Stellenbosch Theological Journal 2019, Vol 5, No 3, 541–559
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17570/stj.2019.v5n3.a25
Online ISSN 2413-9467 | Print ISSN 2413-9459

The two similar but different motivations: "you were a slave in Egypt" and "you were the גר in Egypt"

Onishi, Yoshitsugu
University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa
Onishi.yoshitsugu@gmail.com

Abstract

In the Pentateuchal law, the two similar motive clauses appear: "you were a slave in Egypt" and "you were the גר in Egypt." Both are attached to the laws addressed to the Israelites for the protection of the גר. They show YHWH's desire that the Israelites should protect the גר with an inward understanding of the intention of the law and the appropriate motivation. These two motive clauses are similar and can easily be considered as the same. But they are quite different. They belong to the different traditions. They refer to the separate periods and the different memories. Their functions are different. They motivate the Israelites to protect the different ranges of people. This study demonstrates their clear differences.

Keywords

גר*; sojourner; resident alien; immigrant; motive clause; Pentateuchal law*

1. The two similar motive clauses which belong to different traditions

In Pentateuchal Law, the two similar motive clauses appear: "you were a slave in Egypt" (Egypt-עבד) and "you were the גר in Egypt" (Egypt-גר). Both are attached to the laws addressed to the Israelites for the protection of the גר.[1] These two motive clauses are characteristic of the laws concerning the

1 Ramírez Kidd groups the references to the גר in the Pentateuchal Law by the functions of the laws which refer to the גר. His grouping helps us to understand the intention and function of the laws. He divides the references to the גר in the laws of the Pentateuch into two groups: (1) laws addressed to the Israelites for the protection of the גר, and (2) laws compulsory for both Israelite and the גר, in order to preserve the holiness of the community (Ramírez Kidd 1999:130).

גר. These motive clauses show YHWH's desire that the Israelites should protect the גר with an inward understanding of the intention of the law and the appropriate motivation (cf. Von Rad 1975:198; Chirichigno 1981:312). This kind of the motive clause seems to be unique among the Ancient Near Eastern laws (Sonsino 1980:224).[2]

Among the group of the laws addressed to the Israelites for the protection of the גר, four of them have the Egypt-עבד motive clause, and five of them have the Egypt-גר motive clause. They look similar, but this article will show that they belong to different traditions.[3]

The Egypt-עבד motive clauses (Deut. 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18; and 24:22) occur only in the book of Deuteronomy. And except for Deut. 15:15[4], all occur with the laws for the protection of the גר. The verb "זכר" (remember), and the verb "היה" in second person singular are always used. The noun "פרץ" is used in two of them (Deut. 5:15; 24:22) but not used in the rest (Deut. 16:12; 24:18). The difference between these four occurrences is only the use of "ארץ". This very close similarity lets us infer that the same tradition was in each writers/composers' mind.

The Egypt-גר motive clauses occur in three books of the Pentateuch (Exod. 22:20 [21 in English translation]; 23:9; Lev. 19:34; and Deut. 10:19; 23:8 [7]). All are in the law codes in the different books (Covenant Code, Holiness Code, and Deuteronomic Code) except for Deut. 10:19. None of them use the verb "זכר" (remember), but all of them use the preposition "כי" (because). Exactly the same phrase "כי גרים הייתם בארץ מצרים" is used in four of them (Exod. 22:20; 23:9; Lev. 19:34; and Deut. 10:19)[5]. These closely

---

2 Laws of Hammurabi and Middle Assyrian Laws have the motive clauses, but they are all "repetitive" (they simply repeat a key element within the law and underline it as the motive of the law), and are "formulated impersonally, totally lacking the second person address" (Sonsino 1980:224). In this sense, these motive clauses attached to the laws for the protection of the גר show the uniqueness of the Israelite laws in the Ancient Near Eastern world.

3 In this article, "tradition" is defined as a group of sources or editing of the Biblical texts, which express its theological idea or point of view. Each tradition probably reflects its historical background or the concerns of the writers/composers.

4 This motive clause in Deut. 15:15 appears with the law for the protection of Hebrew slaves.

5 The motive clause in Deut. 23:8 is "כי גר היית בארצו" (because you were גר (singular) in his land). However, "his land" is apparently Egypt.

similar phrases imply that the writers/composers of the Egypt-גר motive clauses used the same tradition, and the differences from the Egypt-עבד motive clause imply that this tradition was different from the one used in the Egypt-עבד motive clauses.

This study will show that, first, these two motive clauses refer to two separate periods and two different memories. Second, depending on this distinction, they have the two different functions. And thirdly this study will demonstrate the different ranges of people which these two motive clauses motivate the Israelites to protect: the Egypt-עבד motive clause for poor people in general, and the Egypt-גר motive clause for the sojourners specific.

