Introduction

Literary Patterns in Deuteronomy

Last Will and Testament

Deuteronomy is part of a last will and testament of Moses. A dying Moses summons Joshua and offers his second thoughts on the great events that he witnessed (Num 27:12—Deut 34:12).[1] The Bible also preserves wills for Isaac (Gen 27:1–40), Jacob (Gen 48:1—49:28), Samuel (1 Sam 12), Joshua (Joshua 23), David (1 Kgs 2:3–4), and Abijah (2 Chr 13:4–12). Women like Sarah (Gen 22:21—23:7), Rachel (35:14–24), the daughter of Jephthah (Judg 11:34–40), the Levite's secondary wife (Judg 19:22–26), the wife of Phineas (1 Sam 3:19–22), and Jezebel (2 Kgs 9:30–37) also leave dying words.

In her will, Jephthah's daughter blesses her household. Her father had promised YHWH a human sacrifice if his warriors were victorious. The victim would be the leader of his welcome-home singers. Unaware of his vow, villagers chose his only child, a daughter. His vow is a death sentence for her and his household. Her last will promises: "You have made a vow to YHWH. Do with me as you have vowed, because YHWH has delivered your enemies up to you. But grant me this favor. For two months, let me and the other marriageable women go off to the mountains to mourn our infertility." (Unless otherwise noted biblical translations are my own.)

Phinehas leads his warriors into battle against the Philistines just as his wife goes into labor. The victorious Philistines carry the Ark of the Covenant off the battlefield thinking they have taken YHWH prisoner. In her will the wife of Phineas reinterprets the event by naming her child *Ichabod,* which can mean either "carried off" or "break out." For her, YHWH is not "carried off" as a prisoner of war, but, like her new born, "breaks out" of the hills of Israel "like a flood" and invades Philistia.

1. McBride, "Transcendent Authority"; Kilchor, "The Direction of Dependence between the Laws of the Pentateuch."

When Jezebel receives reports that her husband's assassin is coming, she puts on her official makeup and wig to assume her place as the ruler of Israel on the royal balcony. Her will indicts Jehu: "Is it peace, Zimri, murderer of your master? Have you come to surrender for the assassination of your king?"

. . . from the Tabor House Community

What will I say to those with me as I am dying?

Betty Campbell

I will thank the persons that will be with me that moment, I would tell them thank you for being here with me, I love you all that are here with me. Share and be with the poor and the oppressed. That's what is important: people and not material things. I would tell them to look for the truth; I feel that there are a lot of lies in today's world. But I think maybe we won't have all that time.

Emilia Requenes Garcia

I will tell them to love one another and to fight for justice and peace. Hope will have time to put in order our things. We have projects that we are implementing and I have to think what to do and my wish is that the things I do, will not end, hope these educational activities that I have been doing with the children will continue, as I have continue the things my mother did. Everything has to be simplified and we should not wait death to put in order the things we left behind.

Graciela de la Rosa Cedillos

The question led me to reflect upon that moment. And I ask myself if people have time to say something in those moments before death. Nevertheless, I realized that if I am accompanied it would be by my more close family and friends, which are not too many. I will tell to be calm, maybe I will like that those around me will hold my hand, and I will tell them to be calm, not to cry, and have strength. I'll ask them to take my ashes to the Medanos, the beautiful white sand of the dessert of Chihuahua. That's all.

Covenant between YHWH and Israel

The core of Moses's last will and testament is a *Covenant between YHWH and Israe*l (4:44—31:29) (My titles for literary units in the Bible are in italics throughout.) YHWH is the Hebrews' patron; the Hebrews are YHWH's clients.

The Hittites developed the covenant genre during the Late Bronze period (1500–1200 BCE).[2] Standard Hittite covenants contain at least six components. They open by: 1) giving the credentials of the patron and the client partners (5:1–6; references to Deuteronomy omit Deut unless necessary for clarity), and 2) a description of the political relationship or *history* envisioned by the covenant. Then covenants lay out 3) the stipulations that will govern the relationship between the partners (5:7—26:15), followed by 4) provisions to record and promulgate the covenant (26:16—27:26), 5) a litany of curses for covenant violations and blessings for covenant compliance (28:1–69), and 6) a list of witnesses to the covenant (29:1—31:29).

Members of Hebrews' households were related by covenant whether they were kin or not. Fathers of households were patrons; other men, wives, widows, children, the ill, the disabled, liminal people, slaves and prisoners of the households were clients.[3] Patrons fed and protected their clients, who acknowledged this favor with unconditional loyalty and gratitude.

Liminal people like female prisoners (see: 21:10–14; see: indicates additional information found with treatment of passage) or debt slaves (Exod 21:1–6) are non-Hebrews in transition to becoming members of a Hebrew household. J. M. P Smith and Edgar Johnson Goodspeed, *The Bible: An American Translation* (1935; BCE dates are labeled; CE dates are not) labeled them "resident aliens."[4]

Outsiders are non-Hebrews who live in or alongside Hebrew villages. Although often labeled *strangers,* they were well known to the Hebrew *insiders* who did business with them.

There were two classes of *slaves* in ancient Israel: *debt slaves* were Hebrews, and *prisoners of war* were not. When slave owners are Hebrews, translations label their slaves as *servants* although the Hebrew word for *slave* and *servant* is the same.

2. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition"; Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Suzerainty Treaty from Sefire in the Museum of Beirut"; McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*; McCarthy, "Covenant in the Old Testament"; Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*.

3. **Further Reading (Patron-Client Relationships):** Malina and Pilch, eds., *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning*; Malina, "Patron and Client."

4. Smith and Goodspeed, *The Bible: An American Translation*.

Patron-client relationships are a basic social institution in both western Mediterranean cultures like Greece and Rome and eastern Mediterranean cultures like ancient Israel. The Israel in Deuteronomy is a microcosm for the macrocosm of Mediterranean culture to which it belongs. Fernand Braudel, who pioneered the Annales School (1960–1980), identified Mediterranean culture as a coherent mega-culture in his landmark work: *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*.[5] Annales School historians like Braudel do not just tell the stories of great men and the decisions they make. Instead, they reconstruct layered descriptions of the short, medium, and long-term processes which create cultures. War is a *short-term* process that develops quickly and lasts only a short time. Cycles of climate change are *medium-term* processes. Architecture, farming, herding, and burial customs are *long-term* processes that develop slowly and then remain virtually unchanged for long periods of time. Deuteronomy deals with each.

Patron-client relationships develop in cultures with clearly defined classes who compete with one another for political and economic power (see 22:22–30). Patron-client relationships are a strategy for managing competition and preventing the wanton destruction of human and natural resources. These relationships manage political and economic life on both the village and state level, and also define the relationships between cultures and their divine assemblies.

Case Law and Apodictic Law

A long-standing tradition of interpretation considers the components of the *Deuteronomic Code* (12:1—26:15) to be a *case laws* and *apodictic laws* (12:1—26:15). Albrecht Alt (1883–1956) pioneered the study of case and apodictic laws.[6] Standard case laws have two parts. There is a dependent clause and a main clause. The dependent clause is introduced by *if* or *when* and describes a situation that puts a household at risk. For example: "If the father of one household, who has a grievance with the father of another household, ambushes and murders him" (19:11). The main clause in a case law is introduced by "then" and imposes a sentence or mandates a procedure to resolve the grievance. For example: "then the elders of the murderer's city shall order the perpetrator to be . . . handed over to the guardian of the innocent" (NRSV: "avenger of blood") "and put to death" (19:1–13).

5. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*; Braudel, "The Mediterranean"; Ruiz, Symcox, and Piterberg, eds., *Braudel Revisited*.

