty to another could be exile for Israel, for this reason Israel lamented as they reflected on their behaviour (past and present). The lament of the exilic community was a cry to their judge, who will punish the disloyal people; this cry was of mercy and desire to remain blessed. This important motivation of rest serves as a good lens for the exilic community to move towards the establishment of a holy community. Perhaps this is why the Decalogue had to be repeated to emphasize the holiness of the day as well as the priestly evaluation of those that serve God.

Bosman (1997:1158-1159) noted that the Sabbath (Exodus 20:11) was motivated by the creative acts of God that rested on the seventh day after creation (Genesis 1-2:4a). The seventh day recalls the memory of rest as it was observed by God. The day was set apart as holy in testimony to how God created the world. Deuteronomy 5:15 the Sabbath also recalls the memory of Israel's liberation by God and included slaves on the list of those to rest. Rest allowed everyone to see and mingle with the slaves who are toiling just as Israel did in Egypt, the slave reminds them of their God and how he redeemed them from bondage. Jonker (2011:67) said the second command illustrates that Yahweh's voice can be heard in the Torah, thus the second Temple community reminded themselves of this by re-imagining the Ark of the Covenant with two tablets of the Torah in it, (not Yahweh's image). God's image can neither be portrayed nor imagined for divine dignity. Jonker (2011:70) further states that the command guard the majestic mystery of YHWH and urges believers to account to God.

This day according to Bosman (1997:1157-1158) was later regarded as a day of holy visit to the Temple and businesses were suspended (II King 4:23, Amos 8:5). The Romans considered the rest day as market day; perhaps most African communities like Southern Kaduna borrowed this culture of rest on market days from them. Most traditional African communities rest on market days for economic purposes. Like southern Kaduna, people tend to see and relate with friends and relations on market days, and more importantly, buy and sell to make income. Their deportation in the opinion of Howard, Jr. (1997:861) was as a result of the sins, some were taken to Assyria, Babylon, Nineveh, and the rest were scattered all over the empires. Most of these has been related to the sin of Manasseh in II Kings 23 and 24, I Chronicle 36 and Jeremiah 52:3. The Decalogue called for dignity, Bultmann (2007:140-141) refers to it as fundamental in the covenant life, though God used Israel but

This confirms that the ideology in Deuteronomy emanates from the logic of the society. Re-contextualizing the text as well as textual recitation, these were two rhetorical devices for the postexilic priestly community. During the post-exilic era, worship was taken further and holiness was more emphasized than covenant.

revealed himself to all creatures to worship him. Within the Christian tradition, this becomes valid to relate vertically (with God) and horizontally (with humanity). He said the literary work of the Deuteronomist may be more original in the context of Deuteronomy 5 than in Exodus 20. This supports the historical arrangement of the Decalogue in this research. Significantly, the Decalogue has a single religious and cultic tradition, to observe the Sabbath. For this reason, the jealous God demanded exclusive worship from his servant.

Bosman (1997:1159-1160) observed that there were cultic activities and celebrations going on during the Sabbath. One feels, there could have been others too who allowed to work like the security who were in charge of the boundaries, as well as the Levites and priests who administered sacrament. However, the day was highly regarded and the Sabbath was wholly observed as holiness unto the Lord. Houston (2007:81) called the Sabbath an institution of great honour to YHWH, which must be kept holy. The day and the practice were dedicated to YHWH, every household and community leaders led by the priests and Levites must ensure the holiness prior to the Sabbath. YHWH wants them to approach him as clean and upright partners. Claassens (2011:71-72) reconsidered the Sabbath not just as other days of the week, but as a day set apart for YHWH. She added that one extreme was referring to Sunday (Sabbath) as a normal day of business. Instead, it was holy time, dedicated for holy God in a holy space where good relationship ought to be develop.

3.9 Preliminary Conclusion

The Exodus of Israel from Egypt was imperative to Deuteronomy. Their deliverance stimulated the institution of the Sabbath in the covenant theology. The Deuteronomist took advantage of this knowledge to design the motivation of the Sabbath in the earlier Decalogue²⁴¹. This theology supports the idea that YHWH disciplines them for “sin of the fathers”. On the other hand, “sin of the fathers” appears as a foundational statement in the reason for the covenant and points to their laments during the exile. Thus the first hypothesis in 1.3 is answered, showing that the Decalogue created the avenue to understanding the text. The argument is, they lamented over the past and remembered the exile, now “Sin of the

²⁴¹Though both Decalogue exist together, not as separate documents. This could be to compliment both motivations of the Sabbath, “God delivered you from bondage to be his people” and “The creator desires faithfulness from his creatures”. Bosman (1997:1157-1158) noted 104 uses of Sabbath in the Old Testament, with the highest in Leviticus about 24x and Exodus 14x (more of priestly context). It mostly referred to weekly usage (Exodus 16:23, 31:15, 35:2, Leviticus 23:3).

fathers” persuades them to think about their future. For this purpose, social-rhetorical²⁴² criticism was used to investigate this chapter (Deuteronomy 5:6-21²⁴³). The same methodology is applied in the next chapter.

This methodology is a multidimensional approach that encompasses various methods to interpret the text at different levels, as explained in Chapter One. Intra-textual analysis was used to address the inner-textual interpretation of the text within the text, without comparing this with other similar texts. Intra-textual analysis searches for meaning within the text. Otherwise, a text can be meaningful without external sources. While others are correlated with similar texts to find meaning, intra-textual analysis tries to find meaning internally. It shows that the purpose of a text could be within its walls. This text began by drawing the attention of the people to listen²⁴⁴ and obey. There were various repetitions, from אָנֹכִי יְהוָה and אֲלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ used for emphasis in the narrative within the text. Another important method includes the opening-middle-closing that shows the division of the text, then the argument in the text that centred on the relationship between YHWH and Israel. Lastly sensory aesthetics were applied, which identified the use of the mouth to speak and the use of the ears to listen to their God, to obey him.

It was followed by various forms of intertextual analysis, which focuses on the interrelationship of biblical texts. It attempted to find the meaning of the passage by comparing various similar texts. Inter-textual analysis²⁴⁵ helps readers to understand how Scriptures relate with one another. This was extensively studied in relationships with other kinds, by evaluating the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5:6-21. It opposes intra-text, and explains the meaning of “sins of the father” by comparing with texts like the “sour grapes” reference in Ezekiel 18 and Jeremiah 31. Affirmatively, sin was not just the responsibility of an individual, but affects the entire community. Hence an analysis of שָׁמַע and הָקְדֵם were carried out in relation to sin of the fathers, and showed an exilic/covenant context. Though

²⁴²There are four aspects of the approach that were advanced in this study: they are intra-textual, inter-textual, socio-cultural and ideological-theological analyses. This method focuses on several effects of a chosen text, like the people, their setting and other developments. Affirmatively the text comprises their environments, religion, politics, economy as well as their socio-cultural activities. Consequently, social rhetorical analysis is the method applied to the study of Deuteronomy 5. In the next chapter we shall look at Exodus 20.

²⁴³See demarcation of text for details on how one came about the limit of the text.

²⁴⁴“Faith comes by hearing”, listening may develop faith in God. This is indicated by exclamatory use of his name. Attentiveness from the heart and the ears, is perhaps to send the message, “YHWH is the only true God”, he dismisses other deities as idols. This may be the reason for referring to “sin of the fathers”: the fathers had not listened to their God. The text progressed with instructions regarding their relationship with YHWH.

²⁴⁵This research shows how the meaning of text is discovered through the lenses of corresponding texts.

the exodus was the motivation of the *Sabbath* in Deuteronomy 5, it helped Israel to reflect on their relationship weekly. YHWH was found to be a faithful partner but one who loves conditionally in this case (if you obey, you will be blessed), in the covenant; his love is unconditional. A condition of “obedience and blessing” for their fidelity.

The method of Socio-Cultural Intertexture Analysis followed, and focused on the society and its cultural life. There were various social and cultural topics that affected the perception of practices and customs in the society. If the socio-cultural beliefs do not contradict God, they may be meaningful. In the present case the fathers sinned and as a result everyone was taken into exile, from the north to the south kingdoms by Assyria and Babylon. While in exile they were urged to obey the emperor, and the priests capitalized on this theology to emphasize obedience to YHWH. The development of Israel into families, clans and tribes was post-exilic. They were held together under corporate responsibility, and “whatever affected one, affected all other members” of the society, even though individual responsibility was also observed. Corporate responsibility may be accepted readily than individual responsibility, both exist side by side. The post-exilic society made the covenant as a mark of loyalty to keeping their relationship with YHWH. This was to help them from straying after idols. Whereas the priests referred to the covenant to support their theology, state treaties had been used to support the idea of obedience during the Assyrian and Babylonian exile. This theology assisted Israel to remember how YHWH desired them to keep the Sabbath, as well as maintain certain socio-cultural tenets, like honour and shame, legal contracts, purity, etc.

Ideological and theological perspectives of the text were taken into cognisance to investigate two things. The first is the ideology which focuses on the powers in the text. Everything is established, not open to criticism nor change. Theological intertexture is open to further discussion and the way in which various groups perceive the text and God. This focuses on their God and Moses, their mediator, as subjects of change and criticism. The contrast is that while ideology does not entertain change, theology calls for change. Ideology is power-centred, theology is God and people-centred. Interestingly, Moses, YHWH and Israel all appear with varying characteristics, but have interests in the issue of obedience. YHWH is located in the community with various action sets that will facilitate blessing, loyalty and

fidelity. The idea of YHWH's seat in Zion²⁴⁶ causes relief, and hope. Israel must avoid all forms of transgressions, like idolatry, that could cause a repeat of the history.

Personally the researcher is aware that the theology of sin of the fathers has raised matters of legacies of parents. These legacies are perceived by Miller (2009:60) as “transgenerational sin” but one will refer to it as intergenerational transfer of sin, from one generation to another including the ancestor. Albeit Deuteronomy 5:8-10 indicates this legacy of sin, does not outweigh the legacy of love that lasts for generations. YHWH restrains them for the purpose of correction. God's discipline is for a short time, while his love lasts for a thousand generations. Perhaps, this supports the Assyrian royal ideology, to respect and obey God/emperor/King. In this ideology the מֶלֶךְ refers to the King in Zion. YHWH hears their prayers and fights their battles, on the condition that they obey him and keep his commandments. Obedience will make Zion a responsible “holy community”.

Essentially most African cultures are concerned with behaviour that leads to honour and respect for one another. They are committed to their ancestors, unlike Zionism that is relaxed, waiting for YHWH. Although the future lies with God, people are careful to avoid behaviour that brings shame and degradation of their name. How can fathers sin when the responsibility of the society lies with all who live in it? In considering ‘sin of their fathers’, as causing fear for the future, they deny the sin of their ancestors. Their fathers are heads of families, they cannot be sinners; instead they are people with dignity, knowing they will return as honourable living beings (ancestors) in the future. This does not mean that fathers do not sin! Respect²⁴⁷ and honour are accorded to those we see, those we know, those we fear and those who provide for us. It is not mostly accorded to moral character or dignity, rather than “eye service²⁴⁸”. Most people just pretend to show respect in the eyes of the community. Sin of the fathers is among the major factors that have sustained corruption.

Israel's big family and community of brothers are like an African extended family that includes the ancestors. This brotherhood started among twelve brothers²⁴⁹ who later became a

²⁴⁶In the Jewish/Mosaic tradition, YHWH must be pleased. Zionism talks of the central dwelling place of YHWH, Jerusalem. Mosaic tradition presents YHWH as detesting disobedience.

²⁴⁷They have no reason to judge God for how he acts in “punishing the children” unless they do their part. Similarly, many honourable(s) and comrades in our society are only titles, without integrity.

²⁴⁸Eye service is pretentious behaviour put up in the presence of people to prove what one is not.

²⁴⁹An important function in the ancient family system, it was an obligation of brothers to strive towards mutual social and practical support to defend the family structure that aimed to keep them united. Brotherhood was also the basis of sharing inheritance; it was given according to seniority in the age of the brothers (and sister on some occasions). They regarded their ancestor (Jacob); their names were later used as the surnames of families in

nation, where corporate life was honoured and with little room for individualism. Interrelationship transcends generations; this idea of brotherhood and sisterhood resonates in languages, ideologies and theologies that taught them to care for one another. YHWH either disciplined or blessed them, depending on how they observed their brotherhood, for the reason that they have a single corporate nature that binds them together, and whatever affects one affects all. In Chapter Two, we saw that they share in their shame/guilt, just as their honour/dignity in the family/clan/tribal. Anyone born into the family inherits the sins of their fathers and mothers. If their fathers sinned, it is as well the sin of the children, and could affect the coming generation, for the reason that they are one in their covenant, like the African ideology of relationship. Africans understand “*you are, because we are; if we are, then you are*”. Equally this idea has given birth to unity, loyalty and love; it is in their midst that a person is respected. This answers the first hypothesis in 1.3.

Since it was part of their agreement to punish the unfaithful, their love was conditional. Remarkably, while they are disciplined for three to four generations, YHWH’s love lasts for thousands of generations. This is why one feels that YHWH does not punish, but disciplines those he loves, allowing them face the consequences and return to him. Similarly, most Africans believe that when people face the consequences of their acts, they learn to respect and obey. During the Babylonian/Assyrian exile they were urged to obey and keep their treaties, likewise they had to obey God and keep the covenant. Intergenerational sin follows the reality of trans-generational curse! YHWH is merciful, yet he judges his partners who brake the treaty; he is a faithful partner who keeps his side of the deal, and he expects faithfulness from his covenant partners. This is why the exodus served as the motivation for the Sabbath²⁵⁰ in Deuteronomy, while creation/rest was the motivating factor in Exodus. The Exodus (priestly story) of Israel after the exile, points to the Decalogue²⁵¹ in Exodus 20:1-17

Israel. These names became family/clan names that served as their tribes and gave them a common lineage. Their covenant bound them to their loving God. Aasgaard (2006:505) explains brotherhood as brothers responsible for securing succession, in some cases, one is allowed to marry the widow of his brother to cover her shame and continue the brother’s line (Meyers 1997:1). The family as a small unit of the society. Members of the family were a collection of brothers regarded as individuals, whose wrong was everyone’s wrong and whose honour was everyone’s dignity. Mayr (1999:621) adds that the rise of a spiritual, religious society did not diminish the brotherhood. It was defined through second and third generations as an extension of the family. This communality was enjoyed at home, and in the diaspora. De Vaux (1997:19) states that the eldest brother was head of a family, and his authority was handed onward along with inheritance right. This was done from brother to brother, as in the Levirate families. Matriarchy was not absent in the ancient community, but featured by the mention of women/mothers and considered significant in society (Genesis 20:12, 24, 34 and II Samuel 13:13).

²⁵⁰In like manner, the Decalogue was re-contextualized and recited in the Exodus to draw their minds to the holiness requirements. In this instance, creation Genesis 1-2, served as motivation of the Sabbath.

²⁵¹The purpose of the Decalogue is to help in the daily regulation of life and to help them pay allegiance to YHWH. This study presumes that YHWH is emphasizing respect to human beings of all ages/genders. This

as a later development of the priest towards the second temple era. An instruction for Israel's dignity!

research points to the traditions that one's response to the covenant has consequences on one's future; just as most Africans/Nigerians believe that corporate groups are affected if their ancestors sinned in the past, although it is not accepted that ancestors could sin, like the sin of the fathers. One feels it is only a denial of the reality, and a pretence to say that fathers do not sin.

Chapter Four

Social Rhetorical Appraisal of Exodus 20:1-17

4.1 Introduction

There have been several debates on “sin” and “original sin” in the Torah, and this thesis intends to further compare original sin and sin of the fathers upon the children in the Decalogue. Although most Africans believed that fathers/ancestors do not sin, this work hopes to investigate an African understanding of “sin of the fathers/ancestors” in a corporate context, as explained in Chapter²⁵² Two and Three, on Deuteronomy 5. These theological reflections will discuss the context of Exodus 20:1-17 using social rhetorical interpretation. This text may be apodictic with God’s expectations of Israel, since the text contains the instructions that reflect God’s hatred towards sin/idolatry. Undoubtedly, these are images of sin²⁵³ that relate either to individuals or to corporate groups, to the father/mother figure, to the family/clan/tribe²⁵⁴. Most of these laws appear in the Pentateuch in relation to Israel as a community. Israel’s God YHWH hated specifically the sin of idolatry; it makes him jealous for his people. For this reason he established a covenant of loyalty and fidelity in a mutual relationship, and supplied the Decalogue²⁵⁵ as a guide, to govern/protect them against repeating the “sin of their fathers” or subsequent exile; as well as keeping them to a monotheistic God.

Conceptually the Decalogue is marked by several features in contexts like Exodus 34. The replications in Exodus 20:1-17 were part of the address of Moses on the plains of Moab (Horeb/Sinai). Though the priestly unit will be analysed in terms of the commitment to the

²⁵²Chapter Three focused on the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5, different from the context of the Decalogue in Exodus 20. The former was in the context of Deuteronomistic history and covenant theology, while the latter was on the holiness context and priestly theology.

²⁵³Like idolatry, evil, iniquity, depravity, rebellion, transgression, wrong-doing, disobedience in a godly society. See Addendum One after the Bibliography at the end of this thesis.

²⁵⁴ Family/clan/tribe is the succession and hierarchy of community among the Israelites. Family is the immediate group that comprises parents and children, in some cases it extends to grand and great grand-parents in a family (as clan). The tribe is the next higher level of the community which is the composition of many clans under one patriarch as father whose name is the name of the tribe. Thus the exodus story is an extended narrative that began in the second book of Genesis, where a family on sojourn to a foreign land increased and needed its own place.

²⁵⁵The record does not indicate how the Decalogue came about, instead it seems to have been inserted into the text considering the end of Exodus 19 and how the story jumps and continues in Exodus 20:18. This forms part of the background to the laws in our contemporary society. It is either adopted or adjusted to guide the communities.

requirements of holiness in response to the covenant with YHWH, it could be considered as YHWH's speech to the collective members of the Israel's society. Durham (1987:278) made a priestly remark that the Sinai theophany was an address of YHWH to Israel at the base of the mountain. It was means of measuring the commitment of both parties toward establishing holiness in the land. Moses persuaded them to listen/hear, obey and respect the words of YHWH, their Creator. Agreeing with Sarna (1991:109) the people were assembled as a corporate entity; as psychic unity they entered the covenant relationship with YHWH. This indicates the purpose of the Decalogue, as serving an important role in Israel's social, judicial and religious life.

Fretheim (1991:223) considers God's speech on the mountain as demonstrating responsibility for both parties. The Decalogue is God's standard for their redeeming them, described by Meyers (2005: 162-163) as God's voice **דִּבַּר** implying an official legal authority. To this Dozeman (2009:464) considered the goal of this story as the promulgation of the divine laws on the divine mountain, calling Israel to listen²⁵⁶/obey the Decalogue²⁵⁷ and understand the language of the priests. The problem is that the pre-exilic kings/parents sinned and refused the words of the early prophets, and the late monarchy was idolatrous. This chapter will use socio-rhetorical analysis to interpret "sin of the fathers upon the children".

4.2 Textual Demarcation of Exodus 20:4-6

Various scholars have worked toward demarcating limits within the text. Starting with the older contributors; this facade the work of 1962, In his book "A Commentary on Exodus" (1962), Martin Noth defines the text from 19:1-20:21, and titles it "Theophany on Sinai with the Decalogue". He probably placed the Sinai theophany even before Chapter 20, yet ending the demarcation in 20:21 seems confusing, for a different topic was introduced in 20:18. Moreover, U. Cassuto (1974) tackled the issue in "A Commentary on the Book of Exodus", under the title "Decalogue" from 20:1-17, setting the Decalogue as a separate unit. Brevard Childs (1977), in "A Commentary on Exodus" followed the demarcation of 20:1-17, with the title "The Decalogue". In like manner, F.B. Meyer (1978) in his "Devotional Commentary on Exodus" agrees with the section as 20:1-17, titled the "Ten Words", a much older opinion.

²⁵⁶Other synonyms include pay attention, heed, attend, hang on, take note, watch, guard etc. The call was for Israelites to listen/obey; if they disobeyed, bondage and exile might repeat itself as a transferred curse. This philosophy of "cause and effect" does not just appear in Exodus 20:1-17, but in other part of the Torah and ANE.

²⁵⁷Though in this case the Decalogue seems to be an insertion into the narrative of Israel's exodus, it lacks a motivation prior to and after the "Ten Words". Perhaps Meyers (2005: 162-163) considers the second law as the most famous since it has the pivotal position and centre of the entire story.

Later the likes of John I. Durham in 1987, uses the title “Exodus” in (WBC) and affirms the demarcation 20:1-17 as “Yahweh’s Principles of Life in Covenant”.

Interestingly Terence E. Fretheim, in his commentary, “Exodus: Interpretation” (1991) extends the larger context from 19:1-24:18, but separates the Decalogue as 20:1-17, the “Ten Commandments”. Possibly following Noth. Nahum M. Sarna came up with a different limit, 19:20-20:26. In the 1990’s, Benno Jacob (1992), in the “Second Book of the Bible: Exodus” titles it “The Decalogue” but varies on demarcation as 20:1-23, possibly for the sake of chapter by chapter analysis. Recently the demarcation was altered: in “Exodus 20-40” (2000) Cornelius Houtman demarcated the text from 20:1-17, and further divided it into sections as “Preamble” 20:1-2, “The only Right Way to Worship YHWH I” 20:3-6, “The Use of YHWH’s Name” 20:7, “The Day of Rest” 20:8-11, “Care for Aged Parents” 20:12 and “Respect for Faithful Citizens” 20:13-17 comprising the last five commands. Then Peter Enns, in “NIV Application Commentary on Exodus” (2000) uses the “Ten Commandments” for 20:1-21.

In “Exodus (NCBC)” Carol Meyers (2005) differs, setting the demarcation as 20:1-24:18, with no specification for the Ten Commandments. Williams H. Propp (2006), in “Exodus 19-40 (AB)” separates 19:1-24:18 as a section, without a specific demarcation for the Decalogue, just a broad limit, like Fretheim. Douglas K. Stuart (2006), in “Exodus (NAC)” has a wider section from 20:1-31:18 though titled “Ten Words and their Significance” from 20:1-17. Recently Thomas B. Dozeman (2009), in “Eerdmans Critical Commentary on Exodus” followed the broader demarcation of 19:20-20:20²⁵⁸ and titled it “The Decalogue”, but did not separate 20:1-17 like Cassuto and others, perhaps because he considers the address to be earlier, before the Ten Words were given. From the above it appears that most of the older scholars had similar demarcation for the Decalogue from 20:1-17, while the recent contributors differ from each other. However, high majority still had 20:1-17, as the limit of the Decalogue. Agreeably, the Ten Commandments did not fit into this narrative prior to 19:25 and after 20:18. These findings are tabled below.

²⁵⁸It could be assumed that Dozeman 2009 has 19:20-25 as opening address just as in Deuteronomy 5:1-5, 20:1-17 as Decalogue and 20:18-10 as closing of the text. Unfortunately, it looks different when one considers chapter 19:25 as a closing because he has been asked to come with Aaron on behalf of Israel. 20:1 is clearly a good beginning, of the Decalogue which ends in vs.17; in vs.18 the people witnessed the thunder, lightning and other sounds, plus smoke from the mountain, which presumes God’s presence in the preparation from 19:20-25.

Author	Year	Text Demarcation	Title of Demarcation
Martin Noth	1962	19:1-20:21	Theophany on Sinai with the Decalogue
U. Cassuto	1974	20:1-17	Decalogue
Brevard Childs	1977	20:1-17	The Decalogue
F.B. Meyer	1978	20:1-17	Ten Words
John I. Durham	1987	20:1-17	Yahweh's Principles of Life in Covenant
T. E. Fretheim	1990	20:1-17	Ten Commandments
Nahum M. Sarna	1991	20:1-17	Decalogue
Benno Jacob	1992	20:1-23	The Decalogue
C. Houtman	2000	20:1-17	The only Right Way to Worship YHWH I
Peter Enns	2000	20:1-21	Ten Commandments
Carol Meyers	2005	20:1-24:18	(No specific topic)
W. H. Propp	2006	19:1-24:18	(No specific topic)
D. K. Stuart	2006	20:1-17	Ten Words and their Significance
T. B. Dozeman	2009	19:20-20:20	Decalogue

Table 6 various demarcation by older and recent scholars on Exodus.

One must note that, only this commandment and that regarding the Sabbath were given supplementary explanations and reasons of their significance to יהוה. The immediate context of the second commandment in Exodus 20:4-6, extends into the second Decalogue, and Vs.5 centres on the “Sin of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation”, the focus of this research.

The salutation, אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ, “I am the Lord your God”, refers to Israel’s God. YHWH “who brought you out of Egypt”, and serves as a memorial reference to remember the past. This draws attention to hearing what יהוה is about to say (“The Ten Words”). The Decalogue, Exodus 20:1-17, is divided into three sections, explained in Chapter Three. The prologue in Exodus 20:1 serves as the beginning/opening to the words. In 20:5 the passion of the second commandment carries over to אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ the only God of Israel, the jealous God who hate idols/deities²⁵⁹. YHWH’s jealousy demands attention: disobeying יהוה will incur penalties for their rebellion upon their children, to third and fourth generation.

After the prologue of the Decalogue in vs.1, vs.2-17 we see the middle and closing part of the Decalogue. This meta-narrative does not have clear opening, middle and closing sections like the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5:6-21. The supposed end of the Decalogue in Exodus 20 shows a continuation from Exodus 19. Although appearing debatable, scholars reconsider the demarcations of the “Ten Commandments” in Exodus 20. However, the Decalogue itself has a three-part division like the former, the opening-middle-closing could be structured into

²⁵⁹God hates idols or worshipping objects or the replicas of his image. On the plains of Moab, Moses made the speech after he had assembled all Israel, but it was YHWH speaking through Moses, the leader and priest of God’s people.

three from the focal point of the text אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל “I am the Lord your God”. “You shall not” are negating words employed in most instances, while the positive commands employ words like “Remember (the Sabbath)” and “Honour (your father and mother).” The priests probably had three segments of apodictic laws as 3-2-5, the first three and the last five being negative phrases, while the next two take positive forms. However, the immediate context of “Sin of the fathers” is Exodus 20:4-6, and the larger context is vs.1-17, just as the majority of scholars demarcate the text. Perhaps vs.4-6 form the background toward understanding the argument; but further text translation and criticism are essential for this study.

4.3 Translation and Textual Criticism of Exodus 20:1-17²⁶⁰

(Vs.1) And **God**²⁶¹ spoke all these words: (Vs.2) “**I am**²⁶² **the Lord your God**, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land²⁶³ of slavery. Vs.3 “You shall have no other gods before²⁶⁴ me. (Vs.4) “You shall not²⁶⁵ make for yourself an idol²⁶⁶ in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below.(Vs.5) You shall not bow down²⁶⁷ to them or worship them; for **I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, punishing**²⁶⁸ the

²⁶⁰ Granting that the second commandment in Exodus 20:4-6 is the immediate background of the study, it cannot be argued in seclusion. Understanding the Decalogue (Exodus 20:1-17) as a whole will give clarity to the framework of the discussion. Three versions of the Scriptures are used concomitantly for translation NIV, NET and NRSV just as in the previous chapter on Deuteronomy. The NET Bible is a more recent account, while NIV and NRSV are used on the other hand to point out the connections and variances in the text. The NIV is much closer to the *SBL* Hebrew in the Logos 6 program that is used for clarification in this work. As such NIV was used in Chapter Three as the foremost centre while others served as substitutes for making the assessment. It will be interesting to refer to those who desire to know more about the criticism/translation of the text to the preceding chapter of this research. Notice that in the references the details of Durham 1987, Propp 2006 and Dozeman 2009 are the sources of all ancient text analyses below.

²⁶¹ The deity is interpreted in the LXX by *kurios* for “Yahweh”. Both LXX, Vg and Tgs interpreted “Lord” as Yahweh, the one who spoke to Moses.

²⁶² This is a reference to YHWH, also as “your God” or “our God”, the God of Israel, the particular God of Israel who loves and saved them. See views above from LXX, Vg and Tgs.

²⁶³ The “land of” translates well, since it is not a specific location or a confined building where they served as slaves.

²⁶⁴ “You shall not” refers to individual Israelites, used about eight times and once as “You shall have no”. These are negating phrases used by the narrator to show YHWH’s strong desire to bless those that keep the law. They appear in the first two commandments and the last six. It indicates Yahweh’s jealousy and hatred towards other gods. The LXX, Syr, Tg Onk, TG Ps-J use “In addition to me” instead of “In my presence”. The vs, did not end with *soph pasuq*, in order words אֵל-פָּנַי “*al panay*” is litt. “Upon my face”, LXX has “beside me”. The MT lacks *soph pasuq*.

²⁶⁵ The point is that only the monotheistic God YHWH should be honoured or worshipped. There is no room for compromise with other deities. פְּסֻלִים is used for “carved images” derived from the verb *pasal* פָּסַל “to carve” a noun that refers to cultic objects. Statue is used, Syr expands as “any statue” or “image” referring to both the Idol and any form of its representation.

²⁶⁶ Image could be a shadow or picture of the real deity.

²⁶⁷ You must not worship or serve them. *Hoph. abed* is used for “serve” פָּקַד “means attend to, give heed to, observe or seek out with interest”. In regards to jealous, MT uses אֵלֶיךָ while [please insert a space before “while”] Nash Papyrus has אֵלֶיךָ for serving as synonyms in Joshua 24:19, Nahum 1:2. It is possible that Nash presented the original punctuation *qanno* as oppose to the original spelling in MT אֵלֶיךָ “Upon a third” is use as upon son’s sons and upon third just as in Exodus 34:7.

²⁶⁸ From “I punish the sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons” it is clear to the reader that those to suffer include the unborn.

children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those that hate me, (Vs.6) but showing love²⁶⁹ to a thousand generation of those who love²⁷⁰ me and keep my commandment. (Vs.7) “You shall not misuse²⁷¹ the name of the Lord your God, for the Lord will not hold²⁷² anyone guiltless who misuses his name. (Vs.8) “Remember²⁷³ the Sabbath day by keeping it holy. (Vs.9) Six days you shall labour²⁷⁴ and do all your work, (Vs.10) but the seventh day²⁷⁵ is a Sabbath to **the Lord your God**. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your animals, nor the aliens²⁷⁶ within your gates. (Vs.11) For in six days **the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh²⁷⁷ day.** Therefore, **the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.** (Vs.12) “Honour your father and mother, so that you may live²⁷⁸ long in the land **the Lord your God is giving you.** (Vs.13) “You shall not²⁷⁹ murder²⁸⁰. (Vs.14) “You shall not commit adultery. (Vs.15) “You shall not steal. (Vs.16) “You shall not give false testimony²⁸¹ against your neighbour. (Vs.17)

²⁶⁹I show covenant faithfulness or steadfast love, the reference to the covenant with YHWH. It points to whoever obeys and listens to YHWH. יהוה as “Yahweh’s act of loyal love towards humankind”, “unchanging love”.

²⁷⁰Loving אהבה encompasses more than choice making, to the fear of God and honour to YHWH. On the other hand, choice is relevant: they have to decide between their idols and their God, who from the beginning of a new Israel, delivered his people. Hence, choose me to save your future generations.

²⁷¹Make use of the name of the Lord your God for worthless purposes or to misuse the name of YHWH is a wrongful reason.

²⁷²Pardon no one who abuses his name; using God’s name for falsification is misuse. In LXX “Yahweh will not” use as “Yahweh your God will not”. *Nasha* “lift, carry, raise, take up” used for more than utterance of Yahweh’s name for wrong intension. *Alapim* אלהים is simply “to the thousand generation”. See *hashav* “to nothingness”, *naqah* “exempt from punishment”, from piel. LXX has cleanliness and purity from *katarise* (verb).

²⁷³Be careful to observe religious rituals to be practiced periodically, like the Sabbath observation. Recall the history of life in Egypt. שמר “keep, guard,” MT has זכר “remember” a qal inf., abs. considered as “emphatic imperative” suggesting a continuous process towards the Sabbath (Deuteronomy 5:12). The idea could be “remember to keep” the Sabbath day as a holy to the Lord.

²⁷⁴You are to do work which entails effort, for six days. Sabbath observance forbids all work, as any little task could be work. *Malcah* has “customary labour,” daily work as one’s occupation and *soph pasuq* are missing.

²⁷⁵“But the seventh day” in Nash papyrus, LXX, Vg and certain Qumran witnesses use “but on the Sabbath day”, “in it”, it is likewise an insertion by LXX, Nash Papyrus, Syr and Vg. Some interchanged “your animal” with “Bull” or “Your ass”. The list expands in the LXX to include “Your ox” or “Your ass”. Proselytos in LXX paraphrased “in your gates”, “residing among” or “the one dwelling with” in a sense, those under supervision.

²⁷⁶Foreigner/resident alien, describe non-resident.

²⁷⁷“Seventh Day” again in LXX, Nash Papyrus, Vg and Tg. The day of Sabbath preparation is the sixth day while the Sabbath is the seventh day of the week. It possibly changed in the Christian era, the day of worship became Sunday following the resurrection of Jesus (I Corinthians 15:1-16:2), which is the foundation of the Christian faith.

²⁷⁸“Your days” may be contextual. LXX has “so that it will be well for you”, and Nash Papyrus interpreted “it may go well with you and in order that”, like LXX. The Hiph rad has “cause to be long”. *Nunparapogicum* expresses “marked emphasis”. אדמה *haadama* “ground, land, territory” especially of land promised to his people (Canaan). In the LXX, “the good land”, *Kabed* LXX as “honour” *tima*, *adama*, “ground designating agriculturally good place”. In LXX has “so that it may go well with you” and “so that you may have long time in the good land”, see Deuteronomy 5:16.

²⁷⁹Notice again how the text is presented as progressive. Neither shall you vs.17-19, with negating functions.

²⁸⁰Vs.13-15, the order is changed in LXX and MT from murder, adultery and stealing to adultery, murder and stealing, though the LXX order seems more accepted by most scholars. Yet the prophet uses a different order: murder, steal and adultery, same as Nash Papyrus. They are prohibited in the new land for the exiles.

²⁸¹You must not offer false testimony/neither shall you bear false witness. Nash Papyrus use “empty testimony” instead *al shaqar* reads “lying testimony”.

“You shall not covet²⁸² your neighbour’s house²⁸³. You shall not covet your neighbour’s wife,²⁸⁴ or his manservant or his maidservant, his ox or donkey, or anything²⁸⁵ that belongs to your neighbour.”(NIV)

4.4 The Ten²⁸⁶ Commandments of YHWH

1. You shall have no other gods before me vs.2
2. You shall not make for yourself an idol vs.4-6
3. You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God vs.7
4. **Remember**²⁸⁷ the Sabbath day by keeping it holy vs.8-11
5. Honour your father and mother as the Lord your God commanded vs.12
6. You shall not murder vs.13
7. You shall not commit adultery vs.14
8. You shall not steal vs.15
9. You shall not give false testimony against your neighbour vs.16
10. You shall not covet your neighbour’s **wife** vs.17 (NIV).

אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים לֹא יִהְיֶה לְפָנָי ²⁸⁸	אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ ²⁸⁹
You shall have no other vs.3	God vs.1, vs.5
You shall not vs.4	I am the Lord our God vs.1
You shall not vs.5	The Lord vs. 7
You shall not vs.17	I the Lord vs.11
You shall not vs.10	The Lord vs.11
You shall not vs.13	I, the Lord your God vs.5
You shall not vs.14	The Lord your God vs.7
You shall not vs.15	The Lord your God vs.10
You shall not vs.16	The Lord your God vs.12
You shall not vs.17 (2x)	

Table 7 showing certain repetition in the Ten Commandments.

²⁸² Is to “desire” to have; *hamad* “to covet” and *ava* “to desire”. The LXX follows the order of two sentences, LXX has *gunakes* for “wife” and *oikian* “house”. Though LXX and Nash Papyrus also has “his field” before “servant”. LXX further added “nor any of his livestock”.

²⁸³ Another person’s wife, friend, neighbour or enemy, you shall not touch.

²⁸⁴ Do not crave his house/his property, humans in God’s image, no lesser but equal, and should be dignified.

²⁸⁵ Field may not be land; land could be country or people’s nation. See Durham 1987, Propp 2006 and Dozeman 2009 for all ancient language translation. It is a comparison of three translations that led to the above analysis.

²⁸⁶ The table indicates the Ten Words of אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה of Israel and their demarcations. These are holiness requirements, the need for respect to human beings and YHWH.

²⁸⁷ The underlined are the small differences between the Decalogue in both records, and they include “remember” and “wife”, though there could be other words in the whole laws.

²⁸⁸ Repeated verbs and phrases in the text are similar to those of Deuteronomy 5. Here meaning is found in the text.

²⁸⁹ Repeated nouns and phrases in the text, see Chapter 3. See Durham (1987), Stuart (2006) and Dozeman (2009).

4.5 Intra-Textual Analysis of the Text²⁹⁰

The art of interpretation that searches for meaning within the text, without necessarily comparing the passage with others, is intra-textuality. Meaning could however be found in the plain sense of the text, between the lines or within the words of the narrator. A text can be interpreted without necessarily engaging other similar texts. This approach takes note of factors such as repetitive patterns, progression of the story, the narrative texture, the opening-middle-closing structure, argument and the sensory-aesthetics which shows the beauty in the text. These characteristics were extensively discussed in the previous chapter, though the context was different; but this approach probes the plain sense of a text.

4.5.1 Repetitive²⁹¹ Textual Pattern

This textual pattern concentrates on the number of occurrences of a word and the purpose of its reiteration within the text. This feature shows re-emergence and indicates the main points of emphasis and the central teaching of the theological text (Robbins 1996:8). Prominent in this text are $\text{לֹא יִהְיֶה לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים}$ and $\text{אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$. These are the connecting points that show progression in the argument and the growth at various levels in the narrative. There is hardly any difference in the reappearance of words as discussed in the previous chapter.

4.5.2 Progression²⁹² in the Account

Progression indicates the development in the account from one stage to another, and how the objective of the passage is reached. Once more, the text hasn't changed but its context has changed from covenantal theology in Chapter Three to the holiness context in Chapter Four. The Decalogue laws now appear in a holiness setting, and progress from one stage to another. The first four relate to God while the last six are related to humanity. However, another development shows that the first three are related to God, the middle two to humans and the last five as regulations within the confines of the community (Robbins 1996:9-10). Though the progress remains the same as in the former chapter, there is the major difference that

²⁹⁰ Socio rhetorical analysis takes into cognisance the first step, viz. Intra-textual texture, focusing on finding meaning within a text of the Scripture. It was used in the previous chapter for a similar text as Exodus 20. Doing same here will amount to repetition and duplication of idea and leads to redundancy in the work.

²⁹¹ This text is same as Deuteronomy 5 that was analysed in the last chapter. See Chapter Three for details.

²⁹² The progression in the Decalogue is not like that in a storyline. The Decalogue is "Ten Words" in a separate document, a code of conduct from YHWH that directs the life of his people to live in a manner that pleases him. There is no connection between the end of chapter 19 and the beginning of chapter 20 in Exodus. Chapter 19 seems to continue after the Decalogue, unlike in Deuteronomy 5 where there is a motivation for the Sabbath before the Decalogue passage and a connection for the beginning and end of the Decalogue with its immediate context; the preceding and succeeding chapters to the Ten Commandments. Words like 'remember' and 'wife' are changed.

Exodus 20:1-17 does not have the prologue and epilogue or succeeding verses, as does Deuteronomy 5:1-21, to show a narrative flow.

4.5.3 Narrative Aspect of the Text

The Decalogue in the last chapter was non-priestly; it now appears as priestly in a holiness context with the same content, even though Exodus is majorly priestly P in nature. Especially 20:1-17. The Decalogue provided the direction towards a better life for Israel, focussing on pleasing their God and doing his will. The story in this context does not refer to the Decalogue in Exodus 20, but in Deuteronomy 5, where the narrator takes time to prepare the ground prior to delivering the commandments. In **vs.1-2** Sarna (1991:109) from rabbinic legendry affirms that the Decalogue²⁹³ was proclaimed in the wilderness as offered by God. According to Houtman (2000:18) Israel had accepted YHWH's²⁹⁴ offer to enter into an agreement. Perhaps both parties were ready before God spoke through Moses. The priestly class was determined to adhere to this oath with YHWH. Dozeman (2009:479) notes that the divine ownership of Israel was supported by the oath. Their liberation was fundamental to their life, and serves as a divine innovation of God their Creator. They were required to obey God by being holy. On the basis of the oath, the theology of cause and effect appears again.

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ “The Lord your God” is the giver of the covenant, and the legal sealer of promises who spoke to Israel through Moses. Stuart (2006:445) suggests that God began by reminding Israel, to reflect on their past and how he saved them. In **Vs.2** a portion of the covenant identifies the parties involved in the oath. The characters are God, Moses and Israel, his chosen people. Propp (2006:165) indicates that Israel heard his voice, signifying that YHWH resumes his tête-à-tête with Moses on the mountain, instead of speaking to the people. YHWH could speak with his voice and be heard from the plains, but God was speaking through his servant Moses, who in turn passed the message to the people of God.

The First commandment: **Vs.3** says “You shall have no other God except YHWH”. It considers the significant place of God in the life of his people. Fretheim (1991:224-225) explains that it refers to loyalty for Yahweh אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ by rejecting other

²⁹³ Interestingly, in the Decalogue, certain verses, like the introductory details in Deuteronomy 5, are not found in the Exodus 20 account.

²⁹⁴ אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ “I am the Lord your God” was a common way by which deities were introduced in the ANE. YHWH the God of Israel, is the one who saved them from bondage in Egypt, their service to pharaoh came to an end by agreeing to this covenant. The beginning of their freedom illustrates that they will no longer serve Pharaoh.

gods. This is confirmed in Deuteronomy 6:5, “you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart” ..., indicating respect/fear for the Lord. Just as it is shameful to disrespect parents, it is a shame to break the laws or disrespect YHWH. Thus it is a significant command. Stuart (2006:448) describes the Hebrew *עַל-פָּנָי* to mean “before me” or “other than me”, the former as saying you could have YHWH as supreme God above others, while the latter suggest that apart from Yahweh there is no other God (before him, ahead of him). The context indicates the latter, referring to the fear of the Lord, for this is an order from God to avoid straying after other gods. However, it does not deny the existence of idols.

Houtman (2000:19-20) indicate that God’s hatred towards other gods shows complete intolerance toward other cultic beings. YHWH is alone, and there is no place for any other deity in this covenant. This commitment entails recognizing YHWH as the only monotheistic God, even in the midst of Canaanites and ancient idols. The LXX renders it, “except me”, “before me” in the MT; Propp (2006:167) puts it “before my face”, denying the efficacy of other deities, and indicating allegiance to YHWH. Dozeman (2009:480-481) argues that the first commandment was not specifically against monotheism, instead on henotheism as well, by advocating exclusiveness to Yahweh. “Other gods” may be conceived as rival deities, but he prohibits them being brought before his face.

The Second Commandment: vs.4-6, is cumbersome and has the first peak of this work. This raises two important issues: first to interpret the purpose of sin of the fathers upon the children, and second, to explain the Sabbath motivation in Exodus 20. Reading of the sin of the fathers upon the children leaves us with two arguments, the first regarding individual responsibility and second regarding corporate responsibility. With this, both responsibilities will be studied from the second commandment in the Decalogue. The first commandment guards against having a substitute god except YHWH, while the second takes it further and says not even the idols or images should be used concurrently with YHWH for any cultic purposes. There are conflicting views in regard to responsibility of people to sin in Israel: it could be interpreted either as individualistic, given the sin of a person, or corporately considering the condition in the covenant that sin will affects clusters of people. In this case, one may argue that sin of the fathers is referring to corporate responsibility, as will be discussed later.

Note that the first commandment warns against rival gods/substitution, while the second commandment warns against cultic events/devotion to idols/images. **Vs.4-6**, the second

commandment, extends further to demarcate cultic events, and what Noth (1962:162-163) mentions as plastic representation of images and painted pictures; building of statues or using natural lights (sun, moon or stars) as gods. These are all illicit cultic images and “spiritual conceptions” of God²⁹⁵. This seems a priestly effort to control the people. Sarna (1991:10) says any form of material representation of god was prohibited. The renewed Israel is separated from the world, and set apart for YHWH. According to Propp (2006:167) statues, images, objects or shapes which indicate a deity were precluded and vetoed to indicate how YHWH rejects even sketches of God. They ought not to worship or create²⁹⁶ the image, even less own one.

