

# *Sepher Torath Mosheh*

Studies in the Composition and Interpretation of Deuteronomy



Edited by **DANIEL I. BLOCK** and **RICHARD L. SCHULTZ**

# *Sepher Torath Mosheh*

# *Sepher Torath Mosheh*

Studies in the Composition and Interpretation of Deuteronomy



Edited by DANIEL I. BLOCK and RICHARD L. SCHULTZ

 HENDRICKSON  
PUBLISHERS

## ***Sepher Torah Mosheh: Studies in the Composition and Interpretation of Deuteronomy***

© 2017 by Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC

P. O. Box 3473

Peabody, Massachusetts 01961-3473

ISBN 978-1-68307-066-5

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Scripture quotations marked (NIV) are taken from the Holy Bible, New International Version®, NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 by Biblica, Inc.™ Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved worldwide. [www.zondervan.com](http://www.zondervan.com). The “NIV” and “New International Version” are trademarks registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office by Biblica, Inc.™

Scripture quotations marked (NRSV) are taken from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1989 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and are used by permission.

Scripture quotations marked (ESV) are taken from the Holy Bible, English Standard Version (ESV®), copyright © 2001, by Crossway, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked (NASB) are taken from the New American Standard Bible®, Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission. ([www.lockman.org](http://www.lockman.org))

Scripture quotations marked RSV are taken from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1946, 1952, 1971 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission., All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked NJPS are reproduced from the Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures. Copyright 1985 by The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia.

Scripture quotations marked CEB are taken from the Common English Bible®, CEB® Copyright © 2010, 2011 by Common English Bible.™ Used by permission. All rights reserved worldwide.

Cover Art: Shraga Weil, “Phoenix I–Out of the Past.” Used by permission of the Safrai Fine Art Gallery, Jerusalem.

Cover Design: Karol Bailey

*Printed in the United States of America*

*First Printing—December 2017*

### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication**

A catalog record for this title is available from the Library of Congress.  
Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC ISBN 978-1-68307-066-5

This volume is dedicated to the memory of  
Harry A. Hoffner Jr.  
John A. Wilson Professor of Hittitology Emeritus  
at the University of Chicago

# CONTENTS

Editors' Preface and Acknowledgments	ix
Contributors	xiii
Abbreviations	xv
Introduction	1
<i>Daniel I. Block</i>	
1. Deuteronomy: A History of Interpretation and Evangelical Responses	7
<i>Peter T. Vogt</i>	
2. Ancient Near Eastern Treaty Traditions and Their Implications for Interpreting Deuteronomy	30
<i>Neal A. Huddleston</i>	
3. Challenges to the Use of Ancient Near Eastern Treaty Forms for Dating and Interpreting Deuteronomy	78
<i>K. Lawson Younger Jr. and Neal A. Huddleston</i>	
4. Josiah and the Composition of Deuteronomy	110
<i>Michael A. Grisanti</i>	
5. The Book of Deuteronomy: Pseudepigraphy, Pseudonymity, or Something Else Altogether?	139
<i>Bill T. Arnold</i>	
6. Slaves and Rebels: Inscription, Identity, and Time in the Rhetoric of Deuteronomy	161
<i>Brent A. Strawn</i>	
7. Literary and Other Observations on Passages Dealing with Foreigners in the Book of Deuteronomy: The Command to Love the <i>gēr</i> Read in Context	192
<i>Markus Zehnder</i>	

8. The Cult in Deuteronomy and Its Relationship to the Book of the Covenant and the Holiness Code	232
<i>Richard E. Averbeck</i>	
9. Wisdom and Torah in Deuteronomy	261
<i>J. Gordon McConville</i>	
10. When a Prophet Quotes Moses: On the Relationship between the Book of Hosea and Deuteronomy	277
<i>Carsten Vang</i>	
11. The Archaeology of Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim and Why It Matters	304
<i>Sandra L. Richter</i>	
12. Hearing Galatians with Moses: An Examination of Paul as a Second and Seconding Moses	338
<i>Daniel I. Block</i>	
13. Concluding Reflections	375
<i>Richard L. Schultz</i>	
Bibliography	379
Index of Modern Authors	419
Index of Ancient Sources	427

## EDITORS' PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The figure of Moses towers over the history of Israel generally and the history of prophecy particularly. Of this man, his biographer writes,

No prophet has risen in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face, who did all those signs and wonders the Lord sent him to do in Egypt—to Pharaoh and to all his officials and to his whole land. For no one has ever shown the mighty power or performed the awesome deeds that Moses did in the sight of all Israel. (Deut 34:10–12 NIV)

And the reach of the book that consists largely of Moses' valedictory addresses to his congregation on the plains of Moab extends over the entire canon, both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament. Of the five books that make up the Pentateuch (known in Judaism as the Torah), Deuteronomy is without rival in its influence. This "book of the Torah of Moses" (סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה) was the heart of the Pentateuch, which priests were to teach and model,<sup>1</sup> which psalmists praised,<sup>2</sup> to which the prophets appealed,<sup>3</sup> by which faithful kings ruled<sup>4</sup> and righteous citizens lived, and by which prophetic authors assessed Israel's spiritual condition. Christians, who have been nourished on the New Testament, will find in Deuteronomy the Hebrew Bible's analogue to the Gospel of John (it offers a profoundly theological narration of Israel's experience of salvation from Egypt) and to St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (it offers the most systematic presentation of the theology arising out of the nation's experience of redemption).

The present volume reflects the ongoing general interest of biblical scholars in Deuteronomy in general and in the critical issues that serious study of this book raises in particular. All the essays included here were first presented at "Debating Deuteronomy: A Colloquium on the Torah of Moses," held at Wheaton College, September 24–26, 2015. Our expressions of gratitude must begin with those who made this colloquium possible. We are grateful to the administrators of Wheaton College for

---

<sup>1</sup> Deut 33:10; 2 Chr 15:3; 19:8; Mal 2:6, 9; cf. Jer 18:18; Ezek 7:26; Ezra 7:10.

<sup>2</sup> Pss 19:7–14; 119; etc.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Kgs 22:16; Isa 8:20; 30:9; 51:7; Hos 4:6; Amos 2:4; Zech 7:12; cf. Dan 9:11, 13.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Kgs 2:2–4; 2 Kgs 14:6; 22:11; 23:25.

creating a climate in which conversations like this may be held freely and openly, and for providing the facilities for the colloquium. Harbor House and its Board Room provided a delightful venue for formal and informal conversation among the participants, and Kristin Siewert hosted us graciously. To the scholars who participated in the program we express our appreciation for their hard work and the cordiality with which they engaged in discussion. Special thanks are due to Jeffrey Tigay, the foremost Jewish authority on Deuteronomy in our time, who presented a stimulating lecture on Thursday evening, and who then listened and watched patiently and graciously as evangelical Christian scholars wrestled with his favorite part of the Hebrew Bible, offering wise words of counsel at critical moments.

We owe special thanks to Michelle Knight, who took care of the book-work involved in a project like this, and for Ellen Block and Carol Schultz, who assisted in the administration of the social aspects of the event. This colloquium could not have been held without the generous support of interested persons. We are deeply grateful for the major portion of the funding for the event that was provided by the Daniel and Ellen Block Fund for Old Testament Studies, established by their son and daughter-in-law, Jason and Carolyn Block. This was supplemented by monies from the Blanchard and Gunther H. Knoedler Chairs of Old Testament.

Converting presented papers into forms suitable for publication involved another set of persons, without whose assistance this published product would never have seen the light of day. We are deeply grateful to Hendrickson Publishers for making these essays available to the public in printed form. From the beginning, their enthusiasm and support have sustained all of those involved. We are especially grateful to Jonathan Kline, the Hendrickson editor charged with making what scholars do look acceptable to the public. Not only has he worked tirelessly on editing the manuscripts, but he also has consistently dealt with the idiosyncrasies and infelicities of the contributors' submissions with grace and respect. This volume is a monument to his disciplinary expertise, close attention to detail, energy, industry, and sensitivity. We would also like to express our appreciation to all the other staff at Hendrickson who have contributed to the production and marketing of this book, for their obvious commitment to both excellence and Christian ministry in their publications.

It has been a privilege to work with the scholars whose essays are included here. We are grateful for the seriousness and grace with which they presented their research at the colloquium and responded to our edits. I (Dan) am also very grateful to my colleague Richard Schultz, who served as cochair of the colloquium and coeditor of this volume. This volume could not have been produced without the assistance of our graduate students. While they have not signed their names, the work of Holly

Brackin, James Cuénod, Michelle Knight, Daniel Lanz, Meredith Morris, Cooper Smith, and Franklin Wang underlies many aspects of the book: proofreading essays, creating bibliographies and lists of abbreviations, checking footnotes for stylistic consistency, and indexing. We are deeply grateful to them. We are also grateful to our wives, Carol Schultz and Ellen Block, for standing by us and giving us space to work on projects like this.

With great respect, we dedicate this volume to the memory of Harry Hoffner, John A. Wilson Professor of Hittitology Emeritus at the University of Chicago. Harry was a scholar of first rank on all things Hittite. However, he was also an evangelical scholar of first rank, who, in response to a student's question at a conference on the Bible and archaeology, wisely encouraged young scholars "to be good at what they do and to be good." The former comment related to their professional work, the latter to their lives and their disposition toward their conversation partners in the academy. Harry modeled both qualities with uncommon grace and modesty. We were delighted when he agreed to contribute a paper to this collection entitled "Deuteronomic Law and Ancient Near East Law Codes." Sadly, his untimely, accidental death precluded his participation in the colloquium and hence his contribution to this collection of essays. We extend our deep condolences to his widow, Wini Hoffner.

While many associates have contributed to this project, ultimate praise must go to "YHWH the God of Israel," who rescued his people from the slavery of Egypt, and who in his incarnation was called Jesus, for he would rescue his people from their sins (Matt 1:21). May this volume bring great glory to God our Savior, and may it enhance our understanding of the Torah of Moses, which guides all who read it in the way of righteousness (Deut 16:20)!

