

Vannoy, Deuteronomy, Lecture 4

© 2011, Dr. Robert Vannoy, Dr. Perry Phillips, and Ted Hildebrandt

Survey of Support for Mosaic Authorship

Review

Last week under Roman numeral II, which is “The Authorship and Date of Deuteronomy,” we surveyed critical approaches. “D” is “Challenges to the classic Wellhausen position from various directions.” Number 1 was trying to move that 621 B.C. date to a later, post-exilic time. Number 2 was “Advocates of a date earlier than 621 but during the monarchal period,” and that would be Welch and von Rad. And then 3 was also pre- monarchal, pushing it earlier, even earlier than the kingdom period, but not back to Mosaic period. E. Robinson and R. Brinker both develop the theory that Samuel was basically the one who was behind the compilation of the book of Deuteronomy.

4. Advocates of a Mosaic Date for Deuteronomy

a. Survey of Early Mosaic Supporters

So that brings us to 4, “Advocates of a Mosaic date for Deuteronomy.” That certainly is the traditional view that the Bible itself presents to us. I’m not going to do anything other than just mention these names, but what you see there is a sequence of people that span from early 1900s to right up to the present. James Orr, the first one, wrote *The Problem of the Old Testament* in (1906) and argued basically for a Mosaic origin for Deuteronomy. H.M. Wiener wrote two books, one in 1912 and the other in 1920. The one in 1912 was called *Pentateuchal Studies*, and the one in 1920 *The Main Problem of Deuteronomy*. So, see already Wiener is focusing in on Deuteronomy as a critical issue for defending a Mosaic origin. J. Ridderbos wrote a commentary on Deuteronomy, two volumes in 1950 and 1951. That’s written in Dutch. I believe its recently has been translated by Zondervan in that *Bible Student’s Commentary* series. I don’t know if you’re familiar with that. It’s the English translation of a Dutch series of commentaries. Most of the Dutch commentaries were written in the 1950s, early 60s, and they’re gradually producing them in English.

b. More Recent Defenders of Mosaic Authorship

Just a comment on J. Ridderbos. J. Ridderbos--the name Ridderbos maybe is familiar to you primarily from the work of Herman Ridderbos who was a New Testament professor in Holland who wrote *An Outline of Paul's Theology*, which is a major work that has been translated, plus some commentaries. Herman Ridderbos was the son of J. Ridderbos, J. Ridderbos, the father, was a professor of Old Testament. I've mention this in some of my other classes. He had two sons, one was N.H. Ridderbos the other was H.N. Ridderbos. Herman was professor of New Testament and he's the one most English speaking people are familiar with. Niko was a professor of Old Testament, and J. Ridderbos was Old Testament, as well. But Niko Ridderbos was the man I studied with. He is now dead. But in any case, J. Ridderbos, the father, defended Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. And then, about the same time, G.C.H. Aalders, also Dutch, wrote an Old Testament introduction which hasn't been translated into English. His short *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, as it's called, has been translated into English. He defends the Mosaic origin.

O. T. Allis, to get to this country, for many years a professor at Princeton, and later at Westminster in the earlier days of Westminster Seminary, wrote *The Five Books of Moses*. It's a good treatment of Pentateuchal criticism, written in 1943. You're up into the Second World War era. Then E.J. Young, a professor at Westminster Seminary, wrote his *Old Testament Introduction*, the first edition was 1949 that was later revised and updated in 1960. He also defended the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy. More recently, R. K. Harrison's massive *Introduction to the Old Testament* in 1969 also defends the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy.

So my purpose of giving you those names is just to show that over this whole period of a century of time where this Mosaic authorship has been attacked, there have been those that have defended the Mosaic position all along. I'd say that they're all pretty much the same, although with Aalders he would allow for a few of what he terms "post-Mosaic" phrases here and there, particularly at the end of Deuteronomy with the account

of Moses' death, which I don't have any objection to either. That has been appended to the book subsequent to its completion. But Aalders finds a few other phrases here and there that he feels were post-Mosaic, which I'm not sure are necessary. But generally they're all very conservative.

c. Pentateuch is Foundational Position for Determining Conservative Books

Student question: So is it fair to say then that this Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is a very foundational position in determining conservative books?

