OD Series: Volume One

Thus says the LORD:

'NO OPEN DEFECATION, ELSE...'

by

Rev James Yamoah (PhD)

Dedication

To

Dr. Siaw Agyapong,

CEO of Jospong Group of Companies, which includes Zoomlion,

for his commitment to the fight against filth in Ghana

.

Acknowledgement

This book was completed with the support of many dependable persons, particularly, my great family. Specific names that constantly ring bells in my spirit are: Madam Mary Nyarko (my mother), Messrs Francis Gyamera Akwaw (of blessed memory) and Peter Yamoah Akwaw (my uncles), Mrs Rose-Vida Danquah and Ms Georgina Achiaah (my aunts), my siblings, cousins and the entire family. The families of Mr Obiri-Yeboah, Mrs Rita Amakye-Ansah, and Madam Charity Nyarkoah (my mother-in-law) deserve mention together with Madam Ernestina Addo.

On the academic front are all who have mentored me in my education. Dr Manuel Budu Adjei and all known past and present faculty and staff, graduates, and students of Ghana Christian University College, Accra, deserve mention. Some professors of Cincinnati Christian University (CCU), Ohio, USA, especially, Dr and Dr (Mrs) Weber, Dr and Mrs Roadcup, Dr Mark Ziese, and Professor Dan Dyke, deserve mention. I am grateful to Dr S Gyanfosu, Mr E Ofori-Attah, Ms A Frempong-Kore, and Ms E Abena Agyeman, and Rev Dr James Walton of Akrofi-Christaller Institute (ACI) for their editorial support. To crown this group are the supervisors of this dissertation, Dr A Asumang and Dr R W Domeris. May God reward all of them for their support for me.

As for the special lady in my life, Mrs Florence Yamoah, and my biological children, they cannot be forgotten in any of the books I author. While it is her presence that provided the needed comfort for this work, it is the constant interactions of Jemima,

Emmanuel, and Joseph (my children), that constituted the source of power that catapulted me to the finishing line. I pray God's abiding presence with them eternally. Above all, I am forever grateful to my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is His faithfulness that has brought me thus far. Indeed, His faithfulness is great (Lam 3:23). **Amen**.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviations for various Bible versions

ESV	2001. *English Standard Version.* Wheaton: Standard Bible Society.
	2012. *Global Study Bible.* Wheaton: Crossway
GNB	1992. *Good News Bible*. New York: American Bible Society.
	1994. *Good News Bible* (with The Deuterocanonical Books). Africa: The United Bible Societies.
KJV	1611. *King James Version*.
NAB	1970. *New American Bible.* Paterson, NJ: St Anthony Guild Press.
NASB	1995. *New American Standard Bible*. La Habra: Lockman Foundation.
NET	2006. *New English Translation*. Biblical Studies Press.
NIB	*New International Bible* (UK).
NIV	1984. *New International Version.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
NJB	*New Jerusalem Bible.*
NKJV	1982. *New King James Version.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishing.
NLT	2004. *New Living Translation* (2nd Ed.). Wheaton Tyndale House.
RSV	*Revised Standard Version.* Oak Harbour: Logos Research Systems.

Common Theological abbreviations (Abb)

Abb	Full meaning	Abb	Full meaning
AD	In the year of our Lord	HB	*Hebrew Bible*
ANE	Ancient Near East(ern)	LXX	*Septuagint*

BC	Before Christ's advent	NT	New Testament
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls	OT	Old Testament
et al	and others		

Abbreviations for Bible books used in parentheses

Genesis	Gen	*Nahum*	Nah
Exodus	Exod	*Habakkuk*	Hab
Leviticus	Lev	*Zephaniah*	Zeph
Numbers	Num	*Haggai*	Hag
Deuteronomy	Deut	*Zechariah*	Zech
Joshua	Josh	*Malachi*	Mal
Judges	Judg	*Matthew*	Matt
Ruth	Ruth	*Mark*	Mark
1 Samuel	1 Sam	*Luke*	Luke
2 Samuel	2 Sam	*John*	John
1 Kings	1 Kgs	*Acts*	Acts
2 Kings	2 Kgs	*Romans*	Rom
1 Chronicles	1 Chr	*1 Corinthians*	1 Cor
2 Chronicles	2 Chr	*2 Corinthians*	2 Cor
Ezra	Ezra	*Galatians*	Gal
Nehemiah	Neh	*Ephesians*	Eph
Esther	Esth	*Philippians*	Phil
Job	Job	*Colossians*	Col
Psalms	Psa	*1 Thessalonians*	1 Thess
Proverbs	Prov	*2 Thessalonians*	2 Thess
Ecclesiastes	Eccl	*1 Timothy*	1 Tim
Song of Songs	Song	*2 Timothy*	2 Tim
Isaiah	Isa	*Titus*	Titus
Jeremiah	Jer	*Philemon*	Phlm
Lamentation	Lam	*Hebrews*	Heb
Ezekiel	Ezek	*James*	Jas
Daniel	Dan	*1 Peter*	1 Pet
Hosea	Hos	*2 Peter*	2 Pet
Joel	Joel	*1 John*	1 John
Amos	Amos	*2 John*	2 John

Obadiah	Obad	*3 John*	3 John
Jonah	Jonah	*Jude*	Jude
Micah	Mic	*Revelation*	Rev

Some Deutero-canonical book

Tobit	Tob	*1 Maccabees*	1 Macc	*2 Maccabees*	2 Macc

Abbreviations of theological research & reference resources

ABC	*African Bible Commentary*
ACE	*African Christian Ethics*
AJET	*Africa Journal of Evangelical Theology*
AJPS	*Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies*
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BDB	Brown, Driver and Briggs, *Hebrew-English Lexicon*
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*
BR	*Biblical Research*
BSac	*Bibliotheca Sacra*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
EBC	*Expositor's Bible Commentary*
EQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
ISBE	*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*
JACT	*Journal of African Christian Thought*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JRE	*Journal of Religious Ethics*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JTI	*Journal of Theological Interpretation*
JTSA	*Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*
NDBT	Alexander, *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*
NIBC	*New International Biblical Commentary*
NICOT	*New International Commentary on the Old Testament*
NIDB	*The New International Dictionary of the Bible*
RQ	*Restoration Quarterly*
SBL	*Society of Biblical Literature*

SBLDS	*Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series*
TrinJ	*Trinity Journal*
TWOT	Archer, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WBC	*Word Biblical Commentary*
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*

Introduction

Just as cutting-edge solutions are sought continually because distinct challenges keep on emerging with time, even so are certain stipulations of Scripture meant to deal with specific issues of humanity. This is the rationale for the contents of this book: ***Thus says the LORD: 'No Open Defecation, else…'*** and two others in the OD Series: ***"Holy War": The Consequence of Open Defecation*** and ***Fellow Ghanaians, Let's Stop Open Defecation, else….*** All three books have their foundation in a journey that was triggered by my abhorrence of the high incidence of Open Defecation practices in Ghana. The desire to help a campaign against this negative practice inspired me to begin a dissertation in September 2010 on the topic: "A Multi-disciplinary Study of Deuteronomy 23:12-14", which was submitted for Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Theology at the South African Theological Seminary (SATS), April 2015. Its contents set out the conceptualisations in a multi-disciplinary exegesis of one of the OT sanitation laws, Deuteronomy 23:12-14, to determine its implications for society. The discussions are geared towards tackling the theological, socio-cultural, and doubtless, ethical implications of sanitation in certain quarters of the world today.

This introductory section of the first book thus serves as the platform for an orientation to the fundamental arguments and discussions presented subsequently. The circumstance that prompted the investigations that culminated in writing this book is my observation of the lack of a clear interpretation of some passages of Scripture for the full benefit of New Testament (NT) believers and larger society today. With my background in Old Testament (OT) biblical studies, and having taught same at a

Christian University, I have observed that some of the OT Laws are underlined by many concepts that need to be explored. Arguably, this is not only due to lack of their exploration, but also, there appears to be little or no consensus among theologians on the fundamental motivations for these laws.

There is also no doubt, that, this lack is premised on the inconsistent models which are available for their interpretation. Interestingly, even when some of the undergirding concepts of these laws have been unearthed, the terrain for connecting and applying them to NT circumstances or make them relevant to Christians, is very rough and unclear. In other words, the existing unclear connections with the NT lead, more often, to inadequate and or inappropriate application of such passages to NT users and/or Christians in general. Consequently, Christians and larger society are often deprived of the intended benefits of such an important law that prohibits open defecation.

So, there is need for scholars to settle on the issues of connectivity between the OT laws, such as the ones on holiness to the NT, and the interpretation of the latter in the light of the former. This is where current efforts are worth supporting. Indeed, some scholars have already shown the way and many more are on the track. For example, Asumang and Domeris (2006:23) have applied appropriate sociological and literary spatial theories to the spaces in the pentateuchal wilderness camp and tabernacle to explain the Christological comparisons and the spatial emphasis in Hebrews which are often intertwined in the author's presentation. Their effort shows how the OT laws can find appropriation in the NT for the benefit of every believer of Scripture.

Thus, while those who treat the Bible as 'specimen' may argue that they make an important contribution since they shed

light on the Bible and enable its interpretation, I wish to posit a contrast. As a biblical scholar of African descent, I fully identify with LeMarquand's (2012:192-199) statement that 'the study of the Bible as merely a 'specimen' to help in the reconstruction of history is known but rarely done by African biblical scholars'. On the contrary, considering the challenges of contemporary life in general, the focus of any critical biblical study should be how to labour for the practical contribution of the text to contemporary Christian discipleship and practice. That is, from hermeneutic premises, then, the OT text should not only be fulfilled in the NT but find application beyond it to the contemporary context.

The pentateuchal laws in Deuteronomy, particularly, have suffered such an unfortunate situation. McKenzie (2002:43) notes: 'It seems to me that Deuteronomy's theological impact on the Bible and beyond may be hard to overestimate and that in the past it has not been fully appreciated'. This begs the question: what should be done to fully explore the significance and theological impact of the pentateuchal laws, particularly, that of the book of Deuteronomy? In answer to this question, one of the laws needs to be thoroughly investigated to substantiate our argument.

Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is worthy of such a consideration. The fundamental argument presented here is that this passage, Deuteronomy 23:12-14, which basically addresses the topic of sanitation, is pregnant with interesting theological, moral, and socio-cultural and other important concepts which require exploration. On the strength of the Historical-Grammatical model for biblical exegesis, the contextual, literary and textual, and other underpinnings of the pericope are analysed, bringing to bear its structural and rhetorical undertones. Therefore, this book intends to reaffirm and re-establish the relationships

among the main thematic areas of the passage; that is, how the laws on sanitation are connected to the environment, holiness, hygiene and disease(s) and contagion. This multi-disciplinary study focuses not only on unearthing these concepts, but also determining the interconnections between them and integrating them meaningfully.

Besides, all the arguments here are aimed at showing how Deuteronomy 23:12-14, which was set in the OT Israel camp and its environment give meaning to the 'name and place theology' and ultimately to a kind of warfare, 'holy war', which may be referred appropriately as 'a war of YHWH/Yahweh' or Yahweh war (cf. Wright 2008:87-88), and which is also designated a 'holy war'. Obedience to the stipulations of this sanitation law that deals with open defecation would no doubt ensure the needed holiness (or purity) of the place and thus pave the way for, Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty to fight His enemies in a 'holy war'. The details of 'holy war' are thus discussed in the second volume, ***"Holy War": The Consequence of Open Defecation.***

As argued already, there are clear connections of such a passage with the NT and its benefits can be derived by Christians in general and the world at large. So, on the strength of our chosen hermeneutical grid, the OT passage is connected to the NT context, where the discussion links the pericope to some appropriate passages. One major link is Paul's letters to the Corinthians, where he discusses purity of the temple (2 Cor 6:14-7:1). The undergirding concepts will lay the foundation for God's judgement against His enemies in a 'holy war' to be engaged.

Overall, the discussions on the OT Open Defecation law of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 in this book are meant to show that the law is undergirded by many concepts which can be integrated meaningfully. They are to help in providing a general framework

for the application of relevant OT passages for NT context and beyond. But more importantly, they are to hammer on the fact that the YHWH's prohibition of open defecation and instructions on how to handle human waste has consequences which are of significance to present-day society.

REV. JAMES YAMOAH, PhD
VICE PRESIDENT – GHANA CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, ACCRA
CONTACTS: 024 446 2843 (WhatsApp line)
E-mail: jimmyamoah@yahoo.com

Chapter 1

Open Defecation: Forbidden by God's Sanitation Law

Open Defecation[1] (OD) is where human faeces are dropped in open places, a situation which is referred to as "free range". In other words, it is the practice of people defecating outside and not making use of a designated toilet, whether such a facility is available or not. In some cases, people engage in defecating into black polythene bags and dispose them off indiscriminately, usually by throwing them onto open places, or thrown behind the house where tenants live, a phenomenon shamefully described as 'short-put human excreta'. Such faecal matter is usually left exposed in open places or not well covered.

This sanitation-related practice, is common in both in rural and urban areas. It is often done in bushes, in gutters or drains, on the beach and banks of water bodies, behind people houses and, in fact, in any available open places. Though children are usually the 'chief culprits' in most free-range communities, the involvement of adults worsen the incidence. OD is a menace or threat to human life and deemed the riskiest of all the insanitary practices. As a result of the extreme negative impact of this age-old practice on society, it is considered as one of the century-old menaces in human history.

[1] It is becoming increasingly difficult to stick to a single track in the use of British or America English since large volumes of work in one track with quotes from the other need to keep changing spelling all the time. Thus, a differentiation between these two closely-related forms, in some jurisdictions, is not a priority. This work makes room for a blend of the two.

Since the practice of defecating in the open have been common to many cultures centuries ago, as indicated above, the havoc it has caused and the threat it continues to pose have also been of a great concern over the ages. There is no doubt that the desire to deal with the menace has driven researchers to seek solutions by exploring many fields, including turning to the Scriptures. And surely, the "Good Book" usually gives specific instructions on how people should handle different situations.

It is such deeper explorations of Scriptures that have led to a discovery of how God dealt with the Israelites concerning the management of human excrement in their camp during the wilderness part of their journey from Egypt to the Promised Land. This major breakthrough in sanitation is specifically connected to the prevention of open defecation and is clearly stipulated in Deuteronomy 23:12-14. The detailed law spelt out in this text or pericope[2] is observed to be connected to a couple of interesting concepts. Hence, the stipulations therein have been subjected to exegetical analysis in this book to determine some of the undergirding concepts and their motivations as well as some of the possible interconnections that exist among them.

Therefore, in this first chapter of this book, the focus is to introduce the law that tackles OD in order to set the stage for more detailed scholarly deliberations on some of the pertinent reasons for the instructions in subsequent chapters. The text under consideration, Deuteronomy 23:12-14, in the NIV[3], reads:

---

[2] A pericope is a designated piece of Scripture that constitutes a self-contained unit and conveys a complete message. In other words, it is a chosen passage that can independently communicate a full message.

[3] Unless otherwise stated, all Scriptural quotations are from the NIV. Moreover, the text provided here is only provisional pending the outcome of the translation of the exegesis of the original text.

> 12 Designate a place outside the camp where you
> can go to relieve yourself. 13 As part of your
> equipment have something to dig with, and when
> you relieve yourself, dig a hole and cover up your
> excrement. 14 For the LORD your God moves about
> in your camp to protect you and to deliver your
> enemies to you. Your camp must be holy, so that he
> will not see among you anything indecent and turn
> away from you.

The extensive interest generated by this pentateuchal law in particular accounts for the many attempts by scholars to interpret it, and some of the many positions that have emerged for its enactment are quite varied. Yet, there appears to be appreciable degree of consensus primarily on uncleanness of the environment with its accompanying dangers that improper faeces disposal poses to human life in general as perhaps the fundamental reasons. This is in the light of the observation that the sanitation in relation to proper handling of faeces of any ecosystem cannot be decoupled from the health of that community, particularly, that of human beings.

All these are to be considered in the light of the ritual (or cultic) demands for a people and by extension the whole camp, because of the presence of the Holy God. Thus, it might be posited that in Israel's observation of God's instructions stated in Deuteronomy 23:12-14, He is present in their camp to protect them and deal with their enemies (cf. Lioy 2010:27). And rightly so. This promise is not to protect them only but to also bring judgement on their enemies through a special kind of war. This

war declared by Yahweh[4], is a 'divine war'[5], and is therefore appropriate that it is called 'Yahweh war' or 'holy war'.

One of the dangers, perhaps, is the consequence that awaits the people of Israel themselves in the event of their failure to heed the instructions. That is, if they soil the camp through faeces dropped by way of open defecation, the same 'holy war' is declared by the Almighty God, against them. The extent of their obedience or otherwise will unfold as the discussions travel through the subsequent chapters in the consideration of one concept after the other.

Chapter Conclusion

It must be re-echoed here: Thus says the LORD: 'No open defecation, else…' is the clarion call of this book. In this very first chapter, the discussions have laid a foundation for some arguments on open defecation to be built. The instructions of Deuteronomy 23:12-14, are seen to be both explicit and implicit. Fundamentally, it mentions the need for God's people to prevent defecating in the open and spelt how what should be done with clear reasons and the risk involved in failure to heed such an instruction.

In the next few chapters, we will be focusing on some of the effects of improper disposal of faeces on the hygiene and

[4] The name of the Almighty God is usually translated from the Hebrew Bible (HB) as YHWH and is designated in scholarly circles as the 'Tetragrammaton'. In this book, YHWH is represented by the more familiar form Yahweh, but the Tetragrammaton still appears in direct quotes and when very necessary.

[5] The Divine war is appropriately called 'Yahweh war' or 'holy way' because it is a special war declared by Yahweh or the Lord Himself.

health of the Israelite community and on their environment as well. Moving further, the discussions will narrow down on the implications of such a practice to the relationship between God and His people.

Chapter 2

Preventing Open Defecation ensures Hygiene & Health

The key concepts that are considered to be underpinning our chosen text (or pericope) are infringed upon by open defecation in one way or the other. Hygiene and health two related concepts identified with the text. Perhaps, it is because issues of sanitation, hygiene and health are intertwined that they are often-times discussed together on many platforms. Indeed, the wealth of every human society rests strongly on the health of the populace. Arguably, there is little or no significant progress when people live in poor sanitary conditions in general.

Consequently, in this and a couple of subsequent chapters we will consider how preventing open defecation enhances quality of life. Interpreting the sanitation laws in the light of hygiene and health shows one of the areas of preventive medicine that scripture emphasises, which also connects to the broader area of public health. It thus serves as a major bridge between theology, and for that matter, religion, and science.

The current chapter is premised on the argument that open defecation has dire imports for hygiene and health of society, thus preventing it will guarantee the safety of their life. The discussions therefore aim at considering both the connectivity between open defecation and these two related concepts and the impact that the former makes on the latter.

OT Sanitation laws are aimed at Hygiene and Health

Hygiene is commonly defined as the practice of principles or rules related to health and cleanliness. In other words, it is the

preservation of health by ensuring cleanliness in order to avoid contamination, and subsequently disease(s). One of the basic motivations for maintenance of acceptable sanitary practice in every environment, no doubt, is the reductions of cases of diseases. In respect of public health matters, sanitation is often regarded as the process of ensuring hygiene, usually through management of pollutants like excrement or faecal matter and other human waste via the sewage systems.

In particular reference to the law under discussion, the pollutant is faeces or excrement or human waste, not just any ordinary filth. Faeces is the body's solid waste matter, composed mainly of roughage from digestion of food, water, and micro-organisms, which is discharged from the bowel after digestion. The term generally qualifies to be used for any waste materials discharged from the body through the anus.

Indeed, experts in matters of hygiene agree that unsanitary acts expose every environment to contamination and diseases. Open defecation in particular is a direct cause of serious waterborne diseases such as diarrhoea, dysentery and typhoid among others. Faniran and Nihinlola admit to a link between lack of proper management of faecal matter and public health (2007:47-48). Irrefutably, 'both direct and indirect open defecation have serious implications on health' (Andoh 2014:26). Thus, the link between open defecation and hygiene is quite hard to break.

Borowski (2003:78-79) notes that good health and quality of life that lead to longevity depend heavily on good hygiene and proper sanitation. And that 'the laws on sanitation and general cleanliness were to be taken seriously, since they were among the main pivots on which good health, quality of life, and longevity rested'. What the code does, according to him, is to 'rather

substitute for the ancient health system a method that does not ensure only prevention of contagious diseases but brings about its arrest and total eradication, a method regarded as "truly wise and philosophic"' (1893:4-5). This is in line with Nossig's argument that: 'the law codes…were rules of hygiene intended to maintain and advance the health of the individual, family, nation…' (Hart 1995:74).

James Bruckner is another scholar who discusses the hygiene and health underpinnings of the Pentateuchal laws. He does so along the lines of obedience to the laws. According to him, the 613 commands of God in the Pentateuch (cf. Watt 1999:102) provided the best practices of hygiene and health, and were given by Him to free Israel from diseases that affected other people (Deut 7:15; 28:60). Bruckner (p. 15) notes:

> If the OT is taken as a guide for defining the well-being of the heart-mind, the person in social relationship, and all its sources for vitality, then the so-called *spiritual* dimension cannot simply be pasted on like a poultice to a person's health.

Bruckner relates the issue of health to soundness of the heart and the mind that originates from the Law. The term *lebäb,* according to him, is mentioned as 'heart' in the 'Shema' (Deut 6:4-5) but better translated as 'heart-mind', and that the health of a person has something to do with the *lebäb* and its decisions and actions in life. On how the whole community of Israel can be kept healthy, Bruckner argues that the first aspect is found in *sämar,* which is interpreted as 'to keep God's instruction', and may also have other meanings such as to: 'preserve', 'keep', 'treasure', 'take care of', 'observe', 'protect as property in trust'.

For Bruckner, the call to keep the instructions in the Pentateuch points to a definition of health that is body-based and

is a measure of the health of the community. Bruckner (p. 7-8) posits that God is the source of the individual and communal health of Israel. Stressing obedience to the Law as a prerequisite to good health, he argues that keeping this commandment against open defecation is considered a preventive care in Deuteronomy, and that, the onus rested on the people and not on God to ensure holiness.

Following Bruckner's line of argument on hygiene is Nossig. He also argues in defence of the law codes that they were not religious in nature, as commonly believed. According to him, the laws were rules of hygiene that were 'intended to maintain and advance the health of the individual, family, nation, and race' (cf. Hart 1995:72-97). Furthermore, Nossig argued that 'the Jews had survived and developed as a nation over thousands of years because they had adhered to the laws of hygiene set down for them in the Torah and its rabbinic and medieval commentaries'.

Similarly, Madeleine and Lane (1978:68-70) indicate concerning the Israelites, that 'there was a positive observable connection between good health and a life lived acceptably to the Lord'. According to them, the effect 'was to minimise the role of the physician and to elevate that of the priest which also strengthened adherence to the Law'. But was the idea that God/gods could be the source of protection from diseases or could cause them known to Israel only? The answer is a big No!

There are pointers to the belief that diseases have spiritual connections and were caused by God/gods and demons/evil spirits, which was greatly upheld and shared by the Ancient Near Eastern nations. According to Madeleine and Lane (1978:68-70), the Mesopotamians believed strongly than the Egyptians in the demonic character of diseases. Their argument is supported by Scurlock and Anderson (2005:17) who also submit that

'Mesopotamian physicians attributed illnesses to gods or goddesses, demons or demonesses, and ghosts'.

The issue of contagion in relation to Hygiene and Health

One of the fundamental connections between diseases and health is contagion. It is the transfer of disease from one person to another. Bruckner indicates that the issues of hygiene, in the Sinaitic Law and its concern for diseases and public health in general, reach beyond what we would call 'medical issues'. The significance of his work to my position in this book is the link he establishes between the laws and the health of the Israelite community. Of particular importance is his indication that something as simple as hygiene is commanded in specific ways in these laws, in order to avoid diseases and contagion.

Bruckner's mention of contagion as a major issue receives support from other scholars. Nossig specifically creates a continuum between the ancient and modern hygienic practices against contagious diseases (cf. Hart (1995:77). Along the same lines, Scurlock and Anderson (2005:19) connect the concept and understanding of contagion to a similar practice of the Near Eastern nations. They note concerning some of the beliefs of the Assyrian and Babylonian that there was some recognition that the act of open defecation could be associated with disease and contagion.

Also agreed to be connected to diseases in the pericope is the prevention of their spread - contagion (Scurlock and Anderson 2005:17-19; Faniran and Nihinlola 2007:48-49). Thus, from all indications, hygiene, disease, and contagion are major issues of concern for the community of Israel in the whole Torah (Borowski 2003:78-80, cf. Lev 12-15; Deut 24:8).

Open Defecation is connected to Hygiene and Health

Narrowing down on the passage under consideration, how does hygiene, health and contagion relate to the law enshrined in the OT pericope? This is the crux of the discussions in this chapter. Though some theologians might argue that hygiene is not explicitly specified as a major reason for the special instruction, a number of scholars see otherwise.

Sprinkle (2000:637-646) and a couple of scholars including Saxey (n.d:124), Adler (1893:4-5) and Hart (1995:72-97), are among those that mention hygiene and health as one of the reasons for the pentateuchal laws on sanitation. Other scholars who are convinced of the hygienic concerns of the OP/sanitation laws include Adeyemo (2006:240, 616), Douglas (2003:54), Hall (2000:348), Alexander and Rosner (2000:154-55), Holman (2003:¶5) and Zodhiates (1996:1526).

Unger (1988:201, 309; cf. Craigie 1983:299-300) states that Deuteronomy 23:12-14 was for the two-fold purpose of preserving the health of a great number of people and preserving the purity of the camp as the dwelling place of God. Borowski also points to the fact that it was to ensure healthy living conditions that Yahweh gave the instruction in the pericope (2003:79-80). Adler (1893:4-5) notes that the health code prescribed by the laws 'do not follow the ancient therapeutical or curative system'. Indeed, sanitation and hygienic injunctions of the passage are appropriate measures for the prevention of diseases, as Saxey (n.d:124) similarly argues.

Additionally, Hart (1995:73-80) notes in respect of the passage that, 'the rules of hygiene were intended to maintain and advance the health of the people'. Hart notes that it is in dealing with health and diseases that Moses, the rabbis of the Talmud, Maimonides, and other Jewish luminaries were

considered as physicians; their task was to preserve the physical health of the people (1995:73-74). By being referred to as physicians, it stands to reason that the passage was one of the underpinning laws that Moses and such people as mentioned above were obeying.

Bruckner also focuses on the stipulations of Deuteronomy 23:12-14, and argues that the text provided for the world's first public sanitation-latrine law that no doubt prevented diseases and ensured the health of the then community. He observes that the regulation also underscored other 'medical' concerns such as quarantine against contagion. Bruckner's (p. 6-15) direct connection between these social issues and obedience to God's instructions is quite relevant, since my argument in this book is that such a connection is espoused by the author of the text under discussion. Of additional importance is his note that obedience to God's law on social, hygienic and health practices is a direct issue that the Divine Locutor espoused by way of the instructions in Deuteronomy 23:12-14.

No doubt, enough evidence to conclude that the holiness espoused by the text raises concerns for hygiene, disease, and possibly contagion in the camp have been advanced. As is well known, hygiene is closely associated with diseases (also sickness or illness, Hb □□□□□, □□□□□□□□; □□□□, □□□□□□; or □□□, □□□□□). What strikes the relationship better here is the fact that the call for hygiene in the pericope was in connection with open defecation. This is because human waste contains micro-organisms, some of which might be pathogenic. Saxey (n.d:124-26) observes the link between the practice of hygiene and prevention of disease and contagion as a necessary health measure achieved through proper disposal of the excrement.

Theological significance – Prevention of defilement by disease

Disease is a health challenge, about which Scripture does not remain silent (Deut 7:15; 29:21-22; Jer 14:18; Psa 103:3; 2 Chr 21:19; cf. Holladay 1988:388-89; Strong n.d.:123). In accordance with the laws (Lev 12-15), some diseases could make people unholy and compromise the camp where God is. A typical example is what Azariah (or Uzziah) experienced when he was stricken with leprosy and was quarantined for the rest of his life (2 Kgs 15:1-5).