2. The two separate periods[6] and the two different memories

Ramírez Kidd shows that the Egypt-עבד motive clause and the Egypt-גר motive clause use traditions distinct from each other (Ramírez Kidd 1999:86-93). According to Ramírez Kidd, the Egypt-גר motive clause refers to a positive idea of Israel's initial sojourning in Egypt, and the Egypt-עבד motive clause refers to a later negative experience oppressed as slaves in Egypt. He finds that the two separate moments in Israel's overview of the history: initial sojourning in Gen 15:13a, and later oppression in 15:13b; initial sojourning in Deut. 26:5, and later oppression in 26:6a. He concludes "The motive clauses Egypt-עבד and "Egypt-גר" do not represent, then, two different interpretations of the same event but refer to two different stages of Israel's past." (Ramírez Kidd 1999:93).

Nelson seems to accept this view (Nelson 2002:278). But he does not distinguish the two periods in his comment on Deut. 26:5-6 (Nelson 2002:308). Brueggemann distinguishes the themes in v. 5 and vv. 6-8. The theme in v. 5 is that the providential power of YHWH transformed Jacob's situation of risk ("wandering") to one of profound well-being ("became a nation, great, mighty and populous"). The theme in vv. 6-8 is the Exodus (Brueggemann 2001:246). In addition, grammatically the first person

6 The periods discussed here is not that of historical criticism which pursues "the world behind the text." But the discussion here is about the biblical portrayal of history, which is the understanding of the canonical text, which shows "the world in the text" (cf. Brueggemann 1997:57).

singular and the third person singular ("my father") in v. 5 change into the first-person plural ("us") in vv. 6f. Therefore, Deuteronomy seems to distinguish the two periods of Israel in vv. 5-6.

Awabdy also agrees with Ramírez Kidd that the two motive clauses refer to different stages of Israel's history (Awabdy 2012:144-185). He shows the distinction between Gen. 45-Exod. 1:5 and Exod. 1:8/9-12:51. The verb גור is used for the life from Abraham's family to Jacob's (Gen. 12:10; 20:1; 21:23, 21:34, 19:9, 26:3; 32:5; 35:27; 37:1; and 47:9). These גור activities in Canaan are collectively recalled in Exod. 6:4. And in Gen. 47:4, Joseph's brothers refer to their גור activities in Egypt. In Exod. 1:9-12:51, the verbal form גור or nominal form גר are not used for Israel's residence in Egypt. As for the root עבד, it is never used of Jacob's family in Egypt as forced labourers, but only as a self-appellative in deference to the Pharaoh (Gen. 46:34; 47:3, 4). The first portrait of Israel's ancestors as עבדים, with the negative connotation of forced labourers, occurs in Exod. 1:13. At that point, "the Pentateuchal language is consistent in marking a fundamental status transition from גר (גור) to פבד." (Awabdy 2012:147).

Other evidence which shows that the two separate periods can be added[7]. Some scholars construe that the Egypt-גר motive clause in Lev. 19:33-34 recalls Israel's exploited and persecuted experience in Egypt (Gerstenberger 1996:279-280; Milgrom 2004:182). But Joosten carefully distinguishes the sojourning described here from the slavery condition of Israel in Egypt described elsewhere in the Holiness Code (Lev. 26:13; cf. 25:42, 55), and infers that the author has taken this clause from the Israelite legal tradition (Exod. 22:20; 23:9; Deut. 10:19) or has employed his own conception of Israel's being גרים with YHWH (25:23) (Joosten 1996:59-60). In addition, he indicates that the גר in Israel in vv. 33-34 must be taken in its usual sense of sojourner, and he says, "It is not likely that the same term would carry different meanings in the law-text and in the motive clause" (Joosten 1996:61-62). Therefore it is plausible to construe that the Egypt-גר motive clause in v. 34 reminds the Israelites of the sojourning (not slavery)

7 In general, it is agreed that the Egypt-עבד motive clause refers to Israel's persecuted period in Egypt. For example, Miller mentions that the background of the Egypt-עבד motive clause with YHWH's deliverance in the Fourth Commandment is Israel's own experience as recorded in Exodus 5 (Miller 2009:130).

experience in the period of their initial sojourning in Egypt. The same word "גר" lets the Israelites identify themselves in their sojourning as the גר/גרים in Egypt with the גר in their land Israel and motivates them to "love" the גר with concrete help.

The context in which the Egypt-גר motive clause in Deut. 10:19 is included also shows that the Egypt-גר motive clause indicates Israel's initial sojourning in Egypt. The language of the motivations in this section (10:12-11:32) can be divided into hymnic theology (10:14, 17-18, 21a), lessons from history (10:15, 19b, 21b-22; 11:2-7), and references to the land (11:8b-9, 10-12, 14-15, 17, 21, 23-25). The historical motivations fall into roughly chronological order (Nelson 2002:132-133). This chronological order matches the historical confession in Deut. 26:5-9 in which Ramírez Kidd finds the two separate periods of Egypt-גר and Egypt-עבד (Ramírez Kidd 1999:92; 2.1). In addition, the enumeration of the historical events in 10:12-11:32 omits what happened at Sinai the same as that in 26:5-9 (Von Rad 1966:159). And both of them have the common expressions: "mighty hand" and "stretched arm" (11:3; 26:8); "a land flowing with milk and honey" (11:9; 26:9). According to this chronological order in 10:12-11:32, the phrase "you were the גרים in the land of Egypt" in 10:19 is placed in the sojourning period of a small number in Egypt before the Israelites were oppressed as עבד (slave). The oppression of Israel in Egypt started after Israel got to be numerous (10:22). This supports the periodical distinction. The Egypt-גר motive clause in 10:19 is used to remind the Israelite of the period of Israel's initial sojourning in Egypt, but not of the period of Israel's עבד experience in Egypt.