# CONTRIBUTORS

**Bill T. Arnold** Asbury Theological Seminary (Wilmore, Kentucky)

**Richard E. Averbeck** Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Deerfield, Illinois)

**Daniel I. Block** Wheaton College (Wheaton, Illinois)

**Michael A. Grisanti** The Master's Seminary (Los Angeles, California)

**Neal A. Huddleston** Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Deerfield, Illinois)

**J. Gordon McConville** University of Gloucestershire (Cheltenham, United Kingdom)

**Sandra L. Richter** Westmont College (Santa Barbara, California)

**Richard L. Schultz** Wheaton College (Wheaton, Illinois)

**Brent A. Strawn** Emory University (Atlanta, Georgia)

**Carsten Vang** Lutheran School of Theology (Aarhus, Denmark);  
University of South Africa (Pretoria, South Africa)

**Peter T. Vogt** LifePoint Church (Maplewood, Minnesota)

**K. Lawson Younger Jr.** Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Deerfield, Illinois)

**Markus Zehnder** Biola University (La Mirada, California); Ansgar  
University College and Theological Seminary (Kristiansand, Norway);  
Evangelische Theologische Faculteit (Leuven, Belgium)

# ABBREVIATIONS

## General Abbreviations

Akk.	Akkadian
ANE	Ancient Near East
AT	Altes Testament
BCE	Before the Common Era
be.	bottom edge
<i>BHQ</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Quinta</i>
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
BrTf	Hittite Bronze Tablet (subordination treaty of Tudḫaliya IV of Ḫatti with Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša)
ca.	circa
Cairo	Cairo Geniza
CC	Covenant Collection
CE	Common Era
CEB	Common English Bible
cf.	compare
ch(s).	chapter(s)
col.	column
D	the extant canonical form of Deuteronomy; the Deuteronomist document or source
DC	Deuteronomic Collection
DH	Deuteronomistic History
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
Dtr	Deuteronomist
Dtr <sup>1</sup>	first version of DH according to Cross
Dtr <sup>2</sup>	second version of DH according to Cross
DtrH	exilic redactor according to Smend; or, Deuteronomic History
DtrN	postexilic redactor according to Smend
E	Lines based on Edel's reconstruction from: Elmar Edel, <i>Der Vertrag zwischen Ramses II. von Ägypten und Ḫattušili III. von Ḫatti</i> . Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 95. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1997
EA	El-Amarna tablets
ed(s).	editor(s), edited by; edition
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i> , for example

esp.	especially
EST	Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty
ESV	English Standard Version
ET	English Translation
et al.	<i>et alii</i> , and others
f(f).	and the following one(s)
fasc.	fascicle
ft.	feet
G	the base stem ( <i>Grundstamm</i> ) of a verb
Gt	the base stem ( <i>Grundstamm</i> ) of a verb with an infix <i>t</i>
H	Holiness Code
HC	Holiness Collection
<i>HDT</i> <sup>2</sup>	Hittite Diplomatic Text
ibid.	<i>ibidem</i> , in the same place
idem.	the same
i.e.	<i>id est</i> , that is
Impv	imperative
J	Jahwist document or source
JE	editorial combination of the Jahwist and Elohist sources
JEDP	Documentary Hypothesis positing the distinct identity and editorial combination of four original literary sources
Jr. v. Chr.	= BCE
LB	Late Bronze Era
LH	Laws of Hammurapi
LXX	Septuagint (the Greek Old Testament)
LXX <sup>Lmin</sup>	Septuagint Lucianic miniscules
m.	meters
MA	Middle Assyrian
MB	Middle Babylonian
Mss	Manuscripts
Ms T	Tayinat Manuscript
MT	Masoretic Text
MT <sup>L</sup>	Masoretic Text Codex Leningradensis
NA	Neo-Assyrian
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NB	Neo-Babylonian
NCB	New Century Bible
NIV	New International Version
NJPS	Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures: The New JPS Translation according to the Traditional Hebrew Text
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
OA	Old Assyrian
OAram.	Old Aramaic

OB	Old Babylonian
obv.	obverse
OG	Old Greek Version of the Old Testament
OL	Old Latin
orig.	original
OT	Old Testament
P	Priestly document or source; Parity
p(p).	page(s)
pl.	plural
Pls.	Plates
PN	personal name/place name
r.	<i>recto</i> (tablet front)
repr.	reprint
rev.	revised; reverse
RS	Ras Shamra
RSV	Revised Standard Version
S	Subordination
σ	Symmachus
Sam(Pent)	Samaritan Pentateuch
s.v.	<i>sub verbo</i> (“under the word”)
Syr	Syriac
T.	Tell
Targ	Targum
θ	Theodotion
trans.	translator, translated by
TSA	Tell Sabi Abyad
Urdt	Urdeuteronomium, the earliest form of Deuteronomy
v(v).	verse(s); <i>verso</i> (tablet back)
VTE	Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon
Vulg	Vulgate
x	times
YHWH	the consonants of the divine name in the Hebrew Bible, conventionally rendered LORD in English translations

## Symbols

( )	encloses words added to a gloss for sense in non-Hebrew texts (and occasional parenthetical additions), except for SAA 2.6-T
[ ]	encloses reconstructed text
< >	encloses scribal omissions; or, in biblical text, marks an emendation
⌈ ⌋	encloses partially damaged signs/letters
!	(superscript) indicates a scribal error in transcription

?	(superscript) indicates an uncertain reading and/or gloss in transcription
×	(subscript) multiplication symbol appears immediately before a sign written within the previous sign (e.g., KA <sub>×</sub> U = KA, Akk. <i>pû</i> “mouth”)
:	a colon in transcription indicates the orthographic transposition of the signs between which it appears (e.g., Eblaite nita:udu for udu-nita, “ram”)
. . .	a break of unspecified length
≡	the fraktur-hyphen marks clitic boundaries (Hittite)
⚡	<i>Glossenkeil</i> , a scribal convention in Hittite that marks stylistically inappropriate terms and collocations (especially Luwian intrusions)
<i>italics</i>	indicates a foreign term in glosses of all non-Hebrew texts; indicates words added to a gloss for sense in all Hebrew texts and in SAA 2.6-T

## Ancient Sources

### Dead Sea Scrolls

4QDeut <sup>n</sup>	Deuteronomy <sup>n</sup>
4QJosh <sup>a</sup>	Joshua <sup>a</sup>
4QPhyl <sup>n</sup>	Phylacteries <sup>n</sup>

### Josephus

<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
<i>J.W.</i>	<i>Jewish War</i>

### Philo

<i>Dreams</i>	<i>On Dreams</i>
---------------	------------------

### Babylonian Talmud

‘ <i>Abod. Zar.</i>	‘ <i>Abodah Zarah</i>
Ḥul.	Ḥullin

### Targumic Texts

T <sup>JNF</sup>	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Neofiti
------------------	------------------------------------

T <sup>o</sup>	Targum Onqelos
Tg. Neb.	Targum of the Prophets

### Other Rabbinic Works

<i>Sipre Deb.</i>	Sipre Deuteronomy
-------------------	-------------------

## Journals, Series, and Reference Works

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ABS	Archaeology and Biblical Studies
<i>AfO</i>	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
AION	<i>Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli</i>
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANEM	Ancient Near Eastern Monographs
ANETS	Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies
<i>AnOr</i>	<i>Analecta Orientalia</i>
<i>AnSt</i>	<i>Anatolian Studies</i>
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AoF	Altorientalische Forschungen
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentary
ApOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
<i>Aramazd</i>	<i>Aramazd: Armenian Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
ARES	Archivi reali di Ebla, Studi
ARET	Archivi reali di Ebla, Testi
ASJ	Acta Sumerologica (Japan)
ASORAR	American Schools of Oriental Research Archaeological Reports
AT	Wiseman, Donald J. <i>The Alalakh Tablets</i> . Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, no. 2. London: The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
<i>AuOr</i>	<i>Aula Orientalis</i>
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BBRSup	Bulletin for Biblical Research: Supplement Series

- BDAG Danker, F. W., W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000
- BEATAJ Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum
- BECNT Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
- BETL Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium
- Bib* *Biblica*
- BIBAL Berkeley Institute of Biblical Archaeology and Literature
- BibInt Biblical Interpretation Series
- BibOr *Biblica et Orientalia*
- BJS Brown Judaic Studies
- BKAT *Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament*. Edited by M. Noth and H. W. Wolff
- BN* *Biblische Notizen*
- BoSt Boghazköy Studien
- BR* *Biblical Research*
- BRev* *Bible Review*
- BrTf Otten, Heinrich. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988
- BWANT Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
- BZABR Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte
- BZAW Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
- CAD* *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1956–2006
- CBET Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
- CBQ* *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
- CHANE Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
- CHD* *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1980–. For an online version of the ongoing project see <http://ochre.lib.uchicago.edu/eCHD/>
- ColAnt Colloquia Antiqua
- ConBOT Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series
- COS* *The Context of Scripture*. Edited by William W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–2002
- CSMSJ* *The Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies Journal*
- CTH* Laroche, Emmanuel. *Catalogue des textes hittites*. Études et commentaires 75. Paris: Klincksieck, 1971

<i>CTR</i>	<i>Criswell Theological Review</i>
<i>CurBS</i>	<i>Currents in Research: Biblical Studies</i>
DBH	Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie
<i>DCH</i>	<i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Edited by D. J. A. Clines. 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1993–2014
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
<i>DNWSI</i>	<i>Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions</i> . J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1995
<i>DPL</i>	<i>Dictionary of Paul and His Letters</i> . Edited by G. F. Hawthorne and R. P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993
<i>EDNT</i>	<i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by H. Balz and G. Schneider. ET. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–1993
<i>ErIsr</i>	<i>Eretz-Israel</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FCI	Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>FZPhTh</i>	<i>Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie</i>
<i>HALAT</i>	<i>Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament</i> . Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2004
<i>HALOT</i>	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
HBS	Herders Biblische Studien
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HDT <sup>2</sup>	Beckman, Gary M., and Harry A. Hoffner. <i>Hittite Diplomatic Texts</i> . 2nd ed. Writings from the Ancient World 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999
HOTTP	Hebrew Old Testament Text Project
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HThKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HUCM	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
ISBL	Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature

- JAC* *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*
- JAJ* *Journal of Ancient Judaism*
- JANER* *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions*
- JBL* *Journal of Biblical Literature*
- JCS* *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
- JESOT* *Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament*
- JETS* *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
- JNES* *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
- JSJ* *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*
- JSJSup* *Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series*
- JSNT* *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
- JSOR* *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*
- JSOT* *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
- JSOTSup* *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series*
- JTI* *Journal for Theological Interpretation*
- JTS* *Journal of Theological Studies*
- KAI* *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. Herbert Donner and Wolfgang Röllig. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966–1969
- KTU* *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit*. Edited by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2013. 3rd. enl. ed. of *KTU: The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani, and Other Places*. Edited by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995
- KUB* *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*. Berlin: Akademie, 1921–
- LACUS* Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States
- LAI* Library of Ancient Israel
- LAPO* Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient
- LCL* Loeb Classical Library
- LHBOTS* The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
- LNTS* Library of New Testament Studies
- LS* *Louvain Studies*
- LSAWS* Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic
- LSJ* Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
- L.T.* Eidem, Jesper. *The Royal Archives from Tell Leilan: Old Babylonian Letters and Treaties from the Lower Town Palace East*. Archaeological introduction by Lauren Ristvet and Harvey Weiss. PIHANS 117. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten; Yale University Press, 2011

MDOG	<i>Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i>
MIOF	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung</i>
MRS	Mission de Ras Shamra
ms T	Lauinger, Jacob. "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty at Tell Tayinat: Text and Commentary." <i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i> 64 (2012): 87–123
MVAG	Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft. Vols. 1–44. 1896–1939
NAC	New American Commentary
NEAEHL	<i>The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land</i> . Edited by E. Stern. 4 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society & Carta, 1993
NIB	<i>The New Interpreter's Bible</i> . Edited by L. E. Keck. 12 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994–2004
NIBCOT	New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIDB	<i>New International Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by J. D. Douglas and M. C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987
NIDNTT	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> . Edited by C. Brown. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975–1985
NIDNTTE	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> . Edited by Moisés Silva. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014
NIDOTTE	<i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> . Edited by W. A. VanGemeren. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997
NIVAC	New International Version Application Commentary
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum: Supplement Series
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
NTL	New Testament Library
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OAC	Oriens Antiqui Collectio
OBO	Orbis biblicus et Orientalis
ÖBS	Österreichische biblische Studien
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
OPSNKF	Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund
OrAnt	<i>Oriens Antiquus</i>
OTE	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
OTG	Old Testament Guides
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies

