

Robert Vannoy, Deuteronomy, Lecture 1

Literary Critical Theory, JEDP

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

1. Course Survey: 4 Topics

This course will cover the book of Deuteronomy in four broad topics. First, today we will be examining the authorship and dates that will include a rather brief survey of critical approaches to the book of Deuteronomy. The book of Deuteronomy is a book that has received an enormous amount of discussion in as far as its authorship and its date; probably more so than the other books of the Pentateuch, perhaps more so than any other book in the Old Testament. Of course, that's a very important matter in understanding the significance of the book. So we'll consider authorship and date.

The second topic in this course on Deuteronomy will be, "The literary structure and scope of the book." The literary structure of the book relates to some of the critical questions, but I think we ought to consider it as a subject in itself because its structure and its scope, I think, have a lot to say about its interpretation, its meaning, and its significance; particularly as you are aware from Old Testament history last year, in relation to the Ancient Near Eastern treaties and their structure to the book of Deuteronomy. What implications does that have for the concept of Meredith Kline's work *Deuteronomy: The Treaty of the Great King*, or of the law being the covenant with his people and what the exact nature of that covenant was? What implications does the literary structure have for understanding the nature of the book?

Third topic is, "Exegetical studies help selected passages." I want to just start that and come back later. Really, I'd like to spend a large portion of the course on exegetical discussions, and I'm sure we will do that.

Fourth topic is, "The influence of Deuteronomy on prophetic writings and on the so called 'Deuteronomistic history.'" I think we ought to look into that, at least to some degree. What is the influence of the book of Deuteronomy on subsequent parts of the Old Testament? How has the book of Deuteronomy influenced prophetic preaching? How has

it influenced the historical books that frequently are given this label of “Deuteronomistic history writing”? Again we’re back into critical questions with that, but I think there’s also something of significance there for understanding the nature of the historical books of the Old Testament.

So those four topics: authorship and dates, literary structure, exegetical studies, and influence on subsequent Old Testament literature. These are the things we want to look at during the semester.

2. Literary Criticism

A. JEDP Survey

First, some general remarks on the state of affairs in relation to literary criticism of the Old Testament. I think that it is certainly a valid generalization that after a century of debate on the JEDP hypothesis formulated by Julius Wellhausen about a century ago in its classic form, that his basic position remains widely accepted and very influential for the origin and nature of the Pentateuch. In spite of certain generally accepted modifications and adjustments to various details of the theory; the basic theory still remains pretty much intact, in the world of Old Testament scholarship, as far as the leading scholarly organizations and publications and societies are concerned.

Typical of current approaches are those expressed by Gerald A. Larue in his book *Old Testament Life and Literature* (1968) where he says, “Most present day scholarship accepts the basic premises of the documentary hypothesis, namely that different source materials are to be found, that the labels J, E, D and P are acceptable for major sources and that the order of development is that proposed in the Graf-Wellhausen thesis.” Now this is 1968; that is not too long ago, and in Larue’s opinion those basic premises from Wellhausen are still accepted today.

Here are the different sources of the Pentateuch. Those sources are often labeled J [the Jehovah source, ca. 850 B.C.], E [the Elohim source ca. 750 B.C.], D [the Deuteronomy source, 621 B.C.] and P [the Priestly source, exilic or post-exilic ca. 550-450 B.C.]. This is the order of those sources, as far as the time of their composition: J’s

early, E is later, D a bit later, P the last, is the order that is still to be regarded as the correct one and that was proposed by Graf and Wellhausen.

Larue goes on to say that the acceptance of this theory is the basic assumption for his theory of the Pentateuchal literature. When he comes to the Pentateuch, he starts on that assumption, that the JEDP framework, or structure that Wellhausen set up, is the way that you approach the literature. I think you ought to say that that is an admirable admission if somebody's going to do that because all too often there is no recognition at all that they are starting on that assumption and that JEDP is simply a theory. You pick up many handbooks today, and it's not presented as a theory or an assumption; it's presented as an established fact, and you start on the basis of that established fact. Larue says, "Because the documentary hypothesis is the most widely accepted of all the theories of Pentateuchal analysis, this book will utilize and delineate the conclusions reached by this method of research." Then he reminds the reader that this documentary hypothesis is nothing more than a hypothesis, a proposition assumed to explain certain facts. It is a theory. It is used to explain certain alleged problems in the Old Testament. So first you adopt the conclusions of that approach, and then you analyze the Old Testament literature on the basis of that accepted theory.

