

구약논단

제 16권 3호(통권 37집) 2010년 9월 30일

Osumi Yuichi(Tokyo Union Theological Seminary) The Tacit Understanding of
Worship as Common Ground of Biblical Interpretation 70
구약성서가 어느 민족에게서나 발견되는 신화 모음이 아니라, 이스라엘 민족의 역사적
예언적 전승이다. 사람이 예배의 경험을 공유하게 되면 성서를 이해 할 수 있게 된다
(고전 14: 23-25). 문화-교차의 시대에서 난감하게 보일 수 밖에 없는 신명기 7장 같은
경우, 외부에서 객관적으로 이해하기는 어렵다. 다만 주님 앞에서만 이해 가능하다.

Osumi, Yuichi The Tacit Understanding of
Worship as Common Ground of Biblical Interpretation 70

The Tacit Understanding of Worship as a Common Ground of Biblical Interpretation

Yuichi Osumi

Tokyo Union Theological Seminary

It is a great pleasure to be one of the keynote speakers of this international conference in the Jubilee Year of the Korean Society of Old Testament Studies. I am a member of the Society for Old Testament Studies in Japan. This Japanese Society was established in 1933 as the first Japanese association for Christian studies, and therefore, is around twenty-five years older than the Korean. This age difference seems to correspond to the different beginnings of the Protestant missionary work in Japan(1859) and in Korea(1884), or the difference between the year when the Japanese translation of the Old Testament was completed(1888) and that of the Korean version of the Old Testament(1910). But needless to say, the history is more complicated. Decisive, I think, was that the interpretation of the Bible in Japan has been since the last fifteen years of the 19th century influenced by the historical critical method, which was in Korea, on the other hand, imported only by a few theologians in the 1930s and expanded after World War II.

1. The Old Testament in the Cross-Cultural World, Indigenous Testament?

Let me begin with a question; Is the ancestral testament of each people interchangeable with the Old Testament?¹⁾

In the mid-1880s, Japanese intellectuals, whether Christian or Anti-Christian, met with so-called higher criticism originating in the Tubingen School. This method made the Old Testament narrative nothing more than a myth, common to every people. Some Japanese preachers influenced by this higher criticism tried to identify the Japanese supreme god - namely the ancestor of Emperor Tenno - with the Tetragrammaton as the Creator.²⁾ As a result this kind of japanization of Old Testament religion went along with nationalism as well as expansionism by which the Meiji government (the modern Japanese government from 1868 until the end of the W. W. II 1945) would counter the colonialism of European and North-American countries.

1) Nitobe Inazo (1862-1933), a Japanese agricultural economist, educator, one of the first Undersecretaries General of the League of Nations, is a precursor to claim that each people has its original ethical code equivalent to the Old Testament. He was baptized in his youth by the Methodist Episcopal missionary, M. C. Harris, and became during his study in the U.S.A. a member of the Society of Friends (Quaker). He taught agricultural economics and colonial policy at Tokyo Imperial University. In teaching, he emphasized indigenous self-determination in colonial administration. In 1900, he published *Bushido: The Soul of Japan* (Philadelphia Pa: The Leeds & Biddle, 1900). He originally wrote it in English for Western readers. He was faced with Western criticism that the Japanese people had no moral education because they had no (Christian) religious instruction. Nitobe answered that Japanese ethics were embedded in Bushido, the unwritten code of moral principles which the knights (bushi or samurai) were required or instructed to observe (Nitobe, *Bushido*, repr. 1969, 4f.). He said in the preface of the book: I believe in the religion taught by Him [Jesus Christ] and handed down to us in the New Testament, as well as in the law written in the heart. Further I believe that God hath made a testament which may be called "old" with every people and nation --- Gentile or Jew, Christian or Heathen (Nitobe, *Bushido*, repr. 1969, XIV).

2) In English and Japanese translations of the Bible of those days the tetragrammaton was called Jehovah by misunderstanding of the Qere perpetuum. This name Jehovah impressed on Japanese people the Lord as one of the foreign deities. Japanese preachers who attempted to indigenize Christianity thought that it was needed to emphasize a relationship between the God of Israel and Japanese people. Also Jesus was a foreign name, but he was accepted as one of the worlds great sages, such as Confucius, Buddha or Socrates, not as the only Son of God.