<i>OtSt</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
PBM	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PIHANS	Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul
R2-H3	Edel, Elmar. <i>Der Vertrag zwischen Ramses II. von Ägypten und Hattušili III. von Hatti</i> . Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 95. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1997
RA	<i>Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale</i>
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
RIMA	The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods
RIME	The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods
RINAP	Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
SAA 2	Parpola, Simo, and Kazuko Watanabe. <i>Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths</i> . SAA 2. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1988
SAA 2.6-T	A composite text that consists of SAA2.6 and ms T.: Text no. 6 in Parpola, Simo, and Kazuko Watanabe. <i>Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths</i> . SAA 2. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1988; Lauinger, Jacob. "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty at Tell Tayinat: Text and Commentary." <i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i> 64 (2012): 87–123.
SAAS	State Archives of Assyria Studies
SAK	<i>Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur</i>
SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBLABS	Society of Biblical Literature Archaeology and Biblical Studies
SBLAIL	Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Israel and Its Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLWAW	Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SBTS	Sources for Biblical and Theological Study
<i>ScrB</i>	<i>Scripture Bulletin</i>
ScrHier	Scripta Hierosolymitana

SEE-J	Scandinavian Evangelical E-Journal
<i>Sem</i>	<i>Semitica</i>
Sf	Fitzmyer, Joseph A. <i>The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire</i> . 2nd, rev. ed. <i>Biblica et Orientalia</i> 19/A. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1995
SHBC	Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary
SIL	Summer Institute of Linguistics
SOTBT	Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
SSS	Semitic Study Series
StBoT	Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten (Wiesbaden 1965 ff.)
StBoTB	Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten: Beihefte (Wiesbaden 1988 ff.)
<i>Str</i>	<i>Studia Iranica</i>
StPohl	Studia Pohl
TA	<i>Tel Aviv</i>
TCS	Texts from Cuneiform Sources
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
<i>Them</i>	<i>Themelios</i>
THeth	Texte der Hethiter
ThWAT	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> . Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970–
TLCANE	Kitchen, Kenneth A., and Paul J. N. Lawrence. <i>Treaty, Law and Covenant in the Ancient Near East</i> . Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012. Issued in three volumes—Part 1: The Texts; Part 2: Text, Notes and Chromograms; Part 3: Overall Historical Survey.
TLNT	<i>Theological Lexicon of the New Testament</i> . Edited by C. Spicq. Translated and edited by J. D. Ernest. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994
TLOT	<i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by E. Jenni, with assistance from Claus Westermann. Translated and edited by Mark E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> . Edited by G. Krause and G. Müller. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977–
TUAT	<i>Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments</i>
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications

UISK	Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
VWGT	Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WO	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WVDOG	Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der deutschen Orientgesellschaft
ZABR	<i>Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

# INTRODUCTION

Daniel I. Block

Having participated in the Ezekiel Consultation of SBL for several decades I have personally been encouraged by the shrinking of the divide between mainstream and evangelical scholarship in many areas of Hebrew Bible research. However, when I moved into pentateuchal studies, focused particularly on Deuteronomy, I encountered a very different world. In few areas of critical biblical research is the chasm between the two approaches as broad as in discussions of the book of Deuteronomy. The issues relate not only to the provenance of the book, but also to its origin and composition, its ideology, its ethic, and its relationship to other biblical books. Evangelicals differ in their responses to historical-critical scholarship. Some avoid it as much as possible; others consider neither critical methodologies nor the results of critical scholarship to be threatening to their evangelical convictions.

The essays in this volume consist of invited papers by recognized Old Testament scholars with a particular interest in Deuteronomy. These were presented at a special colloquium on the book at Wheaton College, held September 24–26, 2015. The purpose of this colloquium was to explore together historical, literary, theological, and ethical issues at the heart of the tensions evangelicals feel when they interact with mainstream scholarship. In addition to the contributors to the colloquium proper, we had the distinct privilege of having the foremost Jewish authority on the book of Deuteronomy, Jeffrey Tigay, in our midst. We treasured his responses to the papers and were stimulated by a special guest lecture from this esteemed scholar on the history of Jewish interpretation of the *ḥērem* ordinance.

Before I introduce the individual essays, a further word on nomenclature is required. It is difficult to find an appropriate label for the interpretive stance the contributors to this volume represent. They reflect a broad spectrum of theological and hermeneutical perspectives within evangelicalism, and all subscribe to the statement on Scripture that unites the fellows of the Institute for Biblical Research: belief in “the unique divine inspiration, integrity, and authority of the Bible.” But this statement

is very general, neither declaring this to be a distinctly evangelical stance, nor prescribing or delimiting what sorts of hermeneutical approaches are deemed to fall within the label.

Whereas the contributors to this volume have little difficulty identifying themselves as evangelicals, as historically and traditionally conceived, the search for a new label is difficult. Perhaps here in the introduction to this book we should be content with describing our hermeneutic, rather than labeling it. Identifying the marks of a distinctly evangelical hermeneutic is precarious business, because few represent the paradigm described completely. However, we must begin somewhere.

First, evangelical biblical scholars treat the object of their study as Scripture, not merely as a literary artifact in a museum that may be dispassionately analyzed. Among other entailments, this means that we stand before the text with reverence and awe, and seek to draw from it spiritual nurture and instruction, even as we pursue our textual analysis.

Second, the goal of evangelical biblical exegesis is grasping the life-giving and life-transforming message of the Scriptures. Our primary objective is not historicist determination of the manner or even the contexts in which biblical writings were produced (given the lack of data on these matters our efforts are admittedly speculative), but establishing the authoritative meaning intended by the text.

Third, an evangelical stance toward the Scriptures is typically positivist, rather than suspicious. If the essence of critical scholarship is “The willingness *not* to take a text at face value,”<sup>1</sup> the essence of evangelical scholarship is first to accept the face value of the text. The Scriptures were not written primarily as riddles, whose true significance is realized by reading *against* the grain. While the latter has its place and often yields interesting results, establishing the meaning of biblical texts requires reading *with* the grain.

Fourth, an evangelical hermeneutic is holistic. However the texts were produced, they have been preserved in the canon by the communities of faith as whole documents. This means that, while dividing the text into its constituent sources or redactions may be fruitful, in the end tensions within the text that are often used to identify editorial hands should be treated as essential features of the text, contributing to its final-form message.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael V. Fox, *Character and Ideology in the Book of Esther* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 148.

<sup>2</sup>Moshe Greenberg has helpfully identified three criteria by which we may identify secondary alterations to the text: (1) historical anachronisms; (2) syntactical incoherence that cannot be explained on the basis of ancient literary habits or textual corruption; (3) contradictions that cannot be accounted for on rhetorical grounds. See Moshe Greenberg, “What Are Valid Criteria for Determining

Fifth, while not becoming a slave to any single method, evangelical scholars utilize responsibly whatever hermeneutical strategy may clarify biblical texts: source, redaction, form, tradition, lexical, literary, rhetorical, historical, and cultural analyses, as well as speech act theory. These are not methods to be feared, but rather to be harnessed in the pursuit of meaning in biblical texts.

Sixth, evangelical scholars base their conclusions on evidence, which means they treat alternative interpretations with respect (rather than disdain), and they repudiate *ad hominem* arguments.

Seventh, evangelical scholars view biblical writings (1) within the context of the entire canon, and seek to locate texts they are analyzing within the history of divine revelation, which climaxes in the incarnation, life, death, and exaltation of Jesus Christ as Lord, and (2) within the context of the process whereby the canon was produced.

Given these features, it is not surprising that evangelical scholars often feel a greater kinship with conservative Jewish and Roman Catholic scholars than with mainstream Protestant scholars. For many of us, our faith commitments are primary, and we approach the Scriptures with believing reverence and awe. In the Scriptures, we hear the voice of God, not merely the reflections of human authors.

Our colloquium on Deuteronomy afforded the evangelical scholars involved an opportunity to give expression to specific topics related to this book that they have recently engaged or that have been an ongoing concern of theirs. As was the case with the earlier colloquium on Isaiah and the volume that was produced therefrom,<sup>3</sup> the diversity of the participants' styles, interpretive frameworks, and specializations enlivened the conversation when we met at Wheaton College and contributed to a volume that introduces readers to the critical issues that Deuteronomy presents and to the variety of approaches with which evangelical scholars address them. The participants did not agree on all points, but the conversations were cordial and the fellowship was warm. However, we must acknowledge at the outset that, although the versions of the papers here have been significantly modified in view of the discussions around the table, the individual scholars are all responsible for their own papers. That they are gathered in this volume does not mean they accept either the methods or the conclusions of their colleagues; nor does it mean that the coeditors agree with all positions presented in the papers that follow.

---

Inauthentic Matter in Ezekiel?" in *Ezekiel and His Book*, ed. Johann Lust, BETL 74 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986), 123–35.

<sup>3</sup>*Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*, ed. Daniel I. Block and Richard L. Schultz (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015).

Peter Vogt begins this collection by tracing the history of the critical interpretation of the book of Deuteronomy. The scholarly issues he discusses relate primarily to matters of the date, purpose, ideology, and composition/structure of Deuteronomy. The figure of Moses has receded increasingly into the background, and the date for the composition of the present book gets pushed later and later. Although the designation “evangelical” was not used to identify a theological or hermeneutical movement until well into the twentieth century, Vogt observes that until recently a conservative Christian response to critical scholarship on Deuteronomy has been largely reactive, rather than proactive. This has changed significantly in the past few decades, as a more confident and assertive evangelical cadre of scholars has entered into the conversations on the book at the highest technical levels.

Neal Huddleston’s and K. Lawson Younger Jr.’s papers are two parts of a single larger, exhaustive project analyzing ancient Near Eastern treaty traditions and their relationship to biblical texts. Huddleston identifies seven unique ancient Near Eastern treaty traditions that appeared between 2300 and 600 BCE. Selecting several texts from each group, he compares the respective traditions and then concludes by briefly relating their functions and forms to the book of Deuteronomy. Lawson Younger joins the conversation in the next paper, as he and Huddleston jointly offer a more sustained consideration of the relationship between ancient Near Eastern treaty traditions and Deuteronomy. After examining the links between the maledictions in Deuteronomy and in the Esarhaddon Succession treaties and finding them tenuous, Huddleston and Younger reflect on how ancient Israel could have been influenced by Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Hittite cultural traditions.

Since the eighteenth century, critical scholars have linked the composition of Deuteronomy with the discovery of the Torah scroll that Josiah’s men found while they were refurbishing the temple in Jerusalem (2 Kgs 22), which pushed the date of composition into the late seventh century BCE. After offering a helpful survey of the history of this interpretation, Michael Grisanti assesses its validity, presenting innerbiblical evidence for an earlier date for the book, and concluding by summarizing recent evangelical responses to this evidence.

Bill Arnold’s paper addresses the issue of whether and in what sense Deuteronomy might be considered a pseudepigraph, a document purported to derive from Moses but which actually was produced much later. Most evangelical scholars have understood the book to represent in some fashion the very speeches of Moses on the plains of Moab (an approach Arnold labels *ipsissima verba*). However, Arnold suggests that, although Deuteronomy is grounded in the authoritative revelation (*traditum*) given to and through Moses, it is the product of centuries of expansion, rework-

ing, and rewriting by Mosaic scribes. While not necessarily preserving the very words of Moses, these scribes have preserved his voice, and the authority of his teaching remains undiminished.