Now, frequently it is said that Wellhausen has become outdated, that there's been a lot of changes to Old Testament scholarship since this time. Yet there's been a move back to the acceptance of the Old Testament as it claims to be: as a reliable piece of literature in terms of the history of ancient Israel, and so forth. There's something to that. Certainly the radical edges to the Wellhausen theory have been knocked off of it, but basically the structure remains intact. Now, I'm leading up to something with all this and that is the critical role that Deuteronomy plays in this whole JEDP argument. It's the cornerstone, but I think we need some background before we lead up to that.

B. R. J. Thompson (VT Sup 19)

R.J. Thompson, that's a different Thompson than the J.A. Thompson, R.J. Thompson wrote a book called *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism since Graf*.

Graf was a predecessor of Wellhausen. Wellhausen built on Graf's work. Thompson wrote in 1970 this book *Moses and the Law in a century of Criticisms Graf*. It's a *Supplement to Vetus Testamentum. Vetus Testamentum*, for you who aren't familiar with it, is probably one of two outstanding technical journals in Old Testament studies. *Vetus Testamentum* being the one, the other, often referred to as 'Z.A.W.', *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, which is a journal for Old Testament academic studies. Both of them are in the library. But *VT* [*Vetus Testamentum*], is a quarterly journal. You might look at it sometime. They publish supplements. This is Supplement number 19; it's a full length book. The supplement series comprises technical monographs on various subjects of interest to various Old Testament scholars. This one was on Moses and the law, and is a history of criticisms since the time of Wellhausen up to when it was written in 1970. On page 163 he says this: "In 1965 then, a century after its publication, the Grafian hypothesis is still favored by the majority of scholars. Prophecies of its demise by Orr in 1905, Stace in 1910, Noybauer in 1918, DeBoise in 1923, Orbock in 1938, Levie in 1947, Ginsburg in 1950 have not been fulfilled. Instead, it has turned the tables on its critics and eroded the conservative bastions in Jerusalem and Rome and made inroads into Evangelical Protestants."

Now that's Thompson's conclusion as far as the continuing influence and acceptance of the Graf-Wellhausen approach to the Old Testament Pentateuch a century after it was first advocated by Wellhausen. So we're not then dealing with something that is of no contemporary importance or interest. It's not outdated when we say that the Wellhausen theories are still something that have to be dealt with.

C. Modern Impact

In recent years many commentaries have been written designed to aid the laity in teaching the Bible. The commentaries have adopted the Wellhausen theory as a basis for their interpretation of the Old Testament. All you have to do is go up to the library and pick up something like the *Layman's Bible Commentary* from the John Knox Press located in Richmond, Virginia and you see that they adopted as a starting point the

acceptance of the Wellhausen theory. *The Torch Bible Commentaries*, the SCM Commentary that's in London, *The Westminster Guides*, that's the Westminster Press in Philadelphia, or the *Bible Guides*, from Abingdon Press, in Nashville, are all popular commentaries designed to help people teach Sunday School class, but they adopt as a starting point the Wellhausen position.

Adherence to the Wellhausen position is also to be found in textbooks used in courses in religion and religious literature given in colleges and universities across the country. Probably some of you have seen that, maybe you have even taken a course in religious literature of the Bible and the textbook adopted the Wellhausen theory. For example, *Understanding the Old Testament* B.W. Anderson is a very common text used in those introductory university courses. *A light to the Nations* by Norman Gottwald is another. I could mention others, but the point is that in many university campuses the Wellhausen theory is present today, both in lecture and in textbook, as being the only way to approach the literature of the Old Testament.