Thus, contracting of a similar disease or any disease from excreta could defile the soldiers and thus make unholy before God. This will in turn endanger the campers because since it becomes an infringement on the holiness of God himself. Thus, for the sake of His holiness and the safety of His army, great precaution needed to be taken to avoid the outbreak of any disease that could render them unholy. Consequently, the hygienic concerns demanded by the text were not something to be treated lightly. Among other important issues, health and hygiene are thus very significant reasons undergirding our pericope for emphasising burying of the excrement outside the camp of Israel.

Moreover, there was a high probability that any epidemic that would break out in the camp due to faeces would likely reduce the human strength of the soldiers. Consequently, a possible rational for burying faeces in the Israelite camp was that 'nobody ended up dying of disease', and 'this in turn left more men to fight enemies with' (Anonymous 2011:§1). Therefore, Holman (2003:¶5) considers Arturo Castiglioni's comment that 'soldiers should prevent the danger of infection coming from their excrement by covering it with earth constitute[s] a most important document of sanitary legislation'.

This means that burying faecal matter in the soil was intended to prevent the spread of diseases associated with it and preserve the health of God's army. In other words, one of the primary motivations of the text was for the health of the soldiers. That is, burying the faeces outside the camp would prevent contact with such pathogens-laden material and for that matter the spread of diseases related with them.

The possibility that the instructions were to deal with contagion in the camp is high and is underscored by ancient evidence. Based on Assyrian and Babylonian practices, Scurlock and Anderson (2005:19) note a link between open defecation and the outbreak of '*li'bu* fever' as a result of contagion. As a result of the link between disease and contagion, prevention of the latter no doubt underscores the social dimension of the pericope better than the other concepts.

Here too, Bruckner (n.d.:7-8) argues that quarantine, that is, the practice of keeping the people from contact with excreta, was to prevent contagion. The bottom line for the regulation is that God would not prescribe this practice for His people, if it would be detrimental to their health and very existence. The onus rested not only on the army but indeed the whole congregation of Israel to be obedient to the hygiene legislation in order not to be declared unholy, but rather enjoy protection from Yahweh.

Socio-cultural significance – disease and contagion

That the issues God was addressing by the legislative instrument was hygiene with implications for disease(s) and contagion is already indicated. The hygienic behaviour the people were supposed to observe in the camp and its implications for Israel was an issue for genuine concern. This is because the health of soldiers in a military camp is connected to their physical

and mental well-being, which also hinges on their practice and maintenance of hygiene. Of course, any unhealthy hygienic practices could subject the camp to contamination, with the resultant outbreak of diseases.

Thus, socio-culturally, the promotion of a healthy lifestyle and prevention of diseases and contagion is one of the important issues throughout generations. More often than not, the question of diseases in any social system brings into focus the issue of contagion. This hygiene-disease-contagion connection is captured straightaway by Radmacher *et al* (1997:328). What might be seen as an individual contamination can take the form of an epidemic, if timely care is not taken to avoid contagion.

Therefore, the practice of burying faeces serves as a guarantee of good health; otherwise people's carefree lives which might allow filth to surround them could lead to an outbreak of disease and contagion. As Faniran and Nihinlola (2007:48-49; cf. Bruckner n.d.:7-8) argue, 'God foresaw the unabated defecation which would result in health hazards in the human settlements, so he gave the directive in the text to maintain hygienic practices'. It comes as no surprise that these scholars advocate a combination of hygiene and sanitation as the main means for preventing contagious diseases in a community situation.

In their comment on the text under discussion, Radmacher *et al* (1997:328) underscore one of the issues of socio-cultural importance for soldiers in a military camp: 'Digging latrines was a part of military life…to prevent disease from spreading through the camp'. In other words, it was an antidote to contagion. Of significant importance for a military camp setting is the fact that any laxness in such an important public health drive is likely to have very disastrous security consequences.

What could happen when the army of a nation suffers an epidemic in the heat of a military operation is anybody's guess. Hygiene thus underscores not only the socio-cultural, but to some extent, the political importance of the regulation.

Chapter Conclusion

The discussions of this chapter have concentrated primarily on the connection between sanitation and hygiene and the implications of such a link. Hygiene is usually connected to best practices of sanitation of a whole in order to achieve desired results. It has also shown that once the Holy God is present with the army, He would not entertain any bodily defilement in the form of diseases. It is by reason of this fundamental idea that social hygiene is one of the best practices to prevent diseases and contagion and ensure both preservation and advancement of humanity an argument that this book wants to establish.

However, it needs to be indicated that other concepts also undergird the instructions of the text. In the chapter that follows, the discussions aim at defending the position that the prevention of open defecation will lead to the establishment of a healthy environment.

Chapter 3

Preventing Open Defecation leads to Healthy Environment

Sanitation, which in the context of our passage, is the prevention of open defecation, is a measure to eliminate pollutants from one's environment. This definition in the light of the fact that survival of humanity cannot be divorced from their environmental conditions. There is no doubt many underlying important reasons for burying or hiding faeces in any place are present. The foremost of these, or what can be described as the 'common-sense' reason that might immediately strike anyone, is to ensure tidiness. God knew that His people cannot make progress in their wilderness journey or win the promises He has made to them when they are unable to manage not just filth, but the worst form of it – faeces.

Besides health and hygiene implications for humans in particular, exposed faeces is not only an eye sour, in fact, the stench or malodour it usually emits is often an irritation to the pleasantness of any environment. While some may argue that the message of Deuteronomy 23:12-14, is not explicitly motivated by reasons of care for the physical environment, from the point of view of environmentalists, this argument is quite hard to accept. That the implications of environmental tidiness in this text are of significance is indicated by overwhelming scholarly support.

God cares about Creation and the Environment

From the Genesis account of creation and the mandate God gave to humankind to take care of the garden (Gen 2:15), it

stands to reason that He was deeply concerned with the care of creation and the environment in which humanity would thrive as part of an enduring ecosystem. Faniran and Nihinlola (2007:47-53; cf. Stott 1999:123-142; DeWitt 2000:71) argue that the injunctions that God gave in the creation mandate of Genesis 1-2 are for humanity to be alive to the need to keep the land in such a way that it remains unpolluted and clean. They strike a link between the important concepts of sanitation and health, since cleanness or proper care of the environment can ensure good health.

As renown 'sacred earth' advocates, Faniran and Nihinlola (2007:52-53) posit that 'the beams of light on the sustainable, integrated and especially rewarding or profitable use of waste on a continuous basis are traceable to the Bible'. They argue that God foresaw the possible explosion of waste that would be generated by increased human population and development of technology. Faniran (2001:24), quoted by Faniran and Nihinlola (2007:48) submits that: 'Because our God knows everything about the earth…and the man He created, He had to provide clear unambiguous guidelines and injunctions on environmental protection/management for its sustainable development'.

Further, Faniran and Nihinlola (2007:6; cf. Bakke n.d.) note that since man is created in God's image, he should live in a holy/clean environment like God. Places such as the tabernacle or the temple and any other designated places of worship are specifically consecrated spaces where people gather to meet and talk to God. That is, 'waste must not stay in the vicinity of the temple of God' (Faniran and Nihinlola 2007:51), because it is filth and incompatible with a holy place.

Consequently, anything that would degrade the Israelites as a covenant community and/or the proper use of the camp of

their army and/or the land as a geographical space would compromise their relationship with the Almighty God and thus endanger the nation.

Environmental Care underpins the pericope

Borowski (2003:79-80) is one scholar who holds to this position that the text is to take care of the environment. Brown, Driver and Briggs (1979:690, henceforth referred to as BDB) also refer to Deuteronomy 23:10-14 as indicative that 'cleanliness in the camp is imperative'. Other notable scholars who have connected this sanitation law to cleanliness of the environment are Crüsemann (2001:247). Again, Douglas and Tenney (1986:187; cf. Barker and Kohlenberger III 1994:264) regard this pericope as a measure for sanitary observance in order that the congregational/military camp environment would be clean. DeWitt (2000:71), Christensen (2002:544), Saxey (n.d.:125) and many more that will not be listed here, add up to the number.

Stott (1999:123-142) is one of the scholars who argue strongly about this law to deal with open defecation and its connection to the environment and creation care. He argues that the Lord God has delegated to humanity dominion over creation. According to him, God expects humanity to care for nature, to ensure the cleanliness of the environment for his/her healthy life on earth, and also to enjoy the continuous presence of God. Thus, He instructed man to keep filth far away from His abodes to enable them to be holy because He is holy (Lev 19:2; 13:46).

The OT pericope emphasises proper defecation practice or waste disposal in order to keep a clean environment as the reason for this sanitation law. But the elucidations of Faniran and Nihinlola (2007:48-49) and Richter (2010:354-376) in particular are the most significant ones to the current discussion. This is

not only because of their distinguished contributions but also in the light of their recognition as advocates of environmental sanity. They are strong campaigners against open defecation of any geographical space, which the argument in this book pursues.

No matter how one looks at the pericope, one of the primary underpinning, which is cleanness of the environment by way of proper disposal of faeces cannot be overemphasised. Crüsemann (2001:247) in particular argues that Deuteronomy (23:13-14) establishes in its place important legal measures of protection such as the maintenance of the purity of nature. Clearly, there are serious implications for ensuring this fundamental sanitation demand.

At least, some questions such as listed here may serve as premises for further discussions:

- Will God be pleased to find His sanctuary and people in filth?
- Will the God of creation be interested in the ceremonial or ritual purity at the camp of His people without showing similar concern for the sanitary conditions of the immediate environment?
- Will God ignore all the serious implications of an insanitary environment such as its effect on health as a result of diseases and contagion?

Therefore, the regulation in the text was not only calculated to create awareness in the people but to elicit a sense of responsibility towards their surroundings. Definitely, such a law was a positive contribution towards addressing pollution of the environment and for that matter, helping in organising the whole ecosystem of the camp.

Similarly, Douglas (1966:2, 12; cf. 2003:2; Kawashima 2003:372) observes, 'pollution is a type of danger which is not likely to occur except the lines of structure, cosmic or social, are clearly defined'. As a result, she describes a polluting person as 'always in the wrong since that person has crossed some line which should not have been crossed and this displacement unleashes danger for someone'. Therefore, in agreement with Douglas, any attempt to eliminate dirt, such as the regulation sought to achieve, is a right step towards the organisation of the environment.

Legitimately, land pollution doesn't affect only humanity, but other entities of the ecosystem which also interact with humanity. Any negative effect on the geographical spaces of humankind has an effect on creation in general. Therefore, the instruction calls for a conscious response in the form of work on the part of Israel to keep their environment tidy. Any introduction of filth by the soldiers could affect not only them, but also the whole ecosystem. Hence, the stipulation placed on the military and the rest of the community about the need to ensure healthy sanitary practices in order to promote a healthy environment.

It meant that it was incumbent on the army in the camp to appreciate clean surroundings, and to maintain them as such. Underlying the call for mere cleanness of the environment was the call for a higher form of cleanness that is ethical, and this will eventually have spiritual consequences. Once humanity was made in the image of God and was required to reflect His likeness, there was a call to holiness, and that was to be just like His ethical nature (Lev 19:2).

Once again, this observation finds corroboration in Faniran and Nihinlola (2007:47-49 cf. Bruckner n.d.:6-8), and Richter (2010:354-376) who argue that pollution in whatever form is

obviously environmentally unfriendly. The pair of scholars posit thus: 'God gave a panacea to counter the waste menace, for all times, namely, that men should not pollute the land and the environment where they live and so defile the land they live and where God dwells…specifically…in Deuteronomy 23:12–14'. Continuing, the team observe that 'the injunctions are for man to be alive to the need to dress, guard and keep the land, so as to remain unimpaired, unpolluted and clean'.

Crüsemann (2001:247; cf. Christensen 2002:544) argues that the passage establishes some important legal measures of protection such as the maintenance of the purity of nature. In other words, the whole covenant community were faced with the instruction on how they would keep the land, particularly the camp space clean and acceptable to God. Indeed, it would be easy also for people to squat anywhere to 'ease themselves', thereby making the whole camp stink and rendering it an unpleasant place to dwell. Thus, tackling open defecation of campers such as soldiers, who, during some of their military engagements, could be far from the tabernacle with all its regular rituals, makes the law significant.

Even soldiers in the camp were expected to keep themselves from natural pollution of all sorts. That is, in the event of failure to observe the law, the unpleasantness of the 'place' as a result of the sight and stench of the faeces displayed in the open would affect the interest of everyone, particularly the army's interest, morale, and most importantly, their concentration on military engagements.

Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has built on the previous one that hygiene and health are fundamental motivation for the instruction contained

in the law on OD/sanitation at the camp. It has touched on the call for a clean environment as one of the fundamental motivations for the law on the sanitation at the camp of the Israelite community that was heading towards the Promised Land from Egypt. It was a call for all Israel in general and the soldiers at the camp in particular to ensure tidiness of the camp by burying their faeces outside it.

The contributions of some scholars have been brought to bear in this discussion. Faniran and Nihinlola's indication of a relationship between a clean environment and ritual purity in order to be holy, just as the laws required (Lev 19:2; 13:46), is one of the issues advocated by this book. In the next chapter, we will focus on humanity as custodians of God's creation which as another major reason for the instructions in this pericope.

Chapter 4

Preventing Open Defecation Shows Stewardship over Creation

The instructions of Deuteronomy 23:13-14 have been described as a measure to prevent the challenge of open defecation and ensure proper faeces disposal in Israel. As a matter of fact, some scholars have made comments with regards to a call for care of creation or care for the environment as a fundamental reason, which will be raised in the course of the interactions on the subject here. Be that as it may, humanity assumes a role of custodians that are accountable to the Divine Owner. The subsequent discussions are meant to diagnose some of the reasons for such a submission.

Richter Sandra (2010:354-376) is one of the champions of creation care. She posits that the testimony of both the OT and the NT is that God has invested in the well-being of the earth and its creatures, and that humanity bears responsibility as God's steward for the same. She notes how even in a fallen world, God still rejoices in the beauty and balance of His creation (cf. Gen 9:10-11; Psa 104:10-11; Job 39:5-27), and promulgates laws that require the long-term protection of creation. Richter's position on creation care as an ethical responsibility is particularly emphasised in other parts of Deuteronomy (14:21; 22:6-7; 25:4) where the people of Israel are instructed not to pollute the environment instructed not to pollute the environment in the wisdom of preserving other creatures with whom they shared the land. This, no doubt, is one of the surest means of preserving nature in general.

On the basis of Deuteronomy's call for stewardship of the land, 'neither economic expansion nor national security nor even personal economic viability is legitimate justification for the abuse of the land' (Richter 2010:376). Clearly, Richter is convinced that even in the midst of the crisis of warfare, God's people are commanded in Deuteronomy 20:19 to treat creation with care. Consequently, she adds:

> Israel was a tenant on God's good land; a steward. The land, its produce, and its inhabitants belong to God, not humanity. And each member of Israel's society stood responsible before God regarding their care of his resources. Moreover, the broader testimony of the OT is that God takes pleasure in his creation. He has designed it, provided for it, and his expectation is that his people will respect and protect it (Richter 2010:375).

More importantly, coming out not only as liberated slaves in a foreign land, but also from many years of wilderness wandering, they were itching to settle in a place they could call their own. They had in mind God's promise of a land, as they had been informed and had continuously been reminded of His promise to their forefathers. The land, considered as 'flowing with milk and honey', is observed by Richter (2010:357) as the incarnation of God's blessing of life for Israel (Deut 6:3; 11:9; 26:9,15; 27:3; 31:20). So, clearly, one of Israel's issues would touch on how they would regard the land as a gift from the Almighty God that demanded appreciation, and also in respect of their environment that demanded their total responsibility.

Richter particularly does well by relating the Torah's position on specific creatures to God's general care for creation. She emphasises on the fact that the first couple was placed in

the Garden of Eden to tend and protect it. She links it with the stipulation in Deuteronomy that the Israelites were only custodians of God's land makes a case for our argument. Richter's work is an excellent defence for the attention that any human habitation like the camp of the Israelites and its environs had to elicit from its occupants.

The military camp of the pericope was to be Israel's zone for a challenge. It marked their place for defence and readiness to battle the nations that had occupied the Promised Land, and some of the neighbouring nations that were in league with such nations for possession. As a military camp, it is easy to assume that it would experience some of the strictest disciplines, and that most of the grievous sins would not be easy to commit. Any disregard to God's instructions and not to take care of the earth would be a total disregard of the command of God to humanity.

In his contribution, Bruce (1979:8; cf. Richter 2010:354-376) opines that humanity's responsibility is not only to his fellows but to the environment and creation as a whole. Of significance here is Bruce's observation of the link between Israel and the land as a gift of God which requires them to not only exercise dominion but to also demonstrate responsible trusteeship, instead of selfish exploitation.

Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has touched on care of the environment as one of the reasons for the call for proper disposal of faecal matter at the camp. Such a call re-echoes the fact that humanity will render an account to God for the way they have handled creation. The scholarly position on the subject is clear: God wants humanity to be good custodians of His creation.

In the next few chapters, we will be diagnosing some of the other ways to appreciate the sanitation law, especially with regards to God's demand for holiness and its connection to blessings. We will see how this is met in the light of any attendant challenge to the OT Israelite community. The discussions will then narrow down in the subsequent chapters to see some of the implications of such a practice to the camp as an earthly space.

Chapter 5

Preventing Open Defecation is linked to Holiness of God

To appreciate to call to avoid open defecation, there is the need to understand what holiness and/or purity mean. These two terms, often used interchangeably in this book and elsewhere, represent a concept which in agreement with Christensen (2002:157) 'cannot be easily explained'. Though many scholars have explained holiness/purity as the central focus for the enactment of the laws, particularly that of sanitation, they nevertheless present different shades of opinions in their reason for such legal injunctions.

The complications involved in the definition of holiness is evident in the light of Regev's (2001:244) comment: 'The holy is the basic foundation of every religion and cult, so differences in definition and characterisation of the concept of holiness have important implications as far as religious ideology and perception is concerned'. Little wonder that scholars of the OT pentateuchal laws in particular continue to discuss the concept of holiness in the hope of finding a common ground for its definition and interpretation of its related stipulations.

Holiness as the nature of Yahweh

For Robert W Domeris (1986:35), Yahweh, the God of Israel, is the basis for all its definitions, and that 'something is profane because God rejects it; something becomes holy only when it interacts with God'. This underlines the fundamental nature of God that causes Him to separate from any corrupt part

of creation. Of course, without God, there cannot be any yardstick to measure holiness. That is, holiness is God's nature.

Wright (1999:352-53) agrees when he notes concerning both the priestly and holiness sources: 'God affirms God's holiness' (Lev 10:3; 22:32; cf. Exod 29:43). The former offers only a few, indirect words about God's holiness, but the latter, unlike the former 'which is more interested in priestly or cultic matters' developed a system of holiness that emphasises God's holiness in relation to the people's experience and conduct (p. 351-52). Though both sources maintain that any transgression can profane God's name, Wright mentions that the former enlarges on the sacredness of deity by noting certain behaviours that make God's name unholy (Lev 20:3; 21:6).

For Wright, the importance of the divine name for the holiness source is further seen in the story of blasphemy in Leviticus 24:10-23. What this means is that: 'the name, rather than God, is the object of profanation, perhaps reflects the belief that God's very self cannot be besmirched, only God's reputation' (1999:352). This categorisation of holiness, as defined by the Priestly Torah or the Holiness material, is relevant for the current discussion.

But, instead of just two sources, which cover only a section of the *Torah*, another scholar, Wells (2000), provides a wider coverage by discussing issues of holiness in the *Torah* in general. Indeed, Wells does well by comparing how the idea of holiness occurs in each book these books by Moses. Hence, he provides an excellent counterpoint to Wright on the subject of holiness.

Holiness is numinous power from Yahweh

It is worthy of note that the discussions on the laws have been approached primarily from the perspective where holiness

is seen not only as a preserve of the deity alone, but certain personalities are empowered to function on His behalf. Such functionaries become the 'holy ones'. This is an observation which is made by Domeris (1986:35). He argues that, 'holiness is not one attribute of Yahweh's among others; rather it is the quintessential nature'. This point is supported by the declaration that His name is holy (Lev 20:3; 22:32).

In his submission, Domeris (cf. Bruce 1979:59) posits that the last few years have seen a change from the negative sense of relating the Hebrew idea of holiness towards separation from the profane, to a positive understanding of the idea as 'belonging to Yahweh'. He quotes Hewett's idea of becoming holy: '[An object] is not holy and therefore used by Yahweh; it is used or possessed by Yahweh and therefore holy'. Thus, the reference for holiness is God, and that He as the 'Holy One' decides who also becomes holy. Along the same line of argument, Domeris notes:

> 'Deep within the idea of holiness there is a sense of numinous power which may be transferred to the bearer. This idea sees holiness as a tangible positive force associated with God, very much like electricity. At one level this power equips the bearer to live a life of ethical and ritual purity, but at another level this power generates an electrical tension which comes to the fore whenever the holy one encounters the realm of the profane'. This is to say, something is holy when the 'Holy One' interacts with it; it is profane when He despises it (1986:35).

In other words, 'because only Yahweh is intrinsically holy, any person or thing is holy only as it stands in relationship to him' (Hartley 1992:lVII), and that the ultimate source of all holiness is

God, 'the Holy One of Israel' (Minear n.d.:22). Moreover, Rosner's (2000:544) position identifies with that of Domeris. He also sees holiness as pre-eminently a characteristic of God himself, and that 'the terminology is used to signify that God is wholly other, distinct and separate from everything that he has made, and different from the gods of human imagination'.

Holiness is clean Yahweh against unclean humanity

Some scholars have explained the call for purity as a purely symbolic one with many interesting reasons offered. Of the many such interpretations are that of Joe M Sprinkle (2000) and Mary Douglas (1996, 2002, and 2003). What Sprinkle considers as the most important explanation of the rules of purity, and which is also of relevance to my discussion here, is that these rules teach the concept of the holiness of the Almighty God in contrast to the uncleanness of humanity.

It is as a result of the unclean nature of humanity that specific regulations like Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is given so that people can relate more closely to the Holy God. Sprinkle sees uncleanness as both ritual (ceremonial) and moral (or ethical), and uses symbolism to explain the link between ritual and moral uncleanness, a view that he also terms as 'symbolic dichotomy'. Defending his position on the symbolic link between ritual impurity and deviations of morality, Sprinkle observes that the use of uncleanness in a metaphorical sense for deviations of morality hints at this symbolic connection.

Sprinkle mentions for example certain ritual practices in the *Torah* on one hand and moral practices on the other, to show the symbolic link between ritual and moral uncleanness. Additionally, he sees the use of the language of ritual purity for moral purity by poetic and prophetic writers as recognition of the

symbolic connection. For him, ritual impurity might symbolically mean immorality and vice versa, and that both are forms of uncleanness.

Sprinkle (2000:652-53; cf. Hartley 1992:lVIII) agrees that everyone by nature inevitably contracts uncleanness from time to time. When Numbers 5:3 and Leviticus 15:31 are taken together with biblical teaching this might imply that human beings, by virtue of constituting a part of this sin-cursed fallen world, are 'unclean' or 'contaminated' and are automatically not eligible to approach God. This, however, does not mean that the hygiene laws were not in any way efficacious, in which case failure to enact the hygienic practices would have been non-consequential. If this were so, the stipulations of our pericope would have been useless, since in that case open defecation could not make a person ceremonially defiled (cf. Ezek 4:12-13).

What this argument means, however, is that some ceremonial 'uncleanness' cannot be equated with 'sin', since natural bodily functions and other factors beyond human control could (and periodically did) cause a person to be unclean. Nonetheless, Sprinkle admits a strong analogy between 'uncleanness' and 'sin'. For him, just as physical uncleanness can come from within, and from without in an analogous way, sin comes both from perverse human nature within and temptations without.

Sprinkle argues that based on the laws of purity in Leviticus 11-15, for example, man in contrast to God, is contaminated and corrupt. Therefore, whether a person is ceremonial unclean as indicated in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 or corrupted by sin, his position is that those who approach God must be sanctified; they must prepare themselves both ritually and morally. In terms of significance, though his argument on the basis of moral purity

directly falls in line with our argument on open defecation, the issue of the ritual purity cannot be overlooked.

Chapter Conclusion

The legislative instrument established by Deuteronomy 23:12-14 affirms the call for holiness which is also demanded by the book of Deuteronomy and the Pentateuch as a whole. The discussions in this chapter which began by establishing a link between avoidance of open defecation and holiness have shown that this kind of holiness demanded by the pericope relates first to God. The most significant of these being the following:

- Holiness as the nature of Yahweh
- Holiness is numinous power from Yahweh
- Holiness is clean Yahweh against unclean humanity

These fundamental definitions of holiness should spark a sense of appreciation for the call on the Israelites not to engage in open defecation in their environment. In the next chapter, attention will be devoted to holiness in relation to Israel as a nation and humanity in general.

Chapter 6

Preventing Open Defecation is Linked to Holiness of People

A significant question to be answered in this chapter is that if sanitation is not a priority for Israel's holiness, why is it required by the pericope, that is, Deuteronomy 23:12-14, for God's dealing with the nation? In other words, were the people of God going to be regarded as holy and enjoy His blessings without necessarily obeying the instructions to practice sanitary living by avoiding open defecation? This is, no doubt, a tough question to address.

Radmacher *et al* (1997:328) agree that the significance of such a sanitation law for soldiers in a military camp was for the promotion of holiness (or purity) of the campers. So, building on the foregone foundation, let us consider some of the definitions of holiness revealed in the Torah. While some of them do not relate directly to sanitation, they are raised for the purposes of helping us to strike the differences. This call, according to Deuteronomy 23:12-14, was the prevention or avoidance of open defecation. This effort begins with the understanding of holiness in relation to the humanity such as discussed below:

Definitions of Holiness in Relation to Humanity

As one may argue, once it is accepted that the 'camp' includes the human presence, the call for its holiness more importantly involves the human beings being involved in practices that will make them holy. Whereas some scholars regard holiness as a primary nature of God, the subject is better discussed against the backdrop of other entities. Some of the

usual entities that are defined by holiness are the people, priest, temple materials, geographical spaces/places, and special days.

David P Wright (1999) is one of the scholars whose submissions on holiness is worth considering. It is significant here because it covers a wide range of entities that will satisfy the interest of the ongoing discussion. The position of this book is, irrespective of the observation that some of the views of critical scholarship challenge the unity of the Torah, this book assumes the traditional view of its unity. Wright observes that within the Torah, there are portions which critical scholarship has designated "Priestly Writings" comprising parts of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and a portion at the end of Deuteronomy.

The "Priestly Writings" are specifically identified by Wright (1999:351-364) as a distinct component of the Torah that explicitly tackle holiness. Scholars have identified two main sources within this part, which are:

a) the Priestly materials, commonly called 'Priestly Torah'

b) the Holiness materials, also called 'Holiness School'

As a major discussant of holiness (vdq) primarily from the "Priestly Writings", Wright compares issues from the priestly sources with that of the holiness school to generate the various views on holiness in the whole Torah. The holiness source, according to Wright, was initially identified by scholars with Leviticus 17-26, thus, it was called the 'Holiness Code' (cf. Clines 1979:81).

However, it is common knowledge now that the holiness source is found elsewhere in Leviticus and even the rest of the Torah. And it is believed that its supplements and postdates the Priestly Torah. Therefore, in situations when the Holiness School adopts the Priestly Torah, it often re-contextualises and transforms the Priestly Torah for its own purposes.

In relation to our immediate discussion, Wright (1999:351-53) argues that both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School consider holiness with respect to the identity and conduct of certain classifications of persons: Priests, Levites, the firstborn, all Israel, and, above all, God. For him, the deity is the paradigm of sanctity for both sources. This means that: 'He is the model for which all holiness is defined'.

Furthermore, Wright notes that the Priestly Torah defines holiness as a state of being in objects, places, and times, that is commensurate with God's holiness; thus, what is not holy 'poses a threat to holiness'. For the Priestly Torah, holiness is attained ritually or by contact with something most holy and that can communicate holiness (Exod 29:37; 30:29; Lev 6:27). The Holiness School on the other hand accepts that God reserves the right to make entities holy, but maintains that holiness is attained ritually and not by contact.