6. Alt, "The Origins of Israelite Law"; Weinfeld, Origin of the Apodictic Law."

Apodictic laws also have two parts. These parts have a variety of structures. "Whoever strikes the father of a household, and he dies, shall be put to death" (Exod 21:12); "Shamed be the father of a household who shames the father or the mother of his household" (27:16); and *You shall not be unjust when returning verdicts* (Lev 19:15) are all apodictic laws.[7]

Legal Instruction

Scholars once assumed that legal assemblies used the case laws in Deuteronomy to resolve disputes between households and that liturgical assemblies used the apodictic laws to celebrate the *Covenant between YHWH and Israel*.[8] If the case laws were intended to provide precedents for legal assemblies, then records of actual trials should cite them. To date no trial records have been recovered in Israel, and trial records which have been recovered in Mesopotamia do not cite the *Code of Hammurabi* or other codes even when precedents are available. Therefore, although the *Deuteronomic Code* reflects legal practice, its stipulations are *legal instructions*—a teaching or wisdom genre providing explanations and motivations for case laws, but not technically laws.[9]

At least two twentieth-century scholars anticipated the identification of the genre of Deuteronomy as legal instruction, rather than law. For August Klostermann and Gerhard von Rad, the stipulations were *preached law* or *parenesis*—law quoted in sermons.[10]

Legal Studies

The *Deuteronomic Code* belongs to a family of legal studies from Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Syria-Palestine, and Egypt, some of which developed as early as 3000 BCE. Unlike legal codes drafted to govern a state, Deuteronomy has little practical interest in state institutions like the monarchy, the

7. Clark, "Law."

8. Richter, *Recht und Ethos*; Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law*; Patrick, "Thinking Biblical Law."

9. Fitzpatrick-McKinley, *The Transformation of Torah*; C. B. Anderson, *Women, Ideology and Violence*; Blenkinsopp, *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament*; Fried, "'You Shall Appoint Judges'"; Westbrook, "Cuneiform Law Codes and the Origins of Legislation."

10. Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch*; von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*; von Rad, *Deuteronomy*.

military, taxation, trade, or even federal law. Instead, Deuteronomy envisions an idealized "people of YHWH."[11]

In *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (1972), Moshe Weinfeld developed a sustained argument that the *Deuteronomic Code*, emphasizing the value of human life and dignity (23:15–16; 21:10–14; 25: 1–3; 21:22–23; 22:1–12), interpersonal social relations (15:1–18; 23:24–25; 21:15–17), and the humane treatment of animals (22:1–12), was parallel to the *Teachings of Amen em Ope,* or the *Teachings of Ahiqar* of Mesopotamia, or Proverbs. Therefore, the *Teachings of Moses* would be a more accurate label than the *Deuteronomic Code* for these traditions that do not pass laws to govern a society, but analyze, explain, and classify laws with the intention of inspiring their audiences to be law-abiding. Mesopotamian scribes made similar studies of astronomy, mathematics, and medicine.[12]

The term "Syria–Palestine" does not appear in Deuteronomy, which refers to this region as "the land of the Canaanites" (1:7), or "the land that YHWH is giving" (2:24–34). Syria-Palestine like "Levant" or "Greater Syria" is a geographical, not a political term. Herodotus identifies "Palestine" as the part of "Syria" between Lebanon and Egypt.[13] The term "Greater Syria" was used by the Ottoman rulers of Turkey to designate Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Israel today. William Foxwell Albright considered Syria-Palestine to be a single cultural region.[14] Consequently *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East* edited by Eric M. Meyers adopted this labeling convention as well.[15]

Comparing Deuteronomy with cultures separated from Iron Age Israel and Judah in both time and place is indispensable for understanding both how the genres developed and their intentions. Admittedly early comparative studies like those of William Robertson-Smith and James G. Frazier were flawed.[16] These nineteenth century scholars focused only on superficial similarities, and ignored the larger social context of cultural parallels.

Consequently, some biblical scholars make only limited use of the comparative method, and study only parallels within the same culture. They assume that parallels in different cultures are the result of spontaneous

11. Nicholson, "Reconsidering the Provenance of Deuteronomy," 538–40.

12. **Further Reading (Codes of Law):** Roth, "The Law Collection of King Hammurabi"; Lafont, "Middle Assyrian Period."

13. Herodotus, *History* I:105; II:104; III:5.91; IV:39; VII:89.

14. T. W. Davis, *Shifting Sands*, 64.

15. E. M. Meyers, ed., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*.

16. W. R. Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*.

invention—cultures facing similar challenges and developing parallel answers without having contact with one another. They also assume Deuteronomy could be compared with the *Covenant Code* and the *Holiness Code*, because all three developed in ancient Israel and Judah, but could not be compared with the *Code of Shulgi* because it developed in Mesopotamia more than 1500 years earlier.

Other biblical scholars study parallels between ancient Israel and Judah and cultures in the same part of the world and from the same time period. They assume parallels developed in one culture, and then were distributed through actual physical contact.

Anthropologists, in contrast, use the comparative method to study cultures not necessarily connected by either time or geography.[17] The challenge is how to reconstruct contexts that accurately identify cultural practices as parallels. The validity of any parallel is measured by whether or not its interpreters have successfully described how the practices interact with their cultures as a whole. If the reconstructed contexts for both cultures are accurate, then they can be responsibly compared and contrasted. This comparative method used by anthropologists is essential to the interpretation of Deuteronomy. Humans from very different times and places develop similar strategies for surviving. Deuteronomy may only allude to a cultural practice which the *Code of Shulgi* describes clearly. Analyzing the similarities and differences leads to a better understanding and appreciation of both.[18]

Shulgi (2094–2047 BCE) ruled Ur.[19] The *Code of Shulgi*—formerly attributed to Ur-Nammu (2112–2095 BCE)—studies uniform principles of justice in a range of social institutions from the standardization of weights and protections for widows and orphans. It teaches that capital punishment is appropriate only for serious crimes like murder and robbery, and recommends compensating victims, rather than physically punishing perpetrators.

17. **Further Reading (Comparative Anthropology):** Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 188; Malinowski, *Magic, Science, and Religion, and Other Essays*; Evans-Pritchard, *Theories of Primitive Religions*; Weber, *Ancient Judaism*; Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, 470; Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*; Radcliffe-Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*; Levi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind*.

18. Eilberg-Schwartz, *The Savage in Judaism*, 1–28, 87–103; Levinson and Stackert, "Between the Covenant Code and Esahaddon's Succession Treaty"; Berman, "CTH 133 and the Hittite Provenance of Deuteronomy 13"; Levinson and Stackert, "The Limitations of "Resonance."

19. Spellings for the names of rulers of Egypt and dates for their reigns follow Baines and Malek, *Atlas of Ancient Egypt*. Spellings for the names of rulers of Mesopotamia and dates for their reigns follow Roaf, *Cultural Atlas of Mesopotamia and the Ancient Near East*. Spellings for the names of the rulers of Israel and Judah and dates for their reigns follow Hayes and Miller, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah*.

Hammurabi (1792–1750 BCE) ruled Babylon. The *Code of Hammurabi* reflects the legal theory, political science, and social organization of Babylon. Just as traditions about Moses (1:1—4:43) introduce the *Covenant between YHWH and Israel* (4:44—31:29), a catalog of the military victories and political endorsements of Hammurabi introduces 282 legal instructions. Likewise just as more traditions about Moses (32:1—34:12) conclude the covenant in Deuteronomy, the *Code of Hammurabi* concludes with an assessment of the role of state law.

The *Hittite Laws* (1650–1200 BCE) reflect the legal traditions of Hatti. The *Hittite Laws* also recommend compensating victims for loss, rather than physically punishing perpetrators. Like Deuteronomy, the *Hittite Laws* also use technical terms like "brother" and "brother-in-law" to identify covenant partners, who seal their covenants with marriages (1:9–18; 25:5–10).

Tiglath-Pileser I (1114–1076 BCE) was Great King of Assyria. His *Middle Assyrian Laws,* like the *Code of Hammurabi* and Deuteronomy, introduces its legal instructions with a catalog of his military victories and political endorsements.

