As everyone knows, biblical study is experiencing a revolution. Interpretation has been thrown wide open as new voices have entered the discussion and new eyes have encountered the text, as the historical-critical establishment and its rationalist-fundamentalist counterpart have increasingly given way to the recognition that what is brought to the text makes a decisive difference in what is found there.\(^1\) The shifting methodological landscape is no doubt unsettling for many of us, even for those of us representing new perspectives. One might well wonder what gaining a voice means if the polity is to be anarchy. Yet amidst such humbling uncertainty
there arises still the hope that a new voice will be heard—a voice from
the text which will be much better than our own.

I approach this study as a Pentecostal and as one who is consciously
attempting to integrate my Pentecostal vocation and perspective with
critical Old Testament scholarship. Such integration is not easy for me,
for I spent many years learning to keep these things mostly separate from
one another. And now that I feel the need to pursue this interface, the way
ahead is far from clear. In terms of examples, there is little for one to follow. Thus the present effort is of necessity exploratory and experimental.

I propose here to look at the way in which the book of Deuteronomy
sets forth the place and role of both inscripturated word and prophetic
utterance. Not only does Deuteronomy evidence repeated emphasis on the
establishment of each of these revelatory dimensions, but in chapters 4 and
5 there is seen sustained reflection, I would suggest, on the dialectical and
complementary relationship between canonical word and what I would
term charismatic revelation.

My Pentecostal perspective (or testimony) on Spirit and Word obvi-
ously parallels and is certainly informing my perceptions on the Deuter-
onomy passages. Yet these perceptions, it seems to me, surface elements
in the text that have been hidden and suppressed by other perspectives
of long standing. Briefly stated, the noticing of such dialectical possibili-
ties in Israel’s testimony of revelation has not been served by a historical-
critical tradition that has legitimated the attribution of any tension or
shift in emphasis to different literary sources or redactional layers. More-
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2 Yet I would note John W. McKay, ‘The Old Testament and Christian Charismatic/
Prophetic Literature’, in Scripture: Meaning and Method. Essays Presented to Anthony
Tyrrell Hanson for his Seventieth Birthday (ed. B.P. Thompson; Hull: University of Hull Press,
1987), pp. 200–17; and ‘The Experience of Dereliction and of God’s Presence in Psalms: An
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3 Interestingly, a similar point has been made in certain quarters of Jewish biblical
scholarship, which appreciates the dialectical dimensions of revelation in a way that is
different, albeit not entirely unrelated, to my own. Note the following quote of S. Talmon,
Such a separation of the sources in biblical literature [with respect to revelatory
notions] is entirely unacceptable not only to Jewish exegetes who are considered
‘pre-critical’, such as S.D. Luzatto and D. Hoffmann—not to speak of the medieval
commentators. Scholars trained in critical method such as Benno Jacob, Umberto
Cassuto and M.H. Segal also categorically refuse to divide the concepts of the biblical
belief in God and revelation into the particular formulations of the Elohistic, Jahwis-
tic, Priestly, Deuteronomistic, Prophetic or Chronistic schools. The various names
and epithets of God and the various forms of divine revelation and their multifarious