The form of the Egypt-גר motive clause in Deut. 23:8 is different from the rest of the Egypt-גר motive clauses. It motivates the Israelites not to abhor an Egyptian (not the גר in general). There seems to be a consensus among scholars that the Egypt-גר motive clause in v. 8 indicates the period of sojourning by Jacob's family in Egypt in Joseph's story (Miller 1990:176; Wright 1996:248; Ramírez Kidd 1999:86-93; Brueggemann 2001:228; Nelson 2002:278). In spite of their memory of "the abusiveness of Pharaoh" (Brueggemann 2001:228) and "the oppression of the later years of their experience in Egypt" (Wright 1996:248), the writers/composers used the

Egypt-גר motive clause to remind the Israelites of their initial sojourning period in Egypt.[8]

3. The two different functions

The distinct memories of these two motive clauses of the Egypt-עבד and Egypt-גר produces the two different functions.

3.1. The function of the Egypt-עבד motive clause

Bennett regards the Egypt-עבד motive clause as a threat of becoming enslaved again. He says, "It is possible to interpret the reference to deliverance as a veiled threat of renewed enslavement." (Bennett 2002:96). Supposing that this clause, all of whose occurrences are in the book of Deuteronomy, was written/composed in the period of King Josiah or later, the threat of Assyria or Babylon might be behind it, although Bennett's dating of the laws with the גר-orphan-widow triad is ninth century BCE during the Omride administration in the Northern Kingdom. And the interpretation as a threat can harmonize with the warning of the blessing-or-curse in the canonical edition of Deuteronomy 28-30.

But Ramírez Kidd interprets that the Egypt-עבד motive clause motivates the Israelites with gratitude for deliverance from Egypt by YHWH. "The principle behind these commands is that of gratitude: the memory of the salvific acts of Yahweh in history, what Yahweh has done for Israel." (Ramírez Kidd 1999:89).

Awabdy, however, indicates that two of the five instances of the Egypt-עבד motive clause mention nothing of YHWH's redemption from Egypt (Awabdy 2012:169). He divides the laws with the Egypt-עבד motive clause into two groups: (1) עבד-Egypt formula mentioning YHWH's redemption (Deut. 5:15; 15:15; 24:18), (2) עבד-Egypt formula alone (Deut. 16:12; 24:22). The motive clauses in the first group suggest "a principle of *imitatio dei* with gratitude." (Awabdy 2012:172). He says, "YHWH redeemed Israel from exploitation, therefore Israel must redeem others from the same by: promoting rest for one's workers on the Sabbath (5:12-15), furnishing one's

8 The parallel of "because he is your brother" and "because you were a גר in his land" also supports that the Egypt-גר motive clause uses the positive memory.

Hebrew slaves with abundant provisions upon their release (15:12-15), and promoting justice for the גר, orphan, and widow (24:17-18)." Both laws of the second group enjoin the Israelite landowner to provide food for the גר-orphan-widow triad in the context of the feast of Shavuot and gleaning provisions. In this group of the laws, Awabdy sees "an inversion principle: the memory of intensive labour for food in Egypt was to be inverted by Israel's landowners when they give away food to those who have not worked for it." (Awabdy 2012:172).

But, as Awabdy argues, Egypt-עבד motive clauses that do not mention YHWH's redemption only occur in the laws concerning the harvest and food provision to people (Deut. 16:11-12; 24:19-21). These laws do not order stopping/preventing oppression or mistreatment. The clause of YHWH's redemption from Egypt is mentioned in Deut. 24:18 but not mentioned in v. 22 although they are placed closely. This difference is probably related to the difference between the contents of the laws. In v. 17 to which the Egypt-עבדmotive clause mentioning YHWH's redemption is directly connected, the mistreatment against the גר, orphan, and widow is prohibited. This kind of mistreatment easily happens in society. The Egypt-עבד motive clause mentioning YHWH's redemption not only reminds the Israelites of their historical experience of mistreatment in Egypt, but also reminds them that YHWH redeemed them from there and stopped the mistreatment and oppression. Through being reminded of this historical experience, the Israelite is prompted to obey the laws which prohibit mistreating vulnerable people. On the other hand, the laws in vv. 19-21 provide food to typical landless people: the גר, the orphan, and the widow, who cannot get food from their own lands. Empathy for these people in a vulnerable condition, engendered by the Egypt-עבד motive clause, is effective in prompting the Israelite to obey these food-providing laws, but there is no mistreatment nor oppression from which such vulnerable people must be delivered by these laws. Therefore, offering a reminder of the Lord's redemption from Egyptian oppression is inappropriate in the laws concerning the harvest and food provision. It shows that the difference between (1) עבד-Egypt formula mentioning YHWH's redemption and (2) עבד-Egypt formula alone is not in the functions of these formula themselves. Rather, it depends on the contents of the laws which these formulae motivate.