The Japanese government itself, however, colonized Taiwan(1895), Korea(1910, just 100 years ago), Manchuria(1932) and other Pacific islands.

Japanese thinkers who took part in the formation of modern Japan were rationalists - Japanese thinking, from the start has affinity to rationalism and pragmatism - so that they criticized the Christian Bible as irrational myth, and at the same time, the government forbade the historical critical interpretation of ancient national records as well as archaeological excavation of the tumuli of ancient rulers, and then absolutized Japanese national religion.³⁾

There were in the Meiji Era of Japan also indigenous pastors who defended orthodoxy against the higher criticism. Uemura Masahisa(1857-1925), leader of the Japan Presbyterian Church, would set up in Japan a church, self-supporting and independent from the American Mission Board, based on an evangelical faith. He established Tokyo Shingakusha (now Tokyo Union Theological Seminary) in 1904, as the first seminary independently administered and financed by Japanese churches. He did not refuse discussion with the higher criticism but adhered to the faith based on the Apostles Creed. Although he himself was essentially nationalist, he accepted the historicity of Christ as the only Son of God, and the history of Israel as that of Gods People.⁴⁾

When the Society for Old Testament Study in Japan was established, most members were pastors. They wished to explain, what is historicity of the Old Testament narratives, and to answer to criticism from rationalism.

In Korea, on the other hand, the American Presbyterian missionaries adopted

3) For example, a Shintoist historian, Kume Kunitake (1839-1931), who was professor at Tokyo Imperial University, published a paper: Shinto wa saiten no kozoku (Shinto is an outmoded custom) in 1891. For this paper, in which he developed an allegorical interpretation of the myths, he was forced to resign from the university in 1892. The most famous critical historian Tsuda Sokichi (1873-1961) questioned the existence of the first fourteen emperors. His books were banned in 1940, the 2600th year of the Imperial reign, that the government forced whole nation also in colonies to celebrate. Cf. Brownlee, *Japanese historians*.

4) Uemura, who believed in Jesus Christ as the object of worship, criticized his contemporary, Ebina Danjo (1856-1937) for adoptionistic Christology. For Ebina, who was under the influence of Higher Criticism, Jesus was only a model of ethical life. He wished to unite with the person of Jesus, but to become a spiritual son of Father God. The controversy on Christology between Uemura and Ebina in 1901-2 is printed in Saba, *Uemura Masahisa Vol V*, 243-438.

the Nevius Plan. Emphasizing Bible study, preaching and church discipline, J. L. Nevius advised, that missionaries should develop programs and institutions that the indigenous church desired and could support, and the indigenous church should support its own pastors. The Gospel, that the Korean church received from the missionaries, released the people from the bondage of old ethical codes and guided the independence movement against Japan.

In Korea and Japan, therefore, the anti-colonialist, indigenous theology is not necessarily liberal, but rather traditional. The Old Testament must be nothing other than the Old Testament. God of Israel cannot be identified with national deities.

The one God is the one who rules the whole world, so he is open to all cultures and nations, but does not absolutize any culture. The prophet Isaiah says: "On that day Israel will be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, Whom the Lord of hosts has blessed, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my heritage (Isa 19: 25 NRSV). Israel is put in relativity as the third. But the historical Israel is the only heritage of the Lord. According to Amos: Are you not like the Ethiopians to me, O people of Israel? says the Lord. Did I not bring Israel up from the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Arameans from Kir (Amos 9: 7)? But you only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities (Amos 3: 2). God of Israel is the one God who is also God of Japan and of Korea. But Koreans and Japanese cannot substitute themselves for Israel.

The Old Testament is, according to Gerhard von Rad, not a collection of mythological ideas common to every nation, but Israel's historical and prophetic traditions. For him the history means a certain event or a series of events that occurred only one time. It cannot be repeated, but only recited and reinterpreted with narrative. The exodus and the entrance into the promised land occurred only once to Israel.⁵⁾

5) Von Rad says: The phenomenon which needs theological explanation is in fact this: the Old Testament does not supply Christianity just with single ideas but with whole catenas of statements (chiefly of a cultic and prophetic kind), whole texts, "h in which Christianity could,

2. The Language for Cross-Cultural Communication

On the theme given to the keynote papers: The Old Testament and Its Interpretation in the Cross-cultural World, I am going to call your attention to language as a basis of cross-cultural communication. The cross-cultural world is actually not multilingual, but ruled by the English language. In fact, we communicate in this international conference not in Korean, nor in Japanese, not even in Chinese, but in English. We can agree that the internet is the most valuable media for global communication. But we cannot use it without English. Most indigenous theologies are formulated and sent out to the world in English!

