

while also providing a means of accounting for the deity's separability from it. In this regard, it is parallel to Dtr's renegotiation of the significance of the ark: both cultic objects presented the deity, but always as a vehicle of its agency to which it was never inseparably bound.

Strengthening this understanding are those passages that promote even more explicitly abstract and partible conceptualizations of the *kābôd*. Deuteronomy's sole use of the term *kābôd*, in Deut 5:24, is the clearest example of this (Lewis 2020, 353–56): “our deity, YHWH, has shown us [*her'ānû*] his *kābôd* and his greatness [*gādlô*], and we heard his voice from the midst of the fire [*mitôk hā'ēš*].” The reference here is to YHWH's communication with Israel from the fire that engulfed Mount Horeb and was itself surrounded by dark clouds, described in Deut 4:11–12. The main rhetorical point there seems to be Deut 4:12's insistence that, “you heard the sound of the words [*qôl dābārîm*], but you didn't see any form [*ûtmûnâ 'ênkem rō'im*]—there was only a voice [*zûlâtî qôl*].” According to verses 16–19, 23, 25, and 28, the goal is explicitly to undermine the compulsion to produce a divine image (*pesel*). For Sommer (2009, 63–64), this is a manifestation of Deuteronomy's rejection of the fluidity model. The fire, like the *šēm*, does not “refers to God's essence or to some deity that overlaps with God. Instead, it refers to a token of divine attention.” Thus, the Israelites did not actually “see” YHWH's *kābôd*, but only came to abstractly understand it, similar to the statement in verse 24 that “we have seen that [*rā'inû kî*] deity can talk to humanity and it will survive.” The usage of the root *r'h*, “to see,” followed by *kî*, “that,” and a subordinate clause, however, is a very different construction from the use of the root in the *hiphil* with the direct object marker *'et* connected to two direct objects that most commonly refer to visible phenomena.³¹ Deuteronomy 4:36 also explains, parallel to 5:24, that YHWH caused Israel to see “his great fire [*išô haggādôlâ*],” while they heard YHWH's words out of the midst of that fire.

This is not a rejection of the communicability of the deity's divine agency, but a renegotiation in line with the concerns described above related to the ark. The Dtr authors and editors seem to be more clearly compartmentalizing the deity's own self from their partible *kābôd* and the visible signs of its presence. Moses more explicitly asserts this compartmentalization in Deut 4:36, partly quoted just above: “From the heavens [*min-haššāmayim*] he caused you to hear his voice, in order to instruct you, while upon the earth, he showed you [*her'ākā*]

³¹ In Deut 5:4, Moses explains, “YHWH spoke with you face to face [*pānîm bəpānîm*] in the mount from the midst of the fire.” The use of the preposition *b-* in the phrase *pānîm bəpānîm* is unique, however. The preposition *'el* occurs in every other occurrence of this phrase. The *beth* may be intended to qualify somewhat the sense in which they spoke “face to face” (Deut 34:10 says Moses is unique for having spoken with YHWH *pānîm 'el-pānîm*). While the reference may not be to visible faces, I suggest it indicates the fire reified the deity's presence.