It now emerges as an independent command, cast within the shadows of the first one - “a catena of old formulae” according to Childs (1977:404-406), who devotes an important section to analyse the Decalogue not on canonical sequence but on context. The commandment did not just refer syntactically to other gods in **vs.5**, but in **vs.3**, it carries the major motivational clause for not worshipping strange gods. This shows that the present redaction in the second commandment in **vs.4** has been incorporated within the frame of reference of the whole command. The repetition now happens using an additional formula of **אֵל קַנָּז** “jealous God” due to false gods (Exodus 34:14, Deuteronomy 6:14, Joshua 24:19). Consequently, Yahweh’s zeal **vs.5** is closely related to his holiness: he will not tolerate his glory being ascribed to other gods, his zeal burns like a “devouring fire”. The execution of his zeal is described in terms of judgement that does not rest with the perpetrator, but instead extends to their fourth generation, using anthropocentric figures of YHWH to describe the extent of loyalty for his people. Where allegiance is given to his image, it shows disrespect and disloyalty.

²⁹⁵ It is offered for the covenant relationship and to keep Israel blameless, as an act of grace on the part of Yahweh. In this case, its invoking the jealousy of Israel’s God is stated as the purpose of the strict exclusiveness to divine worship. Propp (2006:167) notes that the punishment as well as the rewards goes beyond a single person to a body of persons, giving rise to the problem of individual justice and divine retribution. God’s punishment on one hand is extended over several generations of those that hate him. On the other hand, his steadfast love is generally promised upon a fictitious number, “a thousand” generations of his lovers. Hyatt (1980:207) considers all these words as “ethical” or “ritual” Decalogue, sometime as the E Decalogue, for the reason that the first verse seems to use Elohim rather than Yahweh (Exodus 20:1-17). The Decalogue does not comprise the law code, not being detailed enough on the general principles of law.

²⁹⁶ Though the production of deities was forbidden in Israel, it was going on around the world, especially among Israelites’ neighbours in the ancient near east. YHWH forbids all manner of portrayal of the divine. He appears in the first person here recalling the deuteronomic-deuteronomistic tradition.

Vs.4-5a, indicates that the portrayal of images²⁹⁷ in the form of God attract punishment on Israel. Weinfeld (1991:291) said the prohibition of images in Israelite worship was widely attested to in all ancient legal codes. Houtman (2000:31-32) believes the portrayal of images describe the deities in the form of wood, clay, metal, stone, etc. for cultic purposes. Meyers (2005:170-171) observes that the second commandment²⁹⁸ forbids the construction and worship of images that are meant to represent deities. It is sinful to violate God's mandate, considering the freedom he gave them. As for other gods, she differs from others in this submission and critical thought. It was known all over that images/portraits could represent divine presence, as Aaron and Israel did in Exodus 19 (Golden Calf). Hence bowing down and worshipping them was not allowed. This suggests dire consequences upon the generations of the disobedient, as tantamount to rejecting YHWH. The verse evokes an impassioned God אֱלֹהֵינוּ "jealous", reflecting the existence of relationship between them, in the metaphor²⁹⁹ of marriage, covenant bonding and exclusive loyalty. Like others jealousy may not do justice to the term אֱלֹהֵינוּ, it passes beyond human emotional intensity.

However, the jealousy of God does not refer to emotional behaviour or violence which springs out of personal bonding for exclusive attachment, like the marriage bond. Israel is married to YHWH, not other deities! For this reason, God is jealous **vs.5-6**, Cole (1973:156) describe it as zeal אֱזָרָה though "being zealous" could have negative connotations that bring hatred, instead loyal love for his people. It goes beyond intolerance, and comes from God's unique desire for his people (wife/Israel). This is why God will not like to punish his people,

²⁹⁷According to Hyatt (1980:211-212) these commandments were originally directed to images of Yahweh, but now all foreign idols are being condemned by the first commandment. Yahweh was manifesting in words that he cannot be properly portrayed in any kind of image. Fretheim (1990:225) says the prohibition of images and idols set Israel apart from other ancient religious practices common to their ancient context. It is both images of YHWH and those of other gods that are not allowed. Hyatt adds, he is Israel's God, אֱלֹהֵינוּ jealous of his position in their lives. This jealousy has made the deity express his love through his zeal, the kind of zealousness and commitment for justice to the guilty.

²⁹⁸The commandment is extended and includes the motive clauses with the basic intension as aniconic, forbidding the construction of deities. The reason is that representation of flora and fauna are part of the specification for the tabernacle and the temple. The layers of tradition, according to her, are complex and difficult to determine if it disallows aniconism for Yahweh. In ancient religious traditions, statues of gods were placed in the inner sanctums of temples and shrines. In places like the temple and tabernacles of Israel, it was similar practice of sacrifice with the ancient world. In Israel there is a diversion in the cultural practices unlike the Canaanite culture that established an open air worship that uses non-anthropomorphic symbols like stones, or trees (sacred) for divine presence. Aniconism later became an order, as shown in the Decalogue (Meyers 2005:170-171). In simple terms Cassuto (1974:242-243) elucidates, "You shall not make for yourself images for service of God"; images, objects, people or any kind of godlike portrayal is prohibited. Not just a picture primitive aniconic attitude like cultural construction of images for decoration of historical artefacts. It is a deliberate attempt to counter what was already in existence among them.

²⁹⁹Cole (1973:156) uses the marriage metaphor: "No husband who truly loves will like to see his wife being shared by another partner, no one will endure such rivalry;" likewise God hates such behaviour.

instead shows them steadfast love for thousand generations as they continue to love him. This is in opposition to the discipline that lies within the extended family. Cassuto (1974:242) referred to “the jealousy of God³⁰⁰” as a response to faithlessness. The jealousy will cause YHWH to curse the law breakers and discipline their three to four generations, and love is shown to a thousand generations of the obedient. YHWH blesses them in his kindness and showers love like forever on the loyalist. Weinfeld (1991:291) stated that God is impassioned, he measures grace much more than punishment and this makes him compassionate. This is another reason one prefer to say God exercises discipline and not punishment. Propp (2006:172) makes use of morphological terms to describe the culprit as sinner instead of transgressor/wrong-doer. Though God promises to love his people, they are instead disciplined for about four generations as in Job 42:16. The children suffering for the negligence of their parents is like a priestly strategy to encourage faithfulness. This fits into the ancient context of a treaty.

The reference to corporate personality/responsibility is why Meyers (2005:171) says God’s jealousy is a response to human behaviour. A strong punitive justice is laid out for disobedience across their generations. She refers to it as “cross-generational accountability”, that reflects strongly on the family lineage between pre-monarchical to early monarchical era in 12th-8th century in the Iron Age I. This form of discipline troubled the exiles, making them lament their past. They make a further apology for the sin of their fathers as corporate responsibility and show how their transgressions affect generations of the innocent – hence signifying corporate responsibility from the ancient context. Thus individual responsibility must have been prominent during the late monarchy, though it does not shift the institution of justice nor the punitive act of God. Was there a shift in the justice system? God did not change his justice system; it was never abrogated; instead they co-existed in the society. Stuart (2006:449-450) pointed out that God takes idolatry³⁰¹ as a serious and grievous

³⁰⁰Cassuto (1974:242-243) says they cause a feeling of opposition to YHWH, they are theriomorphic figures according to him, fashioned in the likeness of animals, humans and the like of idols.

³⁰¹It is rather unfortunate that this author feels it necessary to explain **vs.5b-6** in a shallow way. Magnante (1987:107, 109) says at the foot of the mountain they enjoyed the presence of Yahweh and the display of his loving dialogue. Any image-representation is believed to be a carrier of the very same deity and could mediate the invincible presence of the divinity. In like manner, Yahweh should not be reduced to objects, restrained to restricted places or carved idols. God created human beings in his image as he is. The jealousy of God and his love for his people are essential for the postexilic community. Corruption of the people keeps them from the blessing that is due them, enforcing God’s wrath. The language is inclusive, although he separated or individualized the people in his comments, “to be sure that the person willing to keep the covenant with Yahweh” There can be no exception of any kind to the ban. He made use of two key words for idol, **עֲצָבֹת** suggesting all forms of idols. Certain characteristics of idols are the following.

offence, which comes with tendencies of punishment that may affect the subsequent generations. **Vs.3-4**, treat them as one, this could have been, “I am the only God”, do not believe in any other. The argument is that since **אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה** is used for both God and divine beings, YHWH appears different as the supreme God where both are used. This argues for strict monotheism, prohibiting all kind of copying of God’s image.

Jensen (1997:144-145) says the problem lies with the physical representation of God, which points to the reality of the wisdom and power of God. This brings to mind the awareness of the worshipper and fills his mind with a sense of reality, his presence and his activities. Hence there is a similarity between the experience of the worshipper of idols³⁰² and worshippers of God, that way the idol “communicates” its power to the worshippers and influences them. This causes jealousy and hatred from YHWH then result in punishment. The lamentation of the exiles will not end if they remain unfaithful and continue in the sin³⁰³ of

-
- a. Guarantee – Ancients believe in their presence as partaking in divine representation.
 - b. Selflessness – Idolatry was materialistic, the fertility cultic practices believe gods could do everything for humans, but could not feed themselves. Thus feeding a personal god attracted blessings from that god. In this vein, they had specific gods who solved various problem, a god for solving each request.
 - c. Easy Sacrificing – They believed that frequent and generous gifts to the gods was a significant requirement for their worship. Thus faithfulness to these idols is holiness.
 - d. Convenient Set Up – They set up high places where they could keep their gods in place, like mountains, hills or trees for worship, to feed the gods and offer sacrifices.
 - e. Normal Life – Idolatry was a common way of life and religion in the ancient world except for Israel. It was an obligation to have gods.
 - f. Logical – Idolatry was polytheistic, syncretic and pantheistic. Belief in multi gods, that everyone is special.
 - g. Pleasing to the Sense – In I King19:18 and Ezekiel 8:9, the fertility and weather god, Baal had people bowing down to them, even kissing and praising them.
 - h. Indulgence – They indulged in sacrifices and ate meat sacrifices to idols, (Deuteronomy 12:15) by pagan, drinking, feasting etc.
 - i. Erotic – They encouraged temple prostitution, that every god could procreate its kind in different ways Stuart (2006:449). Dozeman (2009:482-483) states that the prohibitions in the commandment include verbs like “make”, “bow down” and “worship”, which gives a picture of forbidden objects and their representations. In Hebrew “to cut” and “idol” comes from the same root and similar words **לְפָסֵל** “*pesel*” and **לְפָסָל** “*pasal*” not even the chiselling of stones or metals were allowed. The aim is to guard against YHWH’s image or rival deities. The length of the commandment shows certain significance plus the way God is emphasized in the 1st, 2nd 3rd “God’s name”, 4th “God’s day” and so on. The text spoke of God disallowing his images even today.

³⁰²According to Jensen (1997:145) the first and second commandments vary but are intimately connected in terms of worship. The reference to the physical representation of God in the second, differs from the possession of another deity in place of YHWH in the first. In the ancient world, it is a reality that when life-giving light such as sun, moon and stars are ascribed power of a deity, the temptation is to depend on that power in the family or the land. It now brings to bear the experience of the holy God, having a physical dimension or symbolizing the divine experiences, a substitute now emerges for YHWH in a position closer than Zion. Zion is now at home, just as the temple is brought into the room.

³⁰³Gonzales (2012:377) notes that Sin of the fathers are often repeated in their children. Abraham and Sarah laughed at God’s promise, just as Ismael laughed, betraying unbelief and rejection just as Isaac and Rebecca sin (Genesis 24). Isaac and Ismael are the second generation who committed a similar sin as their parents. In like manner, Jacob sinned in the third generation by deceiving his brother and in the fourth generation Simeon and Levi committed treacherous deception as well by slaughtering the Shechemites, apart from other sins, including

their fathers. The law of individual responsibility seems not to have a place in this argument (Deuteronomy 24:16). However, they were all required to be loyal to the covenant. Faithfulness would lead to generational blessing for all. Levinson (2008:72-78) notes that God is ready to keep his part of the covenant to a thousand generations, if they keep his commandment. This explains God as gracious, who does not delay to discipline idolaters. His zeal makes him punish them; his jealousy is for ascribing to another god what is due him. Thus retributive justice presents a transgenerational punishment (Deuteronomy 7), and support both corporate and individual responsibilities.

Vs. 5b-6: Durham (1987:286-287) believes the “I am” hates representation of himself, to which he reacts as “an impassioned God” who is jealous and faithful to his marriage relationship with Israel (Sarna 1991:110). His jealousy/zeal to respond makes him punish his people. They had a covenant arrangement, according to which they must maintain absolute loyalty. YHWH first loves them and is willing to bless a thousand generations if they obey him. Houtman (2000:32-33) notes that the notion of his jealousy shows his passion and intolerance toward foreign gods³⁰⁴. This portrays him as anthropopathic in their relationship. Unfaithful and dwindling love is not condoned, instead it has repercussions to the third and fourth generations; and evidently great grand-children will be the victims. Meyers (2005:171) finds that this concept of punishment upon future generations has troubled interpreters. It is about cross-generational accountability along family lineages, an idea that has existed since antiquity. Meyers ponders the blessing upon “a thousand” generations as reference to faithfulness and blessing (Psalm 105:8), which renders God’s love conditional³⁰⁵.

With reference to corporate relationship and divine jealousy in this context, Jensen (1997:146-147) says YHWH’s jealousy is not just expressed from being their God, but as their Creator as well. YHWH’s zeal links with the Hebrew root נָצַר. God shows zeal or

(Genesis 4) that of Cain, the rape of Dinah in Genesis 34 and many more in their lineage where children were affected by the sin of their parents.

³⁰⁴Houtman (2000:31-33) repeats that the fabrication of images לְעִלְמֵי of wood, metal, clay, stone or any type hewn or shaped for cultic purposes which function as a deity was not allowed. God is mentioned in cultic representation in images/likeness for his people, they are prohibited from idolatry, and God sees all who do so.

³⁰⁵ In Exodus 34:14 God is jealous, meaning that his loyal love to his people is conditioned in the text. He punishes, Jeremiah 31:29 and Ezekiel 18:2-4, Psalm 105:8-10, Amos 3:2, see also Genesis 50:23, Exodus 20:5, Deuteronomy 6:14-15, Joshua 24:24. Meyers (2005:171) clarified that jealousy may not do justice to the Hebrew term נָצַר – a closer translation may be zealousness, which shows an instant emotion by God, like punishing rebels across four generations. They were warned against God’s wrath and encouraged to focus on YHWH their God. This is due to the plain sense of their understanding, but its main philosophy is logically “cause and effect”, a retributive kind of theology that says “if you obey, you will be blessed; if you disobey you will be punished”.

jealousy as a “passionate lover”, לֵבָבִי here depicting loyalty and love to a partner, and in that capacity God judges Israel’s iniquities³⁰⁶. Fretheim (1991:227) emphasizes that the metaphor of jealousy is used to stress their corporate allegiance to YHWH. Isn’t it a miscarriage of justice, for the innocent to be punished? Justice means getting what is deserved by the culprits for their sin (Deuteronomy 7:7-11). More so, Ezekiel 18:1-2 and Jeremiah 31:29³⁰⁷ justified individual responsibility as related to Exodus 20:5-6. Jensen (1997:147) refers to the mutual concern, and corporate nature of Israel’s life; they are one family just as their God is one. Israel as a whole was involved in the covenant; they lived for one another. In this accord, Levinson (2008:57-60) says the narrator seems to be lamenting the past life of their fathers and mothers in Israel and Judah. Sin accounted for the corporate exile to Assyria and Babylon, making their captivity a divine transgenerational transfer of Punishment³⁰⁸.

Suffering the consequences of ancestors is intergenerational retribution which emanates from retributive justice, as a late idea of the justice system (Kaminsky 2001:319-320). Psalm 23:1 supports it and assumes it as a late innovation. Such references are used to censure Israel’s culture and religion. Though there are cases of individual accountability where the culprit alone is affected, guilt and shame affect his relations as well. Individual justice³⁰⁹ is now popular and more acceptable in society, making corporate justice seem foreign and barbaric in modern times. The emphasis has shifted to individual right and dignity, instead of the corporate. The corporate nation that focuses on their God as a people, now lives individually. They entered the covenant as a people, and in the same manner they should remain faithful, collectively keeping the Sabbath holy. Sin of the fathers serves as a frame of reference for analysing this priestly/exilic text. In addition, Levinson (2008:64) highlights that in the spirit of judicial expectation of individual retribution within the spheres of law (civil and criminal),

³⁰⁶ Hatred of other gods and images is an effort to buy back the honour of his people. Indicating the discipline is an attempt to return them to YHWH. They are not rejected nor cast away, the desire is to rebuke, correct and teach the way of holiness adopted by the priests. The laws direct his covenant people (Deuteronomy 6:20-25, Isaiah 9:7, 37:32, Hosea 13:8, Zechariah 1:14, 8:2). Like a lion attacking and devouring the wild animals, that is how he is colouring his jealousy. Loyalty “for a thousand generations” looks like exaggeration but implies unending love for the reason of obedience to YHWH. Jeremiah 31:29-30 and Ezekiel 18:2-4 suggest individual responsibility, and that sin bears consequences.

³⁰⁷ These references will be explained later, though it has been detailed in Chapter Three.

³⁰⁸ The claims irresponsibility and shift blame to their parents, for causing the exile. They assert that YHWH is unjust, hence their lament. Their fathers sinned, it is their iniquity but they have to endure the discipline for their parents. The injustice inevitably creates a sense of futility for the historic judgement upon the progeny. The exiles are under a destructive catastrophe. This exilic lament will be repeated if they sin, but if they repent it will not Levinson (2008:57-60).

³⁰⁹ This theory of individualism crept in and destroyed the way humankind lived in communities in the ancient times (Joshua 7, II Samuel 21:1-14). In early religious beliefs, the tradition of contagious nature was in place. The nature of same blood, holiness, sin and uncleanness are shared corporately. The non-recognition of such ancient practices is what developed and gave recognition to individual responsibility (Kaminsky 2001:319).

it seems that Ezekiel³¹⁰ might revisit his standard. Ezekiel seems to presume the opposite of divine justice. This notion is to some extent not the justice of God, considering the nature of the covenant with the post-exilic generation. God related theologically with Israel on the condition that they remain faithful.

Transgenerational transmission³¹¹ of sin and accumulation of guilt may seem harsh. Weinfeld (1991:296) explain that the phrase as “upon children and upon the third and fourth generation should not be taken literally.” In his view, it is not just four generations that may suffer, but “a very large number of descendants”. According to him, four generations is only an indication of the generation that human beings tend to live with their great-great-grandchildren. Thus the persistence of God’s anger results in collective punishment upon the family and the society. Propp (2006:172-173) alleges that YHWH is ready to allow the sinner to repent, that is why he does not discipline for thousand generations. Vengeance seems to elapse after four generations, suggesting that such is the period of repentance. Stuart (2006:454) differs, feeling that the statement could mean God will punish the third and fourth generation if they keep on with same sin³¹² as their predecessors. Consequently, Yahweh’s jealousy leads to hatred as a result of his passion for Israel.

³¹⁰Although Ezekiel 18 will be discussed later, Levinson (2008:60-63) sees Judah facing the probability of national disaster, but the prophet offers a temporary intervention plan. He was among the upper class of the society in Judah, who were deported to Babylon 587BCE. Prior to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 597BCE, they were called to redress; until reality dawned. The prophet gave hope saying “the soul that sins shall die”, and 18:2 “fathers ate sour grapes and children’s teeth were on edge”. Ezekiel explains that this proverb is no longer valid. He quoted the proverb saying, “No longer...” proposing individual responsibility and challenging corporate responsibility as a justice system. Ezekiel 18:4 says anyone who sins will be punished for his or her wrongs; no longer will anyone suffer for another’s sin; no more transgenerational punishment or corporate punishment. What is being invoked is a change in ethos by Ezekiel. Children will be spared from inherited sin/punishment, meaning there is to be no more transfer of sin across generations. Previously the prophet Jeremiah (31:29-30) supported the idea, nevertheless he explained its validity in the future, at the advent of moral economy, unlike Ezekiel who uses it to encourage the people out of their lamentation. While Ezekiel proposes instant individual responsibility according to the proverb, Jeremiah advocates future fulfilment. The problem is, if Ezekiel cannot clarify his argument then the exiles will be correct to say YHWH is unjust, which will mean Jeremiah is true that this applies to the near future. First the repudiated proverb shares a few things with the Decalogue, such as retributive justice from one generation to another. Second, they made use of similar language, viz. fathers and children/sons. Third, they refer to divine justice. The perception of the exile is that they suffer innocently and the prophets gave them what wanted to hear.

³¹¹The account began with the parents, second are the children, third are the grand-children and the fourth generation are great grand-children. Yahweh applies this form of discipline not only to Israel (Genesis 15:16).

³¹²A careful reference to patriarchal narratives reveals a great perversion. Halloran (2012:181) says the transmission of sin affects the whole family due to God’s original justice. The sin is ontological in nature, altering the status of humanity. It was by virtue of transmitting grace and redeeming humanity. This is transferable by God’s justice upon humanity, not hatred to his people. We are not just rendered depraved through our parents; our depravity is from the beginning of humankind. Gonzales (2012:375-376) refers to the transgression of Babel, indicating Yahweh’s reference to the collective sin of the Canaanites. We see the iniquities of the Amorites (Genesis 15:16) and Sodom’s wickedness compared with pre and postdiluvian evil in

Dignity to God and humankind is what Sarna (1991:111) refers to as longevity, divinely bestowed on the righteous. Good acts do not concern God alone, it also affects parents, children and their land. Dozeman (2009:483-486) emphasizes that God is the source of love in humankind. They love since Yahweh circumcised their hearts and transformed their character. Their future and generational love is proven by being loyal and respectful, and desisting from all forms of alternative gods, for the reason “I Yahweh your God, am a jealous God”, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל³¹³. The marriage metaphor is used to refer to the covenantal relationship³¹⁴, and idolatry is depicted as a wife who is being lured into adultery. The image of a passionate love is used to describe a theological motif for the existing relationship. Hosea 2:14, 9:15 describes Israel rejecting their God, as an illicit love affair (Hosea 2:7, 10-11). God is the lover while Israel is the wife. Gonzales (2012:370) says the conflation of the stories portrays Abraham’s personal merit as the ground for God’s blessings on his descendants. Transgenerational blessings flow in their lineage; Abraham’s descendants obeyed God.

Houtman (2000:34) mentions that the curse is upon grand and great grand-children, but God’s blessings extend to a thousand generations. The Targum spoke of retribution as explicitly restricted to those who follow the bad examples of their fathers, and are therefore cursed. Meyers (2005:172) indicates that blessings flourish upon “a thousand generations” of those who love YHWH and obey his teachings. The ancestral covenant will endure and be a covenant forever on that basis. Propp (2006:173) explains that fidelity is the bottom line of Yahweh’s request to his loving people. Though it appears figuratively infinite when he spoke of a thousand generations, but since the days of Moses till date, Yahweh has been keeping Israel as his covenant/holy people. This also proves a loving father whose name is holy.

the primeval history. In this regard Adam and Eve sinned just as Abraham and Sarah sinned (Genesis 16) in taking “additional marriage” (doubting God).

³¹³Love and passion become the focal points of describing Yahweh’s craving for obedience and relationship to Israel. He could hate, divorce or punish even till future generations of the culprit. Interestingly most scholars have said little about his love to a thousand generations, Dozeman (2009:483-486) indicates that the commandment spoke against bowing down or worshipping idols. Deuteronomistic history alludes “bow down to them,” not worship “them,” with all forms included to family gods, public idol or personal images used by individuals.

³¹⁴The story of Phinehas depicts Yahweh as jealous in his marriage with Israel. Israel is adulterous, making YHWH a jealous lover, possessing the tendencies of divorcing his spouse publicly due to jealousy. The act now creates their guilt before their lover, prompting divine vengeance upon four generations. The response of love from God’s אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל portrays an imagery of marriage, describing another theology motif of love. God has transformed their hearts, they have been circumcised to love their God and be blessed. YHWH intends good, to prosper their land/people that is why he is zealous and ardent to love/rebuke; he does not punish but disciplines them, for three to four generations.

Holiness is linked to his name³¹⁵**vs.7** (Sarna 1991:111); this law in Exodus 20:7 deals with the abuse/protection of Yahweh's name. They dare not take his name to court for vain or worthless purposes. The divine name (**vs.7**) may not be used to support falsehood, unnecessary swearing in law suit and other useless vows. God will not allow culprits to go unpunished, even if it is not known by the judge or human witnesses. Houtman (2000:34-36) regards it as forbidding perjury, and false swearing when the name is being used for deceptive purposes. Since the expectation is that anyone using the name will likely tell the truth, the name may not be compromised. His people should show a good example in using his name, knowing the consequences involved. Senseless oaths and casual swearing are forbidden acts. The loving father wants Israel to save his name and show him dignity. Meyers (2005:172-173) notes that the essence of a person or object in the ancient Semitic world was believed to be contained in its very name. Thus there is sanctity, holiness and power in God's name/identity. This forms part of the reason for the reluctance to utter his name in ancient times, even less in judicial contexts. Involving God's name in the public was a serious business, for YHWH stands behind what is being uttered.

The next segment of the Decalogue continues with the שַׁבָּת Sabbath (**Vs.8-11**). Fretheim (1991:229) observe that the people were to live daily as though they do not have time to themselves, either for their own business, or what pleases them. YHWH deserves the right to schedule the day to himself, so that one day in a week shall be set aside for activities concerning YHWH, rest and worship. In Deuteronomy 5:12-15, the rest applies also to animals: "Ox and donkey", their servants, male and female, and others. Enns (2000:418) suggests that it is a reminder for God's people "to keep the day holy". Coming from the idea of "remember the day" and to "keep it holy" they will treat the day as respected, separated and set apart for YHWH. Recalling the memory of the day is different from observing the moments of rest. Meyers (2005:173) agrees that the priestly idea of holiness frames the additional material that refers to "keep the day holy" as the reason that "God blessed the day and made it holy". The Hebrew Bible says sanctify the holy day, and mark it by a special sacrifice. In the later Sabbath and post-Sabbath era, their community had a special liturgy that became the hallmark of their celebration and observations.

³¹⁵See Chapter Three analysis for details on the holiness of the name of YHWH. The name is regarded as sacred, and must be carefully used when necessary, especially by those that really understand the manner of its usage. With this practice, the name was preserved among the Jews.

They were to “rest” and “remember” how YHWH created³¹⁶ the earth and after which he rested. Jacob (1992:560-561) seem to differ in his idea of the background of the Sabbath. In his opinion there is a scientific understanding of the origin of the Sabbath, the seventh day of the week. The Babylonian *tabu* days linked this celebration with the four phases of the moon, so that the Sabbath, which is the seventh day of the week, developed from the old festival of the full moon, which the Babylonians called the *sabattu*. However, the Babylonian week had no fixed inner relationship with the Israelite concept of the six days of the week and the Sabbath observance. In Babylon and in Assyria every day was related to the moon, while in Israel the rest day originated from the rest day of creation. Meyers (2005:173-174) assumes that the Exodus narrative already introduces the Sabbath when it emphasises food security (gathering the manna) in the wilderness. This signifies that the sixth and seventh days were connected to the collection of manna on six days of the week and the cessation on the seventh day, the day of the Sabbath. Remembering is a closer description of Israel’s identity formation in regard to their religious and their socio-cultural lifestyle.

The Sabbath was neither the absence of work nor the holiday for servants, but “rest” from activities and rest to regain strength for other days of the week, and to focus on God. Stuart (2006:458-459) analyses “remembering the Sabbath³¹⁷ and keeping it holy” from the idea of “remember the time” and “separate it from other times”, not to do any form of work, but “dedicate time for YHWH”, ceasing³¹⁸ all other activities. Dozeman (2009:488-490) divides the Sabbath into three, to sanctify the Sabbath, guidelines for fulfilling the commandment and its rationale. The priestly authors referred directly to the creation stories in Genesis 1:1-2:4a as the motivation of the Sabbath. The P version differs from the Deuteronomist account in many ways; for instance, the holiness account is not as detailed as the Deuteronomist’s. Rest is now identified as the reason for the Sabbath in the Decalogue. P History directs the creation story as ending with the rest³¹⁹ on the last day (Genesis 2:1-3). The demand for rest actualized the memory of creation, which explains the Sabbath rest. The Sabbath was

³¹⁶Creation was not the only reason for the Sabbath, though it was the motivation for the Sabbath in this book. Other reasons include deliverance from Egypt and protection/provision in the wilderness. YHWH has been there for them and now wants them to obey him in return.

³¹⁷Most English translations differ from “remembering the Sabbath by keeping it holy” (NIV).

³¹⁸However, lactating animals, humans serving food, those eating and the priests who are busy in the sanctuary all did work to some extent. For certain circumstances this was allowed.

³¹⁹He indicated that the six days are for the people while the seventh belongs to their God. On Israel’s cultic calendar the Sabbath is Saturday while the Christians considers Sunday for the Sabbath rest, due to the resurrection on the first day of the week according to the New Testament. Israel conforms to the structure of God’s creation of six days of work and the seventh reserved for rest.

prominent in the exilic and post-exilic tradition. Keeping the Sabbath means obedience to YHWH and failure is faithlessness.

The development of the Decalogue in **Vs.8** continues with worship. The fourth commandment is the longest of all in the Decalogue due to how it is expanded for the purpose of emphasis on the worship of YHWH (Durham 1987:288-289). זָכַר *zakar* (qal inf., abs.), an equivalent of the emphatic imperative “remember” is used as reminder for people to mind the day. This is either due to the difficulties faced in remembering to observe the holy day or due to their disobedience to YHWH (Amos 8:4-8). To keep is שָׁמַר not זָכַר the closest meaning could be “do not forget to observe the Sabbath as a day to the Lord your God”. Houtman (2000:48) says זָכַר “remember”, the object is placed before the verb and is used in regard to “the day of rest”, as familiar to Israel (Genesis 2:2-3. Exodus 16:28-30). Furthermore, through the interruption of the regular days of work, the seventh day becomes sacred and is set apart for YHWH (20:9-10), with its uniqueness residing in the celebration and rest in observance of YHWH. Propp (2006:112) indicates that “observe” or “remember” or “keep” are diverse ways of looking at the phenomenon. It is a day sanctified by YHWH for YHWH as He commanded Israel to be Holy, to keep the day holy.

Childs (1977:413-416) considered the Sabbath as a verbal form of שָׁבַת “rest” as “cessation from work”, unlike the Babylonian *sapattu* and the Akkadian *sabattu* which refers to the celebrations of the full moon festival³²⁰. The commandment of the Sabbath demands consecration of the day that has been set apart for God. Jacob (1992:560) seem to differ about the background of the שָׁבַת finding a scientific understanding of the origin of the “Sabbath, seventh day of the week”. In the Decalogue, they were to rest and remember what YHWH did at creation, in Egypt and in the wilderness. Meyer (2005:173-174) assumes that the Exodus narrative already introduced the Sabbath when it emphasised food security (gathering the manna) in the wilderness.

With regard to **Vs.8-11**, Fretheim (1991:229) adds that YHWH deserves the right to alter or determine keeping the day to himself. Observing the Sabbath now becomes an act of creation, and keeping of the environment in sanity and purity means obedience to YHWH. Enns (2000:418) suggests that it is a reminder for God’s people “to keep the day holy”. Coming from the idea of “remember” and to “keep holy” they will treat the day as a respected day,

³²⁰See the other view about the origin of the Sabbath by Jacob 1992.

separated and set apart for their God. Recalling the day is different from the practice of observing the moments of separation from all except YHWH.

Meyer (2005:173) states that the priestly idea of holiness frames the additional material; the original form, “to keep the day holy,” is for the reason that “God has blessed that day and made it holy”. It became a consecrated day, different from other days. Thus in the Hebrew Bible, the sanctity of the holy day is marked by a special sacrifice, and in later biblical and post-biblical era, their community worshiped and had a special liturgy that hallmarked the Sabbath celebration and observations. (Meyer 2005:173). Interestingly, the stipulation of the Sabbath focused on the community’s interest, not religion. Stuart (2006:458-459) notices that “remembering the Sabbath and keeping it holy”, differs from “remembering the Sabbath by keeping it holy” (NIV³²¹). The idea is to remember the time and separate it from other times, not to do any form of work, but dedicate time for YHWH. It is not the absence of work but the rest from activities to focus on their God.

Of all the commandments **Vs.12** is the most direct one to humankind, commanding appreciation of the meaningful role of parents, to respect them, especially in their old age. In this regard, Durham (1987:290) notes the first four commandments as guiding principles of life in covenant with Yahweh, while the last six set forth to guide Israel’s relationship within the covenant community. YHWH’s expectation of his people is to relate as a human family. From beginning with an outline of the relationship with YHWH as sustenance for human dignity, the focus shifts onto maintaining the expectations in the society, to honour and respect parents. In most traditional African cultures, father and mother do not belong to a specific child, they are parents in the community and should be respected by all who belong to that community. Parents are not only teachers but are also family priests setting an example to the child and the community. Jacob (1992:570-571) explains that no matter how famous a person could be in Israel; they were distinct from YHWH the deity. Humans are the likeness and image of the law giver, the Creator of all humanity, and as such, parents represent the height of that image of God. A relationship of dignity and love is the only way to accord the greatness of the Creator. Parents form a link between God and humanity from their dignity and position of significance. Hence it was reasonable to link the line of thought: honour your parents, that “you may live long on the land which the Lord your God has given you”.

³²¹Most English translations, translate זָכַר contextually as “remember”, “observe” or “keep” the Sabbath.

Creating a good relationship between parents and children is basic for human existence and practices of dignity. Fretheim (1991:231) affirm that it is a fundamental order of creation to respect and relate well with one another. The commandment places the father and mother before the children as model, in the eyes of the society as nurturing agents. They function in the society to lead, teach, discipline and maintain dignity. Hence, they deserve to be listened to, especially their words of wisdom. Houtman (2000:50-52) indicates that like the second, this is another commandment attached to a promise. According to him, it is directed to adults, not just children submitting to parents' authority³²². Similarly, Enns (2000:420-421) explains that the parent-child relationship is an analogy to human dignity, especially with relation to a covenant. The respect for your parents extends to other parents as well, becoming a pattern of life in younger ones to respect older ones.

The commandment expresses a positive attitude toward both parents according to Meyer (2005:173-174) and calls on the society to be mindful of their elders. Children who honour those that gave birth to them, will themselves be honoured by God. They are not just to obey but to further honour with no limitations. Dozeman (2009:492) observes (like Durham, Stuart and other commentators) that the commandment was centred on adults, not children. It is concerned with the care given to the elderly, the law in P recorded in Leviticus 19:3, and Ben Sira 3 further extends the duties to include respect, patience and showing them kindness in their old age (Ben Sira 3:1-16). They are rewarded in the Promised Land, "the land that YHWH your God is giving you". Respect is a social responsibility were part of the history of God's people.

The remaining five commandments appear to be similar in Exodus 20 and in Deuteronomy 5: they all refers to a proper ethics for the community of brothers and sisters. Interestingly, this section, **Vs.13-17**, does not connect with **Vs.18**. The chapter is not organized like it was in the former Decalogue. To an extent the issue started from the fifth commandment which

³²²The family heads in patriarchal societies must take over from where the parents stopped in terms of responsibilities. The respect to the aged parents in the Israelite community must be maintained continuously. Honour your parent and you will live long in the land of promise; likewise, if you honour God, you will be blessed in the land for a thousand generations, and if you disobey you will be punished for three to four generations.

referred to respect for parents in the community, then the narrator outlaid respect³²³ as behaviour for the entire land and related it to other issues. It suggests that one can trace respect as a theme from the beginning to the end. These verses combine the ethics of the society, which is why Jacob (1992:572) explains the laws in **Vs.13-15** as security laws which guarantee every member of the community their safety. In this regard the people were warned not to engage in things like murder, adultery and stealing. Nevertheless, vs. 16-17 also point to safety, this time within the family, the immediate place of human dwelling. Murder³²⁴ is robbing people of their existence, adultery is robbing them of their dignity and stealing is robbing them of their possessions (human, animals³²⁵). It means no one should be robbed of his spaces, whether slaves or free, black or white, everyone ought to be respected.

Moreover, Fretheim (1991:322-238) held that the commands deal with social responsibility and prohibit violence against fellow Israelites (Numbers 35:20-21). He further specifies that the law against adultery³²⁶ is a proactive design towards the family's dignity, indicating adultery as a great sin (Isaiah 5:1-13, Ezekiel 23:36-49). This means it is put in place to protect the integrity of the marriage institution. Properties were seen as an extension of a person. The same goes for murder: taking someone's life is disrespect to life, just as taking their belongings or the dignity of a wife. Similarly, bearing false witness against a fellow citizen means stealing their right and justice, just as coveting their wife or household is an offense against their person. Meyer (2005:174-177) observes that the three laws consist of just two words starting with negative nuances, like "no murder, no adultery and no stealing" in line with the community rules in most African settings.

In reference to the ongoing discussion in **Vs.13**, Houtman (2000:59) agrees that it refers to the propagation of respect and dignity for human beings, especially fellow Israelite citizens that are living in a community of brothers. The thrust of the commandment stands against

³²³The theology of respect can be traced through the whole Decalogue from first to last. Respect is said to be accorded to God, his name, the holy day, to parents and to everyone in the community, men, women, children, and their properties (land, animals, house etc.).

³²⁴ According to Childs (1977:419) murder has been translated as prohibition against killing. It judges the intention of the individual involved (premeditated or unintentional act). Cassuto (1974:244) notes that every civilized human society prohibits killing, adultery and stealing. They are forbidden acts.

³²⁵ Scholars like Robbins and others often tend to omit the place and significance of animals in their interpretation. Hence the ethical respect of possessions here includes animals as well. It could be argued that they are given for food, according to Genesis 1:28-31. This researcher feels that since they make up a great deal of the daily life, they ought to have a significant place in scholarly exposition, thereby making humans respect their existence. Human beings tend to use them for economic, security and agricultural purposes; they should be respected.

³²⁶ See the book of Hosea for details about prohibitions of adultery, which is represented by Gomar and the Israelites as the adulterous people.

deliberate, violent and unlawful killing; against people taking the law into their hands. Enns (2000:420) affirms that although killing was going on in the society, no one was given the right to take the life of another in a premeditated manner. Holbert (2002:75) stresses that the verb does not mean “kill” but “murder”. Encouraging the protection of human life at all cost was basic to the covenant community. Similarly, Stuart (2006:462) interprets this law as “Never murder”, the idea incorporating a ban on taking of lives in any form. According to Dozeman (2009:494) the majority of contributors interpret the key word as “murder”. The God who created knows the significance of human life, and as such humankind must strive to respect one another. It confirms that this commandment lacks specification like the others like adultery, stealing etc.

Adultery is regarded as a grievous sin that ought not to be among God’s people. **Vs.14** indicates it violates the institution of marriage. Childs (1977:422) rightly notes that laws such as “do not sleep with another’s wife” and neither “commit behaviour of harlotry” specifically pertain to the self-worth of women. Houtman (2000:62) says adultery with a neighbour’s wife not only puts one to shame³²⁷, but also dishonours and damages a relationship of trust. Stuart (2006:463) finds the law on the prohibition of sexual immorality is to regulate sexual purity according to the covenantal stipulations, promoting “marital fidelity”. Sex is allowed only with one’s legal partner. Dozeman (2009:494) points out that while the Lord did not specify the consequences of disobedience in regard to adultery, Leviticus 20:20 and Deuteronomy 22:22 spell out certain penalties, including death.

Vs.15 says that the Lord your God says “You shall not steal”. Holbert (2002:99) remarks that stealing is an old issue prevalent in most human societies. Stealing in this regard could be of anything belonging to another person. Stuart (2006:465) says ownership exists in all societies, and comes with responsibilities. In this context, respect should be accorded the owner of property to which Dozeman (2009:494) attaches the reason why the commandment forbids stealing. According to the rabbis then the commandment prohibits stealing, also humans (kidnapping).

³²⁷In honour and shame cultures, mostly in Africa and parts of Asia, people would go to the extent of revenging the death of their fellow brother just to regain their dignity. They could kill someone who stole the virginity of their wife, sister or woman, just as in the case of Dinah and Shechem, the son of Harmon in Genesis 34, and the case of Tamar and Amon, the children of David in II Samuel 13 and many more in recent times. Some also kill to protect the dignity of their deity.

The commandment in this text comes to an end in **Vs.16-17**, unlike the Deuteronomy 5 account that ends only after further discussion. The laws conclude the section in the verses with two ethical issues related to the family, “you shall not bear false witness” and “you shall not covet” while Childs (1977:422) phrases **Vs.16** as “You shall not testify as a lying witness”. Durham (1987:295-296) sees the law connecting to judicial processes of the community. In the community of brothers, everyone was known and respected. As such lying, falsehood, deception fraudulent statement in public against a brother or sister will degrade and shame a person. Houtman (2000:64-65) opts for “no false accusation”, a stipulation that disposes humankind towards the administration of justice. It is important that their role in settling disputes must not be compromised. Witnesses were of paramount importance in judicial matters, since they were seen as accusers as well.

In positive terms Fretheim (1991:237) refers to it as a call to commitment toward other citizens of the land, likewise each member of the community should speak the truth and live by it. Moreover, Enns (2000:423) noted that establishing the guilt and innocence in a case depends on witnesses and their integrity. They could be given the punishment of the accused if they failed to speak the truth. Stuart (2006:465-466) argues that a decent society requires a realistic court system. Dozeman (2009:495) observes the commandment as similar to the third commandment, “you shall not take the name of the lord your God in vain”. This version portrays sincerity not only in regards to YHWH but also between human beings.

Though the last commandment in **Vs.17** seems broad, viz. “You shall not covet”, Childs (1977:425) describes the verb as a subjective emotion, while all the preceding prohibitions were directed against an objective action. This includes the action that comes from the emotions of the heart and the impulses of human will in relating to one another. Durham (1987:297) points out that the commandment is directed to individual members of the society. The key word is mostly accepted as “desire”, the yearning for or lusting after something or someone. Fretheim (1991:237) is of the opinion that if we argue that the object is “house”, it will encompass all who live there and if we assume the object to be “wife” then it applies specifically to the woman, mother or wife in the family. Enns (2000:424) says coveting someone’s wife will lead to adultery, rape or kidnap. Houtman (2000:68) remarked that the verb expresses more than will, it involves the preparation to commit wicked or evil plans. The call is to keep their desire in check.

This kind of precept is concerned with social stability, in the sense that the idea denotes an intense desire generated by passion, which may not be easily controlled (Meyer 2005:178). Dozeman (2009:495) observes that the final commandment moves away from general behaviour to focus on the danger of a misplaced desire, otherwise greed. The commandment interrelates other laws using an idea of desiring other gods and images of worship at first level; in the next, it was a desire with regard to respect for the rest day and parents; then comes the desire for people, belongings and a reputation. These are things that could lead to sin and subsequently to transgenerational transfer of sin. These desires are incorporated in the urge to obey YHWH and be blessed. Thus “Hear O, Israel the Lord your God is one” becomes an appropriate ethics of the community that should lead to morality, holiness and a faithful life. In the course of paying attention to YHWH, they will achieve the promise of “milk and honey”. In synonymous understanding, the laws were introduced in negative and positive tones to show prohibited behaviour versus those promoted in the land of Israel. The text does not seem to have the usual prologue, main body and an epilogue in the narrative.

4.5.4 Opening-Middle-Closing Pattern

This kind of literary device³²⁸ refers to the structure of a beginning, middle and end of a story, or an introduction, main body of the discussion and the conclusion (Robbins 1996:19). In this case there are theories of structuring this text which are established as categories that include first a **5 + 5** arrangement in which the laws are divided into two groups of five. The first five focus on humanity and YHWH while the last five deal with social relations among God’s people. In the second theory the laws are divided as **4 + 6**, the first four relating to God and humankind while the last six relate to social ethics among human beings. One feels there should be another division as **3 + 2 + 5**, as explained in the previous chapter: the first three are negative laws of prohibition and the next two are positive laws petition that refer to the respect that ought to be to YHWH and his people, while the last five focus on the ethics of the society. In this text the beginning refers to what YHWH forbids.