Taking his cue from Deut 6:21 and 9:7, in which Moses the speaker describes his audience as having been slaves in Egypt and rebellious against YHWH since they left Egypt, Brent Strawn explores the extraordinary rhetoric of Deuteronomy. Most of the people standing before Moses on the plains of Moab had not even been born when the Israelites were rescued from their slavery. However, by transporting the audience back in time and space, the book incorporates a rhetoric that is both trans- and suprahistorical, calling on hearers in every generation to celebrate their rescue from slavery and to warn them of the constant danger of rebellion against YHWH. While Deuteronomy is about both *then* and *now* along with *what yet will be*, the clear accent in terms of literary effect is on *now*.

Treating the command to love the נָכְרִי (alien) in Deut 10:19 and Lev 19:34 and related texts as a test case, Markus Zehnder explores the relationships among the so-called “Book of the Covenant,” the “Holiness Code,” and the Deuteronomic law collection. Critical scholarship has tended to highlight perceived contradictions in these documents and to use internal evidence to ascribe relative dates to the documents—dates that typically run counter to the sequence in which they appear in the pentateuchal narratives. In fact, some have argued that later versions of the laws have intentionally supplanted earlier versions. Zehnder establishes that, while exhibiting significant differences, these documents are not contradictory, let alone intended to displace earlier versions of the laws. Rather, they are to be read together as complementary, alongside each other, and the differences reflect new circumstances in which the laws are to be applied.

Richard Averbeck deals with a similar issue, but uses the regulations concerning Israel’s cult in the respective documents as his test case. He observes many parallels across the respective legal documents in the prescriptions for specific cultic practices, and notes that all three (the Book of the Covenant, the Holiness Code, and the Deuteronomic law collection) are framed by cultic regulations. In so doing, he shows that the three documents agree in highlighting that, in Israel, faithfulness to YHWH and obedience to the law begins and ends with the people’s relationship to YHWH, which is the essential purpose of the cult. Apart from this cultic context, the remainder of the laws make no sense.

Gordon McConville’s essay on “Wisdom and Torah in Deuteronomy” is the shortest in this volume. His aim is to examine the profile of “wisdom” in the book and then to explore the relationship between wisdom and torah. He argues that Deuteronomy and the wisdom literature have their own irreducible individuality, which derives from their distinctive

engagements with ancient Near Eastern traditions: Deuteronomy is oriented toward the ancient heritage of treaty and law, while Israelite wisdom is oriented to ancient Near Eastern wisdom. Nevertheless, both are characterized as fully in the service of YHWH.

In keeping with their dating of Deuteronomy to the period of Josiah or later, critical scholars almost universally assume that the eighth-century prophet Hosea antedates this book. The links between Hosea and Deuteronomy are most obvious in Deut 8:12–14 and Hos 13:4–6, Hos 2:10[ET 8] and Deut 8:13/17:16–17, and Hos 4:13 and Deut 12:2. Upon closer examination of these texts, Carsten Vang concludes that Deuteronomy reflects a fixed covenantal tradition that is older than the eighth century BCE.

In her paper on Deut 27, Sandra Richter searches for the historical context in which the ritual at Shechem (between Mounts Gerizim and Ebal) might have been significant for the Israelites, and in so doing offers evidence for the provenance of the book of Deuteronomy. After declaring that there are only two options—Late Bronze/Iron I and the Persian/Hellenistic period of Samaritan worship on Mount Gerizim, prior to the Hasmonean destruction in 114 BCE—Richter examines the archaeological and textual evidence. She concludes that the former argues unambiguously for the earlier date, while the latter, though slightly less firm, points in the same direction.

The final essay, written by me, is the only one in this volume that addresses the influence of the book of Deuteronomy in the New Testament. Against the grain of prevailing New Testament scholarship, I argue that in Gal 1 the apostle Paul identifies himself as a prophet in the tradition of Moses (cf. Deut 18:9–22), which means that he cannot disagree fundamentally with Moses. Acknowledging this to be a limited foray into the discussion of the relationship between Paul and Moses, I use circumcision as a test case. I argue that Paul's and Moses' dispositions toward physical circumcision were remarkably similar; both "servants of God" placed greater weight on spiritual than on external physical markers of faith, specifically on the circumcision of the heart.

Although all the essays in this volume relate to the critical study of the book of Deuteronomy, they are quite diverse in their goals, style, and content. However, taken together they offer a window into the state of evangelical Deuteronomy scholarship in the second decade of the twenty-first century.

## CHAPTER 1

# DEUTERONOMY: A HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION AND EVANGELICAL RESPONSES

Peter T. Vogt

The book of Deuteronomy has long been the subject of intense scholarly scrutiny and analysis. There are few other areas of scholarly inquiry in which the divide between “mainstream” and conservative evangelical biblical scholarship is as great.<sup>1</sup> This paper will examine the history of interpretation of Deuteronomy in terms of how mainstream scholarship has approached the book, as well as surveying conservative responses and alternative evangelical approaches.

### Early Modern Approaches to Deuteronomy

An exhaustive study of the history of interpretation of Deuteronomy is well beyond the scope of this paper; the number of works on Deuteronomy is, quite simply, staggering. I will highlight some representative approaches and issues and illustrate how those issues have been handled.<sup>2</sup> I will then examine evangelical responses to those approaches and their impact.

---

<sup>1</sup>Adequately defining *mainstream* and *evangelical* is a challenging task. For a helpful discussion of the theological parameters of “evangelicalism,” see Timothy Larsen, “Defining and Locating Evangelicalism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology*, ed. Timothy Larsen and Daniel J. Treier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 1–14. Although the scholars discussed in the “Evangelical Approaches” section below would self-identify as “evangelicals,” for our purposes it is less important to highlight *theological* distinctives of evangelicalism than to distinguish between evangelical approaches to *biblical hermeneutics* and the approaches of other, “mainstream” scholars. For a helpful description of evangelical hermeneutics, see the introduction to this volume by Daniel I. Block.

<sup>2</sup>The description and analysis of various views presented here constitute a revised version of those presented in Peter T. Vogt, *Deuteronomical Theology and the Significance of Torah: A Reappraisal* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006). Material from that book is reproduced here with kind permission of the publisher.

The three main issues that have absorbed the attention of scholars and that divide evangelical and mainstream scholarship are the date, purpose and ideology, and composition and structure of Deuteronomy. Though they are interrelated, we will examine them separately to better identify trends.

## Date

Modern critical study of Deuteronomy began with the 1805 dissertation of Wilhelm M. L. de Wette, in which he maintained that Deuteronomy reflected the reforms of Josiah.<sup>3</sup> Jerome had previously posited that the book Josiah's men found in the temple (2 Kgs 22:3–13) was Deuteronomy,<sup>4</sup> but de Wette is credited with the idea that the book itself was intimately associated with Josiah's reforms. De Wette held that the centralization law in Deut 12 could only have come from a period later than the rest of the Pentateuch because centralization is neither assumed nor valued in the latter. Moreover, he maintained on the basis of literary style that Deuteronomy is the work of a different author than Genesis–Numbers (which, like Deuteronomy, he saw as a unity), though he believed that neither work was written by Moses. De Wette maintained that the time of the Josianic reforms was the period most suited to the law of centralization as found in Deuteronomy.<sup>5</sup>

Consideration of the date of Deuteronomy saw significant advancement through the work of Julius Wellhausen, who argued for the existence of three sources in the Pentateuch: JE, D, and P.<sup>6</sup> While Wellhausen acknowledged that this idea was not unique to him,<sup>7</sup> we credit him with popularizing the now famous “Documentary Hypothesis” and articulating the significance of this view for understanding the history of Israel and the development of the literature of the Pentateuch. For our purposes, Wellhausen's contributions were most significant, because he posited that

---

<sup>3</sup>For a concise treatment of premodern interpretation of Deuteronomy, see Daniel I. Block, *Deuteronomy*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 26–28.

<sup>4</sup>Moshe Weinfeld, “Deuteronomy: The Present State of Inquiry,” *JBL* 86 (1967): 249.

<sup>5</sup>See the helpful presentation of de Wette and his contribution to Deuteronomic studies in Gordon J. Wenham, “The Structure and Date of Deuteronomy” (PhD diss., University of London, 1970), 16–43.

<sup>6</sup>Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Edinburgh: A & C Black, 1885; repr. Atlanta: Scholars, 1994). While Wellhausen acknowledged that E once existed as an independent source, he noted that we know of it only as “extracts embodied in the Jehovist narrative” (*ibid.*, 8).

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, 4. Some of Wellhausen's conclusions were anticipated by Eduard Reuss and his student Karl H. Graf.

centralization in Deuteronomy is key to understanding the nature of the reforms in support of which the book was composed.

Wellhausen's work helped establish Deuteronomy as an important starting point for the study of the Old Testament. Wellhausen saw Deuteronomy as representing a midpoint between JE and P. That is, JE was earlier than Deuteronomy, originating in the period of the monarchy but prior to the destruction of the Northern Kingdom by Assyria in the eighth century BCE.<sup>8</sup> Deuteronomy was "composed in the same age as that in which it was discovered," namely, during the reign of Josiah.<sup>9</sup> P was written at a later time and assumes many of the innovations presented in Deuteronomy.

Wellhausen further maintained that the development of Israelite religion can be traced through the source documents of the Pentateuch. He saw in the sources an evolution from a free, spontaneous, and natural religion to a more formalized, artificial expression of faith. The different sources, which represent different stages in the history of religion in Israel, each present a different view of the religion. In this way, he determined the date of the sources. Deuteronomy, most closely associated with the D source, is chronologically the midpoint between JE and P, and is seen as deriving from the monarchic period.

The Documentary Hypothesis emerged as the dominant method in pentateuchal criticism and remained so until about 1970. To be sure, some modified the theory as posited by Wellhausen. But the development of the traditio-historical approach by Albrecht Alt, who saw continuity between events and their description in the pentateuchal sources, as well as archaeological discoveries by William Albright, firmly established the Documentary Hypothesis in modern pentateuchal interpretation.<sup>10</sup> Most notably, adherents of these newer approaches (exemplified by the Alt and Albright "schools") sought to harmonize their findings with the traditional sources and dates postulated in the nineteenth century. In this way, source criticism served to establish Deuteronomy as a product of the monarchic period.

The date of Deuteronomy was further advanced in modern scholarship through the discovery of ancient Near Eastern treaties and the patterns associated with them. Since George Mendenhall identified covenant treaty structures from Hittite documents and proposed that covenant texts

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> For a discussion of the modern development of the Documentary Hypothesis, see Gordon J. Wenham, "Pondering the Pentateuch: The Search for a New Paradigm," in *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches*, ed. David W. Baker and Bill T. Arnold (Leicester: Apollon, 1999), 116–44.

in the Old Testament correspond to ancient Hittite treaty forms,<sup>11</sup> much scholarly attention has been directed toward refining and revising this theory. It is almost universally agreed that the present text of Deuteronomy resembles the form of ancient Near Eastern suzerain-vassal treaties. However, some far less settled questions remain.

There is no solid consensus as to *which* ancient Near Eastern treaties served as the model for the present form of Deuteronomy. Mendenhall argued that the covenant texts of the Old Testament resemble most closely exemplars of the Hittite Empire of the second millennium BCE.<sup>12</sup> This would suggest a second-millennium BCE date for Deuteronomy.