These three scholars suggest three different functions of the Egypt-עבד motive clause: a veiled threat of renewed enslavement, gratitude for deliverance from Egypt by YHWH, and an inversion principle against intensive labour in Egypt. It seems difficult to determine the exclusive function of this motive clause. The functions can alter depending on the readers' situation whether they are in crisis or peace. For example, if readers are in crisis, the Egypt-עבד motive clause can function as a thread of enslavement. But in peace, it can function to prompt gratitude. It is, therefore, appropriate to understand that the basic function of the Egypt-עבד motive clause is a reminder of the Israelites' historical experience of difficulty as עבד in Egypt as it is taken at face value.

3.2. The function of the Egypt-גר motive clause

Ramírez Kidd regards the life of Israel as the גר in Egypt positively, and interprets the Egypt-גר motive clause as motivating the Israelite with a principle of reciprocity: do to the גר the good things which others have done for Israel (Ramírez Kidd 1999:89-90).

Awabdy does not see that Israel's גר experience in Egypt was simply positive. He indicates that the phrase "you know the life (נפש) of the גר" in Exod. 23:9, which is followed by the Egypt-גר motive clause, is not completely negative (Awabdy 2012:163). If the experience of the גר was completely negative, the noun "לחץ" (oppression), which describes Israel's experience as עבד in Egypt (Exod. 3:9; Deut. 26:7), could be used here. By using "נפש" here, Awabdy suggests, "what is meant is the feeling of life as non-indigenous residents dependent on the good will of those in power." (Awabdy 2012:163). He also says, "The Patriarchs' גור experiences were not inherently negative (or positive) but depended on how they were treated by indigenous leaders (cf. Gen 19:9 and 21:32-34; 23:4)." (Awabdy 2012:145; also, Ruppert 1997:157). It is plausible that the Egypt-גר motive clause intends to remind the Israelites of the unstable life of the גר experience of their ancestors whose lives were dependent on the good will of the indigenous people.

Actually, the verb "לחץ" (oppress), which is from the same root as that of the noun "לחץ" (oppression), is used twice as one of the main verbs in the laws with the Egypt-גר motive clause (Exod. 22:20; 23:9). This word is used for the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt in Exod. 3:9 (verb and noun) and of the historical Creed in Deut. 26:7 (noun) (Lohfink 1991:42; Sprinkle

1994:169), which are strong reminders of Israel's negative experience as עבד in Egypt as Awabdy indicates (Awabdy 2012:163). The word "לחץ" (oppress) in Exod. 22:20 and 23:9 is used in the main clause of the command "do not oppress (לחץ) the גר," which connects the גר and the word "לחץ." In addition, in the canonical context, every member of the Israelite nation hearing these words had been in the situation of aliens in Egypt only months prior (Stuart 2006:516). Therefore, it is impossible to separate the Egypt-גר motive clause from Israel's experience as עבד in Egypt completely.

Israel knew the initial peaceful sojourning had changed into the slavery experience by the indigenous Egyptians' oppression (Exod. 1:1-14; Deut. 26:5-6). Sojourners' lives were unsettled and easily changed by the attitude of the indigenous people. Therefore the function of the Egypt-גר motive clause is to remind the Israelites of their peaceful initial sojourning kept by the indigenous Egyptians' hospitality and the loss of it by the indigenous Egyptians' oppression, and urge them to show hospitality to the גר including sojourning Egyptians (cf. Deut. 23:8) as the indigenous people whose attitude can drastically change the life of the גר. In other words, this motive clause prohibits following the example of the indigenous Egyptians who changed their attitude negatively (not reciprocity).[9]

4. The two different ranges of people

Another difference between the two motive clauses of the Egypt-עבד and the Egypt-גר is the ranges of people who the Israelites are motivated to protect.

---

9 Sneed uses the term "the golden rule" to explain the mores of Exod. 22:20-22. He says, "if they oppress a stranger, they would be no better than their arch-enemies the Egyptians." (Sneed 1999:502). Kelly also uses the term "the Golden Rule." He comments on Exod. 22:20 and 23:9, "The kind of ethical thinking behind this legislation belongs to the stream of tradition known as the Golden Rule, which appears in the NT (Mt 7:12; Lk 6:31)" (Kelly 2013:162). The Golden Rule, "whatever you wish that others would do to you, do also to them," (Mt. 7:12), lets us reflect on our experiences and motivates us to do good things for them, whether our experiences are positive or negative. It is so wide principle which can be easily applied to the functions of both the motive clauses of the Egypt-עבד and the Egypt-גר. But it is not suitable for distinguishing the slight difference between the two motive clauses.