Exodus 20:1-17 does not have the opening verses, unlike Deuteronomy; it briefly says in Vs.1-2 “And God spoke all these words saying, I am the Lord your God who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery”. This is followed by a middle section, which is the

³²⁸Otherwise the introduction, the main body/argument in the passage and the conclusion also called the final remarks or final exhortation in the text. Exodus began with a speech, unlike in Deuteronomy where it started with a call to assemble to listen to YHWH.

Decalogue Vs.3-17 and there is no closing section in this text. This contrasts with Deuteronomy 5 where 5:1-5 is the opening, 5:6-21 is the middle section and the closing is 5:22-33, followed by the discussion. In this case there is virtually no connection between 19:25 and Exodus 20:1-17, instead it connects with the subsequent verses 20:18-23 and onward. The opening verse seems to have the purpose of identifying the speaker. Durham (1987:283) notes that it reaches a climax with the sounding of the ram's horn, and YHWH speaks, addressing the people assembled at the perimeter of holiness at the base of the mountain (Exodus 19:19, 20:18-20, Deuteronomy 4:10-14, 5:4, 22-27, 9:10; Nehemiah 9:13). This proves the presence of YHWH in the climatic revelation and divine drama. Jacob (1992:543) said *Elohim* appeared suddenly to the people with no prior preparation and spoke to the "entire people", this time through Moses the intermediary of the people and their God, though they knew of his presence. Houtman (2000:17) explains that the beginning was an indication of the One whose voice is heard - again, through his servant, according to the people's arrangement. The last time in Deuteronomy 5 God spoke to them but this time, they want him to speak through Moses.

Similarly, Enns (2000:411) is of the opinion that the verse poses a number of puzzles. Most of all it indicates an interlude between 19:16-17, 24-25 and 20:18, within which the "Ten Words" were given by YHWH himself. Meyers (2005:163) explain that the beginning was not clear, it had no designation but simply says "And God spoke..." followed by the official formula of his authority. Stuart (2006:445) observes that the verse specifies that God spoke the Ten Words himself directly to Israel and not through a mediator, viz. that the people heard God's voice themselves and could not doubt his presence. Dozeman (2009:479) affirms that the introduction anchors the "I am" code within the literary context of Exodus. The opening verse fulfils the divine announcement of theophany to Moses. It goes to show that the argument is whether God spoke through Moses or directly to Israel. However, one is of the opinion that, prior to the discussion between chapter 19:25 and Exodus 20:1, there is an indication that God spoke through Moses as the mediator of Israel. This can be seen in Deuteronomy 5:1-5, where Moses prepared Israel to hear their God as he addressed their assembly.

The closing aspect is exciting and grabs attention in Deuteronomy 5, though Exodus 20 it differs in how the story ends, and suddenly diverts into the previous issues of the preceding chapter. There may be various reasons that Deuteronomy 5 had further explanations after the

Ten Commandments. Again this indicates that there is no specific closing for this Decalogue, except 20:18-26, which does not argue for the laws, like Deuteronomy 5. Vs.18-26 is entirely part of another narrative and a different argument. Nevertheless, **3 x 2 x 5** could be applied as the opening-middle-closing sections within the Decalogue, as discussed in Chapter Three. The issue is Exodus 20:18-26 does not end the argument in the Decalogue but continues with God's speech on the mountain from 19:25. The argument is for holiness in Israel.

4.5.5 Argument and Rhetorical Structure

Robbins (1996:21) poses the question, what is the argument of the narrator? What does he desire his listeners to hear and learn from the passage³²⁹? Sin of the fathers is argued as individual or corporate responsibility with regards to the Decalogue in the second commandment. Personally, the first argument revolves around the sin of the fathers; and shows what led to the exile, instead of faithfulness that stands as a channel of blessings. Although Exodus 20 posits "remember the Sabbath", Deuteronomy 5 says "observe the Sabbath," a difference and the second point. The third argument indicates that covenant keepers will be blessed for a thousand generations; an unimaginable length of time in their families, just as covenant breakers will be cursed and punished for three/four generations. In the concluding verses, the law says they must not covet or desire what belongs to others especially their "wife" or "house". (To avoid repetitive research this will not be detailed here again, but see Narrative Texture in Chapter Three.) These are issues raised in the Ten Commandments, the law according to Fretheim (1991:201-207) could be discussed from the narrative context in ten ways:

- (a) YHWH is important in both the law and the narratives, and is the chief actor who gives the laws, speaks and acts towards the propagation of a dignified society. This law forms part of the narrative that sketches the picture of respect paid to YHWH by humankind.
- (b) The law is God's gift by grace to humanity. It ties in with the story of the Exodus and Deuteronomy, grounded in the personal and divine will of God.
- (c) Within the narrative there is the personal character of the law in confrontation with the giver of the law and the covenant people.

³²⁹The Decalogue particularly is not a story-like kind of text, but there are lessons to be drawn from the bits and pieces of the instructions which otherwise makes a story. The bigger story revolves around the Exodus of Israel from Egypt, and how YHWH gave them the "Law" and the "Torah" to guide their relationship, other sub themes within the Decalogue like Sabbath and others.

- (d) These appeals must be maintained as a personal relationship between YHWH and Israel, indicating God's choice for humankind as his vessels and partners in the relationship.
- (e) In this relatedness, creation theology emerges in Exodus. God who created is the one who led Israel out of Egypt, and jealously desires their loyalty.
- (f) YHWH's action in the narrative depends on Israel's observance of the law. There will be either blessing or curse, punishment or restoration, depending on their obedience to God. Hence the law serves as both norm and content of their behaviour as God's people.
- (g) The basis for obedience to the law is motivated by the past relationship with their Creator (Exodus 12:26, 13:8, 22:21-27, 23:9), and may seem to be an imposed will of the Creator over the created, with its goal being human dignity and peace.
- (h) God's laws seem a part of the daily life of his people. Although the Decalogue complements the existing idea of obedience to YHWH, it was not a new concept but had been with them, and now emerges as a traditional instruction.
- (i) The law and the narrative testify to the idea of obedience and now function for the remembrance³³⁰ of the mighty deeds of God in the past.
- (j) The Torah has been given as law within the narratives of Israel, according to tradition (Exodus 24:12). On this note, it forms part of the background that clarifies the reasons why God is jealous, why he demands loyal love and the reason for the "sin of the fathers" which is passed on to their grand and great grandchildren.

For these reasons Dozeman (1996:101-102) views the priestly tradition in the Pentateuch as composed of interconnected laws and narratives. Though isolated, it presents a balanced interweaving of both the law and narrative. Hence the plot of the priestly organization in the Exodus is essential for an overall interpretation of holiness theology. The Decalogue in Exodus is therefore within a narrative context. To explain further, Houtman (2000:9, 11, 13) has the following related perspectives:

- (a) The Decalogue is a presentation that came from YHWH, as an extraordinary character at the beginning of the extensive collection of the laws.
- (b) It has a governing power/effect, to guide Israel.
- (c) It is a law that pertains to a relationship between Israel and their God.

³³⁰Through praise, thanksgiving, singing, dance and honour to their God, they were in a sense retelling their stories.

- (d) The law is both social as well as religious in nature.
- (e) They are part of the liturgy in Judaism's feasts of the week.
- (f) It presents an ethical content and prophetic spirituality that enables the Decalogue as God's words.

In this manner, Dozeman (2009:477) says, the Decalogue inaugurates the revelation of the law at the divine mountain. It could be teachings rather than direct revelation in conforming to P's holiness. Hereafter, the transfer of holiness in the future remains the duty of the priestly history (Leviticus 19:2, 9:22-24). The Decalogue could be understood from singular themes like YHWH the one and only God of Israel, YHWH's name as holy witness, obedience to YHWH on the Sabbath etc.

4.5.6 Sensory-Aesthetic Texture

This focuses on the beauty and use of features in the text that refers to the manner and style of crafting the passage. The sensory aesthetics in this text uses same feature as in the previous chapter, "God spoke" making use of the mouth to speak, to call/gather the people together to minister unto them Robbins (1996:29-30). It is expected of Israel to respond by the use of their ears to listen/hear, to perceive the message, just as indicated in Chapter Three. This strategy is used to draw attention of the people to the convener, so that his message and the purpose of their gathering will be made known. It becomes beautiful how the scene develops to the end when the Ten Commandments were received and beyond. With regard to the text, having considered the elements of intra-textual analysis above, it will be important look in detail at various intertextual methods. These intertextures comprise Oral scribal, socio-cultural as well as ideological and theological intertexture.

4.6 Inter-Textual Analysis for Exodus 20:1-17

Intertextual analysis is an emphasis on how a particular text makes meaning from the lenses of other passages that are similar within the Scriptures. Various features comprise the nature and art of seeking for meaning of the text from the interrelationship with other similar texts. In other words, from the correlation of similar texts, the plain sense of the text can be established. The theme of creation in Exodus is a reference to the way God related to Israel from the beginning of their painful exilic experiences unto their post-exilic establishment. Oral tradition played a great role in the עֵלֶּוֹת culture, drawing people to YHWH. Oral intertexture now appears as a significant reference the background of this text.

4.6.1 Oral-Scribal Intertexture

The interrelationship of texts can reveal various meanings; such as how orally narrated stories later became significant documents for finding meaning to life. The oral tradition of Israel is significant for maintaining the relationship with their God. They were urged to recite the שמע ישראל at all times; other oral stories emphasize the need to listen, to hear and to obey their God. In this development, Robbins (1996:40) said there are five elements, considered here as recitation, re-contextualization, reconfiguration, narrative amplification and thematic elaboration, however, not all are relevant. Note that these references served as proof of the priestly involvement in re-arranging the text of Exodus and narrating it to influence changes that soothe YHWH. In this sequence above, we shall reconsider re-contextualization as being relevant. According to Robbins 1996, there are certain aspects of oral scribal intertexture that did not appear in this chapter, for the reason that it was analysed in the previous chapter, although in a different context. Further repetition would amount to repetition.

I. Re-contextualization

In this aspect the message has been transformed into a new context for emphasis and clarity (Robbins 1996:72). The point of departure is to remember how YHWH delivered Israel from Egypt. Sin of the fathers now refers to the memory of what led to the exile; it ought not to be repeated, so it is significant for Israel to obey, just as emphasized in the theology of Assyro-Babylonian contexts. Israel must now remember the essence of their day of rest. The picture of obedience is what the priests wanted to pass across. Everyone must rest on the Sabbath³³¹, slaves or free in order to comply with God, just as he rested on the seventh day. Though Deuteronomy 5 has a different tone in the text, it repeats and recites itself, as shown below.

Text Re-Contextualization
Genesis 2:2- By the seventh day God had finished the work he had been doing; so on the seventh day he rested from all his work.
Exodus 16:22-23 , On the sixth day, they gathered twice as much omers... "Tomorrow is to be a day of Sabbath rest, a holy Sabbath to the Lord" 26-29 , Six days you are to gather it, but on the seventh day, the Sabbath, there will not be any... some went out on the seventh day to gather it but found none. How long will you refuse to keep my commandments and instructions? Bear in mind, the Lord has given you the Sabbath; that is why on the sixth day he gives you bread for two days. Everyone is to stay where they are on the seventh day; no one is to go out. 23:10-12- For six years you are to sow your field and harvest your crops, but during the seventh year let the land lie un-ploughed and unused. Then the poor among you might get some food from it, and the wild animals may eat what is left... six days do your work, but on the seventh day do not work, so that your ox... your donkey may rest... the slave born... and the foreigners living

³³¹The sequence in the narrative now comes to a good height, its peak with keeping the Sabbath day Holy. In his power, he delivers, he saves, he provides, he protects and guides those that obey him. This now takes a very significant place for all those that were saved to rest in compliance to the law of the Sabbath.

among you may be refreshed. In **31:14-16**, “Observe the Sabbath, because it is holy to you. Anyone who desecrates it, is to be put to death; those who do any work on that day must be cut off from their people. For six days, work is to be done, but the seventh day is the day of Sabbath rest, holy to the Lord. Whoever does any work on the Sabbath day is to be put to death! The Israelites are to observe the Sabbath, celebrating it for the generations to come as a lasting covenant. It will be a sign between me and the Israelites forever, for in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed. When the Lord had finished speaking to Moses on Mount Sinai, he gave him the two tablets of the covenant law, the tablets of stone inscribed by the finger of God. In the last section of the book, we notice a continuation **35:2** though recitation of exact words as the previous verses but re-contextualized in **Vs.3** Do not light a fire in any of your dwellings on the Sabbath day.

Leviticus 23:3, There are six days when you may work, but the seventh day is a day of Sabbath rest, a day of sacred assembly. You are not to do any work; wherever you live, it is a Sabbath to the Lord. **24:8**, This bread is to be set out before the Lord regularly, Sabbath after Sabbath, on behalf of the Israelites, as a lasting covenant. **25:2-6**... “When you enter the land I am going to give you, the land itself must observe the Sabbath to the Lord. For six years sow your fields, and for six years prune your vineyards and gather their crops. But in the seventh year the land is to have a year of Sabbath rest, a Sabbath to the Lord. Until during the Sabbath year, there will be food for god’s people. **26:2**, Says, “observe” the Sabbath and have reverence for my sanctuary. I am the Lord your God. Vs. **34-35** Then the land will enjoy its Sabbath years... then the land will rest and enjoy its Sabbaths. All the time... the land will have the rest it did not have during the Sabbaths you lived in it. **28:9-10** On the Sabbath day, make an offering of two lambs a year old without defect... this is the offering for every Sabbath... **8:5** when will the Sabbath be ended that we may market wheat?

Deuteronomy 5:12-15 – refer to Chapter Three for more about this text.

First, the indication that “God rested” serves as an origin to the theology of rest³³² and the motivation for the Sabbath in Exodus. God rested and in like manner all must rest. Secondly, the exiles are to rest after the exodus, and not just those at liberty, but also their servants and their domestic animals. It also presents a new context for understanding the reason of their exodus and the purpose of the Decalogue. Thus the use of six days for work and the seventh day for rest are references to the Sabbath. Sabbath³³³ became a major theme during the post-exilic experience as explained in Chapter Three and will be seen later. This priestly embellishment draws attention to YHWH, to remain holy. This informs the form of social activity for the people of God, but indicates YHWH’s power to create and re-create.

³³²See Dozeman, T. 2006, “God at War” for details about the motivation of the Sabbath from rest at creation. Appreciating the six days of the week set apart for them will help them to appreciate the Sabbath; the day is set as a work-free day, a day of rest and meditation.

³³³The very text recorded by Moses at Sinai according to Aaron (2006:21-22) shows that on the seventh day God called Moses. In the midst of the cloud and the fire on the mountain, Moses took forty days and nights with God. This is detailed in the Torah (Exodus 24:18, 31:18, 32:15, 34:28, Deuteronomy 9:9). Notice the emphasis on the Sabbath to remind Israel about their life and their immediate past history. They should work on other days that were given to them based on their desires, for six days they could choose what to do, but everyone must remember that they have six days for themselves and a day for their God. There is no way, Israel could excuse themselves from their God. They do not live by their will, but his. This is significant in the relationship. YHWH has shown constance and loyalty; it is now their turn pay back.

4.7 Socio-Cultural Analysis

Typical social characteristics of a society include its cultural beliefs³³⁴ and customs; these influence the way people think and conduct themselves. To some extent socio-cultural intertexture has been detailed in the previous chapter on Deuteronomy 5; this analysis of Exodus 20 invites further engagement with the socio-cultural context of the text. The voices of the society are used to appreciate what YHWH requires of them. In order to avoid repetition, refer to Socio-cultural Intertexture in Chapter Three for details on the kind of society³³⁵ that made up the treaty in the holiness context. The intertexture in this section will take into cognizance both the social and cultural concerns simultaneously.

4.7.1 Social Background and Intertexture

The meta-narrative of Israel's liberation is regarded by Meyers (2005:1) as a treaty³³⁶. YHWH gave them certain rules to regulate their lives and the relationship. He would build an everlasting relationship with them, shaped by faithfulness to a covenant. She supposes that a group of people are said to have escaped from Egyptian oppression; journeyed³³⁷ through the wilderness to a place their God revealed to their leader Moses to be their home. Though Exodus forms part of these meta-narratives, Propp (2006:33-35) refers to it as the "cultic

³³⁴Though the transfer of sin is an ancient practice that needs to be understood in three contexts; the exodus of Israel from Egypt, the reception of the Decalogue as well as the imageries of "Parent eating 'Sour Grapes' and children's teeth were on edge" according to Ezekiel and Jeremiah or the concept of Sin of the fathers upon the children. In this case, it builds part of the social life of God's people that helped them to stay close to their God.

³³⁵ The Israelite's society was a traditional corporate community relating as one family and suffering as one family. Their families were the smallest unit of the society, but central to their nationalism. See Covenant Relationship in 4.8.2 under Common social and cultural theme below for solidarity and corporate group under 4.9, Ideological texture for group responsibility during painful experiences and blessings. The hierarchy of such social constructions includes first, the clan which comprises families that are related, second, the tribes which is divide into twelve according to the names of their patriarchal sons of Jacob, and third is the nation, which is also Israel, the people of God. See Chapter Three on socio-cultural context for details as well as Matthew, V.H. 1990 (1988). *Manners and Custom in the Bible*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers. White, Jr. W. 2009. "Family" in Merrill C. Tenney (G, Ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. 2nd Ed. Vol.2. (D-G) Rev. Ed. Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation. 535-540. Post, S.G. 2001. "Family" in Erwin Fahlbusch et al. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.2, (E-I) Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans. 283-285. Dearman, J.A. 1998. "Family in Old Testament" in *Interpretation: Journal of Bible and Theology*. Vol.52/2. 117-129. De Vaux, R. 1997. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Grand Rapids and Livonia: W.B. Eerdmans and Dove, and others cited in Chapter Three.

³³⁶This is following the context of the earlier Ancient treaties of Assyria and Babylon in 15th to 8thCentury BCE.

³³⁷ According to Meyers (2005:11) the Asiatic movement to Egypt was for nearly the whole history of Egypt, at the time they were in control of Syria-Palestine, a substantial number of people from western Asia migrated to Egypt. Majority slaves, captured through military expedition to the southern Lavent and beyond. Another Asiatic campaign brought astronomical numbers of humans including the Apiru, Shasu, Syria and many more. Their collective past shaped the mnemo-history of Exodus for later canonization.

covenant³³⁸, hinging on the song of the sea, Exodus 15:1-18. It came through legal acclamations in the form of covenant stipulations, from the royal institutions. The question is, how can Israel faithfully relate with a transcendent God, whom they cannot fathom? To this the holiness code in the Persian period made sense, especially during the exilic and early post-exilic era. God appears in the “theophany” to solidify and prepare his people to obey him. Dozeman (2009:4) indicates that God appeared in times of difficulties, his presence being shown through nature (in the storm). The earth trembles, the mountains quake and the heavens pour out rain. There was a shout, clouds gathered, lightning and thunder pointed toward God (Exodus 19:16-17, Judges 5:4-7). These phenomena serve to confirm God’s presence and witness involvement in the holiness requirements for his people. They were trembling while their deity remained on the peak of the mountain, the dwelling of God, “Zion” (Isaiah 25:6).

Exodus contains various references to commemoration and memory of the past. Meyers (2005:8, 11) clarifies that creation theology in Genesis and other traditions within the book of Exodus indicates the result of how the past was remembered and how it shaped the social fabric of the community. Their festivals and other rituals are among the practices that gave Israelites their identity, others were the Passover and Sabbath observance, their rituals, priesthood and national. Yahweh had committed his will and loyalty; it was now for Israel to choose holiness. They are related in two ways according to the priestly writers, in “cult” and “covenant”, besides the pledge to fidelity. The temple is now the centre of religious activities and politics. It served as an element of manipulating their relationship which requires both parties to be holy. They gave their sacrifices to please their God, thus Yahweh is determined to bless them. Dozeman (2009:5-7) says the topic of divine presence is important in this narrative for both fathers and their children, but the focus is on holiness. Yahweh dwells in Zion, he is closer to his people, he does not just dwell in sanctuaries and tabernacles (Exodus 25-31, 35-40), but also present in the temple at Jerusalem his sacred dwelling, all these point people toward a holy God.

³³⁸Aaron (2006:14-15) was right when he alleges that the entire Decalogue is harmonized around the composition of the Pentateuch and the forty-year sojourn of God’s people in the wilderness. The major chunk of the materials in the pre-Torah times makes up Leviticus, which contains priestly theology. The context of the wilderness clarifies the cultic documents of the oligarchy of the priests, similar to other legal materials in Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. See, David H. Aaron 2006. *Etched in Stone*. New York: T&T Clark. Propp (2006:33) which takes the reader from the point of rolling deep to Yahweh’s unmovable mountain, ‘the firm seat for your sitting... the sanctum...you had founded’, from the exalted spot: “Yahweh... will reign for ever in eternity’. The song essentially gives a summary of Exodus according to him, indicating Israel’s rescue from the threatening waters, reaching their camp at Yahweh’s mountain, where Jethro advises Moses to institute a rudimentary judicial administration in preparation of their national state.

In covenantal³³⁹ terms this theme emerges through priestly reconstructions, facilitating loyalty and love. Meyers (2005:16-17) indicates that it occurred between the late monarchy and early exilic period that Israel rebelled and were taken captive. The priestly matters that relate to holiness were introduced later, which informs the call by the priestly order as part of the theology of the treaty, that in turn informs the obedience theology. In Propp's (2006:34) opinion the stipulations are agreed upon as keeping the will of the suzerain (exclusive fidelity). Although not all the stipulations were clearly marked out as apodictic, the new treaty extends through the Torah. The fidelity of the Israelites became the bottom line. They testify to their agreement with sacrifices and offerings to appease their God, while Yahweh responds, either with blessing or curse. Dozeman (2009:7-8) notes a new identity through the priestly stipulations like the mountain of Yahweh and the priestly tabernacle in Exodus 33:7-11. The law now comes to play the central role, providing a framework for legal decisions. The law was administered in the palace and assisted by local community officials, as well as temple priests who served as judges. The covenant law code is similar to the ancient Near East regulations. It helped guide the ethical life of Israel, and elders assisted in the administration of justice (Exodus 18). The Decalogue links the law to Yahweh (Exodus 20:1-17) through the covenant theology.

These are apodictic laws that state what God dislikes in the relationship. YHWH is involved in ensuring holiness and blessings. Propp (2006:35) finds that in Exodus 25:10-21 and Deuteronomy 10:3-5, the documents of the covenant of holiness were recognized to be recited publicly at intervals of seven years. Although God is involved with Israel, there are witnesses to the covenant, like God, Moses, Israel, the heavens, earth, and other cosmic beings of the created order. While blessing and curse were clearly stated in Exodus 15:25-26, 23:22-33 and Leviticus 26 there is further explanation in Deuteronomy 27-28³⁴⁰. The covenant form of these cultic documents survived all the exilic and post-exilic meanderings. Besides, The Pentateuch is most concerned with the ancient past as far back as creation (Genesis 1-11) and the ancestors (Dozeman 2009:24-25). The origin of Israel as a nation now connects to the liberation from Egypt to Deuteronomy. The early prophets from Joshua to II

³³⁹The biblical covenant is more than a general agreement: it considers relationship and the fidelity involved. Propp (2006:34) includes "cultic" and "covenantal" ideas as frames of reference for explaining the theory of faithfulness/holiness. It is specifically a political treaty, not just cultic, between the suzerain and the vassal. This treaty differs from the Hittite, Syrian or Assyrian forms, instead having two parties reviewing their relationship, to the benefit of the vassal.

³⁴⁰ In regards to the reconstructions, Propp (2006:35) observed that the Pentateuchal redactors included the tribal saga, list of genealogies, chronological tables, topographical descriptions, ancient poems, royal edicts, civil laws, priestly regulations, agricultural technology, parental wisdom and common sense, etc.

Kings focused on the recent past; the late monarchy marks the period of the book, though significant achievements date back to exilic and post-exilic times.

The priestly theology emerges in the Torah as the “Holiness Code”, while Patrick (2008:606) indicates Leviticus 19:2 as the legal code, “You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am a holy”. It features animal cleansing, purification of women after birth, leprosy, uncleanness of death bodies, in Chapter 1.6, it set out the ritual “Day of Atonement” performed by the priests, their sanctuaries and altars. Leviticus 25 sets the legislation of the Sabbath and the jubilee year. There are blessing for being obedient/holy (26:3-13) and curses for unfaithfulness and infidelity (26:14-45). Avioz (2013:346) notes that Absalom’s narrative indicates the consequences of David’s sin and simultaneous divine intention for humankind. The punishment imposed on Absalom was really due to Nathan’s oracle (II Samuel 12), rendering Absalom an instrument in God’s hands used to punish David (Avioz 2013:347-348). According to Smith (2013:17) Eli, Samuel, Saul and David were Israel’s leaders, who were affected by sin (I and II Samuel). Primarily they were leaders who were also fathers, and three of them lost their dynastic hope as a result of sin. The narrative indicates how God dealt with these fathers in a pattern that shows their unfaithfulness.

Sin perceived in parents is clearly depicted in children, hence following the rule of punishing children for the sin of their fathers, as stipulated in Exodus 34:7 and Numbers 14:18. Meyer (2015:435) reads Leviticus 17-26 as a priestly text influenced by a later generation of priests. In chapter 1-16, it is seen as part of P, indicating that the authors of P were acquainted with these chapters as post-exilic, and containing the theology of land in the text. This idea seems to continue from creation, to the narrative of an unholy king of Egypt refusing the request of a holy God, until he faced the “ten plagues.” We see the holy God now preserving his people in the Passover, and the people responded with their sacrifices of respect, love and loyalty in the tabernacle. During the monarchy people had to be cleansed before entering the temple. The Holiness code runs through Leviticus, with Chapters 11-15 covering cultic cleanliness; in 17-26 various laws were used for emphasizing the benefit of being holy. In Psalm 8, God is mindful of his creatures, in 15 and 22 the holy God seem to have forsaken his own, thus prophet Ezekiel called everyone to holiness while they were in exile. (See certain socio-cultural groups like conversionists and reformists that are relevant for the holiness context.)

I. Category of the Conversionists

These refer to personalities who focus on overcoming dishonesty and corruption among human beings, especially in their own society. According to Robbins (1996:72) they follow a process that could transform people by converting both individuals and the general public. Not even through the other religions or people except the Jews; conversion is possible if people believe in YHWH and obey him. Other interpretive factors³⁴¹ may not need elaboration but it is briefly clarified. The reformists also made effort to change people.

II. The Reformist Category

The reformists attempt to modify the corrupt social structure of the society by making changes in the world they live in (Robbins 1996:73). As movers and shakers of the current status they hope to realize a transformation that will result in keeping the covenant and being obedient to YHWH. They consider salvation as a turn-around process that might take time, but which could attain the new standards for daily living, also pertaining to the Sabbath and the law. Others who strove for similar change included the Utopians.

III. Utopian Category

Utopians are visionary re-creators of new order, not the kind of creation by God, but a way of developing new perspectives along divine principles. They wish to see humanity made free from sin, corruption and wickedness (Robbins 1996:74). It is not just the divine powers that can cause this change, human beings can themselves be involved, hence Utopians strive to keep the covenant as well as re-establish a new society through new. The world as created by God was “good”, but humankind corruption/sin upon the earth. Utopians believe that the world suffers as a result of bad deeds of humanity, exemplified in concepts like “Sin of the father upon the children” in the Pentateuch, and “the sour grapes” theology in the prophets.

³⁴¹**Revolutionist:** They stand ahead, organizing the process of change for everyone, no matter the cost. They seek for community rather than individual change. They deliberately work hard to force their kind of change in their transformation movement, through the destruction of what is sinful. Calling on others to follow their deity and belief system. **Introversionist:** They believe everyone needs to be saved from this sinful world, considering human misbehaviour and wickedness. For this reason, they assist everyone to withdraw from the wicked, criminal and maliciousness. **Gnostic-Manipulationist:** Holds knowledge as the way to change; knowledge aid obedience. This idea teaches the community to learn and memorize. The *Shema* (Deuteronomy 6:4-5) is taught so that the youth can know it, recite it and have memorized it. Robbins (1996:73) refers to it as the right means/technique to overcome evil. It may be a new scientific approach or new method of life like the gnostic. **Thaumaturgical:** Intend to save through meditation and assumptions of transformation. Robbins (1996:73) said salvation takes the form of healing, assuagement of grief, restoration of loss, reassurance, foresight, the avoidance of calamity and the guaranteeing of eternity. In this regard they concentrate on what will modify a person’s situation even after death. See Robbins, V. K. 1996. *Exploring the Texture of the Text: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International.

Unfortunately, in both cases, the result of sin falls on the children. Utopian change hope to save the children from being affected by their parents' sin.

4.7.2 Metaphor-Proverb for Transgenerational Sin

The socio-cultural voices in the text relate the Decalogue and the metaphor-proverb of “the sour grapes”. This might be an exilic proverb use in Jeremiah 31:29 and Ezekiel 18:2 and repeated after the exile, as an image in reference to the laments, complaints and murmuring of the exiles. These post-exilic voices called to warn against the sin curse; to inform of cross-generational consequences of sin. Their complaint is that they are punished due to a curse on their fathers in the past. In the previous chapter, the Decalogue was explained in relation to the Deuteronomic context. It remains a significant adventure to compare the theology of transgenerational transfer of sin in Exodus 20:5 back to a holiness context. Though sin may have progressive or intergenerational effects on a family in African perception, yet God judges the guilty and blesses the righteous. In addition, blaming another person is an attribute of the sinful nature. The sour grapes now point them back to the past, to love/loyalty and to reciprocate dignity.

I. The “Sour Grapes” in Ezekiel 18:2

Although the proverb was believed to be a popular saying when Ezekiel used it, Cooper (1994:188-190) disavows personal responsibility of the people in the past. The predecessors who are guilty of gross misconduct are the ones that deserve this judgement, which is why the younger generation felt they were being punished unjustly. The practice of transfer of sin is not an individual responsibility but corporate one. Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9 shows the sufferings of the exile could be traced to the transgressions of an unfaithful generation, affecting the post-exilic community due to an accumulation of disobedience (Joshua 7:1-26, Exodus 34:6-7). The priestly idea is to reconstruct a holy nation and faithful people before YHWH. Odell (2005:217-219) affirms that Ezekiel 18 is an address to the entire house of Israel, employing a direct method for the priestly-legal disputations. It can be assumed that the post-exiles³⁴² identified this saying as protest against the transfer of punishment (Lamentation 5:7). The lament calls on the prophets to see the kind of injustice that was upon them, but Ezekiel refutes their claims by portraying YHWH as a loving God who disciplines only the culprit.

³⁴²Those who went to Babylon or Assyria were different from those who returned, yet they are bound in corporate responsibility.

Recent studies show that Tuell (2009:107-108) agrees it is a lament of the exiles over the sin of their fathers, although the prophet insinuates that they are responsible for what is happening. YHWH does not take pleasure in their sufferings; it is required in accountability to stay faithful and keep the stipulations. Perhaps they use the proverb as a post-exilic protest for their innocence; they saw the exile as their parents' fault, not theirs. As the covenant applies to the past generation as well as the present one, same applies to the proverb. They have no excuse for what is happening, since the covenant was with them that are alive. Ezekiel called for individual responsibility (post-exilic) as a means of moral liability for this generation. Collective responsibility of the house of Israel is the main point of this argument.

II. The “Sour Grapes” in Jeremiah 31:29

The “sour grapes” appears as an important reference to the exile (Huey, Jr. 1993:2709); while they were in exile³⁴³, the people lapsed into self-pity and concluded that they were being punished for their fathers' sins. Thus the punishment of the previous generation is meted unjustly on them. Jeremiah and Ezekiel drew their attention to individual responsibility, though there was collective responsibility in practice. It means the discipline was for correctional purpose (Allen 2008:353-355), so that we have the scenario of an exilic setting working toward restoration. Their national survival was beginning, and they were being tested by their Creator. Suddenly Jeremiah announces their liberation as a new form of freedom, using the proverb, of the “sour grapes”³⁴⁴. Longman III (2008:209-210) uses an oracle of deliverance, saying “See today I appoint you over nations and kingdoms to up root and tear down, to destroy and overthrow, to build and to plant” (Jeremiah 1:10). The days have come when the house of Israel will forget her pain (post-exilic)³⁴⁵ that led to the exile. Though Ezekiel 18:4 does remind them, “The soul that sins shall die”.

The effect of the “sour grapes” on the faithful generation in Israel was not punishment, but to be regarded as discipline by YHWH, since it lasted only a short time. Though sinners were forgiven after a certain time, their wrong deeds leave a scar upon their progeny. Perhaps YHWH's hatred may be refuted by retributive justice, because corporate responsibility exists, and supports the consequences of sin upon the later generation. Collectively, they enjoy same

³⁴³The priestly authors did so to assure the post-exilic community that YHWH still loves them and desires them to turn back to himself.

³⁴⁴The guilt of 587BCE will end; a greater blessing now awaits God's faithful virgins. Their guilt will be taken away from their shoulders if they continue in obedience.

³⁴⁵Now it may no longer be corporate, but individual responsibility, “the soul that sins shall die” instead of “Sin of the fathers transferred upon the children”. The post-exilic punishment is now a future judgement; also, it is not to be an instant sentence anymore, everyone will wait for the day of reckoning and accountability before God. However, there are consequences for human transgression (Longman 2008:210).

blessings and curses; “we are one family”, what affects one affects all. Particular individuals may be responsible for sin, but collectively they have all transgressed, not just in the post-exilic experience.

4.7.3 Common Social and Cultural Themes

There are some social themes and topics common to Exodus and Deuteronomy, although they differ in their background and contexts. Some themes that differentiate the books include the Exodus, the Passover and the tabernacle which are means of celebrating YHWH’s mighty deeds from the foreign land, as reason to rest. These topics or themes³⁴⁶ focus on building a moral³⁴⁷ religious society as Israel; in other words, adopting the right attitude after the exile, as well as relating with others.

I. Honour, Guilt and the Right Culture

Guilt is an indication wrong while an upright culture is developed from behaviour that leads to honour. Honourable acts are geared towards moral development, especially for a post-exilic society. Israel will be honoured when they do what is right; just as their God is honoured for keeping to his promises (Robbins 1996:62). The priests emphasised the development of a culture of respect and for Israel, to be faithful, since their fathers had failed in the past. There are various perspectives to the concept of honour, such as value, respect, dignity, to be esteemed, glory and self-worth etc. Recently De Silva (2003:432) has related honour to what is mostly yielded to, from a metaphor with a sense of “being weighty” or “impressive” or “possessing importance of being who the person is”. This comes from the display of the right culture, and could be a manifestation of one’s. It is sensitive to guilt, and desires to remain upright and faithful in the eyes of others.

Honour is an ancient concept of dignity especially toward deities or kings, Hagedorn (2004:497) sees it as the self-worth of a person in his society and how they estimate his dignity. In this case, society defines the level of respect a person earns by honourable acts.

³⁴⁶ See Chapter Three for details, **Dyadic and Individual Personality:** There are personalities that help in building good or right attitude for the general public. Characteristics of such an attitude include the ability to obey God. **Challenge and Response:** The challenge is to keep the commandment of YHWH and וְכַרְתֶּם שַׁבָּת. The day of rest, and a day of commitment to their God. YHWH must be obeyed as a sign of honour to him. **Dyadic and Legal Contract:** The legal contract is that which binds people together as parties and inform the about the details of treaties. It is usually drafted by two or more groups to establish genuine involvement of all parties. The covenant is the contract and they must strive to keep their own side of the deal, they entered the treaty willingly; hence the Sabbath rest will remind them of what is binding on them.

³⁴⁷There are various ways in which morality was developed, like the Sabbath observance which has been discussed in Chapter Three and is mentioned briefly in point 4.9 in II, b. As Ideology of Sabbath motivation.

Honour and right culture go hand in hand, as opposed to guilt feelings. It is intertwined with the kinship system, where a family member or relation could buy back the lost value of his/her relative by social intervention. The focus on how is honour (or loss of it) affects a group like the family, clan, tribe in any kind of kinship society. Honour could be a yardstick for measuring achievement and dignity in human society. In the same way, Downing (2007:884-885) notes that it places a high priority on moral behaviour. Equally it places values respect for a slave in the ancient Mediterranean world, where men were more regarded than women and the respect accorded to a male differed from that given to a female. Honour was a virtue sought for going with respect as opposed to shame.

Funderburk (2009:209-210) refers to dual concept for honour, since its interpretation in antiquity – it is used together with shame for ordering a society. Honour could be a valuable reward for excellence in service or behaviour (Isaiah 29:13, Proverb 3:9). In the Jewish context, honour to YHWH came from honouring his will and the existing relationship, from ideologies like the Sabbath or the covenant. Exodus 20:12 indicates the need to honour parents though they have sinned, but honour them that you can see as honouring the will of your God, especially the elderly. In ancient times, defiance carried penalties (see Exodus 21:15, Leviticus 20:9). Kajom (2015:309) isolates respect and understanding as values at the heart of societal peaceful coexistence – the kind of respect that involves dialogue, where parties exercise their rights. Honour goes beyond wealth, while shame provokes a feeling of low esteem on the wrong doer, regardless of his objective status. Though honour and shame are social evaluations of behaviour, shame is the partial loss of dignity or respect in the presence of others.

II. Covenant of Holiness in Israel's Society

The covenant was a way of expressing sanctity and God's presence with his chosen ones. Israel was expected to live a holy life because YHWH their God is a holy God. Their relationship was based on holiness (Robbins 1996:74). Holiness means endeavouring to eschew evil/sin. It could be the absence of sin, or reaching a state of being upright before God. Rofé (2002:19-20) says that the limited recognition of the Lord by just one group of people in Israel, does not contradict his being the single God of the universe. As indicated by Babylonian and Persian Kings in Esther, Daniel and Kings. God loved their fathers and chose their progeny for himself. YHWH saved them from Egypt and tested them in the wilderness, but blessed them with a land of their own (Land of Canaan). Israel's election was not to emulate certain virtues, but instead to bridge certain notions, and to clarify the "One God"

idea. They were to recognize YHWH's lordship and monotheistic nature in their cultic life and relationship with God. Thus a "holy people", "God's reassured possession" and God's elect occupy a special honour in God's presence.

God's special covenant was a sacred contract with his chosen people. According to Gertz (2007:527), all parties ought to keep that covenant, as a high legal practice in the post-exilic community. It mandated power to all partners and equal rights were guaranteed (I Kings 5:26, 15:19, 20:34, Hosea 12:2, Ezekiel 17:13ff.). Then deities were invoked to serve as guarantors of the contract; this is why transgressors were punished for their crime against the deity. In Hosea 6:7, betrayal to YHWH is a breach of the covenant. Ndogo (2011:5-7) said the covenant between YHWH and Israel presents a unique development. In parallel cultures, the people's deities were part of the covenant as witnesses. It is expected of all parties to be faithful. The covenant of holiness is central to Exodus. Likewise, Michael (2011:1-2) comments that divine faithfulness to the covenant is a prominent theme in Jewish piety, especially in the post-biblical world. This was part of their daily life which also served as a community rule; they recited the covenant among the Qumran community. Similarly, it appears in rabbinic literature as well as in the book of Jubilee. In modern times, the preservation of the nation of Israel is also connected to the theme of covenant faithfulness.

Wright (2009:352) adds that the covenant code is a unified composition, for the society. It is stratified to reflect of God's plan. Marlowe (2011:1-2) noted that God's faithfulness is not conditioned on human obedience though the law said if you obey you will be blessed, thus the project's outcome will be realized if Israel obeys God's stipulation. In covenant theology, God is faithful even when Israel fails on their part, but there are consequences attached to make them holy. Hence, conditions exist in Israel-Yahweh covenant for the early post-exilic community. Michael (2011:4) said it is commonly assumed that prior to economic meltdown there is a moral meltdown among people. Equally, unfaithfulness to the law plays a dominant role in the separation of a couple. Just as unfaithfulness to the law would lead to truncated national development, the conspicuous ingredient is faithfulness.

Kinder (2009:775) affirms that the law was given in a setting of grace, just as God's grace was displayed at Sinai. Israel is now made the property of YHWH; he possesses them through a patriarchal covenant making them his holy people (Exodus 19:5-6). They both had what to give in the covenant, they need each other, but YHWH is their own God. Thus YHWH expects them to live according to his will and purpose. Though the law did not annul

the Abrahamic covenant, it helped the audience to understand the character of their God. Abe (2013:30) perceives the covenant as socio-political, legal and religious institution that was expressed in love, mercy, holiness, faithfulness and divine power. Ashdown (2015:14-16) considers the Creator-God who made Israel as Israel's deity; they are chosen as God's covenant partners (Isaiah 41:8-9). They share God's holiness embedded in them, the holy redeemer chose them depicting ownership and possession. Yet he will honour them in the holy relationship to fulfil his role. YHWH plays the role of the owners of Israel, who purchased his people (property). The deity blesses and curse placed them in a royal treaty circle with himself.

III. The Covenant and the Golden Calf

The covenant code was not manmade, but YHWH himself was involved in fashioning the code and the manner of keeping it. Patrick (2008:604) says the covenant of holiness had a constitutional force that made YHWH the focal point of life and centre of authority in Israel. For this reason, Moses shared this glory before Israel as he led them and mediated for them, and upon his silence from the mountain, they constructed the bull calf as deity. Yahweh had provided them an opportunity to return and be happy (Jeremiah 8:7-9). The sin of idolatry became their obstacle; there needed to be a holy allegiance to YHWH. The partners of the covenant of holiness were set back to an idol by the absence of Moses, which left them prone to their enemy.

Listening to Moses was compared to listening to God. Though the bottom line in the priestly Decalogue is to remain holy and divorce all forms of idols, they did the contrary. Unfortunately, the feeling of the absence of the divine was compounded by the long stay of Moses on the mountain which caused the construction of the Golden Calf. Jenzen (1997:228) alleges that Moses tarried long and Israel was feeling vulnerable. For that reason, Aaron and others fashioned a bull of calf in place of YHWH, saying "This is your god, O Israel" (Exodus 32:1). Clearly this revitalized the presence of Moses and brought back the feeling of divine presence that had been lost (Deuteronomy 4:16). Among the ancient cultures, the bull represents sexual fertility and prowess in battle (I Kings 22:11). This event is similar to Gideon's and Jeroboam's stories where similar fabrications there were rejected by YHWH (Aaron 2006:258). The idols served as metonyms underlying the problem of leadership and priestly oligarchy.

The Golden Calf served as the trigger for the divine jealousy and abhorrence of idols, from the Decalogue. Aaron (2006:223) identifies the appearance of the idol as significant opposition to the monotheism urged in the Decalogue. Moses had been toppled by Aaron his brother; Moses and the Levites set up a standard that favoured them to maintain power and relevance, but the incident of the Golden Calf presented a barrier which countered the Decalogue. Markl³⁴⁸(2013:17) states that the first section of the Decalogue provides the basic element of their relationship and climax of the story. The Golden Calf Exodus 32-33 provides a concrete example of a well-made cultic idol, which may cause Israel's guilty generation to suffer. Israel broke the law by this shameful act of sabotage in 32:1-6; they perverted God's pronouncement, creating a substitute deity for their satisfaction, not minding the past or their relationship.

When Moses departed for a long absence, and they experienced their God as unapproachable, the people of Israel were feeling vulnerable to any enemy. However, this does not condone the construction of another god/idol in place of YHWH. With this behaviour, their guilt increased their shame; when they created the golden calf³⁴⁹ idol and bowed down to a man-made deity they dethrone their God who lives in Zion. This suggests that YHWH is inferior to their newly constructed idol. "Your God is holy you too must be holy" was the exhortation of the narrator. Again, it is opposed to the priestly practices in the holiness context, especially the first and the second laws that prohibit the worship of idols and all forms of deities other than YHWH. Israel no longer respects Zion, nor do they have respect for their covenant. Thus made themselves punishable.

4.8.1 Intertexture with Ancient Near Eastern Treaties

Divine punishment or discipline as in the Decalogue was not foreign to the ancient world, especially with regards to their treaties. Perhaps this informs the theology of "cause and

³⁴⁸See, Carmichael, Calum M. 1992. *The Origin of Biblical Laws*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. David H. Aaron 2006. *Etched in Stone*. New York: T&T Clark., made reference to the Golden Calf. See Markl, D. 2013. "Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the Decalogue's Cultural Radiance" in Dominik Markl (ed.) *The Decalogue and Its Cultural Influence*. Hebrew Bible Monograph 58, Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.