Moshe Weinfeld and others responded by noting the similarities between Deuteronomy and the Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon (VTE). They posited that these first-millennium BCE treaties served as the model for Deuteronomy, and accordingly support the contention that Deuteronomy is the product of the monarchic period and, more specifically, the seventh century BCE.<sup>13</sup>

Andrew Mayes claimed that to appeal to the alleged treaty form of Deuteronomy is to miss the significance of the treaty “tradition.” Since Deuteronomy in its present form is not presented as a treaty document, but rather has adopted some of the language and form of a broad treaty tradition, attempts to identify which period of the tradition is represented in Deuteronomy are not helpful. In his view, arguments for the date of Deuteronomy based on adherence to a supposed treaty form are “inadmissible.”<sup>14</sup>

Beginning in the 1970s, serious concerns began to be raised about the Documentary Hypothesis. Some questioned the basic methodology of source analysis, particularly in light of ancient Near Eastern texts held to be unitary on other grounds but which nevertheless exhibit some of the same characteristics as the biblical texts. Others questioned the archaeological parallels used to support the analysis of source critics. In the 1980s, the consensus began to break down further as some maintained that the J source was the latest source, and that it was actually postexilic and post-Deuteronomic. One of the most significant critiques of the Docu-

---

<sup>11</sup> George E. Mendenhall, “Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition,” *BA* 17 (1954): 50–76.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 56–67.

<sup>13</sup> Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972; repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 59–81, esp. 60, and Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 5 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 6–9. In the latter (p. 9) Weinfeld argued that Deuteronomy is based on both the old Hittite model (via the “old biblical tradition”) and the Assyrian model.

<sup>14</sup> A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, NCB (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 33–34.

mentary Hypothesis emerged in this time. In a landmark work, Norman Whybray presented a powerful argument against the Documentary Hypothesis.<sup>15</sup> Whybray saw the entire Pentateuch as a comprehensive work composed by a single author<sup>16</sup> that should most probably be dated to the postexilic period.<sup>17</sup> According to his theory, since the Pentateuch was the work of a single author, Deuteronomy dates to the postexilic period.

The view that Deuteronomy is later than the monarchic period has gained more widespread support following Whybray's work. For example, Norbert Lohfink maintains that Deuteronomy's vision is largely utopian and could never be realized. In particular, the utopian nature of Deuteronomy may be seen in its treatment of the king and its vision for inclusion of the marginalized. He concludes that the final form of Deuteronomy likely dates to the postexilic period.<sup>18</sup>

Eckart Otto maintains that Deuteronomy developed separately from the rest of the Pentateuch and was later combined with Joshua. In the postexilic period, a "Hexateuch redaction" and later a "Pentateuch redaction" took place. Though based on earlier sources and redactions, the final form of Deuteronomy dates, in Otto's view, to the postexilic era.<sup>19</sup>

Mainstream scholarship now generally agrees that, although Deuteronomy is based on earlier sources and redactions, its final form is late. Possible dates range from the monarchic period (seventh century BCE) to the postexilic era. As Gordon Wenham notes, "the academic community is looking for a fresh and convincing paradigm for the study of the Pentateuch, but so far none of the new proposals seems to have captured the scholarly imagination."<sup>20</sup> The same may be said of dating Deuteronomy.

## Purpose and Ideology

Closely related to considerations of the date of Deuteronomy is the book's ideology, which has also been the object of considerable scholarly

---

<sup>15</sup>R. Norman Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*, JSOTSup 53 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, 232–33.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, 229–30.

<sup>18</sup>Norbert Lohfink, "Distribution of the Functions of Power: The Laws Concerning Public Offices in Deuteronomy 16:18–18:22," in *A Song of Power and the Power of Song: Essays on the Book of Deuteronomy*, ed. Duane L. Christensen, SBTS 3 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 346; Lohfink, "The Laws of Deuteronomy: A Utopian Project for a World Without Any Poor?" (Lattey Lecture, St. Edmund's College, Cambridge, 1995), 18.

<sup>19</sup>Eckart Otto, *Deuteronomium 1–11*, vol. 1, 1,1–4,43, HThKAT (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2012), 248–56.

<sup>20</sup>Wenham, "Pondering the Pentateuch," 119.

attention.<sup>21</sup> The association of Deuteronomy with the monarchic period in the earliest part of the modern era has led to several significant conclusions about its ideology. As noted above, Wellhausen's source analysis of the Pentateuch located Deuteronomy chronologically between JE and P. But he also recognized ideological differences in the sources. These differences became a criterion for dating the sources, and were important in tracing the development of Israelite religion.

The evolution of Israelite religion may be most readily seen through a comparison of worship as presented in the sources. For example, Wellhausen argued, based on Exod 20:24–25, that JE assumes that many altars will be built for the worship of YHWH.<sup>22</sup> However, Deut 12 changes this law, insisting on one central sanctuary and delegitimizing all others. This firmly fixes the date of Deuteronomy in the seventh century BCE and associates it with the reforms of Josiah.<sup>23</sup> However, P assumes and never argues for the centralization of worship at the one "chosen place."<sup>24</sup> Wellhausen concluded that this can only mean that the transformation of religion envisioned by Deuteronomy had become a reality by the time P was composed. In his view, this ideological change is inextricably linked with the date of the book.

Gerhard von Rad took a different approach. Utilizing the method of form criticism, he sought to identify the *Sitz im Leben* (setting in life) of Deuteronomy. He held that the form of Deuteronomy (which he limited to chapters 4–30)<sup>25</sup> reflects a traditional cultic setting, perhaps a covenant renewal ceremony. However, in Deuteronomy's present form the cultic setting has been largely abandoned, and the older material has been reworked as an instructional address to the people as a whole.<sup>26</sup>

Central to understanding von Rad's view of the ideology of Deuteronomy is his view of authorship (which, in turn, is connected to questions of date). Von Rad maintained that the Levites were responsible for the composition of Deuteronomy, on the grounds that they would have

---

<sup>21</sup> I understand ideology as representing the system of beliefs (including religious ones), attitudes, values, and assumptions of a community or a part of a community. For a fuller treatment of ideology in Deuteronomy, see Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology*, 15–20.

<sup>22</sup> Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 29.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 34–35.

<sup>25</sup> Von Rad followed Noth in treating the first three chapters of the present book of Deuteronomy (as well as chs. 31–34) as an introduction to the Deuteronomistic History (DH). However, he saw significant growth in Deuteronomy during the period of its independent existence prior to its incorporation into DH in the sixth century BCE. See Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966), 12.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 15–23.

had access to the religious literature as well as the authority to interpret ancient traditions in light of contemporary concerns. Moreover, given the close association between the theology of the holy war and the ark, and the fact that it was the Levites who maintained the ark, the emphasis on holy war in Deuteronomy suggested that the authors of Deuteronomy were Levites.<sup>27</sup>

More specifically, von Rad believed that the authors of Deuteronomy were “country Levites,” who sought, with the support of the “people of the land,” to revive the “old patriarchal traditions” of Yahwism, which date back to the amphictyonic period.<sup>28</sup> He based this argument on the relative insignificance of the king in Deuteronomy and the absence of any apparent reference to the Davidic covenant and associated messianic implications. He further maintained that only the country Levites could have possessed the resources and authority to reinterpret and reintroduce older traditions in light of a new context.<sup>29</sup>

Cult centralization holds an unusual place in von Rad’s interpretation of Deuteronomy. On the one hand, it was supposedly “the most important special feature of Deuteronomy”<sup>30</sup> and was a necessary result of Deuteronomy’s uncompromising insistence that “YHWH is One” (Deut 6:4).<sup>31</sup> Centralization had far-reaching consequences for the religious life of Israel. We should understand the centralizing laws as “a fresh interpretation . . . of the old cultic system, an interpretation which had become necessary owing on the one hand to abuses introduced . . . and on the other to quite new perceptions of Yahweh and his relationship to Israel.”<sup>32</sup> These “abuses” and “new perceptions” presumably involve the anthropomorphic conception of YHWH’s presence and the rejection of that view by the authors of Deuteronomy.

On the other hand, von Rad cautioned against seeing centralization as the theological center of the book. He saw Deuteronomy’s demand for centralization as a relatively late development in the evolution of the book and maintained that centralization was “comparatively easy to remove as a late and final adaptation of many layers of material.”<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 24–25. See also Gerhard von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, SBT (London: SCM, 1953), 66–67.

<sup>28</sup> Von Rad, *Studies*, 66–67.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 62–67. This view has been challenged. See, e.g., the critique of Weinfeld, *Deuteronomistic School*, 53–58.

<sup>30</sup> Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 16, 88–89.

<sup>31</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1, *The Theology of Israel’s Historical Traditions*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 226–27; von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 91.

<sup>32</sup> Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 91.

<sup>33</sup> Von Rad, *Studies*, 67.

Far from pervading the entire legal corpus in Deuteronomy, the demand for centralization is emphasized in only seven areas: the altar law (ch. 12), tithes (14:22–29), firstlings (15:19–23), feasts (16:1–17), the central judicial tribunal (17:8–13), provisions for priests (18:1–8), and cities of refuge (19:1–13). This demand is either unknown or contradicted in other laws.<sup>34</sup>

Von Rad also raised the question of whether or not centralization *per se* was a new concept in Deuteronomy. After all, prior to the establishment of the temple under Solomon, in its various locations the ark may have served as the cultic center to which the tribes journeyed for pilgrimage festivals.<sup>35</sup> Also, the Book of the Covenant begins with its own altar law (Exod 20:24). While von Rad allowed that the altar law in Deuteronomy is different, he maintained that:

It is not right to regard as its primary aspect . . . an abrupt discontinuance of old usages. There is probably, after all, much that is traditional in this Deuteronomic rule which appears to be so revolutionary. This is evident in the resemblance of the form of the basic Deuteronomic law to the law of the altar in the Book of the Covenant. When compared with the latter, the formulation in Deuteronomy appears to be only a fresh wording.<sup>36</sup>

Thus von Rad seemed cautious about the nature of centralization in Deuteronomy and its significance. For him, the idea of covenant and the need for loyalty to YHWH were more significant than the idea of centralization.

Similar ambiguity surrounds the nature of Deuteronomy. On the whole, von Rad saw Deuteronomy as setting forth a utopian agenda. In its present form the book is a record of preaching, couched in the liturgical form of a covenant renewal ceremony. The aim of this preaching is to inculcate in the people obedience and loyalty to the commands of YHWH.<sup>37</sup> In that respect, Deuteronomy is highly realistic, since the purpose and tenor of the exhortation is to bring people to real obedience to YHWH. However, von Rad also saw in Deuteronomy an attempt “by a ‘utopian’ anachronism” to revert back to the old amphictyonic order.<sup>38</sup> Deuteronomy represents an effort by reformers of the seventh century

---

<sup>34</sup> Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 16, 89. See, e.g., p. 115 (on Deut 16:21–22).

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 16–17.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 90–91. According to von Rad, of the three “centralizing ordinances” in Deut 12 (vv. 1–7; 8–12; 13–19), the third is the earliest because it is worded in the singular. See *ibid.*, 16.

<sup>37</sup> Von Rad, *Theology*, 225.

