

## **GOD'S 'NAME' AND GOD'S 'GLORY'**

By J. Gordon McConville

It has become fashionable in Old Testament studies to think of the book of Deuteronomy as the deposit of a 'demythologizing' movement whose aim, in the words of M. Weinfeld, was 'the collapse of an entire system of concepts which for centuries had been regarded as sacrosanct'.<sup>1/</sup> Deuteronomy, it is held, rejects the older theology of the Jerusalem cult which regarded the temple as the permanent dwelling-place of Yahweh. In this tradition, Mt. Zion was the 'mountain of Yahweh's inheritance' in the sense of the Canaanite-mythological idea of the god's cosmic abode.<sup>2/</sup> God is thought of in a corporeal way. Within the tabernacle 'sits the Deity ensconced between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark, his footstool'.<sup>3/</sup> The priestly ministrations served to satisfy his physical needs, and were performed *לפני יהוה*, *i.e.* in his very presence.<sup>4/</sup> On this view, Israel's entitlement to dwell in her land was cultic; it was guaranteed by Yahweh's dwelling on Zion.<sup>5/</sup> This had the effect of evacuating Israel's religion of ethical content, and led to the opposition of the prophets.<sup>6/</sup> But the most systematic rejection of the 'official' Jerusalem theology, it is said, is embodied in Deuteronomy.

Deuteronomy insisted that Yahweh dwelt, not in the temple, but in Heaven. Von Rad, followed by many others, discerns a change in the conception of the ark in Deuteronomy. No longer is it the footstool of God dwelling in the tabernacle, but merely a receptacle

1. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford, 1972), 190.
2. R. E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Oxford, 1965), 94; *cf.* 51ff.
3. Weinfeld, *op. cit.*, 191.
4. *Ibid.*, 192.
5. *Cf.* Clements, *op. cit.*, 86f.
6. *Ibid.*

containing the stones on which the law is written./7/  
 The ark has been 'demythologized'. But the most important weapon in Deuteronomy's demythologizing armoury was, for von Rad and others, its use of name-theology. The question of demythologization could be treated from many angles. But our present study will concern itself only with this aspect of it.

Von Rad, whose work on name-theology has been widely accepted and followed, recognized that it was not new with Deuteronomy, but he believed nonetheless that it attained its most developed form there. Rejecting the 'old crude idea' of Yahweh dwelling in the shrine,/8/ Deuteronomy believed that not Yahweh, but only his name 'as a guarantee of his will to save' dwelt there./9/ The name achieved, indeed, an 'almost material presence', so that the conception of it there 'verges closely on a hypostasis'.

In particular, von Rad set Deuteronomy's 'name-theology' over against the 'glory-theology' of P. Glory-theology was another means, von Rad believes, by which the actual presence of Yahweh at the shrine was denied. Indeed it was an advance over name-theology, for now there is not even a hypostasis of Yahweh there. Rather P's tabernacle becomes 'the place on earth where, for the time being, the appearance of Yahweh's glory meets with his people'./10/ This is in curious contrast to the view of Weinfeld, who thinks the 'glory' imagery 'derives from ancient traditions concerning divine manifestations'./11/ כבוד, he thinks, literally means 'body' or 'substance'./12/ Glory-theology is for him, therefore, the epitome of primitiveness and corporeality in theophany, and it is this that Deuteronomy's name-theology is reacting against./13/

7. G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy* (London, 1953), 40; cf. Clements, *VT* 15 (1965) 301f; Weinfeld, *op. cit.*, 195.
8. G. von Rad, *op. cit.*, 38.
9. *Ibid.*, 38f.
10. *Ibid.*, 39; cf. R. E. Clements, *God and Temple*, 94.
11. Weinfeld, *op. cit.*, 204.
12. *Ibid.*, 202.
13. *Ibid.*, 206.

Despite this disagreement over glory-theology, however, von Rad and Weinfeld are agreed that name-theology was something distinct from it and characteristically deuteronomic.