³⁴⁹The mere mention and details of the Golden Calf should not be misconceived as a presupposition regarding the sin committed by the Israelites/fathers/mothers. The analyses of the Golden Calf argue from the presumption that YHWH forbids idolatry and one example of how it was done refers to how Aaron and the rest of Israel used what was in their possession to construct the image. The image is what one feels could serve as an example of acts that cause divine jealousy and wrath of YHWH. To a loving God like YHWH, Israel should be loyal for granting them freedom, liberation and salvation. Instead, they went on to develop an idol/god like others (Canaanites, Egyptians and Babylonians etc.). Notably, not all Decalogues recorded such study and there are several gods, idols and images that were abolished in the scriptures, as such the selection of the Golden Calf should not trigger a preconception or prejudice. Israel was forbidden to worship all forms of idols or images.

effect” as prevalent in the Pentateuch. According to Pritchard (1955:205-206) these blessings and the long list of curses preceded the ancient monumental inscriptions and Hittite treaties of the late Bronze to Iron Age I. Itamar Singer (2000:93-95) reports the formulation of a “Treaty between Suppiluliuma and Aziru (2.17A) Middle Bronze Age” in the 14th and 13th Century BCE, citing “If Aziru does not keep these words of the treaty and of the oath, let these oath gods destroy Azira [together with his head, his wives, his sons, his grandsons, his house], his town, his land, and all [his possession]! On the other hand, [...if Azira keeps these words of the treaty] and of the oath which are inscribed on this tablet], let these oath gods protect [Azira together with his head, his wives, his sons, his grandsons], his house, his town, his land, [and possessions]!” As curses and blessings are part of the conditions for a lasting relationship in ANET, this fits Deuteronomy 5:8-10. Exodus portrays this as fidelity³⁵⁰ required in the form of holiness, with agreement between two parties, one seeking for blessings and the other seeking for holy practices.

These treaties were part of the Akkadian versions, preserved in the Hittite vassal text with Syria in the late Bronze to Iron Age I. In the “Treaty between Mursili and Duppi-Tesub (2.17B)”, Singer (2000:96-98) discovered certain condition like blessings and curses presented in the text. The stipulations include that “... if Duppi-Tesub [does not keep these] words of the treaty and oath, let the oath gods destroy him together with his head, his wife, his son, his grandson, his house, his city, his land and together with his possession. On the other hand, if Duppi-Tesub observes these words of the treaty and of the oath, let the oath gods protect Duppi-Tesub with his head, his wife, his son, his grandson, his city, his land, your house, your subject and together with his possession!” They follow a pattern of cause and effect, also using blessings and curses as part of the treaty. This is similar to the second commandment that draws attention to sin of the fathers as the cause of curses, but blessing being available for those that are willing to be committed.

The later Decalogue in Exodus 20 adopted certain criteria. The ancient treaties (AT) like the Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon (VTE) in Iron Age II, employed a theophany theology similar to the Decalogue: “if you transgress against the treaty, may the gods... shatter you” which is

³⁵⁰“The Argument between Pillia and Idrimi (AT 3) (2.129)” in Iron Age I by Richard S. Hess (2000:331), includes the stipulation in (AT 2). The tablet was made when Pillia swore a divine oath and made an agreement to be upright. Pillia’s fugitive, who Idrimi’s fugitive seizes Pillia “...and he shall return Idrimi’s fugitive ... If he is a man, it is 500 shekels of copper from the owner as reward, if it’s a woman, it will double ...” In any city, a fugitive, the mayor and five notables swear an oath. Baratarna swears an oath with Idrimi from the day a fugitive is to be returned. Line 44-47, states that whosoever transgresses the words of this tablet, may Adad, Shapash, Ishara and all the gods destroy him.

part of their agreement and a common practice among them (McCarthy 1963:125). There is literature of the treaties that indicate the stipulations and oaths which involves a divine sanction and sanctity. The divine is always included for the sake of consistency, purity and diligence. Holiness was established for divine reasons, which is why the co-partners in the treaty are encouraged to maintain holiness. Hallow³⁵¹ provides various examples of such treaties that are cited here, which stands against evil or wrongdoing.

Hess (2000:329) reports from an Old Babylonian Middle Bronze Age treaty, in line 13b-20: "Whoever exchanges the words that Abbael³⁵² has made for Yarimlin and does evil to his descendants, may Addu dash him in pieces with the weapon in his spear, may Ishtar give him up to the hand of his conquerors, may Ishtar impress femaleness into maleness" (Leviticus 26:36-39, Deuteronomy 5:32, 17:20, 28:19, I Kings 9:11-13). The rebellion of brothers is a common theme (Genesis 4) in the Bible, especially among royals (Judges 9; II Samuel 13-14; I Kings 1-2). This "changes words" to recall an expression of betrayal to God, often expressed as warnings not to deviate. A broken treaty could give glory to an enemy as an indication of infidelity (Leviticus 26:36-39, Deuteronomy 5:9b-10), whereas the theophany indicates God's call to holiness.

³⁵¹Hallow (2000:306) suggests in "Esarhaddon (2.120)" that Sennacherib's destruction of Babylon was condemned by the city's later Chaldean rulers. Nabopollasar, the founder of the Chaldean dynasty declared war on the Assyrians and saw their destruction as just retribution. Nabodinus, the last king, considered the assassination of Sennacherib as evidence of divine retribution. Equally this assassination was compared to the failed siege of Jerusalem in 701BCE by the biblical authors (II Kings 19:36f, Isaiah 37:37f) as though it is *post hoc ergo proter hoc*. In 681-669BCE in Iron Age II the son and successor of Esarhaddon marshalled the physical and spiritual resources of the Assyrian empire to reverse the effects of his father's depredations. He rebuilt Babylon and in his inscriptions for/about the city, he went out of his way to express his solicitude for it, and for Marduk, its patron deity. In "Neo-Babylonian inscriptions", Beaulieu (2000:306) emphasizes that after the fall of the Assyrian empire at the end of the 7th Century BCE, power shifted to Babylon, whose rulers inherited most of the territories formerly ruled by the kings of Assyria. During 626-539BCE, the king of the Neo-Babylonian dynasty embellished their capital with numerous architectural wonders. Besides, they also rebuilt extensively the Babylonian Temple, which had been abandoned due to economic stagnation, civil disorder and repeated foreign interference. Notably, most of the Iron Age II Neo-Babylonian inscriptions contain little historical information. However, the Neo-Babylonian building inscription displays various innovations like the prayer to the deity to whom it was dedicated. This was a later Babylonian text, newer than other records.

³⁵²There were indications of other ancient treaties like the "Abbael's Gift of Alalakh {AT1, (2,127)}". It may not be as old as the Assyrian records. This is an older Babylonian text, Middle Bronze Age from Alalakh; level VII records the background behind the gift of the city of Alalakh as a reward for military efforts. Gift of land and towns were also reported in Joshua 13 and (AT 1). In Joshua 20-21, there are indications of asylum town of the Levites, both of which are presented as gifts of town from the tribes of groups. A similar gift of a town appears in AT 456, both in the Bible and the Alalakh. The gifts were either closely attached to or part of the treaty documents or divine stipulations (Joshua 8:30-35, 24:1-28). In addition, when his brothers rebelled against Abbael their Lord, Abbael, aided by Hebat, Addu and the spear [of Ishtar] went to Irride. He conquered Irride and captured his enemy. At that time Abbael gave Alalakh according to his gracious heart in exchange for Irride, which his father gave. Yarimlin, son of Hammu]rapi and servant of Abbael brought up Ishtar (stipulation line 11-13a), Abbael... Yarimlin ...he shall give city for city.

These forms of treaties³⁵³ were prevalent in ANE context even before the treaties of Israel and YHWH, in post-exilic times, after they came out of both Assyrian and Babylonian exiles. One observes that it sketches the background to the theology of “curse and effect” in both priestly and covenantal contexts of the Decalogue. It is interesting to note that these treaties had certain things in common: two or more parties, conditions attached to the treaty and consequences to unfaithful partners, and the fact that it was established and respected by all involved. Although the theme of holiness is not clearly portrayed here, it appears implicitly in the covenant in ancient treaties. Perhaps the idea emanated from this type of agreements, which is why YHWH calls on Israel to remain holy and obedient. This further set the Sabbath with its holiness requirement, to help them remember to obey. It attaches a condition “to bless them that obey him and keep his commandment for thousand generations, while on the other hand he will punish or discipline those that transgress the agreement for just three to four generations.”

4.8.2 Ancient Context and Leviticus 26:1-5 and 14-16

Theophany clarifies why the ancient context of the law was later related to the theology of holiness like in Leviticus 26. Levine (1989:182) indicates that Leviticus comprises neither legal nor ritual characteristics, but a collection of religious laws and descriptions of ritual celebrations and functions (Deuteronomy 28-30). It has three sections, blessings (vs.3-13), curses vs.14-45 in the form of punishments, and the conclusion. If they keep his laws and allow it to regulate their lives, he will give them peace, abundant produce and free them from any future captivity. There may be diverse punishments leading to defeat, disgrace and shame to the extent of parents eating their children for food with a long exile, should they sin. Gerstenberger (1996:402) indicates the motif of blessing and curse as an ongoing ideology that considers the positive and negative attitudes of God’s people. This is not just to the covenant context, but the priestly context indirectly told them the consequences of infidelity. Though vs.1-2 seems to be inserted, it links to the Decalogue’s main theme of monotheism and respect for YHWH their God. Disregarding YHWH their God results in chastisement, expulsion from the land and dispersion among other nations where they will serve idols (Deuteronomy 4:25-27). It is shame and disrespect to their God to have unholy partners in a relationship.

³⁵³ These were reflections back to the treaty periods in the late Bronze to Iron Age I, showing Assyrian treaties were older than the Neo Babylonian’s. Except for older Babylonian treaties which possibly took place at the late rule of Assyrian dynasty. The Babylonian treaties were in turn older than those of Israelites.

This priestly principle may aim at blessing, their deity desires purity. Milgrom (2004:317-318) clearly details the essence, reminding Israel of their holy deity and his continuous presence in their land. The principle in this case was, “I will do to you”, then a refrain with seven fold stating their sins (as a metaphorical idea of crescendo intensity) which echoes blessings in the curses. Bailey (2005:313-315) refers to a traditional conclusion in most covenantal ceremonies and treaties as ending with blessing and curses. Though extremes and excessive actions may repel contemporary readers, and seem perhaps unworthy of a biblical deity whose love and justice considers forgiveness. In ancient treaties, the standards set a ground for involvement and responsibility of the parties (kings and others), with terrible consequences (curse to the violator and blessing to the faithful). Certain promises relate to agricultural and economic development, from ‘seasons of great harvest’, suggesting the land of promise. Willis (2009:222-223) refer to various kinds of blessings in vs.4, 6, 9, 11 and others, leading to ancestral fulfilment of promise and the blessing of a land.

It shows that deities were part of the treaties and function as upholders or witnesses to the treaty; loyalty is now due to the deity, not just to the parties involved. There is always the other side of the deal: blessings are forfeited in the case of disloyalty to the deity. Leviticus 26:16-17 warns Israel of great disease and foreign invasion, according to the curses in ancient laws code (Deuteronomy 28:22, 30, 39, Amos 5:11, Haggai). There will be reversal of the prosperity to drought and death of economic animals. This is comparable to transgression in African theology: disloyalty incurs generational curse, shame and even death. The ancient audiences were familiar with blessings and curses and the reason for God’s jealousy.

4.9 Ideological Texture

This context emphasizes the power of the deity to bless and to curse, thus it is a discourse³⁵⁴ in service of the powers that exist in the text and behind the text. Various levels of ideology bear further discussion, as will follow.

I. Ideology of YHWH and Individual Location

The presence of God with his people is obvious in the story of the Exodus, right from Egypt to the land of promise. This is another reason why it is repeated all over in the Old Testament. Though Moses was sent ahead of God’s people, he needed YHWH’s help in his duties. Dozeman (1996:5) discusses the war against Egypt in exodus as a war between the forces of

³⁵⁴ This respects the key characters in and under the text; the role of YHWH, Moses, the priests and Israelite.

Egypt and YHWH as a supreme deity with supreme power. YHWH's character is central to the exilic story as one who keeps promises and answers his people. This character has more than one aspect, and could change from being the merciful God to one who disciplines his people when they go astray. His divine power is one of transformation in love, which is why he changes when necessary. Equally, De Silva (2003:432) says the honour given to God was ultimately related to the future of Israel. They were to honour his name and honour the day of rest in conjunction with how he rested after creation; this idea motivated the Sabbath rest in keeping with the holiness context. The plagues in Egypt were meant to bestow honour on YHWH in the eyes of the Egyptians and before the Israelites (Exodus 7:2, 10:2). As such honour means blessings to the land of Israel. One basic ideology of the covenant was to honour God and keep his commandments.

Furthermore, Michael (2011:5-6) describes Yahweh in the Old Testament as a faithful deity, who exercises virtues of being realistic and truthful, thereby proving himself as the God of Israel by his mighty acts through their history. YHWH took the nomenclature of faithful God and became God not just by faithful deeds but through his characters and attributes. Ashdown (2015:12-13) adds the qualities of being as holy, untainted and different from all creatures.

Clines (2013:335-336) referred to the Decalogue as word of YHWH, or God's spoken words to Moses. In this case, YHWH spoke from Sinai to the whole assembly of Israel, but in fear they implored Moses to go as their mediator. There Moses came back with the "Ten Words" from the top of the Mount Sinai which is now their principle with priestly emphasis. Abe (2013:40-41) said in the whole of the covenant, YHWH is portrayed as a holy God, possessing divine power; he is loving, holy, righteous, merciful and faithful. They believe the Creator will not destroy the works of his hands, but will discipline them for their unfaithfulness. Interestingly, for three and for four generations YHWH disciplines Israel, and in this case they neglected YHWH for Baal, Ashera, and other idols as gods and the Amon Re image in the form of God. The Redeemer (see Ashdown 2015:6) of his covenant people will physically deliver them from their enemies, Egypt, Babylon and Assyria, as another form of liberation within the postexilic experiences in Isaiah (41:14, 43:14, 47:4, 48:17, 49:7 and 54:5). This redemption suggests an amendment of a broken relationship between YHWH and his people.

II. Ideology of Groups in Modes of Discourse

Due to YHWH's presence with Israel, they were sure of his continuous manifestation, which made them confident of their God. This may be why the priestly influence in the writing of the Decalogue remains significant, especially when they covenant people remember what YHWH did in the past, and wish therefore to be faithful. In this scenario various groups exist in regards to the covenant relationships. Since the previous chapter on Deuteronomy 5 has defined these groups the discussion will not be repeated;

a. A Corporate Group

The calls from YHWH were made to the people, as they had entered the covenant together (Robbins 1996:75). They were a community of brothers who were living together and whatever affected one affected all; hence sins of the fathers were also the sins of the children. God had demonstrated their election right from creation through the exodus to the promise land. During the deliverance we see how YHWH's power is displayed to show a picture of their Saviour. Stolz (2007b:526) states that solidarity is eminent in the immediate unit of the society. The family is an elementary unit of all socialization, solidarity or governance in the society, as detailed in the last chapter on Deuteronomy 5. Continual or permanent relationships are geared towards peaceful coexistence mostly guided by rules or laws. These laws are coded in the covenant in this context, so that both parties will remember and be faithful, or face the consequences.

The notion of bond has been used to describe civil agreement according to Fergusson (2007:532-533), in which regard the corporate and political significance of the "Covenant People" is regarded in their corporate and federal understanding of YHWH. They formed the community whose foundation was the covenant – a provision that helped the prophets, judges, kings and their priests to establish the theology of the covenant and the administration of justice and human dignity. Their dignity was dependent upon their respect for YHWH. Thus they existed as a people, not as individuals; and entered an agreement with YHWH as a nation. In this context the result of their transgressions can be transferred to another generation. Similarly, blessing of their ancestors and their promises are binding upon the future generation. Patrick (2008:604) says the law was given to Israel, not individuals. This law communicates the unique lifestyle of the people. Between Genesis and Exodus there is a representation of the patriarchal family; according to Livneh (2014:26-27), they were living together in peace and harmony. This is an example of their unity which the priests desire to

see everywhere in the land. This ideology is conveyed through legal and story forms from Egypt to the land of promise. The Israelites' solidarity is clearly conveyed through their family lineage and community life in the jubilee. The roster of clans from Genesis 35 to Exodus illustrates Israel's cohesion during the times of peace and the jubilee list in 38:4-8 demonstrate times of war and struggles.

b. Ideology of the Sabbath Motivation

Priests in this text struggled to retain leadership and keep in touch with the rulers of the society, thereby making the Sabbath a day of rest, a public holiday to be observed in the society. Creation concepts and ideas of re-creation within the community have given a clear picture for Israel to understand their God after the exile, and to see reasons for keeping the Sabbath holy. "Keeping the Sabbath" goes beyond the seventh day, but serves as a pointer to obeying YHWH. Thus there were various forms, first the Passover to remind the people through feasts and festivals similar to the Sabbath; second, the Tabernacle built as a place to remind Israel of their God and his dwelling, signifying his closeness to Israel and the sacrifices due him; third, the supply of supernatural food³⁵⁵ such as manna in the wilderness. Meyers (2005:130) notes that at Mara Israel was tested to introduce them to the observance of the Sabbath just before the Sinai event. The seventh day is proclaimed as "a day of solemn rest", a holy day to the land. The people collected several *omer* of food daily for five days and double on the sixth day, so that there would be enough to eat on the seventh day.

Another peak appears when Israel is tested to gather what they will need on the day of rest when there will be no supply. According to Dozeman (2009:385-386) the Sabbath revelation is a sacred event and a crucial time in the Priestly history. In inaugurating the wilderness experience, it signals the initial recalling of the last structure of creation in Genesis 1. The seventh day of creation in Priestly history becomes significant at Exodus for pointing people back to YHWH. The seventh day also tells them about their origin as well as of the world where they live. The revelation of the manna³⁵⁶ also brings to light the creation for them to understand that since the beginning, God allowed rest only on the seventh day. God himself rested on the seventh day, so also kings, leaders, the patriarchs, the matriarchs and all others

³⁵⁵ The theology of food in the wilderness goes beyond manna, to include the unleavened bread and the omers as well as other feasts that reminded them of the Exodus and their God.

³⁵⁶ Apart from manna, other items of food were brought into play within the community. The use of bread in reference to the exodus now becomes vivid, and there was unleavened bread, the manna, and omers served by God. They were used for celebrating what God had done either on the Sabbath day or on a separate time of the celebration. The Tabernacle also existed with other cultic setups to point the society to their God.

must rest during the Sabbath. The new generation of God's people now appears glorious in their life but they must keep it by keeping total allegiance to YHWH their God.

c. The New Religious Community of Israel

The dialogue continues on another level, since YHWH expects a religiously obedient community³⁵⁷ of faithful people who will value their God and regard the dignity of their fellow humans. In this case, the theology of the Pentateuch now draws attention to the position of God and Israel in the contexts of salvation. It leaves the debate of authenticity with the interpreters of the Israel's redemption (Gowans 1994: x). In Exodus, they must link back to the memory of their past in Egypt, how they were delivered and the kind of commitment YHWH expects of them. Likewise, Gertz (2007:527) observes that the covenant community forms a significant part in the history of emancipation. From the patriarchal to the prophetic era and the time of priestly prominence, the covenant played a vital role in the community life of Israel and the future depended on their faithfulness. It aided the socio-religious unification of the tribes of Israel in confederations of the land. The relationship suffered threats of divorce by the prophets, but the marriage was sustained at last (Hosea 2:4-15, 3:1-4). Abe (2013:30) understood the treaty with the holy community as a divine relationship, established upon religious agreement between YHWH and ancient Israel, even binding on later generations. Israel is a corporate community not individuals, a religious moral driven society governed by a code of honour and shame. It is significant to note the relationship between God and his elected people as corporate one.

With regards to the faithful, Patrick (2008:604-605) expounded that they became a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (Exodus 19:6), distinguished among others nations as a result of their relationship to YHWH. In this accord, these laws addressed Israel as a single religious community under a common cultic leadership with theocracy from their God to guide them in their social, religious, economic and judicial life. Ashdown (2015:21-22) pictures YHWH as a great redeemer who will give vengeance for Israel over Babylon and Assyria with all other enemies on the condition of loyalty. He is the kinsman redeemer who legally determines the guilty and the faultless. He is responsible for providing shelter and protection to the faithful while the unfaithful face punishment.

³⁵⁷It involves the critical evaluation of the Scriptural people and their tradition in light of contemporary psychological needs for help. It attempts to take seriously the variety of voices in the Scripture, the voice of YHWH, Moses, Israelites, the priests and the society.

To this end the family existed as one community with one God, though they had twelve tribes, but came from one ancestor who worked with God. Despite difficult times, especially in the wilderness, which seems like the purification or preparation process for Israel, the significant matter was that the oath had been taken, establishing a treaty between Israel and YHWH. The intention is to develop a people and a lasting culture of respect and dignity. Israel's deity desires respect from his partners, but his presence will encourage them. On this ground they were elected in the context of the covenant, they now need a corporate/national faithfulness to sustain their existing relationship. Thus the unfaithful gave birth to a faithful generation who trust their God. This generation would enjoy "milk and honey" of the promise land. This portrays Israel's Saviour in their socio-religious experiences after the exile, especially in the early post-exilic stage.

4.10 Theological Texture

Covenant relationship is solidified to build on what exists between YHWH and his people. In the words of Donald E. Gowan 1994, theology is a "discourse that concerns God". With this regard, the theology of Exodus is the teaching that relates how God is conceived in the context of Exodus. Exodus contains a broad spectrum of texts that concerns YHWH, their Creator, and the re-creation³⁵⁸ of their socio-religious life during the exile. According to Enns (2000:24-26) creation theology is the argument in the text, presenting God as worthy of being worshipped. Human to worship YHWH is significant in the society which the priests created; they arranged all forms of ritual activities to draw attention of God. This question will help unveil the essential aspects of the narrative. On this basis, the theology of Exodus is concerned with creation of humankind and the deliverance of Israel from bondage in Egypt, as well as the making of the covenant on the mountain of God.

4.10.1 Theology of Exodus

At this level, Exodus serves as another picture of God's re-creative activities and love towards his people. Durham (1987:xix) says the theology of birth³⁵⁹ and recreation begins

³⁵⁸They were indications of another inauguration, from the beginning of creation in Genesis 1-2, to the flood in Genesis 6-9, up to the exodus in Exodus 12-14, then the Decalogue 20:1-17 as well as the arrival in Canaan, according to the book of Joshua. It seems to answer the questions, "What does the book says about the God of Israel?" and "How does it relate to humankind?"

³⁵⁹An idea rather than being; and the priesthood, cults and ancient organized religion now emanates with places of worship and liturgies in the Temple, synagogue and later church, to cement worship. YHWH created and in this order humankind ought to maintain the created order (Durham 1987: xix). His presence is being born to make a bigger picture of the Hebrew and Christian traditions.

now. Elohim gave Israel a special name, a special deliverer and a special covenant for the purpose of special worship. His mercy is now related by a special description. The theology of God's recreation now emerges with the demand for human response towards their God to obey. On this note the Decalogue became their newfound laws to guide their life and regulate them as a society in the direction of YHWH their God. Dozeman (1996:104) remarks that the priestly writers told their stories of deliverance in and through the Deuteronomistic account of their salvation. This is the reason the land plays an important role in their history according to the Priestly sources. Stuart (2006:34-35) indicates that God planned an agenda for Israel and reminded them that He is their God. "I am the Lord and I will bring you out from under the yoke of the Egyptians. I will set you free from being slaves" (6:6). "Then you will know that I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egyptian yoke, to the land I swore to your fathers.

Sarna (1991:xii-xiii) considers the central idea as being God's redemption of his people from Egypt, which appears for over 120 times in the Hebrew Bible, in various contexts. This is what informs and shapes the future development of their culture and religion. It influences their ethical and social consciousness, and makes the Torah the motivation for protecting and promoting their society in the interest of YHWH. Hence this presents a theology of liberation and migration from bondage and slavery into national freedom and personal independence through their God. The book focuses on their God and his loving acts in history. Exodus is now considered the voice of a person speaking. Gowan (1994: xvi-xviii) believes that the spokesperson for Israel, who spoke for and to Israel, formulated their confession of faith. Gowan adds that when Exodus is read with the question of the role of God in mind, another plot can be traced, running through or beneath the surface of the story of their bondage. Thus God's story started with the mystery of his absence or presence in Exodus 1-2. In that scenario Pharaoh attempted to destroy the Israelites through forced labour and other evil acts. However, Dozeman (1996:104) considers these acts as introducing God as their Saviour from Egypt, the land of bondage; He plans to give them a land of freedom which is their own. The one who delivered them from slavery, is the one who led them through the wilderness until they reached Canaan, the land of promise (Exodus 12:31-13:16).

In the end one feels that just as YHWH delivered Israel and blessed them, he can do it to any nation that believes in him. Their political liberation and their religious freedom are significant, but the main idea is that YHWH delivered Israel, and restored their freedom and dignity as a people in their own land. Being under a foreign leader was a form of captivity

and bondage, but now their stress had been removed and their saviour had come. With the agenda of messianic delivery, it points to the plan to bless his people. For this reason, the “Ten Plagues”, the “Ten Commandments” and various acts of God in the story indicates God’s presence. The Passover, and other festivals such as the Sabbath, were used for that reason to remember and celebrate their deliverance from the place of their slavery. Exodus could be studied within the confines of the faith prevalent in the book, possibly to establish the theology of God’s presence. Thus the people of faith are understood within the wisdom of their faith community. Thus the Sabbath motivation prepared the way for the Christian era in the future, since creation does not refer to Jews alone, this motivation included believer’s faithfulness as well as Africans.

4.10.2 Salvation History and the Wilderness Experience

The history³⁶⁰ of these people started with the family of Jacob in Egypt, in a foreign land. They had gone in search of livelihood and a better life. During their stay, their population increased greatly, becoming a potentially military force to be reckoned with; they were hardworking and economically viable. Spiritually, they were blessed by YHWH their God, to the extent that the Egyptians could see the difference made by the presence of God in their lives. Their deliverance came about when they ask YHWH their God for freedom, in which regard he commissioned Moses as their leader to act as a human saviour, while He remained their spiritual saviour. He worked out their deliverance on the premise that the post-exilic people would remain faithful to him. Gowan (1994:127) notes that God had identified himself to Moses, and declared his motives. YHWH heard their cry and their desire for deliverance, and now wanted to fulfil the promises he had made to their ancestors. YHWH intends to liberate a group of slaves out of Egypt, and guide them to Canaan (Exodus 3:6-8, 16-20, 6:6, 8).

Aaron (2006:14) refers to the priestly writers with a plan of situating their socio-political and religious powers within the wilderness life. They reformulated the cultic order so that their oligarchy might be seen as a link to the time of Moses. They used phrases like “And Yahweh said to Moses...” Bosman (2013:565-566) observes that Psalm 114:1-2 points to the election of Judah and Israel as the place of God’s presence, rather than describing the Israelites’

³⁶⁰ Both parties must keep their side of the deal for peaceful coexistence. Kajom (2015:220) observe that memory tends to disturb and hurt people, though it remains significant for restoration. The memory of the past can arise from an experience of pain or violence. In this case, God could punish as a result of their non-compliance to the great covenant of faithfulness. Similarly, Israel was to draw on their past experiences for positive reasons, and their memory was to help bring them closer to YHWH.

exodus as a form of liberation from slavery in Egypt. This is not just a matter of exodus “from” an oppressive “Egypt” but an exodus “towards” the manifestation of the divine presence on the way to and in the land of promise. The psalmist saw another element of the exodus from the questions; “Why does the sea flee, and the Jordan turn its back?” “Why do the mountains and hills skip like lambs?” This is followed by a wandering through the wilderness, described in vs.7-8. Israel’s wandering was a result of their fathers who had sinned at the beginning provoking the exile; now they needed to be faithful to escape punishment.

With regards to the wilderness experience, Dozeman (2010:6-7) says the priests present YHWH as present with Israel during their journey to the land of promise (Exodus 15:22-40:38). On their way YHWH intervened and provided them with water in the desert and saved them from starvation; he gave them manna when they needed food (Exodus 15-17). In Exodus 18 Jethro provided Moses with ideas of joining worship and governance. This was prior to the reception of the law and during the early post-exilic times; Chapter 19-20 describe the establishment of the covenant law on the plains of Moab, at the place where YHWH appeared dramatically to his people (in thunder, lightning, darkness, cloud and fire), signalling God’s divine power and presence. In this understanding, forgiveness, reconciliation and renewal form a complete picture of recreation, re-established by the priestly authors in the post-exilic context. More precisely, Bosman (2013:562) traces the history of Israel from the exodus out of the foreign land, through to the peak period where they had their own land, to when they built a Temple for their God. The opening words of exodus³⁶¹ (Exodus 13:3, 19:1, Deuteronomy 16:3).

Israel was liberated, YHWH spoke to them through their mediators Moses and Aaron and the “Decalogue” was provided to guide them in the land of promise. Dozeman (2009:121-123) explains the subordinate role of the exodus as reinforced by the priestly accounts of the Passover (12:37). The death of the first-born distinguishes the exodus out of Egypt. The *Massot* and the Passover were merged by the priests, moving the *Massot* back to the event of the death of the first-born of the Egyptians. The priests distinguished both feasts with the main exodus. Chapter 12:40-51 is included by the priests in the exodus. Israel left Egypt vs.42, and YHWH brought Israel out of Egypt vs.51, out of the exile. Israel must be involved in the celebration, except their uncircumcised slaves, who are to rest. Bosman (2013:559)

³⁶¹Instead use “When Israel went out of Egypt”. YHWH began by testing Pharaoh with nine plagues to let Israel go, Pharaoh refused, until the tenth plague which was the death of every first-born in the land.

rightly remarks that in recent times the exodus has and generally been interpreted wrongly as a metaphor for escape from slavery/bondage or rescue from some kind of political dominance and social oppression, especially by third world interpreters like African scholars. In Psalms 114:1, we see an exodus from Egypt and an escape from “a people of strange language”. Such references are important for indicating the collection of the “Egyptian Hallel”.

Perhaps they were saved for a purpose; hence they ought to fulfil that purpose to make their God happy. The reason he saved them might be to worship, but it was depicted in the form of the Sabbath rest. God is in Zion, from there he saved them and from there he will protect them. Most liberation is compared to the exodus, especially where people find a better life. While in the wilderness God appeared through thunder, lightning, darkness, cloud and fire; he showed his presence with Israel even in difficult times. Though nature and supernatural appearances. YHWH led his people through the adverse stress of their life. Their covenant partner is holy and faithful, but he desires that they show loyalty in their relationship.

4.10.3 Theology of Sabbath Motivation

There are factors that stimulate a day to be set apart for YHWH. The question is, Why the Sabbath, and what is the purpose of *תַּשְׁבּוּת* the Sabbath in this text? Does the motivation for the Sabbath differ for both Decalogue passages, since they differ in contexts? Answers to these questions will be sought in this study. The development of the Decalogue in **vs.8** continues with worship. Noth (1962:164-165) refers to the pre-history and early history of the Sabbath as complicated. The day must be remembered, it is not to go unnoticed or overlooked. The day should be observed or kept as a devoted day for rest. The reason is confused with a social reason in Deuteronomy 5:14-15, for a priestly account of creation (Genesis 1:1-2:3), a part of divine creation works divided into six days with the seventh as the rest day. Jensen (1997:141) noted the seventh day is God’s, working continuously without rest is a pattern after worldliness which could lead them back into exile. This rest is now for all humanity not just the Jews.

Childs (1977:413-416) considers the Sabbath a verbal form of “rest” or “cessation from work,” considering the creation pattern, different from the Babylonian *sapattu* and the Akkadian *sabattu*, both of which refer to the celebrations of the full moon festival. The commandment of the Sabbath is not to desecrate the day that has been set apart for YHWH their God. Though several meanings are giving, it signifies a day set apart. Durham

(1987:288-289) puts the fourth commandment as the longest of all in the Decalogue due to the inclusion of its purpose and its emphasis on worship. זָכַר *zakar* qal inf. Absolute an equivalent of the emphatic imperative “remember” is used to remind the people to recall the day. This is due to the significance of remembering to observe the day (Amos 8:4-8). In the holiness context the day was a moment of responsibility for the priests, indicating a religious practice that should be the priority for the people. To “keep” means שָׁמַר not זָכַר, the closest meaning could be “do not forget to observe the Sabbath as a day to the Lord your God”.

Houtman (2000:48) refers to זָכַר “remember” as the object placed before the verb, used with regard to “the day of rest”, as familiar to Israel (Genesis 2:2-3. Exodus 16:28-30). Furthermore, through the interruption of the regular days of work, the seventh day becomes sacred (20:9-10). The rest was a spiritual duty to in order to commemorate by all humanity including Africans. Meyers (2005:173) reminds of the parallel with the security of food in the wilderness for the six days of work for Israel to gather while the Sabbath carries prohibition of labour plays the role of “remembrance” in Israel’s identity, remembering the Creator. Dozeman (2009:488-490) considers the text from 20:8-11, as the fourth commandment and separates it into three parts: first the positive aspect of sanctifying the day of Sabbath, the second aspect is the guideline for fulfilling the commandment and the third aspect is the rationale for the holy day. Starting from this one can see an indication of the priestly formation in order to retain their leadership and significance in the society. The idea according to him is to “observe the day”, the responsibility now lies with humankind, to make it a duty to remember or recall from memory their deliverance from Egypt.

The Sabbath was motivated in Exodus 20:11 by emphasizing the imitation of God’s rest on the seventh day (Genesis 2:2-3). Hyatt (1980:212) agrees that the commandment called for Israel’s faithful generation to strive for holiness. This practice represents the attempt to keep the Sabbath day holy, the day of cessation from work, after the supply of manna, and rest for all, including animals and slaves. Houtman (2000:40-41) states that it requires from sunset to sunset, twenty-four hours only on the seventh day of the week be allocated for God by resting on that day. God’s people must rest; being faithful to the Sabbath means faithfulness to God. A unique position is given to the seventh day; it has been dedicated to Yahweh. The Akkadian *sappattu* is now connected to the Sabbath as a cessation day; the monthly observance was turned into weekly observance during the exilic era until the post-exilic period. It boils down to a post-exilic creation metaphor in the Decalogue.

The rest of the day was a commemoration of the time of creation, when God set apart the seventh day; so, as a token of recognition and worship through *imitatio dei* the day is to be kept holy. Stuart (2006:458-460) considers the Sabbath as a day free of regular work, for the labourer to focus on God. The strictness is not just for the reflection on the past and their Creator, but to what he accomplished before he rested on the seventh day. Animals, slaves and strangers must rest after six days of labour (although lactating animals milk out and people eat, the priests work in God's presence). Propp (2006:112) indicates "observe" or "remember" or "keep" as diverse ways of phrasing the phenomenon of the rest. This call was for all humanity to rest not just those that were delivered from Egypt, thus including Africans who believe.

This researcher argues that the restriction of the day emanates from God's creative plan from the beginning of time (Genesis 1:1-2:3). אֱלֹהִים rested, therefore Israel is also expected to rest, and to reconsider the beginning of time. The "rest" of הַשַּׁבָּת now relates to God's "rest" not as holiday, instead in memory of the creation in priestly terms. Hence the day means time of cessation from all form of work for the purpose of holiness and priests. Work ceased on the seventh day, weekly and annually. Israel seems to be familiar with the Sabbath practice prior to the Decalogue, which is why they were asked to remember to observe the day at all costs and through their history. This custom grew into a practice in the harvest festival calendar. In Deuteronomy, they were to remember how YHWH freed them while they were slaves in Egypt. Although the Sabbath is a later development, this priestly custom in Exodus points Israel to holiness, since their God, the Creator is holy. It further prepares the post exilic community to serve God in the confines of the Temple and this time the second temple. The temple is build and is not perceived as an abstract place of worship. The temple was led by the same priests who led the people concerning the Sabbath. The relevance of the Sabbath was motivated in different ways and this is detailed in the next chapter.

4.11 Preliminary Conclusion

Although the theophany functions as the bigger picture of the story in the priestly/holiness context of the Decalogue, this Decalogue indicates the early post-exilic era for regulatory purpose in Israel³⁶² which became central to the relationship between God and the holy

³⁶²Their harmony was spiritual and physical, they anticipated the rest - not just as Sabbath but from their pains and sufferings, as a new picture of re-creation. Thus they rested from suffering for the slaves, while others rested from economic activities. It has been detailed in the previous chapter, certain details are avoided here.

generation. Firstly, the Decalogue had varying demarcations³⁶³ although the majority of scholars isolate 20:1-17. “Sin of the fathers upon the children” couldn’t have been flawless if the text were just 20:4-6. Thus building a worthy background to the study was not possible without the text demarcation, translation and the text criticism. Nevertheless, Exodus 20:1-17 enabled a better understanding for “Sin of the fathers upon the children”. The context changes from covenant to priestly; God blessed his people for being holy in the priestly era and punished them for their sins – hence the background for mentioning sin of the fathers (though the text seems to be inserted by the priest!). Perhaps it is repeated for obvious reasons in the holiness context to add to the emphasis for God’s blessings. This chapter applied social rhetorical interpretation to analyse the text persuasively through various steps.

Secondly, the society analysed in a persuasive search for meaning in the text of this Decalogue. First the elements of (intra-text) were examined as explained in point 4.5 (using repetitive textures, progression, narrative aspect, the opening-middle-closing structure and sensory aesthetics). Secondly the text was considered in conversation with other similar texts outside the main text (inter-text³⁶⁴). With this procedure the text was approached by methods like inter-textual and socio-cultural analysis and interfaced with ideological/ theological inter-textures just as in Chapter Three. Interestingly, there are some discrepancies between Chapter Three Deuteronomy 5:6-21 and Chapter Four Exodus 20:1-17, such as the use of זָכַר “Observe” or “Remember” in the Sabbath commandment and others in 4.5.3. This reference should have been “remember to observe [the Sabbath]” (Exodus 20:8-11 and Deuteronomy 5:12-15). Perhaps they are repeated with added variances³⁶⁵ since there were neither kings nor kingdoms after the exile. The priests invented the holiness theology as opposed to the covenant that favoured kings/kingdoms. While holiness referred to personal sanctity in a later time, the covenant related to parties. The Priestly text uses creation/rest in Genesis 1-2 as the Sabbath motivation. Their liberation became another beginning, portraying creation and re-creation as beginning in the plagues, the exodus, the wilderness, crossing of the Red Sea, the

³⁶³Others argue that the demarcation is from 19:1-24:18, some says 20:1-24:18, others 20:1-23 and 20:1-21 which doesn’t connect. The context is 19:1-24:18, the priestly manoeuvres and secretarial insertions show 20:1-17 indicating its difference.

³⁶⁴ Other include social and cultural contexts for understanding their experiences. Then the ideological (in service of power/people) and theological aspect (interpreted issues related to God); see Robbins K. Vernon.

³⁶⁵ It is not important to repeat what has been done in Chapter 3; instead the differences are emphasized. The exodus, on the other hand, clarifies the intention to the community before, during and after the exile.

Decalogue, the Passover, the Tabernacle etc., with a culminating divine³⁶⁶ appearances of God in the wilderness, and the Promised Land.

Next an analysis of ideological and theological intertextures, which function side by side in opposition to the other. Ideologically, the holy God desires Israel to live a holy life. To this Israel was called upon to remember the past, in order to observe the Sabbath and keep the day holy (Exodus 20:8-11). The purpose of the Sabbath was first to rest³⁶⁷ in reflection of how God had rested. The second purpose is to dedicate the day to YHWH their God³⁶⁸. Third, it points to cessation of work. Nevertheless, in Deuteronomy 5, the Sabbath helped to remind them of the covenant, re-establishing and solidifying their relationship just as the ancient treaties did for kings. This ideology introduces a theology of “cause and effect” in their relationship: obedience lead to blessing, while disobedience lead to curse and punishment on their land. In service of the powers, the idea of obedience was strengthened by the treaties of kings. From these details on Deuteronomy 5, one may well conclude that the Decalogue in Deuteronomy was motivated by older issues, as treaty, covenant and obedience. This is quite older than Exodus 20 where creation/rest serves as motivation to jog the memory Israel. One feels the priestly contexts of Exodus 20 and 34 were inspired by the exile in Deuteronomy 5 and supported the reception of the Decalogue.

This research has noted the efforts of God’s follower to delight their God, as a group striving for the wellbeing of the community of brothers. This community intended to maintain the unanimity of the people under a monotheistic God. They sought after holiness at all cost; at the temple, on the streets, by their dressing, from their food and other means. Hence they lamented the sin of their fathers, upon discovering the unfaithfulness of their ancestors and the cause of the exile. Certain African societies uphold the culture of respect/dignity against all odds, to teach younger ones the need for respect in corporate life. Perhaps this is the reason for holiness after the exile, prior to the second temple era, which came with the disappearance of the kingdoms/kings. The priests took over the temple cleansing, the washing of legs, holy sacrifices and many more duties which were later development with Exodus. It clarifies the context to interpret the Decalogue as insertion after the exile. Thus the holiness

³⁶⁶ Wilderness, Mount Sinai/Horeb, pillar of cloud/fire, shouts, trumpets, trembling, and other divine appearances.

³⁶⁷YHWH allowed them six days for their personal activities. Six days is enough time for any kind of socio-economic activities, the period of looking for bread or time for gathering and preparation for the Sabbath.

³⁶⁸ The Priestly idea of insertions uses various techniques that draw the people’s attention to certain theologies, like the covenant, holiness, faithfulness, the Sabbath, the exodus and many more.

code served for blessing or curse to the Israelites and pointed to post-exilic experiences, to maintain purity. These challenges posed by the post-exilic community called for absolute commitment to YHWH. Failure to be holy brought curses and punishments like the days when sin led to the exile.

It is noteworthy that Exodus is not a treaty text like Deuteronomy, which is comparable to ancient treaties. Ancient kings demanded obedience and anyone who obeyed, retained the favour of the monarchs, while those that rebelled lost favour. Personally this researcher considers it noble to respect and obey one's king! Your king is a picture of your community, and as such your community must show absolute dignity to obey him. From this assumption, the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian kings described in Daniel 1-8 (Nebuchadnezzar, Darius, Cyrus) challenged the Hebrew youth to obey their decrees, or face judgement and hardship. Likewise, the priest who liaised with the kingdoms sent this same message in order to stay in touch with power. Although the context diverged from covenant faithfulness³⁶⁹ to holiness, which provides the answer to 1.3 of the fist hypothesis, this provides substantiating grounds for understanding the holiness context. שמעו (hear) *shema*³⁷⁰ is another post-exilic emphasis that does not just reflect the essence of loyalty and obedience, but portrays the need to live a holy life in the community of brothers. The requirement was for both individuals and the whole group to choose holiness. Individuals were to strive on their street corners, in their bedrooms and public places to uphold holiness as a sign of allegiance to YHWH. Both deuteronomistic and priestly contexts emphasize allegiance to their God as well as making the effort to maintain the relationship.

The practice of corporate responsibility and ancient treaties has brought about the ideology of blessings and curses. Perhaps this is where Israel got the notion of blessing and curse; that parents do have an impact upon their children. On this note, one feels the exiles related their

³⁶⁹Consequently, their unfaithful parents were not allowed to enter the promise land, but the covenant included the innocent. Thus, the law stands against serving idols, using the Lord's name in vain, dishonouring the Sabbath, murder, adultery, stealing, bearing false witnesses and covetousness. Disobedience resulted in discipline visited on three to four generations.