The *Covenant Code* and the *Holiness Code* in the Bible are also significant for interpreting Deuteronomy. The *Covenant Code* (Exod 20:22—23:33) developed in the northern state of Israel (925–721 BCE) and was influenced by the *Code of Hammurabi*—copies of which have been recovered throughout Syria-Palestine during the period.[20] The *Covenant Code* describes the new world which YHWH creates for the Hebrews after their deliverance from slavery in Egypt. Parallels between the *Deuteronomic Code* and the *Covenant Code* are most obvious in instructions on debt (15:1–18; Exod 23:10–11), slaves (15:1–18; Exod 21:1–11), firstborn (15:19–23; Exod 22:29, 34:19) and pilgrimage feast days (16:1–17; Exod 23:14–19).[21]

The *Covenant Code* went through two significant revisions preserved today in the *Holiness Code* and the *Deuteronomic Code*.[22] Each reflects distinct worldviews of two communities living during the same period.[23] The *Holiness Code* calls only priests, Levites and heirs of households to lives of

20. **Further Reading (Covenant Code):** Levinson, *Theory and Method in Biblical and Cuneiform Law*; Patrick, "Covenant Code Source"; Westbrook, "What Is the Covenant Code?"; D. P. Wright, *Inventing God's Law*; R. D. Miller II, "The Israelite Covenant in Ancient Near Eastern Context."

21. **Further Reading (Scroll of Deuteronomy):** Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*; Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*; Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*; Leuchter, *Josiah's Reform and Jeremiah's Scroll.*

22. Kilchor, *The Direction of Dependence between the Laws of the Pentateuch*, 1–14.

23. Leuchter, "The Manumission Laws in Leviticus and Deuteronomy"; Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, 1357–67.

holiness; the *Deuteronomic Code* calls all Hebrews to holiness. The *Holiness Code* (Lev 17:1—26:46) developed in Judah and in Babylon between 925–539 BCE. The instructions teach how to imitate divine behavior–*the Holy.* They describe YHWH's holiness, and how the Hebrews are to acknowledge YHWH's status as their divine patron. The instructions assume that creation is not making something out of nothing, but rather organizing chaos into cosmos—putting people, objects and time in place and assigned a purpose. Holiness is everything in its place and fulfilling its divinely assigned purpose. The instructions also teach how to reset the comos with rituals like the emancipation of debt slaves (15:1–18; Exod 21:2–11; Lev 25:39–46) which return people, objects and time to their divinely designated places and purposes.[24]

Social Settings for Deuteronomy

Mothers of Households in the Villages of Judah

Early Israel (1200–1000 BCE) was a decentralized village culture with a subsistence economy. Villages were small. Most were one-acre parcels with some 50 to 300 inhabitants.[25] There were no monarchs, no soldiers, no slaves and no cities. Villages were governed by the fathers of households like those addressed by Deuteronomy.[26] Villagers shared in the labor-intensive work of terracing, planting, and processing produce.[27] They farmed figs, olives, grapes, wheat, barley, and flax for rope and linen. They consumed all they produced; there was no surplus for trade or to pay for monumental architecture like walls, gates, palaces or sanctuaries.

The Israel founded by David and Solomon (1000–586 BCE) was a centralized city and village culture with a surplus economy, a monarch, a

24. **Further Reading (Holiness Code):** Hildenbrand, *Structure and Theology in the Holiness Code*; Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code*; Milgrom, "The Changing Concept of Holiness in the Pentateuchal Codes with Emphasis on Leviticus 19"; Otto, "The Holiness Code in Diachrony and Synchrony in the Legal Hermeneutics of the Pentateuch"; Regev, "Priestly Dynamic Holiness and Deuteronomic Static Holiness"; Van Seters, "Cultic Laws in the Covenant Code and Their Relationship to Deuteronomy and the Holiness Code."

25. **Further Reading (Villages in Early Israel):** Callaway, "Village Subsistence: Iron Age Ai and Raddana," in (Lanham, Md: Univ Pr of America, 1984), 51-66; Hopkins, *The Highlands of Canaan*; Hopkins, "Life on the Land"; Stager, "The Archaeology of the Family in Ancient Israel."

26. Chaney, "Ancient Palestinian Peasant Movements and the Formation of Premonarchic Israel," 51; Lenski and Lenski, *Human Societies*, 229.

27. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh*, 257–84; Lemche, *Ancient Israel*, 90–99.

standing army to control the population and expand the state's borders, and slaves to produce surplus goods for trade and monumental building projects. These cities maintained a trade network with surrounding villages. Less than half of those who lived in these cities produced enough food for everyone, so trades and arts, such as writing, flourished. Only 10 percent of the households of this Israel lived in cities surrounded by walls; 90 percent continued to live in villages.[28]

Some traditions in Deuteronomy originally developed in village households where members learned how the people of YHWH were to act. Others developed in the state government whose scribes crafted domestic and foreign policies to help rulers of Israel and Judah feed and protect their land and people.

Scholars once assumed that cities and villages were rival cultures like the cities and towns of the Industrial Revolution (1780–1830) in Europe and North America.[29] They considered the so-called case laws in Deuteronomy to have developed in the cities which were not Hebrew, and the so-called apodictic laws in Deuteronomy to have developed in the villages which were.[30] Today most scholars consider the villages and cities of Syria-Palestine, as in other pre-industrial cultures, to be two different parts of a single economy.[31] Cities depended upon villages to provide them with goods and services. In return cities protected villagers' crops and herds, and provided them with markets.

Households in villages and cities mediated their disputes over appropriate behavior for people of YHWH before assemblies which convened at the gates of cities or at the threshing floors of villages. The instructions in Deuteronomy reflect this judicial process.

Women appear as plaintiffs and defendants in Deuteronomy (22:13–22; 25:5–10), but no women in Deuteronomy serve on the assemblies. A trial record from Nippur (UET 5), however, shows that assemblies of women did exist.[32] During 1737 BCE, the woman Enlil-issu and the man Ama-sukkal negotiated a marriage covenant. After ten years without consummating their marriage, both filed for divorce. Enlil-issu accused Ama-sukkal of

28. C. L. Meyers, *Rediscovering Eve*, 38–58; Orni and Efrat, *Geography of Israel*, 270.

29. Sjoberg, *The Preindustrial City*.

30. Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life"; Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*; G. E. Wright, *The Old Testament against Its Environment*.

31. Frick, *The City in Ancient Israel*.

32. **Further Reading (Slandered Bride):** Wells, "Sex, Lies, and Virginal Rape"; Hallo, "Slandered Bride"; Hilprecht, *The Babylonian Expedition*, 6:58; Gadd and Legrain, *Ur Excavations Texts*, 5:256.

misrepresenting her eligibility for marriage; she accused him of slander. The couple appeared before an assembly of mothers to resolve their dispute.

An assembly of mothers also appears in a *Story of Boaz as a Legal Guardian* (Ruth 4:1–22). When Boaz wants authorization as the legal guardian (NRSV: *next of kin*) of Ruth, he goes to an assembly of men (Ruth 4:1–12); when Ruth wants the authorization of their child as heir to household of Naomi, she goes to an assembly of women (Ruth 4:12–18). Normally, the natural child of Boaz and Ruth would be the legal heir of the household of Mahlon, Ruth's deceased husband. Nonetheless, an assembly of women rule that their child is the heir of the household of Naomi (Ruth 4:14–17). Like the words "go back . . . each of you to your mother's house" (Ruth 1:8), the mothers' ruling is both unexpected and surprisingly feminist.[33] Words so emphatically women's words may emphasize the liminal condition of widows like Naomi and Ruth, who have no father, no husband, no son.

The traditions in Deuteronomy shaped daily life in Israel and Judah long before they found their way into Deuteronomy itself. The original setting for at least some of these traditions is in the teaching traditions of the mothers of households. Mothers of households were not only child bearers and household managers; they were teachers.[34] Once boys became young men and could participate in the communal labor of the village like planting, harvesting, and repairing terrace walls, fathers of households became their teachers, but even when girls became young women, they continued to be educated by their mothers. Mothers taught their children to walk, talk, dress, and feed themselves. They also taught them to garden, herd, cook, weave, and make pottery. These daily routines were moments for learning because how they were performed were culturally identifying rituals which distinguished the Hebrews within their own communities from one another and from outsiders. Each time mothers taught children how to dress, they explained the meaning of the clothing. Each time they showed children how to comb their hair, they explained to them the social status which their hair style reflected. Mothers explained to the children why the foods they ate at harvest times were different from those they enjoyed every day; why certain plants and animals were prepared and others were not. Mothers taught children their roles and the roles of others (Prov 31:1).