Vannoy: Yes, I think so. You do find some evangelicals going towards accepting some degree or another some of this as post-Mosaic material. You see that's the shame of the thing. You take the Dutch situation for example. You can trace it in three steps: Aalders was very strong Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He argued against the JEDP theory to time's end. He allowed for a few of these post-Mosaic kinds of things. His successor, in that chair, was Niko Ridderbos, who went a step further and would allow sources in the Pentateuch, maybe some, and he would feel the Pentateuch was completed probably by the early kingdom period. So, you see you're not moving down. He didn't buy the JEDP thing wholesale, but he did make much more concessions to it than Aalders did. The guy in that chair now is a man named Cornelius Helmon; he almost bought the entire JEDP approach. But you could hardly call his view even an Evangelical view of Scripture. So in three steps you move from a conservative position to totally liberal in three generations. That's the way history seems to go. You start, you open the door this much, and then it opens more and then the original position is gone.

It's very involved and very complex. I think there are philosophical things behind it. There are probably intellectual questions of intellectual integrity. They often begin with here's a question that we don't have an adequate answer for so we have to concede at this point. To me, it's the basic view of Scripture that is behind it. Where do you get your view of Scripture? Do you get your view of Scripture in what the Scripture claims for itself, in the attitude that Christ had towards the Old Testament scriptures? It is a deductive process, or method. You get your view deductively that way or you get in

inductively by looking at all these problems one by one and you hold off until you can solve all of them. So you don't come to the conclusion that the Scripture is reliable. I think a lot of these men work with that kind of a methodology. Then they feel they can't say the Scripture is totally reliable because they don't have an answer to this or that problem, and then they feel that it's a matter of intellectual integrity. I don't think I would even question Helmon's Christianity because I know the fellow. And he's a godly fellow. But his views of Scripture are totally different. But I think it's because of their way of approach.

d. Other Books Supporting Mosaic Authorship

I should add to that, although it's not on your list. There's a couple more books to mention, so let me go further. G.T. Manley wrote a book called *The Book of the Law: Studies in the Date of Deuteronomy* in 1957; that's in your bibliography. I'll come back and make some comments on that book. B. Halwerda is Dutch. Again unfortunately, this hasn't been translated, but page 5, under "Centralization of worship in Deuteronomy" you see B. Halwerda there, the fourth entry. And the title there in Dutch is *The place that the Lord shall choose*. He discusses that phrase in Deuteronomy 12 and the implications of it in the centralization issue that is at the heart of Wellhausen's theory. I'll come back to that later also. And then, of course, Meredith Kline who wrote *The Treaty of the Great King*. His book is listed on page 4 under Deuteronomy and the treaty form, *The Treaty of the Great King: Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy, Studies and Commentary*, 1963. Lastly, I should add to that Peter C. Craigie, which is one of the commentaries that you'll read in the introduction for this course. In the New International Commentary on the Old Testament on the book of Deuteronomy published in 1976, he argues for Mosaic origin. So that's the most recent, detailed, good solid of academic commentary that's argued for this position.

J.A. Thompson backs up the Mosaic date. I'll come back and talk a little bit about him, but he feels that the final form that we presently have of Deuteronomy is post-Mosaic. I don't fully understand why he comes to that conclusion but we'll discuss that

later. McConville argues basically for Mosaic origin.

e. Recent Work on Mosaic Origin of Deuteronomy

Now of those from that list of people, I'd like to mention four people in that list who were working on different aspects of the Deuteronomy question, but whose works complement each one in confirming a Mosaic origin for the book. I think it's significant that in the last 25 years there's been new ground broken, you might say, on this question. So, even though it's been debated for a whole century, in the last 25 years--in some cases like McConville's book quite recently--there's been some new work done that tends to confirm and to increase the legitimacy of the argument for Mosaic origin. There are four people whose work together, I think, provides a strong case for reconsideration for this whole JEDP theory and particularly Deuteronomy's place in it. I'll take them in this order: first, Dutchman Halwerda. As I mentioned, he focuses on the issue of centralization of worship as that relates to Wellhausen's theory. He particularly discusses the interpretation of Deuteronomy chapter 12, which is a key chapter for Wellhausen's theory. That's part of the reason why I wanted you to translate chapter 12 and look rather carefully at it. We're going to discuss that in class in another week or two. But Halwerda addresses that centralization issue.