³⁷⁰ This recitation recurred in every part of the Old Testament to paint a picture of the exodus as the Creator's work. The priests used recitation as markers to their advantage. Soon after the exiles even issues were intended; (1) To indicate YHWH's mighty deeds from creation. (2) As indicators that will help readers value the Torah. (3) To perceive the extent of YHWH's jealousy. (4) To inculcate in his people a culture of respect and loyalty in the relationships between them. (5) To keep them focused and faithful to the covenant stipulations. (6) It served as a reminder for keeping the Sabbath rest. These were ways of teaching Israel to observe God's commandments, and teach their children to grow in a relationship with him. These indicators were traced from all parts of the Hebrew Bible to portray the context and significance of the exodus. The Decalogue spells out various things they must keep commit or omit, to be either blessed or cursed; sin of the fathers is the punishments uttered for the unfaithful.

past to their sufferings in exile. Certain African beliefs would have connected it to ancestral curse, a notion that holds in most African belief systems. Consequently, “intergenerational transfer of curse” is indicated in African ideology by punishment meted on offspring of the disobedient, as the consequence of ancestral sin. The reality is, with both individual and corporate responsibility existing side by side in the community, neither abrogates the other. This was not a dispensational or linear practice as stated in 3.9 of Chapter Three. Certain people were punished as individuals, while others suffered corporate discipline for the sin of a person. Thus holiness was significant for the future of the land, their independence and their blessings. The future depended on how they conducted themselves in the presence of YHWH. Their collective sin led to a collective discipline, just as individual sin could lead to corporate discipline. In most Africa contexts, culture is the lens of the society; it serves as the standard for measuring dignity in the form of honour and shame. Instead of exile, Africans will excommunicate the offender and proffer other forms of discipline. Instead of judgement, Africans will punish in form of curse on the culprit. Thus intergenerational curse may lie upon the person’s generation from (colonialism and coloniality), as will be seen in the next chapter. The diagram below refers to the way sin developed from Adam and later became corporate sin, which is understood in communal context in Africa as will be seen in the final chapter.

Chapter Five

Summary, Conclusion and Suggestions for Possible Future Research

5.1 Summary of the Research

The groundwork of this research³⁷¹ was organized in the first chapter, with various preliminary steps and procedures for achieving the end result. Social rhetorical criticism was applied as the methodology to appraise the context of “sin of the fathers” to the optimization of the research goals. The **problem of the research** was, *to appraise the “Sin of the Fathers upon the Children to the Third and Fourth generation” according to Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 5:9, in turn to clarify an African or specifically a Nigerian/Southern Kaduna theological understanding of original sin.* This assesses the concepts in terms of the etiological nature of sin and not the origin of sin. Although the research focused on the context of the Decalogue, it describes how humanity ought to strive towards corporate dignity, especially in Africa. Furthermore, the primary research question is, “How does the allusions to the “sin of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation” in Deuteronomy 5:9 (Deuteronomistic/covenant) and Exodus 20:5 (priestly/holiness) contexts, interpret the African/Nigerian/Southern Kaduna theological understanding of original sin as sin of the father? This forms the development that is clarified in chapters three and four. It is explained as a historical trend and not canonical sequence. Existing research indicated Deuteronomy 5 as Deuteronomistic theology (pre-exilic to exilic era) while Exodus 20 is located in the late exilic to post-exilic era.

There were four hypotheses in 1.3 which indicates the expectations that guided the research. First, the Decalogue served as an existing literary context for paralleling Deuteronomy 5:9 and Exodus 20:5 with respect to how the sin of the fathers upon the children assisted in

³⁷¹The initial design of this work included five chapters, the fifth coming as the conclusion of the research. The research stems from the concept of “original sin” which is basically the imputation of “sin of the fathers upon the children” according to the Decalogue. The primary idea is to conduct an interpretation of “sin of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generations” according to the Decalogue. This frame of reference for an African perception of how the sin of a person or a group could have consequences for other members of their family, tribe, or the society. In this regard, the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5:6-21 and Exodus 20:1-17 served as the core text for researching, and applying social-rhetorical criticism (methodology) to attain the hypotheses of the study. This is followed by the summary and concluding remarks which includes some recommendations for further study.

understanding original sin/sin of the fathers in African context; as addressed in Chapter Two. Second, the historic settings of both Decalogue were significant for interpreting “sins of the fathers upon the children”. This was the main discussion in both Chapters Three and Four; the details for sin of the fathers were analysed. The third shows a theological analysis of the Deuteronomic traditions in Deuteronomy 5 that explained the covenant context, while the priestly tradition addressed the later holiness context in Exodus 20. The last presupposes that an African theological perception of “original sin” can offer a different viewpoint from the western and conventional theological interpretations of original sin; this was elucidated in Chapters Two and Five. This research has explained and will redefine the self-worth of Africans by using socio rhetorical analysis as the methodology of V.K. Robbins for the research. This indicates that sin of the fathers and original sin in the Pentateuch forms a hermeneutical circle for appreciating the concept of sin in African theology.

The second chapter presented a research survey on “Sin and Original Sin” to indicate existing research on the topic and the relation to sin of the fathers. It began by a semantic study of “sin”, and four words were distinguished: **חַטָּא** *sin*, **אִיְוָרָא** *iniquity*, **רַע** *evil* and **עָפָשׁ** *transgress* (see addendum Aⁱ and ii), although “iniquity” and “transgression” appear to be prevalent in the Pentateuch in further survey on the Old Testament’s use of sin. The Pentateuch-*torah*, early prophets – *nabim* and wisdom literatures-*ketubim* showed the interconnections of sin (see addendum Aⁱⁱ). Besides, sin is considered as doing what is forbidden or possessing an advance guilt or shame in Africa. Wrong-doing causes a feeling of disrespect for the perpetrator and his/her relations. Sin is not considered as heavy as the feeling of shame and guilt upon a person and their family, which supports the third hypothesis of 1.3. This follows from an African awareness of the nature of sin in a society from application of the theory of corporate and individual responsibility in the Old Testament. This significant theory of community life and corporate responsibility is comparable in African and Israelites contexts.

The third and fourth chapters focused on the Decalogue. In Deuteronomy 5 the debate was conducted by means of a multidimensional interpretation as social rhetorical analysis. The Decalogue was understood within the larger context of the speeches of Moses, though it later changed to the theophany due to the emphasis on holiness. Four methods were applied, viz. intra-textuality, inter-textuality, socio-cultural intertextuality as well as ideological and theological inter-text. This analysed the “sin of the fathers upon the children” as being related to “The parents eat sour grapes and the children’s teeth were on edge” in Ezekiel 18:2 and

Jeremiah 31:29. Perhaps scholars understood the prophets to be speaking for individual responsibility in these verses, but the corporate nature of their society did not allow for the abrogation of corporate responsibility nor its abolishment, thus both responsibilities co-existed. Sin of the fathers and the covenant clarify the ideology of corporate responsibility, and reminded Israel to obey their God and be blessed.

The fourth chapter was not far removed from the third, since it adopted the same methodology, although this time the study was centred on the theophany in the holiness context (Exodus 20), changing from the speeches of Moses to theophany. This priestly ideology was applied in all forms of activities to keep the people close to their God, and perhaps to keep the priests in power and maintain their close connections to the palace. While the priests in late exilic and early post-exilic context emphasized the theology of holiness, they referred to the creation (rest) of humankind in Genesis 1-2, as the motivation for the Sabbath. Both the priestly narrators and Moses called on Israel after the exile to “rest” and to observe the Sabbath, in view of the memory of their creation and the exodus, and the consecration of the Sabbath was extended to all humankind. God created humanity, not only Israel, hence this motivation invites all, including Africans, to rest on the Sabbath. In like manner, African societies may derive lessons of corporate human dignity from both contexts. “Corporate responsibility” in African societies explains a lot about *Ubuntu*, *Zumunici* (unity), respect and human sustainability. This explains the Africa perception of original sin as sin of our ancestors across generation of clans. Hence, point 5.4 below, clarifies certain forms of inter/trans-generational curse as transferrable.

5.2 Existing Research and Consequences of Sin of the Fathers

The findings on the investigation into sin of the fathers from the beginning³⁷², conceptualise sin as inherited from human ancestors, and depict the theology of original sin as inter-

³⁷²Perhaps sin emanated from the pre-Torah revelation, where rebellion is said to have taken place within the earliest cosmic order: people (?) sinned and were thrown out (Gonzales 2012:374). Halloran (2012:185) describes original sin as present even prior to any human personal decision or choice in behaviour. Patrick (2008:603) notes that the law began in Genesis within the socio-cultural and religious realms. Biblical tradition specifies that they were to “be fruitful”, to “multiply”, and “fill the earth” and “subdue it” (Genesis 1:28). These responsibilities were given to humankind, to earn blessings for themselves. Blessings meant empowering God’s creatures to succeed and attain a good life, but was conditional to choice and will to keep covenant with God. Besides Genesis 2:4, 25-26, indicates that creation culminated with marriage like the covenantal tie (Malachi 2:14-16). De Beer (2014:65-66) notes God’s work of creation as having two accounts, first the divine image and likeness (Genesis 1:26-27), and second God fashioned humans from the dust of the אָרֶץ (ground), breathed life into them and made them living beings (2:7). For this reason, human beings received a divine value that enables them to partake in the divine nature. Like the covenant ideology; “Man” was given a “woman” as partner (2:21-23), to be fruitful, to multiply and to fill the earth (1:28). On this basis, the theme of “male and female”. On this note Andrews (2011:231) says God called forth the created order and it came to be. Within the

generational sin. This leads to the conclusion that though original sin is not an African ideology, African will be more familiar with inter-generational curse. This is what Meyers (2005:171) refer to as a strong punitive justice is laid out for disobedience across generations. She refers to it as “cross-generational accountability”, otherwise transgenerational punishment in 2008 by Levinson and transgenerational transfer of sin according to Miller (2009:60). It shows that consequences are transferable as curses and sustained in the society. “Sin of the Fathers” emerges as a traceable theme in the Old Testament for the reason that the first couple sinned (Genesis 1-3:6). They sin individually and transferred the trend corporately onto all human progeny. To this end, certain references are made on how sin spreads its consequences within the Old Testament. Besides the sin of Adam was rudimentary to all human transgressions³⁷³; the covenant context provides a ground for Africans to understand the reason for sin of the fathers and inter-generational sin. The theme of human sinfulness and retribution is evident from the beginning through the patriarchal narratives to the prophets and other parts of the Scriptures. The main problem in 1.0 is to indicate in the Decalogue³⁷⁴ how sin of the fathers is appraised in relationship to an African understanding of original sin.

created bounds God saw that it was good, not sinful. The world was created with humans as the crown of God’s work, given the benefit of living and have their freedom within their world, with the will to decide what affects the others. It is here that humanity fell/sinned and their decision led to the fallen nature that affects all humankind. Halloran (2012:185) equates this root of “original sin” to the historical rejection of God’s friendship through human misbehaviour. Hence sin can neither be part of the original creation nor did it arise out of the creation. Instead it came to exist in the situation as a result of the choice, resolution or human judgement of what is more valuable to them. The explanation says those that were caught in this act likely had little knowledge of God. Their religious sense was just evolving, hence they fell; though one disagree with this idea for the reason that God was present with them in the fellowship and their ability to understand was made easy through direct fellowship with God.

³⁷³It could be regarded as human choice to disobey, which is why De Beer (2014:73) clarifies that the human soul consists of three motions: the intellect, reason and inner perfection, each involved in a specific kind of knowledge. One feels God is involved in this act to save humanity in future and help them stay away from sin. Moreover, Fitzpatrick (2009:703) considers the transformation that resulted when humankind ate from the garden. This caused the prevention from attaining their coming together with God, because their misdeed now defined their new state of corruption and wantonness. Genesis 3 reveals a tragic human condition. Andrews (2011:231-232) clarifies this as the divine command call that created a world that God saw as good. Within the creation space, human creatures were considered the crown of all creation. Their decisions affected every other person made by God, like sin of the fathers upon the children. It may be overly judicial, but the ancient treaties have shown the picture of YHWH’s love as conditional to obedience and loyalty. This is similar to the concept of holiness in the priestly context of the Decalogue.

³⁷⁴ Sin of the fathers appeared in both contexts of the Decalogue, hence the appraisal of the Decalogue was detailed in chapter three and chapter four of the research. Appraisal considers two things and analyses them. One has positioned Deuteronomy 5 in the older context of covenant and Exodus 20 in the later context, for the reason that the covenant tradition is older than the holiness context. Duke (2015:347)-348 made reference to four texts where God visits the guilt of parents upon children to include Exodus 34:6-7 and Number 14:18-19 apart from the two texts under consideration. One considers the two Decalogue for the appraisal of this research. In trying to position the contexts of the Decalogue, holiness theology supports the lateness of Exodus’ record. Mtshiselwa (2016:135, 140) refers to earlier and later source, that the earlier sources were re-read and reused,

With reference to this, Miller (2009:55-57) discusses image making and image worship, signifying to the Golden Calf. Perhaps, these practices led to the option of sin of the fathers being visited upon the children as part of the covenant violation. Witte, Jr. (2009:5) argues that sin of the fathers appears in four texts all within the Pentateuch and two in the Decalogue, but the plain sense of the text is related to idolatry. Those that hate and continue to perpetuate evil shall suffer intergenerational transmission of guilt and punishment. In his view, sin of the fathers serves as call to repentance. It is not just sin of the father that serves as the cause of the transfer of guilt from one to another, but unfaithfulness to the covenant and the inability to remain holy. Though the first family sinned in the garden (Genesis 3:5-7) and transferred the guilt upon their descendants. Sin has progressed from individual transgression to corporate responsibility, which informs the perception of original sin. Miller (2009:57, 59) pointed to wrong behaviour as having theological impact on human life and consequential upon the faith of the believing community. Israel's idolatry was not regarded as an individual sin but the community's, they agree to be faithful. We are expected to be holy as our God is holy else there will be curse. In this era, body purity and ritual cleansing as in Leviticus 25-26 were emphasized. This practices of holiness were closer indications of the second temple era and later applied in the Church, this is explained in the preliminary conclusions in chapters three and four (3.9 and 4.11). Sin of the fathers³⁷⁵ in the holiness context must have been re-emphasized by the priests to prepare God's people for the revival of Temple worship. Classifying existing views is a way of indicating the development of the argument that will give clarity to ones' own contribution in this research.

A survey of existing research indicates that the call for holiness has been a norm for the clergy; the Priestly theology is immersed in the Torah as a "legal/Holiness Code": "You shall be holy, for I, the Lord your God am holy" (Leviticus 19:2)³⁷⁶. People are blessed for being

and that Leviticus 25:8-55 which are ascribed to Deuteronomistic and priestly writers were reused in the holiness context. He asks, if the theme of deliverance from Egypt were indicated as captivity from Babylon, why was it repeated in the holiness context long after the liberation from exile? Insinuating its lateness as compared to Deuteronomic traditions.

³⁷⁵ The few commentaries that made reference to sin of the fathers are appreciated, knowing that it is not the second command but an extension. This emphasis sends a message that affects the whole context and reiterated the lament of the exiles. The problem lies in the fact that most scholars neglected the issue in their work. This topic is of great relevance to African perceptions and other third world communities.

³⁷⁶ Animal cleansing, purification of women after birth, uncleanness of leprosy and dead bodies and others, in Leviticus 16, are set out in the ritual "Day of Atonement" made by the priests, for the people, as well as their sanctuaries and altars of sacrifice. Leviticus 25 sets the legislation of the Sabbath and the jubilee year. The theme of holiness runs through Leviticus-Numbers and other books, Meyer (2015:435) observes that in Leviticus 11-15, the code seems to cover cultic cleanliness, and in 17-26, various laws for the benefit of being holy. This theology is visible in Numbers 16:1-40 as well. On another Levitical occasion, Aaron and certain rebels point to Moses as claiming personal holiness over them. The Psalmist was not left out from the holiness

holy/obedient (26:3-13), just as they are cursed for infidelity (26:14-45). This does not always seem so, but sin comes with consequences. Gonzales (2012:373) connects sin as unified with descendants and their land since primeval history. For this reason, the Deuteronomistic called for obedience during the exile until early post-exile in line with the ancient treaties of kings, was a requirement for better relationship. The priest called for holiness after the exile, but prior to the revival of the second temple the emphasis increased. This portrays the Decalogue as a continuation of the speeches of Moses, and the call for covenant loyalty. He gave what he received from YHWH to solidify human relationships with their deity. This supports the first hypothesis in 1.3, by indicating a context for understanding the sin of the fathers upon the children as a form of retributive justice.

5.2.1 Theology of Retributive Justice in the Old Testament

In the Old Testament there are occasions and indications of retributive theology, the few examples indicated below interrelate with sin of the fathers and consequences from pre-exilic to the post-exilic era. Most of the examples were with important figures in the Old Testament like Achan, Eli and David whose sins affected their children. This is possibly the reason that during the second Temple period the priests used the holiness theology to draw the people to God. Retributive justice is first an area to which Levinson (2008:59) dedicates attention, when he discusses the lament of the exiles for an injustice on the part of the past generations and the divine Judge. They assume they are suffering unjustly, and claimed innocence of their generation. They envision a repetitive catastrophe upon them, and the possibility of dethroning their God by their idols. This thought their doubts bring to mind a loving God, and an unjust Judge who is weighing them down with burdens. Van Leeuwen (2011:134-135) designates sin³⁷⁷ metaphorically to be "guilt" which weighs a person down. Guilt could be considered as the magnitude of feeling of sin/shame. Moreover, it could be a personal self-recrimination or public castigation. The notion of "sin as guilt or debt" of the past can indeed "weigh a person down" and spread the shame/guilt.

emphasis: in Psalm 8 God was mindful of his creatures, even though they are the little beings he had created; in 15 and 22 the holy God seem to forsake his people for holiness. Like (Leviticus 19:1-4) their God is holy, they too must be holy to please him. The prophet Ezekiel called for holiness while Israel was still in exile; holiness became the way of pleasing YHWH.

³⁷⁷Perhaps the metaphor of sin as a weight to be carried, with sin as a debt to be paid, drives the point across. By sinning, Adam and Eve incurred a debt before God, viz. death. By sinning, sinners were now considered to have incurred a debt in some way. Sin then has a "cost," and we, as it were, "pay for our mistakes." Although humankind fell, the decisions right at the outset, in the end lead to tragic results. Conversely, both notions are rooted in Scripture and developed in both Judaism and the early church. Among key biblical texts in his historical and theological argument are Leviticus 25-26, Isaiah 40:1-2, and a number of texts from Proverbs, all of which together raise issues that became eschatological, especially in Jeremiah and Daniel.

Ro (2011:410) says the text focuses on a very refined theological problem which emerged in the post-exilic period. However, in the exilic period, it is more of a lamentation like Sodom and Gomorrah or the days of Noah and the flood. God is believed to be responsible for certain outcomes due to human disobedience. Zimran (2014:313-314) says disloyal kings were condemned to national defeat (II Chronicle 14:9-14; 16:7-9; 20:1-30; 24). Equally, obedience to the covenant was rewarded with economic prosperity (II Chronicle 27:6). This is exemplified by the standard of "measure for measure" or "blessings and curses" from the idea of "cause and effect" that relate human actions and their consequences³⁷⁸ as in the covenant theology. The Chronicler gave examples of incidents and punishments meted out as either by "blessing and curse" or by "measure for measure" (II Chronicles 25). On account of "civil war" between Judah and Israel, it lacks any reference or allusion either to cause-and-effect or the direct recompense principle. Although the Chronicler does not always adduce the doctrine of retribution in the same way, direct recompense forms a recurrent motif in chapter 21, which balances sins and punishment and explain the clauses that link action and consequence.

In the covenant context, God dealt with fathers in a pattern for their infidelity. First "Sin of the Fathers" is illustrated in the family of King David, thus Absalom's noted consequences from David's sin. Assenting with Avioz (2013:346-348) the punishment imposed on Absalom was due to Nathan's oracle in II Samuel 12. Absalom is considered an instrument in God's hands to punish David following the rule of punishing children for the sin of their fathers (Exodus 34:7, Numbers 14:18, Lamentation 5:7). Just as in ancient treaty context of

³⁷⁸The war with the Edomites is one of the most prominent accounts in 2 Kings 8:20-22. In this case, "Edom has been rebellious against Judah because Jehoram led the inhabitants of Jerusalem astray and made Judah wayward". The doctrine of retribution reflected in this verse suggests that the sin adduced in vs.11 is intimately associated with the sentence described in vs.13-14 and 16-17. Verse 11 depicts Jehoram not only as being personally idolatrous but also of leading the people away from the worship of God. The indictment of this sin in vs.13 indicates that the punishment delineated in the continuation is directly due to his corruption. Ro (2011:412) confirms that the concepts of sin and punishment as inter-generationally transmittable according to both Decalogues (Deuteronomy 5:9b-10 and Exodus 20:5b-6). It contradicts "individualistic" conclusions on texts like Gen 18:25-26, Jeremiah 31:29f and Ezekiel 14:12-20. It is worth mentioning that the cultic laws concerning offerings in Numbers 15 belong to the atonement for unintentional transgression of a community or individual. In cultic sacrificial systems, an individual in a family or community is always regarded as one living entity, not as a self-sustainable independent personality. Meyer (2015:435) clarifies Leviticus 17-26 as an addition to the priestly text made by a later generation of priests. He regards chapter 1-16s as part of P, indicating that the authors of P were acquainted with chapter 17-26 and regarded it as post-exilic and saw a land theology in the text. Similarly, this ideology began from creation, where an unholy king in Egypt refused the request of a holy God, until he was faced by the "ten plagues". The holy God now preserves his people through the Passover, and the people respond with their sacrifices of respect, love and loyalty in the tabernacle. During the monarchy, at the early temple period, no one was allowed to enter the temple with iniquity in their heart or body, they had to be purified by the priests at the entrance of the temple to declare them holy.

blessings and curses, there seems to be a divine intention to discipline both David³⁷⁹ and Absalom. The second pattern comes from Israel's kings and priests. Smith (2013:17-19, 21-23) joins Eli, Samuel, Saul and David as Israel's leaders affected by sin (1 and 2 Samuel). Primarily, these are leaders/fathers! Three of them lost their dynastic/hope as a result of wrong-doing, like Eli and his children, Hophni and Phinehas whose disloyalty led to punishment. In Leviticus 7:31 and Deuteronomy 18:3, they were priests under their father Eli. They despised the offerings of the Lord, committed immorality with women in the tabernacle of the Lord and blasphemed the Lord (Numbers 15:30-31). Whoever blasphemes will be cut off from his people (Leviticus 24:16), according to the blessings and curses in the ANET and the covenant practices.

Moreover, Smith (2013:22-23) finds that in I Samuel, the two sins that caused Eli's guilt were that he violated the prescribed worship order and that he pleased his sons over God (2:27-29). God sent punishment upon his household, for his sons had brought curses on themselves and he did not rebuke them. In 2:30, the Lord says "...those who honour me I will honour, and those who despise me will be lightly esteemed." The sin became a national and dynastic sin that led to more consequences³⁸⁰. The third pattern emerges from Achan's story. Berman (2014:115-119) narrates a great challenge from the story of Joshua 7, although the text indicates that he acted alone, and describes the sin as a breach of law by Israel (7:1, 11). In the field of moral actions, collective responsibility is attributed to the whole of Israel. Evidently "corporate responsibility" existed in ancient Israel; primitive Israelites had no clear distinction between an individual and his social group. This supports the presupposition that both responsibilities co-existed in Israel. Certain scholars have adopted this basic approach that the corporate nature means the group is treated as a single/related whole in the covenant,

³⁷⁹ Walters (2015:94-95) observes that the first responsible step is owning up. Though he refers to David as individual, I am a human being my sin is *before me*, using the metaphor of space and place. Vs.3-4, said against thee, thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight. I continue talking to God. Surely I have wrong thee. I, David, committed *this evil*, the Holy One sees my sin, Psalm 51:4. David refer to individual responsibility for his sin but the consequences included his family.

³⁸⁰ Jehoram's death and burial was recounted by Zimran (2014:308-310) in II Chronicles 21:19-20. Vs.19 depicts Jehoram's demise after an illness. "Asa slept with his fathers... and was buried in the grave that he had made for himself... a very great fire was made in his honour" (II Chronicles 16:13-14). God later promises Zedekiah: "Thus says the Lord concerning you: You will die a peaceful death; in Kings: II Kgs 8:24: He slept with his fathers and was buried with his fathers in the City of David. II Chronicle 21:20: ...was buried in the City of David, but not in the tombs of the fathers. The account shows Jehoshaphat's death and burial in II Chronicle 21:1: "Jehoshaphat slept with his fathers and was buried with his fathers in the City of David" which shows his connection to his ancestors. Vs.20 reveals his disconnection from the ruling house by means of the reference to the kings' tombs. Hereby, he is portrayed as unfit for interment and thus eternally sundered from his own family and the royal house. The only exceptions to this practice is Jehoram's son who also "followed the practices of the house of Ahab" and Amon, "sacrificed to all the idols that his father Manasseh had made and worshiped them" (II Chronicle 33:22).

and will be treated as a single related whole in their punishment as well. Thus the sin of Achan is an expression of collective responsibility, like “sin of the fathers”. The Hebrew Bible ascribes the notions of collective guilt directly or indirectly in Exodus 20:5, Deuteronomy 5:9 as well as Lamentation 5:7, Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 18, 20.

Berman (2014:118) argues however that a large group’s sin did not lead to consequences on another group. Yet there are stories of individual disobedience and punishment upon the wrong-doers (Leviticus 24:10-12, Numbers 15:32-35 II Samuel 6:7). This is consistent with the law codes of the ancient Near East of the 19th Century and the Laws of Hammurabi from the 18th Century BCE. These seem to sanction collective responsibility over individual responsibility. Zimran (2014:314) describes the parameters of the transgression as having to create a link between the king and the people as corresponding to the delineation of Jehoram's sin. The appearance of Jehoram's brothers as a collective figure in 21:4 indicates the significance of the family³⁸¹ ties between the murderer and his victims. Throughout the biblical period, brothers and sisters demonstrate common responsibility. This is derived from the notion of solidarity, where a person is not an individual.

Furthermore, it is by the same covenant methods that ancient kings made their treaties binding on all, and blessings and curses were considered beyond the generation of the partakers. Berman (2014:118-119) looks to the vassal treaties of the ancient Near East (see 3.7.1 and 4.8.1), and explicitly rejects the notion of communal punishment for the crimes of an individual. This opposes the Late Bronze Age Hittite Ismerika Treaty of the fifteenth century that “If within the land a single city commits an offence, you... shall defeat the city together with its men.... If within a city a single household (commits an offence), that household including its free men shall perish.... (If) a single man commits an offence; (he alone shall die)”. Fortunately, the treaty of the 8th Century BCE sanctions collective punishment³⁸², the way it is displayed in Joshua 7. Zimran (2014:318) observed the forms of

³⁸¹He/she belongs to a collective whole, whose members pledge to protect one another and to ensure the security, stability, and continuation of the family unit. This account reflects the conditions required for family membership. The punishment is to be understood in the context of the promise to the Davidic dynastic. This is alluded to in other verses and explicitly in Vs.7: Nonetheless, the Lord refrained from destroying the House of David for the sake of the covenant between him and David; in accord with the promise to keep his descendants.” The way in which he is buried constitutes a punishment for his deeds.

³⁸²Concerning individuals or collective responsibility of a royal assassination, the vassal is warned. According to him, the treaty does not request the entire city, let alone the entire people, being punished for another person’s guilt. On that note the story of Joshua 7 details the account for collective punishment for the sin of an individual, stating that what Achan did endangered the entire camp. God called for the devoted goods to be purged, that Israel may benefit again from YHWH’s divine fortified presence and blessings.

dual punishment³⁸³ that comes from within and without (vs.14-19) to evoke II Samuel 7:14. This ties the punishment more closely to the sin, thus demonstrating that it is based on the principle of “cause and effect” that God at times judges.

Retributive justice is God justifying the actions of humanity by means of blessing or cursing. It has been established from various scholars that God visits a person’s sin upon their relations, either individually or corporately. This has been the case for the reason that humans share their nature. In the case of this research, sin of the fathers is not regarded as punishment transferred upon the children but discipline, because God still loves them. Besides, until parents and their children failed to respect their oath and keep their side of the agreement God disciplines them. Retributive justice is portrayed as existing in two phases: God disciplines those he loves either as individual or as group. However, corporate and individual discipline co-existed side-by-side throughout the Old Testament; it was not a linear retribution which changed from corporate to individual responsibility, as most commentator and preachers interpreted Ezekiel 18:2 and Jeremiah 31:29. Instead, judgment is both corporate and individualistic. Covenant and holiness theology in divine-human relationships also indicates certain consequences for violators.

5.2.2 Theology of Consequences and Sin of the Fathers

To sum it up, one will say, the consequences of sin could bring curse/discipline upon a person/group in the form of divine justice, as argued in Chapters Three and Four. Orobator (2009:61) agrees that in an African context, sin is a reality with great consequences for both the perpetrator and his community. On this note, life is a shared reality which is maintained through family lineage. Admitting that sin started from an individual (Genesis 3:6) has a does

³⁸³The affinities between 2 Chronicles 21 and the divine pledge to David’s dynasty, together with those between Jehoram’s punishment and the promise, bestow a symbolic significance upon his chastisement. Linguistically, rather than producing offspring from his own loins, to ensure the continuation of the Davidic line, Jehoram is destined to lose. The form of his death thus directly reflects the conditions for membership of the royal family. It is possible to leave the link between deed and reward on the contrived linguistic level alone here. There was an agreement between Israel and YHWH. Hence, God’s discipline was not based just on their involvement in idolatry; improper response to the Sabbath law was regarded as infidelity, making God jealous. In Exodus the Sabbath is regulated by the priestly ideology of holiness, and individual sanctity (perhaps post-exilic and prior to the second temple). In this regard, Wright (1996:75) indicates that God took a day to rest after the creation, so we too must rest (24hrs). Possibly a *remembrance* יָדָא *day* that points the people to their past and connects them to their future. Brueggemann (2001:68) describes the Sabbath shift from creation to the exodus as addressing a new community which differs entirely from Exodus 20 to Deuteronomy 5. It was an established community that was willing to live according to Yahweh’s will. They made the seventh day full of priestly activities that caused holiness and maintained the relationship with their God. Biddle (2003:111) noted that labour was prohibited on the day but allows for everyone in the family within the six days of the week; they are granted equal status on the seventh day, including their slaves, visitors and animals. Thus personal/group acts are connected! Equally in Africa, “I am, because we are”.

not deny its corporate nature that affects the progeny. Migliore (2014:159-160) underlines that the Eden event is narrated as a portrayal of the goodness of creation and not the history of sin. Its condition and injustices emanate from its corporation. This practice of viewing individualism and community in interlinked was prevalent in ancient Israel and the ANE context. In this research, one indicated in Chapter Two that the conception of sin of the fathers has parallels and connections with most African settings, especially the West African/Nigerian context. There are interpretations of sin's outcome in Africa similar to Erickson's (2013:550-564) and others.

- a. **Divine Disfavour:** On more than one occasion, God hated his chosen people, writes Erickson³⁸⁴ (2013:550-553), quoting Hosea 9:15: "I hate them for their wrong-doing in Gilgal." Nel (2014:282-283) comments that it leaves a mark on people and interrupts the relationship between God and his people. To most Africans there are various ways of settlement in case of wrong doing and being guilty of what is forbidden, they use elders and family.
- b. **Guilt and Shame:** Guilt affects the relationship just as Adam and Eve were affected by guilt and shame when they decided to hide in the garden for shame after eating what had been forbidden. According to Erickson³⁸⁵ (2013:552-553) they were subject to guilt feelings for being wrong, for violating God's instructions. Stewards of God's vineyard who failed the holy one of Israel, had responded by being unfaithful (Leviticus 19). Agreeing, Nel (2014:282-283) emphasizes that sin leaves a sense of guilt on humankind, which comes from the disrespect shown to God. God's idea is to ensure righteousness while the stability of the society depends on its members keeping the moral standard of relating to their God. Moral guilt or iniquity of humanity before God extends to the guilt that affects others (Genesis 26:10, Proverb 30:10, Jeremiah 2:3, 51:5). Shame affects a name, according to the third commandment, as it reflects also in an African understanding. On the other hand, it is honourable to bear a good name, as a sign of dignity and respect.

³⁸⁴ "I will drive them from Zion and not any longer will there be love between us" (Jeremiah 12:8). God hates the wicked: Psalm 11:5, "he hates and dislikes wickedness." Proverbs 6:16-17, Zechariah 8:17, the reason is that they first hated God and transgressed. Although he is not retaliating, he hated such behaviour, not the person or people. God's plan for dignity, honour, respect, love, trust and many more was replaced by fear, shame, guilt and seeking for hiding places (Genesis 3:7-15, Isaiah 63:10, Lamentation 2:4-5). God's anger lasts for a moment and his favour has no end (Psalm 30:5, Judges 2:14, Jeremiah 10:24).

³⁸⁵The feeling of insufficiency and inadequacy appears, making sin ugly, the spoiler and lacking any moral ground. While good is beautiful, sin is ugly and shameful to the society. Humankind the crown of God's creative acts, gifted with life and personhood to dominate and rule the earth (Genesis 1:28-31).

- c. Liability to Discipline:** Humankind is liable to being punished, in the form of discipline. YHWH disciplined those he loved through the exile and brought them back when they repented. Erickson³⁸⁶ (2013:554-557) explains sin as accountable upon the sinner, with divine justice being shown through certain punishment to correct the people/person. On most occasions, the prophet warns the exile against idolatry, not to fall into God's wrath or retributive justice. Nel (2014:282) adds that sin³⁸⁷ provokes jealousy and irritates God, leading to divine vengeance. Where the Creator is not regarded by the creature, it indicates the violation of the relationship and indignity to the Creator.
- d. Sin Leading to Death:** Death is one obvious end result of sin³⁸⁸, which destroys a nation and separates people. Erickson (2013:557-560) is of the opinion that God forbade Adam and Eve as individuals but their failure originated the entire human depravity (Genesis 3:16-19). Both the covenant and the Decalogue were given to guard against such consequences. In addition, Nel (2014:283) explains that sin has the power to affect or to influence people's behaviour corrupting a whole generation (Genesis 6:5-8). The prophets affirmed that Israel was regarded as evil nationally (Jeremiah 5:1, Micah 7:2). The wisdom books describe the universality of human sinfulness in Psalm 14, and Ecclesiastes 7:20.
- e. Enslavement of the People:** There are consequences of sin; internally it enslaves the culprit and externally it damages the relationship with God and other people. Nel (2014:283) noted that the resultant guilt of Adam's sin affected the earth (Genesis 3:17-19), instead of human happiness our ancestors brought calamity upon the innocent generation. Enslavement seems to have crept into the family lineage,

³⁸⁶It may seem inappropriate for God to be hostile, in the light of his loyal love and covenant faithfulness to his people. God's retributive justice is intended for rehabilitation and correction which is why it is not punishment but discipline (Genesis 9:6), upon individuals or corporate community. The crime of the father became a propensity of children imitating parent's failure, and such trends are likely to continue in the future, causing more indignity. In Isaiah 1:24, 61:2, 63:4, Jeremiah 46:10, Ezekiel 25:14 God's retributive dimensions are found Psalm 94:1, God is an avenger, in Sodom and Gomorrah the community was affected, and in Genesis 6:1ff only Noah and his family were saved. Divine justice functions on individuals and also corporately (Psalm 95:8-11), in Joshua 7 Achan's family were affected by a person's sin, Psalm 119:71, he disciplines those he loves.

³⁸⁷Corporately in II Samuel 12:10-12 David learnt about the repercussion of his wrong-doing coming upon his family. (Amnon raped Tamar, Absalom killed Amnon to buy his sister's honour back, later Absalom revolted against his father David). Likewise, Orobator (2009:62) notes that the experience of sin in Africa occurring within a wider context of life; sin embraces the world that is yet-to-be-born, the living, the living dead as well as their animals and plants in the world of nature.

³⁸⁸Similarly, parent's sins do not just leave a scar for future generations but kill their progress and relationships. Unlike the Pelagian view, the Calvinists seems to be right, arguing that sin led to death, and that death was not created from the beginning, as Pelagius presumed. "They hid themselves and became separated from their God." Death here is not just physical murder but also spiritual, killing the dignity and relationship that exists with their God in the form of breaking the covenant, failing to show or receive mutual loyalty.

examples of which include Cain's murder of Abel and further lying to God, in Genesis 4; David taking Uriah's wife and planning to have him killed, in II Samuel 11, and Abraham repeatedly lying, in Genesis 12, 20 and Genesis 26:6-11.

The consequences of sin go beyond his/her family and leave a lasting scar of shame and guilt upon them. This becomes a stigma upon those affected including the past, present and future members of the family/clan. In many West African communities, ancestors are believed to be holy, and their family presents them as righteous and upright before others. When such ancestors are known to have sinned, they become a symbol of disgrace; some Western African communities may excommunicate people stigmatized with shame. Positively this practice encourages dignity, but on the other hand it stigmatizes people and create class difference. Maintaining dignity has been part of the African practices until colonialists declared such practices as barbaric and immoral. Honour and shame practices were a human dignity practice in most African cultures.

The children grow up to respect the elders (male or female), the community respect their leaders and do as they say. The people are united under the umbrella of their culture and the centre grew stronger daily. Human inferiority was foreign to the African cultures, except for those that chose shame/disgrace. Africans treat shame and defiance just as God punished insubordination. The ideology in this regard is to discipline those you love, in order to correct them and restore them to God or their society. In this regard, there are two important contributions of this research which one feels have addressed the problem of the research.

5.3 Contributions to Old Testament and Conclusion of Research

This research has contributed significantly to the field of biblical scholarship and African theological research. It has also clarified the reasons for sin of the father upon the children. More importantly, it highlighted the remarkable relevance to African theology and reached four significant conclusions:

a. The Etiological³⁸⁹ Nature of Retributive Justice

Punishment upon the children emanates from their failure to keep the covenant and it is not a form of judgement or punishment from God, although such a response was part of the

³⁸⁹The etiologic nature of retributive justice provides reasons for the spread and sustainability of sin and not an indication of the origin of sin.

covenant. Hence while other scholars see such punishment being visited upon the innocent, it is rather discipline from a loving God. When parents reprimand their children, they do so in love with the aim of correction, not rejection. God's intention was to restore his people to himself, in the same way that "a loving mother will. According to this research, both corporate and individual responsibilities are regarded as subject to a form of discipline for sin. Both forms of responsibility existed together from biblical-human history. Hence the form of retribution is a response to sin as twofold in nature in terms of its consequences. Viewing the dual/twin character of human responsibility – as both individual and simultaneously corporate – removes the confusion regarding justice of the idea of sin of the fathers. There are still individual, as well as collective repercussions to our actions, as immanent human depravity is personal and also collective. However, individual responsibility has continued to enjoy a plausible atmosphere, the reason being that, retribution is separated from ancestors according to Deuteronomy 24:16, Ezekiel 18 and Jeremiah 31. It is relevant for Africans to connect to the good examples of ancestor or parents for the character of shame and honour.

Israel violated the existing agreement with their God, making the consequence to their transgression valid until the third and fourth generation; in the same way our fathers' misbehaviour in most African communities is believed to have great consequences upon their imminent generations. One can conclude that corruption (in Africa) may pile up future punishment upon generations, if we do not change. The guilt/shame or honour/dignity of an African/Nigerian affects every relation in the family/clan according to communal life. The theology of "Sin of the Fathers upon the children" is regarded as significant in an African perception of ancestral misbehaviour. It is against this background that "sin of the fathers" causes the impediments to community development; this supports the third hypotheses in 1.3. Gonzales (2012:385) pointed out that Moses' intension was to inspire his readers by the good examples of faith and obedience portrayed in the patriarchal stories. This is how southern Kaduna cultures call for positive examples, especially by parent to avoid sin of the fathers. Sin of the fathers could be defined as the violation of rights and their inability to meet the demands of their time, which then affects their children. Again this addresses the fourth hypotheses in 1.3. In other words, sin is a violation of what is right and the adoption of what is wrong for a society. In southern Kaduna for instance, religion limits certain affiliations, like in politics or business, for the sake of dignity. Our parents' sin is believed to have affected the children when they fail to meet the community's expectation, within our context.

The second important aspect of the etiological nature of retribution is the motivation for the Sabbath in the meta-narratives (Deuteronomy 5 and Exodus 20) which served as the broader context of the story behind the Decalogue. Deuteronomy is non-priestly and covenantal (placed as late pre-exilic to exile), but Exodus is priestly (placed as late exilic to post-exilic). Deuteronomy used Israel's exodus as the motivating factor, while Exodus use creation and *imago-Dei* as the Sabbath³⁹⁰ motivation. The people were encouraged either to "remember" or to "observe" the Sabbath, in different contexts. The covenant people for instance were urged to observe the Sabbath (Deuteronomy 4:45), in the Deuteronomistic context, with their knowledge of the exodus supporting the motivation. Thus the narrator(s) referred Israel to their liberation to indicate the significance of YHWH in their life/history.

Various scholars refer to זָכַר as "observing or keeping", but one prefers "remember" with regard to the Sabbath practice, for the reason that their creation and their freedom was to be remembered; to observe the day and to rest for his glory. Again it recalled the covenant and rest, in the festivals of weeks, of wheat harvest and of first fruit (Exodus 34:22-23), making the Sabbath a time to remember, as well as devotion. Though corporate African life informs a covenant-like relationship that binds everyone, born or unborn, living or dead in a group, they could together remember that God rested. "And God rested" serves as a formula that "humankind must rest" from all labour (Genesis 2:2-3). Personally for this researcher, the Sabbath should be a "Remembrance Day", not just *rest* or *cessation* day, but day of freedom to mingle with others, and rest from all manner of labour. The rest included everyone in the land on the Sabbath³⁹¹ day indicating not necessarily a day of worship, but also a holiday and

³⁹⁰McConville (2002:128) affirms that the Sabbath was to be treated as a festival, observed with a strong connection between their creation and their deliverance from Egypt. Exodus informs the festival calendar, which guided the Jubilee (Leviticus 25). The celebration was followed in honour of their restoration, as a society. In Cooley's (2014:189-191) words, the first six indications occurred in a structure describing YHWH's mandate to his people while the seventh was a request of the Psalmist (19:8-11). The origin of the days is described through the rest ideology and the theology of cessation in Genesis 1, where God used six days for work and the seventh day to rest. In Israel's experience the seventh day appeared as a day for the Lord, seemingly enacted by the priests' theology to commemorate God's creation in Exodus. The Torah influences the Sabbath. Cooley (2014:189-191) notes its composition as "septenary seventh-day-circle" which traces the beginning of the Sabbath calendar to Genesis 1. The narrative calculated the calendar year indirectly to be 52 weeks of a seven-fold pattern, as in Psalms 19. Although the Psalm did not refer to the seventh day as the Sabbath day, the priests inserted it to fit their holiness theology, indicating holiness to God in Levitical and Priestly activities in the cosmos (Psalm 19), and thus observing the Sabbath, either from sunrise to sunset.

³⁹¹With reference to the priestly theology, Houtman (2000:40-41) states that it requires from sunset to sunset, twenty-four hours only on the seventh day of the week to be allocated for God by resting on that day. God's people must rest, and being faithful to the Sabbath means faithfulness to God. A unique position is given to the seventh day as being dedicated to Yahweh. The Akkadian *sappattu* is now connected to the Sabbath observance. It was a cessation day, with the monthly occasion being turned into weekly observance during the exilic era until the post-exilic period. The custom grew from the practice of the harvest festival calendar that work ceased on the seventh day in every year. In the Decalogue Israel had been familiar with Sabbath practice right from history

rest from all work. Creation symbolically describes the finished work of God, and the beginning of blessings, while Exodus symbolizes liberation. It is a remembrance day for the gratification of what God did in the past, and observance of the covenant. The variance in the context of the Sabbath law comes from זָכַר “remember” or “observe” from various translators, from the root זָכַר to remind the people of the covenant and the day as holy. The key point of the motivation however, lies upon their “exodus” and the “rest”, which is why they must observe the seventh day (see 3.8.4 under VI and 4.10.3 for other details). All the days were blessed - six to serve human purpose while the seventh was blessed as a holy day, sanctified and set apart from the others days for their God.

Prior to the Sabbath discussion, the main argument of this research indicated that sin can be considered from corporate Israelite society to affect all who belong to the family/clan. The second argument is the motivation³⁹² of the Sabbath as discussed in 5.2.2. Creation serves as the motivation for the Sabbath in Exodus, while the Exodus of Israel serves as motivation for the Sabbath in Deuteronomy. A further comparison³⁹³ of all records of the Decalogue is shown below, but only two will be compared in this manner.