Holiness is a virtue bestowed on Priests and Levites

From both Priestly Torah and Holiness School sources, Wright (1999:354; cf. Regev 2001:246) deduced that the priests have a level of holiness that is different from the rest of the people. Both sources view holiness of the Priests and Levites as bestowed externally rather than deriving from individual merit. Moreover, both identify the priests' holiness in ritual or cultic terms, and that the priestly consecration rite as a whole sanctifies them, the High Priest inclusive.

In the estimation of Wright, the Priestly Torah, unlike the Holiness School, lacks much discussion of the holiness of the Levites. Nevertheless, the Levites might be thought to be holy since they are substitutes for the Israelite firstborns (Num 3:11-13, 44-51). However, Wright (1999:355) notes that the Holiness

School never calls them as such, not even in their installation rite (Num 8:5-22), as indicated in their being restricted from contacting the furnishings of the tabernacle (Num 4:4-20; 18:2-4). The holiness of the priest has received consideration by scholars such as Asumang and Domeris (2006:22), Moskala (2000:13-15), Unger (1988:582), and Adler (1893:6-7).

Holiness is ritual, moral, and a functional office

One of the significant issues of discussion here is Domeris' definition of holiness as not just in ritual (or cultic) and moral (or ethical) sense. On the contrary, it is as a functional office that certain individuals or groups are called to occupy. Domeris (1986:36-37) notes that the functional aspect of holiness is connected to the title, 'the holy one', which underscores the idea of 'an authorised *representative or agent*' of the realm of the holy. He continues that such an agent is 'one chosen by Yahweh for a particular task, which also involves a certain life style'.

Although Domeris does not declare a clear tripartite view of ethical, social, and religious distinctions as, for example, postulated by Lioy (2004:17-21), yet his proposal leans very much towards that interpretation. He identifies the dichotomous interpretations which are ethical and ritual with a quote from Snaith that these ethical and cultic aspects of holiness 'belong to the periphery of the word and not to its central core' (1986:35-37). Consequently, he indicates that beyond these we may also discover a functional aspect which is central to the interpretation of holiness yet to be explored, and that by treating only the ethical this functional aspect has been either lost or ignored.

The numinous power of God's holiness, in the view of Domeris, is revealed in His functional role, and serves as the background for the interpretation of the office of the holy one in

the OT. This is where members of Yahweh's council are described by some terms; holy ones (Psa 89:5, 7), *elohim* (Psa 82:1), or as sons of God (Job 1:6). He continues that these terms carry functional overtones, 'suggesting agency and authorised representation' (1986:36).

Moving further, Domeris buttresses his position by using two Hebrew words. The first is *shaliah* or 'agent' found in the Rabbinic writings, which is probably based upon an understanding of the office of the holy one. The other is *malak,* meaning 'angel' or 'messenger', which is another term that shares the functional view of the holy one.

Holiness is separation of Israel from Gentiles

Once again, Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is very significant in its demand for purity, a position symbolically interpreted by Sprinkle (2000:51; cf. Wright 2011:508) to mean a separation of Israel from the Gentiles. For him, the clean/unclean system which divided people and land into categories symbolically reinforced the teaching elsewhere that Israel was a 'holy nation' (Exod 19:6) set apart from all others. He categorises the priests as 'holy' and so separated them from the other Israelites. Nevertheless, he regarded the Israelites as a whole as 'clean' and rather separated them from non-Israelites who were 'unclean'.

The book identifies with such categorisation as the basis for God's purpose to destroy the 'unclean nations' from the Promised Land, which necessitated the regulation. For Wright (1999:353), Israel's separation from other nations does not bestow holiness on them; 'it only sets the stage for consequent holiness' (Lev 20:24-26). He notes from both sources that God is the model for which Israel is to strive for holiness.

Hence, the Israelites' holiness is analogous to divine holiness: 'You shall be holy for I the LORD your God am holy' (Lev 11:44-45; 19:2; 20:7, 26). This indicates that holiness is not a pre-existing state, but a state that one has to attain. Thus, the Holiness School specifically makes holiness a requirement for the Israelites and not an optional vow; it is achieved primarily through behavioural (moral/ethical) rather than ritual means.

Wright (1999:353) continues that the people's holiness entails distinguishing entities that are acceptable by the covenant from the unacceptable. And though attainment and maintenance of holiness is by observing the laws, the Holiness School accepts that God is the ultimate source of holiness (Exod 31:13; Lev 20:8; 22:32). Thus, 'God and His people come into dialectical interplay: when the people live a life in accordance with divine holiness, they are, in turn, sanctified by God'.

One of the areas where Wright position finds support from Wells (2000:27) is on Israel's holiness in relation to their election. On this, Wells notes that the relevance of Israel's election at Sinai is the call by God on them to be holy. The relevance of Well's position is that other scholars argue along similar tangent. Sprinkle (2000:651), for example, posits that though some of the laws were arbitrary and without any inherent moral value, they 'nonetheless inculcated into Israel the concept of "holiness", creating in them a sense of identity as a "separated" people' and thus served as great "object lessons". His symbolic view on 'purity as separation' of interest to this discussion since our overall objective is to call for a similar sense of purity which underscores a 'separation' from open defecation.

Another point about the holiness of Israel that is relevant to our discussion is the contrast Wright brings between Deuteronomic holiness and Levitical holiness. He submits thus:

'Deuteronomy considers the people holy from the beginning, prior to any act of obedience, on account of their election by YHWH (Deut 7:6; 14:2, 21)'. The observation of Wright is corroborated by Regev's (2001:244-246) idea that 'the Priestly materials view holiness as dynamic, sensitive and dangerous, with limited access to the sacred, while Deuteronomic holiness is static and access to the sacred is far less restricted. Therefore, in Deuteronomy, holiness is not an active entity but a status'.

Arguing further, Wright draws attention to the light which the Holiness School provides on the Priestly Torah and emphasises the links between the two (1999:362; cf. Baker and Arnold 1999:136). He observes that holiness is a fundamental theological principle in both the Holiness School and the Priestly Torah. Of some interest is his note that the people are considered by Deuteronomy as holy, 'prior to any act of obedience, on account of their election by YHWH', which means that it is sin/disobedience that makes an entity profane.

Wright reveals that the origin of holiness presented by both sources is God. However, attainment of holiness by individuals is made possible through engaging acceptable moral/ethical behaviours. This observation is quite significant since it advocates acceptable lifestyle as one of the major conditions for God to act on behalf of His people.

Holiness might be a separation from Sexuality

The issue of whether holiness has anything to do with sexual intercourse is a sensitive one. Indeed, scholars have divers opinions on this. For Sprinkle (2000:649-50), the holiness laws can be interpreted from the point of sexual morality. He refers to certain pagan cults where sexual acts were sometimes performed as part of the worshipper's devotion to a deity to

provide a contrast. He mentions a once common but more recently challenged scholarly reconstruction, that is, the hypothesised pagan practice of sacred prostitution, in which 'fertility was conveyed to the land through ritualised sexual intercourse at the cultus'.

For the people of Israel, sacred sexuality, let alone prostitution, in Sprinkle's view, would have been unthinkable. Pointing to Deuteronomy 23:10-11 and Leviticus 15 as seemingly referring to defilement as a result of genital discharges, Sprinkle argues that all expressions of sexuality rendered any Israelite unclean, hence such a person is unfit to approach a sanctuary. Specifically, he mentions that the requirement of the Deuteronomy text that soldiers defecate outside the camp implies that the faecal matter could ceremonially defile (cf. Ezek 4:12-13).

In Sprinkle's view, the extension of defilement to cover faeces is perhaps as a result of the close proximity of the organs of excrement and the organs of reproduction. That is, since verses 12-14 come on the heels of 10-11, which address impurity as a result of nocturnal seminal emission, seeing defecation as a source of impurity is as a result of the links between urine/semen and faecal emissions. The validity of his position might be seen in the command at Sinai (Exod 19; cf. 1 Cor 7:5) for the people to consecrate themselves by abstaining from sex.

However, this position is hard to accept and no doubt debatable. Indeed, one may argue that if all expressions of sexuality rendered an Israelite unclean, then all forms of semen emissions outside of coitus may as well be labelled as sexual, and thus, make one unclean. Perhaps, it is better to conclude that Sprinkle's position, though not a clear trajectory for many to

easily accept, still has some merits as far as holiness is concerned.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, the elucidations have covered the kind of holiness demanded by the pericope which covers many entities with emphasis on the Israelites as a whole and not only limited to that of the priests and the Levites. Specifically, the definitions of holiness that have been outlined so far in connection with Israel as a nation are that:

- Holiness is separation, wholeness and completeness
- Holiness is a virtue bestowed on Priests and Levites
- Holiness is ritual, moral, and a functional office
- Holiness is separation of Israel from Gentiles
- Holiness might be a separation from Sexuality

The legislative instrument established by Deuteronomy 23:12-14 affirms the call for holiness demanded by Pentateuch as a whole and the book of Deuteronomy in particular. It also stands to reason that interpreting the sanitation law in the light of holiness/purity is an affirmation of the religious dimension of the law. The next chapter will consider the final aspect of the relevance of holiness in the light of the call for the prevention of open defecation.

Chapter 7

Preventing Open Defecation is a Channel to Divine Blessings

One of the most welcome arguments about holiness is its link with blessings from God. Douglas (2002:49-50) argues that holiness is an attribute of the Godhead, who is also the source of all blessings. In her opinion, God's work through the blessing is essentially to create order, through which humanity can prosper. It also means that, not only is God the source, but he is also the connection between holiness and blessings and that it is the blessing of God that would make it possible for the any group or individuals to survive meaningfully on earth.

The close connection between staying from open defecation in order to ensure a holiness of the people and the camp and the overall implications of these on the relationship between God and the covenant community of Israel is the focus of this chapter.

Relationship between Open defecation and Holiness

The maxim, 'Cleanliness is next to godliness' is derived from the dictum that occurs at the conclusion of the Mishna of the treatise Sota, and is also literally rendered as, 'Outward cleanliness leads to inward purity' (Adler 1893:4). This is to say that, no matter how one considers it, there is a close connection between sanitation with regards to management of human waste and holiness (purity). And especially, as far as the OT laws are concerned, the observance of such cleanliness is not just a wish but a clear command by God.

There cannot be much arguments about the many reasons advanced for the explanation to the OT laws. However, the dominant reason has been as a dichotomy, where cultic and moral reasons dominate, with other reasons as health (or hygiene) and sanitation also argued. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that scholars who interpret the OT laws as a dichotomy usually give ritual purity and hygiene in relation to health as the two main poles. As one of the authorities on this subject, Hall (2000:348) also indicated: 'Hygienic cleanliness (health) and ritual purity were closely related'.

Mary Douglas, a British Social Anthropologist and a champion in that field, pioneered an approach to define holiness in the Torah by explaining the concept from a physical, i.e., moral and social (cf. Moskala 2000:21-24), and then, sometime later, ritual (2003:2) perspectives. While most of her arguments were premised on the book of Leviticus, their overall implication for the pentateuchal laws in general cannot be ignored. And though she placed too much emphasis on symbolism, she nevertheless raised some salient issues that contribute to major arguments raised in our discussion.

In one of her major submissions, Douglas (1966:7-40; cf. Sprinkle 2000:637-39), argues that avoidance rules of any single culture work together as a clear system to form a coherent definition of things permitted and prohibited, of things sacred and defiled. Such rules, in her view, are to be treated systemically or structurally. Accordingly, the only way in which issues of sanitation make sense is in reference to a total structure of thought whose keystone, boundaries, margins and internal lines are held in relation to the rituals of separation. Douglas links sanitation to holiness when she argues that the call for holiness and the rituals associated with it is what gives meaning to the

concept of sanitation or the practice of hygiene (cf. Sprinkle 2000:637-39). Therefore, any piecemeal interpretation of the pollution rules of any culture is bound to fail.

Moreover, Douglas (cf. Klawans 2003:20) believes that practices like avoidance behaviours 'could no longer be dismissed as something inherently or distinctly primitive'. This is to say that, 'our own notions of hygiene', for instance, 'are not necessarily any more rational or objective than the religious conceptions frequently dismissed as irrational'. Furthermore, she mentions that avoidance behaviours could no longer be treated in a 'piecemeal' fashion, that is, on a one by one basis.

Therefore, Douglas (2002:51-52) deduces that once it is accepted that holiness may also mean separateness, then it equally represents wholeness and completeness in a social context. Her position is also mentioned by Sprinkle (2000:649-50) who points out the connection between cleanness/holiness and such concepts as 'wholeness,' 'physical perfection', and 'completeness'.

Holiness is Proper Sanitary Practice

In the light of the foregone arguments, it is not difficult to defend the intimate relationship between holiness and proper sanitary practices. Worthy of comment here is Douglas' position on the effect of pollution, which results from improper sanitary practices, on holiness. For Douglas (1966:12), pollution is a type of danger which is not likely to occur if the lines of structure, cosmic or social are clearly defined. She notes: 'A polluting person is always in the wrong. He has developed some wrong condition or simply crossed some line which should not have been crossed and this displacement unleashes danger for someone'.

Douglas (1966:1-2; 2003:2; cf. Kawashima 2003:372; Owiredu 2005:18) also reveals that the whole repertoire of ideas concerning pollution and purification are used to mark the gravity of the event, and the power of ritual to remake a man. For her, 'dirt, obscenity and lawlessness are as relevant symbolically to the rites of seclusion as other ritual expressions', so dealing with it is 'a positive effort to organise the environment'.

Consequently, it is not out of place to appropriate Douglas' identification of the holiness laws as tools for a major social issue as sanitation, especially, in dealing with a menace like open defecation or human waste. Her argument is a positive step towards linking holiness to sanitation. Indeed, her argument of a link between hygiene and purity is significant to the submissions presented in this book. She does not only identify three or more of the important concepts of the text being discussed. Her work lays a foundation for the integration of these concepts in the light of other ideas in the Torah.

It is probably in the light of Douglas' position on dirt that Cothey (2005:135) comments that 'Douglas highlighted the positive social functions that purity concepts can fulfil and described the diverse forms in different societies that such purity concepts can take'. Some of Douglas' views find support in some scholars like Joe Sprinkle (2000). Jacob Milgrom is mentioned by Klawans (2003:20-21) as supporting this position.

Prevention of Open Defecation as a means to Blessings

From the link that Douglas and other scholars have established between sanitation and holiness, all the issues connected to holiness and the blessings associated with it are also connected to healthy sanitary practices such as proper hygiene and avoidance of open defecation. Indeed, Douglas to

find a single common denominator that underlies all the rules of the ritual laws, and that the purpose of the ritual system is to drive a wedge between the forces of death, which are ritually impure, and that of life, which like God are holy.

In the light of the foregone arguments, any impurity which would cause a withdrawal of God also means the withdrawal of blessing. Consequently, 'blessing and success in war required a man to be whole in body, whole-hearted and trailing no uncompleted schemes' (2002:52-53). Of greater interest here is Douglas' assertion that the opposite of blessing is cursing, and that, where the blessing is withdrawn and the power of the curse unleashed, there is barrenness, pestilence, and confusion. She argues that positive and negative precepts are held to be efficacious and not merely expressive; so observing them draws down prosperity, infringing them brings danger.

Douglas articulates also important issues when she points to the universe as a place where people prosper by conforming to holiness and perish when they deviate from it. Thus, her advice that: 'If there were no other clues we should be able to find out the Hebrew idea of the holy by examining the precepts by which men conform to it' (2002:50) is one of the main objectives of this book.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, we have established two additional significant underpinnings of the concept of holiness. These are the fact that:

- Holiness is proper sanitary practice
- Holiness is a means to blessings

These two observations are of special interest to the arguments of this book. That is, proper sanitary practices as

oppose to open defecation is regarded as holiness and it's a means to blessings. In other words, open defecation can equally open the door to curse on the people.

Therefore, beginning from here, the arguments will make efforts to establish in this book that though the people were actually declared holy 'prior to any act of obedience' (Wright 1999:353), obedience to the instructions of sanitation and proper disposal of faeces was still required to enjoy the promises of the laws as stipulated in the text under discussion. In the subsequent sections attention will be devoted to holiness of the geographical space/place like the camp, which may or may not enclose the tabernacle.

Chapter 8

Preventing Open Defecation Shows Holiness of Israel's Camp

One of my core objectives in this book is to establish that our passage advocates the concept of "Place holiness" or the "Divine Place theology". This is in connection with not only some specific places of the earth but it extends to the whole earth. Consequently, the previous discussion concentrated on how the motivation for burying the excrement outside the camp was meant to generate a sense of the holiness among the Israelites in relation to Yahweh, their God. Building on holiness as an integral undergirding concept for the sanitation laws is another issue identified by scholars and relevant to our current discussion. This is sanitation in relation to the holiness of Israel's camp or encampment.

The fact that the Almighty God wanted to be present or found in a sanitary environment as required by the text is a clear indication that the sanitation laws are an extension of the enactment of communal holiness. Thus, designating a place for a latrine gives an indication of how important the issue of sanitation was in the scheme of the Lord God. He wanted the covenant community to regard the place as sacred and give the camp the maximum respect that it deserved. This is identified by Wright (1999), who notes that the text relates to a Yahweh-man-place holiness, where the Almighty is calling for the purity of not only the person but even the camp environment.

Thus, it is reasonable for the discussions of our chosen sanitation law to proceed along the lines of this motivation. In this chapter, then, focus will be on how the holiness (or purity) at

the camp and its theological and socio-cultural significance to the recipients undergirds the regulation on sanitation.

Holiness of a Specific earthly space

To begin with, it might be helpful to first explain Israel's camp in terms of 'space' or 'place' in order to establish it within the context of our discussion. Ordinarily, 'space' is an area or place or land on the earth's surface, with the earth itself occupying the same in relation to the universe. Asumang and Domeris (2006:4) consider space as an aspect of reality which incorporates distances, directions, time and orientation and intimately affected by and reflected in human perceptions and conceptions of it, and their relationship with each other. They note that when space is discussed in terms of human interaction with parts of it, it is called 'place,' which in relation to other places is termed 'location'.

Asumang (2005:27) moves further to provide another significant definition by citing Brueggemann (1977:5):

> A place is a space which has historical meanings, where some things have happened which are now remembered and which provide continuity across generations. Place is space in which important words have been spoken which have established identity, defined vocation, and envisioned destiny. Place is space in which vows have been exchanged, promises have been made, and demands have been issued.

The holiness of a geographical space/place concept took central stage in the Scriptures with the construction of the tabernacle which metamorphosed into the temple. In relation to these, Unger (1988:582) mentions that the Scriptures ascribe

holiness to places such as the sanctuary, and to things such as altars and other accessories of worship. For instance, the innermost part of the sanctuary, the adytum, where the Almighty God was present, was 'the holy of holies', that is, 'the holiest place' while the forecourt was holy (cf. Hartley 1992:IVII).

One significant issue of Wright's (1999:355-57) work which interests our discussion is his association of holiness with place. He contrasts Minear's (n.d.:18-26) argument that 'holiness is a term that is rightly used only of persons and not of things' and that 'it is not a thing to possess, but an action by which to be possessed'. For him, the sanctuary is the primary place of holiness, and the description of the tabernacle exhibits a gradation of holiness from the adytum to the court.

Wright again notes that the Priestly Torah focuses mainly on the sanctuary and its relative degrees of sanctity, while the Holiness School explains that factors such as communicable impurities are excluded, so that the people do not pollute their camp where God dwells among them (Num 5:3b). Thus, he argues from these documents that holiness is applied to the camp which houses the sanctuary.

Moreover, Wright (1999:356-58) claims that 'the Holiness School expresses the idea that God dwells among the people in the camp (Exod 25:8; 29:45-46; Num 16:3; 35:34; Lev 15:31; 26:11). The association of holiness with place is further corroborated by Wright's further argument from both materials. He mentions that the Priestly Torah's view that the sanctuary is holy means that all sin/impurity must be kept out of it to avoid pollution (cf. Lev 12:4). Worthy of note is Wright's submission that the Holiness School amplifies the priestly materials by including the land as a locus of pollution caused by various sins,

though the degree of pollution is ultimately not on the same conceptual level.

The holiness of place/space indicated here, for me, relates to consecration or otherwise of the place, which is both the sanctuary and the land. This is not only interesting but very significant for the whole idea of sanitation. The point of interest here is that, while the pollution of the sanctuary has a cultic remedy in sacrifice, there is no cultic remedy for the pollution of the land/camp as a geographical space. Since there is no remedy, any pollution of the camp would be sanctioned by divine judgement in the form of divine war.

Reason for ensuring holiness at Israel's camp

The demand by the pericope for holiness at Israel's congregational camp is not strange. This is because the camp here doesn't refer only to the land as a geographical space. In fact, the camp (Num 5:1-4) was regarded as a holy place in respect of everything within the precinct: the tabernacle, the articles, the priests, the people, and even the land itself as a geographical space.

Moreover, instructions concerning Israel's camp should also not be seen as only about the land, the geographical space, or the materials; but rather, as including the people and the totality of the precinct. This means that the camp as a sacred space with all the impersonal materials within it was the target for the holiness law.

This, notwithstanding, there is a greater probability that the emphasis on ritual or ceremonial holiness as a demand by Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is because of the impersonal materials within the sacred space rather than the human objects. As NJB puts it: 'Your camp must therefore be a holy place'. Wright

(1999:355-356) points out that the object of ritual cleansing is primarily the sanctuary and not so much the worshipper.

That the sanctuary needs this constant cleansing from human impurities and sins shows the sanctuary to be set apart, sacred. Therefore, the holiness and sacredness of that sacred space is emphasised. Wright posits: 'For both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School, the sanctuary is the primary place of holiness…This gradation of sanctuary holiness is part of the Priestly Torah's larger scheme of the geographical distribution of holiness and impurity'. Moreover, the demand by the pericope for holiness at a military camp is not strange since the camp still shared some of the purity rules of the congregational camp where certain persons, detestable materials, and activities were to be put outside the camp to avoid its defilement.

Why is exposed human excrement a defilement agent?

To make Israel impure, one would have expected an immoral act like bloodshed/homicide, which is so grievous that not only does it pollute the land, but cannot be atoned for by any means except by the blood of the one who shed it (Num 35:33). Besides this grievous sin is idolatry, since altars for idolatry also guide fluids into the ground, or both licit and illicit sex on or near the ground (Deut 22:25; Gen 19:5; 38:9; Judg 19:22-27; Ruth 3:7-8; Song 7:12-13). All these forms of sins, as Klawans (2003:23) also argues, are not difficult to conceive of as a means of defiling the sanctuary and the land as a whole. No wonder, the dead were buried outside the camp while lepers were excluded from it till they were healed (Lev 10:4-5; 13:46; Num 5:2; 15:35-36; 31:12; cf. Zodhiates 1996:1526; Unger 1988:201).

Many other reasons have also been put forward, including the argument that some bodily emissions could render a person

unclean. In fact, Owiredu (2005:20; cf. Grabbe 1997:100) underscores Douglas' argument that any bodily discharges including human waste could disqualify anybody or people from approaching the tabernacle.

All these defiling agents, notwithstanding, none of them was emphasised by the pericope. Rather, the fact that exposed faecal matter was indicated by the passage as the would-be defiling agent of the camp means that there is something more to exposed human excrement. Interestingly, the argument that human excrement could lead to ritual defilement is not exclusive to our passage in Deuteronomy. In fact, there are other passages which support this observation.

This calls for further exploration and interrogation of this connection, especially in the light of Ezekiel's reaction to God's instructions concerning faeces (Ezek 4:12-13). The decision of the Almighty God to allow Ezekiel to use cow dung instead of human excrement (v. 15), for example, affirms this argument. In other words, since cow dung, which is animal excrement, was allowed by the Lord God, one may argue that any excrement other than that of humans did not defile. Indeed, he knew that such excrement could lead to ritual impurity, and so protested against Yahweh's instruction (Ezek 4:10-15).

Ezekiel's protest is vindicated by God's readiness to punish the covenant community for their rebellion, since the Almighty God himself said: 'In this way the people of Israel will eat defiled food'. It does reaffirm the argument that all such excrement could defile, but that God did not have problems with other creatures' excrement *per se*, only that of humans. At least, it is obvious some animals could be present at their military camps and that their droppings could also be an 'eyesore'. But by emphasising that of humans, the Almighty and Eternal One could

test the obedience of the people and their willingness to maintain a holy community.

Beyond the books of the OT, however, one of the greatest contributions to the practice of burying human excrement for the sake of purity comes from the Essenes (cf. Magness 2004:68-71; Friedman 2007; Maugh II 2006:¶1-4; Anonymous 2006:¶1-30). Cromwell (2014:§7) reveals that the practice of camp holiness by the Essenes did not only reflect that of Deuteronomy 23:12-14, but they also respected Prophet Ezekiel's protest against God's instruction to bake bread using faeces as fuel. Continuing he notes, 'they regarded Prophetic writing such as Ezekiel to be "authoritative scripture for legal use"'.

Chapter Conclusion

The chapter has discussed the demands of holiness that the sanitation law on open defecation stated in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 brought on the covenant community of Israel. The argument is that the requirement of holiness if obeyed had an ultimate goal of victory in their battles and blessings of Divine presence (cf. 26:19; 28:1-14; Lev 26:3-13; Num 5:1-4). On the contrary, it had a proximate goal of severed relationship with God that would result in defeat in battles and other forms of punishment, if disobeyed (cf. 28:15-25; Lev 26:14-39).

Our discussion would be incomplete without considering the extent to which the sanitation law on open defecation falls in line with the whole message of the testament. This is relevant in the light of the fact that various users of the Hebrew Bible (HB) have in some ways experienced the impact of the text. So in the next chapter, efforts would be directed at establishing the significance of preventing open defecation in the camp of Israel and at various places considered to be holy in the whole of the

OT Scripture. This will make its relevance not limited only to the Israelites in the Pentateuch.

Related to the issues of preventing open defecation in the camp of Israel is God's Presence to Israel's camp. The extent of its relevance is discussed in the subsequent chapter.

Chapter 9

Holiness of Israel's Camp is because of God's Presence

One area of relevance to our discussion is the fact that the book of Deuteronomy gives attention to the concept of sacred space/place, sometimes called "Place Holiness theology" or "Divine Place theology" in Israel. My core objectives in this chapter is to establish that our passage advocates this concept of "Place holiness" or the "Divine Place theology". Interestingly, a number of scholars have also identified Deuteronomy as giving special attention to this concept as a result of the divine presence (or the "Name theology").

The significance of the discussions is to consider all the arguments on this sacred space concept, its relationship with the divine presence, and how it is portrayed in the sanitation law. Finally, the significance of these concepts to our arguments on open defecation will be brought to bear.

What is meant by a 'Divine Place'?

Scripture not only emphasises the sacredness of certain places of the earth, but also reveals Yahweh in unique ways at such places (Exod 3:5-6; Josh 5:13-15). Such earthly places are often regarded as 'holy' as a result of the divine presence. Accordingly, any place where the Almighty God manifests His presence (or Himself) is considered a holy ground. Usually, the significance attached to such a sacred earthly place has led to some theological developments which are connected to two related or twin concepts: "name theology" and "place theology". In other words, "Place theology" carries the idea that once

Yahweh is associated with any place, such a geographical area is considered holy. In such cases, the Lord God will let people observe such a place as holy because of His presence.

Christensen (2002:542-44) is one of such scholars who holds such a view that Deuteronomy gives attention to "Place theology" concept in Israel. Hundley (2009:537-540; cf. Inge 2003:42) also corroborates this position. He notes Wilson's conclusion that, 'of the thirteen comparable passages, five refer to divine presence in both accounts, six do so only in Deuteronomy and two only in the Tetrateuch'. Moses not only testified of how God revealed himself at Sinai (Deut 4:10, 36-39), but re-echoed the relevance of the Lord's presence in Israel's deliverance from Egypt (v. 37).

The concept of 'Place theology' continued to be the experience of Israel through their battles for the Promised Land. For instance, Joshua experienced it immediately after the Israelite community crossed the Jordan, while he was probably surveying and strategising to conquer Jericho (Josh 5:13-15). Also, the Jerusalem temple was erected at a place or land space which used to be the threshing floor of Araunah.