4.1. The range of the Egypt-דדד motive clause

Awabdy indicates the difference between the Israelites' עבד status in Egypt and the עבד status in the Israelite society. He says, "Israelites in Egypt were never slaves proper, but forced government labourers probably composed of various subclasses." (Awabdy 2012:169). He suggests that this broadness of the Israelites' עבד status in Egypt broadens the beneficiaries of the Egypt-עבד motive clause.

> The Hebrews' עבד status in Egypt as conscripted builders was much broader than a *paterfamilias'* עבד "male slave" or אמה "female slave," so D's עבד-Egypt formula impels observance of commands that integrate or assist not merely foreign slaves proper, but various groupings of *personae miserae*: *bêt-'āb* workers and non-*bêt-'āb* working גר (5:14-15); liberated Hebrew slaves (15:15); triad גר-orphan-widow alone (24:22) or among other vulnerable persons (16:12); and the גר-orphan dyad with the widow (24:18). (Awabdy 2012:169-170)

Therefore, the Egypt-עבד motive clause is not only for the גר or the עבד but for all the oppressed people mentioned in the relevant laws. This can be demonstrated in all the appearance of the Egypt-עבד motive clause (Deut. 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18; and 24:22) as follows.

Deut. 5:15 Deut. 5:15 is in the Decalogue. This Commandment on the Sabbath has remarkable differences from that in Exodus 20:8-11. One of the differences is the addition of the phrase, "in order that your male slave and your female slave may rest as well as you." This addition emphasizes that this commandment is not only for the Israelite house holder himself to rest but also for the people who work for him to rest (Thomson 2014:62; Miller 2009:126, 129). "[A]t issue is the "rest" – the well-being – of even the lowest social classes" (Cook 2015:65). In other words, it is for protection of the people in a weak status.

Another difference from the Commandment in Exodus is the replacement of the motivation of the creation to that of the historical memory of slavery in Egypt and deliverance from there by the Lord. "[T]he grounding of the sabbath is no longer in creation but in the Exodus" (Brueggemann 2001:68). Combined with the difference mentioned above, this motive clause does not motivate the Israelite himself to rest on the Sabbath day, but motivates

him to have sympathy with his male slaves, his female slaves, and the גר, and compels him to let them rest. It is quite different from the case in which the creation motive clause is attached to this Sabbath commandment. The creation motive clause motivates the Israelite (and everyone) to imitate the Lord and to rest as He rested (Miller 2009:124). By this replacement of the motive clause, therefore, the emphasis was shifted from imitation of the Lord to sympathy toward the weak through their historical memory.

Cook believes that this motive clause in Deut. 5:15 compels empathy with slaves (not with גר) (Cook 2015:65). Although it is placed directly after the phrase "in order that your male slave and your female slave may rest like you," the reference to this motive clause should not be limited only to male and female slaves. As Awabdy rightly indicates, Israelites in Egypt were "forced government laborers probably composed of various subclasses" (Awabdy 2012:169), and different from the slaves in Israel society. And the intention of the fourth commandment is providing rest to all – no matter the social class (slave, alien), gender (son or daughter, male or female slave), or even species (domestic animal) (Nelson 2002:83). The motive clause of Egypt-עבד with the deliverance from there is "closely related to the concern for providing rest for those unable to secure it for themselves and liable to excessive and oppressive labor." (Miller 2009:129). Therefore, the motive clause in v. 15 should be applied to all the people (except "you") in the list in v. 14 in order to prompt sympathy with these laborers and to provide rest to them.

The range of the Egypt-עבד motive clause in Deut. 5:15 is, therefore, not only for the גר in v. 14. It compels the Israelite householder to have sympathy with all the labourers (including even domestic animals) by the historical memory of Israel's heavy labour in Egypt. The memory of YHWH's deliverance from heavy labour in Egypt, urges the Israelite householder to follow YHWH and to provide rest to labourers in his/her house. The גר is also one of the labourers who engages in labour under the control of the Israelite householder as the suffix "your" attached to גר suggests (Nelson 2002:83). The גר should be protected by receiving rest as one of the labourers.

Deut. 15:15 The Egypt-עבד motive clause is used in the law in Deut. 15:12-15 which protects the Hebrew slave as one of the vulnerable people. The

motive clause in Deut. 15:15 mentions YHWH's redemption. It reminds Israelites of YHWH's redemption from Egypt and motivate them to liberate the oppressed. This motive clause in 15:15 apparently does not focus on the גר because this law does not mention the גר.