Exodus 20:8-11 Priestly tradition and Theophany	Deuteronomy 5:12-15 Deuteronomistic and Speeches of Moses
a. Vs.8 uses זָכַר remember ³⁹⁴ in terms of memory and past record.	b. Vs.12 uses וַיִּזְכֹּרָהּ for observance in terms of calendar day of the Sabbath.
c. Vs.9 spoke of the time space given for human activities besides God’s time.	d. Vs.13 time for human beings is six days of the week, much more than YHWH’s time.
a. Vs.10 time for YHWH is just a day, in it no work is to done by all, except to think and remember their God and their past slavery. Their slaves too must rest.	b. Vs.14 there is time for YHWH, the seventh day, a holy day that ought to be observed. No one should work on the day including the servants and animals.
c. Vs.11 the reason is that God created the heaven and the earth in six days (Genesis 1-2), and rested on the seventh day. Human beings must rest like God, for this reason YHWH blessed the day and made it holy.	d. Vs.15 they must remember that they were slaves in Egypt, but YHWH saved them, for this reason he blessed the day. The day should be observed weekly as a sign of faithfulness.
e. Sabbath details base on past memory.	e. Sabbath details base on Egypt memory.

Table 8 analysis of the Sabbath in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5.

as a day given a special place by Yahweh himself at creation, when the division of time was set. Hence YHWH is Lord over time as well as the people

³⁹²The difference is that while the divine memory is prevalent in the priestly history, there is indication of insertions within Exodus, which in turn informs a priestly involvement in redressing the Decalogue. In the other hand in the covenant code the Deuteronomistic emphasis on the Sabbath points to a motivation to prepare the land for post-exilic faithfulness to worship their God. Deuteronomy 5:12-15 shows their memory was of how God saved them from Pharaoh and the life they lived in the wilderness. God provided for them and opposed their enemies; his intention was to love them for thousands of generation.

³⁹³Dozeman in his 2009 commentary on Exodus, compared the Decalogue in a different manner.

³⁹⁴“Remember” has been inter changed with “observe”; see narrative for details.

There are differences in the rendering of the Decalogue in both accounts as indicated in the table above. In this case, we saw YHWH having an anthropocentric nature, depicted by a metaphor of marriage and relationship. God hates sin, hence he instituted the Sabbath through the priests to keep his people holy, just as the Decalogue was given to keep them holy for the reason that their God is holy. God said they were not to create idols as part of their religion/culture nor portray images of God of any kind. This shows that he hates idolatry and desires strict monotheism. Secondly the Israelites were never to bow down to any form of deity nor accord them respect, or transfer the honour due to their God – i.e., put them in the place of YHWH or use them concurrently as gods, because that would imply having a divided allegiance toward YHWH. God warns of transgenerational transfer of punishment for failing to keep the covenant. Failure to do what is agreed is sin; Africans believe its guilt brings shame and disgrace, or even death.

Significantly, the day was not just a rest of day, but time to enjoy the benefits of the six days' labour. It is a day of freedom and remembrance of the exodus/creation; the slaves among them also enjoy certain benefits such as the freedom to mix with others, while they rest from labour, and serve God like others. The theme of remembrance now radiates in both Sabbath day and the memory of sin of the fathers. This could remind them of their liberation, and direct them towards a personal relationship with the Creator.

b. Idolatry and Divine Jealousy

Although jealousy³⁹⁵ may be regarded as a human characteristic, it could be considered as arising from rivalry or desiring what belongs to another. Godly jealousy involves God's hatred for idols and cultic images that take his place as Israel's deity. It is a demand for exclusive worship, to which God expresses jealousy about his covenant partners preferring to worship idols over him. If God is able to love, he can express watchfulness over those he loves not to be snatched from him. Though God created them in his image (Genesis 1-2) as his physical representations, he also delivered them from bondage/slavery (Exodus 20:1). God's jealousy could be regarded as zealousness from his desire to save unto himself. YHWH is extremely watching over his people; he is careful with whatever comes on them.

³⁹⁵The Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary explains *jealousy* as being unhappy and angry due to someone else or something you want which may be snatched from you. Funk & Wagner Standard Dictionary puts *being jealous* as being apprehensive of being displaced by a rival in affection or favour; it involves being revengeful on account of fickle treatment. Smith (2011:368) considers *jealous* an adjective that describes the feelings of envy, and having a dislike for any possible rival.

By his jealousy, God is securing Israel from her enemies, to be sure they are protected and safe with him. He earnestly and anxiously keeps watch against thieves who will try to steal what belongs to him, making God jealous. God's jealousy is a response from the covenantal agreement, which Israel failed to reciprocate. Jealousy in this case involves a battle or fight for justice, to keep what belongs to you. Thus this command could be reformulated for easiness to the African understanding of this research to be;

- c. Do not make idols or build them even if they are part of your African cultural artefacts.
- d. Never portray God in images or pictures, neither of YHWH nor of another deity as object of worship.
- e. Do not attempt to worship idols with YHWH either secretly or in public.
- f. By possessing cultic images, you divide the allegiance between YHWH, idols and other images, thereby making him jealous for being substituted with Man-made deities.
- g. YHWH hates his partners visiting shrines/idols; hates mixing covenant relationship with other cultic activities. Their mandate is to stick to YHWH their only deity.

Perhaps the "golden calf" fits as an example of the prohibited idol that YHWH hated. The existing covenant between the two parties binds them in a mutual relationship that dare not be broken by an idol. YHWH the Creator is Israel's one and only God. YHWH has made them his possession; they are now married to their God. The theology of "sin of the fathers" might have sounded egotistical, with its emphasis on punishing the innocent for what they did not do, but the treaty terms stipulate punishment for violators, and corporate responsibility indicates a group's responsibility. For this reason, idolatry causes God's jealousy and serves as the reason for punishing the children. In the individual sense, each one sinned, and in corporate terms, their parents did not sin only by themselves - their children were included in their sin. They did not protect their children from the repercussion of their acts.

In the first place idolatry is equated to dethronement of YHWH. When they bow to idols they divert allegiance to that deity. They made a golden calf who dethroned YHWH, making a new idol, even though the carving of idols was forbidden. Similarly, our African ancestors communed with their traditional gods, though they also used the gods for economic purposes. There were various African traditional covenants with multiple oaths, which puts their children in various forms of bondage. Our suffering in Africa should not just be linked to underdevelopment owing to western colonialists but should be viewed from our ancient

socio-religious practices as well. These were the kind of cultic activities that made YHWH zealous to punish their iniquities. These practices pose challenges for most Africans: we are left with an inherited responsibility that we have always had, related to serving the western powers for our survival. Though blessed with abundant resources, we are almost at the edge of development. When God said “be fruitful... have dominion over the earth and subdue it”, the means to sustain this were not available. From this research one feels that a modern approach to African development should inculcate religious approaches. An African neo-religious approach (i.e., Christianity) may well have a significant message to address to the African mind.

Replacement of God must have brought certain consequences to the African soil and our corporation. In arguing for corporate human responsibility, the memory of sin and discipline come to bear in the context of the Decalogue. Sin of the fathers brings shame and guilt in the society; but intergenerational transfer of curse is perhaps a tolerable concept in African belief systems. There are two grounds for divine discipline, viz. Firstly, parents’ behaviour in the past and secondly, children’s present behaviour. In the past, dignity was shown to one another, people were willing to participate in corporate humanity as though it was transferred to an individual. They respected the dignity of their brothers, and corporate life made them work hard towards personal dignity – unlike the exiles, who did not just lament over the sin of the fathers, but dared plead for individual responsibility in opposition to communal life, even in their disobedience. They were considering the sins of others, crying over the wrong deeds of the past and forgetting their own involvement. Nonetheless, Ezekiel 18:1-4 said about their lament that they were pleading for individual responsibility.

Although Africans believe in the corporate nature of life, the consequences of wrong-doing (like touching what is forbidden) is not foreign to them. There was no little corruption, just as there is no little sin before God, *sin is sin*, wrong is wrong; the concern for fidelity is applicable to Africans. This supports our last hypothesis as proposed in point 1.3. It is said that “African problems need African solutions”; African development and dignity can easily be achieved if the approach is centred on the ‘people’s community’. It is said that “the broom can only sweep when it is joined tightly”. The society in the past have tried to focus on corporate development, but modern individualism has set things apart. A lawless father begets lawless children, just as a corrupt leader begets corrupt followers. Thus sin is inherited and is transferable by the fact that human beings are born in sin, and are sinners from womb.

Their corporate life has been hampered by various modern challenges applied in pursuit of modernity in Africa. People may literally lose hope of better life even by 2063, when Africa hopes to have eradicated poverty, if for instance, weaker economies are looking up to Nigeria and South Africa for better life and development, while they are applauding corruption and enriching themselves with titles of honour. In Chapter Two the main focus was on understanding how Africans can come to terms with original sin in form of ancestral sin/shame, just as sin of the fathers could serve as another way of looking at sins of our ancestors across generations.

c. Comparative Analyses to the Decalogue

Although this thesis referred to the Deuteronomistic and priestly contexts, the Decalogue alludes to faithfulness as human responsibility in both cases. In some instances, punishment is corporate, and in other cases it is individualistic. This research had concluded that responsibility was not dispensational but instead it co-existed side by side with the other. Personally, it is against this background of “sin of the fathers upon the children” that the covenant/holiness idea in the Sabbath motifs is understood in both Decalogue. Although another record of the Decalogue appears in Exodus 34, our comparison centres on this two.

<i>Exodus</i> (Priestly Theology)	<i>Deuteronomy</i> (Deuteronomistic History)
➤ Theophany and memory of the past.	➤ Speeches of Moses in memory of the past.
➤ Creation “rest” is the motivation for remembering the Sabbath.	➤ Exodus and liberation is the motivation for observing the Sabbath.
➤ Creation serves as the basis for relationships.	➤ Exodus serves as the basis for relationship.
➤ “Elohim rested”, so Israel must remember the Sabbath rest.	➤ “YHWH liberated” them, so they must observe the Sabbath.
➤ “Creation” reminds them of the Creator and God’s intention for peace and freedom.	➤ “Exodus” reminds them of the Deliverer and restoration of the temple and kingdom.
➤ The Creator plans to bless Israel with a holy land if they remain holy.	➤ The Deliverer promises to give Israel their own land for keeping the covenant.
➤ Remembrance serve as the metaphor of acknowledging the Creator.	➤ The knowledge of the exodus replaces the knowledge of creation.
➤ Although their parents sinned, there is need to be holy as their God is holy.	➤ They lamented for the sins of their fathers, now they need to be faithful.
➤ God’s dwelling is in Zion in the post late to post-exilic era.	➤ God’s presence is felt in the wilderness for the exilic community.

Table 9 Comparison of the Decalogue contexts.

YHWH the God of Israel had positioned himself solidly in the wilderness to show his power, although he lives in Zion, his dwelling place. No one can approach him except Moses, the mediator of Israel. God blesses Israel; the Creator and Deliverer of the faithful generation will bless those who keep the covenant. The authors were aware of Israel’s condition after the

exile, which is why they capitalized on that knowledge to understand their past; and the reason that they are punished for their fathers' sin. The narrators crafted the passage to pursue the goal of understanding their monotheistic God, and to explain the need for human dignity in the community of brothers. In both contexts, there is a form of foundation for their relationship, but the books are motivated differently. They start with a relationship in which they need to be loyal to one another. Israel and YHWH are not just in a relationship, YHWH must love and Israel must remain faithful/holy to their covenant. There is treaty in disguise which has stipulations, and references to blessings and curses just as in ancient treaties of kings.

The Sabbath was meant for rest, following the fact that "God [had] rested." Only those serving in the Levitical and cultic roles could labour on the Sabbath. Humankind³⁹⁶ are God's representatives on earth, making them demigods who were to rule and subdue the earth. No matter what, the day of rest must take precedence as the seventh day unto the Lord, Saturday. The argument is that it was changed from Saturday to Sunday. Following the Christian revelation and the resurrection of Jesus described in the New Testament. The question is, should we maintain double Sabbath days now? Do we continue with rest on the Sabbath since we go to Church and not Temple, and confess Christianity not Judaism? Is there a difference between the Sabbath day for Israelites and for Christians? This questions will remain as food for thought due to limit as a potential field of study in the future. Nonetheless, the day is a rest day and time to cease from activities.

First, the aetiology of "sin of the fathers upon the children" indicates the continuous presence of sin/corruption across generations, which points towards continuation of sin in the society as incessant. This continuous presence of sin through generations manifests as a collective responsibility, and further extends to spread shame upon others. While on one hand, retribution presupposes "cause and effect", this is similar to the nuance in Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic tradition. For instance, in Genesis 6:1-8, wickedness was everywhere on earth, no one listened to Noah's preaching until God punished humanity with the flood. Later in chapter 18, the sin and evil of Sodom and Gomorrah was everywhere, so that Abraham

³⁹⁶The priest made this day a holy day and a rest day as well – which might sound as though other days are evil and not blessed as the seventh day. Notably, it was within the six days of the week that God blessed Israel with bread, manna and quails, within the six days God gave them all they needed for sustenance during the time of service on the Sabbath. Unlike the representation on images and portraits [do not understand this, but perhaps just because I am not knowledgeable about the field], this is representation of his image in humankind which he created for his own glory. For this reason alone, human beings ought not to think of encroaching into the seventh day, but rather to take the day as God's day alone.

could not find even five righteous people; suddenly God reacted to their acts with destruction upon the land. Sin of the fathers thus portrays the heavy prevalence of sin and corruption everywhere as a result of human transgression (see details in addendum II). This clearly describes inter-generational sin to mean sin of the fathers for the African mind. In other words, it is the consequence of bad behaviour or wrong-doing that lingers. Though retributive justice suggests repercussion of bad behaviour, YHWH will bless those that obey. Conversely, cause and effect does not apply to all situations of human sinfulness.

Second, this thesis reflects the etiologic nature of sin by providing reasons for visiting the sin of the fathers upon the children. The prevalence of sin does not suggest the origin of sin, nor how sin came about, instead it provides reasons for the spread and why Africans should come to terms with collective responsibility. Granting that Deuteronomy 5 suggests corporate responsibility on one hand, on the other hand Exodus 20 implies individual responsibility through the holiness code. The Deuteronomist requires commitment from the people, the priests called for personal cleanliness and observance of cultic duties in the form of rites of individual holiness. Therefore, the theology of the Decalogue indicates the co-existence of both responsibilities throughout human history and the relationship with YHWH. At some points God disciplines his chosen people collectively, and in others instances justice is served to individuals who sinned, not the group. Again, this implies that the teaching of the “sour grapes” in Ezekiel 18 and Jeremiah 31 is not individualistic but relates to corporate liability. It is good to note that covenantal faithfulness or Israel resonates well with Deuteronomy; the ancient treaties where kings took oaths of fidelity and vows of faithfulness, sealed with blessings and curses on the parties involved also support this. The interplay between group and personal holiness could present a solution to the question of retribution.

Third, creation theology as motivation for the Sabbath opens up the idea of *imago Dei* in relation to humankind and their God. Though it was not YHWH who created, but *Elohim* according to Genesis 1:1 theologically human being are all in God’s image, and the Sabbath became an identity marker. Israel benefited from this ideology much more as God’s chosen people, but creation extends to other human beings as well. The motivation of the Sabbath by reference to the creation and Exodus/liberation became a good reason why God requires faithfulness, but this is required from all humanity, including Africans. For being in his image and likeness, they should behave as God’s representatives. Although everyone was created individually, not as a family or clan, corporate faithfulness was expected of them. This law now includes every human race. Besides, modern Christianity has its stronghold in Africa, its

growth and population in Africa is an indication that African mission must rise to the task, to rescue the western Church.

A change of emphasis is introduced with the injunction that they must respond to God as a covenant community. This juxtaposition of ideology and theology has clarified the presupposition of culpability which says, if your ancestors committed sin, you may inherit the consequences. Children of slaves inherited the status of slaves, just as children of traitors were never trusted, even years after the event. For instance, the Boers that supported the British, after they lost their children still bear the scar of their parent's misbehaviour. Another example is the youth that are born after apartheid did no evil, yet they are stigmatized by the modern South African society. This is an important concept which has helped in the understanding of the implication of sin of the fathers upon the children. What began with individuals has turned out to affect the corporate group, marking fidelity as a standard for everyone to emulate. It was not dispensational fidelity, and at no time was one responsibility ended, nor a method of justice changed, instead both individual and corporate responsibility existed. Discipline/punishment was not specific, instead both ways were applied. The co-existence of collective and individual responsibility heightens the complexity of sin as a phenomenon in the society.

- a. For this reason, the rhetoric of covenant and holiness indicates the continuation of both collective and individual responsibility. This is why social rhetorical analysis became the relevant methodology for doing this research.
- b. God's act of liberation is combined to his act of creation to support the motivation of the Sabbath, showing a reason why Israel should remain faithful to their Creator. Their deliverance was not just of individuals, but of collective Israel, hence they should remember to observe the Sabbath by keeping it holy.
- c. This is the reason why sin of the fathers does not indicate the origin of sin, but perpetuates the sin or corruption across generations of God's creation. It was not just fathers who were affected, but up to three to four generations were declared guilty and felt the shame of their acts. Thus the western concept "original sin" should be regarded as intergenerational sin in African theology.

There are three other ways in which one would like to believe this research has delivered a contribution. The first is that it has clarified the understanding of retributive justice and the Sabbath motivation in each context. The second was to analyse further how/why God was

dethroned from Zion, and its implications. The third was to compare both contexts of the Decalogue for easy comprehension.

Personally, the wholeness of corporation is a significant binding factor that supports human dignity in Africa, which is commensurate to this context. The advantage of corporate life is that it helps establish unity, and create checks and balances, although it may infringe on personal rights. Sin of the fathers is perceived from the concept of original sin, like sin of the ancestor, even though ancestors do not sin. Perhaps the idea of “sin of the fathers upon the children” is a memory of the community who hated their past (exile) and wishes those experiences not to be repeated. While covenant faithfulness served as a major expectation of the corporate community, memory served as a late exilic and early post-exilic call to for the community to stay clear of behaviour that could unleash another exile. The idea proves that innocent children had to suffer, based on an existing covenant relationship, unlike the way most commentators interprets “no longer punishment upon the innocent” in Ezekiel 18:2 and Jeremiah 31:29. These generations were disciplined for what concerns them; their family and clan were part of a treaty with God, which had been violated. Granting that an individual³⁹⁷ sins, (Genesis 3:6) their corporate nature affects their progeny, holding them responsible for sin of their fathers.

d. Conclusion of the Study

Obtainable research indicates certain perspectives and development of existing views³⁹⁸ on retributive justice. It is categorised into literary, sociological, theological and legal perspectives, in order to figure out the African understanding and own viewpoint.

³⁹⁷De Beer (2014:74-77) says Adam is the universal human antagonist. As a result, there is a common human nature contained in multiple persons. An individual is considered the totality of person and elements out of the common nature, while a *person* is that distinction between human and nature. Thus true freedom means leaving behind all that is individual, to be among spiritual beings. The hypostases of the fall do not divide our common nature, instead fragments it into different individuals to lose its divine likeness. Thus, the ‘image of God’ implies humans as personal beings in corporate form, possessing the ability to choose freely for or against their God.

³⁹⁸In categorising scholarship, it is important to note that there are conservatives and liberals, the conservative tend to detail their emphases on maintaining traditions in the Old Testament while liberals focus on changes and lay little emphases on maintaining the orthodox tradition. Among them are Jews, westerners mostly Americans and perhaps some Germans, the African scholars did not refer to sin of the fathers in anyway. Though there is no mention of sin of the fathers in the African Bible commentary, it did not say anything about this issue perhaps for liberal thought. Both Chianeque L.C. and Ngewa S. who wrote on Deuteronomy did not pay attention to sin of the fathers just as Ndjerareou A who commented on Exodus omitted the discussion of sin of the fathers, perhaps for their views and irrelevance. Holter (2011:51) added that the second had not receive so much attention from Old Testament scholars in Africa. He said, the African Bible Commentary also neglected this aspect; as such it is symptomatic of the situation to have Ndjerareou look down on this issue in Africa biblical and theological research (see Scriptura, 106:2011). Jonker made reference to Holter in (2011:67) with regards to this fact. Majority of the western scholars like Miller 1994/2009, Merrill 1994, Brueggemann 2001,

I. Literary Perspective

It is hyperbolic, when certain interpretations point to the tendencies for the limit of punishment to be extended upon a family not just to third and fourth generation but as far as it can go. Such exaggerations illustrate that justice does not end at the fourth generation as indicated in the text instead, it continues subsequently. Speaking in hyperbolic language, Merrill (1994:148) held that the repercussion is so great that it impacts generation yet unborn, if they people continue to hate God. Though the scholar did not refer to sin of the father in the discussion, but refers to hating God. In addition, Duke (2015:351-352) thought it is hyperbolic to say thousand generations in God's mercy and judgement. God's faithfulness portrays an extended future generations which is in contrast to his judgement that last only few generations. To him the hyperbole emphasizes the extreme longevity of faithfulness and mercy as opposed to the conciseness of God's judgement. The text is said to refer to the prominence of God's dependable mercy. He saw figures of speech in the first and second parts of the text. This is common in ancient context to include grand and great-grandchildren in the extended family, especially in terms of covenant or indenture, making it an idiomatic expression for the living family members. The parents lived long to bless the future generation and not curse. Just as ancestors in African theology are, believe to be living for blessing.

Furthermore, Enns (2000:415-416) alleged that when jealousy is aroused through disobedience, the result becomes punishment³⁹⁹, but when aroused by obedience it results in blessings. By referring to the suffering of the descendants, it is intended as a deterrent to, and punishment of, their ancestors, not just a transfer of guilt. Ancestors feel the pains when they see their great-grandchildren in anguish. Hence, the hyperbolic exaggeration and the continuity of sin in literary form shows the intensity and degree of damage. Signifying the sustenance of sin, corruption and evil in the society. Nonetheless, this opposes those who says judgement ends after four generations like Miller, Propp, Meyers and others to whom one concurs. For it refers to the longest family unit which ends in most cases after the fourth

Christensen 2001, McConville 2002 and Biddle 2003 seem to generally place emphasis on the textual details and neglected how the text relates to certain culture. Although a conservation like Miller detailed the discussion as indicated as indicated in chapter three. Brueggemann surprisingly refers to it in passing but Merrill had little time for the issue. Likewise, the scholars like McConville and Biddle consider the issue of sin of the fathers lightly and of little significance. Perhaps for their knowledge and world view! On the other hand, Weinfeld and Tigay applied the theology of sin of the fathers to the Jewish and applicable to other cultures, making it relevant and clear to the African context.

³⁹⁹Although, it does not make sense to describe God's visitation upon Israel as an act of punishment towards Egypt. Sin of the fathers has no reference to Egypt, except as an exaggeration.

generation, the extended family unit commonly lives up to four generations. Witte, Jr. (2009:5) indicates that this text refers to the perpetuation of idolatry; he portrays God's response as eternal upon the disobedient.

Remarkably, Meyers' (2005:171-172) feminine view shows that Jeremiah 31:29-30 and Ezekiel 18:2-4 contest cross-generational punitive justice; though she did not indicate the outcome of sin of the father. According to her, their over-emphases were part of the societal changes during the late monarchical era. Deuteronomy 24:16 indicate a judicial process that does not involve generational collective responsibility. She regards this as hyperbolic, indicating extra emphasis of the message, not the real statement. One is challenged to determine when such changes of individual responsibility became the emphasis of the time. It is clear how Stuart (2006:454) described it shallowly in his words, that God determines how to punish successive generations for the same sin they learn from their parents. If the children continue with the sin of their parent, they will not escape from God's wrath. Does this say no limit to punishment as long as there is no limit to sin? He also made it look conditional on obedience, not grace of four generations; and as established rule in treaty and covenant. This description does not show limit but end at fourth generation as indicated in the second command.

II. Socio-Cultural Perspective

In building up this argument, Durham (1987:287) noted YHWH's jealousy with his people as part of his holiness Exodus 34:14; those that hold him in contempt, he shall reign the storm of his judgement to their four generation. This Jewish scholar on Exodus, Sarna (1991:110) asserted the Israelites' conceptions of community are bound to God by a covenant. The society like most African cultures, practice collectively responsible for its actions, and individuals are likewise accountable to the community for their behaviour, this is completely like the southern Kaduna culture of honour and shame. There is now a mutuality of responsibility and consequences, similar to what one regards as co-existence of both responsibilities. In other words, Duke (2015:351, 354) said when God visit the guilt of a father upon someone, it is for an on-going disobedience against the covenant. Hence, a jealous God in the context of covenant does not refer to a negative emotional state of God, instead the passion God has for his true followers. However, this uses the language of human emotion to convey a distasteful envy. He added that the community which compose the collective responsibility did not hold God as unjust or irrational for making them responsible,

instead understood in terms of the covenant that the extended family is liable to same discipline.

The idea of communal punishment was popular in ancient Israel according to Weinfeld (1991:298-299). Communal solidarity in families was common that a proverb from the prophets was circulating in Jerusalem during the exile, “Our fathers ate unripe grapes and their son’s teeth were set on edge” (Jeremiah 31:29-30 and Ezekiel 18:2-3). He considered the Jewish culture in his analyses, that even if a person escapes the punishment by dying, the burden is transferred upon his children. Whatever is the opposition to this in the prophets or Pentateuch Deuteronomy 24:16, it does fall within the context of individual or collective retribution. God’s morality is confirmed by Wright (1996:72) who commented briefly that the sin of idolatry reaps its reward in the living generation of those who practice it. Idolatry is believed to be the sin that caused the exile, Howard, Jr. (1997:861-862) noted *glh* (reveal/taken to exile) as being sent to exile for the reason that God’s people sinned, exile now reveals and uncovered them (Isaiah 5:13, 27, Amos 7:11, 17). II Kings 16:9, 17:11, Amos 1:5-6 points to Israel and Judah taken to exile by Assyrian and Babylonia. This ranges from an individual seizure of another fellow or at worst an army taken captive.

Holter (2011:52) refers to idolatry and all forms of detestable things in Judah and Jerusalem to be the cause of the Babylonian exile. The layers of the Deuteronomistic literatures expressed similar negative response to cultic images as standard to exclusive worship. Boda (2016:28-29) said, the theme of exclusivity of worship dominates the speeches in Joshua. For instance, Joshua 22 confronts the Transjordan families/tribes about the building of an altar as wrong doing. To this, Samuel’s family tries to obey God, but on moving to Shiloh, an illicit practice crept into the family that affected their exclusivity to YHWH and were judged. Eli’s family also follow sooth with a similar cultic violation, and the family was collectively punished by YHWH (I Samuel 1-3). The punishment of one generation is heavily placed upon another as ‘third’ and ‘fourth’ referring to the *בְּתֵיבָה* the extended family in Israel, similar to extended family in African context. The house of the father is same in Tyap “*atyo li*” is father’s house while in Surubu it is the owner of the house “*piyurarah*” or the father of the house, whose sin/guilt transfers shame⁴⁰⁰ upon his children in southern Kaduna beliefs.

⁴⁰⁰ The manner of understanding sin in Africa differs with the west. Certain western consideration influenced the definition of sin, Dube (2015:118) mention that sin was defined according to practices that were not acceptable by the missionaries. Practices with religious connotation or culture were majorly affected such as wedding

The בְּנֵי תָא forms “an extended family” as “community of brothers” that makes up the Israelite community. Tigay (1996:66) speak of divine retribution as extending to descendants which corresponds to the concept of family solidarity in ancient societies. Accordingly, the warning implied God’s passion to punish the idolaters and their offspring, otherwise, inflicting punishment upon their descendants. God will reward the loyal ancestors upon their progenies. The extended family is affected by sin as Carpenter (2009:450) noted, the generation three and four in ancient context began with the living and cover all those that are living or were able to see each other. Not just the extended family, the anger of Kings and gods were also allowed to burn upon generations of those that sinned and threatened family or national solidarity as portrayed by Hittite literatures. Boda (2016:32-33) adds that sin and its accompanying guilt and punishment is understood as corporate solidarity. Like Joshua 7, sin affected both Achan’s family and the entire Israel. Boda does not just see the intra-generational nature of sin, guilt and punishment, but also an intergenerational character of sin like the case of Manasseh. He added that the generation that follow Josiah experienced the judgement for being in the same guilt as their predecessors. These are indications of intergenerational transfer of guilt and discipline upon an extended family.

It is believed that when an elder or parent lay curses on the children, it follows them. Similarly, like the southern Kaduna practices where the king could pronounce punishment upon those that bring shame to the tribe or the land. The pronouncement of the king could linger on the extended family. Although the transfer of guilt and punishment is scary to modern southern Kaduna cultures, this calls for everyone to guard against bad behaviour and promote human dignity. To this, punishment in southern Kaduna cultures like sin of the fathers, appears as a call to order not just intergenerational judgement. One could presume that older scholars detail the text as a reality. This gives the impression that most scholars who expound sin of the fathers in their commentaries, are older scholars. They took their time on this issue to explain its meaning and implication, unlike the younger and recent contributors. It points to the essence of engaging with the text in an African/Nigerian context.

dance, initiation to adulthood, herbal medicine and many more that became wrongful acts. Basically, certain customs and traditional practices were regarded as heathenism, useless, sinful and evil, to them it was syncretism to be a Christian and participate in traditions. Evil was not just practices but the community was also regarded as evil, not only on individuals but translated into the public space. Dube, M.W. 2015. “Translating Cultures: The Creation of Sin in the Public Space of Botswana” in *Scriptura*. Vol.114/1:109-119. While it is honour for an African to be initiated to adulthood or to use herbal medication, the western classification made it a shameful practice and sin.

III. Theological Perspective

The decision to obey God or not is significant in to Israel's brotherhood, this confirms Childs (1977:405) reiteration that to "bow down and serve" is a stereotype Deuteronomistic expression which refers to worshipping "strange gods". Agreeing with him, Yahweh's zeal is closely connected to his holiness (Joshua 24:19). His zeal as his holiness, burns with pains like a "devouring fire" upon the third and fourth generation as the clue of God's judgement for infringing on the agreement. In covenantal framework, Boda (2016:28) describe sin as the violation of promise, the ruining of the treaty/relationship between Yahweh and his people which was established in Sinai. He added that, a covenant has vertical and horizontal axes, one with Yahweh and the other within the people. The priority of the vertical axis is made clear by the fact that the key violations in the former prophets are related to the worship of Yahweh. Boda (2016:28) explain further that Deuteronomy has two core values for worship in Israel, Yahweh, the exclusive object (5:7-9, 6:13-14, 13) and the special place of worship (12). Rejecting this could lead to jealousy.

In few words, Brueggemann (2001:67) denote that God is jealous enough to punish and faithful enough to show his loving kindness. In this manner, YHWH is free to punish the disobedient and free to be bless to obedient. Christensen (2001:114) and Biddle (2003:104) did not even acknowledge the theology of sin of the fathers at all. They did describe how the exilic community mixed deities as it created a shift away from YHWH and this made them more polytheistic. McConville (2002:) alleged the punishment as threat, as far as three to four generations have been taken to mean God's wrath falling upon the three following generation for the sin of idolatry. This is similar to the experience of Achan in Joshua 7 where other members of the family became affected for an individual's misbehaviour. Although this victimization may be repudiated in the prophet and the Pentateuch, it does not stop the application of divine retribution on individuals and the corporate group. Duke (2015:360-361) noted the practice of individual responsibility like corporate to have predate Israel, from the Gilgamesh epic. He suggests the literary history of Ezekiel and Jeremiah texts came from the Babylonian exile.

More so, Houtman (2000:33) perceived the portrayal of God as strongly anthropopathic; that YHWH's will for Israel is to be solely devoted to him. YHWH does not condone iniquity

from his partner⁴⁰¹. Retribution is explicitly restricted to the person who follow bad example of the father. The sons are described as rebellious and the father as wicked. No mention of the daughters and wives, perhaps for patriarchal reasons. Perhaps, this is the reason for God's jealousy. Dozeman (2009:485) noted "*el qanna*" as emotionally rooted in love and marriage. The husband is potentially violent towards his wife due to his spirit of jealousy. Hosea 2:7, 10-13, the prophet refers to this relationship as an illicit love affair, though it is divine jealousy not human's. Divorce is regarded as for any Israelites who replace YHWH in anyway. YHWH's jealousy turns to hatred and creates guilt that is contagious, promoting divine vengeance through four generations. This treaty is binding upon those involve and there will be punishment on anyone who breaks the agreement. This alludes to collective responsibility and divorce individual responsibility. Duke (2015:361) assumes that the people of Ezekiel days used the proverb of multi-generational accountability to excuse themselves from personal responsibility. Rhetorically, it was more appealing to call for individual responsibility to repent than collective. This emphasis in Jeremiah 31 focuses on the future and serves a purpose of giving hope to the future generation after the exile.

IV. Legal Perspective

The trend in this study as indicated by Noth (1966:163) suggested God's reward reaches far beyond an individual who obeys God, there is also an extension of punishment upon those that hate YHWH. He made reference to sequence of generation that will be blessed for parent's faithfulness, though did not refer to sin of the father in particular. Weinfeld (1991:294-296) mentioned "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon children ... third and fourth generation"; when God avenges, he does so slowly, suggesting his mercy and justice are the opportunity he grants to those that desire to repent. His graciousness with Israel is for his grace in the covenant agreement. Covenant grace conveys a message of legacy in relationship with parents and their children collectively. Collective responsibility in his view teaches human beings about divine reward and punishment. These legacies are perceived by Miller (2009a:60) as "transgenerational sin" and perhaps transgenerational blessing from one generation to another including the ancestor. Notwithstanding Deuteronomy 5:8-10 indicates the legacy of sin do not outweigh the legacy of love that lasts for thousand generations. One differs here, that when punishment is administered in love, it is discipline for the purpose of

⁴⁰¹ The *LXX* and *Vulg.* Considers generation while *Targum* and *Pesh.*, translates as descendants. Thus third and fourth means the grandchildren and great grandchildren, NET used sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons with this regard. One who follows the bad way of parents in Houtman's (2000:34) opinion will be punished. Although punishment when administered in love is regarded as discipline.

restoration. Duke (2015:349) added that the phrase ‘the one hating me’ specifies the identity of those who will receive the guilt from their parents. They are those who hate God and are consistently unfaithful to the covenant, in his view, not all sons will be liable to this punishment. Perhaps this alludes to individual responsibility than collective.

Again, Miller (1990) said it transcends generation; God counts up to the fourth generation, but that’s the end of divine retribution. This observation shows that, God may not go beyond the fourth generation in administering justice or discipline because He will forgive and restore blessings upon his people. Even though little is said by Fretheim (1991:225-227) on sin of the fathers, he declares that YHWH lives above and relates with his creatures. He cherishes their faithfulness and judges their disloyalty, their iniquity and substitution. Substituting him increases his jealousy and therefore making him hate wrong doers to show divine zeal to own his people. On this note, Propp (2006:171-173) term Yahweh’s jealousy as raging and intense, when Israel serve other gods. He becomes zealous for Israel that he applies intergenerational vengeance “upon son’s and son’s sons”. Intergenerational transmission of sin and accumulation of sin may be a harsh judgement, but this affected only great-great-grandchildren. It seems bad before YHWH that “the sons of wickedness continue to fill their father’s bag of sin. After four generations, the load is sufficient to justify their retribution”. Therefore, holiness becomes essential for a sustainable relationship.

Although this research appraises the Decalogue in two contexts, it presents the issue using social rhetorical analyses in the text. Miller (1990:76-77) pointed to God as being jealous, making claims to the expression of positive words and exclusiveness of the relationship. This form of covenantal relationship between Israel and God responds to obedience positively and negatively to disobedience as explained in the chapter three. Miller added that God punishes across generation but not further than four generations; he insinuates that if they repent God will forgive them and one agree to that. YHWH demands exclusive obedience and loyalty, for anyone who err and return to him, he will accept them and bless them. In agreement with this, God discipline his people for a short while, and show love for many generations. It is surprising how, Miller (2009:60) indicates that there is a restriction of divine punishment which no longer operates across generations. This restriction is thought to promote individual responsibility. This argument has been deliberated in chapter three and four, it will be good to note that God’s love is not conditioned on obedience. God loves you if you obey and blesses your generation, but it doesn’t mean he hates those who disregard him to please self. If one

goes wrong, the punishment for wrong doers is temporal, suggesting love in disguise, for discipline indicates you are still loved.

To this Pleins (2001:331) refers to the Decalogue as introducing instant punishment in form of divine retribution, where God visits the iniquities of the ancestors upon their descendants instantaneously. However, this is not the beginning of instant judgement - see Genesis 3-4, Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel. It is also right as Pleins affirms that the message of repentance is addressed through Ezekiel 18 and Jeremiah 31, to both corporate group and individuals in the land. This factor of immediacy allows the exiles to participate in the renewal process. Though Ezekiel and Jeremiah affirm to individual responsibility and deny the intergenerational curse or cross-generational punishment, it does not dissuade the co-existence of individual and corporate/collective responsibility in divine justice. Like Lamentation 5:7, our fathers sinned and are no more, but we must bear their guilt and shame. This is why Miller (2009:60) said it is disturbing to punish children for parent's iniquity, the reason being that only the guilty party should bear the shame and punishment. Presumably, he is alluding to individual responsibility, but affirmed to generational networking of consequences of sin. Miller affirm the principle of generational punishment as present in scriptural stories (II Samuel 17:10, I Kings 14:7-18, II Kings 9:7-9). To him it is not in all occasions that God punishes generations referring to Ezekiel 18 and Jeremiah 31:29-30. Apparently, this is regarded as the co-existence of the two, and the application of both responsibilities.

V. African Perspective

Africans count the family members to include the living and the dead; where the shame of the parents is placed upon the living, it affects the dead. Although ancestors do not sin, instead they are venerated like the divine representative of the family. In Nigerian and southern Kaduna cultures, the shame of wrong doing serves as a strong negative portrayal upon everyone who seeks for honourable life. This indicates the overlap⁴⁰² between original sin and intergenerational transmission of sin, in either ways there is a legacy of collective responsibility for a person's culpability. Turaki (2012:7) term sin as what the family or the community disallows. The meaning depends on the views of the people. This I regard as what

⁴⁰² Refer to chapter two on the survey of sin and original sin for more on how original sin relates to the context of sin of the fathers and ancestors in Africa. The portrayal of Adam serves as an ancestor and a father whose irresponsibility was transferred upon his future generation, just as parent's sin is transferable upon their progenies.

the family forbids that brings shame upon them. Although God is merciful in administering justice, in the same way, he disciplines the disobedient, with the intension of restoring them to fellowship. Hence individual and collective responsibility exist side by side with the other in making sure human being are responsible.

Even though the inheritance of culpability seems to be limited, God's vengeance lapses after the fourth generation. In contrast, the reward of virtue last almost a lifetime. He added that, the notion of transgenerational guilt is reinvented from the doctrine of original sin, and this time one regards as intergenerational sin and shame. Intergenerational sin in my opinion, lies continuously between generations, while transgenerational sin incorporates sin upon subsequent generations. Thus ideologically, Ezekiel 18:2 and Jeremiah 31:29-30 proposed the end of corporate responsibility and the beginning of individual responsibility as the rejection of hereditary guilt. Scholars are familiar with sin across generation in various nomenclature. Nonetheless, intergenerational transmission of sin goes hand in hand with shame in a community. Boda (2016:33) indicates that it provides a way for people to return to God individually and corporately when they are disciplined. The family and society where one belongs to, feel the shame more when there is a transgenerational or intergenerational transfer of sin or the transmission of guilt.

In order to concluded, there is an African theology of sin in most cultural setting which encompasses the collective opinion of what the community forbids. Kaminsky (1995:175) argues that Ezekiel found himself in a context that compelled him to give the audience a different view of the text on how God administer justice. This model of divine retributive justice and forgiveness is constructed to fit the needs of the moment. In broad and general terms, original sin has been compared to sin of the fathers in chapter two, while in chapters three (3.4.3) and four (4.5.3) the main text is appraised between the Decalogue. What has been neglected by most scholars is the relevance of the issue in terms of the African culture and its implication. Personally, one concurs with Miller (2009:60) who allude to transgenerational transfer of sin and accumulation of guilt. Propp (2006:172) pointed to transgenerational transmission of sin. This is what one interprets as, intergenerational transfer of curse, following these scholars above for the reason that it includes the dead and the living members of the family. The covenant is significant for corporate relationship and communal life in Africa, families support this theology. Sin of the fathers is not exclusive to the male partner but for all to exercise dignity and respect others. Witte, Jr. (2009:5) affirm that sin in this situation comprises both the father's and the mother's sin transferred upon the children. Such

inter-generational-transmission of sin serve as a memory to respect each other, to draw them back to YHWH and to help them to keep the covenant as well as remain holy before God. Respect and holiness in the presence of YHWH describes the inclusion of Church's ideology and relates to human dignity as taught in African Christian theology (see 2.4 and 2.5).

Majority of testimonies and remembrances indicates how families tell the good stories of their departed relation. They disconnect from commenting on suffering and shame in connection to their ancestors. The ancestor does not have a bad side in such occasions and no matter how the past of the parents, no one will remember or pronounce their derogatory stories. They are hidden to create a picture of respect for the living and self-worth of the family/clan. Our corporation is linked to our ancestors just as it is linked to their stories. Kaminsky (2001:127-128) maintains that corporate responsibility is truer to biblical tradition truer to the reality of human experiences, but it is oriented towards mercy and blessing not punishment and curse. He further said, the reality of our collective responsibility in family experience still exist. One agrees with him and further argue for the co-existence of both responsibilities in the society. This is important as we relate to each other and the rest of the community, that we remember the implication of our behaviour to others and the effect over our loved once. Corporate-ness might have been rejected by most people for reasons like Achan's family being killed for his sins (Joshua 7) or suffering for your parent's sin. Possibly, Ezekiel 18 and Jeremiah 31 were written to correct some aspect of corporate life and not to indicate the end. According to Boda (2016:28) one can see the influence of Deuteronomy in texts like Joshua 7:11, 15, 24:25, Judges 2:1, 20, I Kings 11:11, 19:10, 14, II Kings 11:7, 23:1-3. Deuteronomy 7:1-5 links the destruction of the Canaanites to the core values of exclusivity of worship. This explains the value of their corporate relationship.

Israel violated the existing agreement with their God, making the consequence to their transgression valid until the third and fourth generation; in the same way our fathers' misbehaviour in most African communities is believed to have great consequences upon their imminent generations. One can conclude that corruption (in Africa) may pile up future punishment upon generations, if we do not change (see chapter 1.5 footnote 12). The guilt/shame or honour/dignity of an African/Nigerian affects every relation in the family/clan according to communal life. The theology of "Sin of the Fathers upon the children" is regarded as significant in an African perception of ancestral misbehaviour. It is against this background that "sin of the fathers" causes the impediments to community development; this

supports the third hypotheses in 1.3. Gonzales (2012:385) pointed out that Moses' intension was to inspire his readers by the good examples of faith and obedience portrayed in the patriarchal stories. This is how southern Kaduna cultures call for positive examples, especially by parent to avoid sin of the fathers. Sin of the fathers could be defined as the violation of rights and their inability to meet the demands of their time, which then affects their children. Again this addresses the fourth hypotheses in 1.3 and answers the research question in 1.1. In other words, sin is an abuse of what is right and the adoption of what is wrong for a society. In southern Kaduna for instance, religion limits certain affiliations, like in politics or business, for the sake of dignity. Our parents' sin is believed to have affected the children when they fail to meet the community's expectation, within our context.

It may be contested in the "sour grapes" metaphors used by prophets Ezekiel 18:2 and Jeremiah 31:29, who referred implicitly to individual responsibility at some points during the Assyrian and Babylonian exile. Kaminsky (2001:323-324) observes that while they stress individual retribution in ancient Israel, this does not show corporate responsibility as being absolved in Israel's history. According to Duke (2015:361) the prophets emphasized individual responsibility, but did not rule out corporate responsibility and collective guilt. Kaminsky (2001:324) affirms that Ezekiel did not refer to the end of corporate responsibility, nor did he reject it. The community of brothers was incorporated in a single humanity. Therefore, whatever happens to the member of their family affects other members, since they lived together as one Israel; elected as an entity, their victory and success was collective like their liberation. Their sufferings, their wilderness experiences were a group's, and as a group they expected the Promised Land (their nation and their own king/leader). Even before and after the monarchy, they had shared and enjoyed corporate freedom. Kaminsky (2001:128) further explain that our individuality can better be understood in our relatedness to one another and to the various engagements on daily basis as human beings. Meaning, the individual is linked through the consequences that flow through each person's behaviour. This suggests the continuation of corporate responsibility. Thus collective engagements is what Africans refer to as communal living (Ubuntu, Zumunci or Nezit in Tyap in southern Kaduna). In this manner, communal life in African culture has been neglected, and little has been giving attention from neglected biblical texts as the Decalogue.