Building on von Rad's basic premise, F. Dumermuth attempted to explain the presence of name-theology in Deuteronomy.<sup>14</sup> In his attempt to discover which sanctuary was intended by the expression 'the place which the Lord shall choose',<sup>15</sup> he traced the history of name-theology in distinction not only from the glory-theology of Psalms and Chronicles, but also from ark-theology, of which, he thought, only a residue remains in Deuteronomy.<sup>16</sup> He proposed that while ark-theology was at home in Jerusalem and Judah, name-theology arose in the north, that is, in a part of Israel for which the ark and its traditions were lost after the division of the kingdom. Name-theology was, he believed, a conscious attempt to replace the ark as a guarantee of God's presence.<sup>17</sup> However, when Deuteronomy appeared in Jerusalem, found by Josiah, the name-theology remained, and the ark found no real place in Deuteronomy again. But in the long run, 'name' proved to have little staying power. Although it features in Psalms and Chronicles it is not really at home in either. Glory-theology is more characteristic there. Dumermuth thus tried to trace the contrast between name- and glory/ark theologies right through the Old Testament.

This, then, is one understanding of the nature of name-theology in Deuteronomy. The existence, however, of certain Old Testament passages which seem to combine name-theology happily with the themes with which it is said to be incompatible<sup>18</sup> leads us to ask whether it is the right one.

14. F. Dumermuth, 'Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihren Voraussetzungen', *ZAW* 70 (1958) 59-98.
15. *Ibid.*, 61ff.
16. *Ibid.*, 70ff.
17. E. W. Nicholson takes up the same idea in *Deuteronomy and Tradition* (Oxford, 1967), 71ff.
18. One such is 2 Sa. 6:2, where we read of '...the ark of God which is called by the *name* of the Lord of hosts who sits enthroned on the cherubim'. Cf. 1 Kgs. 8:10-12 with vv. 14 ff, where glory-theology and name-theology are juxtaposed in Solomon's prayer.

One other way of looking at Deuteronomy's name-theology is against the background of the use of the 'name' of a king or overlord in the Ancient Near East. The king Abdu-Heba, mentioned in the Amarna letters, 'set his name in the land of Jerusalem'./19/ The phrase *šakan šumšu* is like the Hebrew שָׁכַן שְׁמִי in form. It appears to be an affirmation of ownership of the place where the name is set,/20/ with implications of control over the surrounding area./21/

The ideas attendant on the Akkadian phrase *šakan šumšu* can plausibly be carried over to Deuteronomy./22/ The phrase 'the place which the Lord shall choose to put his name there' indicates that the chosen sanctuary will be Yahweh's possession for ever, and indeed affirms his lordship over the whole land. Thus the name-theology of Deuteronomy becomes a way of expressing the essential deuteronomic theme of conquest and possession of the land. This is a very different angle on name-theology from that proposed by von Rad, Weinfeld and others. It makes its origins legal not cultic,/23/ and therefore does not depend purely on the postulation of the reaction of one kind of cult-theology against another. /24/ It raises the possibility that name-theology, while it undoubtedly has a peculiar role to play in Old Testament theology, should be seen as complementary to other ways of speaking about the presence of God, rather than as representing a different conception of that presence.

19. El-Amarna letters 287: 60-63.
20. Cf. J. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem* (Munich, 1963), 163; R. de Vaux, *RB* 73 (1966) 449. Schreiner cites C. Bezold's opinion (*Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar*, Heidelberg, 1926, 272 b), that 'to set the name' means 'to establish lordship (die Herrschaft antreten)'.  
21. For a more detailed treatment of the Akkadian phrase in relation to the Old Testament, see C. J. Wenham, *TB* 22 (1971) 112f.
22. The inference is made by both Schreiner and Wenham.
23. De Vaux, *RB* 73, 449.
24. This is not to suggest, incidentally, that all the scholars who point out the El-Amarna parallel deny that name-theology should be seen in terms of a contrast with glory-theology; cf. de Vaux, *op. cit.*