Then secondly, G.T. Manley in his book, the full title, *The Book of the Law: Studies in the Date of Deuteronomy*. He handles a number of questions there including the centralization issue, but he's particularly strong in discussing the alleged developmental relationship between, JE and D and then the P law codes. These three law codes, according to the Wellhausen theory, have a developmental relationship between them. What he does is compare material in what they call "JE," what they call "D," what they call "P," he compares that and points up numerous problems with a developmental theory. So, you know, even though on the surface it may sound impressive, Manley points up some problems with that kind of idea in his book.

Then thirdly is Meredith Kline. The strength of Meredith Kline is a totally different perspective. He works with the literary form of the book of Deuteronomy. He

looks at both its form and content from the perspective of the analogy with particularly the Hittite treaty texts, and he finds that there is close correspondence between the Hittite treaty texts and the structure of the book of Deuteronomy. The Hittite treaty texts are to be dated approximately to the Mosaic era, and certainly not 600 B.C. So I want to go into more detail with you on Kline's position. But what he uses is what you would really call a "form critical analysis" to argue for a Mosaic origin by finding an extra-biblical analogy in precisely the time that Deuteronomy represents itself to be. I think he makes a good case for that; I think he has a fairly strong argument. You can't speak in terms of proof. I don't think you can use arguments like that to prove beyond any question Mosaic dates for the composition of the book, but you certainly can create a model that fits with the date and that supports a Mosaic date.

The fourth person is Gordon McConville, the book you're reading. *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*. Now basically in McConville's book, instead of viewing the laws in relation to the laws elsewhere in the Pentateuch, showing how D relates to JE or D relates to P, McConville focuses primarily on Deuteronomy's laws as uniquely reflecting the theology of Deuteronomy. He says there's a theology behind all these laws, and the laws reflect the theology. The next step in his argument is he finds the theology to be reflective of the concerns of Israel at the time where they were about to enter the Promised Land, which, of course, then would be the time of Moses at the end of Moses' life. They're about to enter the Promised Land. He finds that behind the laws are the issues reflect that sort of a situation and a theology that pertains to that situation where they're about to cross over into the Promised Land. So you see what he's getting at is the theology behind the book which he says fits with the time of Moses.

So, you get McConville looking at Deuteronomy from that theological perspective. You get Kline looking at it from a form-critical structural perspective. You get Manley who looks at the Wellhausen theory and shows problems with that kind of approach. You get Halward who works with the centralization of worship issue. So what I'm saying is, a lot of these recent studies on the book of Deuteronomy complement each other in re-confirming a Mosaic origin.

If you look in your bibliography, page 5, I have there, “Centralization of worship in Deuteronomy.” That article by Kundall, “Sanctuaries: central and local in pre-exilic Israel with particular reference to the book of Deuteronomy.” That’s a helpful article. And McConville chapter 2: “The Altar Law and Centralization of the Cult.” Wenham in another article you’re reading, “The Date of Deuteronomy: lynchpin in Old Testament Criticism,” in *Themelios* in 1985. Those are three helpful articles. I might also pull your attention at this point to the third entry on page six, which has just come out. N.J. Paul. Now that’s in Dutch. This is a 1988 dissertation. And its entitled “The Archimedean Point of Pentateuchal Criticism.” And what he’s talking about is dating Deuteronomy. The whole dissertation is on this where he’s basically arguing for a Mosaic origin. So that’s really exciting. I just got a copy about two weeks ago, just before this course started.

I just wanted to call your attention to those four people, particularly. And you’re reading Kline and McConville. I’m going to discuss Kline at some point because I think that his argument is a crucial one. I’m also going to discuss Halward. I’m not going to be able to do much with McConville or Manley. You are going to be reading McConville. Manley, unfortunately, is out of print, so it’s hard to use it, but I just want call your attention to it.