Mothers not only taught women their roles in a patriarchal culture like ancient Israel, they also taught them how to survive in that culture. The daughters of Lot, Rebekah, Tamar, and Naomi are all women who, not

33. Chapman, "The Biblical 'House of the Mother' and the Brokering of Marriage."

34. Fontaine, "The Sage in Family and Tribe," 161; Eilberg-Schwartz, *The Savage in Judaism*, 229–34; Camp, *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs*, 81–82; Fontaine, *The Sage in Family and Tribe*, 161; C. L. Meyers, *Rediscovering Eve*, 136–39.

only know the world of elite men, but how to manage that world to their advantage. Rebekah is a master strategist who tutors Jacob, who is not an heir, how to become the heir of the household of Isaac. Naomi is similarly shrewd in her advice to Ruth on how to approach Boaz at the threshing floor and persuade him to fulfill his role as legal guardian for the household of Elimelech.

Scribes for the Royal Household in Jerusalem

The responsibility of mothers for the women, children, the ill, the disabled, liminal people, slaves, prisoners, outsiders, livestock and crops of their households was a model for the scribes who assisted rulers responsible for the feeding and protecting the people and land of Israel and Judah.

Teachers, called "mothers" and "fathers" (Prov 1:3–13), originally tutored one or two high status apprentices, called "sons" (Prov 5:1–23), to become scribes who could read and write.[35] Schools for scribes with many students at government centers like Gezer eventually replaced tutoring. Most, but not all, students were male. Seshat, divine patron of writing in Egypt, was female; royal male and female children were taught to read and write; and statues of some elite women portray them sitting in the scribal position. At Mari and Sippar some literate women, often daughters of scribes, officially served royal women as scribes.

Students learned their craft by repeatedly copying classic texts, like the *Teachings of Khety*, or the *Gezer Almanac*. Class days were long; corporal punishment was common.

Literacy led scribes to influential careers in both temple and palace. They collected taxes, recruited workers and soldiers, surveyed land, supervised building projects, drafted and catalogued letters, covenants, and royal annals. Deuteronomy, recovered from a temple archive and reflecting wide access to political, judicial, and economic traditions, is just the kind of work in which scribes excelled. These responsibilities gave them access to their monarchs, who came to rely on them for advice on both the development and the implementation of domestic and foreign policy. The scribes who developed Deuteronomy not only functioned like the mothers of households, but also canonized traditions developed by these mothers in Deuteronomy.[36]

35. Wente, "The Scribes of Ancient Egypt"; Pearce, "The Scribes and Scholars of Ancient Mesopotamia"; Cohen, Snell, and Weisberg, eds., *The Tablet and the Scroll*; Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 56–83.

36. Matthews and Benjamin, *Social World of Ancient Israel, 1250–587 BCE*, 22–36.

Only the names of a few male scribes appear in the Bible: Shebna, who served Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:1—21:26); Shaphan who served Josiah (2 Kgs 22:1—23:30); and Baruch who served Jeremiah (Jer 36:1–32) during the reign of Jehoiakim.[37] All three lived during the period when Deuteronomy was developing.

There are no named women with the title of "scribe" connected with Deuteronomy. Nonetheless, high status, literate, and named women do appear consistently in both the Bible and the world of the Bible as advisors to monarchs and as administrators of domestic and foreign policy.[38] Therefore, women may not have only served as role models for male scribes, and have provided traditions of their own to be used in Deuteronomy; there may have been as yet unidentified women who collaborated with males scribes in the development of Deuteronomy.

Naditu women at Nippur (5900–4300 BCE) managed the resources of their households by investing them in other households instead of receiving a dowry to invest in the household of one husband (*Code of Hammurabi*, arts. 144–146). These *naditu* were not only financial planners, but also drafted and witnessed the covenants governing their investments. Like Tamar (Gen 38:1–30) and Rahab (Josh 2:1–24; 6:22–25) *naditu* women are often labeled *prostitutes.* None, however, are sex workers. All are women who – above and beyond what is demanded by their status—put themselves at risk to deliver their households. *Naditu* women could marry, but only after negotiating covenants with surrogates to bear children for their husbands. To protect the resources of their households of origin, these children could inherit only from their fathers, not from their *naditu* mothers.

Enheduanna of Sumer (2285–2250 BCE) was daughter of Sargon of Agade, who appointed her as *En* Priest to godmother Inanna at Sumer. She is the first named writer—male or female—in the world of the Bible. Her *Hymns to Nanna* and *Sumerian Temple Hymns* redefined the worldviews of the diverse cultures which Sargon conquered into a single worldview for the empire. Enheduanna also used her influence to keep Sumer in the south loyal to Agade in the north. During Sumer's bid for independence,

37. **Further Reading (Scribes and Sages):** Gammie and Perdue, eds., *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*; P. R. Davies, *Scribes and Schools*; van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*; Stökl, "The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age"; Van Seters, "The Role of the Scribe in the Making of the Hebrew Bible"; Whybray, "The Sage in the Israelite Royal Court"; R. J. Williams, "Scribal Training in Ancient Egypt"; Wente, *The Scribes of Ancient Egypt*; Pearce, "The Scribes and Scholars of Ancient Mesopotamia."

38. **Further Reading (Female Scribes):** Camp, "The Female Sage in Ancient Israel and in the Biblical Wisdom Literature"; Harris, "The Female 'Sage' in Mesopotamian Literature (with an Appendix on Egypt)"; Camp, "Female Voice, Written Word."

Lugal-ane exiled Enheduanna, but his revolt failed and she was reinstated. She celebrated her return to power with the hymn: *Exaltation of Inanna*. After her death she was honored as a member of the divine assembly.[39]

Nin-shata-pada was a daughter of Sin-Kashid of Uruk and Durum (1803–1770 BCE) who appointed her high priest of Meslamtaea and Lugal-girra, divine patrons of the afterlife.[40] She was also a scribe, who composed her own official letter to Rim-Sin, ruler of Larsa (1822–1763 BCE). She asks him to be as magnanimous to her as he had been to the people of Uruk and Durum after he conquered them, and to reinstate her as high priest. Her letter was preserved in the royal archives at Larsa indicating Rim-Sin granted her request. Her letter became part of the canon of writings which male scribes-in-training copied.

Shibtu (1775–1761 BCE) was primary wife of Zimri-Lim of Mari. Her official reports to him show that she was his regent with standing administrative responsibilities. She supervised senior male officials and provincial governors. She oversaw daily affairs for the capital city, the palace, the temple and the archives as well as infrastructure improvements like the construction of a reservoir. When Zimri Lim was away, Shibtu officiated at temple sacrifices and collected intelligence for him from male and female prophets.[41]

Beltiremanni was a female scribe in Babylon (1792–1595 BCE). She composed a dictionary, a task requiring a high level of literacy.[42]

Bathsheba first appears in the Bible as a woman of honor, whom David orders to the palace and rapes (2 Sam 10:1—12:31).[43] She is not seductive. She is modest and obedient, both to the tradition of bathing after

39. **Further Reading (Enheduanna):** Fontaine, "The Deceptive Goddess in Ancient Near Eastern Myth"; Hallo, "The Exaltation of Inanna (1.160)"; Hallo and Van Dijk, *The Exaltation of Iananna*; Meador, *Inanna, Lady of Largest Heart*; Westenholz, "Enheduanna, En-Priestess, Hen of Nanna, Spouse of Nanna"; Sjöberg, "A Hymn to Inanna and Her Self-Praise"; Winter, "Women in Public"; Binkley, "Before the Greeks."