Before proceeding to examine more closely in what way name-theology might relate complementarily to glory-theology, a word will be in place about the relation of name- and ark-theology. J. Schreiner took Dumermuth to task for his belief that name-theology was the north's answer to its loss of the ark. To compare name-theology with ark-theology is not to compare like with like. If a parallel exists between the ark and something in Jeroboam's cult it would be the calves set up in Bethel and Dan. The very plurality of Jeroboam's sanctuaries stands against the view that Jeroboam was merely trying to replace the Jerusalem cult.<sup>/25/</sup> These criticisms are telling. And Schreiner strengthens his case by giving due weight to 2 Samuel 6:2 (cited above <sup>/26/</sup>) as proof of the close relationship, that existed between the ark and the name. In Jeremiah 7:12, furthermore, Yahweh's name was said to have been at Shiloh - which was of course the home of the ark for a long time.<sup>/27/</sup> If Schreiner then goes beyond the evidence in suggesting that the procession of the ark to Jerusalem was a bearing of the name thither,<sup>/28/</sup> he has nonetheless redressed the balance in favour of a proper association of name and ark.

Exodus 33: 18ff is a vital passage for the interpretation of the relation between the name and the glory of God. Its interest lies not merely in the juxtaposition of the two ideas, but in that the passage comes close to articulating how they stand in relation to each other. J. Barr thinks it unlikely that any source division could separate out the various 'presentations' of the Deity in this passage.<sup>/29/</sup> But because of the subject-matter of the passage, we have to go further and say that, at this point at least (and the passage is broadly classified as belonging to JE) there is a theology whose perspective can embrace both the name and the glory.

25. Schreiner, *op. cit.* 159f.

26. See note 18.

27. Schreiner, *op. cit.*, 161.

28. *Ibid.*

29. J. Barr, *VTS* 7 (1959) 35. As well as שם and כבוד, the passage contains the terms מלאך, פנים, טוב and אהור.

In v. 18 Moses makes the bold request of Yahweh: 'I pray thee, show me thy glory'.<sup>30</sup> Yahweh declines to show Moses his glory, but says rather: 'I will make all my goodness pass before you, and will proclaim before you my name' (v. 19). Moses is then granted a vision of God. While God's glory passes by, Moses has to be shielded from it lest he should die. He then sees God's back (אחור), but not his face (פנים). The introduction of these last terms makes the terminology a little problematical. But it is clear enough, that Moses has had to be shielded from a full view of God's glory, while he is permitted to be fully conversant and familiar with his name. In the familiarity of the name and in the fact that the glory of God is not immediately accessible to Moses, we may have a clue as to how to proceed in evaluating the different uses of the two terms.

As Barr has pointed out, the problem in Exodus 33:18ff, coming as it does on the heels of the rebellion in Exodus 32 (the making of the golden calf), is: 'how can Yahweh now go with Israel on their journey?'.<sup>31</sup> There is a deep tension here. On the one hand, Moses expresses the concern that Yahweh should continue to be among his people; his presence is seen as essential to their continued well-being. Yet on the other, that very presence is likely to consume them (v. 20). And Yahweh's answer to the problem is to shield his glory (v. 22) (alternatively, his face, vv. 20,23), while proclaiming his name (and making all his goodness pass before Moses, v. 19). The theophanic terms are marshalled in such a way as to provide a solution to the problem raised by Israel's need to approach and be intimate with one who by his nature was holy and unapproachable. Hence the centrality of the notions of

30. B. S. Childs has suggested that this request parallels Moses' earlier desire to know God's name (Ex. 3:13). *Exodus* (London, 1974), 595.
31. Barr, *op. cit.*, 35. V. 20 suggests a general sense in which the presence of Yahweh is likely to consume men, *i.e.* not specifically related to the sin of Ex. 32. Whether or not the sin of Ex. 32 is in mind, however, the nature of the tension is the same.

graciousness and mercy (v. 19). The name and the 'goodness' reflect this disposition to have mercy.<sup>32/</sup>

Confirmation for the distinction made (in this JE passage) may be found in the use of 'glory' in certain passages attributed to P. In Exodus 40:34f it is said that the glory of, the Lord filled the tabernacle and Moses could not enter the tent of meeting because of it. As in Exodus 33:18ff the unapproachability of God's glory is emphasized. Exodus 40:34f is closely followed by 1 Kings 8:11 and 2 Chronicles 7:2.