<sup>38</sup> Von Rad, *Studies*, 64n2. The idea of the amphictyony as promulgated by Noth and understood by von Rad has been largely rejected. This idea was first introduced in Martin Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels*, BWANT (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930).

BCE to recover the lost glory of an earlier, better age in which Israel was ostensibly devoted to YHWH and in which it could rely on the security of his protection. Of course, it would be practically impossible for a monarchic state to revert to the institutions and practices of the premonarchic period. Thus, the vision of Deuteronomy is ultimately utopian.

However, at the same time von Rad saw the book as fiercely realistic in its opposition to syncretism and the influence of Canaanite religion. He noted that “Deuteronomy is in no sense a theoretical compendium of the will of Jahweh: rather it develops its demands” against Canaanite religion, which represented a threat to Yahwism.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, on the one hand, Deuteronomy may be seen as utopian in terms of the era to which it seems to want to return and the way it envisions Israel in every generation as being on the verge of the fulfillment of divine promises. On the other hand, it is fiercely realistic in its expectation that the people of YHWH are to be uncompromisingly loyal to YHWH.

In contrast to von Rad, Weinfeld maintained that Deuteronomy presents not a utopian ideal that could never be implemented but a realistic and revolutionary program of reform. The goal of that reform was the consolidation of power in Jerusalem, both of the king and the temple, and a correction—even repudiation—of earlier thinking and theology. In Weinfeld’s view, at the heart of Deuteronomy is a program of centralization that intentionally resulted in “demythologization and secularization.” He notes:

The centralization of the cult was in itself, of course, a sweeping innovation in the history of the Israelite cultus, but its consequences were . . . decisively more revolutionary in nature, in that they involved the collapse of an entire system of concepts which for centuries had been regarded as sacrosanct. . . . [Israelite religious life] was freed from its ties to the cult and was transformed into an abstract religion which did not necessarily require any external expression. Indeed the very purpose of the book of Deuteronomy . . . was to curtail and circumscribe the cultus and not to extend or enhance it.<sup>40</sup>

As a realistic program of reform, Deuteronomy in some form served as the basis for the reforms of Josiah.<sup>41</sup> Indeed, the connection between

---

<sup>39</sup> Von Rad, *Theology*, 227–28.

<sup>40</sup> Weinfeld, *Deuteronomistic School*, 190. See also Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 37.

<sup>41</sup> Weinfeld stated that the form of Deuteronomy that served as the basis for the reforms included “an introduction, a law code (certainly chapters 12–19, which embody the principles of the reform) and the admonition in chapter 28 regarding the rewards for obedience and punishments for violation of the ‘terms of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to conclude with the Israelites’ (Deuteronomy 28:69)” (Moshe Weinfeld, “Deuteronomy’s Theological Revolution,” *BRev* 12.1 [1996]: 38). See also Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 9–13.

Deuteronomy and Josiah's reform is so strong that Josiah's reform "might well be called the Deuteronomic Reform."<sup>42</sup> Weinfeld argues further that

the book of Deuteronomy appears indeed to have the character of an ideal national constitution representing all the official institutions of the state: the monarchy, the judiciary, the priesthood, and prophecy. These institutions are successively referred to in Deut 16:18–18:22 and are depicted not only in realistic terms but also in terms of the ideal at which this neutral circle of scribes was clearly aiming—a national regime which incorporated all the normative, spiritual, and religious circles of the period.<sup>43</sup>

It is clear that in Weinfeld's view Josiah's revolutionary reforms sought to some extent to apply the requirements of the form of Deuteronomy that existed at that time and that they accorded with the theological understanding and ideology of the book.<sup>44</sup>

For Weinfeld, centralization of the cult was at the heart of Deuteronomy's program, and thus Josiah's reforms. What started with the call to eliminate the worship sites of the Canaanites went on to centralize the cult through the elimination even of the YHWH-centered high places. This centralization had far-reaching implications. Before, priests could be consulted in difficult judicial matters at local altars, but the elimination of such altars necessitated changes. This accounts for Deuteronomy's call to appoint judges in the towns.<sup>45</sup> Because centralization resulted in the reduction of the significance of the cult in the day-to-day lives of the Israelites, Weinfeld understood this as "secularization."<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>Weinfeld, "Theological Revolution," 38. However, he noted that at least one aspect of the reforms, the eradication of alien cults, was undertaken *prior* to the discovery of the Book of the Torah. See also Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 73–74.

<sup>43</sup>Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic School*, 168.

<sup>44</sup>However, it would be simplistic to argue that Weinfeld saw in Josiah's reform simply the application of Deuteronomic principles. Rather, he recognized a more dynamic relationship between the reform and the book of Deuteronomy in which the reform itself (which was based in large part on some form of the book) reshaped the book and contributed to its development.

<sup>45</sup>Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic School*, 233–35.

<sup>46</sup>Weinfeld described Deuteronomy as having a "distinctly secular foundation. Not only do we encounter institutions of a manifestly secular character such as the judiciary . . . the monarchy . . . the military . . . and civil and criminal laws which treat of the family and inheritance . . . loans and debts . . . litigations and quarrels . . . trespassing . . . and false testimony . . . and the like; but . . . even institutions and practices which were originally sacral in character have here been recast in secularized forms. . . . The very book which is so centrally concerned with 'the chosen place' has almost completely ignored the sacral institutions which the chosen place must necessarily imply and without which the conduct of sacral worship is unimaginable" (*ibid.*, 188).

According to Weinfeld, Deuteronomy's program also involved demythologization. Demythologization refers to the tendency to reinterpret earlier theology (which most understand to have been less abstract in its theological constructs) in favor of a more spiritual, abstract understanding. The tendency toward secularization and demythologization may be seen in the following features of Deuteronomy: profane slaughter, an altered understanding of firstlings, reinterpretation of tithes, a changed view of the cultic calendar, a humanitarian motivation for laws, cities of refuge, the elimination of priestly involvement in local judicial matters, the status of Levites, a more abstract conception of God, and a shift in the understanding of the presence of God.<sup>47</sup>

As we have seen, for Weinfeld, Deuteronomy's program is eminently realistic, though he also conceded that it contained some utopian elements. On the one hand, Deuteronomy is realistic in its political agenda to support the reforms of Josiah in the seventh century BCE. On the other hand, Deuteronomy seeks to advance a more abstract, spiritual religion.

Bernard Levinson introduced another approach that has had considerable influence. Like Weinfeld, Levinson saw Deuteronomy (understood as a form of the book that included a law of centralization) as supporting the reforms of Josiah.<sup>48</sup> For him, the authors of this work were scribes who drew on other texts—particularly the Covenant Code—intentionally to support radical transformation of Israelite law, religion, and social structure. Such transformation was unprecedented in the history of Israel.<sup>49</sup>

Levinson agreed with Weinfeld that the authors of Deuteronomy envisioned a radical program of reform. He suggested that this was carried out through a radical transformation of existing law and practice through the use of the very lemmas of the earlier laws.<sup>50</sup> With this reinterpretation, the authors deliberately redefined the nature and role of the judicial system at the local level. Deuteronomy is obviously radical in that it transfers to the central tribunal the authority to adjudicate ambiguous cases and supplants the clan-elder role in the judiciary with the appointment of judges and officers in each town (Deut 16:18).<sup>51</sup> Levinson noted that Deuteronomy is completely silent on the role of clan elders, and that the authors "impose their professionalized judicial system upon the city gate

---

<sup>47</sup>Moshe Weinfeld, "On 'Demythologization and Secularization' in Deuteronomy," *IEJ* 23 (1973): 230–31. See also Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 37–44. For a more detailed discussion and evaluation of Weinfeld's view, see Vogt, *Deuteronomic Theology*, 71–93.

<sup>48</sup>Bernard M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 9.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, 3–22.

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*, 124–27.

as if it were a tabula rasa without traditional legal-historical occupants.”<sup>52</sup> According to Levinson, this silence about the elders can “only constitute a deliberate polemic.”<sup>53</sup> The purpose of the authors of Deuteronomy was to create an independent judiciary, free of control by the institution of the monarchy. The result is a political system in which the judge does not serve the king; instead, both offices, king and judge, are subject to the authority of the Torah.<sup>54</sup>

For Levinson, Deuteronomy’s vision of the program of centralization of justice is both realistic and utopian. On the one hand, it is utopian in its subjugation of all offices to the Torah. On the other hand, it is realistic in its systematic and deliberate reinterpretation of the Covenant Code and the judicial system and procedures described there. Levinson recognized in Deuteronomy both a “draft constitution” and a description of the office bearers of theocracy. He noted that “the Deuteronomic agenda is thus both cultic and judicial, both utopian and practical; it is concerned both with the rewriting of texts and with the transformation of public life.”<sup>55</sup>

I conclude by briefly considering the view of Lohfink, who saw Deuteronomy as a utopian text that could not be implemented. The purpose and ideology of the book was to articulate a normative worldview that centered on God’s concern for the marginalized. It postulated a “world that is in contrast to all other worlds.”<sup>56</sup> According to Lohfink, Deuteronomy envisions a society in which poverty and marginalization are “beyond the borders.” In so doing, Deuteronomy contrasts sharply with both the ideologies of the ancient Near East and earlier legal material.<sup>57</sup>

## Composition and Structure

My final area of review is the composition and structure of Deuteronomy. As with the previous issues, mainstream scholarship has posited several different possibilities for the composition of the book.

Scholars have described the structure of Deuteronomy in several different ways. The variety in approaches stems from the book itself, which Christopher Wright aptly notes is “so rich in content and texture that, like a rich fruitcake, it can be sliced in various ways.”<sup>58</sup> At the same time,

---

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 125.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 126–27.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 137.

<sup>56</sup> Lohfink, “Laws of Deuteronomy,” 16.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>58</sup> Christopher J. H. Wright, *Deuteronomy*, NIBCOT 4 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 1.

scholars are divided on whether to understand the book as a unified composition or as a composite representing different strata and layers.

Following Wellhausen's proposal that the Pentateuch represents different sources dating to different time periods, questions arose as to the composition and unity of Deuteronomy. Some have understood its growth in terms of sources, reminiscent of the understanding of the development of the Pentateuch as a whole. They used the change in form of address between second-person singular and plural (*Numeruswechsel*) to identify sources in Deuteronomy.<sup>59</sup> In this approach, the oldest version of Deuteronomy used a singular pronoun, while a later version used plural forms.

Not all accepted this understanding. Lohfink saw the *Numeruswechsel* as a stylistic device intended to capture the attention of the listener.<sup>60</sup> Parts of Deuteronomy considered on other grounds to be a unity (such as Deut 4:1–40) alternate between singular and plural forms of address. This calls into question the reliability of the *Numeruswechsel* as an indicator of disparate sources.<sup>61</sup>

More recently, some have explained the phenomenon of *Numeruswechsel* on rhetorical grounds as well. Timothy Lenchak argued that the change in number represents a deliberate attempt by the author to persuade his audience. Rather than being a merely stylistic issue, the change in address reflects the author's determination to convince his audience that all Israel—as individuals and as a collective—must be radically devoted to YHWH.<sup>62</sup>

After Wellhausen, Martin Noth had the greatest influence on mainstream understanding of the composition and structure of Deuteronomy. In his landmark work *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*,<sup>63</sup> Noth claimed that Deuteronomy is best seen not as a part of the so-called Hexateuch, but rather as the first part of a Deuteronomistic History (DH), which consists of the books Deuteronomy through Kings. He saw this work as the product

---

<sup>59</sup> See the description and analysis of this approach in Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 34–38. See also Duane L. Christensen, “Deuteronomy in Modern Research: Approaches and Issues,” in *Song of Power*, 3–5.