D. Failure to Recognize Challenges

I think what's so misleading about these study guides and textbooks is this theory is presented as fact and as something that is established and irrefutable. If someone is not initiated into the vast literature of Old Testament scholarship of the last century and aware of all the debate that has gone on over this, the person is unable, really, to cope very well with many of the arguments that are presented. They may be are unaware that many tenets of the theory have been challenged and disputed, even among the critical scholars themselves. There's been a crossfire between these critical scholars attacking each other on various facets of their position. So unanimity is something that is found in survey books but hardly ever in the technical literature. When you get into the technical literature, you get into an unbelievable tangle of arguments back and forth over all kinds of details to these theories.

In this whole discussion around JED and P, Deuteronomy is of central significance. The interesting thing is that in the last few years, there have been some

exciting developments in the study of Deuteronomy that relate rather directly to this whole problem, and particularly through the question of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. So it will be our purpose to gain some insight in this discussion of authorship and dates into the question of why the dating of Deuteronomy is so crucial to the whole JEDP theory, and to learn something of the more recent developments in regard to the authorship and date of Deuteronomy that really provide some new weapons to be used against the Wellhausen position.

E. Wellhausen School's Approach to Deuteronomy: Deuteronomy Written in the Time of Josiah's Reforms ca. 621 BC

Now, let's look first at the authorship and dating of Deuteronomy from the Wellhausen school perspective. What is it? Just by way of a brief comment, as far as background, the book of Deuteronomy, according to its own witness, is of Mosaic origin. If you go through the book, it clearly presents itself as material written by Moses to the people of Israel on the plains of Moab before entering into the Promised Land. Both Jews and Christians have held it to be Mosaic all through the years until the beginning of the 19th century. So it's a rather recent development, historically, for the Mosaic origin of the development of Deuteronomy to be questioned.

In 1805 and 1806 a man named Wilhelm de Wette advanced the view, which has dominated the view of the critical scholars, that the law book that was found in the temple, according to 2 Kings 22, during the time of Josiah, is to be identified for the most part with Deuteronomy. Now, that in itself is not something drastically new. But the book of the law was identified with Deuteronomy. And here's the critical thing: that this book originated shortly before that time. In other words, it was written just before the time of Josiah about 621 B.C. as described in 2 Kings 22. DeWette antedated Wellhausen and adopted the view that Deuteronomy was the law book that originated shortly before the time of Josiah. In other words, its representation being Mosaic, is a "pious fraud."

That opinion of the origin of the book shortly before the time of Josiah became a cornerstone of the whole JEDP theory. Now, we want to get into why that is the case to a

degree. We can't discuss some of these questions in great detail, but we can get some idea of the line of argumentation. One aspect of the JEDP sequence, the force behind the Wellhausen theory was that he brought together lines of argumentation that seem to converge and support each other. One aspect of his line of argumentation concerning the sequence of the JEDP source documents was the comparison of legal material within those documents. In other words, you compare the legal material in the J source, the E source, the D source and the P source. The claim was made that if you compare the legal material within these sources, you can see a development. The one point that is fixed as far as a time is concerned, in that whole sequence of development, is the date of the book of Deuteronomy, which is dated to 621 B.C. So the legal material that is placed prior to that, of course, would need to be prior to 621. Correspondingly, that which according to the theory shows development subsequent to Deuteronomy, it would have to come after 621 B.C. But the point of reference becomes 2 Kings 22 and the identification of Deuteronomy with the law book that originates in the reign of King Josiah at about 621 B.C.

F. Deuteronomic and Covenant Codes

Now, in this approach, the main legal section of Deuteronomy is chapters 12 to 26. The legal material really begins there at chapter 12. That's generally known as the "Deuteronomic Code." They speak of a "Deuteronomic Code" as to be distinguished from other codes of law that are found in the Pentateuch. You have the Deuteronomic Code, Deuteronomy 12-26. Wellhausen felt that code originated in the time of King Josiah about 621 B.C. or shortly before. He compared that legal material with other groups of legal material in the Old Testament, concluding that these other groups of laws belonged to other points of time and these periods of time were rather widely separated.