This place became the choice for a sacrifice of David to God, because it was where the angel of God who was executing 'holy war' against Israel was restrained from further action (2 Sam 24). The choice of this place for sacrifice confirmed what the book of Deuteronomy states concerning a place that God would choose for Himself (12:5-26; 14:23-25; 15:20; 16:2-15; cf. Macdonald 2006:212-14; Longman III and Dillard 2006:116). Beyond the book of Deuteronomy, King Solomon encountered the Almighty God in the temple and received the promise that presence of the Lord, the Almighty One would remain there forever (2 Chr 7:12-16).

Relevance of the Divine Presence

Christensen (2002:543-44; cf. Macdonald 2006:217) sees the motivation for purity in the military camp of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 to be the holiness of Yahweh. That is, the regulation is a caveat for His holiness and continued presence in the camp. However, there is more to it than just that; His presence is also to make certain provisions (v. 14) which will be argued strongly in the section that follows.

The notion that God's presence in the camp of Israel is connected to other functions has support from other scholars. For example, Holladay (1988:250) notes: 'The LORD walks in the midst of the camp' and that He, the Almighty is present 'to grant a request'. Macdonald's (2006:216-220) comment that 'YHWH's divine presence is to assure God's people of success in the conquest of the land' also supports this position. No doubt, Israel usually defeats their enemies as a result of the presence of the Almighty God in their midst when at war.

Once it is understood from the covenant at Sinai that Israel's whole existence was defined by their relationship with the Lord; His name was supposed to ring a bell in their hearts and His presence was all the assurance they needed. Peay (2005:23) captures this idea as follows: 'The drama of the Exodus experience was fuelled by the continuing presence of God to the people…since the divine presence constitutes the core of the covenant relationship'.

Therefore, as noted earlier, the 'husband-wife' metaphor in the Sinai covenant necessitates the domestic responsibility of the 'husband' ensuring a ritually 'neat home'. No wonder, Yahweh, the Almighty God, roams about unceasingly in their habitation as indicated by the main text (cf. Lev 26:12).

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, the divine Presence concept has been discussed to serve as the primary motivation for Yahweh's special promise to His people. It can be confidently argued that the camp became holy because of the presence of the Holy God. Thus, the call to maintain a holy camp by burying faeces outside it is because of His presence.

But is it only the camp of Israel that the presence of the Almighty God dwelt? What about other places of the earth or even the earth as a whole? These are the issues that will gain attention in the next chapter, as we argue to establish the fact that the presence of God makes the whole earth, including the land of Ghana, a 'divine place'.

Chapter 10

God's Presence is Underpinned by a 'Divine Name'

There are instances where a person (or even a group of people) encounter(s) the Divine Creator and is/are confronted by the mention of His name. Names such as YHWH (i.e. Yahweh), the Lord God Almighty, or 'I AM WHO I AM', which is His name forever, His memorial name to all generations (Exod 3:14), and sometimes the name of God with that of the patriarchs attached such as the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, are typical examples. This phenomenon has led to what is known theological circles as the 'Divine Name theology' or the 'Name theology'.

The significance associated with this kind of theology is that it is not just the revelation of the divine name, but also the divine presence which is at stake. These two concepts which usually bring the place of encounter into some prominence require considerable attention if the stipulations of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 are to be taken seriously. Thus, in this section, our focus is narrowed down to some of the fundamental issues connected to the 'Divine Name' in the text.

What is in the Divine Name?

Using some of the encounters Moses had with Yahweh, the Living God, the Lord himself emphasised the significance of the divine presence. He did not usually use the first person pronoun 'I', by saying, 'I will go with you' though 'I' also stands for His personality. Rather, His involvement is often defined by the term 'presence' in the sentence 'My Presence will go with you' (Exod

33:14). This means that there is something more to 'presence' than can be found in just the pronoun 'I'.

Holladay (1988:294) notes that the word translated as 'presence' is □□□. Interestingly, the NIV and other versions like KJV, NAS, NIB, and RSV translate □□□ of Exodus 33:14 as 'my presence'. In both Job 2:7 where the 'presence' is used in relation to the heavenly realm and Exodus 33:11 and 14 where the event is in connection with the earth, the word is the same, □□□. Holladay (1988:294) notes that the derivative of □□□, that is, □□□□, might be used as a masculine plural construct suffix or first common singular where it is translated as 'the visible or front side of something' (Exod 26:6; 2 Sam 10:9); or as 'before' or 'in the sight of' something (Gen 19:13; 2 Sam 15:18); or as 'a person's self', or 'in person' (2 Sam 17:11); or as 'face' as of Yahweh (Psa 11:7). He adds that in the form as in □□□□□□□ □□□□, it is usually translated as: 'face to face' (Exod 33:11). However, this rendition also means 'presence'.

This argument is corroborated by Milgrom's (n.d.:248) submission that the traditional interpretation that Moses spoke to God 'face to face' (Exod 33:11; Deut 34:10; Num 12:8) must be understood as 'God's presence rather than God's form'. Several views have thus been expressed on the significance of the divine name and presence (cf. Gianotti 2010:16-19; Bruce 1979:57-58) especially in relation to His people. In actual fact, the Almighty God himself underscored the importance of His presence in Exodus 33:14 when He said to Moses: 'My Presence will go with you' Moses understood what Yahweh, the I AM, meant by 'presence', and also insisted on its use in his reply: 'If your Presence does not go with us, do not send us from here'.

The significance of this is that 'presence' emphasises the 'total involvement' of the personality in question. It also means

the Almighty in all His attributes: compassion, glory, goodness, love, majesty, and all other attributes, especially His power (cf. Exod 33:19; 34:6-7). In each encounter with the divine name and presence, special rules are laid down (cf. Wells 2000:30), which means that the divine name is not encountered casually; it usually comes to brace people up for unique experience(s).

Before Israel's liberation from slavery in Egypt, Moses at Mount Sinai had already experienced Yahweh, I AM, as 'the God of his fathers/forefathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob' (Exod 3:6). This is a title which, according to Adler (2009:265), is not the proper name of God. Agreed or not, God indeed disclosed His real identity as the 'I AM WHO I AM' (ref. Exod 3:14; cf. Adler 2009:265; Block 2011:21). It was during this special encounter that Moses was commissioned as the Deliverer of the people of Israel from bondage. In Egypt, Moses experienced the same Almighty God as YHWH (Hb □□□□). Here, He appeared as the Powerful One to redeemed Israel with outstretched arm and with acts of judgement (Exod 6:3-6).

The significance of the name variations is that different divine names have different meanings (Adler 2009:266), as acknowledged by Gianotti (1996:30-38; cf. 1985:38-51), and they reveal aspects of His character and relationship with His people (cf. Sumrall 1982:8). Typical examples are where the Almighty God revealed himself as Elohim, El Shaddai, and the like to the forbearers of humanity on special occasions (ref. Gen 2:21; 3:8; 4:10; cf. Kaiser Jr 2001:142; Hertog 2002:228). He did the same to the patriarchs of Israel; Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and made them experience His power of sustenance (Gen 12-50; Adler 2009:265). Consequently, the names of the patriarchs were kept alive in the heart of every Israelite, or were kept alive in Israel for at least one important reason. And that is,

that their expectation of deliverance from bondage in Egypt and the establishment on the Promised Land would one day be accomplished.

Yahweh's name also reveals His covenant, since every Israelite was fully aware of His dealings with the forefathers. He is the One who covenanted with these patriarchs as the Self-existent and eternally faithful God. So, in the mind of the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of their forefathers, was and still is and will ever be, alive. He is the Living God. No wonder, throughout the Pentateuch and even beyond, He continued to reveal Himself to these patriarchs. Such encounters usually come to serve a dual purpose; a) to remind Israel of the faithfulness of the Covenant-keeping God (cf. Kelley 1992:32; Archer Jr 1994:128-31), and also referred to as the 'Promise-keeping' God (Brueggemann 2013:23); and b) to place on Israel a faithful and obedient response.

Deuteronomy is one of the books that make special mention of the divine presence. This makes the concept very significant. Macdonald (2006:217) sees a similar significance when he notes: 'Deuteronomy consistently appeals to Yahweh's presence amongst or before his people' (7:20-21). Therefore, the encounter of the divine name, Yahweh (YHWH), in Deuteronomy (1:8; 6:10; 9:5; 29:13; 30:20) was to serve this dual purpose.

However, the book takes Israel's relationship with the divine name to a level which is more personalised and thus paramount. This is evidenced in 'Yahweh your God' (also, 'Yahweh thy God') which occurs several times throughout the book. This name binds Israel to God. In this name, there is a shift of covenant responsibilities from the original Sinai participants to the new generation at Moab. One notices the reference to Yahweh in Moses' address to the people: 'The LORD our God…at

Horeb' (1:6; cf. 5:3) and the 'the LORD, the God of your fathers' (1:11, 21; 4:1). In these instances, Moses was recounting events from Sinai/Horeb to Moab.

This generation aged nineteen years and younger, which had grown up at that time (not including Joshua, Caleb, and Moses himself; cf. Num 14:29) was not the one made up of those who had experienced the events from Sinai/Horeb onwards (Lev 26:45). Yet, Moses decided to make all of them responsible for the covenant. Hence, there is the combination of 'our' and 'us', when he included himself, and when the address was directed to the people, 'you' and 'your'. The objective of Moses was to change the mind of this generation from thinking that it was their fathers who had made the covenant with the Almighty God and not them. This is supported by Moses' statement: 'It was not with our fathers that the LORD made this covenant, but with us, with all of us who are alive here today' (Deut 5:3).

Beginning with Chapter 4, however, Moses addressed the people mostly using second person plural *you* and *your*, and often calling the divine name, 'Yahweh *your* God', in order to make the congregation (excluding him) take full responsibility for the address. He was transferring the covenant responsibilities from the original Sinai congregation to this new one; the older generation had been wiped out from the camp (Deut 2:14-15). By this time, Moses had accepted that he would not be part of those that would cross over the Jordan (Deut 3:23-27), so there was no more 'us' and 'our', except places like 5:2 and 3 when he referred to Horeb.

Additionally, there is affirmation of who 'Yahweh your God' really is in Deuteronomy. In Chapter 32:39, the Almighty God makes a reconnection and an incomparable claim: 'See now that I, *I am* He, and there is no god besides me' (NAS; my emphasis).

This not only reveals that it is the same 'I AM' of their fathers who is addressing the new generation, but that He alone deserves their trust as the Only True God. The mention of Yahweh's name as 'the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob' is thus significant, in that 'God's name reveals His character' (Sumrall 1982:8; cf. Yamoah 2012:55-57), in this case, the character of One who keeps covenants from fathers to children for generations (Deut 5:8). He is the Unchanging God (Mal 3:6), the Covenant-keeping God, the One who is faithful to His promises (Exod 34:6-7; cf. Lam 3:23). Moreover, the attachment of identities to Yahweh's name shows that He is the God of relationships, keeping faith with all who walk faithfully with Him.

It is within this frame of renewed and a personalised relationship and understanding of who the Almighty God is that Moses gave the stipulation in Deuteronomy 23:12-14. The stress on the second personal pronoun in the regulation cannot be overlooked:

> Designate a place outside the camp where *you* can go to relieve *yourself.* As part of *your* equipment have something to dig with, and when *you* relieve *yourself*, dig a hole and cover up *your* excrement. For the LORD *your* God moves about in *your* camp to protect *you* and to deliver *your* enemies to *you*. *Your* camp must be holy, so that he will not see among *you* anything indecent and turn away from *you*.

The import of these emphases was that Moses reminded the people of a personalised relationship with Yahweh, 'the LORD *your* God', so that the blessings for obedience to the stipulation and the curses for disobedience, would be on them and not on their fathers. Overall, the mention of Yahweh is a justification of the 'Name theology' in the text (cf. Macdonald 2006:216-17).

Relationship between the Divine Name and Divine Place

It is hard to ignore or underestimate the relationship between the "divine name" and "divine place". Therefore, in this section, attention is directed at the possible relationship between the "Divine Name" and "Divine Place" and the applications of this twin concepts. Indeed, the two concepts usually go together: one affirms the other. On Mount Sinai, for instance, when Moses wanted to use his ignorance as a means to hide from God's divine plan, the Almighty One gave him this assurance: 'I will be with you' (Exod 3:12).

This is an indication of the divine presence. Then, in Egypt, the Lord God revealed Himself as Yahweh in Chapter 6:2 to confirm His promise and convince Moses of not only the divine presence, but the name as well. Also, in Chapters 33 and 34 of the book, the Almighty God, the Lord, mentioned His name in connection with the presence in verses 19 and 5-7 respectively.

One of the implications of 'place' and 'name' concepts is in connection to the future place of worship. Such a worship place for Israel is what Longman III and Dillard (2006:116; cf. Block 2005:138) identify in the book of Deuteronomy as 'the place the LORD your God will choose'. Similarly, Richter (2007:342-366) advances evidence that the concept, 'the place YHWH will choose' and/or the 'placing of the name' motif, is embedded within the whole book of Deuteronomy.

Here, the Almighty God indicated that when they have conquered and possessed the Promised Land, He would choose 'a place for His name', where the people would always come and worship and sacrifice to Him. That 'place for His name' would also be the resting place of the Ark within the tabernacle. I regard both the 'divine name' and 'divine presence' as very significant marks of identifying the Almighty God in Israel's military camp.

They make Yahweh's emphasis on 'holiness of the place' in the text very meaningful.

In this aspect, the message of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is quite unique in the expression of both concepts. In the text, the 'divine name' and the 'divine presence' are manifested by the single phrase: 'the LORD your God walks in your midst' Thus, not only the divine name, 'Yahweh your God' is mentioned but 'walking in their midst' is also indicated. Accordingly, the Almighty God gave meaning to the holiness demanded by His presence, that is, 'walking in their midst', by spelling out the specific instructions for the upkeep of the camp.

Application of the Divine Name and Place concepts

The two concepts can be applied to the congregational camp as a whole. Hill and Walton's (2000:106-7) comment, 'the Holy God resides within the tabernacle and makes it imperative to prevent anything unclean from coming into contact with the divine presence', is appropriate here (cf. Lev 22:3; Num 5:2–3). This is affirmed by the Ark which symbolises the 'divine name' and 'divine presence' and reminds them of the faithfulness of the Almighty God in fulfilling His covenant promises (cf. Kelley 1992:32). The Ark equally elicits the obedience required of the people by the covenant (cf. Exod 6:2; 12:12; 20:1; 23:20-21; Lev 18:2-4, 21, and 30). Whether it is the congregational or military camp, 'place theology' and 'name theology' are relevant to the Israelites.

Macdonald (2006:212-14) defends both 'place theology' and 'name theology' in the book of Deuteronomy. He points to an assertion in Deuteronomy 4:36 where there is an appeal to Yahweh's heavenly and earthly presence; 'from heaven you were caused to hear of his voice, and upon earth you were caused to

see his great fire, and his words you heard from the midst of the fire'. The relevance is that Yahweh, who is I AM, the Almighty Lord, is 'God in heaven above and on the earth below', that is, His name and presence fill the whole of creation; they are everywhere. Even beyond the context of the pericope, which is the military camp, the 'divine name' and the 'divine presence' find additional significance in the book of Deuteronomy where both concepts culminate in the designation of a single place, as Christensen (2002:542-44) also acknowledges.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, the 'Name Theology' concept has been discussed. The chapter has revealed that not only did people who occasionally encounter God have special testimonies which connect with the Name of God that is revealed during the encounter, but the Divine Name also consecrates a place to become divine. It is clear from the discussions in this chapter that the name of the Almighty God revealed as Yahweh, I AM, underpins His character and also connotes significant meaning and influence on all His people. Not only did people who occasionally encounter God have special testimonies which connect with the Name of God that is revealed during the encounter.

Chapter 11

How Relevant is God's Presence to Israel's Camp/Land?

In this chapter, attention is focused on the relevance the Divine presence to the camp of Israel as a geographical space. Related to Israel, 'Place theology' carries the idea of specific places which are major concerns for Israel's existence. Such places define Israel's relationship with Yahweh, where obedience to its purity regulations guarantees their victories in the conquest campaigns. Thus, it is significant to critically examine the concept of 'Place theology' to see its implication for the Israelites.

A holy/sacred place is not only connected to the symbolic presence of the Almighty God, that is, the Ark of Covenant, as some might propose. In fact, the experience existed sometime before the use of the Ark. Genesis 28:10-17, where Jacob first encountered Yahweh, and 35:1-15 where Yahweh established him at Bethel, are typical examples. Then also, Exodus 3 where Moses encountered Yahweh, the I AM, who is the Lord God Almighty. 'Place' - ground or land or camp or any such precinct, in such special instances, is emphasised in unique ways.

Mount Sinai (or Horeb, Exod.19:11) is one of such places. YAHWEH instructed Moses to set boundaries to it in order to keep the Israelite community from it, because He, Yahweh, was identified with it. Therefore, Mount Sinai gained attention as the mountain of Yahweh, the Living God, and was regarded as holy as testified because of Yahweh's presence there. That is, it is His 'presence' which is important not just the mountain.

Wells (2000:28-29) presents some arguments on the basis of Gilbert's observation concerning Horeb, that it was not holy prior to the revelation of Yahweh: 'It is his presence that makes it holy'. For Wells, then, it means that 'a place in itself cannot be holy except by God's presence'. Beyond the Torah, a place of Israel's camp at Gilgal and near to Jericho, where Israel's physical military leader, Joshua, encountered an angel of the Almighty God (Josh 5:13-15), is another example of a place that demonstrates the place theology concept.

In effect, what one can say is that 'place' is never inert, but it should rather be considered as a huge responsibility on any group of people that are within. This reflection might not be hard to defend since it a 'place' offers an opportunity and a challenge that will 'enable the people to be established by God as a people holy to himself' (Inge 2003:39-40).

Divine place in connection with Israel

Narrowing down the discussions on sacred place, Lioy brings Israel into focus. He relates the subject of divine presence down to what happens in the earthly sanctuary. The sanctuary, commonly identified as the Tabernacle or Tent of Meeting, became a centre for sacerdotal activity in Israel from the time of the encampment at Sinai until a permanent structure, the temple, was built by King Solomon during the monarchy period. The position of Sprinkle (2000:654-55) on the sanctuary and the land as sacred space against the background of other scholars who treat the topic in the light of the military camp will bring a contrast that is helpful.

Like Lioy, the contributions of Sprinkle and Inge on the concept of place holiness are insightful and worth exploring. The key idea of place holiness and the notion that the purity system

is central to creating a sense of sacred spaces to Israel is captured by all of them. Indeed, Sprinkle (2000: 654-55) does not treat the place holiness concept with emphasis on the congregational/military camp. His focus is on the land of Israel which encompasses the sanctuary, priests, and all the people. He notes Wright's observation on the concerns of the priestly writings that the documents were meant to put impurity in its proper place, and that in them there was similar concern about the proper place for holiness and purity.

Moreover, Sprinkle notes that the purity system is central to creating a sense of sacredness of space for ancient Israel. He points out that the whole system of purity is concerned with protection of the sanctuary, even where it is not immediately clear (Lev 12:4; 15:31; Num 19:13, 20). Sprinkle (2000:654) appropriately argues: 'The sanctuary as God's residence was the source of holiness, blessing, and order, and it was threatened on every side by the pollution that surrounded it'. He notes that the holiness of the tabernacle was incompatible with the condition of uncleanness in the surroundings. This was a reminder that the tabernacle space should be set apart from defilement. Hence the rules of clean and unclean instilled in the Israelite that a special holiness was associated with Yahweh's sanctuaries.

Sprinkle mentions the observation of Wright that the object of ritual cleansing with the blood purification is primarily the sanctuary and not so much the worshipper. That the sanctuary needs this constant cleansing from human impurities and sins is an indication that the sanctuary is to be set apart, to be sacred. Thus the holiness and sacredness of that space is emphasised. Sprinkle further argues that it was the sense of the sacredness of the tabernacle and temple space that made purification from moral and ritual impurity essential.

Continuing with his argument, Sprinkle observes that the information about places of purity and impurity as a whole reveals a larger system of 'cultic topography'. This, for him, also distinguishes sacred space/places from non-sacred or common space/places and/or defiled unclean space/places. He further submits that it was because the tabernacle was regarded as a holy space/place that one needed to be careful not to approach it in a condition of ceremonial impurity. Hence, the holiness rules inculcated in the mind of the Israelite worshipper that the sanctuary was sacred.

Inge's definition and examination places the concept in a context that is quite significant to our situation. He explains 'place theology' as carrying the idea that once God is associated with any place or environment, such a geographical area is considered holy, and thus should not be defiled. Inge refers to Brueggemann as proposing that the narrative of the OT centres on the land which has been promised. Then he quotes Oliver O'Donovan: 'The possession of land was a climax of mighty acts by Yahweh…Yet there was another aspect to the role of battle…It also represents the acts of consecration, by which the community gives itself to receive the gift' (2003:35).

Furthermore, Inge notes that 'this consecration requires deep faithfulness on the part of Israel, and will necessitate a very careful balance in the three-way relationship between people, place, and God'. His contribution to this discussion is the linkage among three major players in our investigation: God, His people, and the camp as a geographical space. As he puts it:

> 'Place is not inert: it offers opportunity and challenge and it would seem that it is the land which enables the people to be established by the Lord God Almighty as a "people holy to

himself"…Responsibility to the land as well as to Yahweh is important' (2003:39-40).

In a sense, the whole land of Israel was, in the words of Sprinkle, 'somewhat sacred space, in contrast to the defiled space of Gentile lands'. Nonetheless, Gentiles are allowed to share the semi-sacred space of land, even partaking in holy things, such as the Passover meal and of the Feast of Weeks (Exod 12:48; Deut 16:14). Like the Israelites, they also had to undergo ritual purification for carcass impurity (Lev 17:15). This was done because the sanctuary, Israel's sacred space, was holy.

The inference from Inge is that Israel was to take care of their land, not only because they dwell on it but also that they were accountable for it. Though for him, the land itself is not referred to as holy, a position that is in contrast to that of Wright (1999:356-58), it nevertheless belonged to God and needed to be protected from defilement as required of a steward (Deut 13:12-18; 21:23). One way to achieve this was to keep it holy for the One who established the people on it.

Divine place in connection with the camp

Some specifically point to the instructions of 23:12-14 as being in connection with the above concept. Our interest here is in the understanding that not only the temple but some geographical spaces such as their camp also served as localized sacred places for fellowship between Yahweh, the I AM, and His covenant community. And as already indicated, the motivation for the holiness of the camp is that the Almighty God is present with His people, the Israelites.

For example, Lioy (2010:31) identifies the requirement of the camp of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 with the demands of the

divine Creator for His sacred spaces. His reference to the temple and the military camp of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 as one of the sacred places identified by Moses. Macdonald (2006:217) supports this position and reveals that the pericope is a characteristic Deuteronomic justification of the divine presence in the camp. But his discussion on the sanctuary and the land as sacred space against the background of other scholars who treat the topic in the light of the military camp will bring a contrast that is helpful.

The submission of Lioy (2010:31) is excellent when he notes that the camp (and not just the tabernacle or tent or temple) was commanded to be kept holy (Deut 23:12-14), since 'impurities did compromise the holiness of the sanctuary and altar' (Grabbe 1997:97; cf. Milgrom 1976). This is because the dwelling of the Almighty God was not restricted to the temple but He moved about in their midst, throughout the camp and even on the whole land. Hill and Walton (2000:106-7) agree that Yahweh, the Holy God, resided in the camp, making it imperative to prevent anything unclean from coming into the camp (7:20–21; 22:3; cf. Num 5:2–3). Adeyemo (2006:240; cf. Unger 1988:201; Craigie 1983:299-300) also states that the camp was to be kept holy in honour of the Almighty God, and to avoid the situation in which His presence is not experienced.

Chapter Conclusion

At this juncture, everything in the passage points to the fact that improper disposal of human waste or faeces on the land was a detestable thing to Yahweh's presence. The fact that it was not even expected to be exposed outside the camp but had to be covered emphasises the premium that the Almighty God placed

on the holiness of this ‘place’. The motivation is the presence of Yahweh himself.

The foregone also affirms the ‘theology of holiness’ of the camp because He was in the midst of it. By demanding its holiness, the Almighty God had to prescribe certain practices that would also make His people stay uncorrupted. This is a way of expressing the meaning of holiness in relation to the Lord God.

Chapter 12

Significance of Preventing Open Defecation to all Israelites

At this juncture, the bottom line of such a demand for holiness is not far-fetched. Even when whole community of Israel and their soldiers were encamped for battle, their obedience to the requirements of the law was important not only for their victory, but also to guarantee their continued survival. It is in this light that the implications of the demand for holiness in their bodies and the materials of the sanctuary in relation to the camp as discussed in the previous chapter cannot be overemphasised.

Indeed, the enjoyment of victory in the conquest of the Promised Land alone could be a great source of motivation to the new generation to bury their faecal matter outside the camp. Israel's call to ensure ceremonial cleanliness within their camp was an uncompromised requirement for significant reasons. This is why these and other related issues are addressed in the following sections.

The dangers of Defecating Openly in the camp

If there is any subject that needs critical consideration, it is how the OT community Israel used to value and respond to divine instructions. This is very germane in the light of their disobedience to the stipulations in the text leading to their defecating openly in the camp. Perhaps, it is also important not to treat Israel's reaction to this law as peculiar but rather link it with that of other OT texts to show how the latter throws light on the former.

Thus, one cannot overlook the significance of any scholarly debate on the nature of their motivations or responses towards any of the laws in the rest of the HB. This point is buttressed by Lioy (2004:6) when he observes that, 'Many Old Testament scholars recognise the vast importance of the Decalogue to the study and understanding of the Hebrew Scriptures.' This, notwithstanding, the motivations in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 are likely to be different from the manner of motivations in the Ancient Near East (ANE) nations mentioned in the scriptures.

Indeed, the response of Israel would be informed by a couple of factors that they attach to the instruction. God had promised to lead Joshua, Caleb, and the younger generation to the Promised Land and ensure their continued survival on it. However, they were to live responsibly to enjoy such assurance. Obedience, which has been argued as the main theme of the book, would sustain the presence of Yahweh, the Almighty God, in order to perform this functional role of His.

Understanding that the divine presence means 'Yahweh in all His attributes' also implies that He is not only the Defender of His people but also the Supreme Judge (Gen 18:25; Judg 11:27). His acts of judgement are executed through war (Deut 23:14). By 'a mighty hand and outstretched arm' (Deut 4:34) and by His great power as Judas acknowledged (2 Macc 15:24, GNB), He will execute 'mighty acts of judgement' against His enemies (Exod 6:6).

At this juncture, one could guess the mental frame of this surviving generation of Israel on the east side of River Jordan towards the stipulations of Deuteronomy 23:12-14. By way of God's judgement in the course of the wilderness travel, their loyalty and faithfulness had no doubt been tested. Indeed, they had been transformed into a generation that could be described

as a refined community (cf. Gibson 1994:15; Funk 1959:209; Dozeman 1998:43).

Now, the nation could boast of Yahweh, the Powerful One who brought them out of the clutches of a powerful nation, Egypt, and had already led them to defeat powerful kings and their nations. They had had lots of military battles already, and had experienced His power over their enemies by giving them victory. They had had their share of divine judgement that came with devastating results. All these experiences had prepared their minds and made them poised for victory with the full assurance of His presence in their camp. Their mental attitude was not that of defeatists, as their forefathers, but rather towards conquering and continued survival in the Promised Land. It is obvious then that they were in a state of a heightened expectation and readiness for success.

Thus, the message of the pericope could not have come at a better time. They needed it to assure them of what was ahead. It was the surest motivational message for them to possess the promise that the Almighty God made to their forefathers, the land of Canaan. The onus rested on these recipients' readiness to maintain the holiness of the camp, for they could not afford to miss the opportunity to enter and possess it, since the reverse undoubtedly held true. This means that the lack of 'holiness of camp' as a result of exposure of human waste would lead to war by the Lord God against His own people as his enemies. Put in another form, in the event of failure to obey the rules, the Almighty would not only remove His protection and leave the camp but would also allow their enemies to defeat them and plague them with contagious diseases.

Israel no doubt proved obedient to this camp stipulation, hence, the victories they experienced in the conquest under

Joshua (Josh 12) and beyond. There were occasional cases of disobedience of other regulations concerning 'Yahweh's war' like what happened at Jericho when Achan disobeyed God's expert instructions (Josh 7) and their disobedience in allowing some of the Canaanites to remain on the land, which became a snare to them as recorded in the book of Judges.