<sup>60</sup> Norbert Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5–11*, AnBib 20 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1963).

<sup>61</sup> Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 36. The use of *Numeruswechsel* as a criterion for source identification continues, however. Modern versions of the theory are influenced by the work of Martin Noth; see below.

<sup>62</sup> Timothy A. Lenchak, “Choose Life!”: *A Rhetorical-Critical Investigation of Deuteronomy 28,69–30,20*, AnBib 129 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1993), 13–16.

<sup>63</sup> Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1957). References here are to the English translation of the first 110 pages, which appears in Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 15 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981). The remainder of the work appears in English translation in Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, JSOTSup 50 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

of an author, not an editor, who “brought together material from highly varied traditions and arranged it according to a carefully conceived plan.”<sup>64</sup> According to Noth, the book of Deuteronomy was composed to serve as the introduction to the larger work. Thus, chapters 1–3 of Deuteronomy are not simply an introduction to the book of Deuteronomy, but function primarily as an introduction to DH.<sup>65</sup> This introduction was placed before an older version of the Deuteronomistic law that is essentially the same as that found in Deut 4:44–30:20.<sup>66</sup> Noth also postulated a purpose for this entire composition—to demonstrate that the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE was a result of Israel’s failure to keep the covenant. As the introduction to DH, Deuteronomy helps explain the nature and terms of that covenant.

Noth’s approach signaled a significant departure from that of his predecessors. Since Wellhausen, the study of Deuteronomy was focused largely on identifying the various sources lying behind the final form of the text. In particular, scholars tried to identify the earliest form of Deuteronomy (sometimes called Urdeuteronomium = UrDt) and other sources that were combined with it to form the present book. However, Noth argued for a basic UrDt that was modified by a single author, whose purpose was to explain the fall of Jerusalem and the catastrophe of the exile. To a great degree his analysis consisted of distinguishing between Deuteronomistic and earlier materials.

Mainstream critics adopted Noth’s approach in many respects. Some suggested that there were two (or more) versions of DH that have been woven together in the final form of the text. For example, Frank Cross distinguished two versions of DH. The first, Dtr<sup>1</sup>, which was composed in the time of Josiah and in support of the Josianic reforms, characteristically emphasized themes of judgment and hope. The second version, Dtr<sup>2</sup>, which was composed during the exile (about 550 BCE), was far less hopeful in its outlook. However, Cross noted that he followed Noth in seeing the author of Dtr<sup>1</sup> as truly creative, and did not challenge the general implications of Noth’s theory for the book of Deuteronomy.<sup>67</sup>

Noth’s approach was significant for the study of Deuteronomy because he made the idea that different voices could be heard in Deuteronomy generally acceptable.<sup>68</sup> Noth’s additional proposal that the purpose of the

---

<sup>64</sup> Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 10.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 12–17.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>67</sup> Frank M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274–89. For discussion of how Noth’s and Cross’ proposals have been modified more recently, see Vogt, *Deuteronomistic Theology*, 10–13.

<sup>68</sup> J. Gordon McConville, *Grace in the End: A Study in Deuteronomistic Theology*, *Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 34.

exilic redactor of Deuteronomy and DH was to explain the exile in terms of failure to keep the terms of the covenant became a criterion for subsequent scholars for identifying redactional layers. Perceived changes in perspective or purpose were used to separate out layers of the text, and each layer was consequently seen to represent a particular ideology. Mark O'Brien rightly notes that "since Noth, the trend has been to concentrate on separating the Deuteronomistic (Dtr) redaction from the earlier material."<sup>69</sup>

While Noth thought primarily in terms of two sources in the present form of Deuteronomy (Urdt and Dtr), later scholars discovered many more layers. Although in principle the number of layers could be unlimited, efforts among mainstream scholars to identify pre-Deuteronomic, Deuteronomic, and Deuteronomistic layers in Deuteronomy (and DH) have reached an impasse. Despite broad acceptance of the fact of later redaction of an Urdt, conclusions about the identification and number of literary strata are diverse and, at times, contradictory.<sup>70</sup> This has led some to pursue new avenues of inquiry.<sup>71</sup>

Beginning with the important work of Robert Polzin, synchronic readings of Deuteronomy became common.<sup>72</sup> Polzin demonstrated that Deuteronomy exhibits a careful and deliberate interplay between the voices of Moses and the narrator of the book, and that the "separate voices of Moses and the narrator gradually fuse as the book progresses toward its conclusion."<sup>73</sup> Apparent contradictions, so often used to identify disparate sources or layers in the book, are the result of a deliberate effort to preserve a "plurality of viewpoints, all working together to achieve a truly multidimensional effect."<sup>74</sup> Polzin's work was significant because it presented a plausible synchronic reading of the text.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>69</sup>Mark A. O'Brien, "The Book of Deuteronomy," *CurBS* 3 (1995): 97.

<sup>70</sup>The theory of a later redaction of DH has also been called into question recently. A. Graeme Auld, "The Deuteronomists and the Former Prophets, or What Makes the Former Prophets Deuteronomistic," in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*, ed. Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 268 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 116–26, claimed that the influence goes in the opposite direction, i.e., that Kings has influenced Deuteronomy.

<sup>71</sup>According to O'Brien ("Deuteronomy," 101), "interest in tracing the contours of dtr and pre-dtr layers throughout Deuteronomy seems to be waning."

<sup>72</sup>Robert Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History*, part 1, *Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges* (New York: Seabury, 1980); and Polzin, "Deuteronomy," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. R. Alter and F. Kermode (Cambridge: Belknap, 1987), 92–101.

<sup>73</sup>Polzin, "Deuteronomy," 92.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.*, 93.

<sup>75</sup>Polzin noted that a synchronic reading cannot ignore diachronic considerations, and he maintained that the two approaches are complementary to one another. See Polzin, *Moses*, 2–5.

Since Polzin, there has been an increasing tendency to read Deuteronomy as an organized whole, even among mainstream scholars. The subtleties of argument and the skill of the author(s) or editor(s) of the book are increasingly recognized. Lohfink posited that the book can, in fact, be read as a whole, in which the various parts are interconnected and support a coherent argument.<sup>76</sup> Dennis Olson has also offered a theological reading of the book that seeks to take seriously the development of thought from beginning to end.<sup>77</sup>

## Evangelical Responses

From the beginning of the modern era, some have rejected the tenets and conclusions of mainstream scholarship on Deuteronomy. In general, past evangelical responses to Deuteronomy scholarship (and, in many ways, Old Testament scholarship in general) may be fairly described as reactive rather than proactive.

In assessing evangelical responses, it is important to note that, strictly speaking, “evangelicalism” as a movement did not emerge until the late 1920s in the United States (arguably marked by the founding of Westminster Seminary in 1929) and the mid-1940s in Great Britain (with the founding of Tyndale Fellowship). Earlier conservative perspectives were simply part of the overall scholarly conversation and did not constitute a readily identifiable movement.<sup>78</sup>

For the sake of convenience, I shall divide evangelical responses to mainstream scholarship in terms of the three primary issues addressed above.

### Date

As noted above, Wellhausen’s proposal for the composition and date of the Pentateuch and its implications for understanding Deuteronomy gained widespread acceptance in the scholarly community. Samuel Driver, who largely fit the mold of what would later be called evangelicalism, embraced the Documentary Hypothesis and helped advance and popularize it

---

<sup>76</sup> Norbert Lohfink, “Zur Fabel des Deuteronomiums,” in *Bundesdokument und Gesetz: Studien zum Deuteronomium*, ed. G. Braulik, HBS 4 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1995), 65–78.

<sup>77</sup> Dennis T. Olson, *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses: A Theological Reading*, OBT (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994).

<sup>78</sup> Gerald Bray, *Biblical Interpretation Past and Present* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 539–43.

in the English-speaking world. His commentary on Deuteronomy reflects both the assumptions and conclusions of the Documentary Hypothesis.<sup>79</sup>

However, others rejected the Documentary Hypothesis and “fought against the rise of liberalism.”<sup>80</sup> While not specifically focusing on Deuteronomy, James Orr and Oswald Allis represented this resistance camp.<sup>81</sup> As was the case with many others for much of the twentieth century, their work was largely reactive, responding to prevailing views of the composition of the Pentateuch (and, therefore, Deuteronomy).

The tension between evangelicals and mainstream scholarship on Deuteronomy (and the dominance of the Documentary Hypothesis as an explanation for the composition of the Pentateuch) is exemplified by George Manley’s work.<sup>82</sup> While engaging with evidence against the scholarly consensus dating Deuteronomy to the reign of Josiah, he articulated a case for a Mosaic date and origin for the book. Despite his careful presentation of evidence, his work was largely ignored. Von Rad’s 1964 commentary on Deuteronomy (translated into English two years later) appears to be unaware of Manley’s work or the arguments he proposed.<sup>83</sup> This is not uncommon. As Wenham notes,

conservatives have persistently tried to argue for a much earlier date for Deuteronomy, indeed often for a Mosaic origin of the book. Yet their arguments, even when cogently presented, have fallen on deaf ears; critical scholars may list conservative works in their bibliographies, but they rarely take the trouble to interact with them.<sup>84</sup>

Meredith Kline’s work represents another significant evangelical contribution to the discussion of the date of Deuteronomy. Responding to

---

<sup>79</sup> Samuel R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895), xxxiv–lxxvii.

<sup>80</sup> Bray, *Biblical Interpretation*, 543.

<sup>81</sup> See, e.g., James Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament Considered with Reference to Recent Criticism* (New York: Scribner’s, 1906); and Oswald T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses: A Reexamination of the Modern Theory That the Pentateuch Is a Late Compilation from Diverse and Conflicting Sources by Authors and Editors Whose Identity Is Completely Unknown*, 3rd ed. (New York: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1969).

<sup>82</sup> George T. Manley, *The Book of the Law: Studies in the Date of Deuteronomy* (London: Tyndale, 1957).

<sup>83</sup> Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*. Manley’s work was cited, however, by other evangelicals.

<sup>84</sup> Gordon J. Wenham, “The Date of Deuteronomy: Linch-Pin of Old Testament Criticism, Part One,” *Themelios* 10 (1985): 15. Not all evangelicals argue for an early date for the book. James Robson, “The Literary Composition of Deuteronomy,” in *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, ed. David G. Firth and Philip S. Johnston (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), 19–59, argued that the rhetorical situation of the book is the exilic period, though its origins are understood as Mosaic.

the discovery of ancient Near Eastern treaty documents, Kline held that the structure of Deuteronomy resembled the treaty pattern of the second millennium BCE. Because treaties from that period included historical prologues (like Deut 1:5–4:49), the book should be dated to the second millennium BCE, since first-millennium BCE treaties lacked this element.<sup>85</sup>

Mainstream scholars reacted to this conclusion by arguing that the absence of historical prologues in extant first-millennium BCE treaties does not conclusively prove their absence from all such treaties. The textual evidence may have been lost, or the prologues may have been presented orally or simply assumed.<sup>86</sup> Consequently, awareness of treaty parallels has not resulted in a consensus concerning the date of Deuteronomy.