After over 200 years of national isolation, Japan re-opened in 1858, and many missionaries came into the country. The first Protestant missionaries were native speakers of English. They started their missionary work in China, then came to Japan and found that Japanese intellectuals could read Chinese literature, although the portion of intellectuals was very small. So they brought Chinese Bibles to Japan. But the most important work for missions was offering the Bible to people at large in their own language.

The Translation Committee, sponsored by the American Bible Society, British and Foreign Bible Society and the Scottish Bible Society in Tokyo, translated the New Testament from the Greek text and the Old Testament from the Hebrew referring to the King James Version or the Revised Version.

In the meeting of thanksgiving for the completion of the translation of the

and still does, find its own expression. Moreover, these Old Testament texts and statements are not completely isolated in their bearing on the New; they also refer back to their own Old Testament context, and the New Testament may therefore claim this vast range of reference also (von Rad, *Old Testament Theology vol II*, 352.). Also the creation belongs to the history:

The statements made about God as creator, particularly those in Genesis, seem to stand rather apart; nevertheless, they are closely allied to Israel's characteristic understanding of the world as it is expressed in the historical books and the prophets (ibid. 339). Facing the postcolonial question, what is the task of Old Testament theology, or, whether the historical approach to the Old Testament theology can be still effective, or no longer (Perdue, *The Collapse of History*, esp. 7-11, 45-68, idem, *Reconstructing Old Testament Theology*, 280-339), I would stand up for the claim that the Old Testament must be interpreted as history.

Bible on 3 February 1888, G. G. Cochran (Methodist missionary from Canada), the secretary of the Old Testament Translation Committee, summarized the meaning of translation of the Bible as follows:⁶⁾

The history of versions of Holy Scripture is interwoven with the history of the progress of the Kingdom of God. This is amply shown in the appearing of the more noted versions in important crisis of the providential history of mankind. When the canon of Old Testament Scripture was duly closed, and the living waters of Divine Revelation were about to burst beyond the narrow limits within which hitherto they had been long confined, all things were by the hand of Providence prepared and ready for the great event. The dispersion of the Hebrew people carrying with them their sacred writings amongst the nations round about; the diffusion of the Messianic hope, kindling afresh the desire of the nations to study it for themselves; the spread of the Greek language, the fittest medium of the time in literature and civilization; these gave the occasion and provided the channel for the great version of Holy Scripture, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, known as the Septuagint, which spread over many nations the dawn of an auspicious day, that quickly brightened into noon, as the Sun of Righteousness in the New Testament, flung the splendor of perfected revelation upon the world. Then as Christian evangelism moved outward in obedience to the divine command from Jerusalem, Judea, and Samaria toward the ends of the earth, the way of the gospel messenger was prepared by the Syriac versions in the East, and by the Latin versions in the West.

This summary of the history of versions presupposes the dominant position of the New Testament over the Old, and sees the Old Testament only as a preparation for the supreme revelation of the New Testament. This view is theologically problematic and needs to be reexamined.⁷⁾ But G. G. Cochran understood rightly that the Holy Scripture expects itself to be translated, and

6) Saba, *Uemura Masahisa Vol IV*, 128f.

7) Rendtorff, *The Canonical Hebrew Bible*, esp. 8-9. Van Ruler, *The Christian Church*, esp. 11-14.

that the Greek translation of the Holy Scripture provided the way to the appearance of the New Testament.

The Hebrew text itself is, in a certain sense, a translation of the Word of God. For the Greek-speaking Jews and the first Christians, Hebrew was a foreign language, and they read the translated Bible. But they found in the Greek text new meaning that the Hebrew text did not explicitly know. By translating the Bible into Greek, on the contrary, the Greek language gained new vocabulary and new style. The translation into each indigenous language gives new meaning to the text, and each language gains new vocabulary and new style.