40. **Further Reading (Nin-shata-pada):** Pearce, "The Scribes and Scholars of Ancient Mesopotamia"; Hallo, "Lamentations and Prayers in Sumer and Akkad"; Tetlow, *Women, Crimes, and Punishment in Ancient Law and Society*, 1:19–34.

41. **Further Reading (Shibtu):** Artzi and Malamat, "The Correspondence of Šibtu, Queen of Mari in ARM X"; Batto, *Studies on Women at Mari*; Stökl, "The Role of Women in the Prophetical Process in Mari"; Stokl, "Where Have All the Female Prophets Gone?"

42. **Further Reading (Beltiremanni):** Tetlow, *Women, Crimes, and Punishment in Ancient Law and Society*, 1:47–118.

43. **Further Reading (Bathsheba):** Bowen, "The Quest for the Historical *Gebîrâ*"; Cushman, "The Politics of the Royal Harem and the Case of Bat-Sheba"; Hammond, "Michal, Tamar, Abigail and What Bathsheba Said"; Jacobs, "Mothering a Leader"; C. Smith, "'Queenship' in Israel."

menstruating, and to the command of the ruler of Israel. She is not conspicuously bathing in sight of David. The roof was a private, not a public space; it was out of sight of all those on the ground floor of a pillared house. Furthermore, she assumes that David is in the field with his soldiers around Rabbath-ammon. Although in his youth, David was a womanizer, as an old man he cannot have intercourse even with Abishag, the most beautiful woman in Israel (1 Kgs 1:1–4). He is no longer fit to be king, but he still does not adopt an heir. Aware of the danger that David's indecisiveness poses, Amnon (2 Sam 13:1–22), Absalom (2 Sam 15:1—24:25) and Adonijah (1 Kgs 1:1–10) each campaign to become his heir. Each fails. Bathsheba and Nathan finally negotiate a resolution to this on-going crisis of succession which could have destroyed Israel. The woman who was once a victim of the household of David became the architect of its survival.

The marriage of Jezebel, a daughter of Ethbaʿal of Tyre (1 Kgs 16:29—22:40), to Ahab of Israel (875–853 BCE) ratified a covenant between the two states.[44] Jezebel was not simply a diplomatic wife; Ethbaʿal installed her as regent with the authority to override Ahab when necessary (1 Kings 21). Among her accomplishments was building a new sanctuary for YHWH as a divine warrior.[45] When Jehu assassinated Ahab, Jezebel assumed the throne of Israel and indicted Jehu for treason. He responded by assassinating her as well. As the mother of Ahaziah (853–851 BCE) and Jehoram (851–844 BCE) of Israel, and of Athaliah (844 BCE), the only ruler of Judah who was a woman and was not from the household of David, her political influence continued for a generation.

There is still no clear evidence yet that ordinary women in cultures whose divine assembly was headed by a godmother or with elite women in high-profile positions, like Nin-shata-pada, Shibtu, Beltiremanni, Bathsheba, and Jezebel, exercised greater authority in public life than women in cultures whose divine assembly was headed by a godfather and where there is little evidence of elite women in high-profile positions. Nonetheless, both ordinary and elite women in Judah may have made greater contributions to the development of Deuteronomy than has been previously recognized.

44. **Further Reading (Jezebel)**: McKay, "Eve's Sisters Re-Cycled"; Dutcher-Walls, *Jezebel*; Everhart, "Jezebel: Framed by Eunuchs?"; McKinlay, "Negotiating the Frame for Viewing the Death of Jezebel"; Pippin, "Jezebel Re-Vamped"; Trible, "The Odd Couple: Elijah and Jezebel"; Wyatt, "Jezebel, Elijah, and the Widow of Zarephath"; Zlotnick, "From Jezebel to Esther; Avigad, "The Seal of Jezebel"; Brenner, *The Israelite Woman*.

45. Trimm, "*YHWH Fights for Them!*"

Levites in Judah

Scribes were not the only high status males with a connection to Deuteronomy. Levites and prophets also had influence. During the early monarchy, Levites served sanctuaries like Shiloh as priests (1 Sam 1:3). Levites also appear in Judges, but without defined status. When their regional sanctuaries were decommissioned, some Levites migrated to Jerusalem to continue their liturgical ministry (see 18:1–8). Others, like "the Levites who reside in your cities," served on legal assemblies in the cities and villages of Judah to oversee the implementation the worldview of Deuteronomy (12:12, 18; 14:27; 16:11, 14).[46] The scribes were the genius behind the world view of Deuteronomy; the Levites were responsible for its implementation.[47]

. . . from Victor H. Matthews

If the book of the Judges actually reflects a historical representation of the pre-monarchic, settlement period, then one would expect, based on their designation as a tribe of priests (Num 1:49–53; 3:5–13), that there would be numerous instances in which Levites would play a prominent role in these stories. However, the portrayal of the village culture in Judges contains very little mention of the Levites or of any organized cultic procedures being directed by Levites. Instead the Israelites, collectively, and within their small communities and households seem to be fairly self-reliant when it comes to making sacrifices or engaging in other activities that in later periods will be associated with the Levitical priests, especially those working in the context of the temple in Jerusalem. In a practical sense, the lack of Levites may simply be part of the overall Deuteronomic picture in Judges in which social chaos, civil war, and violations of traditional practices as well as the covenant are the natural order of things. However, the small number of Levites may also reflect the conditions in a rural culture that neither needs

46. Leuchter, "'The Levite in Your Gates"; Geoghegan, "'Until This Day' and the Preexilic Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History"; Dearman, "My Servants the Scribes"; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, 92.

47. **Further Reading (Levitical Authorship of Deuteronomy):** von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, 11–66; Lundbom, "The Inclusio and Other Framing Devices in Deuteronomy I–XXVIII"; Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*; Brettler, "A 'Literary Sermon' in Deuteronomy 4."

someone fully dedicated to cultic activity nor can support him and his family.

The mention of the Levite and his concubine in Judges 19–20—while perhaps intended as "shock fiction" for the audience demonstrating how politically and socially chaotic the Judges period was—provides graphic details of an unhappy marriage. The Levite treats his wife (concubine) as property to be reclaimed. Without protest, he allows her to be thrown to a mob of ruffians to be abused so that he can remain safe and finish his dinner. Then, after she has been brutally raped, he straps her body to his donkey, carves up her corpse, and calls for justice precipitating a civil war. This text speaks to our heightened awareness of spousal abuse, sexual and physical assault, and the plight of women and children victims. Hopefully, those in charge will ask the right questions and seek true justice rather than listen to the fabrications of those concerned about their own safety and social standing.

Given the absence of Levites in the Judges narrative, the normal cultic practices that comprise "family religion" appear to be in the hands of the head of household rather than a priest or priests. For example, in several cases when sacrificial altars are mentioned, they seem to be erected as part of an *ad hoc* process designed to commemorate a theophany (Judg 6:24) or to entreat God to help them deal with a current dilemma (Judg 21:3–4). The ability to erect an altar wherever convenient is also found in the story of the divine messenger's announcement of Samson's birth (Judg 13:19).

When an itinerant Levite from Bethlehem leaves his hometown and comes across Micah's house in his search of his own "place," Micah is quick to hire him to replace his son as the priest. In this way Micah attempts to raise the value of his shrine, being able to point to a trained priest from a recognized center of ritual activity that can perform the traditional ritual duties and guard its sacred objects. This sequence of events raises a number of issues about Levites during this time period. For example, how much formal training did Levites receive and what rituals did they perform beyond animal and grain sacrifices? We are not provided with a set of credentials other than what is contained in the initial question: "From where do you come?" that is answered: "I am a Levite of Bethlehem in Judah" (17:9). Judah was held to be the place of origin for first quality Levites and that may play into Micah's desire to hire this young man.