Based largely on contextual considerations, evangelicals continued to press for an early date for Deuteronomy. For example, in his 1970 doctoral dissertation, Gordon Wenham presented a case for an early date for Deuteronomy based not only on treaty patterns but also on other factors, while Peter Craigie's argument for an early date for Deuteronomy was still based largely on treaty patterns.<sup>87</sup>

Around 1980, evangelical scholarship shifted from its reactive stance to a more constructive approach. This is evident in discussions of the date of Deuteronomy. Gordon McConville argued for a premonarchic date for Deuteronomy, not on the basis of treaty parallels, but on the basis of the ideological and theological emphases in the book. He noted that the rhetoric of Deuteronomy circumscribes, rather than advances, the powers of the king. This suggests that Deuteronomy opposes the "ANE royal-cultic ideology, in which the king is chief executive in cult and political administration."<sup>88</sup> Deuteronomy's opposition to the "royal-cultic synthesis,"<sup>89</sup> which was expressed further in accounts of the establishment of the monarchy, embedded this ideology into the fabric of Israel's worldview, which enabled Israelite religion and ideologies to survive the exile. McConville claimed that since it is unlikely this theology could

---

<sup>85</sup> Meredith G. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963). Kline took up Mendenhall's approach and applied it to Deuteronomy, arguing that as a whole it has the form of the second-millennium BCE treaties. A similar approach, though not focused exclusively on Deuteronomy, was taken by Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1966).

<sup>86</sup> See John A. Thompson, *The Ancient Near Eastern Treaties and the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1964), 14–15; Thompson, *Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974), 51.

<sup>87</sup> Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 24–28.

<sup>88</sup> J. Gordon McConville, *Deuteronomy*, ApOTC 5 (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2002), 34.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

have arisen in the disruptive context of the exile, the book must be dated much earlier.

Elsewhere I have presented a case for a premonarchic date for Deuteronomy based on the implied audience, another internal consideration.<sup>90</sup> Deuteronomy's remarkably positive treatment of Moab, Edom, and Ammon as Israel's "brothers" (Deut 2:4, 8) and recipients of land granted by YHWH does not fit international political realities in either the monarchic or postexilic periods.<sup>91</sup> Similarly, the place of sacrifice and the implied audience argue for a premonarchic date. It is hard to conceive that Deuteronomy could have been written in either the monarchic or postexilic periods without mentioning Jerusalem as "the place" of sacrifice. It seems even less likely that an alternative site, Mount Ebal (Deut 27), would have been named in either of those periods.<sup>92</sup>

## Purpose and Ideology

As is the case with the date of Deuteronomy, evangelicals have resisted most mainstream understandings of the purpose and ideology of the book. As I noted above, since Deuteronomy is usually associated with the monarchic period, its purpose and ideology may be seen as advancing relevant political interests. On this issue, evangelicals have tended again to be reactive in their criticism of mainstream scholarship. Given the general evangelical preference for dating the book to the premonarchic period, presentations of its purpose and ideology have largely focused on Moses' audience and Deuteronomy's communication to it. In particular, scholars have emphasized the book's historical significance rather than its rhetorical strategy or its literary devices.<sup>93</sup>

In recent years, evangelicals have focused on the purpose and ideology in differing ways. Rather than simply seeing the final form of the book as coming from Moses' hand, most allow for subsequent editing of the book.<sup>94</sup> This affects the understanding of the purpose and ideology of

---

<sup>90</sup> Peter T. Vogt, "These Are the Words Moses Spoke': Implied Audience and a Case for a Pre-Monarchic Dating of Deuteronomy," in *For Our Good Always: Studies on the Message and Influence of Deuteronomy in Honor of Daniel I. Block*, ed. Jason S. DeRouchie, Jason Gile, and Kenneth J. Turner (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 61–80.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 65–72.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 72–79. For another attempt to date Deuteronomy based on internal considerations, see Block, *Deuteronomy*, 27–33.

<sup>93</sup> As a representative example, see Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, esp. 30–32.

<sup>94</sup> See Duane L. Christensen and Marcel Narucki, "The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch," *JETS* 32 (1989): 465–71.

the book. Since a complete survey is impossible, I will focus on a couple of representative works.<sup>95</sup>

Wright argues that Deuteronomy should be interpreted based on the standpoint assumed in the book itself. (He maintains that the book is substantially Mosaic in terms of its origin, though he allows for subsequent editing.)<sup>96</sup> This leads him to identify a missiological purpose for the book; Deuteronomy seeks to foster an awareness in the audience that God is actively working in the world through Israel to advance his purposes and plans. In the context of a polytheistic culture, Deuteronomy “bends every rhetorical, literary, emotional, and moral skill to the task of equipping and motivating God’s people to live for God’s purposes in each generation.”<sup>97</sup> This contrasts sharply with Weinfeld and others who see in Deuteronomy a revolutionary, centralizing program of reform in support of the monarchy.

Similarly, Daniel Block sees in Deuteronomy not a political manifesto or program of reform, but a call to the people of God to faithful covenant living in response to God’s election of Israel and revelation of himself, and to advance their missional calling.<sup>98</sup> In addition to providing guidance for the administration of the covenant community, the book seeks to inspire the people to live out their relationship with God and thereby serve as a witness of YHWH’s grace to the nations. This is essential since Deuteronomy conceives of Israel as a theocracy with “Yahweh as her divine suzerain.”<sup>99</sup> This, too, represents a break from the more traditional (mainstream) understanding of Deuteronomy as a support for the claims of the monarchy.

Finally, my own work presents an alternative to the prevailing view that Deuteronomy advances a program of centralization, secularization, and demythologization.<sup>100</sup> Rather than advancing a radical program of centralization in support of the monarchy, Deuteronomy is radical in its insistence on the supremacy of YHWH and the way his people are to respond to this ideology in every aspect of life. Contra Weinfeld and others, I argue further that Deuteronomy centralizes sacrifice but perceives worship as extending into every aspect of life.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> For a survey of approaches to Deuteronomy with different understandings of its theological purpose and ideology, see Paul A. Barker, “Contemporary Theological Interpretation of Deuteronomy,” in *Interpreting Deuteronomy*, 60–90.

<sup>96</sup> Wright, *Deuteronomy*, 7–8.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>98</sup> Block, *Deuteronomy*, 38.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>100</sup> Vogt, *Deuteronomical Theology*.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 160–203. See also the shorter treatment of the subject in Peter T. Vogt, “Centralization and Decentralization in Deuteronomy,” in *Interpreting Deu-*

As is the case concerning the date of Deuteronomy, recent evangelical study of the purpose and ideology of Deuteronomy has been less reactive and more proactive. This has served to advance the scholarly conversation and debate in constructive ways.

## Composition and Structure

The final area I will examine is recent evangelical contributions to discussion of the composition and structure of the book. Once again, with their generally holistic hermeneutic, evangelical scholars break from mainstream approaches. As noted above, many mainstream scholars are rethinking long-standing forms of source-critical analysis. Whybray's work was an important catalyst in this movement, but the seeds for such a trend were planted even earlier.

The canonical approach of Brevard Childs served as a precursor to this change in direction.<sup>102</sup> Childs' emphasis on the final form of the text helped to undermine the notion that issues related to sources and the evolution of the text are primary. Rather, analysis should focus on the final form of the text. Meanwhile, Robert Alter's literary-critical work reinforced efforts to examine the final form, regardless of the underlying compositional process.<sup>103</sup> In particular, Alter's interpretation of literary doublets, type scenes, and the like provided an alternative to the historical-critical approach that saw those features as markers of disparate sources. This corresponds well with Polzin's approach, as described above.

In this area the correspondence between mainstream and evangelical approaches is obvious. Although Childs, Alter, and Polzin are not evangelicals, focus on the final form has gained acceptance in mainstream scholarly debate because of their work. Many evangelicals, who emphasize the final form of the text, are contributing to the broader conversation, despite persistent differences in understandings of the origin and nature of the biblical texts. This is particularly evident in mainstream scholars, such as John Van Seters and Rolf Rendtorff, who argue that the Pentateuch is essentially a single work,<sup>104</sup> sometimes for the same reasons

---

teronomy, 118–38.

<sup>102</sup>The literature on canonical criticism or a canonical approach is extensive. Childs' most significant contributions are *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London: SCM, 1979); and *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993).

<sup>103</sup>Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 2nd ed. (New York: Basic Books, 2011). See also Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*, ISBL (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).

<sup>104</sup>See Wenham, "Pondering the Pentateuch," 123–32.

that evangelicals do, though there is virtually no agreement as to when or for what purpose(s) the text was written.<sup>105</sup>

With reference to Deuteronomy in particular, James Robson has articulated an understanding that represents current evangelical scholarship in several ways. Robson maintains that “the question of the composition of Deuteronomy is very complex. . . . The difficulty is that the evidence points in different directions. Some evidence points toward an earlier date. . . . However, other evidence points to a final date of production significantly later.”<sup>106</sup> While seeking to avoid prejudging the evidence in either direction, after careful analysis of the data he concludes that the relationship between explicit and implicit evidence for understanding the composition of Deuteronomy “needs careful reflection. To regard some statements as self-evident and determinative for the interpretation of all other data is ultimately inconsistent.”<sup>107</sup>

Discourse analysis has provided another profitable approach to Deuteronomy’s composition. Studies like Jason DeRouchie’s advance the understanding of the composition of the book through a careful analysis of participant reference, connection, *inclusio*, and repetition.<sup>108</sup> These studies are significant because they provide additional data for analysis and help ground conclusions on more objective textual data.

As is the case with reference to the date and ideology of Deuteronomy, recent evangelical scholarship on the composition of the book has engaged with mainstream scholarship in important and helpful ways.

## Conclusion

This brief overview of the history of interpretation of Deuteronomy and the response from evangelical scholars has highlighted two key developments. First, in the three areas surveyed recent mainstream scholarship has become increasingly fragmented and pluralistic. For example, the lack of consensus on the date of Deuteronomy is a marked change from the early modern era, when the Documentary Hypothesis was widely ac-

---

<sup>105</sup> For similar emphases on the ideological unity of Deuteronomy, see J. Gary Millar, *Now Choose Life: Theology and Ethics in Deuteronomy*, NSBT 6 (Leicester: Apollos, 1998); and Paul Barker, *Deuteronomy: The God Who Keeps Promises* (Melbourne: Acorn, 1998).

<sup>106</sup> Robson, “Literary Composition,” 57.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>108</sup> Jason S. DeRouchie, *A Call to Covenant Love: Text-Grammar and Literary Structure in Deuteronomy 5–11* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2007). See also DeRouchie, “Counting the Ten: An Investigation into the Numbering of the Decalogue,” in *For Our Good Always*, 93–125.

cepted and the dates of the various sources were largely agreed upon. Similar lack of agreement characterizes perspectives on the composition of the book and its purpose and ideology.

Second, whereas in the past evangelical scholarship was largely reactive (which is understandable, given the overall academic environment), in recent decades scholars belonging to this group have made many proactive contributions to the study of Deuteronomy. The absence of the same level of scholarly homogeneity among mainstream scholarship coupled with a more confident and assertive evangelical cadre of scholars has resulted in a more collaborative and stimulating environment than at any time in the history of the study of Deuteronomy. Even if evangelicals' work has not been widely accepted, their increasing significance in scholarly conversations is a welcome development.