It is significant to note that, where most scholars are implicit one have chosen to be explicit in describing retributive justice. Personally, there is an indication of continuity of both responsibilities, since Ezekiel and Jeremiah did not clearly indicate the end of corporate

responsibility. Pleins (2001:330) noted that frequently Ezekiel 18 and Jeremiah 31 are read as a shift away from an ancient tradition of punishment meted out in terms of corporate responsibility, thereby indicating the beginning of Individual responsibility as the new alternative. He said “this distinction is misleading”. Individuals were held responsible for their actions (Exodus 21-23, Deuteronomy 12-26). He explains the shift as the immediate punishment upon the unjust as the opposed to transgenerational punishment. However, one is obvious that corporate responsibility did not end at some point, but that individual responsibility was emphasized much more than corporate as noted by Kaminsky. To this, one differs with Kaminsky by taking a stands for the co-existence of both responsibilities. This is neither a linear development nor dispensational practice, but the existence of the two, they are sboth applicable in dealing with divine retribution and human irresponsibility.

There hasn't been clarity as to end of corporate responsibility, and Africans can easily perceive corporate responsibility than individual responsibility for the communal life they live. Intergenerational transmission of sin is easily understood in most African cultures. This brings us to where I differ, that it is neither the beginning of immediate punishment nor the end of intergenerational transfer of discipline, discipline in the form of punishment but the continuation of both individual and corporate responsibilities. Corporate or collective responsibility has been practiced concurrently from the beginning with individual responsibility, and both are still co-existing side-by-side with the other. Responsibility is neither individual nor collective, this development indicates that God's punishment is individualistic at some points and in other cases, God punishes corporately. This is where I became explicit from what others have said in the past to indicate one's personal contribution to biblical research. Although it has been detailed in 5.3, this is essential to African research, especially in Southern Kaduna where communal life is still promoted, where collective responsibility is seriously adhered to in the form of collective shame and honour. Collective shame is disregarded highly and honour is appreciated, the reason being that ancestor venerated and everyone must work hard to be regarded.

Retribution in some African contexts is much more communal and corporate in nature. Collective responsibility agrees with the statement above which is what one considers as the significant way in which retribution is meted out in Africa. In order words, this research project suggests the idea of the evocation of generational retribution in certain African contexts. Although both individual and corporate responsibilities co-exist, most African

cultures accept the collective rather than the individual responsibility. Since most African communities are collectivistic, punishment for sin is inclined to become collective in nature. Collective or corporate responsibility is mainly for the well-being of communities, which is why one believes that YHWH disciplines those He loves. His discipline is to help human beings reconsider the dignity of one another.

5.4 Relevance of Research in African Context

“Sin of the fathers upon the children” is considered as a reflection of the exiles over their past and how the past inflicts pains and regret in their lives. It raises a challenge of relating the past to present and how a group is affected by the behaviour of its members, similar to the common African ideology, “I am, because we are, and if we are then I am”. Turaki (2012:19) adds, in traditional African community, there are clans and sub-clans, with networks of beliefs, behaviour, morality, ethics and ethnicity. These are significant structures in the process of socialization in brotherhood. This system is more powerful than any form of relationship; all are members share affinity and responsibility to the blood-community, like sin of the fathers upon the children. Perhaps certain scholars may disagree with this corporate perspective of “Sin of the Fathers upon their Children” as being applicable in modern times, but its relevance has been established in the third and fourth chapter, using Levinson’s principles of transgenerational punishment and Kaminsky’s perspective on corporate responsibility. Miller calls it transgenerational transmission of sin.

Sin is perceived as corporate in the African context, though people fear the shame and guilt much more than its punishment. Corporate responsibility is appreciated as having great consequences that could affect many people. On this note one can make the following remarks:

- a. Sin has power which influences both individual and group, it tends to confront as well as keep the wrongdoer(s) in constant bondage.
- b. Sin comes with consequences that leave a scar on the perpetrator even after they are forgiven or reconciled.
- c. Sin leaves behind feelings of guilt that remind the wrong-doer of the misdeed, in the form of shame.
- d. Sin is doing the forbidden or being disobedient to the community, as an act of being lawless and living without dignity toward the benovolent society.

- e. Sin is an infringement of other people's right, their happiness as well as their blessings.
- f. Sin encourages corruption and ends up destroying the perpetrators.

Although people complain of corruption and mismanagement in Africa, it has affected all. Most African leaders fuel corruption by allowing the influence of power and the need for prestige and protection to take the lead in their lives. Recently, they are referred to as “comrade” and “honourable”, who are supposed to uphold their constitutions and portrays good examples, but on the contrary they tend to twist the constitution to their favour, unlike Western leaders whose corruption is hidden in the way they uphold their constitutions. Israel had a covenant to uphold, it remains with them to show fidelity.

In the context of making a covenant, most African practices shows that ancestral treaties and pledges are made by parents (grand or great grand-parent) which are to be sustained through a continual offering of sacrifices. The text of “sin of the fathers upon the children” can easily be understood in this context, where the father failed and transgressed before their gods, and incurred penalties. Their penalty is transferred upon their children as a way of punishment or discipline. It is similar to the covenant that stipulated their God would give them protection and open doors in families, clans or tribes, as in Africa. This is the philosophy that should have made most African societies law-abiding citizens, rather than imitating Western superior law systems to manage a society.

Though the present generation might have forsaken those gods or idols, it is believed that certain ancestral curses⁴⁰³ still linger. It now affects them as a result of their failure to maintain the ancestral offerings or sacrifices and the valueless worship⁴⁰⁴ like in certain

⁴⁰³“Demonic Sites” are sites where people go to receive from and give to their ancestors through idols/gods. Sometimes they are regarded as heritage sites, where people showcase their culture to tourists. People goes there with certain sacrifices or requests, depending on the condition of their relationship, For instance, someone could desire to be wealthy, intelligent in school, to be famous or become a ruler of people. People may visit such sites to consult certain herbalists or traditional doctors. It may start with parents and later the children maintain the practice and pass it on. These examples are not just found only in Nigeria; this research used the snow ball method of sampling from different people within the university community, to locate such practices. Apart from this, there were various stories from friends and colleagues in the university community, such as a conversation with Dr Ntozakhe Cezula in the Faculty of Theology, Stellenbosch University which confirmed the Xhosa stories. Richard Bwala, a PhD student at the Science Faculty, Stellenbosch University gave the mountain version. Irene and Diffa, PhD students of Agriculture from Ghana narrated the version of refusal to marry; this information was gathered between 25th and 29th October, 2015 in the Stellenbosch University community in South Africa. In the case of “Premature Death” at a specific age in the family, that is when people die at a young age without having achieved anything, their parent are blamed, or even killed.

⁴⁰⁴ The advent of Christianity and the missionary revolution have led to the new paradigm of “no idols” and the concept of “the worthlessness of these gods”. African Traditional Religion has now been regarded as an inferior religion compared to the superior white Christian religion. Most people do not believe in ancestral curse nor the

South African cultural practices among the Xhosas and Zulus. They observe annual sacrifices to the gods to keep the relationship and enjoy protection like most Africans do. Transgenerational “curses” or “blessings” in Africa could be social, economic, political, theological or religious and health-related issues.

5.4.1 Social Relevance: Ancestors/Living Dead as Family

Ancestors are members of the family who are not just dead and gone or forgotten. They are living and contributing to family development and protection. They are dead, yet continue to be present as “good spirits” due to the good life they lived. Note that there is never a bad ancestor by definition, for ancestors do not sin. What qualifies ancestors is the good life they lived. Orobator (2009:114) considers an ancestor as a relation of the living. The living community too regards an ancestor as a departed relative who resides in close proximity to the supreme God. In other words, they are dead, but have come back as an invisible part of the family. The influence of an ancestor depends on how good they were while they were alive. Likewise, their presence is felt based on their past relationship. Ancestors⁴⁰⁵ are living dead members of the family. They live and celebrate their joy and share in their pain as a family. In like manner, they guide their relatives from danger and assist them towards better choices. Turaki (2012:19) affirms that people are not individuals or independent, they are part of a community and relate as interdependent family. No one claims personal right or freedom alone and none fulfils his/her obligations and duties single-handedly.

Time distinguishes an ancestor; and with time older people disappear in death but their behaviour determines the space they keep for their loved ones, for in a short while they reappear in the family without physical bodies and continue living with them. Thorpe (1991:95) mentions the Yoruba’s of western Nigeria, who believe that at death a person enters the invisible spirit realm and becomes a living-dead. Not all dead people enjoy such elevation or recognition as ancestors. Though the departed exchange the present for another life, this is similar to the Tyap cultural belief as well as that of their neighbours in southern

transfer of punishment due upon the culprit’s progeny. However, it does not erase the point that sin has effects upon the sinner or other relatives. The point here is, sin or unfaithfulness has consequences, and humankind must learn to respect God and dignify all creatures in the society.

⁴⁰⁵ According to Mbiti (1975:44) prayers to the living dead goes thus, “O good and innocent dead, hear us: hear us, you guiding, all-knowing ancestors, you are neither blind nor deaf to this life we live: you did yourselves once share it. Help us therefore for the sake of our devotion, and for our good.” Such kinds of prayers are the issues that sustain the belief in ancestors and spirits. To an extent, one sees a certain level of connection between the extreme emphasis of spirits among the Pentecostals and the African traditional beliefs.

Kaduna, that the dead have only translated⁴⁰⁶ their dwelling place. Among Orobator's (2009:75) definitions of ancestors one thing stands out which relates to human dignity, viz. that in order to be promoted to a living ancestor⁴⁰⁷, the person must have lived a distinguished life among his/her people. Turaki (2012:20), a Gwong speaker from southern Kaduna, confirms that being in the community is not only related to the living but also to the spirit world. The community of the ancestors now lives in the past and includes the unborn. The living dead protect, maintain and control the community of the living from their realm. Hence, being a good ancestor among the Tyap and their neighbours in southern Kaduna is a great honour/dignity to community.

Time is measured by focusing on the past and the present but not on the future, like in the Western perception; Africans do not consider the future. Instead, the past is considered as what matters, because it helps people to know how to live in their present space; the Creator alone knows the future. The way and manner of life in the past explains dignity and proper relationships. Mbiti (1971:24-25) reflects on time as the composition of events that have taken place in Africa, not as an academic concern. He describes two views, the "long past" and "a dynamic present". What has not taken place (future) has no place, and as such is irrelevant to human existence. The future is vague; events that have not taken place cannot constitute time. The future is not determined for it has not been realized. Moreau (1998:307) accepts Mbiti's ideology of time as a long past and a dynamic present. What happens is done without consideration of what is yet to come. The belief is, "let tomorrow take care of itself"; and some believe that only God knows the future, so leave it for God. Experience determines how Africans coordinate religion, social life, politics and economy. In the cultural orientation among Tyap and their neighbours of Southern Kaduna people look backward, without presuming what is yet to happen. This is how social life and daily human interaction is determined. However, there are other images and representations that pointed to certain

⁴⁰⁶ In July 1997, my father Elder Bulus Takore went to be with the Lord. He was a good father, a hardworking farmer who lived a good life among the Church elders and was respected in our immediate local community. He founded prayer houses and led the mother Church. As a former military chaplain, who later worked as a civil servant in the bad old days, he remained faithful in his duty. One might say, "An ancestor has gone before", but I can also say in this context that I see him close to me, especially where help comes just on time. Unfortunately, as a believer in Christ, my praying mother at home, in Nigeria, who is living and still serving God, should take the credit of the intercessor.

⁴⁰⁷ Orobator states that life was not just easy in the hereafter-death; in many instances people who died have tried through an ordeal to join the living dead community, like crossing a river or climbing a mountain. The other side of it is that relatives of the departed could make offerings of various kinds to assist their beloved ancestor at the final point. They make good wishes, offerings in monetary terms, to settle for any obstacle on the process of crossing/climbing, visit their resting place or rewrapping the dead body, as well as honouring their memory by celebrating in communion with them. Yet one feels such devotions are not religiously/Christianly compliant for believer in Christ.

patterns⁴⁰⁸ of family illness and cursed marriages in forbidden families in Africa, which depends on past relationship to ancestors and community life.

5.4.2 Political Relevance: Colonialism and Coloniality

There are two sides to the legacies of Colonialism⁴⁰⁹: on one hand it left a positive mark of development while on the other hand, it left a mark of corruption in the society that is being transferred upon the generations. The failure of our fathers to be law-abiding has caused great setbacks to the structures of our society (Nigeria), leading to the present chaotic constitutional situation of the society. Colonialism and coloniality first left us with “Constitutional and Judicial Challenges”, such as the “Immunity Clause” in Nigeria. Constitutionally it protects corrupt politicians in office to perpetuate their abusive practices. It has not allowed the rule of law to be implemented properly. The wrong of the past is now transferred upon other generations. The colonialists indirectly created a “transgenerational trademark,” as the second problem that separates the superior from the inferior classes in terms of literacy or wealth. Superiority comes with the assumption that you need to be and act like Western people to be

⁴⁰⁸(a) *Pattern of Family Illness*: Refer to experiences where family members undergo mental illness at a certain age and then disappear after some years, never to come again. It becomes a pattern within the family as a result of parents or great-grand parent who failed to offer certain ritual sacrifices to the village gods. Although there are curses, it becomes hereditary. A relation for instance experience seasonal madness; he is healthy in summer, in winter he becomes mad⁴⁰⁸, and this had been happening for more than ten years now. The reason is attributed to ancestral causes and curses. Some believe that the leaders of the community could decide to inflict madness as a punishment upon the family until they offer sacrifices for cleansing of the past, like the annual Xhosa and Zulu sacrifices offered at a certain age by all in the family, clan or tribe. Failure to do so attracts curses upon the family, not just the individual involved. (b) *Cursed Marriages in Forbidden Families*: In this situation, it is forbidden to get married from certain families. People are forbidden to pick a husband or wife from certain families as a result of inter-generational curses, possibly from their grand/great grand-parent’s association in witchcraft or idolatry (they are *osu* in Igbo). Perhaps they were committed initially, but later failed the gods, which then lead to the curse. Not even from the whole village would anyone be permitted to marry someone from such families. In the same way, the cursed family must look for suitor outside their village to marry. At times this is believed to be a way of serving punishment in the form of discipline from the gods in Africa. This category includes the slaves and outcast; any association with them transfers their shame and puts you in their category. People are afraid to break the laws of the gods; the same way they are afraid of cursed families.

⁴⁰⁹There are still traces of colonial prevalence after about 55 years of independence; all over Africa you still see the marks of colonial slave experiences. The backward economic situations of most African countries started with their colonial parents or great grandparents who took over leadership after their independence from the colonialists, most of which took place in the 1950s to 1960s (like Nigeria in 1st October 1960). These leaders are mostly celebrated as founding fathers and heroes of yesterday. The same leaders could not maintain the development processes of the colonizers, hence failed their nations and children. Their sins were transferred upon their children and are now affecting their later generations and the nation at large. The same leaders of yesterday did not go for hospital treatments in their own countries, instead they were flown abroad. They couldn’t fix the facilities and amenities of their nations. In most African countries, due to the lack of proper health facilities, today’s leaders also travel abroad for medical check-ups. Nigerian society is blessed with large untapped natural and human resources, but they are poorer than many. The selfishness that is perpetrated by our leaders in stealing national resources runs in the veins of the children as well, which is why we cannot define sin of the fathers only in the past, instead the children do even worse than their parents. The lament will be for the future generation.

considered civilized. Many years after colonization, the effect of colonialism is felt (coloniality), in structures like master-servant or parents-child relationships, or in the form of the responsible versus the irresponsible. You must have certain skills to present to the “superior” colonizer to be accepted, like language, dress and other social appearances. This re-establishes dependency and other trends of modernization in our infrastructure and social amenities.

Down the line 30–50 years later, the adoption of new forms of colonization have caused certain people to be regarded as superior, even among the locals. Thus the third issue became degenerate among the local cultures through the misinterpretation of local African cultures, seeing them as “inferior African cultures”. Thus the “African sin” is that of inferiority, in comparison to the Western ideologies that are passed on trans-generationally through a superior-to-inferior relationship. It ascribes superior dignity to Western conventions. . It has become normal to tag anyone who lags behind in the country, as lazy, not hardworking and not having a direction in life. Turaki (2012:9) says down the line we want to move towards living in accordance with biblical tenets in the midst of African cultures. We are not certain which way to go because we do not know the right direction. We do not know where and we cannot follow the directions set by people of another tradition, who do not know how we began because they started from a different place than we did. Our directions may not be the same as theirs, the knowledge of the African terrain is what we need to understand, without which one feels the Africans will not perceive human dignity. Instead, we will end up imitating the Westerners and never be ourselves.

Colonial structures help to preserve the history of the people and points out to people how much they have learnt, from where they started. Colonialism left various challenges for African Christianity, and challenged African traditional kinship and communal values, yet they could not transform our context. Turaki (2012:9) explains that unless we know what we need in order to transform our context, we cannot make progress in the transformation process. We must understand the people we wish to transform. The whole blame of African backwardness and underdevelopment may not be caused by our colonial masters, though they served as catalyst for our growth, since they were more exposed and had better opportunities. The problem is now the superiority of the West versus the inferiority of the colonized. The colonizers have taught our parents to steal from the natural resources instead of using it for the nation, they amass and accumulate for themselves. Genesis 1:28 says, we are to take care

of the earth as good stewards of God's possessions, using the wisdom God gave us to make the earth a better place for all humanity. Israel is expected to live according to their law but our democracy is not observing the "rule of law", where everyone is subject to the law. It has not helped its citizen, nor organized for citizens to exercise the rights embedded in the constitution.

This leads us to the next issue, viz. the abuse of power as the main reason why Boko Haram has not been defeated by the nation. Their abuse of power by law has made many things dysfunctional in the society, since their activities favour the superior groups. It was the Shagari style⁴¹⁰ of governance or democracy which instead of being helpful caused religious consciousness, division and geopolitical zoning in the interest of the politics of representing the rich class and the West. More so, Miller (2009a:57) observed the politics behind the story of Israel, has similarities in the construction, carving or building the images of the kings who rule. It relates between the proliferated images of kings and those of their ancient Near Eastern rulers. The king was not just a human ruler but to an extent a representative of God on earth, as God rules in heaven while kings rule on earth. They had kingdoms that extended over vast distances just as God's kingdom is beyond human measurement. This relates the authority of the king to the supreme authority from the Creator as their ruler. In the end we inherit curses for the sins of our leaders.

5.4.3 Theological Relevance: Inter-Generational Curse

Ancestors in Africa are venerated like divine beings for their role in the family, which allows the family to be comfortable and protected. They are never related to bad acts or curses, but to good deeds and blessings, and in that capacity they contribute to the good course of their society. However, there are curses that emanate from the bad behaviour of the fathers (like sin of the fathers), which indicates ancestral curses. Just as there are there are good ancestors, there could conceivably be cursed ancestors, through whom generational curses are introduced, but their bad behaviour is often hidden and denied. Similarly, humankind ought to remain productive, but ancestral sin/disobedience has resulted in inter-generational curse. This has made ancestral curse a theme related to inter-generational curses in African societies such as Nigeria. Perhaps cursed ancestors bring about cursed marriages and cursed families,

⁴¹⁰ The Shagari style is a reference to one of Nigeria's earliest democratic leaders who attempted to stabilize the country. Shagari is one of Nigeria's former presidents, about whom it is said that his rule pioneered our current democracy, although Nnamdi Azikiwe and Ahmadu Bello ruled before him as civilian presidents who took over from the colonialists. Perhaps they also contributed to the present confusion, but it was during Shagari's regime, just before the 35 years of northern military dictatorship that things fell apart and corruption crept in drastically.

spreading recurring shame, corruption and the frequent sin to the generations. Significantly, the guilt does not erase a person from being in God's image nor delete one from being part of the family/clan. Guilt is now a burden inherited from parents, which is transferred unto the future generations. The Sabbath appears as the clarification and way out, provided by God to deliver his people from this bondage.

The ideology of the Sabbath motivation has no doubt raised theological issues with regards to causality. Although the study was not based on canonical sequence but on historical context, it must be borne in mind that Deuteronomy 5 is older than Exodus 20. Notably, the former appears from late pre-exile to exile while the latter comes during the late exile until the post-exilic era. The post-exilic era was the period prior to the second Temple restoration, when certain religious practices of holiness were revived. During the exile the Sabbath was maintained, but what had been observed on a specific day and time of the week, became more organized in the confines of the Temple, becoming a Sabbath for all creation, based on the motivation and no longer based on the exodus of the Israelites. This motivation has opened doors for new perspectives of understanding the texts. The Sabbath is no longer celebrated outside, but inside a building, in the sacred holy place of the Temple of God. There were no sacred Temples, but sacred times which were observed as Sabbath, but now there was a sacred time and a sacred Temple. The seventh day is no longer the physical space but the spiritual space with the same priests. What was reserved for Israelite worshippers is now available for all believers, including Africans.

There was no reason to destroy the old Sabbath, but a change in form and centre of worship took place. The Temple became the dwelling place of God, built for cultic and spiritual purposes after the exile, but the Sabbath was maintained as holy. This gave room for all who believe in God, to worship, and has opened the doors for the Christian era and the growth of the Church. To this end, both Sabbath days continued from Deuteronomy (exile) and was reconstructed in the Exodus (post-exile). The priests taught obedience not just to God but also to the emperor, thereby ensuring that the priest could retain his relationship with the emperor. During the Sabbath, they received further support that kept them organized, viz., certain kings' palaces had Temple courts. This new theology of Sabbath contextualization supported what YHWH required from his people. Likewise, what had been a marker of Israelite identity became a symbol of believers' commitment with God. This has opened doors for the Gospel and the church to penetrate places like Africa. The growth of the Church in Africa indicates

that the majority of Christianity in the world comes from Africa, and that with time they have to salvage Europe and America with the Gospel. Therefore, the guilty whose sins affects generations, could now end the further spread of sin through the Sabbath.

Intergenerational curse could be inherited as the consequence of the wrong conduct of parents, like disobeying the ancestors. Similarly, Olupona (2014:28) confirms that neglecting the ancestors in one's lineage could result in punishment and misfortune such as illness or death. Cultic offerings are made for sustenance of the lineage and in expectation of other blessings. Hence when Africans suffer various setbacks, it could be a reminder to remain faithful. This curse is a form of judgement passed upon parents to children and across their descendants. God disciplines a sinner to deliver them from their guilt, not as a form of rejection. The theology of faithfulness is to restore blessings.

5.5 Further Suggestions for Studies

Although the Decalogue has been studied in various ways, this study attempted to explain how the emphasis on "sin of the fathers" in the Decalogue can help an African to understand the persistent human corruption and prevalence of sin in society. In the past, such passages have been neglected for African research, like the African Bible commentary keeps silent about it. Perhaps most scholars feel that corporate responsibility is no longer an issue of research, or its relevance is degraded. This research is pertinently significant for scholars, to focus on areas of the Scripture that are mostly neglected when doing human dignity studies in Africa. In this case, just as "sin of the fathers" in the Decalogue is used for research, that is how the "sour grapes" in the prophets Ezekiel 18 and Jeremiah 29 can help in interpreting the persistence of sin in Africa. This can be promoted by focusing on various institutions like health and economy in African society to affect the culture of human dignity and to encourage modern development. Science and other fields could look further into the health and economic relevance of sin in the society.

I. Health Relevance: Inherited Diseases and Stigmatization⁴¹¹

Certain genetic diseases can be transgenerational or hereditary, such as what parents transfer upon their innocent children. The question is, in what ways do people respond to genetic deficiencies and health hazards? In most cases it follows the bloodlines of those involved. In terms of disease and illnesses, children link their suffering to their parents. It may be true that parents with HIV/AIDS leave various stigma upon their children. God allows new-born to be infected by the mistake of their parents. The society sees the parents' promiscuity and their shame as a scar upon their children. People limit exposure to such sick children as a result of their illness/disease⁴¹². This is stigmatization, and manifests in customs like nicknaming, songs of sarcasm or derogatory and mocking speech, and links the parents' shame to their progeny. A society recognizes the mark of shame and disgrace more than the marks of honour and respect, due to the sensitivity of generational stigma. Certain hereditary diseases like *dementia*⁴¹³ could be transferred to generations of the family. These kinds of trends indicate the reality of intergenerational transfer of curse/disease.

⁴¹¹ It does not have a one way meaning, (Grom 2008:201) but stems from the desire for validation, to which end many people have inflicted wounds upon themselves. In this sense, supernatural causes cannot be denied. In Modl's (2012:284) words, Paul used the term in the New Testament for the visible mark left by affliction (stoned, whipped, shipwrecked etc.). Then it became a synonym for a scar on the body, a visible mark which also has an invisible nature/function, felt as stigma. Stigmas like tattoo marks are mentioned in the Old Testament (Exodus 13:16, Leviticus 19:28, Isaiah 44:5, Ezekiel 9:4). The wounds of Christ on the cross were also regarded as stigmata symbolizing the cross suffering.

⁴¹² In this regard, Katongole (2005:29) says as an extremist view among conservatives, HIV/AIDS is seen as God's punishment or discipline on the society member who fail to obey and live by God's will in regards to sex and marriage in Africa. It shows that God's hatred toward sin has led to various kinds of punishments. He uses illnesses like plagues to discipline those that disobey, and the obedient prosper.

⁴¹³ A chronic mental disorder from brain disease or injury, marked by the loss of memory and impaired reasoning. Accessed online on www.google.com on 11th November, 2015 at about 4:51pm. Others may include: (a) Cancer (mostly deadly but could be controlled if dictated early); (b) Sickle cell anaemia (there is certainty that it may be passed from parents to children); (c) Dementia; (d) Dwarfism (a condition of stunted growth); (e) Haemophilia (the lack of clotting factor in the blood which leads to continuous bleeding and eventual death if not controlled); (f) Tuberculosis has the same tendency of transfer from mother to child, not through blood medium this time. By nursing the child, the mother might transfer the virus to the innocent child. (g) Diabetic parent with such family history possess the tendencies to transfer the disease to her child. Some of this might continue or reappear after some years on another person within the family. Other similar transgenerational illnesses include bipolar dysfunction or schizophrenia (a mental disorder) and others.

II. Economic Relevance: Nepotism and Inherited Corruption⁴¹⁴

The economic growth of most African societies is affected by various factors. In Nigeria for instance, the community has long been divided along the lines of religion, politics, and nepotism. Recently these factor have hampered economic growth and corporate. Corporate life is fading away gradually, and giving way to all manner of individual misappropriations of governance due to “the sins of our fathers”. God values what he made as “the crown of God’s creation” (Genesis 1:28-30, Psalm 8:4-5). We ought to be economically productive, to create

-
- a. ⁴¹⁴First, although, the society has been dominated by masculine voices in culture, in tradition, in religion and in politics, in economic and judicial matters, all serving to promote patriarchy, and enforcing the picture of fathers’ sins – this may be the reason the text refers to “sin of the fathers” in the Decalogue. All the same, it does not leave the women outside the boundaries of matriarchal sins/corruption; women have shown their support and involvement in dishonest activities in Africa/Nigeria. Corruption at some points is believed to be in the veins and blood of people (at birth), indicating a transfer of corruption across generations.
 - b. Second, these forms of corrupt activities of the fathers have led to the loss labour force in Africa/Nigeria. Since they have no sense for nation building, young people are being forced to migrate abroad in search of better jobs, because the highly placed are either keeping the office for their unborn children to inherit or waiting to be bribed to employ qualified young people. They create space for their immediate offspring or people of their religion to occupy, not based on national merit.
 - c. Third, religion and politics have divided humanity right from the past. People are represented by zones, so that for any available job people are employed according to the place they represent. Although it may look good, it promotes personal interest and a representation of those that brought you there for the job. Despite the fact that the world is talking about inclusivity, equality and gender balance in positions of responsibilities in the society, this issue is addressed religiously and politically.
 - d. Fourth is the issue of personal businesses in the form of inherited Churches for family enrichment, and financial accumulation instead of going into the whole world to preach the Gospel. Every roadside-trained pastor, mostly among the Pentecostal churches, wants to open his own church and make his name known. To an extent, the corruption has taken people to the point of praying through the names of their head pastor, as a channel of reaching God. Most of these churches are inherited either by wives of the pastors or the children of the head pastor, since it is registered as a family non-profit organization. Reason for such include the lack of trust in other pastors, or the fear of delegation and the continuity of family affairs.
 - e. The fifth is ideology of inherited corruption, which has created a deep hole from parents to children, in the sense that NGO’s and certain Church related NGO’s are not working on ground. They mostly give reports, without having been there to see what is happening, yet they report and collect support for such works.
 - f. Sixth are “Crisis Related Migrations” where people are leaving the country for other places due to the fear of being persecuted. It has been the norm to travel abroad, a custom which was inherited from the past generation, where people travelled out in search of greener pastures, not because they were being persecuted. They learned this from their fathers and will transfer it to their children. The belief is that there is poverty at home while opportunities lie abroad. If they travel out, they are expected home only as wealthy people, or be shamed on their return. The atrocities are numerous that some travel out and post the visa to their loved ones to join them; some visit places and disappear just for the craving of getting rich. On the other side those leaving tend to exaggerate their experiences. In some instances, the craving for material riches and financial gain has made many prefer to be abroad. When their expectations are not met they end up stealing, selling drugs or going into cybercrimes, because they have to “get rich quick” and be like others (like Western civilized people). Never can you go back as poor as you left the community, else the shame may kill you and be a serious stigma upon your family. Another side to this is Western colonization is that most people who leave Nigeria and some Africa countries to take asylum (in Europe and America), come from the non-crisis zones of the country. They lie for instance in the name of Boko Haram when they are not even nearly affected, and enter the Church to testify their achievements. The level of corruption has grown deeper and wider even to including the church. The “sins of our father” are numerous in our context, we are not even talking about reasons people kidnap others as business, female national and international prostitution, child trafficking, oil pipeline stealing, and other dubious related crimes that happens underground.

value for humanity and uphold our coexistence. In like manner, Israel lived corporately and valued every member of their society, like most African communities. In the second commandment, there are certain economic dimensions in the production of images/gods/idols⁴¹⁵. It includes the refining of gold, silver and other materials used for decoration, to create beauty and to attract the people to serve them. One believes not only were such cultic objects worshipped, they were also produced for commercial purposes. Thus in divine jealousy YHWH reminds them “I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers”. It indicates the significance of the first commandment in the second commandment. This explains further, that the fathers strayed⁴¹⁶ after their redemption from Egypt. They made their Deliverer exercise humanlike emotions and resentment as jealousy. YHWH covets exclusive glory for inter-generational blessings, as opposed to inter-generational curses which last for only three to four generations. “Sin of the fathers” serves as the focal point for understanding the economy of the Decalogue, both in priestly and covenant contexts. Israel wasn’t an individualistic community, but brothers who lived a corporate life and had corporate blessing.

Further Old Testament research could be encouraged on “the perception of the future and time in African theological/biblical research.” It is important to note that:

- a. The theme of sin of the fathers is not applicable only to the Nigerian and West African setting, but to other parts of Africa as well, especially where ancestral theology is still prevalent. Intergenerational sin is not just an African issue because it is traceable in third world contexts and other parts of the world.
- b. Studies on life after death as the existence of ancestors could be interrelated with the African ideology of time, investment and the future of humanity.
- c. The tradition of honour and shame in African contexts could encourage the right behaviour and common humanity as it is applicable to other parts of the world.
- d. Although sin of the fathers implies corporate responsibility, other text like Ezekiel 18:2 and Jeremiah 31:29 may apply to individual responsibility. Perhaps such areas will clarify human responsibility in modern African research.

⁴¹⁵See Miller (2009a:56).

⁴¹⁶These encounters of our fathers led to other modern issues that became enormous for our African leaders, who couldn’t solve them. We are now affected by parental misdeeds in the Southern Kaduna context: there was corruption from their lack of accountability to government funds. The inheritance for their children is illiteracy without understanding the significance of education; idolatry, social injustice by the elites and the upper class like in Amos’s days.

- e. Although most interpreters have failed to include the sustainability of the animal and plant kingdoms, it is essential for Africa to evaluate its behaviour toward these creatures. The future of animals has been tampered with right from our ancestors through hunting for economic purposes. Their survival (ecosystem) is significant for human existence.
- f. This research has opened doors in areas of African development, African sustainability studies, the evaluation of African servant-leadership, inter-religiosity and human Social Corporation in terms of migration and integration. Others fields of social sciences could use this idea to see the reasons for the backwardness in Africa from sin of the fathers.

This work invites scholars to evaluate further how corporate and individual responsibility co-existed side by side all along as part of human responsibility. It is important to see how “original sin” (Genesis 1-3) relates to “sin of the fathers upon the children” in the Decalogue, and how these function as significant factors for comprehending human dignity. Hence the sin of an individual has adversely affects relationships to his/her corporate group, like inherited corruption. Although causality has been the watchword in the theology of cause and effect, it no longer works in all situations. Retribution is in some case individualistic while in others it is corporate. The major solution to inherited corruption is the need for servant-leadership and servant-followership, especially in modern African societies. Servants-leaders who will fear God will serve the people. Those are the leaders who will serve and consider nation building, its great citizenship as well as the honour of their land, thus striving for the well-being of the human society. In the future one might venture to engage the context of the “sour grapes” in the prophets, similar to the “sin of the fathers” for the advancement of human dignity research.

Bibliography

- Aasgaard, R. 2006. "Brother, Brotherhood" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (NIDB) (Me-R)*. Vol.4. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 505-507.
- Aaron, D.H. 2006. *Etched in Stone: The Emergence of the Decalogue*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Abe, G.O. 2013. "Berith: Old Testament Divine Covenant of Yahweh's Faithfulness vis-à-vis Human Covenant Unfaithfulness" in *BJASS* Vol.15/1: 29-41.
- Adamo, D.T. 2005. *Africa and Africans in the Old Testament*. Benin City, Nigeria: Justice Jeco Press and Publishers Ltd.
- _____, 2015a. "What is African Biblical Hermeneutics?" in *black theology*, Vol. 13/1, April, 59–72.
- _____, 2015b. "The Task and Distinctiveness of African Biblical Hermeneutic(s)" in *OTE* 28/1: 31-52.
- _____, 2015c. "The Burning Bush: An Ecological Sin? An African Reading of Exodus 3:1-3" in *Theologia Viatorum: Journal of Theology and Religion in Africa* 39/1:1-29.
- Albertz, R. 2009. "Social History of Ancient Israel" in H.G.M. Harrison (ed.) *Understanding the History of Ancient Israel*. Oxford: The British Academy, 349-367.
- Allen, L. and Laniak T. 2003. *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther (NIBC)*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers Inc.
- Amit, Y. 2009. "Narrative Literature" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB (Me-R)*. Vol. 4. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 223-225.
- Anderson G.A. (1955) 2009. *Sin: A History*. New Heaven and London: Yale University Press.
- Andrews, J.A. 2011. "Original Sin and the Scandalous Nature of Existence" in *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 5/2: 231-250.

- Appiah-Kubi, K. 1987. "Christology" in John Parratt (ed.). *A Reader in African Theology*. Marylebone, London: SPCK, 69-81.
- Aquinas, T. 1945. 1945. *Basic Writing of Saint Thomas Aquinas*. Vol. 1 & Vol. 2, edited and annotated by Autum C. Pegis. New York: Random House.
- _____, 1952 (1941) *Summa Theologica of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (Great Book of the Western World). Vol. II/20, (Editor in Chief) Robert Maynard Hutchins. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Revised by Daniel J. Sullivan. Chicago: William Benton Publishers.
- Armerding, C.E. 1983. "Israel" in E.M. Blaiklock and R.K. Harrison (ed.) *NIDBA*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 254.
- Ashdown, S. 2015. "A Cognitive Semantic Approach to Redeemer (Geol) in Deutero-Isaiah" in *Acta Theologica*. Jaargang 35/1, June: 5-31.
- Attridge, H.W. 2009. "Sin, Sinner" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB*. Vol.5, (S-Z) Nashville: Abingdon, 263-279.
- Augustine, St. A. 1962. *The City of God*. Vol. 1 & 2, Translated by John Healey, edited by RVG Tasker. London: Deut. & Sons Ltd.
- Avery-Peck, A.J. 1992. "Oral Tradition, Early Judaism" in David Noel Freedman (ed.) *AB* Vol. 5. (O-Sh) New York: Doubleday, 34-37.
- Avioz, M. 2013. "Divine Intervention and Human Error in the Absalom Narrative" in *Journal for the Study of Old Testament*. Vol, 37/3: 339-347.
- Bailey, L.R. 2005. *Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary, Leviticus and Numbers*. Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys Pub. Inc.
- Barton, J. 2002. *Ethics and the Old Testament*. St. Albans Place: SCM Press.
- Bediako, K. 1992. *Theology and Identity: The Impact of Culture upon Christian thought in the Second Century and in Modern Africa*. California: Regnum Books.
- _____, 1995. *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion*. New York: Orbis Books, 73.

- Bellinger, Jr. W.H. 2009. "Zion" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB (S-Z)*. Vol. 5. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 985-986.
- Bender-Junker, B. 2008. "Utopia" in Erwin Fahlbusch et al. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.5. (Si-Z) Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans. 653-655.
- Bendor, S. 1996. *The Social Structure of Ancient Israel: JBL Vol.7*. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd.
- Berman J.2014. "The Making of the Sin of Achan Joshua 7" in *Biblical Interpretation 22*: 115-131.
- Biddle, M.E. 2003. *S&H Bible Commentary: Deuteronomy*. Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys Pub. Inc.
- _____, 2005. *Missing the Mark: Sin and Its Consequences in Biblical Theology*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Birch, B.C. 1997. *Hosea, Joel and Amos*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Blenkinsopp, J. 1997. "Family in First Temple Israel" in Leo G. Perdue et al (eds.) *Families in Ancient Israel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- _____, 2003. *Isaiah 56-66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday.
- Block, D.L. 1997. *The Book of Ezekiel 1-24*. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Pub.
- Boda, M.J. 2016. "Prophets" in Keith L. Johnson and David Lauber (eds.) *T&T Clark Companion of the Doctrine of Sin*. London and New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 27-43.
- Bosman, H.L. 1997. "שַׁבָּת Sabbath" in W.A. VanGemeren (G.ed.) *NIDOTTE Vol.4*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1157-1162.
- _____, 2013. "Psalm 114 as Reinterpretation of the Exodus During and After the Exile". *OTE 26/3*: 559-582.

- _____, 2014. "Exile and Restoration" in Robert L. Browley (G,Ed.) *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Ethics*. Vol.1, (Abo-Lyi). New York: Oxford University Press, 243-251.
- _____, 2015. "The Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies in Africa" in Magne S. (ed.). *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Interpretation*. Vol. III, Bristol: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 253-268.
- Bottingheimer, C. 2011. "Original Sin: Catholic Theology" in Hans D.B. *et al.* (ed.) *RPP Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol. ix (Nat-Pes), 381.
- Breneman, M. 1993. *Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther (NAC)*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers.
- Brettler, M.Z. 2008. "King, Kingship" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB* (I-Ma). Vol.3. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 504-512.
- Brischofberger, O. 2007. "Conversion" in Hans Dieter Betz *et al.* (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.3. (Chu-Deu)Leiden: Brill, 469-470.
- Brown, W.P. (ed.) 2007. *The Ten Commandments: A Reciprocity of Faithfulness*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Brown, M.L. 1997. "Lamentation: Theology of" in W.A. VanGemeren (G,ed.) *NIDOTTE* Vol.4, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 884-893.
- Brueggemann, W. 1991. *Jeremiah 26-52 (To Build and To Plant): ITC*. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Pub.
- _____, 1998. *Isaiah 1-39*. Vol.1. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- _____, 2000. *I & II Kings Smyth and Helwys Bible Commentary*. Macon, Georgia: Smyth and Helwys Publishers Inc.
- _____, 2001. *Abingdon Old Testament Commentary on Deuteronomy*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Butler, T.C. 1983. *Joshua (WBC)*. Texas: Word Books Publication.

- Bultmann, G. 2007. "Deuteronomy" in J. Barton and J. Muddiman (eds.) *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Great Clarendon Street: Oxford University Press, 135-158.
- Byron, G.L. 2008. "Ideological Criticism" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB (I-Ma)*. Vol.3. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 7.
- Callahan, J. 2001. *The Clarity of Scripture: History, Theology and Contemporary Literary Studies*. Illinois: Intervarsity Press.
- Cassuto, U. 1974. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press.
- Childs, B.S. 1977. *Exodus: A Commentary*. Bloomsbury: SCM Press.
- Christensen, D.L. 2001. *Word Biblical Commentary: Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9* 2nd ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Claassens, L.J. 2011. "Sabbath Reconsidered: Human Dignity and the Fourth Command" in *Scriptura*, Vol.106:71-80.
- Clement, R. 2001. *The Book of Deuteronomy (Epworth Commentary)*. Peterborough: Epworth Press.
- Clines, D.J.A. 2013. "The Decalogue: The Scholarly Tradition Critique" in Dominick Mark (ed.) *The Decalogue and Its Cultural Influence*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 333-342.
- Cole, A. 1973. *Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary (TOTC)*. London: Tyndale Press.
- Conrad, E.W. 2008. "King, God as" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB (I-Ma)*. Vol.3. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 504-505.
- Cooley, J.L. 2014. "Psalm 19: A Sabbath Song" in *Vetus Testamentum* 64: 177-195.
- Cooper, Sr. L.E. 1994. *Ezekiel (NAC)* Vol. 17, Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers.
- Cover, R.C. 1992. "Sin, Sinners" in D.N. Freedman (ed.) (*ABD*) Vol.6 (Si-Z) Double-Day: New York, 31-40.
- Craigie, P.C. 1976. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

- Craigie, P.C. et al. 1991. *WBC*. Vol.26. Jeremiah 1-25. Texas: Word Books Publishers.
- Creach, J.F.D. 2003. *Joshua (Interpretation)*. Louisville: John Knox Press.
- Daiber, K.F. 2007. "Community Ethics" in Hans Dieter Betz *et al.* (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.3. (Chu-Deu)Leiden: Brill, 325-330.
- Davids, J.J. 1983. "Israel Stele" in E.M. Blaiklock and R.K. Harrison (ed.) *NIDB*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 254-255.
- Dearman, J.A. 1998. "Family in Old Testament" in *Interpretation: Journal of Bible and Theology*. Vol. 52/2: 117-129.
- De Beer, W.V. 2014. "Being Human, Becoming Like God: Patristic Perspectives on Humankind" in *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 148: 65-82.
- De Silva, D.A. 2003. "Honor and Shame" in T.D. Alexander and D.W. Baker (eds.) *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*. Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 431-436.
- De Vaux, R. 1997. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Grand Rapids and Livonia: W.B. Eerdmans and Dove.
- Dickson, K.A. 1984. *Theology in Africa*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Dozeman, T.B. (2006) 1996. *God at War: Power in the Exodus Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 2009. *Exodus: Eerdmans Critical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.
- _____, 2010. *Methods for Exodus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Downing, F.G. 2007. "Honor" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB (D-H)*. Vol.2, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 884-885.
- Dube, M.W. 2015. "Translating Cultures: The Creation of Sin in the Public Space of Botswana" in *Scriptura*. Vol.114/1:109-119.