The earliest of these other groups of legal materials were found in the "Book of the Covenant," or what's often called then the "Covenant Code," Exodus chapters 20-23. That Covenant Code, Exodus 20-23, is assigned either to J or to JE. Now the critics have often had difficulty in distinguishing between J and E. There's a lot of dispute whether

the Covenant Code is the product of J or is a product of the combination of J and E, but in any case, J or JE. In the Covenant Code of Exodus 20 and 23 there is said to be no centralization of worship. Centralization of worship, as we're going to notice, becomes a very important issue in this whole discussion. Notice Exodus 20 verse 24. "Make an altar of earth [that's within this Covenant Code] for me and sacrifice on it your burnt offerings and fellowship offerings, your sheep and goats and your cattle. [Now where?] Wherever I cause my name to be honored, I will come to you and bless you. If you make an altar of stones for me, do not build it with dressed stones, for you will defile it if you use a tool on it. And do not go up to my altar on steps, lest your nakedness be exposed on it." But altars are to be made by these stipulations, and they can be built as this indicates in all the places where "I record my name." This does not sound like centralized worship.

One of the standard commentaries of the critical school of thought in terms of Deuteronomy is the commentary by S.R. Driver in the ICC series (International Critical Commentary). It is sort of a standard textbook on Deuteronomy from the Wellhausen approach. He says on page 136--this is a commentary on Deuteronomy but talking about Exodus 20 to 24, the verse we just looked at from the Covenant Code--"Exodus 20:24 and following lays no stress on sacrifice being confined to a single spot, but directs it to be offered upon an altar built of simple fashion of earth or unhewn stone and attach it to whatever place, 'in whatever place I will put my name. I will come unto thee and bless thee.' The law is meant quite generally; its intention is to authorize the erection of altars built in any part of the land. So the idea is in Exodus altars can be built anywhere; there's no restriction on that. Whereas as we will notice later in Deuteronomy, the claim is there is centralization with a restriction involved."

G. Holiness Code & P

So, to get back to our point of JEDP progression, you have the Deuteronomic code, that's been dated at 621, and the J that's earlier, represented in the Book of the Covenant. It's also usual to refer to Leviticus 17 to 24 as the "Holiness Code." The Holiness Code sometimes is referred to as the letter "H." Now, with that legal material in

Leviticus 17 to 24 you have many different opinions as to date, whether it's before or after Deuteronomy. But it's somewhere not too long either before or after Deuteronomy. So you get the Covenant Code, you get Deuteronomy, then you get the Holiness Code that is distinct from Deuteronomy but developed around the same general time.

Finally, there's the Priestly Code: "P." The Priestly Code is dated during or after the exile (550-450 B.C.). So it'd be a good hundred years or more after the time of Josiah who lived in 621 B.C. That includes Exodus 25 to 31, Exodus 35 to 40, Leviticus 1 to 11, and Numbers 25 to 36, and some other smaller sections. In other words, this Priestly Code is felt to contain legal material of the "P" document, which comes from the time of the exile or after and is found in these scattered sections through the Pentateuch.

The relative dating of these codes was an essential feature of the Wellhausen's theory. Wellhausen's theory was based on this idea of development of religion in Israel. The relative dating of these codes was one of the lines of argumentation that was used, and in fact, one of the key lines of argumentation to demonstrate this development of religion by placing these things in a sequence. Driver, whose ICC commentary on Deuteronomy I mentioned a few minutes ago, on Roman numeral XIV of his introduction, page 14, puts it this way: "The different relation in which Deuteronomy relates to the three codes of JE, as in the Covenant Code; H, as in the Holiness Code; and P may be described generally as follows. It is an expansion of the laws of JE." And here you've got P as an expansion of JE. P follows JE and expands it. D is an expansion of JE. D is in several features parallel to the law of holiness, substantively parallel to the law of holiness, it contains a movement with the other parallels. A movement of the laws, not indeed always the same as, but similar to, the ceremonial observances and institutions codified in P; it contains allusions to "P." It anticipates certain things at times in P." He says that, "The dependence of Deuteronomy upon JE, on the one hand, and its independence from P, on the other, has thus established that the legislative quality of the books has been given the exact same matter through historical sections." He brings an authorial argument to compliment the good points of the liberal material.