The English language is one of the indigenous languages. But it ruled the world in the 19th century, and English-speaking missionaries were sent to many countries. They translated the Bible into each indigenous language referring to English translations and published from the English-speaking Bible Societies.

3. What Enabled People to Understand the Bible?

A few Japanese, who visited missionaries to learn English, became the first Protestant Christians in Japan. At that time, they had no knowledge of English. Christianity was for them only a banned religion. The contents of the Bible were not known. What did enable them to understand the text of the Bible?

In the above mentioned meeting of thanksgiving for the completion of the translation of the Bible, J. C. Hepburn as the chairman of the Translation Committee said:⁸⁾

Accordingly, after considerable correspondence, in the following year, 1884, a standing committee and a committee of three translators were appointed by an assembly of the native brethren. The translating committee consisted of Messrs. Matsuyama, Uemura, and Ibuka, but

8) Saba, *Uemura Masahisa Vol IV*, 123f..

owing to a want of support from the native churches, and other important duties pressing upon some of the members, and especially the want of acquaintance with the original text, the committee were not able to accomplish what they had hoped to do.

The missionaries spoke English and were able to read Greek and Hebrew. They also understood Chinese. But what was difficult for them was formulating Japanese texts. The Japanese assistants learned English from the missionaries and understood the written Chinese, but their knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew text was not sufficient.

In spite of those difficulties, they completed the translation and J. C. Hepburn said:⁹⁾

May I not also add that we have every reason to believe the pure native and single style and language of this sacred Book, so easily understood by the most unlearned, so chaste and free from Chinese and foreign terms, and read by the millions of this people, will have a powerful influence in preserving the native tongue in its purity,

Hepburn said further:

They have endeavoured to adhere faithfully and as literally as possible to the Hebrew original, desiring not only to give its true meaning, but also to retain the beautiful and instructive figurative language in which God has conveyed his mind to the children of man.¹⁰⁾

In what way did the Japanese assistants understand not only the meaning of words or ideas, but also the power of style in Hebrew texts? Why were the missionaries able to judge the language of Japanese translation as beautiful?

A saying of Paul is worthy of attention, namely 1 Corinthians 14: 23-25:

9) Saba, *Uemura Masahisa Vol IV*, 125.

10) Saba, *Uemura Masahisa Vol IV*, 126.

If, therefore, the whole church comes together and all speak in tongues, and outsiders or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are out of your mind? But if all prophesy, an unbeliever or outsider who enters is reproved by all and called to account by all. After the secrets of the unbelievers heart are disclosed, that person will bow down before God and worship him, declaring, God is really among you.

Most commentators compare speaking in tongues with the intelligible speaking of prophecy. But Paul did not say that the prophesying is the effective art of persuasion. An outsider or unbeliever is not reproved by the prophesying of each speaker, but he takes part in the gathering of the whole church and shares the experience of worship with all partakers, namely with the whole church. Paul required people to prophesy in the assembly for building up of the church (14: 12). Most partakers cannot tell explicitly what the experience of worship is, but can only bow down before God. This tacit understanding of worship is, I think, common ground for Biblical interpretation.¹¹⁾

When a few Japanese young persons visited the first Protestant missionaries to learn English, the missionaries taught them to pray together. The Japanese pupils prayed in clumsy English with the missionaries. They gathered on Sunday to hear sermons by the missionaries. In this experience of worship, they understood tacitly, to whom, for what they were allowed to pray, how merciful and truthful the Lord was. Naturally, we are not free from misunderstanding, and the experience of worship is often innovated. But we can recognize that the praised is the same Lord, and can correct our misunderstanding. Because

11) In understanding of this common experience of worship, I took a hint from the concept of the tacit knowing by Michael Polanyi. He discussed the process of scientific discovery (not about sharing the faith!) by starting from the fact that we can know more than we can tell (Polanyi, *The Tacit Dimension*, repr. 2009, 4), and said: Scientific tradition derives its capacity for self-renewal from its belief in the presence of a hidden reality, of which current science is one aspect, while other aspects of it are to be revealed by future discoveries (idem 82).

the ability of translation is based on this tacit understanding and innovation of understanding of worship, the history of translation of the Bible must be the history of revision.