However, there is no evidence that the direct recipients failed in war as a result of disobedience to the stipulations of this pericope. It can be concluded that the recipients of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 obeyed its dictates and enjoyed its promises to the fullest.

Socio-Cultural Significance of avoiding Open Defecation

The need to engage acceptable sanitary habit is a fundamental socio-cultural requirement. Socially, such a need is meant to maintain a sense of consciousness of the communal life expected of both the soldiers in the camp and the community as a whole. It is of even greater significance here because the pollutant involved is faeces or human waste. The nature of faecal matter is such that every society would not like to see smeared around or dropped in the open. If it comes from the highest rational beings who should know better, then it should be disposed-off in accordance with best social practices. This is why open defecation is a disgrace to the moral fibre of the human society.

Openly defecating within the immediate neighbourhood of people is regarded a serious breach of socio-cultural ethics. It obviously offends public sensibilities and is an eyesore. Israel as a nation would not like to flout this instruction let alone be regarded as 'dirty' with regard to their camp and ultimately the land which they aspired to possess. Clearly then, it would be a

huge affront to public decency if the military and the remaining community were to be allowed to ease themselves in the camp wherever they wanted.

Hart argues that it is the need to inculcate in the covenant community the values of sanitation, espoused by our pericope, that Nossig probably considered Moses and some of the Jewish leaders as sanitation officials whose task was to preserve the moral health of the people (cf. 1995:73-74). Particularly, for the military at a camp preparing for battle, anything that would infringe on their conditions of stay could demoralise them, and lead to a disappointing outcome in their warfare. Acceptable social habits would be a blessing, in that the people would all benefit from one another and enjoy life to the fullest.

Discussions that centre on issues of sanitation are not only linked with creation care. In fact, they are also direct attention to the ethical (moral) responsibility that God has entrusted to humanity as will be shown in the subsequent section.

Moral/Ethical Significance of avoiding Open Defecation

Richter shows interest in Deuteronomy's concern for the long-term environmental impact of the civilisation on the land. She wonders whether it was not Israel's perspective of nature which was reflecting the character of their God, and thus, ensured their culture and their economy. For, as Richter (2010:365) states, 'The *politeia* of ancient Israel taught that economic growth was not a viable excuse for the abuse of the land, and true economic well-being would come only from careful stewardship of the same'.

There are other scholars who share Richter's position. For example, McConville (1986:11) notes: 'Not only the land itself but everything in it is a gift', that is, including the cities, houses,

the cisterns, vineyards and olive trees. He posits: 'There is a sense in which the land never becomes fully Israel's, for even though Yahweh gives it, it remains ultimately his'. Thus, He reserves the right, as its owner to oversee to its proper care.

Wright's (2004:87) note on the moral implications of nature care for the land in particular is appropriate and supportive. He mentions that the land that God gave Israel was the monumental, tangible proof of His dependability, on moral grounds, so, 'the LORD was a God *worthy* of obedience' (his emphasis). He further observes that Israel could not use the fact that the land was a gift 'as a license to abuse it, because *the land was still* Yahweh*'s land'* (his emphasis). He retained the ultimate title of ownership and therefore also the ultimate right of moral authority over how it was used' (2004:93).

Similarly, Millar (1995:389-392) observes that ethics in the book of Deuteronomy are based on the response to God's gracious initiatives demanded of Israel, especially concerning the Promised Land. For him, the land, from the perspective of the book of Deuteronomy, is a moral device that proclaims both the grace of the Almighty God and Israel's responsibility. Having increased from a migrant family of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, Israel as a nation now needed a land to settle on. As a people that had been enslaved before by as powerful a nation as Egypt, Israel understood what it meant to wield power and be in control of a land.

Kudadjie and Aboagye-Mensah (1992:6) also see specific compelling reasons for the community of Israel to obey the requirement of Deuteronomy 23:12-14. They posit that Israel was expected to be ethically different. That is, the fact that they have a distinct history and a distinct God must manifest itself in their daily moral living. In other words, in their dealings with fellow

Israelites and other nations, Israel must reflect the nature and character of the Holy God.

Chapter Conclusion

In terms of significance, it has been argued in this chapter that the resultant defeat of Israel for her disobedience, the misery, shame, and pain as a result of enslavement as they later experienced in Judges (4:1-3; 6:1-6; 10:6-10), would be the driving force that would inform her predicted return to the Lord, the Almighty God. Little wonder, even during the period of rebellion and punishment, the Lord God made some provisions for reconciliation and restoration, after their repentance (cf. Deut 30:1-10; Lev 26:40-46).

A couple of conclusions can be drawn at this point. Though the stipulation was to elicit strict obedience from the Israelites at the east of Jordan, it nevertheless was also a test of the faith of successive generations to see if they would trust in Yahweh. The concept of war was tied to the covenant of Israel with God. All these point to the fact that both the immediate recipients of the instructions on sanitation and the subsequent generations valued the restrictions on open defecation and obeyed it to the letter.

On the basis of this evaluation and response from the Israelites, the next chapter will consider whether there are any implications of open defecation for the Gentile nations.

Chapter 13

How Significant is Preventing Open Defecation to Gentiles?

From all indications, the life of the people of Israel was meant by God to be different from all the people on the earth. That is, they were not to live like the Gentiles. Indeed, their socio-cultural and moral lives must demonstrate their distinctiveness (Deut 15:1-18). Failure of Israel to live up to such requirements could spell doom, because they were a people peculiar to God. However, was this "life of separation" something that covered all spheres of life in such a way that the other nations of the world were free from the infringements of their laws such as the one on open defecation?

However, a couple of questions that might arise is such as:

- should Israel's evaluation and reaction to this pentateuchal laws on sanitation be taken as special?
- how do other texts contribute to a better understanding of their response to the passage under discussion?

It is to find out whether this practice had any significance to the Gentile Nations that, as indicated earlier, the discussion on the pericope needs to be extended to cover the Gentile world of the OT. This section is committed to that step. The objective is to find out how nations other than Israel related to God's message.

How did Israel and the Gentile Nations compare?

Deuteronomy 23:12-14 has lots of significant connections to the ANE practices; hence, some of the motivations that it brings are not very different from theirs. This notwithstanding, it

is not easy to strike an agreement among scholars on such a connection. For example, the idea of living in a 'camp' where the presence of the deity would continuously reside at a 'sacred centre' among His people may not have been a novelty of the Israelites. This is because, Kawashima (2006:229) notes such a practice to have been 'more or less directly inherited from ancient Near Eastern traditions'. Moreover, the issue of setting up camps for military purposes was a common feature (1 Sam 28:4).

On the contrary, Craigie (1976:300) sees the idea of having a symbolic presence of deity at a military camp as a peculiarity of the Israelites. His position is supported by the expression of surprise by the Philistine army when the Ark was brought into the camp of Israel during one of their military encounters with Israel. Gripped by fear, they said, 'A god has come into the camp, we're in trouble! Nothing like this has happened before' (1 Sam 4:7). Thus, the ANE nations had to contend with Israel's military camps where their God was with them (Deut 23:12-14; 1 Sam 11:11). Such presence was Israel's guarantee of protection and assurance of victory if all the regulations were obeyed.

Whichever way one looks at it, there is no controversy about the fact that the laws of the Almighty God and the sacredness of the tabernacle or Israel's camp demanded the desecration of all pagan 'sacred spaces'. Consequently, Israel, acting on the divine demands of a 'holy war', was commanded to destroy all pagan sacred objects and places (Exod 23:24; 34:13; Deut 7:5; cf. Sprinkle 2000:649-56).

Another area of comparison between the Israelites and the ANE nations is the desire to have their god(s) in their midst. Briley (2000:99) reveals that the concern of Israel for purifying the

camp so that God might not depart from their midst is a practice they shared with their pagan neighbours. The difference, however, as Milgrom (1991:259) observes, is that:

> The ancients mainly feared impurity because it was demonic, even metadivine, capable of attacking the gods. Hence, men were summoned, indeed created, for the purpose of purifying temples to aid the benevolent resident gods in their battles with cosmic evil. In Israel, however, there are no traces of demonic impurity.

Milgrom (1991:260) considers this as 'the priestly theodicy' and 'one of the major contributions of priestly theology' in Israel. As Briley (2000:100) notes:

> Human beings assume the place of the demonic in paganism in that they alone can bring contamination to the sanctuary and ultimately force God's departure. It is the sins of human beings, therefore, which defile the sanctuary, and the holiness of God which threatens wrath and/or abandonment unless the situation is rectified.

From the ongoing discussions, it is clear that certain degrees of differences exist between some of the practices of the Israelites and the Gentiles. This notwithstanding, some degree of commonness exists, especially with regards to their commitment to rituals.

Did Open Defecation have any implication for Gentiles?

Bruce (1979:62, 78; cf. Radmacher *et al* 1997:290-91) notes that the ritual regulations, including those of Deuteronomy are based on those familiar to the patriarchs in Canaan of Mesopotamia. While the laws of the Almighty God demanded

strict adherence to holiness requirements, the same could not be said about those of the other nations. That is, His laws were a strict message that needed to be obeyed. Furthermore, Bruce opines: 'Sometimes, indeed, "torah" is explicitly directive'. This is precisely the case with our passage, where strict rules were to be obeyed in order to ensure continuous and positive divine relationship.

To some extent, the ancient Israelite idea of health is seen to compare well with that of other ANE nations. Particularly, the issue of whether a sickness or disease is contracted as a result of punishment for sin by God or the gods is revisited in the light of ANE beliefs. As already indicated, God, and even Satan and demons, His spiritual enemies, employ diseases in warfare.

Scurlock and Anderson (2005:17) also underscore the observation that Mesopotamian physicians attributed illnesses to gods or goddesses, demons or demonesses, and ghosts. The recognition of an association between open defecation and the outbreak of '*li'bu* fever' as a result of contagion by these physicians is observed to compare with that which underpins the hygienic requirement of the sanitation text under study. In this light, the views of some ANE nations and Israel on involvement of spirits in disease are comparable.

Of much concern to the discussion, however, is the issue of 'holy war'. Interestingly, the concept of 'holy war', also called *herem,* was not unique to Israel since during war, both Israel and the nations of the ANE would have the belief that their god or the gods respectively fight for them (cf. Wright 2008:88). Indications are that the whole laws of the HB cannot be taken as special compared with those of the ANE nations.

This is also observed by Bruce (1979:62) in his comment that a great part of the Pentateuch constitutes a modification of

ancient Near Eastern laws, which were probably brought by the patriarch Abraham from Mesopotamia. Bruce cites, particularly, the laws of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, and mentions that the civil law as well as the rituals are based on those familiar to the patriarchs in Mesopotamia or Canaan.

Nevertheless, there are differences with regard to what or who constitutes the source of motivation to each group; for example, whether it is Yahweh who fights for Israel or the gods in the case of the nations. In all cases, the God of Israel proved that He was above other gods and that He decided in which direction victory in wars must go. Interestingly, Israel would be the direct beneficiaries, because, as mentioned in the text, it is the Lord, the Almighty God, who fights for them, while the other nations would be at the receiving end of His wrath, because their practices were usually abominations to Him.

These nations had been picked out by God for destruction, because they served other gods and practised idolatry, which was against His law, and indulged in other filthy practices which He abhorred (Deut 5:7-10; 7:16; cf. Exod 20:3-6; Num 25:1-3). In fulfilment of His promise to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Gen 15:17; 17:7; 28:12-15; Exod 33:1), the Almighty God would apply the strategy of displacement by substitution. He would drive away all the people who were in the land and establish Israel in it.

Beyond the Pentateuch, especially in the books of some of the prophets, the Almighty God reiterates His call for holiness as a motivation for His readiness to fight for His people. This is seen in His judgement of the Gentiles for their detestable practices and their attack on His people. Jeremiah's messages against nations like Egypt, Philistine, Moab, and Babylon (chapt 46-51) are examples. Ezekiel articulates one of such 'holy war'

messages, which was against Gog, of the land of Magog (chapt 38-39), and in the process specified some divine weapons involved (38:4, 22; 39:6).

Israel as an example to the Gentile Nations

God's mission in the OT would be achieved by overthrowing all His enemies, particularly idolaters, and not only Israel, in war. As Wright (2010:16-19) notes, 'since God's mission is to restore creation to its full original purpose of bringing all glory to God himself, and thereby to enable all creation to enjoy the fullness of blessing that he desires for it, God battles against all forms of idolatry'. Watt (2011:130) provides the reason: 'God knows that idolatry and the potential demonic influence which traffics through the practice of idolatry is accompanied by deception, manipulation and futility'.

So, as to the question of whether Israel's evaluation and reaction to this pentateuchal laws on sanitation be taken as special, the answer is, by all means, No! Indeed, their response to the law that banned them from open defecation may reflect that of the neighbouring nations. In this way, the choice of Israel by God was for the sake of the rest of the nations. Meaning that, it is not 'a privilege but a responsibility. It means being chosen for a task; being a chosen instrument by which God will fulfil His mission of universal blessing' (Wright 2010:16-19; cf. 2006:224-25, 329-33; Block 2011:25). This is the reason why God sent His prophets not only to condemn the abominable practices of the nations, but also to warn them of the consequences of not turning from such practices.

There are some indications that such a responsibility on the nations is the inspiration for Isaiah's warnings (cf. Isa 40-48), and the motivation for Jeremiah's (10:2, 5) messages about the

emptiness of idols. This practice, described as 'monotheing dynamic' by Wright (Watt 2011:130-131) is 'the motive which drives the entire narrative behind the release of Israel from Egypt, which was as much for the attention of Egypt (Ezek 30:19) as it was for Israel (Exod 6:7) - for both nations to come to know God as the only true God'. As Watt (2011:130-131) also argues, God executed judgment against the gods not only to demonstrate that He was powerful than them, but also that He demanded total loyalty and obedience and was prepared to punish every disobedience in order to achieve His purposes (Exod 12:12; Psa 9:16; Ezek 25:11; 30:19; 38:22-23).

It is against this backdrop that God has consistently waged 'holy war' against His 'enemies' through the OT into the NT context. Without any controversy, this divine objective of the Most High inevitably continues today and will never abate until all 'enemies' are vanquished.

Chapter Conclusion

The discussions of this chapter have centred on the meaning of the stipulations of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 to, the people of Israel, the original audience. The effect of worldview on the original audience living as a community and their understanding of theology were briefly mentioned in the hope of figuring out their interpretation of the laws and its impact on them. The meaning and application of this text on sanitation which is undergirded by environmental care, holiness, hygiene associated with health, diseases and contagion in the camp, 'name theology' and 'place theology', and 'holy war' were considered in the light of their theological and socio-cultural significance.

Another achievement of this chapter is the integration of all these identified concepts. The final lap of the discussions in the chapter covered the implications of the text to other users such as the rest of the OT covenant community and other nations. The implication of the text to the people has been shown: that they should prepare to possess the land but that this would only be achieved through war, with God as their leader.

In all, the chapter has satisfied its objective of discussing what the pericope meant to the audience, and perhaps, subsequent generations of the OT era. Now, this discussion is not merely of historical and/or theoretical interest, with no application beyond the OT times. In the next chapter, attention will be paid to the relevance of this OT text to the NT Church, all Christians and the larger society.

Chapter 14

How Relevant is Sanitation in the New Testament Context?

Many people have advanced reasons why the OT laws are irrelevant for NT believers. As such, the laws hardly become well understood to be fully applied to the NT context. One of the most likely observations for their arguments is that these laws have not been fully examined for their meaning. Thus, indications that some of the laws, such as found in Deuteronomy, have been or are being explored to the advantage of the NT believers' community are uncommon, though not completely lacking.

However, one of the objectives of this book is the discussion of a sound biblical model of exegesis of the pentateuchal laws in the light of the NT. The issue regarding the scholarly and theological debate on the relevancy and applicability of the OT to the NT and the Church such as argued by Bahnsen (cf. Gundry 1996:93-143) and Strickland (cf. Gundry 1996:229-279) continues to rage on.

Need for connecting the OT to the NT

Indeed, any exegesis of an OT text is incomplete until it is applied to the NT for the benefit of the Church and larger society. Longman III (2006:34) notes that the OT 'is not a self-enclosed body of literature; rather; it ends with the expectation of a coming fulfillment'. To satisfy this objective, there should first be a clear connection between the two testaments.

Lioy (2004:6, 13) establishes a link between the OT and the NT, noting how the importance of the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount is evident in the study of ethics today, and

indicating that 'the moral law has continuing relevance as a rule of guide for the Christian church today'. Asumang's and Domeris' (2007:10; cf. 2006:23) employment of appropriate sociological models in spatiality to examine the expositions in *Hebrews* definitely indicate that through appropriate hermeneutical processes the passages of the OT can be well applied and understood in the NT.

Over here, I do not only accept the challenge to connect the motivations of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 to the NT context, but more importantly, to use it to sensitise Christians and the larger contemporary society to the relevance of this passage. The current chapter charts a pathway on the basis of a hermeneutical procedure to interpret Deuteronomy 23:12-14, and provides explanations of the historical, grammatical, theological, and sociological functions of this law on sanitation. It pursues this aim by reviewing the debate on the Christian hermeneutics of the OT laws in the hope of providing reasonable interpretations of such laws for contemporary Christian reflection and praxis.

In so doing, it employs intertextuality to link the text to several NT passages. In the end, it establishes that concepts such as hygiene, environmental care, holiness, 'name theology', 'place theology', and 'holy war' are not only applicable to NT believers, but also find ultimate fulfilment in the issues of Revelation 19:11-21:27.

The OT camp is alluded to in NT camp

The concepts that undergird Deuteronomy 23:12-14 shed light on some NT passages, though not directly. The first is the sacred space/place, the camp, which was developed into the temple. Since the NT Christian community was characterised by such terms as house, household, and the like and not only

temple, it illustrates how the OT notion of sacred space is not strictly applied in the NT. Before the inauguration of the Church, the OT idea of the temple which lingered and was utilised in the book of Acts by the early Christians as a sacred space was doomed to destruction (Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:21; cf. Matt 24:2).

Consequently, an identifiably erected structural 'place' was not as strongly emphasised in the NT as in the OT. In this light, Sprinkle's (2000:654-55) argument that under the new covenant 'the idea of sacred space is abolished and supplanted by the sacred community' is quite understandable. The reason for the lack of emphasis is that in the NT context in particular, 'sacred space is located in the group, not in some impersonal space like a temple' and that, as Asumang (2005:29) puts it, 'the group is the central location of importance.'

Yet, some efforts to identify the OT camp in the NT are worthwhile. For instance, the word is implicitly used in reference to Jerusalem (Matt 4:5). Asumang also, continuing his argument on the issue, notes that Luke's positive attitude towards the NT temple of Jerusalem reflects a similar theology of the OT sacred spaces/places like the camp. Asumang and Domeris' (2007:1-33) discussion of the migrant camp in the Torah as a uniting theme for the Epistle to the Hebrews also shows the parallel between the OT camp and NT camp.

The Christians who are addressed in the book of Hebrews should be seen as a 'cultic community on the move' (Johnsson 1978:249) since there are many typologies between the Israelites in the wilderness camp and Christians in Hebrews (cf. Asumang 2005:128). Therefore, the argument is that the NT Jerusalem in Hebrews represents the camp of the OT in the spiritual sense. This is particularly so in terms of how animals in

the OT were slaughtered outside the camp (Num 15:35; 19:3; 31:12) since their carcasses would defile the camp.

However, the blood was brought to the tabernacle within the camp for the purification and sacrifices, a step which shows the holy nature of the camp. Moreover, since the temple context developed from the wilderness camp setting in the Pentateuch, envisioning Christians as a temple is seen as an allusion that travels back to the Israelites of the pentateuchal context. Be that as it may, Paul's message can be explained from the wilderness camp context of Deuteronomy where the community life of the recipients of our passage (Deut 23:12-14) assumes a central position.

Just as the wilderness was considered a 'location where God is encountered, where personal transformation takes place and where community is formed' (Dozeman 1998:43), the new life of the Christians (2 Cor 5:17) was expected to manifest in a transformed community living. Like the camp of the passage where impurity must be avoided, Paul was concerned with the kind of practices that defile the holiness of God's people and must thus be avoided (Hafemann 2000:292, 295).

To strengthen his argument, the messages of two prophets, Isaiah and Ezekiel, are recalled by Paul (cf. Liu 2013:214). The use of 'not being unequally yoked' which is expressed in Deuteronomy 22:10 is the starting point of the link of the pericope to the purity tradition of Deuteronomy and connected to some of the messages of Isaiah. Domeris (1986:37) mentions the Pauline title *hoi hagioi* (1 Cor 1:2) which describes Christians serving as 'holy ones' in the world on behalf of the Almighty God. As 'holy ones', Scripture emphasises a major issue: 'Touch no unclean thing and I will receive you' (2 Cor 6:17) which is a call for purification traced to Isaiah 52:11.

Additionally, just as in the congregational/military camp, Israel served as priests (cf. Sprinkle 2000:642; cf. Madeleine and Lane 1978:270-271) and had to keep the camp from defilement, 'Paul views the Corinthians as priests fulfilling Israel's role' (Hafemann 2000:285; cf. Exod 19:6). By this, Paul was establishing an indirect link between the Christians at Corinth and the socio-religious life situation of the OT camp.

OT Holiness is alluded to in NT Christians holiness

Turning now to the issue of holiness of the camp, some passages lend support to the argument that the theological and moral principles of holiness (or purity) of the OT camp/temple operate in the NT, though not in the literal sense. To this end, the idea of defiling the camp of the OT text heavily influenced Paul's teachings on purity in some passages of 1 and 2 Corinthians.

Thus, the discussion in this section that aims at establishing the link between Deuteronomy 23:12-14 and the NT text will be necessary. It will also include a brief analysis of 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 to show its background and how the underpinnings of the OT passage are indirectly applied by Paul in this NT passage. The text reads:

> Do not be yoked together with unbelievers. For what do righteousness and wickedness have in common? Or what fellowship can light have with darkness? 15 What harmony is there between Christ and Belial? What does a believer have in common with an unbeliever? 16 What agreement is there between the temple of God and idols? For we are the temple of the living God. As God has said: 'I will live with them and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they will be my people.' 17 'Therefore come out from

them and be separate, says the Lord. Touch no unclean thing, and I will receive you.' 18 'I will be a Father to you, and you will be my sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty.' 7:1 Since we have these promises, dear friends, let us purify ourselves from everything that contaminates body and spirit, perfecting holiness out of reverence for God.

Liu (2012:289) provides great insights on Paul's letters to the Corinthians on the basis of the abundance of historic peripheral materials in the Jewish and Greco-Roman world. For him, these contexts provide ample evidence on temple purity for the Church at Corinth to understand Paul's temple purity metaphor in passages such as 1 Corinthians 3, 5, 6, and 7 and 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1.

To be specific, a high degree of relationship exists between 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 and Deuteronomy 23:12-14, though there is no direct proof that Paul had the OT text in mind. Consequently, one can draw on some ideas of purity of the camp/temple in the OT to expound the idea of purity of God's people in these passages. The discussions here are irrespective of the debate on whether or not 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is non-Pauline and an interpolation, as some scholars have also clearly discussed (ref. Hafemann 2000:278; Barnett 1997:338; Martin 1986:191-195).

On the basis of a carefully engaged textual exegesis and also on the socio-historical context of 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1, Liu (2012:289) establishes that temple purity conveys the idea that 'the authentic worshipping community is the dwelling place of the Spirit of God'. Here, the Christian community is addressed as a unit/group or camp/temple situation and not in any way as single individuals. Barnett (1997:349; Briley 2000:100) argues that

the phrase, 'temple of God' (2 Cor 6:16), is in reference to a congregation and not individuals. Like the purity laws of the pericope, Briley (2000:100; cf. Barnett 1997:356) notes that Paul's call for separation in 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is 'in the language of the OT ritual purity laws'.

Hafemann (2000:282) also comments on Paul's choice of the word *naos* for the temple context of the passage which, arguing that it refers to the sacred worship space itself (cf. Mark 14:58; 15:29; John 2:19-20). By referring to the Christians as the temple of the living God (2 Cor 6:16), Hafemann (cf. Blomberg 1994:75) argues that Paul was equating them to the OT temple situation, so that the church, 'both in regard to its individual members (1 Cor 6:19) and in its life together corporately (1 Cor 3:16-17; cf. 6:19), is now the place of God's presence in the world'.

Like the OT passage under discussion, the separation required by 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is the removal of anything unclean/impure from amongst believers, because 'the LORD is in their midst' (Deut 23:12-14). In the context of the NT text, however, it is not faeces as in the OT, that can defile the Christian community but unbelievers (2 Cor 6:14-15) who engage in the idolatry of the Greco-Roman world (cf. Barnett 1997:342; 2 Cor 6:16). As has been argued in an earlier discussion, idols are enemies of God, so engaging in their worship is enmity to God. As Paul instructed in 1 Corinthians 5, ensuring purity is not just to associate with any defiled entity (v. 9), but to 'get rid' (v. 7), or to 'expel' anything that is evil (v. 12) from the 'camp' of believers, a position that Liu (2013:145) identifies with.

It is also to uphold the purity of the camp that criminals were executed outside the camp (Lev 24:23) since the law did not allow impurity to corrupt the tabernacle. This OT requirement,

according to Asumang (2005:128), is represented in Hebrews where the suffering and death of Christ occurred outside Jerusalem. This is because being on the tree as a dead person, the 'carcass' even though it was situated outside the city, would have defiled the city and temple within it.

However, the blood Christ shed on the cross outside the city performed its work within the temple with the tearing in two of the curtain that separated the Holy Place from the Most Holy Place. Just as in the OT the blood was brought to the tabernacle within the camp for the purification, the camp as described by the Epistle to the Hebrews, Jerusalem, represented a place of purity and purification.

It is worthy of note that the use of the Greek transliteration, *naos,* for the 'camp/temple', in 2 Corinthians 6:16 (cf. Hafemann 2000:282) highlights God's presence in the midst of His people and not just among the physical structures. It emphasises the position that the body of believers is the 'place' for God's presence in the world. This, arguably, gives further credence to the link between the OT and the NT in general, and Deuteronomy 23:12-14 and 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 in particular.

OT 'Place theology' is alluded to in NT 'Place theology'

Forward on, the promise, 'I will live with them and walk among them' is parallel to 'the LORD your God moves about in your camp' (Deut 23:14). The body of believers in the temple context in the NT text is just like the camp context. Keener (2000:487) strikes this connection when he observes concerning, 'God will live' (Gk □□□□□□) with His people in the NT, that it was, 'a frequent Jewish hope that ultimately points back to a promise of God's covenant for Israel' (Exod 25:8;

29:45-46; Lev 26:12; 1 Kgs 6:13; Ezek 37:27; Zech 2:10-11), and connected to the temple (Ezek 43:7, 9).

Similarly, Martin (1986:204) argues on the 2 Corinthians 6:16: 'The people of God are the temple of God, for he dwells in their midst and walks among them'. This is also indicated by Hafemann (2000:284):

> The first Old Testament reference is taken primarily from the promise of God's covenant presence…which, however, was originally stated in the second person ("I will put my dwelling place *among you*"), not the third, as it is in 2 Corinthians 6:16 ("I will live *with them*"). This alternation is due to the conflation of Leviticus 26:11-12 with the new covenant promise of Ezekiel 37:27. ("My dwelling place will be *with them*").

In other words, ethical/moral purity needed to be upheld and practised/maintained by the NT community so as to be sanctified for God to dwell amongst them (cf. Anonymous 2014:§1). Be that as it may, the text underscores the concept of 'place theology' in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 that is argued in this book. Moreover, the 'name theory' concept of the OT pericope is indicated in the NT text. This argument is underscored by Paul's choice of the title 'the Lord Almighty' (2 Cor 6:18), which is also ascribed to Yahweh, in the OT pericope and argued already.

Chapter Conclusion

Now, it can be concluded that Paul's call for purity (2 Cor 6:18) on the basis of God's promises (2 Cor 7:1) is similarly indicated in the OT passage (Deut 23:12-14). Moreover, the arguments of Hafemann (2000:286) is that Paul's call to such a life is grounded 'in the present exercise of God's sovereignty to

deliver and protect his people [Deut 23:14] as their father' (2 Cor 6:18). As established already, such a promise is undergirded, ultimately, by God's power of judgement through 'holy war'. Such war undertones undergird some of Paul's messages in the two epistles to the Corinthians.