The only hints to the Levite's duties in the Micah episode are found in his hiring contract: "Stay with me, and be to me a father and a priest"

(Judg 17:10). There is a sense then of serving as an advisor, a teacher, and a cultic official. However, the text also refers to the Levite as being "like a son to Micah" (Judg 17:11) and that may indicate that Micah retains the upper hand in running the household and the shrine. The only active priestly role described in this narrative involves the Levite "standing by the entrance of the gate" when the Danites arrive the second time (Judg 18:17b). That, at least, does suggest he is performing the traditional priestly role as a guardian of a sacred site (Num 1:53; 1 Sam 1:9b).

One thing that does seem clear from this narrative is that Levites were free to travel from one tribal area to another in search of employment, and that points to the practical calculation that these small villages could not sustain more than one or two Levites. We do not know when the legal stipulations about providing the Levites with a portion of the harvest and the sacrifice became standard practice, but with the centralization of the cultus in Jerusalem some modifications must have occurred to provide sustenance to the marginal and unproductive members of society (Deut 14:27–29; 26:11). Certainly, for small villages the sacrifice of any portion of the harvest or the flock would have been difficult and therefore it seems likely that they could not readily support large numbers of Levite families in addition to other cases of social welfare. Therefore, when a Levite family had more than one adult son, presumably the elder succeeded his father as the village priest while the remaining sons were forced to leave and become itinerant priests seeking a position wherever they could find one. During the pre-monarchic period the priesthood may have been a choice for secondary sons who otherwise were without inheritance or employment. If that is the case, then these individuals could become "Levites" through performing cultic activities in the rural areas. That in turn suggests that the performance of cultic activities was not exclusively tied to the tribe of Levi in the pre-monarchic period.

If no Levite was present or available to the village, sacrificial and purity practices naturally would have fallen back on the head of household or his designee, as seems to be the case in the story of Micah. His willingness to employ and support the itinerant Levite within his household, however, does not speak to his willingness to share the Levite's services with the other villagers. Micah has already at the beginning of his story proven himself to be an avaricious man and he may well have jealously hoarded the Levite's skills for himself. After all, he considered the acquisition of the Levite as proof "that the Lord will prosper me" (Judg 17:13; not prosper the village or the Israelites in general). Having established and maintained a peripheral altar in his home, Micah completes his cultic "furnishings" by hiring the Levite as his officiant and thus giving his house shrine greater legitimacy.

On a practical level it seems likely that in the village culture, primarily made up of settlements of only a few dozen individuals, they could not support a full-time Levite. For them it was sufficient to designate heads of household to perform cultic tasks. Presumably, however, they could draw on a Levite from a cultic site like Bethel if an oracle was needed or some other more complex cultic act became necessary. In terms of the narrative analysis of the book of Judges, however, the paucity of trained religious professionals is in keeping with a divided and often pluralistic group of clans and tribes. It is important to the editors of these otherwise independent episodes to create a narrative link that explained why the Israelites were so often being oppressed or at least taxed by their neighbors. The point had to be made repeatedly that YHWH is willing to intervene, appoint a judge to deal with a crisis, and provide military victories for those who remain faithful to the covenant. However, the repeated failures to adhere to the stipulations of the covenant and particularly to a YHWH-only pledge make it clear that in this period religion is more often a mixture of religious practices and gods.

Levites therefore have no legitimate place or role to play in the Judges period. Their occasional appearances, aside from the artificial injection of Phinehas into the civil war narrative (Judg 20:26–28), simply reinforce that fact that they do not and cannot perform the tasks traditionally assigned to Levites. Instead, they, like most other characters in Judges, are portrayed as flawed individuals, who have little stake in teaching about or ministering before YHWH. For instance, the unnamed Levite in Judges 19–20 is portrayed as a failed husband (Judg 19:2), a traveler exercising poor judgment (Judg 19:11–14), an ungrateful guest (Judg 19:16–20), and a coward who sacrifices the life of his concubine to preserve his own skin from a crowd of lawless men (Judg 19:22–25). It is more in character that they are willing to serve idols and to sacrifice others rather than speak the truth. After all, this narrative is intentionally presented as an example of a world-turned-upside-down and it would upset the balance of chaos for Levites to suddenly appear to rectify the situation. That will have to wait for the establishment of the monarchy and the construction of the temple in Jerusalem.[48]

48. Matthews, "Looking for Levites in the Book of Judges."

Prophets in Israel and Judah

Hosea, a prophet who preached in the northern state of Israel which declared its independence from Judah after the death of Solomon (925 BCE), is another elite male voice in Deuteronomy.[49] His followers fleeing to Judah during the war between Israel and Assyria brought his teachings to Judah where they were preserved in Deuteronomy. Like Hosea, Deuteronomy teaches the Hebrews to worship YHWH only at one sanctuary (12:2–28), and calls for the destruction of all the sanctuaries in Israel dedicated to any divine patron but YHWH, especially sacred trees dedicated to godmother Asherah.[50]

Although Deuteronomy frequently mentions the "sanctuary that YHWH will choose," only the *Deuteronomistic History* identifies it as the Temple in Jerusalem (1 Kgs 11:13). Deuteronomy promulgates its covenant on Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Ebal, which are in Israel where Hosea preached, not in Judah where Deuteronomy develops (26:16—27:10).

Deuteronomy also uses prophetic genres like trials—often labeled "oracles."[51] Deuteronomy places both the desert generation (1:19—2:1; 9:1—10:11) and Moses (see 3:23–29; 32:48–52) on trial. In Deuteronomy, as in the prophetic traditions, trials contain indictments (9:1–11), sentences (9:12–17), appeals (9:18–29) and mitigations (10:1–5 + 10–11). Deuteronomy also portrays Moses, a prophet, as the narrator and promises a *prophet like Moses* will be the only teacher on whom the Hebrews can rely (see 18:9–22).[52]

According to his annals (2 Kgs 22:1—23:30), Josiah declares Judah's independence by removing from the Temple in Jerusalem any architecture or artwork reflecting Judah as a client of Assyria. The renovations led to the discovery of a scroll assumed by scholars to be Deuteronomy.[53] Josiah sends

49. **Further Reading (Northern Traditions in Deuteronomy):** Bennett, *Injustice Made Legal*.

50. **Further Reading (Prophets):** Kaltner and Stulman, eds., *Inspired Speech*; Malamat, *Mari and the Early Israelite Experience*; Nissinen, Seow, and Ritner, eds., *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*; Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*; Beuken, "1 Samuel 28"; Lust, "On Wizards and Prophets"; Matthews, *Social World of the Hebrew Prophets*.

51. **Further Reading (Prophetic Lawsuit):** Daniels, "Is There a 'Prophetic Lawsuit' Genre"; Davidson, "The Divine Covenant Lawsuit Motif in Canonical Perspective"; DeRoche, "Yahweh's *Rîb* against Israel."

52. Weinberg, "Authorship and Author in the Ancient Near East and in the Hebrew Bible"; Benjamin, "An Anthropology of Prophecy."

53. **Further Reading (Josiah):** Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*; Knoppers, "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King"; Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*, 137–69; Lundbom, "Lawbook of the Josianic

the scroll to Huldah, a female prophet, for authentication.[54] Huldah accepts the scroll as official (18: 9–22).[55] Monarchs routinely sent scrolls to prophets for authentication. Neither Kings (2 Kgs 22:1—23:30) nor Chronicles (2 Chr 34:1—35:27) comments on that fact that Huldah is a woman, which indicates that women prophets were not unusual in Judah.[56]

Even if the discovery of a scroll of Deuteronomy is a literary rather than a historical tradition, 622 BCE became the designated anniversary for launch of Josiah's reforms (2 Kgs 21:24—23:28; Ezek 1:1–2).[57] The discovery of a copy of an ancient covenant by a ruler in the sanctuary of a divine patron was a motif associated with major cultural reforms. Hittite traditions describe Muwatallis (1320–1294 BCE) promising to look for a written copy of a *Covenant between Mezzulla and Hatti* and to rededicate the Hittites to its observance.