H. J. N. Callow Smith Book on Hebrew Law; Holiness Code & P

He mentioned another book but there is a dependence on the Wellhausen tradition. *The Origin and History in Hebrew Law* from J. N. Callow Smith. Now, I've sort of given you this general plan of Smith's comments on that thing. On page 39 he has a chapter entitled "The Deuteronomistic Code." He says, "The next stage of development of the Hebrew law is represented by the Deuteronomistic Code, Deuteronomy chapter 1, verses 1 and 6. Now, what do we mean by the next stage?" Well, page 43 he elaborates, "It is [that is, the Deuteronomistic Code] a revision and expansion of a previously existing code.' that code was the Covenant Code! You have certain parallels in certain specific types of legal cases covered in Exodus 20 to 23, and you'll find these laws then referred to later in Deuteronomy. While discussing the same subject, the two codes will show the differences that have come with the progress of time. At least 200 years passed from the adoption of the Covenant Code before the Deuteronomistic Code was accepted by the people at large! Any time you see differences between Exodus and Deuteronomy in the expression of the same legal material, you're assuming that several centuries divide the formulation of the one code in light of the other code." And he takes that framework further with the other code. Later in that same chapter he discusses the centralization of worship.

As for as Deuteronomy, then he says, "The most important of the new laws is Deuteronomy. It's given first place, and the code [and that'd be in chapter 12] is the law requiring that all public worship and in fellowship must be carried on in the central shrine in the temple in Jerusalem." The centralization of worship becomes the key issue. That's the new thing that Deuteronomy adds. He says in page 55, "The centralization of worship in Jerusalem was a most significant step in the life of the Hebrews." His conclusion on the Deuteronomistic Code. "The Deuteronomistic Code is an expansion and a revision of the covenant theory. It reports in some degree on the progress and the social, economic, and religious life of Israel through the country with religion being the focus of the three things." And then he discusses the Holiness Code at the time of the exile. The fact that this code does not repeat frequently the other codes, especially the Covenant Code and

the P code, is indicative of its independent character. I'm talking about the Holiness Code.

The Priestly Code constitutes the larger part of the two documents. Like the other documents, the code is composite. It seems to have been based upon several previous moral codes. The Priestly Code is associated with the name of Ezra. It is recorded in Ezra chapters 7 to 10. Ezra gathered a group of priests and Levites from Babylon and with them came to Jerusalem to institute the reform of all marriages between Jews and aliens living in the land. So there is a link between the P code with the time of Ezra. So you get that general progression. Now that you get into a lot more complex questions and detailed matters in consideration of this whole matter but you need to understand the general progressive element of the theory.

I. Manley's Opposition: Centralization of Worship

Now, it may sound like an impressive theory, particularly when you read all the detailed arguments that are developed in some of this literature. But I think that if you read a book like Manley, *The Book of the Law*, he will give you a detailed comparisons on what has been written and weigh a lot of these arguments on a detailed basis. Can you really argue whether these laws bear out the conclusions that has been drawn by Wellhausen? I think that Manley's book does a good job of showing that the material doesn't really support those assertions and those conclusions. Now, it would take far too much time to go into that in detail, but I do want the graduate students to read Manley's *The Book of the Law* and to see then the nature of the material involved.

But for our purposes, I think the thing we want to note is that the identification of the Deuteronomic Code with the book of the law found in the temple in Josiah's time and then saying that the demand for the centralization of worship was something new in 7th century B.C., that was characteristic of the Deuteronomic Code. That idea of centralization was founded at this time, was written in the book of Deuteronomy, which it originated at that time, because it demanded centralization of worship, while the other codes did not. That centralization is the cornerstone to the whole Wellhausen hypothesis.