In some P passages the glory of God does seem to appear to all the people.<sup>33/</sup> There is probably no need to think, however, that this constitutes a second kind of understanding of the glory within P. A ready explanation is found in Exodus 16:10, 24:16. In the former of these it is said explicitly, and in the latter strongly suggested, that the glory appeared 'in the cloud'. Probably, therefore, we have to suppose that in those passages where the glory appears at the tabernacle (as Numbers 17:7 (16:42)), the cloud that normally covered it<sup>34/</sup> covered the glory also.<sup>35/</sup> The cloud

32. Barr rightly points out that this passage and the problems it raises have nothing to do with the question of anthropomorphism, but are entirely about the relation between sin and the presence of God, *op. cit.*, 36. Here is another indication that Weinfeld, von Rad and others have been mistaken in thinking that the relation between 'name' and 'glory' was to be discussed in terms of anthropomorphic and anti-anthropomorphic conceptions.
33. *E.g.* Ex. 16:10, Nu. 14:10; 16:19; 17:7 (16:42); 20:6.
34. See Nu. 9:16, Ex. 40:38.
35. Support for this comes from J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology I* (University of California Press, 1970), 45n. Milgrom describes the appearance of God's glory as 'cloud-encased fire'. In the same place, incidentally, he argues that the Sinai theophany of Ex. 19 is the archetype of P's tabernacle, indicating a correspondence which, he thinks, demands a re-appraisal of source-criticism, pp. 44f and nn. 167, 170. For the appearance of the glory in the cloud *cf.* M. Weinfeld, *op. cit.*, 202f.

would presumably have lessened the effect of the vision of God's glory, thus fulfilling the same function as God shielding Moses in Exodus 33:22.

There is, incidentally, a hint of a specific purpose in the appearance of God's glory in Numbers 16:2, namely that '. . . you shall know that I am the Lord'. And here, once again, it seems that the glory has similar functions in JE and P. Numbers 14:20f (JE) looks forward to the day when 'all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord'. In the P passages, 'glory' is a means by which people shall know the Lord; in JE it anticipates a day when all men actually would know him.

We can conclude from these occurrences of 'glory' in JE and P that they consistently express some unusual manifestation of God. The glory of God is unapproachable and dangerous and may not be seen by the people, or even by Moses. The name of God, on the other hand, is something with which his worshippers are permitted to become familiar. From Exodus 3:14 and 33:19 we know that there is no hesitancy on Yahweh's part in this respect, in contrast to the revelation of his glory.

It seems to me that the broad distinction discerned here can be maintained in large parts of the Old Testament. The Psalms, the prophets and Chronicles all accommodate both the name and the glory. This in itself is an indication that they are compatible, and that the various writers concerned consider them to have complementary roles. But this is precisely what Dumermuth felt it necessary to deny. In his view the name is not really at home either in Psalms or Chronicles. It has crept into the latter, he believes, via a deuteronomistic redactional layer, while in Psalms where both terms appear, the glory idea seems to be preferred. /36/

A look at these books, however, reveals that no more here than elsewhere are the two terms in competition with each other. In the Psalms the context of the 'name' is usually one of personal devotion. The Psalmists 'call on thy name', *i.e.* in normal prayer (63:4; 80:19; 99:6

36. *Op. cit.*, 78.