III. The Covenant Form of the Book of Deuteronomy and Its Historical Implications

A. The Structural Integrity of the Book has Often Been Questioned

So, let’s go on to Roman numeral III on your outline. That’s “The covenant form of the book of Deuteronomy and its historical implications.” Now much of what I’m going to say under Romans numeral III comes from Meredith Kline’s work in his *Treaty of the Great King*. But “A” is “The structural integrity of the book has often been questioned.” Wellhausen said that there was an original core to the book of Deuteronomy, which he said was chapters 12 to 26. So, you see 1 to 11 then, and 27 to 34, he felt were later accretions. The original core of the book was not Mosaic, and of course, that was late. But what he’s saying is that structurally you don’t have unity in the

book. There's an original core of 12 to 26, the rest was added later; in other words, later than 621 B.C. Kline says of Adam Welch, who was one of the men we discussed under advocates of the date earlier than 621, but during the monarchial period, Kline says, "Welch finds confusion throughout the book but deems the framework, in particular, so hopelessly disordered that he declares it misleading to speak of an editor, since that would suggest that a degree of order had been introduced into the chaos." That's Adam Welch's estimate of Deuteronomy: so chaotic that there's no structural unity or order to it. He doesn't even want to talk about an editor because he thinks that would suggest a degree of order had been introduced that he doesn't find.

Another problem often discussed by these critical scholars is what is termed the "two introductions" for the book. Many of these writers say that Deuteronomy has two introductions. They say that there's one introduction in chapters 1 to 4, and then there's another introduction in chapters 5 to 11. It's a redundancy, they say, two introductions. G. Ernest Wright wrote the commentary on Deuteronomy in the *Interpreter's Bible* series, which is a pretty standard critical commentary from the 1960s, I believe. Wright, *Interpreter's Bible* volume 2, says of these two introductions: "Neither needs the other. They seem independent of each other." And then he adopts a view originally advocated by Martin Noth that Deuteronomy is really not to be taken as a part of the Pentateuch, but it's the first book of what Martin Noth calls the "Deuteronomistic History." It runs from Deuteronomy to the end of 2 Kings: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. Deuteronomy is the first book of that corpus of material, which he feels was written or edited by one individual in late, post-exilic times. What he says then is that Deuteronomy is the first book of that Deuteronomistic history, and that Deuteronomy 1 to 4 is the introduction to that Deuteronomistic history as a whole, whereas chapters 5 to 11 is an introduction to just the book of Deuteronomy. But I just mentioned some of those things to point out that the structural integrity of the book has often been questioned. In other words, a lot of these critical scholars come to the book and they don't find a coherent structure to the book.

The Deuteronomistic History is from Deuteronomy to the end of Kings. Of course,

the reason why you'd call that Deuteronomistic History is because the theology that's reflected through the historical narratives follows the theology of Deuteronomy, interestingly enough. Now, of course, what they're saying is that it's that kind of theological schema that's been imposed on earlier history because Deuteronomy wasn't around until 621. So, how would you find the history of Deuteronomy influencing, let's say, the period of the Judges if the book wasn't written until 621 B.C.? They'd say that the whole period of the Judges has been recast, or described, in a way that reflects the theology of Deuteronomy. There is a very real Deuteronomistic influence throughout all of those books, and of course, if you put it where it belongs, in the Mosaic era, you'd expect there to be Deuteronomic influence through all those books.

b. Von Rad's View of Deuteronomy's Structural Pattern

Alright, "b" on your sheet is Gerhard von Rad who called attention to the significance of Deuteronomy's structural pattern in his *Problem of the Hexateuch*, 1938. I mentioned that when we were looking at challenges to the Wellhausen position. Von Rad argued for a date earlier than 621, but still in the monarchal period; but the interesting thing is part of his argument was found in the structure to the book. That sets him apart from his older critical scholars, or even some of his contemporaries that found the book to be chaotic. He called attention to the structure of the book as a whole in his *Problem of the Hexateuch*, pages 26 and 27. I think I mentioned this earlier, but he says, "Obviously, from the point of view of form-criticism, no one would accept any such picture of the origins of Deuteronomy. It is precluded by the recognition of the fact that Deuteronomy is in form an organic whole." He continues, "We may distinguish any number of different strata and accretions by literary criteria, but in the matter of form various constituents form an indivisible unity. The question is thus inescapably raised what was the original purpose of the form of Deuteronomy as we now have it?"