Annals of Muwatallis, ruler of Hattusas

Whatever covenants and rituals I . . . can find described in writing in the sanctuary archives—which I have not already restored—I shall obey. So help me Mezzulla, divine patron of storms and my divine patron, I shall follow the covenant with our divine patrons when I recover a copy of it, and, henceforth it shall be faithfully observed.

Likewise whenever I interview an elder, who can describe a certain ritual to me, I shall also carry it out . . .[58]

Reform"; Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 108–14; Leuchter, *Josiah's Reform and Jeremiah's Scroll*, 33–49.

54. **Further Reading (Huldah):** Pietsch, "Prophetess of Doom"; Weems, "Huldah, the Prophet"; Glatt-Gilad, "The Role of Huldah's Prophecy"; Edelman, "Huldah the Prophet—of Yahweh or Asherah"; Handy, "The Role of Huldah in Josiah's Cult Reform"; Trible, "Huldah's Holy Writ"; Priest, "Huldah's Oracle".

55. Zevit, "Deuteronomy in the Temple," 201–3.

56. C. L. Meyers, *Rediscovering Eve*, 182–92; Hackett, "In the Days of Jael."

57. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*; Römer, "Transformations in Deuteronomistic Biblical Historiography."

58. *Covenant between Mezzula and Hatti* (KB xi, 1, revised by DCB).

Iron I Period: A Time in Deuteronomy

The mothers of households and palace scribes, as well as the Levites and the prophets, who influenced the development of Deuteronomy were parts of larger social and political settings in Judah. At the end of the twentieth century, two distinct schools of thought on the setting, not just of Deuteronomy, but of the Bible as a whole developed. [59]*Maximalist* scholars assumed that biblical traditions develop at crisis points, like the invasion of Israel by Assyria and then the invasion of Judah by Babylon. Once traditions like Deuteronomy developed they continued to evolve over time. The Deuteronomy that developed before the destruction of Jerusalem continued to be refined and reapplied to new crises. After 586 BCE, the Deuteronomy that developed to prevent the destruction of Jerusalem was reinterpreted to explain why Jerusalem was destroyed and to teach the exiles how to maintain their identity as the people of YHWH. *Minimalist* scholars assumed that the entire Bible developed to prevent the assimilation of Jews into the Hellenistic culture imposed by Alexander after 333 BCE. The following reconstruction of larger social and political settings that appear in Deuteronomy and where Deuteronomy itself developed assumes maximalist hermeneutics.[60]

There are two kinds of time in the Bible. First, there is the *time in* a tradition. For example, the time in Deuteronomy when Moses speaks to the Hebrews on the east rim of the Arabah Valley is the Iron I period (1200–1000 BCE).[61] Second, there is the *time when* a tradition was told. The time when Deuteronomy in the Bible today begins to develop is Iron II period (1000–586 BCE).[62] To understand and appreciate Deuteronomy requires

59. **Further Reading (Maximalist and Minimalist Criticism):** Coote and Whitelam, *The Emergence of Early Israel in Historical Perspective*; P. R. Davies, *On the Origins of Judaism*; Halpern, "Erasing History: The Minimalist Assault on Ancient Israel,"; Lemche, *The Old Testament between Theology and History*; Thompson, *The Bible in History*; Hendel, "Of Doubt, Gadflies and Minimalists."

60. **Further Reading (Date of Deuteronomy):** Harvey and Halpern, "W.M.L. De Wette's 'Dissertatio Critica . . .': Context and Translation"; Pakkala, "The Date of the Oldest Edition of Deuteronomy"; MacDonald, "Issues in the Dating of Deuteronomy"; Pakkala, "The Dating of Deuteronomy."

61. Archaeologists working in the world of the Bible created a calendar using the raw materials used for tools and weapons, for example, *Stone Age, Chalcolithic Age, Bronze Age, Iron Age.* The dates for these periods reflect the consensus of early archaeologists on when these materials first came into use. Subsequent research has made modifications in the actual dates when these raw materials came into general use, but the calendar dates have not been updated. *The Social World of Deuteronomy: A New Feminist Perspective* follows the calendar in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* edited by David Noel Freedman.

62. **Further Reading (Tradition History of Deuteronomy):** Wells, "Judges and

knowledge of both times, as well as pivotal events in the Late Bronze period which preceded them.

Based on archaeological dates for the Battle of Kadesh (1286 BCE), the wars of Merneptah (1224–1214 BCE), and Ramesses III's battle with the Sea Peoples (1190 BCE), the appearance of the Hebrews in Syria-Palestine described in Deuteronomy is generally dated to 1200 BCE at the beginning of the Iron I period.

When the political reforms of Akhenaten (1364–1347 BCE) plunged Egypt itself into turmoil, he recalled his troops from Syria-Palestine. Villagers there could not harvest their crops and Egyptian officials sent urgent appeals to Akhenaten at El-'Amarna for help.[63] Although the social unrest in Syria-Palestine created by Akhenaten occurred well before the time in Deuteronomy, it models the lack of any centralized Egyptian control in Syria-Palestine assumed by Deuteronomy.

Deuteronomy assumes the Hebrews led by Moses are the descendants of Egypt's slaves. The emancipation of these slaves was a result of the struggle between the empires of Egypt and Hatti for control of Syria-Palestine. The on-going conflict drained the resources of both. Ultimately, the battle at Kadesh on the Orontes River (1286 BCE) motivated Egypt and Hatti to negotiate a covenant to give themselves time to recover economically, and to prepare to defend themselves against the Sea Peoples who were raiding the eastern Mediterranean coast.

The term "Sea Peoples" first appears in a *Hymn of Merneptah* as a label for the Sherden, Sheklesh, Lukka, Tursha and Akawasha who fought with Libya against Egypt. The *Annals of Ramesses III* also include the Denyen, Tjerkker, Weshesh, and the Philistines among the Sea Peoples who invaded Egypt.

Social chaos uprooted the Sea Peoples from their homelands. They migrated through Cyprus and then on to the coasts of Hatti, Syria-Palestine, and Egypt. After a fierce battle on Egypt's Mediterranean coast, Ramesses

Elders in Biblical and Neo-Babylonian Law"; van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*; Otto, *Gottes Recht als Menschenrecht*; Pakkala, *The Date of the Oldest Edition of Deuteronomy*, 388–401; Knauf, "Observations on Judah's Social and Economic History and the Dating of the Laws in Deuteronomy"; Geoghegan, *The Time, Place, and Purpose of the Deuteronomistic History*, 149–50.

63. Spellings for ancient geographical sites follow Rainey et al., *The Sacred Bridge*. A *tell* (Hebrew: *tel*; Arabic: *tall*) is an artificial hill or mound formed by the eroded debris from ancient settlements at a site. If Rainey and Notley give both Arabic and Hebrew spellings, for example, *Tell Arad* and *Tel Arad,* or do not list the site in their index, sites in Arabic-speaking countries are spelled *Tell* or *Tall* and *Tel* for sites in Israel.

III (1194–1163 BCE) ceded control of much of the southern coast of Syria-Palestine to the Philistines.[64]

The withdrawal of the Egyptians and the Hittites from Syria-Palestine was not an unqualified blessing. Some villagers tried to protect their households from war and famine by migrating east into the mountains, where they re-established abandoned villages or founded new ones. Some archaeologists label these refugees "proto-Israelites." Deuteronomy designates this region as part of the "hill country," even though it assumes the Hebrews migrated west into the region, whereas some archaeologists consider these proto-Israelites to have migrated east into the region from the Mediterranean coast (see 1:6–8).[65]

As the Late Bronze period ended, Merneptah (1224–1214 BCE) celebrated his wars on a stele which contains the only mention of *Israel* yet discovered in the Egypt of this period. The annals primarily commemorate Merneptah's victory over the Labu and Meshwesh peoples in Libya and the Aqawasa, Turusa, Luku, Sardana and Sklusa Sea Peoples who were their allies. The final lines celebrate an earlier military campaign in Syria-Palestine. Here Merneptah celebrates his defeat of the city of Ashkelon, the city of Gezer, the city of Yanoam and *the people of Israel*. Each was clearly a threat to Egypt's economic interests by raiding or taxing caravans moving between Egypt and Damascus.