There is very little doubt that 'holy war' is underscored in the whole NT. This is indicated by the way the concept is emphasised in many encounters during the eschatological period as captured in John's Revelation. The next chapter has all the details.

Chapter 15

How Relevant is Sanitation to the Eschatological Period?

My choice of identifying intertextual associations based on parallel accounts, allusion, and inner biblical interpretation, has been indicated in the preceding section. Our passage on this discussion on sanitation, Deuteronomy 23:12-14, is not only relevant in the NT but ultimately finds fulfilment in the eschatological age (cf. BDAG no. 552; Vine 1996:40, 307; Thayer 1980:487-88; TWOT no. 690d). Clearly, it finds intertextual connection to the divine eschatological programme of God revealed to John in Revelation 19:11-21:27.

As already indicated, one of the significant areas of application of the sanitation law concerns the camp in the NT (Gk □□□□□□□□□□, *parembole*) as a sacred space/place. Continuing thence, the argument in this section is that not only is the OT camp transformed from the camp of God's people and assumes the name, 'New Jerusalem', in the apocalyptic age, but also some imageries of the OT camp exhibit ultimate fulfilment in the NT text of Revelation. While the parallel between the OT camp and the Jerusalem of the book of Hebrews appears to be general, the parallel between the camp in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 and the camp of Revelation 19:11-21:27 exhibits greater connections.

It will be expedient at this juncture to briefly explain what the parallels between two texts are, in order to justify the position that the camp of the OT is transformed into the New Jerusalem. To begin with, the LXX translation for 'camp' or 'encampment' (Hb □□□□, *Mahaneh*) as in the pericope (Deut 23:12-14) is

□□□□□□□□□□. Thayer (1980:487-88) argues on the basis on Hebrews 13:11-14, that □□□□□□□□□□ is 'used for the city of Jerusalem, inasmuch as that was to the Israelites what formerly the encampment had been in the desert'.

This means that the OT camp of Israel where faeces should not enter is alluded to in the NT 'camp', the city of Jerusalem outside which Jesus suffered (John 19:20), as also indicated in Hebrews (13:12), where impurities should not enter. However, since this earthly camp is not an enduring city, believers have to rejoice, by faith, in the eternal one, the heavenly Jerusalem, the city which is to come (Heb 12:22; cf. 13:14).

Significantly, □□□□□□□□□□ of Revelation 20:9 refers to 'the "camp" of the saints' (KJV; NAS; and NET) or 'the "camp" of God's people' (NIV and NIB) or 'the "encampment" of the saints' (CBS) which is the place of the gathering of the saints at the *Parousia* (cf. Zodhiates 1996:1660; TWOT no. 690d). The implication here is that the temporary OT camp of Deuteronomy 23:12-14, which is still not an enduring one in Hebrews 13:11, becomes the eternal Holy City, the New Jerusalem of Revelation 21:1-27. This is because in all these camps impurities should be kept outside. This emphasises the parallels between the camps of the two testaments.

However, the question is, how did the earthly camp become the renewed heavenly one? Obviously, the temporary camp which became the city of Jerusalem had to undergo some form of renewal. The OT wilderness/migrant camp of Israel, consisting of the people as a community, their geographical space, and its materials by the Sinaitic covenant was not only God's bride (Isa 54:4-8; 62:5; Jer 2:2; Hos 2:16; cf. Craigie *et al* 1991:24; Henry 1961:937) but also His family property (cf. Christensen 2002:156).

The camp then metamorphosed into 'Jerusalem' when the temple was built in the city (2 Chr 7:12-16) as a place chosen by the Lord God. Yahweh's own designation of the OT Jerusalem as the city 'where I chose to put my Name' (1 Kgs 11:36; cf. 2 Kgs 21:7) is seen in the Jewish people's reference to it as the 'chosen city' (1 Kings 8:44, 48; 11:13, 32; Zech 3:2; Tobit 13:11; 13:9; cf. Keener 2000:486). However, after her glorious beginning (Jer 2:2; cf. Ezek 16:9-14), the 'chosen city' became defiled (Ezek 22:1-5) as a result of her unfaithfulness and was described as a prostitute and adulterous wife (Ezek 16:15, 32).

Thus, the renewal of Jerusalem became a familiar Jewish expectation (Tobit 13:7-16; 2 Bar 4:2-6). Keener (2000:486-87) notes that the restoration of the temple was a specific hope for restored Jerusalem (Ezek 37:26-28; 41-48). It might be in the hope of such a renewal that Tobit connected Jerusalem, the 'chosen city', with the title 'holy city' (13:11; cf. 13:9; cf. Keener 2000:486) with the latter being alluded to in the NT in Matthew 27:53, and then in Revelation 21:2 and 10 (cf. 11:2; 22:19).

Consequently, Jerusalem, the OT defiled city (Ezek 22:1-5; 16:15, 32) and alluded to in the book of Hebrews (Asumang and Domeris 2007:1-33; Asumang 2005:128; Johnsson 1978:249), underwent a renewal. In the eschatological age, the Holy City becomes a prepared 'bride' (Rev 21:2), just like the NT Church (2 Cor 11:2; Eph 5:23; cf. Keener 2000:486). Indeed, the OT and the NT camps become the eschatological camp (Rev 20:9; cf. 11:2) which is now changed by God into the glorious New Jerusalem (Rev 21:2; 21:9-27).

Therefore, the description given to the Holy City, the New Jerusalem in Revelation 21:27, is that the city is devoid of 'anything that defiles' (NKJV) or 'nothing ritually unclean (NET) or 'nothing impure' (NIB, NIV). All these renditions are enough

indications of ceremonial impurity (cf. BDAG no. 552) and agree with the view that the measure of Deuteronomy 23:12-13 was to check ceremonial impurity in the camp.

This is also in agreement with the position of Asumang and Domeris (2006:22) and a host of other scholars as Christensen (2002:543-44) and Macdonald (2006:217; cf. Klawans 2003:19-22; Lioy 2004:17-21; Gaebalein 1992:140; McConville 1986:18; Adeyemo 2006:240; Douglas and Tenney 1986:187; Sprinkle 2000:637-46, 654-55; Cromwell 2014:§7; Friedman 2007:§7, 10; Barker and Kohlenberger III 1994:264). Ceremonial purity is thus significant in the eschatological camp and shows the parallels between the two.

Interestingly, the holiness required of the NT camp in Revelation (21:27) parallels the OT military camp (Deut 23:12-14). The statement, 'Your camp must be holy' in the OT has already been shown to mean that the camp is to be 'separated from defilement'. Linguistically, the LXX rendition for the holy camp: '□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□', shows that the adjective for holy, □□□□□□, which means, 'set apart' or 'separated' by God, which is derived from □□□□□□ (*Hagios* or *Hagiōsunē;* cf. Unger 1988:581) is from the same root as *Hagnos*.

The meaning is that the NT adjective, □□□□□□, parallels that of the OT, □□□□ (holy), used for the camp. This finds corroboration in Vine's (1996:40, 307) observation that the NT adjective is also used for the eschatological Jerusalem (Rev 21:2; cf. 11:2) since it is 'used of things that are devoted to God'. This confirms the parallel between the holiness of New Jerusalem as a camp, and that of Deuteronomy 23:12-14.

Being a holy camp has other implications, since impurity is also the opposite of □□□□□□ (cf. Thayer 1980:351). As indicated in the previous chapter, God's requirement for holiness (Deut 23:14) is not limited to ceremonial purity, but is extended to being obedient to His moral requirements. That is, it is not only human waste that makes the camp unholy, but the presence of people who break God's moral laws. Just as God would not permit any impure persons in the OT camp, impure persons are not permitted in the NT eschatological/apocalyptic camp (Rev 21:8, 27).

In line with the above, the people of the migrant camp (both the wider congregational camp and the military camp) referred to as God's people in the eschatological camp (Rev 20:9), now become the saints 'whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life' (Rev 21:27). This finds support in Keener's (2000:486) observation on the New Jerusalem that, as the OT Jerusalem included the people, 'the eternal and holy city, the New Jerusalem undoubtedly includes the saints of God'. Since the perishable cannot inherit the imperishable, the saints are those who have resurrected in changed and eternal bodies (cf. 1 Cor 15:35-57). This allusion strengthens the link between the OT camp, the city of Jerusalem, and the eschatological city, the New Jerusalem.

OT Holiness is alluded to in the Eschatological camp holiness

Another area of interest to the current discussion is the link of the pericope (Deut 23:12-14) to the eschatological age. Liu (2012:289) notes that the kind of community living as indicated by Paul concerning the Corinthians 'serves as a good testimony of unity and holiness and has an eschatological identity by representing the new people of the age to come'. He concludes

that ‘by preserving its purity, the community leads an ongoing sanctified life in the worship and service of God toward its consummation’. Here too, Hafemann (2000:293) connects the message of 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 with the past, present and the future. His argument is that the passage makes Christians of today ‘recover the covenant and eschatological perspective of God’s plan’.

This is just like the promises of the pericope, which look to the eschatological camp of Revelation 19:11-21:27, as will be shown in the later sections of this chapter. Hafemann (2000:287) notes, ‘Inheriting God’s promises in the *future* is based on keeping his command in the *present*, which in turn is brought about by working out the holiness that has *already* been granted to those who are part of God’s people’ (his emphasis). So, ‘those who hope in God’s future redemption purify themselves in the present’.

Lastly, obedience is the underlying reason for the holiness that 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 espouses just like the pericope, as argued right from the beginning and emphasised at some sections of the book. The promises of the NT text are definitely for the future ‘but conditioned on holiness and driven by obedience’ (Hafemann 2000:287, 292-293).

OT ‘Presence’ is alluded to in Eschatological camp ‘Presence’

The second significant parallel between Deuteronomy 23:12-14 and Revelation 19:11-21:27 centres on two issues: the ‘place theology’ and ‘name theology’. As noted previously, the ultimate significance of it in the OT pointed to the NT period and beyond. Whether they are at the larger camp where the whole congregation meets (Num 5:1-4) or at the military camp (Deut 23:12-14), the phrase: ‘in the midst of them’ of, particularly, the

latter text, underscores a specific geographical space. Attention is briefly devoted first to how the OT divine name captured in the phrase: 'Yahweh walks in your midst' relates to the NT context. This will then be followed by a discussion on 'place theology'.

A major link lies in the description of the camp in the OT text and that of the passage of Revelation which is described as the City God loves or 'the beloved City' (cf. NJB; CSB) or New Jerusalem. Keener's (2000:487) observation on Revelation 21:3 concerning 'God will live' with His people is noteworthy. The reason is neither farfetched nor mind-boggling. The import of the message is similar to the promise of God in the OT text and captured in other areas of the book (12:5-26; 14:23-25; 15:20; 16:2-15; 17:8-10; 18:6; 26:2; cf. Longman III and Dillard 2006:116; Macdonald 2006:212-14).

So in the NT, the significance of the divine name and presence where the Almighty God would be with His people became a reality. This was when God would be humanly present with His people, hence was to be called 'Immanuel' (Matt 1:22-23; cf. Isa 7:14); at birth he was named Jesus (Matt 1:25). Therefore, not only is the mention of the LORD your God a justification of the 'name theology' in the pericope (cf. Macdonald 2006:216-17), but the 'name theology' is also quiet important in NT Christology. This is when God gives Jesus 'the Name above every name' (Phil 2:9) and others derive from this name theology.

At this juncture, then, Christology, the exposition on the teaching about Jesus as Christ with particular regard to his divine and human nature which makes him significant for the salvation of humanity (cf. Ohlig 1996:15), is quite significant. However, Christology, arguably the most debated issue theologically, is not

only an interesting but also important subject which requires a comprehensive treatment and thus is beyond this book.

Nevertheless, a brief mention of it will surely suffice for our discussion. The significance of 'Christology' to our discussion here is that it derives from the 'name theology' (cf. MacLeod 2005:76-94; Milbank 1991:311-333; Gianotti 1985:46; Ellis n.d.:27; Shepherd 2006:99-111; Ascough 1997:766-68; Cotter 1945:259-289; Gieschen 2003:115-158; n.d.:3-32; 105-126; Boring n.d.:125-151), which our OT pericope (Deut 23:12-14) espouses. Thus only a link to our discussion on 'name theology' concept will be engaged here to strengthen the argument.

Basically, Jesus is identified with the title, 'Christ' (Gk □□□□□□□□, Matt 16:16; Mark 15:32; John 20:31; Lioy 2007:35-36; Berry n.d.:131-134; Cumming 2012:134-35), God's provision for the salvation of humanity. Thus, scripture says: 'For, those who receive Jesus….' (John 1:12). His name is 'the name that is above every name' (Phil 2:9), the confession is that he is the Christ (Phil 2:10; cf. 1 Cor 12:3; Ohlig 1996:15).

Besides, there are many Christological titles in Scripture. Jesus is identified as the 'Son' (Rom 1:1-3; Heb 1:1-4; which in the Greek manuscripts of the NT, appears 79 times (Aker *et al* 2012:178; cf. Ellis n.d.:27). In relation to Jesus as the 'Son' is the title 'Father' (Gk □□□□□□□*pater*) which is in reference to God, and appears 260 times in the Greek manuscripts of the NT (Aker *et al* 2012:178). Augustine is referred by Weedman (2011:768-786) to have argued these 'Father' and 'Son' titles as one of relationship and not of subordination.

Then also is the title, 'Son of God', which according to Aker *et al* (2012:178), appears 45 times in the NT alone (Matt 1:18-25; Mark 15.39; John 20:31; Rom 1:1-4; 1 Jn 2:24-27; 5:10). Other scholars, including Cumming (2012:141), Köstenberger

(2009:312-14), Angel (2011:299-317), Broadhead (1993:14), and Davis (1989:11-14) clearly identify Christology with these and other passages. However, Nolland (1996:3-12) objects to any interpretation of Christology in connection with Matthew 1:18-25.

Then also is 'Son of Man' (Matt 24:30-44; Mark 13:26; 14:62; Luke 5:24) as noted by Ellens (2006:69-78), Kirchhevel (1999:181-187), Bacon (n.d.:143-182), Bock (1991109-121); and Schmidt (n.d.:326-349). Kirchhevel (1999:181-187) clearly identifies nine 'Son of Man' passages in Mark 8-14 alone. Christological titles are not mentioned in Scripture alone. For example, the title, 'Word of God' (John 1:1), is mentioned in the *Qur'an* in Sura 3:45 and 4:171 (Cumming 2012:134-35, though Arberry (1955:79, 125) cites it under Sura III:40-44, and IV:165-169). This title, together with 'Son of Man', will be significant as the discussion touches on 'holy war' in the camp of the last book of the Bible - Revelation.

Also conspicuous in the NT is the title 'Lord' (Gk □□□□□□, *kurios*). This is a title which is 'rarely used in the Synoptic Gospels [e.g. Luke 2:11]. It occurs some 200 times in the Pauline Epistles' (Cotter 1945:272). Others include 'Saviour' (Luke 2:11; 4:42; Phil 3:20; Ferda 2013:230); Son of David (Matt 1:1; 9:27; Mark 10:47-48; MacLeod 2005:84); the Wisdom of God (1 Cor 1:24, 30; Finger 1994:44); and the Last Adam (1 Cor 15:45; Kee n.d.:174).

All these are indications that the Christological titles in Scripture are many. The significance of Christology here is that Jesus' statement: 'Where two or three come together in my name, there I am with them' (Matt 18:20), is observed as an index of 'place theology'. The 'where' in the passage signifies 'space/place' and is identified with the OT concept of camp as a

geographical space/place. Then also is Jesus' farewell message, 'And surely I am with you always, to the very end of age' (Matt 28:16-20). Like the assurance of the Almighty God in the OT camp, the Lord Jesus gave assurance of his continued presence, therefore indicating a parallel between the OT and NT.

In spite of all these, it is the renewal of the temple promises in the eschatological age where Yahweh, the Almighty God, will dwell among His people (Rev 21:3, 22), which indicate the ultimate fulfilment of the camp promises of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 as well as the hope of the restored Jerusalem (cf. Ezek 37:26-28; 41-48; 43:7, 9; Keener 2000:487). Though some striking differences exist between Yahweh in the OT pericope and Jesus in Revelation (19:11-21:27), there are interesting and significant intertextual parallels which exist especially in connection with the title 'Son of Man'. In his contribution, Ao (2014:25-28) not only mentions Smith and von Rad as describing the 'Son of Man' of Daniel 7:13 in a messianic sense, but also he identifies this 'cloud rider/Son of Man' with a single figure, the Jesus who is revealed in the Gospels.

Gianotti (1996:30-38) quotes Eichrodt: 'It is in the person of Jesus that the function of the name of Yahweh as a form of the divine self-manifestation finds its fulfilment'. So, just as in the OT God has a secret name, Yahweh, which he revealed later to Moses (Exod 6:2-3; cf. Aune 1998:1056), so in Revelation 19:12, the rider also has a secret name. It may be the name, *Jesus,* since it is the name at which mention 'every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth' (Phil 2:10), or its composite, *Jesus Christ* (Acts 4:11-12; Phil 2:11).

However, the most likely one is YHWH (i.e., Yahweh) since it is the secret and divine name of Israel's God in the OT. In support of this argument, Gieschen (2003:115; cf. n.d.:123)

notes that the name is YHWH since it is 'not uttered in the world', and is 'above all things', and 'is the only name that the Father shares with the Son'. Furthermore, both God and Jesus are described in a similar term as 'righteous judge'. It is argued here that the general reference to God in the OT as the One who judges in righteousness (Psa 9:8; 72:2; 96:13) is applied in Revelation 19:11 to the rider, most certainly Jesus (cf. Longman III 1982:291, 297-300; Radmacher *et al* 1997:2196). Even in the OT, similar references are made of Jesus.

The argument of Aune (1998:1053) that the description of the 'shoot of Jesse' as the king who 'judges with righteousness' points to Jesus, and supports our position. His comment that 'justice' in connection with the rider in Revelation 19:11 is not only a fundamental character of God in the OT, but is also a standard He required for judges and kings (Psa 7:11 and Jer 11:20; Deut 1:16 and 16:18; and Prov 31:9 respectively), falls in line here.

Longman III (1982:292-97), like Shepherd (2006:99-111) and Bacon (n.d.:182), argues that the Divine Warrior who appears as the 'cloud rider' in Daniel 7:13 connects more with the NT references to Jesus' descent on the cloud. In fact, most of this references were the Lord's own admission (Matt 24:30; 26:63-64; 26:64; Mark 14:61-62; Luke 21:27; and Rev 1:7).

More importantly, the rider in Revelation, like Yahweh in the camp of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 (cf. Ps 18:9-15; 104:1-4), is a warrior. In Revelation 19:16, this warrior, bearing a title on His robe and thigh 'King of kings and Lord of lords' is similar to the warrior of Chapter 17:14 since he also bears the same title (cf. Keener 2000:452-453). Asumang (2007:17-18) identifies this rider with His saints as God, the Divine Warrior. This, not only serves 'as a bridge to the NT use of the motif of the Divine Warrior

chariot' (Longman III 1982:292-97), but also affirms the connection between the Divine Warrior of the congregational camp of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 and that of the eschatological camp of Revelation 19:11-21:27.

In connection with 'place theology', the Divine Warrior in the OT camp (Deut 23:14) is alluded to as the Divine Warrior who fights for His people in Revelation 20:9. An indication of this is shown by the mention of the camp of God's saints in the NT text. Another indication of presence in this text is the consuming fire that came to destroy the enemies that had surrounded the camp. This confirms the fact that like the OT camp, God is present to protect His people and defeat their enemies. However, the ultimate demonstration of presence is where the renewed camp, the New Jerusalem, emerges from heaven and a loud voice says that 'the tabernacle of God *is* with his people and he will dwell with them' (Rev 21:1-3; NKJV), and God is present in His divine names as 'Yahweh', the Lord God Almighty (Rev 21:22).

Keener (2000:487) notes that the Jewish hope is transferred to the entire city, the New Jerusalem, which is a temple city (Rev 21:22) and is shaped like the Most Holy Place in the OT (21:16). It stands to argue that 'this will be the most explicit 'tabernacling' of God with humanity since the incarnation which declared that Jesus, the Word, 'made his dwelling' (i.e., 'tabernacle') among humanity (John 1:14)' (Keener 2000:487).

In Revelation 21:3, mention is made of God coming to dwell with His people in the eschatological camp. Appropriately stated, 'the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them' (KJV, NKJV) in the holy city, the New Jerusalem, as God's eternal promise to His people. This divine presence here makes the heavenly camp a divine place and parallels the divine presence that is mentioned in connection with the military camp

as well (Deut 23:12-14). Thus, in the NT apocalyptic camp, 'the dwelling of God' will be with his people, and 'he will live with them' (Rev 21:3; cf. Thielman 2005:646).

The kind of holiness demanded of the NT camp (Rev 21:27) as a result of the divine presence parallels that of the OT military camp (Deut 23:12-14). The NT description of the New Jerusalem as the Holy City where God will dwell with His people means that it should be kept holy. In other words, just as the OT camp should be kept holy with all excrement buried outside because, Yahweh, the Almighty God, was in the midst of it, so 'God's presence is able to dwell among his people in the holy city, because all evil is banished from it' (Thielman 2005:646). Therefore, the 'place theology' concept of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is alluded to, and is ultimately fulfilled in Revelation 21:1-3, in the eschatological age.

Chapter Conclusion

The chapter has not only underscored my argument in this book that all the underpinning concepts of our OT pericope on sanitation, i.e., Deuteronomy 23:12-14, shed light on some NT passages. In other words, all the concepts find intertextual links, especially as far as camp regulations such as purity of both the people and the camp, God's presence, and 'holy war' are concerned. In fact, a major link between the OT and NT is the fact that they both reveal the God, who wants Israel to remove dirt or corruption from their midst because He has 'tabernacled' among them in order to overcome their enemies for them.

This summary reflects the stipulations of Deuteronomy 23:12-14, which are appropriately alluded to in many NT passages and ultimately in Revelation 19:11-21:27. Thus, interestingly, the issue of sanitation is even relevant to the

eschatological period. All these links underscore the fact that the NT indeed articulates the message of the OT. They also confirm the position of Scripture that regulations in the OT were a shadow of realities in the NT (Heb 10).

The submissions concentrated on three main arguments that aimed at proving that: (1) the camp of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is alluded to in the New Jerusalem in Revelation 21:1-27; (2) the 'place theology' of our OT text (Deut 23:14) is alluded to in the camp of the NT text (Rev 21:1-3); and (3) the 'holy war' concept of the OT text is alluded to in the NT text. These main arguments have been explained in turn.

Building on such an observation, the discussions in the current chapter reveal the eschatological camp as the ultimate place for the fulfilment of the call on believers to abstain from all forms of corruption. This is because this final war is to annihilate all forms of evil and usher in the eternal camp where the eternal promises of the Almighty God will be enjoyed.

Chapter 16

People who Practice Open Defecation are God's enemies

As established already, the burying of human excreta outside the camp of Israel was motivated, primarily, by ceremonial holiness or purity considerations, and to some extent environmental sanitation, and hygiene in relation to the health of the people. Based on these realisations, the values of Deuteronomy 23:12-14, when explored, can have unlimited implications. The first is for pure living of everyone, especially Christians; second is for environmental sanitation issues, especially, concerning the challenges associated with the disposal of human faeces. And finally, for the improvement of health through the promotion of preventive medicine.

The premise of the current discussions is the argument of theonomists that the Decalogue has relevance for Christian living today (cf. Gundry 1996:93-143). OT cleanness and uncleanness, which metaphorically symbolised moral purity and impurity is applicable now since 'moral purity is still a Christian idea' (Sprinkle 2000:654-656). True, the moral undergirding of the laws has continuing importance, if not for everybody, at least, for the Church (cf. Wright 2011:508).

Currently, the impact of some OT laws in the study of ethics from both non-Christian and Christian perspectives (cf. Lioy 2004:6) and their implications for many other areas of life (cf. Poythress 1995:139) cannot be overemphasised. According to Naugle (2002:262), the laws, the gospels, and all the major

underpinnings of the epistles 'express God's moral will within the framework of the covenant of redemption'. Since by special and natural revelations, 'God's casuistic expectations, anchored in his own holy character, are revealed to all human beings' (Naugle 2002:262; cf. Rom 1:18-2:1), where special revelation includes the laws, we can infer that our OT sanitation pericope, which although falls under the Deuteronomic Code (Deut 12-26), has ethical implications for all people.

It is in this light that the ethical/moral underpinnings of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 have been argued as relevant to First Century Christians, preferably referred to as the NT Church, using particularly, Paul's Second letter to the Corinthians, and to some extent, Romans. It has been shown that since the apostle addressed the church as a community and on the basis of holiness of the OT camp/temple regulations, the stipulations of our OT text sheds light on his message. As part of the Apodictic Laws (Klein et al 2004:341-42) which primarily treat moral and religious matters, the applicability of ethical/moral issues like sanitation espoused by the passage cannot be overemphasised. Like the OT pericope, where the whole Israelite covenant community is represented by the army in a military camp, the Christian community in 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is addressed as a unit/group, and not as single individuals, in a camp/temple context (Liu 2012:289; 2013:214; Barnett 1997:349; Briley 2000:100; Hafemann 2000:282).

Moreover, the similarity between the theology of the OT sacred spaces like the camp and the NT temple of Jerusalem has been well noted (Asumang 2005:29). Apparently, the parallels and typologies between the wilderness migrant camp in the Torah and the Epistle to the Hebrews are indications that Christians, as a 'cultic community on the move' (Johnsson

1978:249), must be obedient to the stipulations of the camp. Specifically, since the OT congregation camp also represents the spiritual Jerusalem of the eschatological age (cf. Asumang and Domeris 2007:1-33; Asumang 2005:128), all NT believers or Christians, as 'holy ones', are equally enjoined to a life of ethical/moral purity that parallels that of the OT laws.

While Christians are guided by the fact that they are not bound by the ceremonial requirements of the laws, they should accept that their moral obligations are still effective. The fact that Paul's call on Christians for purity in 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is 'in the language of the OT ritual purity laws' (Briley 2000:100; cf. Barnett 1997:356; Hafemann 2000:282) is an indication that the principles of the purity laws are applicable to Christians at all times. According to the OT regulation (Deut 23:12-14), faeces defile God's holy place, the camp, such that anyone who does not bury human waste outside, but defecates within the camp has disobeyed the law.

Thus, it is not just the faecal matter that defiles the camp, but also the act of disobedience of this regulation. This is tantamount to breaking both the ritual and the moral laws, and making the person a sinner. In the NT, it is written, 'All unrighteousness is sin' (1 John 5:17), and that 'Everyone who sins breaks the law' (1 John 3:4), meaning that it is the moral implications of the laws which are emphasised in the NT.

Generally, then, as a community of believers (1 Cor 3:16-17; cf. 2 Cor 6:14-7:1), regardless of the period and place, the moral purity requirements of the laws, as spelt out in Deuteronomy 23:12-14, specify the type of behaviour 'that always is the duty of God's people' (Lioy 2004:17-21). As a covenant community, the OT Israelites were called to reveal the Almighty God to their world (Block 2011:25; cf. Wright 2006:224-

25, 329-33) for which Deuteronomy 23:12-14 had to address specific issues of their covenant living, particularly, holiness in relation to sanitation and hygiene. Similarly, for the Christians at Corinth, moral purity needed to be practised and maintained by the community 'so that it could be sanctified as the dwelling place of God' (Liu 2012:289).

Not only in the NT period, but all Christians have been called into a covenantal relationship with God which is distinct, since they constitute a holy nation in the holy camp (1 Pet 2:9). Moreover, just as Israel in the military camp were fulfilling the role of priests (Deut 23:12-14; cf. Exod 19:6; Sprinkle 2000:642; Madeleine and Lane 1978:270-271), and the Christian community at Corinth was addressed as priests fulfilling a divine responsibility in the camp/temple (cf. Hafemann 2000:285), contemporary Christians are required to serve as priests in the world (1 Pet 2:9).