Deut. 16:12 Deut. 16:12 is in the regulations of the Feast of Weeks. This Feast is a celebration of the harvest at the conclusion of the grain harvest in early summer (Christensen 2001:344). The same celebration is termed "Harvest Festival" in Exod. 23:16 (Brueggemann 2001:174; Nelson 2002:208). Differing from the regulations in Exodus, the regulations here include a list of the participants in the rejoicing celebration in v. 11: you, your son, your daughter, your male slave, your female slave, the Levite who is in your gate, the גר, the orphan, and the widow who are among you. The list is similar to the one in Deut. 5:14 though the latter includes animals and omits the Levite, the orphan, and the widow. The difference shows the character of each list: the list in Deut. 5:14 contains the labourers under the control of the Israelite land owner, and the one in Deut. 16:11 contains people in the Israelite land owner's household and people who have no land in his/her town (cf. Brueggemann 2001:174). At the same time, the similarity of these two lists shows the similar intention to include equally all people who should receive "rest" (Deut. 5:14) and who should join the celebration (Deut. 16:11). Another similar list is also in the regulations of the Feast of Booths (Deut. 16:14). The repetition of nearly identical lists may emphasize the participants in the joyfully celebrating community (Nelson 2002:204). Lohfink says, "When the Levites, the strangers, the orphans, and the widows celebrated the feast of Tabernacles in the community of an Israelite neighbour family, it was not just a question of eating and drinking, but above all of full participation in Israel's joy." (Lohfink 1991:48).

Nelson indicates that the two Feasts of Weeks and Booths in Deuteronomy are "liturgically thin, deritualized and humanized into joyful responses to a prosperous harvest." (Nelson 2002:204). Compared with Exod. 23, the focus of these two feasts is shifted to a joyful celebration of the harvest before the Lord together with the whole community. Therefore, the Egypt-עבד motive clause in Deut. 16:12 supports joyful celebration which embraces the landless people who do not have a harvest from their own lands. The motive clause reminds the Israelite land owners of their historical experience as oppressed slaves in Egypt and compels them to empathize

with the landless people who cannot celebrate the Feast without receiving provision of the harvest from the land owners. This Egypt-עבד motive clause, therefore, does not focus on the גר in the list of the participants. It motivates the Israelite to help all the members of the list including the גר.

Deut. 24:18 Nelson regards this Egypt-עבד motive clause in Deut. 24:18 as a general motivation for the entire "social torah" (vv. 10-17) that falls between the brackets formed by vv. 8b–9 and v. 18. "Israel's own experience with slavery is to be paradigmatic for its empathy for distressed groups (cf. v.22)." (Nelson 2002:292). Cook focuses on the repetition of the phrase "you were a slave in the land of Egypt" in v. 18 and v. 22. "Having lived through a brutish existence themselves, community members should be in a place to empathize with those still in dire straits." (Cook 2015:179). According to Brueggemann, the motivation in v. 18 belongs together with the affirmative sanction of v. 13 and the negative sanction of v. 15, and these statements together lodge economic transactions in the context of YHWH's good governance (Brueggemann 2002:239). Therefore, the Egypt-עבד motive clause in v. 18 is functioning in the Canonical context together with the other phrases to motivate the Israelite to protect vulnerable people in general. The גר appears five times in this small section (vv. 14, 17, 19, 20, and 21), and is protected as one of the vulnerable people without any special distinction as an outsider (Van Houten 1991:94). The Egypt-עבד motive clause in v. 18 does not focus on the גר specifically, but also includes other vulnerable groups.

Deut. 24:22 Deut. 24:19-22 concerns the harvest. Concerning three different products (grain, olive, grapes), it orders leaving the harvest for the גר, the orphan, and the widow. The three orders are very similar in form, and especially the last two form a clear parallelism (v. 20, 21). By repeating the גר-orphan-widow triad three times, this landless class is emphasized (cf. Nelson 2002:292). Nelson indicates that "It shall be for" could be translated "it belongs to." This means that this is not voluntary almsgiving. The גר-orphan-widow triad have a legal right to access the three most important products of the land: grain, oil, and wine (Nelson 2002:292).

The Egypt-עבד motive clause does not focus on the גר because the law repeats the גר-orphan-widow triad to emphasize this whole class who should be protected. This motive clause functions to remind the Israelite

land owners of their historical experience as עבד in Egypt, compels them to empathize with all the people in the vulnerable class, and encourages them to be generous.

4.2. The range of Egypt-דד motive clause

In contrast with the range of the Egypt-עבד motive clause, the Egypt-גר motive clause focuses on the גר. It is used only for motivating the Israelites to protect the sojourners. This can be demonstrated in all the occurrences of the Egypt-גר motive clause (Exod. 22:20 [21]; 23:9; Lev. 19:34; and Deut. 10:19; 23:8 [7]) as follows.

Exodus 22:20; 23:9 Both of the laws in Exodus 22:20; 23:9 are in the so-called the Covenant Code or, in the term of the Bible, "the Book of the Covenant" (Exod. 20:22-23:33) (Sprinkle 1994:27; Dozeman 2009:416). Exodus 22:17-23:19 consists of cultic regulations and regulations on social justice which are inextricably intertwined without dichotomy between the secular and sacred (Sprinkle 1994:160-161). Among the laws on social justice to protect vulnerable people, the Egypt-גר motive clause is directly attached to the laws which mention only the גר as those who should be protected.