He says structurally the book has four sections. That's in his *Problem of the Hexateuch*, page 27. He feels that the book structurally reflects, in chapters 1 to 11, a historical presentation of the events of Sinai and paranetic material connected with those

events. “Paranetic,” do you know what that is? “Paranetic” means exhortation. It’s from the Greek *paranesis*. Deuteronomy has that sort of sermonic character to it. It gives exhortations. Then the second section of the treaty is the law, chapters 12 to 26. Chapters 12 to 26 is the legal material. Then he speaks of the sealing of the covenant in 26:16 to 19, and blessings and curses in Deuteronomy 27 and following.

So what he concludes is, he wants to look at the whole book form-critically. What situation would give rise to this sort of form? And what he says then is, “In these four sections we recognize once again the basic features of what was formerly a cultic ceremony manifestly associated with the same festival which is reflected in the Sinai tradition along with JE.” So, the way he looks at it he sees the structure, and he believes, form-critically, there was some sort of cultic festival that produced this kind of literary form that’s reflected in the book. I’ll come back to that view later, but my main reason for calling attention to this is von Rad at this point is going against the consensus of critical scholars that the book is chaotic. He’s saying, “No, there is a structure.” It’s different than the source critical approach in methodology but has some points of similarity while utilizing different presuppositions.

c. Meredith Kline: Treaty of the Great King

1. Deuteronomy is a Covenant Renewal Document

Alright, “c” Meredith Kline utilized a form-critical methodology honoring the integrity of Scripture to open a new perspective on the structure of Deuteronomy, which has implications for its interpretation and date. Now, that’s all in your outline. What I want to do under “c” is summarize Kline’s argument. So “1” is statement of Kline’s thesis. On page 28 of his *Treaty of the Great King* he says, “The position to be advocated here is that Deuteronomy is a covenant renewal document which in its total structure exhibits the classic legal form of the suzerainty treaties of the Mosaic age.” I think that sentence gives you his thesis.

2. Kline’s Outline of Deuteronomy

Let's go on to "2." That's the introduction of his thesis. "2" is, "Kline's outline of Deuteronomy." When Kline looks into the book, he breaks it down into five parts: first, a preamble 1:1 to 5; second, a historical prologue, covenant history from 1:6 to 4:49; third, stipulations--covenant life in 5:1 to 26:19. That's basically chapter 5 through 26. Now, that breaks into two sub-sections 5:1 to 11:32, in other words chapters 5 to 11 is the "Great" or "Basic Commandments." The great commandment basically is: love the Lord your God, serve him alone, covenant loyalty, fundamental obligation of your loyalty to the Lord exclusively. "B" is ancillary commandments; those are the detailed stipulations, and that's chapters 12 through 26. Then fourth, sanctions--covenant ratification 27:1 to 30:20; that's the section of blessings and curses and other things. Then 31 to 34 is dynastic disposition, or covenant continuity. It is the provision for succession to Joshua on Moses' part, or dynastic disposition. So that's the structure that Meredith Kline sees in the book.

The article that I asked you to read by K. Kitchen is really a review of this book by Nickelson. Nickelson rejects the whole covenant analogy and Kitchen, I think, shows that Nickleson's rejection is unwarranted.

3. The Standard Elements of the Hittite Treaty Texts

Number 3 is, "The standard elements of the Hittite treaty texts." We talked about this analogy between the treaty texts and the structure of the book of Deuteronomy. What is the structure of the treaty texts? Everybody's pretty much agreed if you look at these Hittite treaties, there are twenty some of them, they pretty regularly follow this sort of a structure. They have five elements: 1) a preamble that introduces the great king, gives his name, his titles, that kind of thing; 2) the historical prologue summarizes the previous history of the relationship between the great king and his vassal; 3) the stipulations: these are the obligations that are placed on the vassal. They are placed on the vassal and are based on a sense of obligation to the great king because the great king has done certain things for the vassal. Therefore, the suzerain, or king, has reason to expect that the vassal will reciprocate by adhering to these stipulations.

Those stipulations can be divided into two types: basic stipulations and a detailed stipulations. A basic stipulation is that fundamental obligation of loyalty, and the detailed stipulations spell out all sorts of specific things to be done for the great king.