Wellhausen acknowledges that himself in Wellhausen's philosophy statement, page 368: "Because I differ from Graf chiefly in this; that I always go back to the centralization of the cultus, and deduce from it the particular divergency. My whole position is contained in my first chapter; there I have placed in clear view that which is so important to Israel's history. Namely, the part taken by the prophetic authorities in the great metamorphosis of the worship which by no means came about of itself." "My whole position," he says, "is contained in my first chapter, and I always go back to the centralization of the cultus."

In the first chapter, on page 17 and following, in the first paragraph of his book, he says, "The oneness of the sanctuary of Israel was not originally recognized. It was a slow growth over time in all that precedes in the building of the temple where there is not a trace that can be found of any sanctuary with exclusive legitimacy. All the parts of the sanctuary were part of the heritage taken over by the Hebrews from the Canaanites." So this idea is that centralization of worship is required in Deuteronomy. The fact is that 621 B.C. becomes a fixed point for Wellhausen's theory, and it becomes an important one. But the question we want to ask is: is centralization of worship the main point of Deuteronomy chapter 12? And if so, to what extent? And what relation does it have to this whole theory? Is there really a progression between all these codes? We'll discuss that thoroughly when we pick it up at this point in the next hour.

Second Hour

Review

The end of the last hour we had gotten to the point where I had tried to give you a general idea of the significance that the date of Deuteronomy and the identification of Deuteronomy with the law found in the time of Josiah has for the JEDP literary-critical approach to the Pentateuch formulated by Wellhausen. I demonstrated how important it is for that whole theory to regard Deuteronomy as being derived from the time of Josiah. At the close of the hour I mentioned that Wellhausen himself acknowledged that his thesis centers around that issue. He himself makes the connection of Deuteronomy with Josiah

and the theory of centralization of worship that he feels is strongly advocated in Deuteronomy. He thinks that centralization of worship began in the time of Josiah.

J. Importance of Deuteronomy for the JEDP Theory

Now, I want to pick up at that point and then just give you a couple other brief quotations that emphasize the crucial importance of Deuteronomy for the JEDP theory as a whole. This book, if you're not familiar with it, is a good book to know about. It's called *The Old Testament and Modern Studies*, edited by H.H. Rowley. *The Old Testament and Modern Studies* contains a collection of essays that survey Old Testament studies in all the various disciplines of Old Testament studies, summarizing the approaches that have been taken in this century. So that you have, for example, an article "Old Testament Archaeology of Palestine," by W. F. Albright; "Pentateuchal Criticism," by Professor North; "Historical Books," by Snype; "Prophetic Literature," by Einfeldt; "Psalms" by A.R. Johnson, and so on. I won't go through it all. But what it does is take all those different areas of Old Testament studies and gives you a summary article that sort of summarizes the research up to the 1950's. It's a good collection of essays, trying to give you a perspective of Old Testament studies in the last generation.

In one of these articles written by G.W. Anderson, page 283, the article is on Hebrew religion. He talks about Wellhausen's position, its importance and the debate surrounding it, and then he says, "At no point has the conflict been keener than on the date and nature of Deuteronomy, the keystone of the Wellhausen system of chronology." Deuteronomy is the "keystone" of the Wellhausen system of chronology. The debate, he says, has been keen in connection with that dating of Deuteronomy. And then he adds, "If there is serious uncertainty here, the entire structure of the theory is weakened." So, in other words, if you seriously question Wellhausen's placing of Deuteronomy at that 621 B.C. date, according to G.W. Anderson, who largely follows Wellhausen, if you can knock that out, you hit it at that cornerstone of the theory. If you can knock that date of Deuteronomy, you really seriously undermine the whole structure. "If there is serious uncertainty here, the entire structure of the theory is weakened." So Deuteronomy

assumes a very important place in the literary critical discussions.