The law in Exodus 22:20, which consists of the law protecting the גר and the Egypt-גר motive clause, is followed by the law which protects the widow and the orphan. The latter law has its own motive clause in vv. 22-23[10] which warns that YHWH himself will kill the person who mistreats them. This punishment results in the wife of the oppressor becoming a widow and the children becoming orphans, which is an instance of the *Lex Talionis* (Dozeman 2009:546). Therefore, the motive clause in vv. 22-23 is specifically attached to the law protecting the widow and the orphan in 22:21, and the Egypt-גר motive clause is specifically attached to the law protecting the גר in v. 20.

10 The next law in Exodus 20:24–25 also has its own motive clause in v. 26. Sprinkle indicates a clear parallel structure for the three cases (vv. 20, 21–23, 24–26), each of which includes a command or commands and a motive clause or clauses (Sprinkle 1994:167). This parallel structure also supports the conclusion that the Egypt-גר motive clause in v. 20 is applied only to the law protecting the גר in v. 20.

The law protecting the גר in 23:9 has no relationship with any other group of the people though it might be related to the preceding laws concerning legal proceedings (Meyers 2005:201; Sprinkle 1994:184). Thus, the Egypt-גר motive clause in 23:9 is clearly attached only to the law protecting the גר.

In this context, one more "גר" is mentioned in 23:12. It is, however, mentioned in the list of labourers including livestock (your ox, your donkey, the son of your female slave, and the גר). In the Sabbath commandment in Deut. 5:12-15, the Egypt-עבד motive clause is added (Deut. 5:15). But the Egypt-גר motive clause is not added to this Sabbath regulation in Exodus 23:12 despite two occurrences of it (Exod. 22:20; 23:9) in this context. It supports the conclusion that the Egypt-גר motive clause motivates the Israelite to protect the גר specifically.

Leviticus 19:34 The גר is contrasted with אזרח (native) in Lev. 19:34. Therefore the law in vv. 33-34 protects the גר specifically as one who has come from outside of the country or the community. Kim indicates two parallels: (1) the prohibition against oppressing the Israelite neighbour (v. 13) and the prohibition against oppressing the גר (v. 33); (2) the order to love the Israelite neighbour (v. 18) and the order to love the גר (v. 34) (Kim 2011:60). Gerstenberger regards it as a complement to vv. 17f. According to him, "love" is community-related, and refers to "the shared connection and mutual responsibility of human beings living in a community of faith" (Gerstenberger 1996:272). It means, therefore, "The foreigner is to be treated equally with natives and is to be included in the obligation to solidarity of the congregation" (Gerstenberger 1996:279). "Love" is not an emotion but a deed which includes concrete help and cherishing (Milgrom 2004:218; Douglas 1999:42-43). The גר must be welcomed into the mutual helping community of the native indigenous Israelite. The Egypt-גר motive clause is attached to this law in which the גר is contrasted with the native Israelite. Therefore, it motivates the protection of the גר specifically.

Deuteronomy 10:19 Brueggemann argues that the law in Deut. 10:19 is to protect the גר economically so that they do not end up as slaves, as did Israel (Brueggemann 2001:131). Although the reason why Israel got to be slaves in Egypt was not an economical one, rather affliction and oppression with forced labour made them slaves (Exod. 1:11-14), it is clear that the order "love the גר" is intended to prevent them from ending up as slaves,

as did Israel. Oppression by the indigenous people made Israel slaves in Egypt. Beyond the prohibition of oppression, "do not oppress the גר" in Exodus 22:20 and 23:9, Deuteronomy 10:19 radically orders the Israelites to "love the גר." Loving is what is needed to prevent the גר from ending up as slaves.

In v. 18, it is said that the Lord protects the orphan, the widow and the גר. But the object of the commandment to love which is compulsory for the Israelite is only the גר. The Egypt-גר motive clause is placed directly after this commandment. Therefore, the function of the motive clause in v. 18 is to remind the Israelites of their sojourning lives in Egypt, and prompt them to love the גר (no other vulnerable people).

Deuteronomy 23:8 The two commandments in Deuteronomy 23:8 form a parallelism: "Don't abhor an Edomite" and "Don't abhor an Egyptian." And each of them has a motive clause: "because he is your brother" and "because you were a גר in his land." Therefore, this Egypt-גר motive clause is only attached to the command "Don't abhor an Egyptian," and the motive function is limited to this command.

The context in 23:2-9 is the list of regulations who may enter the assembly of the Lord. "An Egyptian" in v. 8, therefore, must be a sojourner. It means that the Egypt-גר motive clause motivates the Israelites not to mistreat a kind of the גר.