Additionally, our OT pericope, Deuteronomy 23:12-14, requires that Christians consecrate themselves in the camp, God's holy place (cf. Psa 24:3-4), by (metaphorically) burying their 'faeces' (or 'filth', cf. Holladay 1988:301; BDB 8043-44:844) to avoid breaking the 'camp law'. Since Christ was a cursed 'thing' because He was hanged on the cross (Deut 21:22-23; cf. Gal 3:13) outside the camp so that He would not defile the city with its temple (Num 15:35; 19:3; 31:12; cf. Heb 13:11-12; Asumang 2005:128), NT believers should necessarily nail all forms of unrighteousness/'moral impurities' to the cross of the Lord which is positioned outside the camp.

In other words, all forms of pollution, in the moral sense, have to be avoided in every area of life, since only the clean person can approach the Almighty God in worship (cf. Alexander and Rosner 2000:546; cf. Gaebalein 1992:141-42). Not only

this, but Christians are to go to Christ outside the camp (Heb 13:13), and like faeces, bury the old nature which was conceived and born in sin (Psa 51:5). And just as Christ resurrected outside the camp, so believers will be identified with Him not only by being raised as in baptism to a new life (Rom 6:2-4; 1 Cor 15:31), but also by being like Him in His resurrection.

Christians as new creations (2 Cor 5:17) are compelled to be morally holy and responsible in every sphere of life (cf. Kudadjie and Aboagye-Mensah 1992:4-6). In this light, they will be serving as 'holy ones' (*hoi hagioi*, 1 Cor 1:2) in the world on behalf of Yahweh, the Almighty God (Domeris 1986:37). As is also argued, 'morality does not conflict with holiness' (Douglas 2002:53), since holiness itself is a moral requirement (cf. Klawans 2003:19-22; Moskala 2000:25-26).

Our call to serve as 'holy ones' in the present world should commit us to pursue ethical purity, as dictated by Deuteronomy 23:12-14. Wherever Christians are or gather become a 'holy ground', and thus, can be defiled, 'not by ceremonial but ethical impurity' (Sprinkle 2000:646-658). As Paul instructed (1 Cor 5), the church should ensure purity by not associating with any defiled entity (v. 9), but to 'get rid' (v. 7) or 'expel' anything evil (v. 12) from the 'camp' of believers to a place outside the camp (Liu 2013:145), so their present 'camp' should remain absolutely holy.

When the Scripture describes our bodies as God's temple, it is not just as a sanctum for sacerdotal activity, but as the abode of the deity represented by His in-dwelling Spirit (1 Cor 3:16), which had to be kept holy. Thus, to live as a holy nation (1 Pet 2:9), Christians must, in the ethical/moral sense, have clean hands, a clear mind/conscience, and a pure heart. As 'salt' and 'light' of the world who are to let their light shine (Matt 5:13-16),

striving for moral holiness wherever we are, homes, markets, offices, schools, and church, is not negotiable; it is a must. There should be a distinction between Christians and non-Christians (cf. Deut 22:10; 2 Cor 6:16).

In this way, we will not only enjoy His presence with the blessings of divine 'protection and victory' (Deut 23:14), but also every promise that godliness holds for the present life and the life to come (1 Tim 4:8). Just as Douglas (2002:49-50) argues for this connection between purity and blessings from God, any impurity which will cause a withdrawal of God will not only withdraw His blessing, but will also open the door to His judgement by way of war. This is why Isaiah (13:3-5) mentions how God would engage in a war against His people for breaking His moral laws (Isa 59:15-19; cf. Asumang n.d.:22; 2007:16-17; 2011:20-21). Thus, moral purity brings blessings, but filth brings divine judgement.

Not everything should be blamed on demons/witchcraft

One of the main reasons why God will punish the disobedience of people is how they have managed to get themselves subdued under the influence of demonic and ignorance. Though Scriptures teach us about the operations of demonic forces, yet people can also become enslaved to an ideology or worldview which is contrary to the revealed truth of God through the Scriptures. This form of enslavement can be manifested in human traditions, public opinion or cultural feasts and festivals and maintain control through fear of consequence.

We need to be clear that believe and fear that these forces have unleashed into humanity have made them to attribute every negativity to demons and witches such that the consequences of our disobedience to God by not obeying his law are even

attributed to witchcraft and related evil forces. And this ignorance is very much felt in Africa, with extremely religious countries like Ghana being the worst offenders. But if adhered to, such beliefs will continue to make spiritual powers guardians or trustees over the lives of individuals, groups, and their cultures. No wonder, John draws attention of Christians to some people whose teachings believers are to be careful with (1 John 4:1-6).

So, this trend must change. In other words, some people's negative practices such as disobeying God's instructions and the punishment that comes upon such culprits should not be placed at the doorsteps of demons. Humanity must own up when we sin by disobeying God's instructions and become His enemies. The argument here is that since Christ claimed authority over them, satanic forces are powerless against Christians (Mark 1:23-26; 5:1-15; Longman III 2013:427); with Him on their side nothing can harm them (cf. Kibor 2006:156).

No controversy, God through Christ has won victory over evil forces and will continue to subdue them. We have also shown that though witchcraft and its related practices are major targets because of their closeness of their operations to humans, yet they are not the only targets. All people who disobey God's instructions are also targets. Thus, all practitioners of open defecation are God's enemies.

Without doubt, Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is applicable to Christians, not only in the NT or present time as argued above, but also presses on into the future when the sanitary injunctions and practices required of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 becomes a yardstick for God's people to enjoy His eternal blessings in the eschatological camp. This is the eternal camp (Rev 20:9; cf. Tob 13:9; cf. Keener 2000:486), which is 'prepared as a bride beautifully dressed for her husband' (Rev 21:2, 9) and

transformed into a new and Holy City, with the name, New Jerusalem, and descends out of heaven (Rev 21:2, 10).

The holiness of the eschatological city, the renewed camp of the OT, whether congregational or military, is underlined by the fact that 'nothing impure will ever enter it' (Rev 21:27). This also underscores our argument that ethical/moral purity is a yardstick for enjoyment of divine promises now and of the eternal camp.

Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that the law on sanitation spelt out in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 does have fruitful implications for the NT user and also finds ultimate fulfilment in it (cf. Kunhiyop 2008:115). Specifically, it has been shown that believers' call to a life of purity addressed in Paul's letters to the Corinthians (1 Cor 2-6 and particularly 2 Cor 6:14-7:1) had undertones of the camp/temple kind of community purity. It is proper to end this chapter on the note that by applying the principles stated in Deuteronomy 23:12-14, which requires responsible attitudes and acceptable practices towards our natural environment, faeces-related hygiene/health challenges could no doubt be drastically reduced if not totally eradicated.

It is appropriate then that the next chapter concentrates on the effect of open defecation. Specifically, we will appreciate some of the challenges of improper disposal of faeces to the human society and large and narrow down our focus on some of the implications of such a practice to humanity. Once again, Ghana will be at the centre of the discussions.

Chapter 17

Open Defecation

Leads to 'Divine War' against People

The fact that the sanitation law of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is pregnant with many concepts such as environmental care; hygiene, which are important public health issues and might be appropriately be connected to disease(s) and contagion; and holiness, can no longer be denied. The series of motivations that originate from defilement are observed in similar events; one within the Pentateuch and the other outside it but still within the OT. Indeed, under our exegetical pericope, the law can be further explored under many thematic areas, some of which we will definitely encounter as the discussion progresses. Thus, of the many concepts unearthed so far, each of them may undeniably be argued as a fundamental motivation.

Overall Motivation for preventing defilement in the OT Texts

As mentioned in an earlier section about the series of motivations, the motivation for this step is that the camp is holy; the motivation for the camp holiness is that God is present; and the motivation for His presence is to judge His enemies by protecting His people and giving them victory over such enemies in a 'holy war'. Therefore, the overall motivation for the sanitation law under discussion here, which is against open defecation, is 'holy war'. My position here is in contrast to that of Christensen (2002:543-544) and a couple of scholars like Macdonald

(2006:217) who rather argue that holiness of the camp is the final motivation.

Interestingly, this overall motivation parallels that of other texts within and outside the Torah. Specific texts and occasions are Exodus 3:5-8, at Sinai, when Yahweh was about to rescue His people and send them to the Promised Land; and Joshua 5:13-15, at the plains of Jericho, after the Israelites had crossed River Jordan and entered the Promised Land. Sandwiched between these two major texts is the sanitation law of Deuteronomy 23:12-14, at the plains of Moab, on the east side of the river, when the people had been led to the brinks of the Promised Land and were ready to enter in order to possess it. The instruction at the plains of Moab was: 'Dig a hole outside the camp and cover your excrement'. That is to say, 'Take away your excrement'.

Clearly, in all these texts indicated above, the initial motivation is that the space/place in such contexts is holy and needed to be observed as such. This holiness is also motivated by the presence of God, which is finally motivated by His preparedness to engage in a 'holy war'. Though differences in the cause of defilement exist, the motivations for the instructions in all the texts appear to be similar; exposed faeces on a holy land (Deut 23:12-14) and sandals (Exod 3:5-8 and Josh 5:13-15).

Moreover, 'holy war' which God promised to wage against the occupants of the Promised Land to drive them away and which is reiterated in Deuteronomy is fully engaged in the book outside of the Torah, especially during the conquest. The inference is that by means of 'holy war' our pericope connects well within the Pentateuch and also extends immediately after into the book of Joshua, thus emphasising its relevance. As to whether the idea was an extension of the laws that banned the nations from entering the assembly of Israel is not clear.

Widening the scope further, other books of the Torah talk about Israel's preparedness for the conquest of the Promised Land through 'holy war'. For example, scholars including Christensen (2001:lxxxviii; 2002:CX-XII, 157), Macdonald (2006:223), Borowski (2003:35-41, 76), Bruce (1979:257; cf. Sprinkle 2000:637-55; Gaebalein 1992:5-10; Stevenson 2002:54; Gaebalein (1992:5-10); and Wright 1999:355-358) have observed 'holy war' in the Torah. Macdonald (2006:223) notes concerning the wilderness wanderings of the Israelites that the divine presence is particularly associated with the 'holy war' ideology.

After the conquest, Deuteronomy 23:14 most likely became a pivotal law during the nation's periods of distress at the time of the monarchy. A couple of examples exist. David acknowledged that victory in their warfare depended on divine strength. He not only acknowledged, Yahweh, the Almighty God, as the Commander-in-Chief of the army of Israel, but also the significance of the divine name make which make all of Israel's battles those of Yahweh (1 Sam 17:45-47). What probably happened to King Jehoram might be another form of it. It is not the nature of his sickness and death, but the reason for his death, that is, God smote him with sickness for his unfaithfulness to His commands (2 Chr 21:12-19).

King Hezekiah found strength in the assurance of God when he faced the Assyrians. He said: 'With us is the LORD our God to help us and to fight our battles' (2 Chr 32:8). Yahweh did respond by sending an angel to annihilate the Assyrians (2 Chr 32:21). This also confirms an earlier position that Yahweh's army in a 'holy war' includes agents such as angels. Prophet Isaiah articulated the warfare underpinnings of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 quite understandably. The prophet's message in Chapter 13:3-5

raises essential issues about the concept discussed in the text. These, among others, include: the involvement of Yahweh, the Almighty God, in a 'holy war', His warriors, weapons, and who constitute enemies in such a war.

In chapter 59, Prophet Isaiah mentioned how God would engage in a 'holy war' against His people because they had broken His moral laws. From verses 15-19, the prophet revealed God as the Warrior who would put on 'righteousness like a breastplate, and a helmet of salvation on his head; put on garments of vengeance for clothing, and wrapped himself in fury as in a mantle' to fight against His own people for all their sins (cf. Asumang 2007:16-17; 2011:20-21). Jeremiah distinguished between Yahweh, the Almighty God, and worthless idols, and indicated the war that the former would wage against the latter for their provocation (51:17-19).

The relevance of Yahweh war is seen in its continuous celebration in Israel in connection with their important festivals. Christensen mentions how during occasions such as the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the spring festival of Passover, and in the context of the pilgrimage festivals, the Ark of the Covenant, was usually brought from Shittim to Gilgal, where the people of Israel were encamped as the hosts of Yahweh, the Almighty God. Then all the people would pitch camp in 'battle array' with the Ark of the Covenant in the tabernacle in the midst of the camp. He notes: 'All Israel, past and future would have a part in this Yahweh's war celebration' (2002:CXI, 51).

There are indications that 'holy war' travelled even beyond the HB into the intertestamental times. Helleman (3002:404-405) notes how Gentiles who attempted to defile Israel's sacred space found themselves on the receiving end of such wars. To be specific, he (cf. 1 Macc 7:46) observes that the Syrian general,

Nicanor, who threatened to burn down the temple during the intertestamental period died and his army massacred so that not even one of them was left, adding, 'even Jews who compromised their ancestral faith by profaning sacred space are not exempted'.

Christensen (2002:542) and Cromwell (2014:§7) note that the tradition of celebrating YHWH's war was kept alive by a community at Qumran connected with the Dead Sea Scrolls. Cromwell particularly notes how the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) discovered around AD 1946 and considered to have come from the Essenes reveal some of such practices by them. He notes their belief that the Temple in Jerusalem and its sacrificial ritual had been polluted by ritually impure priests who were unfit to serve, since, as Milgrom (1991:260; cf. Briley 2000:100) argues, it is only the priest who can pollute the sanctuary.

Reasons for 'Holy war'

The concept of 'holy war'/'Yahweh war' is common in the Scriptures. Usually, it used as an instrument for divine justice as it brings judgement on the enemies of the Almighty God. In Genesis 12:1-3, the Lord God told Abraham, 'I will curse those who curse you'. Thus, God inflicted the household of the Pharaoh of Egypt when the latter took Sarah, Abraham's wife. From Isaac through the descendants of Jacob in Egypt, the Lord God of Israel never ceased to wage war with the enemies of His covenanted partners.

Throughout Israel's migration from Egypt to the Promised Land, God engaged the enemies of His people. Even after the people had settled in the land, He engaged in wars on their behalf. Being a 'holy war', the spoils belonged to Yahweh, and we see this at the capture of Jericho when the silver, the gold, and

the vessels of brass were put into the treasury of the house of Yahweh, the Almighty God (Josh 6:24).

Clearly, the Almighty God indicated the kind of function He would perform in Israel's military camp: (1) to protect the troops from their enemies and, (2) to deliver their enemies into their hands (cf. van der Woude 1989:29; Matthews 2006:58). Another major reason the Almighty God would engage in a war is to establish purity and justice (cf. Poythress 1995:142), and so different descriptions of 'holy wars' are evident in Scripture. One such is where the Almighty God directly executes judgement over a section of humanity, as happened in Noah's flood (Gen 6:1-7) or Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18:16-19:29), because of the sin and rebellion of humanity.

Some of the warfare during the time of the judges took this form. In such wars, all material considered harmful to the existence of the Israelites or abominations were annihilated; either burnt or destroyed by other means, divine or physical, so that the wrath of the Almighty God was averted and His presence maintained with His people. 'Holy war' ensures cleansing since, as Wright (1999:355-358) argues, 'the execution of wilful murderers cancels or prevents pollution'. This means that 'holy war' removes any sin which would have aroused the anger of the Almighty God. There is also the case where the Lord God executes judgement over gods as happened in Egypt before the Israelites were set free.

Another form of 'holy war' is the situation where Yahweh, the Almighty God, uses human instruments to destroy physical enemies because of sin, as was the case of Israel against the Canaanites. There is even the case where specific persons are targeted by the Almighty God for destruction because of their disobedience, as happened to Achan (cf. Josh 7). There is yet

another type of war where Yahweh fights against His own nation, Israel, as a result of their sin and rebellion.

Akrong's note applies here: 'Every monotheistic religion needs some theory of evil, for if God is good, where does evil come from?' Certainly, not from the Lord, the Almighty God, because Akrong continues elsewhere thus: 'God cannot be the source of both good and evil' (2001:18-19). Whether all evil come from God's enemies or not, which is also another subject for discussion but beyond the scope of this book, at least, who the enemies are and even the weapons to deal with them, though not mentioned in the text, are implicitly connected to 'holy war', and are therefore issues which are worth discussing.

'Holy war' serves as one of the major motivations, if not the greatest, in the OT. In fact, there are clear indications that the concept, as a consequence of divine judgement in the OT, continued into the NT times. Asumang (2011:1-46) confirms 'holy war' as an important concept in the NT. A typical example is what is written concerning the death of Herod 'that God inflicted sickness on him that led to his death' (Acts 12:20-23).

Chapter Conclusion

A lot of conclusions can be drawn from our discussions at this stage. For, as long as the biblical Israel would live, "holy war" was going to be part of the mission of God and that of His people; consequently, the concept would pervade several aspects of their life (cf. Asumang 2011:19). In their obedience, the Almighty God promised that He would defend/defeat their enemies and sustain them on the land; in their disobedience He would punish them. In doing so, He, the Lord, would be refining them as His chosen people.

Chapter 18

Thus says the LORD: 'No Open Defecation, else…'

The discussions in this book have focused on some of the recent historical developments which have given room for concern to biblical scholarship. These developments centre on the nature of interpretation of the pentateuchal laws on holiness. Generally, it is realised that the Pentateuch contains laws from the Lord Almighty that demanded obedience from His covenant people. This final chapter is committed to drumming home the fundamental objective of this book which is its title. In doing so, it intends to provide a summary of all the discussions on Deuteronomy 23:12-14 that have so far engaged our attention in this book and end with the conclusion of all the submissions.

There was the need to explore ways by which the rational for the stipulations in the text will be fully obeyed so that its blessings will be realised. This called for the establishment of the literary, exegetical, and theological roles of the text in the book as a whole, the Torah, and the OT in general. It also called for an exploration in order to apply the passage to subsequent generations up to today, and even look beyond into the future apocalyptic period.

A major issue is that different views on the approach to interpretation of these laws are held, with new approaches emerging without much agreement (cf. Regev 2001:246; Wright 1999:351; Baker and Arnold 1999:136). While some interpretations of the laws are appealing because they are meaningful and applicable, unfortunately, the same cannot be said about many others. The issue of synthesis of all the

concepts within such laws in order to provide an integrated whole also appears not to be clearly addressed, and thus gives further room for concern.

Thus, there was need for identification of a clear basis for integrating all the underpinning thematic issues of the text in order to holistically establish their significance and find an acceptable way to connect them to the NT context. This is what necessitated 'a multi-disciplinary' approach to the discussion of the text in this book. This approach was achieved on the basis of a historical-grammatical method which also recognises symbolic and or allegorical undertones of scripture.

It has been argued in this book that it is the pentateuchal laws in Deuteronomy that have particularly suffered such an unfortunate situation. Thus, Deuteronomy 23:12-14, which basically addresses sanitation needed to be thoroughly investigated. I have also argued that the stipulation was actually meant to ensure proper sanitary lifestyle demonstrated by cleanness and hygiene in relation to public health concerns. Besides, they were meant to ensure cultic holiness as a result of the sacred space that would pave the way for Yahweh to fight His enemies in a 'holy war' (Hb □□□), a term which is not explicit in Scripture (cf. Wright 2008:87; Longman III 2013:794-95).

The genesis of the arguments in this book is that while some of the pentateuchal laws are spelt out in simple and straightforward thematic outlines, others are underpinned by concepts/disciplines which appear to be bundled together. This latter situation has led to inconsistent and inadequate interpretations by scholars. Typically, while some hold to a dichotomous position and argue that cultic/ritual and ethical/moral issues are the rationale for the laws (cf. Moskala 2000:13-26; Cothey 2005:132; Sprinkle 2000:646-649;

Adeyemo 2006:240; Klawans 2003:19-21). Others who see beyond just a dichotomy argue that ethical, social, religious, and functional distinctions are detectable within the laws (cf. Lioy 2004:17-21; Domeris 1986:36-38).

Some of the scholars who are advocates of a cultic/ritual view of the laws interpret them in relation to the Lord Almighty. For example, Domeris (1986:35) notes: 'The tendency in early semantic studies, particularly as related to the Hebrew idea of holiness, was towards the sense of separation from the profane'. He notes that the last few years have seen 'a change from this negative sense to a positive understanding of the idea as 'belonging to Yahweh''. That is, the Almighty God is absolutely and completely different and separate from creation in terms of holiness.

It is also not uncommon for discussions on holiness to centre particularly on human beings, though they stand defiled in relation to the Lord Almighty. The attempts are geared towards the inspiration of humanity to be holy in order to relate to the All-Holy God. Sprinkle (2000:637-657) sums them up thus: 'The most important message conveyed by these laws is that God is holy and man, conversely is contaminated and unfit, in and of himself, to approach a holy God'. However, scholars such as Douglas (1966:1; 2002:51; 2003:2; cf. Alexander and Rosner 2000:154-55; Moskala 2000:21-24), Milgrom (cf. Klawans (2003:20-21) and Sprinkle (2000:645-47; cf. Moskala 2000:13-15) interpret the laws symbolically.

In fact, there are varied forms of sociological and other interpretations (Cothey 2005:135; Moskala 2000:11-41; Sprinkle 2000:651). A typical example is Wright (1999) who notes how Milgrom presented Israel's holiness as the reason for the legal prohibitions in the Deuteronomic document. He

interprets Milgrom's position to mean that the concept of holiness in Deuteronomy is based on obedience to prohibitions in the stipulations, which includes separation from other nations – Chapter 23:1-7. As a chosen race through Abraham and Isaac and Jacob (Exod 3:6, 15), they were to be different from the people of the surrounding nations in terms of their relations not only to Yahweh, the I AM, the Lord God Almighty, but also to sacred places/spaces. This is evident in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 where the Lord is calling for purity of His people who were living as a group or community, and purity of the place where His name and presence are experienced.

In relation to such social or community life of people, the anthropological approach to the idea of holiness in the Pentateuch, which was pioneered by Mary Douglas, makes a contribution to this discussion. Douglas (2003:2) explains holiness/purity from a physical instead of a ritual/cultic perspective. Cothey (2005:135) comments that, 'Douglas highlighted instead the positive social functions that purity concepts can fulfil and describe the diverse forms in different societies that such purity concepts can take.'

To some degree, Douglas' argument might be considered as a positive step towards linking holiness to sanitation or vice versa, though it was not accepted by other scholars. Alexander and Rosner (2000:154-155), for instance, contest her arguments when they write that whilst Douglas' explanation was well received, 'uncleanness should certainly be understood in a ritual rather than a physical sense'.

One of the salient observations of a community life expected of the addressees in the pericope is the idea that sanitation is related to holiness, that is, holiness is brought about by prevention of environmental pollution. Hence, one of the

areas that Douglas champions is the idea of dealing with dirt. For her, 'eliminating dirt is not a negative movement, but a positive effort to organise the environment' (2003:2; cf. Kawashima 2003:372).

Wright (1999:357-358) argues along the same lines by commenting that the text cannot be interpreted only in the light of cultic and ethical laws; it is also a matter of sanitation. The call by the text to prevent pollution points to stewardship of the property of Yahweh, the Lord Almighty, and links the deity to His people and the environment. Crüsemann (2001:247) notes that the text establishes important legal measures of protection, such as the maintenance of purity of nature.

Connected to defecation in general is the issue of its proper treatment. Borowski (2003:80) identifies a possible reason for the dearth of evidence on human excrement and sanitary facilities during the Iron Age in Palestine. He believes that it might be due to the instructions that were given to Israel in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 to cover their excrement after defecation. This lack of much evidence on faecal disposal might be an indication of the extent to which this law was carried out. Sprinkle (2000:641) argues that 'the whole land of Israel was somewhat considered sacred and holy'. Consequently, holiness was not limited to the sanctuary and camp area but covered the whole land of Israel.

There are additional unanswered issues associated with the text. Usually associated with sanitation is the prevention of disease(s). Thus, one might assume that this is only implied in the pericope, probably as one considers the hygienic undertones. That is, the instructions to have human excrement buried were to ensure prevention of diseases. In that case, there exists a possibility that the instructions were to deal with contagion. This

is so, since one cannot rule out a relationship between faeces, diseases, and contagion in a community life such as envisaged in the text.

It might also mean that covering the faeces was not only to ensure holiness, but to promote health through the prevention of the spread of diseases associated with sewage. This is buttressed by Douglas's (2003:54) argument on the subject of 'clean and unclean' in relation to health regulations of the Israelites. However, it is not clear why the text did not specify disease(s) and the associated issue of contagion as other reasons for the special instruction concerning treatment of sewage.

Borowski further underscores the importance of sanitation by relating it to quality of life. Like Douglas, he mentions the subject of health regulations of the Israelites in relation to holiness. He notes that 'Good health, quality of life and longevity depend heavily on two factors: good hygiene and proper sanitation' (2003:78-79). What this also means is that the laws on sanitation were to be taken seriously, since they were among the main pivots on which good health, quality of life, and longevity rested.

In addition to the above, Borowski points out that it was to ensure a situation such as mentioned above that Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, gave such instructions. It is no wonder, that, there appears to be a lack of mention in Scripture of diseases in connection with pollution by excreta. A possible reason might be that the Israelites saw the stipulations as key not only to survival, but also good health, and thus strictly obeyed them.

It is likely that such an understanding was not peculiar to the Israelites. Scurlock and Anderson (2005:19) note concerning Assyrian and Babylonian practices that the practice of open

defecation could be associated with disease(s). They translate an Assyrian and/or Babylonian passage that was purported to be one of such instructions (probably to a male), 'He should not enter a room for defecation (or) there will be an outbreak of *li'bu* fever'. So the likelihood is that these nations evolved similar kinds of instructions to deal with diseases and contagion.

While it was common knowledge in Israel that some diseases result from microbial infections through contact with faecal material, it was also believed that diseases were caused by God (Borowski 2003:77). Such a belief could be shared by the ancient Near Eastern nations in relation to their gods or spirits in general. Indeed, the likelihood exists that such practices were common features among most of the eastern cultures of that period. According to Scurlock and Anderson (2005:17) 'Mesopotamian physicians attributed illnesses to gods/goddesses, demons/demonesses, and ghosts'. Therefore, Deuteronomy 23:12-14, requires the holiness of the camp not only for Israel to have unhindered access to the Almighty God and continue to enjoy His promises, but to also avert His wrath which could lead to calamities like defeat in wars, sicknesses, and death.

Perhaps a more interesting section of our discussion on sanitation which has implications for holiness of a geographical area is the 'name theology' which has also given birth to the concept of 'place theology' or 'the theology of holiness of a place'. 'Place' has been shown as referring not only to the special inner court of the sanctuary called 'the most holy place' or the other space within the shrine called the 'holy place', but to any geographical space. Thus, it has been argued that the interpretation of the pericope extends beyond cultic boundaries. Besides Yahweh, the God of Israel, the idea of holiness is

extended to cover the people as a community in the camp as well as the camp as a geographical space (cf. Sprinkle 2000:654-656; Valiquette 1999:53).

Wright (1999:355-358; cf. Baker and Arnold 1999:136) notes how the Holiness School's extension of issues relating to holiness and pollution and the sanctifying effect of Yahweh's presence cover not only the sanctuary and the camp but the whole land. He reveals from both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School that the sanctuary is rather the primary place of holiness. Inge (2003:35-40) refers to notes by Brueggemann and O'Donovan on the importance of land to the Yahweh-Israel covenant. For both, the role of land as a promised gift from, I AM, the Almighty God, and the faithfulness required of the people towards it constitute the fulcrum of the OT narratives. Thus, in terms of the call for holiness, the emphasis is on all the geographical spaces: the whole land, the congregational or military camp for the people, and the sanctuary. Nevertheless, there are clear indications that Deuteronomy 23:12-14 emphasis on holiness of the congregation and military camp.

Israel's faithfulness to the Almighty lay in its obedience to the laws regarding consecration of self and maintenance of holiness of the land, but of significant concern here is the camp within which the sanctuary was erected. 'Place theology' is associated with the sanctuary and specific places of the land such as the camp, as revealed in chapters 5-27 of Deuteronomy, specifically, in passages such as 12:5-11; 14:2-6; 26:2. It is thus not surprising that the text, which is primarily concerned with the military camp, but lies within this section of the book, also contributes to the concept. This is because this camp is also a specially designated geographical space where the holiness of Yahweh, the Almighty God, is extended to cover.