4. The Deposit of the Treaty Text in the Sanctuary

Next, sometimes, but not in all the texts, you have a provision for the deposit of the treaty text in the sanctuary of the vassal. Sometimes you have provision for periodic reading, so that text is then to be read to the people on certain occasions periodically, which finds a parallel in the Mosaic deposit of the copy of the law in the tabernacle and the reading of the occasion of the Feast of Tabernacles. But then 4) witnesses; and 5) curses and blessings. The witnesses are the gods who witness the agreement, or covenant. The curses and blessings are the things that these gods will ensure happen to the vassal if he is either obedient, in which case he will be blessed, or if he is disobedient, then he will be cursed.

5. Treaty Document Was a Libretto of the Covenant Ceremony

It's not incompatible with the book's own representation as coming from Moses. Some have felt there is a tension with this as a covenant. It's like the Hittite treaty, but do you realize that the book presents itself as a series of addresses. What Kline says on page 29 is the treaty document was libretto of the covenant ceremony. The libretto, like the word from a musical composition, the libretto of the covenant ceremony sometimes includes the response of the vassal as well as the declaration of the suzerain. When one therefore identifies Deuteronomy as a treaty text, we are also recognizing it as a ceremonial word of Moses. The customary conception of these Mosaic addresses is they are freely ordered farewells modified so that their formal structure closely followed fixed ceremonial-legal traditions. So this is certainly no stereotype liturgical recital. In other words, what he's saying is the book reflects a covenant renewal ceremony and the setting is Moses in the plains of Moab leading the people through their renewal of allegiance to the Lord. So, understanding it as a covenant renewal document is not incompatible with

the book's own representation consisting of a series addresses of Moses.

There's a formal similarity here with von Rad's approach. But, as far as differences, von Rad does not honor the integrity of the book as it is represented in the book itself. He has a highly theoretical cultic derivation theory. What he means by that is, and I've touched on that in the last class, he feels that there was a cultic ceremony held at Shechem under Joshua and the traditions to that ceremony were carried on through the years and generations by the Levites who, after periodic covenant renewal events, the form of Deuteronomy was devised, fairly late. Now, he feels it is not more than a century before 621 B.C. that the form is set so that he feels that Shechem ceremony, the ritual of it and the ideas of it, were preserved by the Levites and eventually the book of Deuteronomy's structure was derived from that. So both Kline and von Rad are using what you might call form-critical methodology in looking at the structure of the book but Kline's doing it in a way that honors the integrity of the text; von Rad is not.

Let's take a 10 minute break.

6. Deuteronomy Begins as the Ancient Treaties Forms Do

Number 6 is: "Deuteronomy begins as the ancient treaties forms." On page 30 of Kline's *The Treaty of the Great King* he says, "Deuteronomy begins precisely as the ancient treaties began. 'These are the words of,' those are the first words of the book of Deuteronomy—'These are the words of.' The Jewish custom of using the opening words of the book as the title turns out in the present case to serve to identify this book at once as a treaty document. Deuteronomy 1:1 to 5 then goes on to identify the speaker of the words as Moses, one who received divine revelation, and communicates the will of the sovereign Lord to Israel. Yahweh there is the suzerain who gives the covenant to Moses who is his vice-regent and covenant mediator. This section thus corresponds to the preamble of the extra-biblical treaty. The preamble in the treaty is where the Great King identifies himself. So this section of the treaty corresponds to the preamble. The biblical treaties also identify the speaker as the one who by this covenant is the spokesman. To go on to verse 3, "Moses proclaimed to the Israelites what the Lord had commanded him

to carry out.”

7. Kline’s Approach to Deuteronomy Solving the ‘two introductions’ Problem

Alright, number 7 is: “Kline’s approach to Deuteronomy solving the ‘two introductions’ problem.” He says on page 30, the bottom of the page, “A major problem concerning the unity of Deuteronomy is the presence of the ‘two introductions’ form in chapters 1 to 4 and 5 to 11.” He discusses that a bit. Kline says “The two introductions have obviated the real structure of Deuteronomy. A historical prologue regularly follows the preamble and precedes the stipulations of the treaty. And Deuteronomy 1 to 5, 1:5 through 4:49, qualifies admirably as such a historical prologue.” So what Kline is saying is that the two introductions are solved by this understanding of Deuteronomy as a covenant structure.