- Duke, R.K. 2015. "Visiting the Guilt of the Fathers on the Children: Is God Immoral?" *Evangelical Quarterly*. Vol.84/4:347-365.
- Durham, J.I. 1987. *Exodus (WBC)*. Vol. 3, Waco: Word Books Publishers.
- Dyrness, W. 1979. *Themes in Old Testament Theology*. Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Enns, P. 2000. *The NIV Application Commentary: Exodus*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Erickson, M.J.D. 2001. *Introducing Christian Doctrine*. 2nd Edition L. Arnold Hustad (ed.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- _____, 2007. *Christian Theology*. 3rd Ed. Grand Rapids: BakerAcademy.
- _____, 2013. *Christian Theology*. 3rd Ed. Grand Rapids: BakeAcademic.
- Feinberg, C.L. & Fee, G.D. 2009. "Priest and Levites in Old and New Testament" in Merrill C. Tenney (ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.4. (M-P) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 963-985.
- Fensham, F.C. 1982. *The book of Ezra, Nehemiah*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Fergusson, D. 2007. "Covenant People" in Hans Dieter Betz *et al.* (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.3. (Chu-Deu)Leiden: Brill, 532-533.
- Fitzpatrick, J. 2009. "Original Sin or Original Sinfulness?" in *New Blackfriars*. Vol, 90/1030: 701-717.
- Frame, J.M. 2009. "God, Biblical Doctrine of" in Merrill C. Tenney (ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.2. (D-G) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 784-794.
- Fretheim, T. E. 1991. *Exodus (Interpretation)*. Louisville: John Knox Press.
- _____, 2005. *God and World in Old Testament: A Relational Theology of Creation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

- Friedly, R. 2011. "Priesthood and Religious Studies" in Hans Dieter Betz et al (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.10. (Pet-Ref) Leiden: Brill, 364-345.
- Funderburk, G.B. 2009. "Honor" in in Merrill C. Tenney (ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.3. (H-L) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 209-210.
- Gerstenberger, E.S. 1996. *Leviticus, A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Gerstenberger, E.S. 2009. "Old Testament, Family" in Hans Dieter Betz et al (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.5. (F-Haz) Leiden: Brill, 44-45.
- Gertz, J. C. 2007. "Covenant and Old Testament" in Hans Dieter Betz et al (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.3. (Chu-Deu)Leiden: Brill, 526-528.
- Gertz, J. C. et al. 2008. *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Literature, Religion and History of the Old Testament*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Gerlitz, P. 2005. "Priest, Priesthood" in Erwin Fahlbusch et al. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.4. (P-Sh) W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 345-347.
- Giacumakis, Jr. G. 2009. "Desert" in Merrill C. Tenney (G, Ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.2. (D-G) 2nd (Rev. Ed). Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 110-112.
- Goto, N. et al. 2015. "The Sins of their Fathers: When Current Generation Are Held to Account for the Transgression of Previous Generations" in *Political Psychology*. Vol.36/4:479-487.
- Gowan, D. E. 1994. *Theology in Exodus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Gunn, D.M. and Farrell, D.N. 1993. *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Greenman, J.P. and Larsen, T. (Eds.) 2012. *The Decalogue Through the centuries*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Grom, B. 2008. “Stigmatization” in Erwin Fahlbush et al. (Eds.) *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.5, (Si-Z). Grand Rapids: WB Eerdmans Publishing Company, 201-202.
- Grund, A. 2012. “Sin and Guilt in the Old Testament” in Hans D. B. et al (Eds.) *RPP: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.12 (Sif-Tog) Leiden: Brill, 22-24.
- Guthrie, Jr. S.C. 1994 (2005). *Christian Doctrine*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Hanson, P.D. 1995. *Isaiah 40-66*. Louisville: John Knox Press.
- Hagedorn, A.C. 2004. *Between Moses and Plato: Individual and Society in Deuteronomy in Ancient Greek Law*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hawkins, R.K. 2007. “Holy One” in in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB* Vol.2. (D-H) Nashville: Abingdon Press, 858.
- Healey, J. and Sybertz D. 1996. *Towards an African Narrative Theology*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Heesch, M. 2013a. “Utopia” in Hans Dieter Betz et al. (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.10. (Tol-Zyg)Leiden: Brill, 250.
- _____, 2013b. “Utopia, Territoriality and History” in Hans Dieter Betz et al. (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.10. (Tol-Zyg)Leiden: Brill, 250-251.
- Hess, R. 2000 “Abbael’s Gift of Alalakh (AT 1) (2.127)” in Hallo, W.W. (Ged.). *The Context of the Scriptures: Archival Documents from Biblical World*. Vol.3, Brill: Leiden, 462d, 467c, 470b, 471c.
- Hillers, D.R. 1992 [1972]. *Lamentations (AB)*. 2nd (Rev. Ed.) New York: Doubleday.
- Holbert, J.C. 2002. *Ten Commandments: A Preaching Comentary*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

- Holter, K. 2011. "The Second Commandment and the Question of Human Dignity in Africa: A Creation-Theological Perspective" in *Scriptura*, Vol.106:51-60.
- House, P.R. 1998. *Old Testament Theology*. Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Houston, W. 2007 (2001). "Exodus" in J. Barton and J. Muddiman (eds.) *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Great Clarendon Street: Oxford University Press, 67-91.
- Houtman, C. 2000. *Exodus (HCOT)*. Vol.3, Chapter 20-40. Leuven: Peeters Pub.
- Howard, Jr. D. M. 1997. "glh" in W.A. VanGemeren (G,ed.) *NIDOTTE* Vol.4, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 861-864.
- _____, 1998. *Joshua (NAC)*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers.
- Huey, Jr. F.B. 1993. *Jeremiah and Lamentation (NAC)*. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- Jacob, B. W. 1992. *The Second Book of the Bible: Exodus*. Hoboken: Ktav Pub. House Inc.
- Jagersma, H. 1982. *A History of Israel in the Old Testament Period*. London: SCM Press Ltd.
- Jensen, R. W. 1997. *Systematic Theology: The Triune God*. Vol.1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, P. 2005. "Sin" in B.T. Arnold and H.G.M. Williamson (Eds.) *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books*. Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 889-905.
- Jones, B.C. 2009. "Wilderness" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB* Vol.5. (S-Z) Nashville: Abingdon Press, 848-852.
- Jonker, L. and Lawrie, D. (Eds.) 2005. *Fishing for Jonah (anew): Various Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*. Stellenbosch: Sun Press.
- Jonker, L. 2011. "Guarding the Mystery and Majesty of God: Reflections on the Hermeneutical Implications of the Second Commandment" in *Scriptura*, Vol.106:61-70.
- Jonowski, B. 2010. "Kingship, Divine" in Hans Dieter Betz *et al.* (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.7. (Joh-Mah) Leiden: Brill, 202-203.

- Kafang, Z.B. 2008. *The Psalms: An Introduction to their Poetry*. Kaduna: Pyla-Mak Services.
- Kaiser, W.C. (1998). *The Christian and the "Old" Testament*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.
- Kajom, D. H. 2015. *Violence and Peace Initiative in Nigeria*. Kaduna: Pyla-Mark Publishers Ltd.
- Kaminsky, J.S. Corporate Responsibility in the Hebrew Bible. *Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplementary Series: 196*, Sheffield Academy Press.
- _____, 2000. "Corporate Personality" in D. N. Freedman (ed.) *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 285-287.
- _____, 2001. "The Sin of the Father: A Theological Investigation of the Biblical Tension between Corporate and Individual Retribution" in *Judaism*, 319-332.
- Kato, B.H. 1975. *Theological Pitfalls in Africa*. Kisumu: Evangel Publishing House.
- Katongole, E.M. 2005. *A Future for Africa: Critical Essays in Christian Social Imagination*. Scranton: University of Scranton Press.
- Kaufman, G.D. 1968. *Systematic Theology: A Historical Perspective*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Keenan, S.J.J.F. 1999. *Commandment of Compassion*. Sheed and Ward: Wisconsin.
- Kessler, R. 2008 [1992]. *The Social History of Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Kinder, D. 2009. "Ten Commandments" in Merrill C. Tenney (G,Ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.5. (Q-Z) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 770-776.
- Kirkpatrick, F.G. 2001. *The Ethics of Community*. Oxford: BlackWell Publishers.
- Koole, J.L. 1997. *Isaiah*. Part 3. Vol.1. Isaiah 40-48. Kampere: Kokpharos Pub. House (HCOT).

- Kopf, U. 2011. "The Idea of Reform" in Hans Dieter Betz *et al.* (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion* Vol.10. Leiden: Brill, 697-700.
- Kugler, R. 2009. "Priest and Levite" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB (Me-R)*. Vol.4. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 596-613.
- Kraus, H. 1986. *Theology of the Psalms*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub.
- Kunhiyop, S.W. 2008. *African Christian Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Hippo Books.
- Leith, J.H. 1993. *Basic Christian Doctrine*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Levering, M. 2007. *Ezra and Nehemiah: Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press.
- Levine, B.A. 1989. *The JPS Commentary, Leviticus*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Levinson, B. M. 2008. *Legal Revision and Religious Renewal in Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Livneh, A. 2014. "United We Stand: Israelites Solidarity in Two Jubilean Clan Rosters" in *Journal of Jewish Studies*. LXV/1, spring. 26-37.
- Longman III, T. 2008. *Jeremiah, Lamentation (NIBC)*. Peabody: Hendrickson Pub. Inc.
- Lotz, D.W. 2005. "Reformation" in Erwin Fahlbusch *et al.* *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.4. (P-Sh) Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 509-531.
- Luc, A. 1997. "חֲטָאֵי הַתּוֹרָה" in W.A. Vangemeren (G,Ed.). *NIDOTTE* Vol.2. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 87-93.
- Lundbom, J. 1999. *Jeremiah 1-20 (AB)*. New York: Doubleday.
- Machen, Jr. A.W. 1911. "Corporate Personality" in *Harvard Law Review*. Vol.24/4 (February): 253-267.
- Mann, T. W. 1995. *Deuteronomy: Westminster Bible Companion*. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.

- Marlowe, W. C. 2011. "Divine Covenant faithfulness in the Face of Human Covenant Unfaithfulness" in *Testamentum Imperium*. Vol.3: 1-39.
- Martens, E.A. 2003. "Sin, Guilt" in T.D. Alexander and D.W. Baker Dictionary of the OT Pentateuch, 764-778.
- Matthews, V.H. 1990 (1988). *Manners and Custom in the Bible*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- _____, 2007. *Studying the Ancient Israelites: A Guide to Source and Methods*. Grand Rapids: BakerAcademics.
- Marlowe, W. C. 2011. "Divine Covenant faithfulness in the Face of Human Covenant Unfaithfulness" in *Testamentum Imperium*. Vol.3: 1-39.
- Markl, D. (ed.). 2013. *Interdisciplinary Perspectives in the Decalogue's Cultural Influence*. Hebrew Bible Monograph, 58, Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1-28.
- Mayr, H. 1999. "Communities, Spirituality" in Erwin Fahlbusch et al. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.1. (A-D) W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids. Vol.1 (A-D), 621-622.
- Mbiti, J.S. 1970. *Concepts of God in Africa*. London: SPCK.
- _____, 1971. *New Testament Eschatology in an African Background*. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 1975. *An Introduction to African Religion*. London: Heinemann.
- _____, (1969)1990. *African Religions and Philosophy*. Chicago: Heinemann.
- McConville, J. G. 2002. *Apollos Old Testament Commentary on Deuteronomy*. (Series Editors) David W. Baker and Gordon, J. Wenham. Leicester and Illinois: Apollos and InterVarsity press.
- McConville, J. G. and Williams, S. N. 2010. *Joshua: The Two Horizons of Old Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

- McCurley, F.R. 2008. "Sin" in E. Falbush *et al* (Eds.) *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol. 5 (Si-Z). Grand Rapids/ Cambridge: Eerdmans and Brill, 14-17.
- MacDonald, N. 2003. Deuteronomy and the Meaning of "Monotheism" in *Forschungen Zum Alten Testament*. 2. Reihe, Mohr Siebeck.
- McGrath, A.E. 1997, 2001, 2003. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- McNutt, P.M. 1999. *Reconstructing the Society of Ancient Israel*. Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press and SPCK.
- Meek, C.K. 1978. *Tribal Studies in Northern Nigeria*. Vol. II New York: AMS Press.
- Meyers, F.B. 1978. *Devotional Commentary on Exodus* Kregel Publication: Grand Rapids.
- Meyers, C. 1997. "The Family in Early Israel" in Leo G. Perdue *et al* (eds.) *Families in Ancient Israel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1-47.
- _____, 2005. *Exodus (NCBC)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, E. E. 2015. "People and Land in the Holiness Code: Who is YHWH's Favourite?" in *OTE* 28/2:433-450.
- Merrill, E. H. 1994. *The New American Commentary on Deuteronomy*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers and Paternoster Press.
- Michael, M. 2011. *Christian Theology and African Traditions*. Kaduna: Yuty Graphics.
- _____, 2011. "Covenant Faithfulness in the Face of Human Covenant Unfaithfulness: Is Yahweh's Covenant Faithfulness Ultimately Contingent upon Human Obedience?" in *Testamentum Imperium*. Vol.3: 1-29.
- Migliore, D.L. 2004. *Faith Seeking Understanding: An Introduction to Christians Theology*. 2nd Ed. Grand Rapids Michigan/Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- _____, 2014. *Faith Seeking Understanding*. Grand Rapids: WB Eerdmans Publishing Company.

- Milgrom, J. 1990. *The JPS Torah Commentary. Numbers*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.
- _____, 2004. *Leviticus, A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- _____, 2004. *Leviticus: The Book of Rituals and Ethics*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- _____, 2007. "Holy, Holiness in Old Testament" in *NIDB* Vol.2. (D-H) Nashville: Abingdon Press, 850-858.
- Miller, P. D. 1990. *Interpretation: Deuteronomy*. Louisville: John Knox Press.
- _____, 2009a. *Ten Commandments: Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- _____, 2009b. "Ten Commandment" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB* (S-Z). Vol.5. Nashville: Abingdon Press. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 517-522.
- Mol, J. 2009. *Collective and Individual Responsibility: A Description of Corporate Personality*. New York: Orbis Books.
- Modl, L. 2012. "Stigma" in Hans Dieter Betz et al. (Eds.) *RPP Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.XII, (Sif-Tog) Leiden: Brill, 284-285.
- Moreau, A. S. 1998. "Africa and the Future: An Analysis of John Mbiti's Concept of Time" in Samuel Ngewa, et al. (Eds.) *Issues in African Christian Theology*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers Ltd, 306-319.
- Mpagi, P.W. 2002. *African Christian Theology*. Kisubi: Marianum Publishing Co.
- Mtshiselwa, N. 2016. "Mind the Working Class People! An African Reading of Leviticus 25:8-55 with Latino/a Critical Tools" in *OTE*. 29/1:133-150.
- Nave, G. 2006. "Conversion" in *NIDB* (A-C) Vol.1. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 728-729.
- Ndjerareou, A. 2006. "Exodus" in Tokumbo Adeyemo (G,Ed.) *ABC* Nairobi: Word Alive Publisher, 85 -182.

- Ndoga, S.S. 2011. "Divine Covenant Faithfulness in the Face of Human Covenant Unfaithfulness" in *Testamentum Imperium*. Vol.3: 1-17.
- Nel, M. 2014. "Sin in the Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament" in Robert L. Brawley (ed.) *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.2, (Mag-Zep). Oxford: Oxford University press, 279- 284.
- Nelson, R.D. 1997. *Joshua, A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Niditch, S. 1996. *Oral World and Written World: Ancient Israelite Literature*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Noth, M. 1962. *Exodus: A Commentary*. Bloomsbury, London: SCM Press.
- Nyirawung, M. D. 2013. "Contextualising biblical exegesis: What is the African Biblical Hermeneutic approach?" in *HTS Theological Studies*, Vol.69/1 Cape Town. http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?pid=S0259-94222013000100109&script=sci_arttext&tlng=es: Online source accessed on 15/02/2017 at 01:03.
- Odell, M.S. 2005. *Ezekiel: Smith & Helwys Bible Commentary*. Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys Pub. Inc.
- Oduyoye, M.A. (1986) 2000. *Hearing and Knowing: Theological Reflections on Christianity InAfrica*. Orbis Books.
- _____, 1995. *Daughters of Anowa: African Women Patriarchy*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Ohler, A. 1985. *Studying the Old Testament from Tradition to Cannon*. Edinburg: T&T Clark.
- Ollenburger, B.C. 1987. "Zion the City of the Great King" in *JSOT Supplementary Series 41*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Olupona, J. K. 2014. *African Religion: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Orobator, A. E. 2009. *Theology Brewed out of An African Pot*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

- Oswalt, J.N. 1998. *The Book of Isaiah 40-66 (WBC)*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Otto, E. 2008. "Ethics, Old Testament" in Hans Dieter Betz et al (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.5. (Dev-Ezr) Leiden: Brill, 577-598.
- _____, 2010. "Moses" in Hans Dieter Betz et al (ed.) *RPP. Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. (Mai-Nas) Vol.8. Leiden: Brill, 568-571.
- Patrick, D.M. Jr. 1982. *Sin and Judgment in the Prophets: A Stylist and Theological Analysis*.
- Patrick, D. 2008. "Law in the Old Testament" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB*. Vol.5 (I-Ma) Nashville: Abingdon, 602-614.
- Payne, J.B. 2009. "Zion" in Merrill C. Tenney (G, Ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.5. (Q-Z) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 1234-1237.
- Perdue, L.G. 1997. "The Household, Old Testament and Theology and Contemporary Hermeneutics" in Leo G. Perdue et al (eds.) *Families in Ancient Israel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 223-257.
- Perlitt, L. 1999. "Covenant" in Erwin Fahlbusch et al. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.1. (A-D) W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 709-711.
- Peters, T. 1994. *Sin: Radical Evil in Soul and Society*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.
- Pfloh, E. 2009. *The Emergence of Israel in Ancient Palestine: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives*. London and Oakville: Equinox Pub. Ltd.
- Pixley, F. 1992. *Biblical Israel: A People's History*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Pobee, J. 1979. *Toward an African Theology*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Porubcan, S. 1963. *Sin in the Old Testament: A Soteriological Study*. Roma, Herder.
- Post, S.G. 2001. "Family" in Erwin Fahlbusch et al. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.2. (E-I) W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 283-285.

- Pressler, C. 2002. *Joshua, Judges and Ruth (Westminster Bible Commentary)*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Pritchard, J.B. (ed.). 1955. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts. Relating to the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 274-275, 288-290, 292-297, 301-303, 426-428.
- Propp, W. H. C. 2006. *Exodus 19-40 (AB)*. New York: Doubleday.
- Redditt, P.L. 2008. *Introduction to the Prophets*. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.
- Rhoads, D. 2009. "Narrative Criticism" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB (Me-R)*. Vol.4. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 222-223.
- Ro, J. U. 2011. "The Theological Concept of YHWH's Punitive Justice in the Hebrew Bible: Historical Development in the Context of the Judean Community in the Persian Period" in *Vetus Testamentum* 61: 406-425.
- Roberts, J.J.M. 2009a. "Temple, Jerusalem" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB (S-Z)*. Vol.5. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 494-509.
- _____, 2009b. "Zion Tradition" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB (S-Z)*. Vol.5. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 987-988.
- Robertson, O.P. 1990. *NICOT: Book of Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah*. Grand Rapids: WB Eerdmans Pub. Co.
- Robbins, V. K. 1996. *Exploring the Texture of the Text: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International.
- _____, 2010. *Sea Voyage and Beyond: Emerging Strategies in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Bland ford Forum: Deo Publishing.
- Robinson, W. H. 1981 (1964). *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel*. (Rev. Ed.) Edinburg: T & T Clark.
- Rofé, A. 1997. *Introduction to Prophetic Literature*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____, 2002. *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretations*. New York: T & T Clark.

- Rogerson, J.W. 1980. The Hebrew Concept of Legal Personality. *JTS* 21: 1-16, 43-59.
- _____, 1992. "Corporate Personality" in D.N. Freedman (ed.). *The ABD*. Vol.1, (A-C). New York: Double-Day, 1156-1157.
- Roth, M. 2000. "The Law of Hammurabi (2.131)" in Hallo, W.W. (Ged.). *The Context of the Scriptures: Archival Documents from Biblical World*. Vol.3, Brill: Leiden, 335-353.
- Rowan, W. 2005. "Sin" in Jean-Yves Lacoste (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Christian Theology*. Vol.3 (P-Z) New York: Routledge, 1476-1479.
- Rudin, A.J. 2008. "Zionism" in Erwin Fahlbusch et al. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.4. (P-SH) W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids. Vol.5, 856-860.
- Saarinen, R. 2011. "Original Sin: Definition" in Hans D.B. et al (ed.) *RPP Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol. ix (Nat-Pes), 380-381.
- _____, 2011. "Original Sin: Protestant Theology" in Hans D.B. et al (ed.) *RPP Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol. ix (Nat-Pes), 381.
- Sarna, N. M. 1991. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Exodus*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Schiffman, L.H. 2009. "Oral Law, Oral Torah" in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB* (Me-R). Vol.4. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 336.
- Schmid, K. 2012. "Deuteronomy within the Deuteronomistic Histories (Genesis-II Kings)" in Konrad Schmid and Raymond F. Person Jr. (eds.). *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuchal, Hexateuch and the Deuteronomistic History*". *Forschungen Zum Alten Testament* 2, Rihle, 8-30.
- Seidl, T. 2010. "Narrative, Bible" in Hans Dieter Betz et al (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.5. (Mai-Nas) Leiden: Brill, 713.
- Selman, M. J. 1980. "House" in J.D. Douglas (ed.). *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. Part 2, Goliath-Papyri, 668-672.

- Seow, C.L. 2007. "God, Names of" in *NIDB* Vol.2. (D-H) Nashville: Abingdon Press, 588-595.
- Singer, Itamar (2000:93-95) formulated a "Treaty between Suppiluliuma and Aziru (2.17A) Middle Bronze Age" in Hallo, W.W. (Ged.). *The Context of the Scriptures: Archival Documents from Biblical World*. Vol.3, Brill: Leiden, 93-98.
- _____, (2000:96-98) in the "Treaty between Mursili and Duppi-Tesub (2.17B)" in Hallo, W.W. (ed.). *The Context of the Scriptures: Archival Documents from Biblical World*. Vol.3, Brill: Leiden, 93-98.
- Smedes, L.B. 1993. *Shame and Grace: Healing the Shame we don't deserve*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Smith, B. W. 2013. "The Sin of Eli and Its Consequences" in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 170 (January-March): 17-30.
- Sherlock, C. 1996. *The Doctrine of Humanity*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Shuster, M. 2004. *The Sin and Fall: What we have become as Sinners*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co
- _____, 2008. "Sin" in W.A. Dyrness and Vetu-Matti K. (Eds.) *Global Dictionary of Theology*. Nottingham: IVP, 817-825.
- Speiser, E.A. *Theology*. Nottingham: IVP, 817-825.
- Spieckermann, H. 2003. "Kingdom of God in Old Testament" in Erwin Fahlbusch et al. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.3. (J-O) W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 123-124.
- Stienstra, N. 1993. *YHWH is the Husband of his people: Analysis of Biblical Metaphor with Special reference to Translation*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Pub. House.
- Stigers, H.G. 2009. "Temple of Jerusalem" in Merrill C. Tenney (G,Ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.5. (Q-Z) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 716-752.
- Stolz, F. 2005. "Priest, Priesthood in Old Testament" in Erwin Fahlbusch et al. *The*

- Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.4. (P-SH) W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 347-348.
- _____, 2007a. "Brother, Brotherhood" in Hans Dieter Betz et al (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.2 (Bia-Chr), 229-230.
- _____, 2007b. "Covenant and History of Religion" in in Hans Dieter Betz et al (ed.) *RPP, Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.3. (Chu-Deu)Leiden: Brill. 526.
- _____, 1970. *God: Ancestor or Creator: Aspects of Traditional Belief in Ghana, Nigeria and Sierra Leone*. London: Longman.
- Stuart, D. K. 2006. *Exodus (NAC)*. Vol.2, Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Sweeney, M.A. 2005. *The Prophetic Literature*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- _____ 2011. "Saul's Institutional Identity in the Deuteronomistic History" in Lester L. Grabbe & Martti Nissine (Eds.) *Construct of Prophecy in the Former and Later Prophets and Other texts*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 165-174.
- Tarazi, P.N. 1991. *The Old Testament Introduction*. St. Vladimir Seminary Press: Crestwood.
- Tate, W.R. 2006. *Interpreting the Bible: A Handbook of Terms and Methods*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- _____, 2008. *Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach*. 3rd Ed. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Thompson, J.A. (1974) 2009. "Israel, History of" in Merrill C. Tenney (G, Ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.3. (H-L) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 382-402.
- Thorpe, S.A. 1996. *African Traditional Religions*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Tigay, J. H. 1996. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication society.

- Treier, D. J. 2008. *Introduction to Theological Interpretation of the Scripture: Recovering a Christian Practice*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Tuell, S. 2009. *Ezekiel (NIBC)*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Turaki, Y. 1999. *Christianity and African Gods: A Method in Theology*. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University.
- _____. 2012. *The Trinity of Sin*. Nairobi: Hippo Books/WordAlive Publishers.
- Van der Merwe, C. (2004). *The Lexham Hebrew-English Interlinear Bible (Dt. 5:6)*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press.
- Vandervelde, G. 1975. *Original Sin: Two Major Trends in Contemporary Roman Catholic Reinterpretation*. Rodopi NV: Amsterdam.
- Van Leeuwen, R. C. 2011. "Toward a Biblical Account of Sin?" in *Journal of Theological Interpretation* (Review Article)5.1: 133-144.
- Verhoef, P.A. 2009. "Mishnah" in Merrill C. Tenney (G, Ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.2. (M-P) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 284-285.
- Von Rad, G. 1963. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Bloomsbury, London: SCM Press.
- _____, 1980. *God at Work in Israel*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Vos, H.F. 1983. *An Introduction to Bible Archaeology*. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Walker, L.L. 2009. "Deuteronomy, Book of" in Merrill C. Tenney (G, Ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.2. (D-G) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 121-131.
- Walters, S. D. 2015. "I Talk of My Sin (to God) (and to You): Psalm 51, with David Speaking" in *CTJ*50:91-109.
- Weinfeld, M. 1991. *The Anchor Bible: Deuteronomy 1-11. A Translation with introduction and Commentary*. Vol.5. New York: Doubleday.

- _____, 1992 “Deuteronomy, Book of” in (eds.) *ABD*. (D-G) Vol.2. 168-183.
- Westermann, C. 1984 (1974). *Genesis 1-11, A Commentary*. London: Westminster John Knox Press.
- White, Jr. W. 2009. “Family” in Merrill C. Tenney (G,Ed.) *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Vol.2. (D-G) 2nd (Rev. Ed.) Full Colour. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 535-540.
- Wieland, J. 2007. “Corporate Culture” in Hans D.B. *et al* (ed.). *Religion Past and Present: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. Vol.111. Leiden: Brill, 495.
- Wills, J.T. 1979. *Genesis*. Austin, Texas: Sweet Publishing Company.
- William, T.F. 1997. “” in W.A. VanGemeren (G,ed.) *NIDOTTE* Vol.4, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 657-663.
- Willis, T.M. 2007. “Family” in Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (ed.) *NIDB* (D-H). Vol.2. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 427-430.
- _____, 2009. *Leviticus (AOTC)*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Witte, Jr. J. 2001. “Family” in Erwin Fahlbusch *et al.* (Eds.) *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Vol.2. (E-I) Wm B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 285-289.
- _____, 2009. *The Sin of the Fathers: The Law and Theology of Illegitimacy Reconsidered*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Work, T. 2009. *Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible: Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brazos Press.
- Wright, C.J.H. 1996. *Deuteronomy: NIBC (NIV)*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers and Paternoster Press.
- Wright, D. P. 2009. *Inventing God’s Law*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zimran, Y. 2014. “The Covenant Made with David: The King and the Kingdom in 2 Chronicles 21” *Vetus Testamentum* 64: 305-325.

iAddendum A

I. חָטָא as “the missing mark” is by far the most frequently used (about 595 times) and it simply means “to be mistaken”, “being deficient or lacking”, “to be at fault” or “to miss a specific goal or mark” (Prov. 8:36, 19:2; Job 5:24). Porubcan (1963:9) noted that they did not obey the commands but **חָטָא** sinned against his ordinances. Lev. 5, it is used if anyone sin and breach the faith against Yahweh by deceiving his neighbour or his superior. It has to do with personal responsibility towards another, being responsible to obey or keep the law (Num. 6:11; Job 2:10; Ps. 39:2; Jer. 2:35). William Dyrness (1979:105) understand **חָטָא** as a deviation from the right way, a sin against God, against thee have I sinned (Ps. 51:4), missing the mark, deviating from the path (Judg. 20:1). Deviated from the path of wisdom by perverse person who sows disharmony and strife in the community. Cover (1992:32) adds that **חָטָא** frequently expresses the ethical failure of one person to perform a duty or common courtesy on behalf of others. Luc (1997:87-88) emphasize that it is to miss, fail or sin. It is used in the Old Testament to indicate being against God or disobeying God’s word. It is used as missing the mark in Judges 20:16. It could also be translated in social and political context to mean erring, fault, guilt, offense or crime and frequently in Leviticus 16:30 it is used broadly during worship for cleansing in regard to sin offering.

Moreover, P. Jensen (2005:900) noted that the word appeared in Job 20:16 as “missing the mark” but seems metaphorical (Josh. 7:20; I Sam. 15:24 and II Sam. 12:13, 23). It is also used to refer to a sin committed against someone, either God or humans, otherwise the refusal to obey a norm of conduct which results in sin, (I Sam. 19:4; II Kg. 18:14). F. R. McCurley (2008:15) affirms that **חָטָא** is a mistake made or the act of missing a goal or a code of conduct (Gen 42:22). Attridge (2009:263) added that **חָטָא** is a “missing mark”, not as a deliberate act rather a failure of intention considered as a slip-up or error or mistake of a human being. Rowan (2005:1476) indicates that **חָטָא** is used in the Old Testament in reference to failure to keep God’s commandment or to honour God. In Lev. (16:21-30), we see a contextual use of **חָטָא** before the Lord, in opposition to the unlikely broader usage of **חָטָא**. It goes to show that, **חָטָא** has a broader usage compared to other definitions. However, the priestly and non-priestly application at the pre-exilic era, during the exile and even the post-exilic times seems to vary especially in the synonymous appearances of the word.

II. עָפָס “breach of law” is another word; it is used about 135 times to simply mean wilful or knowledgeable violation of a norm or culture. Porubcan (1963:24) applied **עָפָס** as rebellion or revolting against a person or God, Isaiah 43:27, your fathers sinned against me, Jeremiah 3:13 you rebel against Yahweh. It looks priestly, always used in moral or religious sense and at the post-exilic times to warn God’s people (Exod. 34:7, Lev. 16:21; Ezek. 21:29). Dyrness (1979:106-107) said it is an art of rebelling against a superior, an act of unfaithfulness prior to an agreement. It could be one’s trespass, as Israel rebelled against God Isaiah 1:2; 43:27. This is a reference possibly a non-priestly call, made about the sins of the patriarchs before the exile. What happened wilfully or voluntarily to stray from a norm. Cover (1992:32) follow some of his predecessors that the verb is translated as “to rebel, revolt or transgress by refusing to pay allegiance to a covenant intentionally”, again it is priestly and post-exilic, (I Kg. 12:19, II Kg. 1:1, 8:20, 22; Isa. 1:2; Jer. 3:13; Hos. 7:13, 8:1). **עָפָס** transgression, seems to have a narrower meaning among the three II Kings 1:1, it normally implies a wilful violation from an inferior to a superior in relationship Proverbs 28:24. In Ezekiel 2:3, it meant to ‘rebel’ a nation that rebelled against me ..., they revolt against me and their parents Genesis 50:17. Thus depicts overstepping one’s boundaries set by law to regulate the people’s socio-religious life after the exile (Num. 14:41; I Sam. 15:24). A common view of sin is translated as *transgression*, E. A. Martens (2003:766-767) see **עָפָס** as a breach of law/relationship, a kind of taking what rightly belongs to another person, like kidnapping (Gen. 5:17; Exod. 22:9{MT 22:8}; II Kg 8:20, 22). This is not just rebellion or protest against Yahweh but means to rob or embezzle, also the misappropriation of relationship or duty. Attridge (2009:263) accepts the idea as transgression. This can be a calculated effort or plan to refuse what is right or to carry out a responsibility; doing what is wrong. Thiselton (2015:770) considered it as rebellion or a deliberate breach of relationship with God. This relates to covenant treachery or betrayal of loyalty. The breaking of commitment with God.

III. אִי, אִי as “iniquity” or “guilt”: This occurs about 229 times in the Hebrew Bible, but the etymology of the root is disputed. Porubcan (1963:15) said **אִי** it is acting crookedly, wrongly in the sense of transgression, at times it appears as guilt as a result of transgression. Used in other instances to mean punishment for guilt in the pre-exilic times Leviticus 19:35; you shall do no wrong but be morally responsible Ezekiel 3:20. Dyrness (1979:106) said it is a state of being sinful and wrong, deserving punishment. It comes from offense committed which makes one guilty (Ps. 34:21-22, Prov. 30:10). As such one is responsible for all he/she does, even the unknowingly committed non-priestly and wisdom notice before the exile. The noun according to Cover (1992:32-33) could be an “error” or “iniquity”, it is used to indicate moral guilt or iniquity committed before

God which clearly relates the thought between sin and guilt and their resultant repercussion Job13:23, 26; Daniel 9:13. This term is at times used interchangeably with עֲפָשׁ. Luc (1997:88) define it as iniquity which has predominant religious and ethical usage which is mostly used in the Pentateuch (Gen. 4:6, 15:16, 19:15; Exod. 20:5, 34:9; Num. 14:34; Deut. 5:9). This occurs 231 times in the Old Testament before the exile as a priestly instruction. Its plural serves as a summary for all sinners against God Leviticus 16:21-22.

The marks totality of sin against God in Exodus 34:7 translates wickedness, rebellion and sin; and is used to proclaim God's mercy and forgiveness. Martens (2003:767) refers to אִיִּי as "crookedness", "perversity" or "iniquity" in describing sin in (Gen. 19:15, 44:16; Exod. 20:5, 34:9; Deut. 5:9), which occurs as bearing iniquity in concrete acts. Jensen (2005:901) also translates the word as "iniquity" and regards it as the generalized term for sin against a person (II Kg. 7:9) or God (Josh. 22:20). In the Pentateuch, most appearances of sin are translated from אָשׂא as the act of guilt (Neh. 9:2), the state of guilt (II Sam. 24:10) or consequences/punishment of guilt (Gen. 4:13) and could also be confession of guilt made (II Sam. 14:9; Ezra 9:6) in relation to others. It is important to emphasize that this term אָשׂא will usefully be considered in this study.

IV. עָרַשׁ or עָרַע as "evil/being guilty": According to Martens (2003:767) the term is morally regarded as defective in character or action. The term עָרַשׁ is opposite of good, it is used in the story of the tree of knowledge of good and evil Genesis 2:9, 17, 3:5, 22. As such, a community must purge עָרַשׁ from it midst and ranks Deuteronomy 17:7, 12, 19:19, 21:21 for sanity. The noun may refer to morality or ethically wrong engagements, as in what Joseph used when speaking to Potiphar's wife in Genesis 39:9 and in Genesis 50:17, 20, it means acting in evil deeds. Jensen (2005:900) regards it as a calamity, as doing evil in the sight of the Lord. It is often used to describe Israel's failure to obey Yahweh. In the historical books it was used to refer to the endemic sinfulness of Israel's kings (II Kg. 21:9; II Sam. 11:27; II Chron. 35:21-22). Dyrness (1979:106) is of the opinion that in its entirety, it can be used to refer to the sin/disobedience/lawlessness or mischiefs of a group of people in a family/community. As guilty before the law and before God for what is intentionally done.

ii Addendum B

To understand the Decalogue, one must look at it within its context. Sin is a key word that was emphasized in this thesis; understanding the concept within the Old Testament will enable the perception of the term in this research.

Old Testament Examples of Sin

It is significant that numerous cultures and societies in Africa interpret the implication of sin in their society, especially as it transmits from Adam's (original sin) to their groups/family, and mainly from אָשׂא and אָשׂא from the scriptures. In this light, Migliore (2004:150-153) described sin in three ways first as the denial of our relationship to God and the need for his favour towards us. Secondly, in dealing with fellow creatures, it takes the dual form of domination and servility, self-exaltation and self-destruction. Thirdly, sin is the denial of the destiny that has been appointed by Yahweh for humankind. These he did using the concept of image of God in human beings, taking his root from אָשׂא. Shuster (2004:172) clarify that the perversion and inescapability of sin underlies the system of sacrifice, atonement and salvation, which are key to the religious life of God's people even in the old covenant. The conception of sin is understood in hermeneutical circle. This serves as the circle for understanding original sin from a West African/Nigerian perspective from the idea of sin of the fathers in Deuteronomy 5:9 and Exodus 20:5. Since several western scholars have studied original sin in the past, it will be significant to study it in an African or west African viewpoint. At this juncture it is important to also clarify the use of the terms אָשׂא, אָשׂא and עֲפָשׁ in relation to sin of the fathers, and how it applies and verifies the African appreciation of original sin in the Old Testament. **a. Sin in the Pentateuch(Torah)**

Major theories regarding the origins of sin took its root in the Pentateuch(*Torah*ⁱⁱ- older) from root words like אָשׂא, אָשׂא and עֲפָשׁ and many more. Though the popular teaching of sin and original sin began from Adam and Eve's, possibly dated between the 5th to 4th centuries BCE. Another presupposition says "sin began with the devil" (I Enoch 6-11, Genesis 6:1-5), the devil, who was in existence before the creation of humankind first sinned before Adam. On the other hand, the fall of humankind affected corporate humanity. Sin took various forms in the Pentateuch, Dyrness (1979:99) observe that God ended his creation and appreciated everything; described it as good Genesis 1:31. This created nature did not represent barrier or evil. Although there was an inherent nature of sin in humans from the beginning according to Genesis 2:16-17. In this regard, McCaurley (2003:15-16) used Israel's affront against honouring God through Moses, in the Decalogue Exodus 20:1-17 and Deuteronomy 5:6-21 for his illustration. It shows a set of warnings/rules that Yahweh wants his people to obey and keep. Hence non adherence means sin, not just as breaking of rules/codes rather dishonouring the authority

established by the Lord at the deliverance of his people. Genesis 3:5, asserts that they went with their mind to eat the forbidden fruit. Notice that the Pentateuch made use of particular word often than others, like Genesis 26:10 described the guilt and deception of Isaac before Abimelech, a perspective that indicates a major use of transgression, iniquity and guilt from the word **חַטָּא**. This idea runs through the Pentateuch.

Moreover, Israel must live in obedience to YHWH; in Deuteronomy 30:20 they are to love God, obey him and cleave to him in order to overcome sin. The decision of sin was external, we saw self-seeking, pride, lust, greed, anxiety and fear as Turaki (2012) noted in “Trinity of sin”. The first individual family suffered due to their part in first act of disobedience to God in Genesis 3:14-16. To this end, Attridge (2009:268-269) added that thereafter the story of the first murder followed by their descendants, where the first individual sin appeared Genesis 4:7, later in Genesis 6:5, we see the mischievousness of a whole society (Gen. 13:13, 19:5, 24). In the days of Abraham, despite his effort to intercede and cleanse the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, to instil purity; the indigenes were bent on molesting the visiting angels Genesis 18. This shows why the priestly traditions devoted attention to the purity of the cultic system (Lev. 5:1-5; 16; Num. 15:22-31, 28-29), during the Passover, at the festivals, at the feasts etc. This section ended with Israel’s march into the promise land, with the promise to keep the commands of Yahweh (Deut. 4-5:8-10; 6:13; 7:4-6; 11:16-17; 13:1-18; 19:15-21; 22:5-29; 25:13-16; 30:1-5). To keep God’s promise means avoiding iniquity and guilt **חַטָּא**.

b. Sin in the Prophets and Narrative (*Nebiim*)

The main messages of the prophets were unique calls for redress and repentance from sin. The prophets were popularly known as seers of the future or pointers of the right way, those who saw ahead. They possess the ability to understand before others. Probably they exerted pre-exilic Persian influence during the 3rd Century BCE during this times. To this, Attridge (2009:264) state that the prophetic literatures were exclusive in two broad components of wrong doing; first the social and economic evils, like denouncing the oppression of the poor, and second in the fidelity of Israel God (Yahweh). Like prophet Amos the sins of sexual immorality (2:7-8), Idolatry (5:25-26), then he reserved the most stringent condemnation for social injustice as a focal point of reflecting on the sins of the people. Right after his oracles against the Nations, he went further to their transgression **עֲוֹן** in Amos 2:4, 6, hence Judah and Israel did not follow the laws/Torah of Yahweh. They sold the righteous for silver and the needy for a pair of sandals (2:6-7, 8:4).

Furthermore, Attridge (2009:268) noted the major form of sin in the historical era as Idolatry. Although it could be from **חַטָּא** iniquity, guilt that affects others. In Judges we see the pattern in the form of continual transgression among the covenant people (2:18-20; 6:10; 8:27, 33; 10:6, 10, 15; 20-21), portraying Israel’s **חַטָּא**. Prior to the monarchy, Samuel began with the perverse sons of Eli who desecrated the temple (2:17; 3:13). Later the sons of Samuel also became wayward, and took bribe to pervert justice (8:3). The prophet, judge and leaders, reminded them of the day of infidelity from the word **אִיכָּל**, fidelity to Yahweh and the great consequences (12:10, 14, 24). They emphasized that only the fear of God can keep them from sin. Their iniquity at this stage became group iniquity and their kings followed in this trend of sinning (15:3-24), particularly David went astray in II Sam.7:14; 11; 12:1-11 just as Saul did before God rejected him. This plague of infidelity repeated itself through the veins of the kings of Israel and Judah. Similarly, Solomon devoted his life to adultery/foreign wives. These women infiltrated the land with their gods (I Kg. 11:4-8; 13:34; 14:16; 15:28-34; 16:1-33). Although the chronicler could not recount all their sins, Ezra and Nehemiah attempted a bit (Ezr. 9:4-15; Neh. 9), the reason being that the younger generation should use the awareness of sins of their fathers to create the conscious of its consequences.

c. Sin in the Writings and Apocalyptic (*Ketubim* - Psalms/Wisdom)

Perhaps the writings took place between the 2nd Century BCE and the 1st Century AD after the birth of Christ during the Hellenistic era. In this respect, it could be said that sin hindered the relationship of a holy God to his “holy people” during the era. This is why Zamani B. Kafang (2008:149-150) describe sin as standing in opposition to righteousness. He noted how the Psalmist employed several words in (Ps 10:15; 25:7, 11; 37:12-16; 51:2-14; 58:2; 59:3; 62:4, 9-10; 73:8; 78:8, 17, 57; 103:9-10; 119:69, 118) in reference to iniquity and guilty of God’s people. Attridge is of the opinion (2009:269) that there is an eloquent picture of tussle with sin in the psalms. Psalm 51, shows a call for repentance and a plea for cleansing, saying “he was born a sinner and even at his conception”. Using it to describe his situation. Due to the nature of sin and its transferable characteristic, this call for renewal continued in several passages with the use of **חַטָּא** (Ps 10:2-8; 12:1-5; 31:6, 17-18; 82:8; 106:9, 36). In Proverb they made use of the woman of folly to depict sin **אִיכָּל** and evil **רָעָה** in the sight of God. Her ways will lead to adultery, discord and death (Prov. 1:10-12; 2:12-19; 6:16-19; 22:16, 22; 26:22-28), hence Israel ought to watch against such characters. Likewise, though Job was upright, but his friends became wayward and

rebellious (Job 22:6-7; 24:2-3, 14-15, 22-23), it was in Bildad's words that find the adage, "How can a mortal be found righteous?", "How can one born of a woman, be righteous?" (25:4; 34:24). Ecclesiastes was popular for recounting the taxonomy of sin **חַטָּה** (Eccles 3:16-20; 7:7-9, 20, 26; 9:1-11). The preacher admonishes the progress of righteousness and the abolishment of wickedness/evil in reference to these three **חַטָּה**, **חַטָּה** and **עֲשָׂה**.

The apocalypticⁱⁱ era was not left out, Dyrness (1979:106) said God does not keep the wicked alive Job 36:6, their ways shall perish (Ps. 1:6), they will not seek God (Ps. 10:4), and they love violence (Ps. 11:5). Wickedness is a condition of one who cannot stand before God, and one who is liable to his wrath. The psalmist equally recounted various appearances of his sin/disobedience, Kafang (2008:152) cited (Ps. 51), to illustrate how David was asking for forgiveness, to avoid further consequences. In his prayers, he asks God to "wash him from his iniquities"; "cleanse me from my sins"; "purge me with hyssop". This sincere confession and search for pardon, expressed his inner spiritual change from the use of words like create in me a clean heart and renew your spirit within me, this is a form of covenant renewal. In other instances, he said remember not my youthful sins (Ps. 25), I acknowledge my sins and did not hide my iniquity and (Ps. 32) forgive the guilt of my sins; again using **חַטָּה**. Thus there are different indications of sins in the wisdom and Psalms but **חַטָּה** seems to be more prevalent.