4. A Case Study: Deuteronomy Ch. 7

As a case study today, I will read Deuteronomy 7. This is a disturbing text in the cross-cultural era. Interpreters will often judge the Lord from an ethical standpoint. This text, however, cannot be understood objectively from the outside.

The stumbling block is laid in the first five verses :

1. When the Lord your God brings you into the land that you are about to enter and occupy, and he clears away many nations before you the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations mightier and more numerous than you
2. and when the Lord your God gives them over to you and you defeat them, then you must utterly destroy them. Make no covenant with them and show them no mercy.
3. Do not intermarry with them, giving your daughters to their sons or taking their daughters for your sons,
4. for that would turn away your children from following me, to serve other gods. Then the anger of the Lord would be kindled against you, and he would destroy you quickly.
5. But this is how you must deal with them: break down their altars, smash their pillars, hew down their sacred poles, and burn their idols with fire.

In the cross-cultural world today, only a few commentators see in this chapter justification of the holy war, colonialism or genocide. Even if there are many people who will justify total destruction of their enemies, but they do it actually without a Biblical basis. To remove the stumbling block from this passage, we may see that there is in Deuteronomy 7 no historical reality. The

Deteronomist's instructions were written at a time when Israel was no longer a conqueror, but small oppressed nation.

In the book of Joshua, on the other hand, Joshua executed the instructions of Deut 7:

Joshua took Makkedah on that day, and struck it and its king with the edge of the sword; he utterly destroyed every person in it; he left no one remaining. And he did to the king of Makkedah as he had done to the king of Jericho (Josh 10: 28).

But we can say that Joshua 9 and Judges 1 are nearer to historical reality than Joshua 10-19. In Joshua 9, Joshua said to the inhabitants of Gibeon:

Now therefore you are cursed, and some of you shall always be slaves, hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God. They answered Joshua, Because it was told to your servants for a certainty that the Lord your God had commanded his servant Moses to give you all the land, and to destroy all the inhabitants of the land before you; so we were in great fear for our lives because of you, and did this thing (Josh 9: 23-24).

And according to the historical summary Judg 1, Israel did not drive out the inhabitants of the land:

But the people of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites who dwelt in Jerusalem; so the Jebusites have dwelt with the people of Benjamin in Jerusalem to this day (Judg 1: 21).

Furthermore, the commandment Deut 7: 3 forbids intermarriage with surrounding people, it can be assumed that these peoples would still be around to intermarry with.

The problem, however, is not whether Israel in reality destroyed inhabitants utterly without mercy, but whether the Lord commanded genocide.

Deuteronomy introduces this God with his proper name and the title your God. The name YHWH (tetragrammaton) manifests his presence. All tasks have to be done before the presence of God (coram Deo).

The title your God, on the other hand, expresses the covenantal relationship between the Lord and Israel. The Lord makes the covenant with Israel: the Lord will be the God of Israel and Israel will be the people of the Lord (see especially Deut 26: 17-19). The Lord defines himself in the relationship with his people Israel. Israel, on the other hand, is defined only in the relationship with the Lord. This communicative definition of the Lord and Israel is a presupposition for understanding this chapter. Only Israel, properly as the people of the Lord, must obey these commandments literally.

In the Structure of the book of Deuteronomy, 5: 1ag - 10: 11 show the history of making the first covenant and of the breaking and renewal of it at Horeb(9: 7 - 10: 11), and give a frame to the exhortations(6: 1 - 9: 6). In this section of exhortations we find also historical review repeatedly motivating the people to obey the commandments(6: 12, 16, 20-25; 7: 7-8, 18-19; 8: 2-5, 14-16), by calling attention: "do not forget!" in 6: 12; 8: 14, and "remember!" in 7: 18; 8: 2(see 9: 7: "remember and do not forget!").

Deuteronomy 7: 18 says:

Do not be afraid of them. Just remember what the Lord your God did to Pharaoh and to all Egypt.

In this literary context, The text of Deut 7: 1-26 is constructed chiasmically as showed in the following: ¹²⁾

[A] The commandment not to allow influences of the inhabitants of the land to remain (vv.1-6) - "you shall utterly destroy them..and show them no mercy" (v.2b)

[B] The Lord is the faithful God who maintains covenant loyalty

12) On the structure of Deut 7, see Osumi, Deuteronomy, in *The International Bible Commentary* (ed. Farmer et al.), 499.