etc.), 'sing praises to his name' (68:5, *cf.* 92:2; 135:3 etc.), 'fear thy name' (61:5), 'love his name' (69:36), 'worship thy name' (86:9), 'give thanks to thy holy name' (106:47), seek 'help . . . in the name of the Lord' (124:8), 'trust in his holy name' (33:21) and 'know thy name' (9:10). The last of these perhaps embraces all of them, being strongly reminiscent of Yahweh's revelation of his name in the Pentateuch and that readiness to make it familiar which we have noticed. The name-tradition is clearly very much at home in the Psalms, and evidently occurs readily to the psalmists when they seek to express feelings towards God which would be the stock-in-trade of regular, normal worship./37/

In contrast, 'glory' appears to be the preferred expression when the context is that of the dramatic manifestation of God, and is therefore in continuity with its use as we have observed it in both JE and P. Psalm 97 exemplifies this well. Here all the peoples of the earth behold a dramatic manifestation of God on Zion. The gods themselves bow before him. The attendant imagery is that of fire and lightning and mountains melting like wax. And very significantly, 'clouds and thick darkness are round about him' (v. 2). The appearing of the glory on Sinai (Ex. 19:16; 24:15ff) is clearly recalled, as indeed is the general theme, in P and JE, of the glory being covered in cloud. Psalm 96:3ff speaks similarly of the spectacular nature of God's glory, such that all the nations see it and fear. /38/ This fear is different from the godly fear of the worshipper of Yahweh in the expression 'fear thy name' (61:5). It is rather the terror of those to whom God

37. Of all the places mentioned Ps. 116 may illustrate most clearly the worship context. There we read of 'my supplications', v. 1; 'the soul's rest', v. 7; praise for deliverance from death, tears, stumbling, v. 8; and walking before the Lord, v. 9. Schreiner has also seen the close relation between prayer and the name (*Sion-Jerusalem*, 164). He cites Solomon's dedication-prayer as itself an embodiment of this, and also cites passages in Psalms and elsewhere to show how the name is used in contexts of grace, salvation and trust in God.
38. *Cf.* Ps. 66:2f.

appears as the most terrible of enemies. 106:20 relates God's glory and his judgment on Israel's sin very closely.<sup>39/</sup> 108:6 expresses the wish that God's glory should cover the earth - reminiscent of Numbers 14:21 (JE) - and a reference again to the visible majesty of God. Other examples of the use of 'glory' for a dramatic manifestation of God are 102:16; 104:31f (of Sinai); 96:3; 72:18; 145:11f. Often the thought is simply that of loftiness and majesty, without any specific theophany; 113:4; 19:2; 138:5f.

There are a few occasions in the Psalms when the roles of 'name' and 'glory' might seem to be reversed. 111:9 reads 'Holy and terrible is his name'. 44:51 and 54:1 stress the might of God's name, enabling the worshipper to overcome his enemies. But there is no real departure from normal usage here. The 'terrible' (נורא) of 111:9 corresponds to the 'fear thy name' of 61:5. And the latter two passages are really contexts which express trust in God for strength. 26:8, on the other hand, uses 'glory' in a context of devotion. The Psalmist says 'I love. . . the place where thy glory dwells'. It is significant, however, that the object of 'love' is 'place', not 'glory'. The combination 'love thy glory' is unthinkable. The distinction therefore is persistent.

This is true even in those texts which contain the combination 'glory of his name', and variants. When this occurs the context usually brings one into the foreground more than the other. In 29:2 and 66:2 the stress is on the glory; in 79:10 it is probably on the name. Psalm 96 is a song of the victories of God set in the context of normal worship, resulting in a curious intermingling of the two themes - but no confusion.

We have to conclude from the above that 'name' and 'glory' in the Psalms fulfil distinct functions. There are contexts where the one is appropriate and the other definitely not. The psalmists do not trust or love or call on God's glory, whereas this is characteristic of the name.

39. This was often the case in P. In Nu. 14:10 it heralds the judgment on the faithless spies, vv. 36f. Cf. Nu. 16:19ff (the judgment on Korah).