5. Conclusion

The two motive clauses, the Egypt-עבד motive clause "you were a slave in Egypt" and the Egypt-גר motive clause "you were the גר in Egypt", are similar but quite different. They belong to the different traditions: the Egypt-עבד motive clause belongs to Deuteronomic tradition, but the Egypt-גר motive clause probably belongs to the later composition because it occurs in the three books of the Pentateuch. They refer to the separate periods and the different memories: the Egypt-עבד motive clause refers to the period of the Israel's later oppressed experience as slaves in Egypt, but the Egypt-גר motive clause refers to the period of the Israel's initial sojourning in Egypt. Their functions are different: the Egypt-עבד motive clause functions to remind the Israelites of the Israelites' historical

experience of difficulty as עבד in Egypt, but the Egypt-גר motive clause functions to remind the Israelites of their peaceful initial sojourning kept by the indigenous Egyptians' hospitality and the loss of it by the indigenous Egyptians' oppression, and urge them to show hospitality to the גר as the indigenous people whose attitude can drastically change the life of the גר. They motivate the Israelites to protect the different ranges of people: the Egypt-עבד motive clause protects poor people in general, but the Egypt-גר motive clause protects the sojourners specific.

This difference provides the two perspectives to protect the גר. First, the גר should be protected as one of vulnerable people with reminding of the oppressed experience or history. Second, the גר need to be protected specifically as the גר who are in the unsettled situation in the strange country, easily influenced by the attitude of the indigenous people. Both perspectives must be considered to develop a policy in this current world where are filled with the refugees and the immigrants.

Bibliography

Awabdy, M.A. 2012. "He loves the Immigrant": Deuteronomy's theological and social vision for the ger. Asbury Theological Seminary.

Bennett, H.V. 2002. *Injustice made legal: Deuteronomic law and plight of widows, strangers, and orphans in ancient Israel*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Brueggemann, W. 2001. *Deuteronomy*. Nashville: Abingdon Press. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries.

Brueggemann, W. 1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: testimony, dispute, advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Chirichigno, G. 1981. A theological investigation of motivation in Old Testament Law. *JETS* 24(4):303–313.

Christensen, D.L. 2001. *Deuteronomy 1:1–21:9, revised*. Word Biblical Commentary, volume 6A. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Cook, S.L. 2015. *Reading Deuteronomy: A literary and theological commentary*. Smyth & Helwys. Reading the Old Testament.

Douglas, M. 1999. *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Kindle version.

Dozeman, T.B. 2009. *Commentary on Exodus*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Gerstenberger, E.S. 1996. *Leviticus: A commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press. The Old Testament Library.

Joosten, J. 1996. *People and land in the Holiness Code: An exegetical study of the ideational framework of the law in Leviticus 17-26*. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, Volume LXVII. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Kelly, J.R. 2013. The גר and the אזרח in the Passover to Yhwh. *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 23(2), pp.155–166.

Kim, J.M. 2011. *Holiness & perfection: A Canonical unfolding of Leviticus 19*. An outline of an Old Testament dialogue, Vol. 3. Bern: Peter Lang.

Lohfink, N. 1991. Poverty in the laws of the ancient Near East and the Bible. *Theological Studies*, 52(1):34–50.

Meyers, C. 2005. *Exodus*. The new Cambridge Bible commentary. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Milgrom, J. 2004. *Leviticus: A book of ritual and ethics*. A Continental Commentary. Kindle version. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Miller, P.D. 1990. *Deuteronomy*. Interpretation: A Bible commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox Press.

— 2009. *The Ten Commandments*. Interpretation: Resources for the use of Scripture in the church. Louisville: WJK.

Nelson, R.D. 2002. *Deuteronomy: A commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Ramírez Kidd, J.E. 1999. *Alterity and Identity in Israel*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Ruppert, L. 1997. The Foreigner and Association with Foreigners in the Old and New Testaments. *The Covenant Quarterly* 55(2):151–163.

Sneed, M., 1999. Israelite Concern for the Alien, Orphan, and Widow: Altruism or Ideology? *ZAW* 111:498–508.

Sonsino, R. 1980. *Motive clauses in Hebrew law: Biblical forms and Near Eastern parallels*. Society of Biblical Literature: Dissertation series, 45. California: Scholars Press.

Sprinkle, J.M. 1994. *The Book of the Covenant: A literary approach*. Sheffield: JSOT Press. JSOT Supplement, 174.

Stuart, D.K. 2006. *Exodus*. The new American commentary, Volume 2. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Thomson, D.A. 2014. *Deuteronomy*. Belief: A theological commentary on the Bible. Louisville: WJK.

Van Houten, C.D.G. 1991. *The alien in Israelite law*. England: Sheffield Academic Press. JSOT Supplement, 107.

Von Rad, G. 1966. *Deuteronomy: A commentary*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

— 1975. *Old Testament theology*. Volume I. London: SCM Press Ltd.

Wright, C.J.H. 1996. *Deuteronomy*. Understanding the Bible commentary series. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.