(v.9b)

[C] The Lord repays in their own person those who reject Him (v.10a)

[C]The Lord repays in their own person those who reject Him (v.10b)

[D] Observe the commandment, statutes and ordinances that "I am commanding you today" (V.11)

[B] The Lord will maintain covenant loyalty (v.12b)

[A] The commandment not to allow influences of the inhabitants of the land to remain (vv.16-26) - "you shall devour all the peoples...show them no pity" (v.16a)

Between the commandments [A]-[A], historical review motivating the people to obey the commandments is put [B]-[B]. In this review, Israel stands before the Lord, who will maintain covenant loyalty [C]-[C]. The principle is to observe the revealed law of God (v.11 [D]), not the extermination of other nations. To observe the law is the same as not to remain under the influence of the inhabitants of the land and their gods (vv.1-6, 16-26). Israel is a people holy to the Lord, namely his chosen, treasured possession (v.6, cf. Exod 19: 5f.).

The habits of worship which seven nations as inhabitants of the land, namely the altar in their own style, the pillar of stone which was accepted also in Israel in the past (Gen 28: 18, 35: 14), "asherim (the plural form of "Asherah", a wooden pole usually planted beside the altar: see Deut 16: 21), seemed good for asking a divine favour and had to be destroyed (v.5).

V.2 itself does not command to exterminate them literally but prohibits them to live in Israel as the Hittites, the Gergashites and so on in their own way (see Exod 34: 12-15). The Lord will drive them away from the land often without warfare (vv.20-24).¹³⁾ So, do not be afraid of them, even if they seem stronger than you, and remember what the Lord did to Pharaoh (vv.17-19, see 1: 29-31 and cf. 8:2).

13) See Exod 23:27-31 and the comments by Moshe Weinfeld. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 362, 364f., 380-382, 382-384.

We were not elected because of our greatness but because of the Lord's loyalty to the covenant (vv.7-8a). But according to Josha 9, it was Josha, who disobeyed this commandment and did not drive out the inhabitants of the land. Joshua and the leaders of Israel did not ask direction from the Lord. They should as the people of the Lord stand before him and ask.

Within the text of Dut 7, I find myself as an interpreter before the Lord who himself will maintain covenant loyalty (v.12b). Before the Lord it is clear that Israel (and we also) were not elected because of our greatness but only because of the Lord's loyalty to the covenant (vv.7-8a).

Bibliography

- Brownlee, J. S., *Japanese historians and the national myths, 1600-1945: The Age of the Gods and Emperor Jimmu*, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia and Tokyo: University of Tokyo, 1997).
- Nitobe, I., *Bushido: The Soul of Japan, An Exposition of Japanese Thought*, Revised Edition, (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905. Repr., Rutland VT and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1969).
- Osumi, Yuichi, Deuteronomy, pages 488-516 in *The International Bible Commentary: A Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by William R. Farmer et al., (Collegeville, Minn: The Liturgical Press, 1998).
- Perdue, L. G., *The Collapse of History: Reconstructing Old Testament Theology*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994).
- _____, *Reconstructing Old Testament Theology: After the Collapse of History*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005).
- Polanyi, Michael. *The Tacit Dimension*. New York: Doubleday, 1966. Reprinted with a new foreword by Amartya Sen, (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago, 2009).
- Von Rad, G., *Old Testament Theology. Volume II: The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker, (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965).
- Rendtorff, R., *The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Orton, (Leiden: Deo, 2005).
- Van Ruler, Arnold A., *The Christian Church and the Old Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971).

Saba, W., *Uemura Masahisa to sono jidai (Uemura Masahisa and His Era)*
Vols I-V and 3 Supplements, (Tokyo: Kyobunkwan, 1937-43, 1976).
Weinfeld, M., *Deuteronomy 1-11*, Anchor Bible 5, (New York: Doubleday,
1991).

Key word

Historicity

Indigeneity

Translation

Tacit-understanding

Worship

투고일: 2010년 7월 1일

심사일: 2010년 7월 15일

게재확정일: 2010년 8월 1일