This may seem to push us towards von Rad's opinion that the name verged on a hypostasis of God, the glory being more in the way of an attribute. Von Rad said of Deuteronomy's conception of Yahweh's presence at the sanctuary: 'It is not Yahweh himself who is present at the shrine, but only his name as a guarantee of his will to save; . . .'/40/ This is to go too far, however, for von Rad fails to take sufficient account of the possibility of direct communion with God in name-contexts, above all in Deuteronomy itself./41/ The Psalmists too communed directly with their God. They could love, trust and call on him without invoking the name as intermediary (*cf. e.g.* Ps. 30:1-5). It is true, of course, that name, being and personality are closely related in Hebrew thought generally./42/ But when God's name is made to appear almost synonymous with himself (as in 68:5a, where 'God' and his 'name' correspond to each other in *parallelismus membrorum*) the form is subject more to poetic considerations than to ontological./43/ Weiser is surely nearer the mark when he says that the name in the cult is a proclamation of the nature of God, linked with that of his will./44/ It is not necessary to think of this proclamation in terms of theophany however./45/ Exodus 33:18ff suggested that

40. *Op. cit.*, 38f.

41. Deuteronomy's common formula 'the place which the Lord shall choose to put his name there' is very often closely attended by the expression לַפְּנֵי יְהוָה (before Yahweh); *e.g.* Dt. 12:7, 12, 18(2x); 14:23, 26; 15:20 etc. The phrase לַפְּנֵי יְהוָה was one which Weinfeld thought characteristic of that theology which Deuteronomy was consciously opposing. But these passages show that Deuteronomy could also conceive of Yahweh as in some sense directly present at the sanctuary.

42. *Cf.* W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament II* (London, 1967), 40.

43. *Contra* Eichrodt, who has thought 'name' to be a hypostasis in the Psalms; *op. cit.* 41ff.

44. A. Weiser, *The Psalms* (London, 1962), 30ff.

45. *Contra* Weiser, *ibid.*, 30.

the proclamation of the name was something less than a full theophany. And the day-to-day practice of the cult was probably not dependent on theophany. Our observations on the use of the name in the Psalms have shown it to be used in contexts of normal worship and devotion.

It is clear from the above that Dumermuth's belief in the Psalmists' preference for 'glory' is misguided, and pays scant regard to the way in which both terms are actually used. There could only be the sort of preference he envisages if they meant roughly the same thing and were somehow in competition with one another. But this is not the case.

A brief look at Chronicles yields a similar result. Dumermuth claimed that 'name' is not really at home there, but has been imported from the deuteronomistically redacted books of Kings. There are, however, several occurrences of the name of God in Chronicles passages which are not even paralleled in Kings.<sup>46/</sup> In all of these, of course, the use of 'name' derives ultimately from the usage in Deuteronomy. The reference is to the house that was (or was to be) built for 'the name of the Lord'.<sup>47/</sup> But the absence of the Kings parallel invalidates the claim that name-theology only entered Chronicles via the deuteronomistic redactor. There is no good reason to suppose it has not been directly inspired by Deuteronomy itself. The presence of 'name' in Chronicles therefore (it is actually more frequent than 'glory'), is more than just an embarrassing anomaly which can be argued away. It is integral to the theology, of the Chronicler.<sup>48/</sup>

Dumermuth's conclusions about 'name' and 'glory' are, therefore, unsupported by the evidence in Psalms and

46. These are 1 Chr. 22:7f; 2 Chr. 6:32f; 7:14; 20:8.

47. There are other occurrences of 'the name of the Lord' in Chronicles without parallel in Kings, but these are not so directly associated with the place chosen by the Lord, or the building of the temple: e.g. 2 Chr. 14:11; 18:15.

48. Clements, *God and Temple*, 128f, sees that both are at home in Chronicles.

Chronicles. The indications are, on the contrary, that the use of the two terms is determined, not by the appropriateness of each to one or other theological movement, but rather by their separate functions, which appear to be recognized throughout the Old Testament.