It was argued that one of the headaches of theologians is the observable lack of consensus among them with regards to the interpretation of the Laws. One such area of disagreement centres on the different types of concerns addressed by the laws. Daniel T Lioy (2004) is a key defender of the tripartite interpretation of the pentateuchal laws. He is convinced of three distinct concerns that are evident within the Mosaic code, namely, morality and ethics (Exod 20:1-26); social and civil; and religious and ceremonial (24:12-31:18). Lioy describes moral laws as that which specifies the type of individual and community behaviour 'that always is the duty of God's people, regardless of when and where they live' (2004:17-21). He emphasises with respect to the laws that 'ethical, social, and religious distinctions are detectable within it'.

Lioy (2004:17-21) continues: 'The aim of such division into three parts is to catalogue the constituent elements of the law, just as one might classify different types of literature according to their genre'. Thus he insists: 'There is an essential unity to the law, it is not a juridical monolith'. Continuing, Lioy mentions how McQuilkin also recognises the difficulty of differentiating between the moral, ceremonial, and civil aspects of the laws. Lioy notes that a major concern of those who argue against the tripartite division of the laws is that it is difficult to draw a line between moral precepts and other laws, and that they can be overly subjective and arbitrary in nature. However, he rebuffs this position and argues that 'the division though hard, is worth the effort', because 'it is convenient and a valid interpretation of the data present in the Old Testament'.

Hill and Walton's (2000:105-6) submission also make great contribution here. Their argument that applying the concepts of the holy, common, clean, and unclean to the

physical, moral, and spiritual realms of life as basic to the ancient Hebrew worldview is one that is clearly indicative of Lioy's tripartite position. The distinctions, for Hill and Walton, allowed the people to order their relationship to the natural world in such a way that they might indeed 'be holy' just as the Creator of the whole universe is.

No doubt, Lioy's (2004:17-21) position can be considered as a clear development over the usual dichotomous approach; it is like combining some of the social and physical elements of the symbolic view. His articulation captured some important areas that make for a classification beyond just a dichotomy: morality/ethics (Exod 20:1-26); religious/ceremonial (24:12-31:18) and social/civil; and that are evident within the Mosaic code. Beside ritual and moral holiness which Domeris calls 'peripheral', he proposes that holiness is not only a virtue but a 'numinous power' that emanates from God. His elucidation brings to the fore the fact that there are more concepts that need to be incorporated into such classification to take it even beyond a tripartite interpretation as will be shown by the study.

Moreover, I identify with Domeris' (1986:35) position that the ethical and cultic aspects of holiness do not constitute the central core of the word, and appreciate his proposal of another dimension to the interpretation of the laws. He typically identifies a divine function, especially that of 'holy war', which though it has not been explored, and 'has been either lost or ignored', has made great contribution to the discussions in this book.

Notwithstanding the observation that the OT pentateuchal laws on holiness are underlined by many concepts, there is currently lack of consensus among Christian theologians on exactly how to approach some of these laws. Put differently, there is no agreement among scholars on the various Christian

methodological approaches to the contemporary application of OT laws. Better still, what Christians should make of, say, the historical, literary, theological, and sociological functions of the OT laws, should be clarified. While some like Bahnsen (cf. Gundry 1996:93-143) think of a theonomic reformed approach where the OT laws are very central to the application of the NT, others like Strickland (cf. Gundry 1996:229-279) argue against any form of continuity between the Law and the Gospel.

Apparently, there appears to be some level of confusion among scholars, and it is not surprising that my personal anecdotal experience in the context of Ghana suggests that an appreciable percentage of Christians continue to wonder whether to turn completely away from the OT, particularly its laws, or attempt an application of them. This notwithstanding, the position of scriptures still holds that God in in the camp of His people wherever they are and thus requires the maintenance of the purity of their environments.

Overall Conclusion

There are clear indications that the instructions contained in the text, that the people should practice proper sanitary habits by avoiding open defecation, is not limited to only OT people but also relevant to both NT context, the global community today, and even looks beyond into the eschatological period. Now, the question at this concluding section is; does the failure of the contemporary world to observe the divine instructions against open defecation elicit any reaction from Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty? The answer is simple: Yes! It leads to 'holy war', as the discussions in the Volume Two of this Series will seek to argue.

Works Consulted

Aboagye-Mensah R 2006. War. In *ABC,* by Adeyemo T (ed), 967-968. Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.

Adeyemo T (ed) 2006. *ABC.* Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.

Adler A 2009. What's in a name? Reflections upon divine names and the attraction of god to Israel. *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 37/4:265-69.

Adler H 1893. Sanitation as taught by the Mosaic Law: a paper read before the Church of England Sanitary Association. 1-12. Online article: http://www.jstor.org/stable/60240182, 2012-08-01.

Aker B, Bennett J, Hausfeld M, Hemando J, Hodum T, Nunnally W and Simnowitz A 2012. The Necessity for Retaining Father and Son terminology in Scripture translations for Muslims *AJPS 5-2:*171-243.

Akrong A 2001. Symposium: Towards a theological perspective on culture and tradition: Towards a theology of evil spirits and witches. *JACT* 4/1:18-26.

Alexander T D and Rosner S B 2000. *NDBT.* Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.

Andoh D 2014 (24 Nov). Make issues of sanitation a priority. *Daily Graphic*, 26. Website: www.graphic.com.gh.

Angel R A 2011. *Crucifixus Vincens:* The 'Son of God' as Divine Warrior in Matthew. *CBQ* 73:299-317.

Anonymous 2014. Review of Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians by Yulin Liu. Online article: http://www.mohr.de/en/theology/subject-areas/all-books/buch/temple-purity-in-1-2-corinthians.html, 2014-09-08.

_____ 2012 (23 Nov). Piloting faecal sludge to biodiesel begins. *Daily Graphic*, 53. Website: www.graphic.com.gh, 2013-23-02.

_____ 2011. Why does God hate faeces? Online article: http://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20110624191949AAPk1TA, 2014-27-01.

_____ 2010. Ghana News Agency - General News on Ghana. (25 Apr). Online article: www.ghanaweb.com, 2011-23-02.

_____ 2007. Goal 7 - Ensure environmental sustainability. *The Millennium Development Goals Report*, 22-27.

_____ 2006. Biblical Latrine: ancient parasites show that cleanliness may have been next to sickliness. *ScienceDaily.* (14 Nov). Online article: www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2006/11/061113180523.htm, 2014-30-01.

_____ 2002. Analysis of Health development in the region. In Health-for-all Policy for the 21st Century in the African Region: Agenda 2020. *AFR/AC50/8* Rev.1:3-7.

Ao A T 2014. The 'Day of the Lord' as an Eschatological Paradigm in the Old Testament *New Life Theological Journal* (NLTJ) 4/1 (Jan):19-32.

Arberry J A 1955. *The Koran translated*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Archer Jr G L 1994. *A Survey of the Old Testament Introduction.* (rev and exp), Chicago: Moody Press.

Ascough S R 1997. Review of *The Name and Way of the Lord: Old Testament Themes, New Testament Christology. CBQ* 59:766-68.

Asumang A 2014. Strive for Peace and Holiness: The Intertextual Journey of the Jacob Traditions from Genesis to Hebrews, via the Prophets. *Conspectus* 17:1-52.

_____ 2011. 'Resist him' (1 Pet 5:9): Holiness and Non-Retaliatory Responses to Unjust Suffering as 'Holy War' in 1 Peter. *Conspectus* 11:1-46.

_____ 2010. 'The formation of the disciples as agents of divine power and revelation: a comparative study of the gospels according to Mark and John': A dissertation submitted to SATS in candidacy for the degree of PhD in Theology, 1-509.

_____ 2008. Powers of darkness: an evaluation of three hermeneutical approaches to the evil powers in Ephesians. *Conspectus* 5:1-19.

_____ 2007. Put on the Lord Jesus Christ, Put on the Last Adam: The Background of Paul's Ethical Instructions in Romans 13:11-14. *Conspectus* 4:1-22

_____ 2006. *Hearing the Voice of God: Principles for Life Changing Bible Study.* London: Lulu.

_____ 2005. 'The Tabernacle as a Heuristic Device in the interpretation of the Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews': A Thesis submitted to the SATS in candidacy for the degree of Master of Theology. *Conspectus.*

Asumang A and Domeris W R 2007. The migrant camp of the people of God: a uniting theme for the Epistle to the Hebrews. *Conspectus* 3:1-33.

_____ 2006. Ministering in the Tabernacle: Spatiality and the Christology of Hebrews. *Conspectus* 1:1-26.

Augustine *City of God* VII.30, 291, 292; XXII.6, 1030.

Aune E D 1998. *WBC*: *Revelation 17-22.* Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Bacon W B n.d. The 'Son of Man' in the usage of Jesus. *JBL* 143-182.

Baker D W and Arnold B T 1999. *The face of Old Testament studies: a survey of contemporary approaches.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Barker K N and Kohlenberger III J R 1994. *EBC: Old Testament* (Abridged ed). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Berry L D n.d. Revisioning Christology: The Logic of Messianic Ascription. *Anglican Theological Review* 70/2:129-140.

BibleWorks.com 2006 WTT - *BHS Hebrew Old Testament* (4th ed). BibleWorks, LLC.

Block I D 2011. Bearing the Name of the LORD with honor. *BSac* 168 (Jan-Mar):20-31.

_____ 2005. The Joy of Worship: The Mosaic Invitation to the presence of God (Deuteronomy 12:1-14) *BSac* 162 (Apr-Jun):131-49.

Blomberg C 1994. *The NIV Application Commentary: From biblical text…to contemporary life.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Bock L D 1991. The Son of Man in Luke 5:24 *BBR* 1:109-121.

Boring E M n.d. The Christology of Mark: Hermeneutical issues for Systematic Theology. *Semeia* 125-151.

Borowski O 2003. *Daily Life in Biblical Times.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Briley T 2000. The Old Testament 'Sin Offering' and Christ's Atonement. *Stone-Campbell Journal* 3 (Spring):89-101.

Broadhead K E 1993. Jesus the Nazarene: Narrative Strategy and Christological imagery in the Gospel of Mark. *JSNT 52:*3-18.

Brown F, Driver S and Briggs C 1997. *BDB: with an appendix containing the biblical Aramaic.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

Brown K J 2007. *Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics: Scripture as Communication.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Bruce F F 1979. *NIBC* (Based on the NIV). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Bruce F F, Harrison K R, Youngblood R and Ecklebarger K 1986. *Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. Nashville; TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Bruckner J K n.d. A Theological description of Human Wholeness in Deuteronomy 6 *Ex Audita* 1-15.

Brueggemann W 2013. *Truth speaks to Power: The Countercultural nature of Scripture.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Christensen D L 2002. *WBC: Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (vol 6B). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Clines J A D 1979. Introduction to the Pentateuch. In *NIBC* by Bruce F F (ed), 78-83. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Cothey A 2005. Ethics and Holiness in the Theology of Leviticus. *JSOT* 30/2:131-151. Online article: http://JSOT.sagepub.com, 2011-18-03.

Cotter C R 1945. The Divinity of Jesus Christ in Saint Paul. *CBQ* 7/3:259-289.

Craigie C P 1976. *NICOT: The book of Deuteronomy.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

_____ , Kelly H P and Drinkard Jr F J 1991. *WBC: Jeremiah1-25* (vol 26). Dallas, TX: Word Books, Publisher.

Cromwell B 2014 Old Testament Toilets. Online article: http://www.toilet-guru.com/biblicalold.php, 2014-27-01.

Crüsemann F 2001. The Torah and the unity of God. *Word & World:* XXI, 3:243-252.

Cumming J 2012. Is Jesus Christ the Son of God? Responding to the Muslim view of Jesus *AJPS* 15:2:133-142.

Davis G P 1989. Mark's Christological Paradox. *JSNT* 35:3-18.

DeWitt C B 2000. *The Care of creation: Focusing concern and action.* Leicester, England: IVP.

Domeris W R 1986. The office of the Holy One. *JTSA* 35-38.

Douglas J. D. and Tenney M C. 1986. *NIDB.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Douglas M 2003. *Purity and Danger: An analysis of concept of pollution and taboo.* Taylor & Francis e-Library.

_____ 2002. *Purity and Danger: An analysis of concept of pollution and taboo.* NY: Routledge.

_____ 1966. *Purity and Danger: An analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo.* NY: Routledge.

Dozeman T 1998. The wilderness and salvation history in the Hagar story. *JBL* 117:23-43.

Ellens H J 2006. The Unique Son of Man in John. *Proceedings EGL & MWBS* 26:69-78.

Ellis E E n.d. Background and Christology of John's Gospel: Selected motifs *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 24-31.

Faniran A and Nihinlola E. 2007. *A Creation Sacred to God: Proceedings of 1st Sacred Earth Workshop*. Jericho, Ibadan: Daybis Ltd.

Ferda S T 2013. The Soldiers' Inscription and the Angel's Word: The Significance of 'Jesus' in Matthew's *Titulus. Novum Testamentum* 55:221-231.

Finger T 1994 (14 Nov). In the name of *Sophia*: Seeking a biblical understanding of holy wisdom. *Christianity Today,* 44.

Friedman M 2007. Ancient latrine fuels debate at Qumran. Online article: http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/tech/science/discoveries/2007-01-02qumram-latrinex.htm, 2014-30-01.

Funk RW 1959. The wilderness. *JBL* 78:206-214

Galli M 2001. Now what? A Christian response to religious terrorism. *Christianity Today* 22 (October):24-27.

Gianotti C R 1996. The Meaning of Divine Name YHWH. In *Vital Old Testament Issues: Examining Textual and Topical Questions,* by Zuck B R (ed), 30-38. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Resources.

_____ 1985. The Meaning of the Divine Name YHWH. *BSac* (Jan-Mar):38-51.

Gibson J B 1994. Jesus' wilderness temptation according to Mark. *JSNT* 53:3-34.

Gieschen A C 2003. The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology. *Vigiliae Christianae* 57/2:115-158.

_____ n.d. Confronting Current Christological Controversy. *Concordia Theological Seminary* 3-32.

_____ n.d. The Real Presence of the Son Before Christ: Revisiting an Old Approach to Old Testament Christology. *Concordia Theological Seminary* 105-126.

Grabbe L L 1997. The Book of Leviticus. *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 5:91-110.

Gundry S N (ed) 1996. *Five views on Law and Gospel.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Hafemann S J 2001. *The God of promise and the life of faith: understanding the heart of the Bible.* Wheaton: Crossway Books.

_____ 2000. *2 Corinthians: The NIV Application Commentary from biblical text…to contemporary life:* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Hall H G 2000. *The College Press NIV Commentary: Deuteronomy.* Joplin, Missouri: College Press Publishing Company.

Hart M 1995. Moses the Microbiologist: Judaism and Social Hygiene in the Work of Alfred Nossig *Jewish Social Studies*, New Series 2/1:72-97. Online article: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4467461, 2012-08-01.

Hartley J E 1992. *WBC: Leviticus* (vol 4). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.

Henry M 1961. *Matthew Henry's Commentary in one volume:* Grand Rapids, MI; Zondervan.

Hertog C D 2002. The Prophetic Dimension of the Divine Name: On Exodus 3:14a and its Context. *CBQ* 64:228.

Hill A E and Walton J H 2000. *A Survey of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Holladay W L 1988. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Holman J 2003. Good Health through the Bible! *Investigator* 89 (March). Online article: http://ed5015.tripod.com/bbiblehealthHolman89.htm, 2014-27-01.

Hundley M 2009. To Be or Not to Be: A reexamination of name language in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history. *VT* 59:533-555.

Inge J 2003. *A Christian theology of place*. Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Johnsson W G 1978. The pilgrimage motif in the Book of Hebrews. *JBL* 97:239-251.

Kaiser Jr W C 2001. *The Old Testament Documents: Are they Reliable & Relevant?* USA: IVP.

Kawashima R S 2006 The Priestly Tent of meeting and the problem of divine transcendence: An 'archaeology' of the sacred. *The Journal of Religion* 226-257.

_____ 2003. The Jubilee year and the return of cosmic purity. *CBQ* 65:372.

Kee C H n.d. Christology and Ecclesiology: Titles of Christ and models of Community. *Semeia* 1171-1192.

Keener C S 2000. Revelation: *The NIV Application Commentary*: *from biblical text…to contemporary life.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Kelley P H 1992. *Biblical Hebrew: an introductory grammar.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Kibor E J 2006. Witchcraft & Socery: A biblical Perspective with implications for Church Ministry. *AJET* 25/2:151-160.

Kirchhevel D G 1999. The 'Son of Man' passages in Mark. *BBR* 9:181-187.

Klawans J 2003. Ritual purity, moral purity, and sacrifice in Jacob Milgrom's Leviticus. *Religious Studies Review* 29 January 1:19-28.

Klein W 1998. Evangelical Hermeneutics. In *Initiation into Theology: The rich variety of Theology and Hermeneutics,* by Maimela S and König A (eds), 319-336. Hatifield, Pretoria: J L van Schaik Publishers.

Klein W W, Blomberg C L and Hubbard Jr R L 2004. *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Köstenberger A 2009. *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters: Biblical theology of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Kudadjie J N and Aboagye-Mensah R K 1992. *Christian Social Ethics.* Accra, Ghana: Asempa Publishers.

Kunhiyop W S 2012. *African Christian Theology.* Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.

_____ 2008. *African Christian Ethics.* Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.

_____ 2006. Witchcraft. In *ABC,* by Adeyemo T (ed), 374. Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.

_____ 2002. Witchcraft: A Philosophical and Theologiical Analysis. *AJET* 21/2:133-143.

Lioy D T 2013. A Comparative Analysis of the Song of Moses and Paul's Speech to the Athenians. *Conspectus* 16:2.

_____ 2010. The Garden of Eden as a Primordial Temple or Sacred Space for Humankind. *Conspectus* 10:25-57.

_____ 2007. Jesus as Torah in John 2:1-22. *Conspectus* 4:23-39.

_____ 2007. The Unique Status of Jesus as the Divine Messiah: An Exegetical and Theological Analysis of Mark 1:1, 9-13. *Conspectus* 3:34-53.

_____ 2005. Progressive Covenantalism as an Integrating Motif of Scripture. Online article: https://bible.org/article/progressive-covenantalism-integrating-motifscripture#P7_148, 2014-14-03.

_____ 2005. *The search for ultimate reality: Intertextuality between the Genesis and Johannine prologues.* New York: Peter Lang.

_____ 2004. *The Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount*. NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Liu Y 2013. *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians.* Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.

_____ 2012. Preview of 'Purity in 1-2 Corinthians in the Context of the Jewish and Greco-Roman World'. *TrinJ* 33/**2** (Fall):289.

Longman III T 2013. *The Baker Illustrated Bible Dictionary.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

_____ 2006. *Making sense of the Old Testament: Three crucial questions.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academics.

_____ 2003 (May). The God of War: God seems to sanction raw violence in the Old Testament. Does his character change in the New Testament? *Christianity Today,* 62.

_____ 1982. The divine warrior: The New Testament use of an Old Testament motif. *WTJ* 44:290-307.

_____ and Dillard R B 2006. *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (2nd ed) Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Macdonald N 2006. The Literary Criticism and Rhetorical Logic of Deuteronomy I-IV. *VT* LVI/2:203-224.

MacLeod J D 2005. Eternal Son, Davidic Son, Messianic Son: An Exposition of Romans 1:1-7. *BSac* 162 (Jan-Mar):76-94.

Madeleine S and Lane M J 1978. *Harper's Encyclopedia of Bible Life.* San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers.

Magness J 2004. Two notes on the Archaeology of Qumran. *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on its*

Archaeology 69-71. Online article: www.springerlink.com/index/6352737837120810.pdf, 2014-30-01.

Martin P R 1986. *WBC: 2 Corinthians* (vol 40). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Matthews V H 2006. *Manners and Customs in the Bible: An Illustrated Guide to Daily Life in Bible Times.* (3rd ed) Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

Maugh II H T 2006. Latrine practices posed health risks to sect: Archaeologists look at the toilet rituals that shortened the lives of the men who created the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Los Angeles Times.* Online article: http://articles.latimes.com/2006/nov/14/science/sci-qumran14, 2014-30-01.

McConville J G 1986. *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy.* Trowbridge, Wiltshire; Great Britain: Redwood Burn Ltd.

Milbank J 1991. The Name of Jesus: Incarnation, Atonement, Ecclesiology. *Modern Theology* 7 (Jul):311-333.

Milgrom J 1991. *Leviticus 1-16: A new translation with introduction and commentary* (Anchor Bible, vol 3); *Leviticus 17-22; Leviticus 23-27.* Online book: http://www.amazon.com/Leviticus-1-16, 2011-03-12.

_____ n.d. Encroaching on the Sacred: Purity and Polity in Numbers 1-10, *Interpretation* 241-253.

Millar J G 1995. The Ethics of Deuteronomy: An Exegetical and Theological Study of the Book of Deuteronomy (unpublished D.Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford). *Tyndale Bulletin* 46/2:389-92.

Minear P S n.d. Holy People, Holy Land, Holy City: The Genesis and Genius of Christian Attitudes *Interpretation* 18-31.

Moo D 1988. Divine Healing in the Health and Wealth Gospel. *TrinJ* 9:191-209.

Moskala J 2000. Categorization and Evaluation of Different Kinds of Interpretation of the Laws of Clean and Unclean Animals in Leviticus ll. *Adventist Theological Society* 1-41.

Naugle K D 2002. *Worldview: The History of a Concept.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Nolland J 1996. No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1:18-25. *JSNT* 62:3-12.

Ohlig K-H 1996. What Is Christology? *Theology Digest* 43/1(Spring):15-20.

Owiredu C 2005. Blood and Life in the Old Testament (A Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Department of Theology, University of Durham), 1-190.

Packer J I 2002 (7 Jan). Wisdom in a Time of War: What Oswald Chambers and C.S. Lewis teach us about living through the long battle with terrorism. *Christianity Today,* 45-49.

Peay A S 2005. Heart to heart: Congregationalism as a Post-Denominational Ecclesial Spirituality Expressed through Relational, Worship and Fellowship. *International Congregational Journal* 4/2:17-40.

Poythress S V 1995. *The Shadow of Christ in the Law of Moses.* Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing.

Radmacher E D, Allen R B and Wayne H H (eds) 1997. *The Nelson Study Bible* (NKJV). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Regev E 2001. Priestly dynamic holiness and Deuteronomic static holiness, *VT* 51/2:243-261. Online article: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1585253, 2011-23-02.

Richter S L 2010. Environmental Law in Deuteronomy: One Lens on a Biblical Theology of Creation Care. *BBR* 20/3:355-376.

_____ 2007. The Place of the Name in Deuteronomy. *VT* 57:342-366.

Saxey R n.d. A Physician's Reflections on Old Testament Medicine. *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*. Online article: www.dialoguejournal.com/wpcontent/.../Dialogue_V17N03_124.pdf, 2012- 01-07.

Schmidt N n.d. Recent study of the term 'Son of Man'. *JBL* 326-349.

Scurlock J A and Anderson B R 2005. *Diagnoses in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine*. Online book: http://books.google. co.uk/books, 2011-03-12.

Shepherd B M 2006. Daniel 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man. *WTJ* 68:99-111.

Smith K G 2010. How to do an exegetical study. *Conspectus* 10:1-10.

Sprinkle J M 2000. The rationale of the Laws of clean and unclean in the Old Testament. *JETS* 43/4:637-657.

Stevenson J S 2002. Judah's successes and failures in holy war: an exegesis of Judges 1:1-20, *RQ* 44/1:43-54.

Stott J 1999. *New Issues Facing Christianity Today* (fully rev ed). London: HarperCollins Publishers.

_____ 1990. *Decisive Issues facing Christians Today: your influence is vital in today's turbulent world.* Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H Revell Company.

Strong J n.d. *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. Nashville: Broadman & Holdman Publishers.

Sumrall L 1982. *The Names of God: God's name brings hope, healing, and happiness.* New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House.

Thayer H J 1980. *BDAG* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Thielman F 2005. *Theology of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Unger M F 1988. *New Unger's Bible Dictionary* (rev and updated ver). Chicago: The Moody Bible Institute.

_____ 1994. *Biblical Demonology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications.

Valiquette H P 1999. Exodus – Deuteronomy as discourse: Models, Distancing, Provocation, Paraenesis. *JSOT* 85:47-70.

van der Woude A S (ed) 1989. *The World of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Vine W E 1996. *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words* (with topical index). London: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

'War': Unger M F 1988. *New Unger's Bible Dictionary* (rev and updated ed). Chicago: The Moody Bible Institute.

Watt P G 2011. God's judgement upon Egypt in Isaiah 19:1-15: its probable reasons and some implications for contemporary Africa (A thesis submitted for the degree of MTh at the SATS). *Conspectus* 2014-07-22.

Weedman M 2011. Augustine's *De Trinitate 5* and the problem of the Divine Names 'Father and Son'. *Theological Studies* 72:768-786.

Weeks L A 2010. *The Choice of War: The Iraq War and the Just War tradition*. Santa Barbara, California: Praeger Security International (an imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC).

Wells J B 2000. *God's Holy People: A Theme in Biblical Theology.* Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press Ltd.

Wright D F 1996. Hermeneutics. In *NDT,* by Sinclair B F, Wright F D, and Packer J I (eds), 680-81. Leicester, England: IVP.

Wright D P 1999. Holiness in Leviticus and beyond: differing perspectives. *Interpretation* 53:355-364.

_____ 1987. *The disposal of impurity. SBLDS* 101: Atlanta Scholars.

Wright J H C 2011. *The Mission of God: unlocking the Bible's grand narrative.* Norton Street, England: IVP.

_____ 2010. The Whole Church – A brief Biblical Survey in the whole gospel, the whole church, the whole people (A three-year project of The Lausanne Theology Working Group in collaboration with The World Evangelical Alliance Theological Commission, vol 2). In *Evangelical Review of Theology* 34/1, by Justin Thacker, 16-19. Great Britain: Paternoster.

_____ 2008. *The God I don't understand: Reflections on tough questions of faith.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

_____ 2006. *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's grand narrative.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

_____ 2004. *Old Testament ethics for the people of God* (a fully rev updated and integrated ed of *Living as the*

people of God and walking in the ways of the Lord). Leicester, England: IVP.

Yamoah J 2012. *Pacesetters of Divine Ministry: Let us learn from them.* Kumasi, Ghana: Classic Graphics.

_____ 2012. *Suffer to gain: How the righteous should overcome difficult times*. Kumasi, Ghana: Classic Graphics.

Zodhiates S 1996. Old Testament Lexical Aids: *Hesed. The Hebrew-Greek Key Study Bible*: *NIV*. Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers.

_____ 1996. Old Testament Lexical Aids: *Mahaneh*. *The Hebrew-Greek Key Study Bible*: *NIV*. Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Rev James Yamoah (PhD), Vice President and Lecturer of Old Testament and Biblical Hebrew of Ghana Christian Univ. College (GhanaCU), Accra, has since 1989 been in the teaching ministry. As ordained minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, he has travelled the length and breadth of Ghana preaching in many denominations and speaking at various Youth, Leadership, and Ministers' seminars and conferences. Affectionately called Rev Dr JY by his students, the authors married to Florence since 1991 and they are blessed with Jemima, Emmanuel and Joseph.

In this Volume One of the OD Series, ***Thus says the LORD: 'No Open Defecation, else…'***, he sets out the conceptualisations of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 to determine the motivations of the underpinning concepts of this law on **Open Defecation**. The discussions are geared towards unearthing the theological, ethical, and socio-cultural implications of this law for the world today. Dr Yamoah is also the author of the following under-listed books:

- *Always Ready: Over 150 Messages to Help you Study, Teach, Preach, & Live the Bible Systematically*
- *Pacesetters of Divine Ministry: Let us learn from them!*
- *Can You Be God's Transformational Leader? Yes You Can!*
- *Amazing Grace: A Guide to Spiritual Formation & Disciplines*
- *Suffer to Gain: How the Righteous should overcome Difficult Times*
- *A Model for Hebrew - English Translation and Application: The Biblical Hebrew Student's Companion*
- *Arise & Shine! Be a Youth with Vision and Mission*
- *A model for Old Testament Exegetical Dissertation*
- *"Holy War": The Consequence of Open Defecation*
- *Fellow Ghanaians, Let's Stop Open Defecation, else…*

All governments and their agencies, NGOs, Religious groups, especially, Christians, and the larger society, are encouraged to find application from the issues of Sanitation in this book. It is a must read; you definitely need a copy!

For further details please contact: 024 446 2843; jimmyamoah@yahoo.com