H.H. Rowley himself, has written a little book that is a summary of the JEDP position called *The Growth of the Old Testament*. It's sort of an introduction to a basic Wellhausen source critical position. On page 29 he says, "The code of Deuteronomy, therefore, is of vital importance in Pentateuchal criticism since it is primarily by relation to it that the other documents are dated." In other words, that is the one fixed point, 621 B.C. and the time of Josiah, with the relative dates of the other codes depending on the date of Deuteronomy. "Moreover, that code can be more precisely dated with a greater measure of probability than any other. But the reason, of course, is it is in the highest degree possible that the law book as the basis of Josiah's reform was the book of Deuteronomy and that the book first became publicly known at that time." So he speaks of the significance of the dating Deuteronomy and ties it to Josiah's law book.

The standard critical introduction is Dr. Otto Eissfeldt's, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. If you want the most elaborate introduction to the Old Testament in the Wellhausen tradition this would be it. This is an English translation of the recent German edition in 1965. On page 171 he talks about this identifying of Deuteronomy with Josiah's law book, dating it in 621 B.C., and then he says, "By this part of history a large section of Deuteronomy has been established, and a fixed point was discovered by which the age of the other component parts of the Pentateuch could also be determined. DeWette's thesis thus provided Pentateuchal criticism with a 'point of Archimedes' to which it could attach itself in order to deliver it from the bonds of church and synagogue tradition, and put in its place an alternative dating of the Pentateuch in its heart." I don't need to keep going to discuss that further. But he speaks of the fixed point as an 'Archemedian point,' so to speak, of the whole structure.

So the dates of Deuteronomy are of enormous significance in the critical approach particularly for the Pentateuch, but that has implications to the other parts of the Old Testament, as well. Archimedes was a Greek mathematician, and an Archemedian point is a point by which other things are determined. In other words, its sort of a fixed starting, or standing point, from which one can move the world. If you can determine that you can

determine everything else.

Now, I think that the thing I'd like to draw out of that is this: that it is certainly, then, that the whole question of the date of Deuteronomy is of great significance but it is by no means a settled and agreed upon matter. Particularly, that is the case today in a recent discussion concerning the date of Deuteronomy. The whole topic is in a great deal of flux, and if you take Anderson's statement there 20 years ago--that if there are serious questions about Deuteronomy--that this whole structure is in serious jeopardy. Certainly then, that is something of great significance.

L. Challenges to the JEDP Theory

I have been working here with an outline. We started yesterday with Roman numeral I. "Authorship and date: a survey of critical approaches." Capital "A." was, "The theory of the Wellhausen school," which I tried to get to you and that we've just come to the conclusion of. Capital "B." is, "The challenges to the classic Wellhausen position from various directions." 1. under that, "Advocates of the post-exilic period."

Now, the challenge to the Wellhausen theory is from various directions. Since the advocacy of the Wellhausen position the date of Deuteronomy has never been a settled question. It's always been debated. Some want to push it later and some push it earlier. A few have said that you should take it as what it claims to be, Mosaic. There are all sorts of positions that have been established. I don't want to take the time, and I don't think that this is the place for it anyway, because of we want to get into the book itself. To go into detail in all these theories, that is a study in itself.

If you read *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, the article on "Pentateuchal Criticism," you will get somewhat of a survey of the discussion in that article. It is chapter 3, "Pentateuchal Criticism." You will also get somewhat of a survey of these critical positions in Thompson's introductory material. More so in Thompson's introductory material than in Cragie's introductory material. If you want a good survey of positions of criticism on Deuteronomy from an evangelical perspective, look into the introduction of E. J. Young: *Introduction to the Old Testament*. R.K. Harrison is more

recent and more detailed, that is R.K. Harrison's *Introduction to the Old Testament*. It gives a good survey of the variety of critical positions. I just want to give you some broad lines, a few names, maybe some ideas of directions and not much more than that.

But first of all, there are advocates of a post-exilic date. The first one here is R.H. Kennett. He wrote the book, *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*. He proposed a date for Deuteronomy in the post-exilic time of Haggai or Zechariah. In other words a post-exilic date sometime around 520 B.C. or in that general area. I don't think that there'd be much point going into a lot of his argument. [Tape cut off here]

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