Our starting-point was von Rad's treatment of name-theology in Deuteronomy. Does the above throw any new light on the fact that the name is common in Deuteronomy, while the glory and the ark find a place there only once each?<sup>49</sup>

We have noticed, especially from the Psalms but also from elsewhere, that 'name' seems to be used in contexts where the kind of revelation of and response to God is that of normal, ongoing worship. 'Glory' occurs, on the other hand, for dramatic, exceptional divine manifestations, or when some emphasis is laid on God's majesty. This is why the use of 'glory' is appropriate in, for example, the narrative of the exodus, so full of miraculous, unique event. Deuteronomy, however, in its legal part, deals rather with what is to be the routine of worship in the new land. Hence the appropriateness of 'name'.<sup>50</sup> The same factor explains the few occurrences of 'glory' and 'ark'. This does not mean the author of Deuteronomy had no time for them. They are at least present. And in its single reference to the ark, Deuteronomy has what might be thought an unlikely companion in the Psalms, where 'ark' also occurs only once.<sup>51</sup> Yet the Psalms are not usually thought to be incompatible with an ark-centred theology. With the now common association of many Psalms with the cult of the first temple, the reverse is

49. At 5:24 (21) and 10:8 respectively.

50. The relation between the name and worship in Deuteronomy and the deuteronomic literature was affirmed by Schreiner on the basis of the Amarna letters. He compared the prayer of Solomon in 1 Kgs. 8 with that of Abdu-Heba: may the King - in this case Yahweh - care for his people and land. The prayer assumes a connection between the presence of the name of Yahweh at the sanctuary and salvation: 1 Kgs. 8:29f, and *cf.* v. 16.

51. Ps. 132:8.

the case. It seems, then, that the preponderance, of 'name' over 'glory' and 'ark' in Deuteronomy can be explained quite acceptably in terms of the nature of the book itself.

It is true, then, that 'name' is deliberately chosen in Deuteronomy when it is used. But this is not because it is somehow the badge of a theological movement that underlies the book, but rather because, especially in the legal part, ordinary worship is a prominent subject. Two further points lend support to this contention.

First, Deuteronomy is not unique in associating the name of God and a place of worship. The same combination is found in Exodus 20:24. That context also envisages regular worship rather than special manifestations of God. Secondly, the use of the term 'name' in Deuteronomy fits in with the book's wider concern to set the worship of Yahweh over against that of foreign gods. Other gods also have names. This gives rise to the possibility of contrast between Yahweh and them, possibility which is exploited in 12:3-5. Yahweh will put his name at the place which he shall choose (v. 5); but the names (אֱלֹהִים) of foreign gods are to be destroyed (v. 3).<sup>52</sup> This is not just a stylistic effect, although it is that. It shows again in what sense the name and the glory are distinct from each other. The presence of the name of Yahweh at the cult-place of Israel means that it is Yahweh who dwells there and has power there, and no other god. The point is insisted upon in the name-names contrast because 'the place which the Lord shall choose' (whichever sanctuaries that phrase was subsequently applied to), would almost certainly have been associated with the names of particular foreign deities before it was associated with Yahweh. In this way diction is wedded to content. It is difficult to imagine such an effect being produced with 'glory', since it is hardly conceivable that a Yahwist would write of the glory of a foreign god. This is evident from a passage like Psalm 97:5ff, where the

52. G. J. Wenham says, on the basis of 12:3, that 'Yahweh's name is conceived of dwelling in his sanctuary in much the same way as the name of Canaanite gods dwelt in theirs'. *TB* 22, 113.

appearance of Yahweh's glory (v. 5) is evidence in itself of his exaltation above all other gods (vv. 6, 8). The contrast here is of a different kind, and apparently does not oppose Yahweh to other particular gods, but rather to gods in general. For this reason too, then, the use of the name of Yahweh, rather than that of his glory, is more appropriate to the purposes of Deuteronomy.