Chapters 5 to 26 correspond to the stipulation section of the treaty. It is the third division, or section, of the suzerain. Von Rad has noted the bulk that includes chapters 5 to 27 and start with 1 to 4 as a paranetic historical survey. Others separate 5 to 11 from 1 to 4 with the thought they are an introduction to chapters 12 to 26. But Deuteronomy 5 to 11 is to be recognized as expounding a covenant way of life, just as do chapters 12 to 26. Together they declare the suzerain’s demands: the basic obligations and detailed obligations. The former section presents a more general comprehensive structure of primary, or basic, demands. Chapters 12 to 26 present the bulk and add the more specific, detailed requirements. He says later on the bottom of page 32, “The character of the Deuteronomic stipulations from 12 to 26, you get this sermonic, or paranetic, kind of style.” And, “The character of the Deuteronomic stipulation from 12 to 26 exposes the inaccuracy of speaking of a Deuteronomic author following some rigid stylistic way.” He says, “This feature is not without parallel in the form of treaty stipulations in some treaty texts.” He says, “This document will be featured and will be naturally fully exploited by Moses in conducting the renewal ceremony which was also a personal farewell.”

8. Deuteronomy 5-26 Stipulations of the Treaty Form

Number 8. I should say under number 8, chapters 5 through 26, are the first phases of the stipulations of the treaties. The treaties were updated, they were customarily modified when they were updated. You do get some differences. For example, in Deuteronomy 5 in the Sabbath commandment, if you compare the Sabbath commandment from Deuteronomy 5, say verse 15, with Exodus 20, verse 11, verse 15 of Deuteronomy 5 says, “Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and the Lord your God brought you out from there with his mighty hand, and now the Lord has commanded you to observe the Sabbath.” It’s a new generation that Moses is addressing. In Exodus 20 the Sabbath commandment is based in the 6 days of creation. Exodus 20: “In six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth and all that’s in them and rested the seventh; therefore the Lord blessed the seventh, and made it holy.” Now the stipulation is the same between Exodus and Deuteronomy, but the stated motivation is different. This may be a result of updating to this new generation a feature that was characteristic of the renewal of a treaty.

9. Deuteronomy 27-30 Means for Covenant Ratification

Alright, chapters 27 to 30: that’s number 9. Deuteronomy 27 to 30 follows the standard form the treaties have presented as means for covenant ratification. It is usual to see 26 and following as added material: not part of the original form of the book but later accretions, or appendixes. To say that disregards the structural continuity of the treaty pattern, because in chapters 27 to 30 you have the blessings sanctioned in the covenant. That was a standard feature of the treaty texts. Here’s the way chapters 27 to 30 breaks down from Kline’s view. Here is a more detailed outline: 27:1-26 you have a ratification ceremony in Canaan. When you get into Canaan you are to go to Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim and there write out the law, and there’s to be a ratification ceremony. Then blessings and curses are in chapter 28. The covenant oath is in 29. So again that fits well with the structural integrity of the book based on that treaty analysis. That’s number 9.

10. Deuteronomy 31-34 Final Arrangements [Song of Witness et al.)

Number 10: Chapters 31 to 34 takes on great significance as an integral feature of the covenant rather than just appendixes. Chapters 31 to 34 in a more detailed way include final arrangements 31:1-29 is the song of witness. Witnesses were a structural feature of the treaty form. You get a song of witnesses in 31:30 through 32:37. The difference there is that in the Hittite texts the gods would be the witnesses. In Israel you don't have a polytheistic notion, but you have a song of witness, looking forward to days to come, explaining what's going to happen to you if you depart from the stipulations. That's a big part of the book, and an important part of the overall structure. Then Moses' testament in 32:48 to 33:29 where he pronounces his blessings on the tribes. Dynastic succession in 34:1-12, as leadership transitions over to Joshua, which was really the occasion for the whole renewal ceremony. Treaties were renewed at the point of dynastic succession, and here is precisely that. Moses is the authority, and he passes the mantle to keep the continuity going forward to Joshua. So again, there is not an entire dependency on the Hittite treaty form but its structural ideas do add to the integrity of the whole document.

Transcribed by Dawn Cianci
 Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt
 Final edit by Dr. Perry Phillips
 Re-narrated by Dr. Perry Phillips