64. **(Further Reading (Philistines):** Dothan, "The "Sea Peoples" and the Philistines of Ancient Israel," in *Civilization of the Ancient Near East, Vol. II*, ed. Jack M. Sasson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1995), 1267-1279; Dothan, *The Philistines and Their Material Culture*, 1–24.

65. Dever, "The Late Bronze-Early Iron I Horizon in Syria-Palestine"; Faust, *Israel's Ethnogenesis*, 159–87.

A Hymn of Merneptah

a Let my enemies prostrate before me begging for peace;
    Let none of my enemies raise their heads in revolt.
    b I devastated Tehenu (Libya) in the west;
    I put down a revolt in the land of Hatti (Syria-Palestine) in the north.
        c I plundered Canaan (Syria-Palestine) from one end to the other.
            d I took slaves from the city of Ashkelon;
                I conquered the city of Gezer.
            d' I razed the city walls of Yanoam to the ground;
                I left the people of Israel childless and without grain.
        c' I left the land of Hurru (Syria-Palestine) a widow.
    b' I have pacified all lands . . .
a' Let every rebel prostrate before Merneptah,
    Before the Pharaoh of Southern and Northern Egypt,
Before the divine presence of Amun-Re,
    Before the Divine Assembly's Beloved, who dawns like the sun.[66]

Iron II Period: The Time When Deuteronomy Begins to Develop

During the Iron II period, a *time when* in the development of Deuteronomy, the states of Ammon, Moab, and Edom formed east of the Jordan River; Israel and Judah formed west of the river; Philistia, Tyre, and Sidon formed along the Mediterranean Sea coast.[67] Now Assyria, not Egypt, dominated Syria-Palestine when Tiglath-Pileser III (744–727 BCE) inaugurated a new age of empires. He reorganized Assyria's bureaucracy to gain control of the trade routes running from the Mediterranean coast inland. To avoid any embargo of Assyria's imports of metals, lumber, and horses, Tiglath-Pileser ratified covenants with the states like Israel and Judah as allies, colonies, or provinces.

Allies aligned themselves with Assyria's foreign policy and provided logistical and military support to the empire. They retained self-determination in their domestic policies as long as they were able to meet their quotas. Assyria preferred to leave local governments in place rather than to administer

66. Matthews and Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels*, 4th ed.
67. Bloch-Smith and Nakhai, "A Landscape Comes to Life: The Iron Age I."

states directly. Local rulers did a better job of managing economies than Assyrian governors. Local soldiers provoked fewer incidents with Egypt than Assyrian troops. Nonetheless, only states with healthy economies, efficient governments, and popular monarchs could survive. Revolutions changed the northern state of Israel from an Assyrian ally (738 BCE), to an Assyrian colony (732 BCE), and finally to an Assyrian province (721 BCE).

In *colonies*, local officials retained their titles, but Assyrian administrators reviewed all domestic policies to guarantee they would meet the empire's budget.

When the quotas of colonies were not met, Assyria incorporated them into the empire as *provinces*. Assyria assigned them military governors, deported local officials, and redistributed populations to developing regions of the empire.

By the time Tiglath-Pileser died, he had built Assyria into the most powerful and tightly controlled empire since Egypt, Hatti, or Mycenae at the end of the Bronze Age. Independence movements met stiff reprisals. Loyalty to Assyria cost Ahaz of Judah (735–715 BCE) a staggering amount for Assyrian troops to repel an invasion of Judah by Syria and Israel during the Syro-Ephraimite War (734–732 BCE). Consequently, Sargon II (721–705 BCE) reduced Israel to the status of an Assyrian province with little or no self-government (721 BCE).

The rulers of Israel and Judah during the 150 year period from the invasions of Tiglath-Pileser of Assyria to the victory of Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon struggled to preserve their independence. Traditions—like those that emphasized that YHWH alone was the divine patron of Israel (4:1–10; 6:4–25) and that this one divine patron was to be worshiped at only one sanctuary (12:2–28)—which would eventually find their final form in Deuteronomy, emerged from these struggles.

Hezekiah (726–697 BCE) declared Judah's independence from Assyria in 701 BCE as part of his bid for independence and closed regional sanctuaries of YHWH. Celebrations of harvests at Jerusalem inspired households to embrace the cause of independence. Logistically, centralization of worship put supplies of grain, wine, and olive oil brought to Jerusalem by households under direct royal supervision, and thus less vulnerable to confiscation by enemies. Assyria responded by invading Judah and laying siege to Jerusalem. Hezekiah ransomed Jerusalem by turning his war chest over to Assyria, and recommitted Judah as a loyal ally.

Manasseh (697–642 BCE) remained an ally of Assyria. He also allowed regional sanctuaries to re-open, diversifying stores of produce and allowing for the inclusion of acknowledgment of Assyrian sovereignty in the official worship of Judah. Manasseh had a long and stable reign, and Judah avoided another Assyrian invasion.

Amon (641–640 BCE) was assassinated for seeking to transfer Judah's alliance from Assyria to Egypt. Royal officials in Jerusalem were convinced that Egypt was powerless to prevent Assyria's takeover of Syria-Palestine, so they assassinated Amon to prevent him from wasting time and resources courting a powerless ally (2 Kgs 21:23).

Josiah (640–609 BCE) was crowned at the age of eight and ruled thirty-one years. He was groomed by the scribes to recommit Judah to Hezekiah's policies seeking independence from Assyria and to embrace the evolving worldview in Deuteronomy (2 Kgs 21:24). When Ashurbanipal of Assyria (668–627 BCE) died after a forty-year reign, Babylon expelled Assyria's diplomats and merchants. Josiah then implemented more of his own policies to declare Judah's independence from Assyria.[68]

Josiah considered himself to be both a new Moses and a new Joshua. Josiah dedicated his domestic policy to Moses and his foreign policy to Joshua. Joshua and Josiah were both warrior-kings. Archaeological evidence suggests that the peoples who made up early Israel migrated east from the Coast Highway and moved from the west into the hills north of Jerusalem; Deuteronomy and Joshua assume the Hebrews invade from the east and move west across the Jordan River. In his campaign to free Judah from Assyria, Josiah also breaks out of Jerusalem in the east and moves west. Therefore, this description of Joshua conquering the land east to west (2 Kgs 23:19; 2 Chr 34:6) may be an homage by the young ruler to his ancient patron.

. . . from Beth Alpert Nakhai

Absent archaeological evidence for the Jerusalem Temple, scholars are forced to rely upon relevant passages throughout First and Second Kings, which describe the Temple, its construction and consecration, its renovations and alterations, and finally, its destruction at the hands of the Babylonians. They are aided by archaeological comparanda from earlier and contemporary temples at Hazor, Tell Tayinat, ʿAin Dara, and more. The scholarly literature on these temples is rich. The Bible describes the

68. **Further Reading (Josiah):** Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah*; Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, 190–209; Leuchter, *Josiah's Reform and Jeremiah's Scroll*; Grabbe, ed., *Good Kings and Bad Kings*.

Temple in Jerusalem as tripartite in plan, accessed through a spacious courtyard, and well-appointed with elegant cultic paraphernalia. It was constructed during Solomon's reign (mid-tenth century BCE) as a royal chapel, at which the king could attend to the cult of YHWH, the God of Israel (1 Kings 6–7). Later, its national importance grew as the Monarchy moved to centralize the nation and institutionalize its religion. The transition from royal chapel to national temple took place in the second half of the eighth century, during the reigns of Jotham (2 Kgs 15:35b), Ahaz (2 Kgs 16:10–18) and Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:4); three-quarters of a century later, Josiah (2 Kgs 23:4–24) reestablished and reinvigorated this religious centralization.

While the Jerusalem Temple may never have played as important a role in Israelite and Judean life as it would come to play later, once it was but a memory, it was nonetheless significant throughout the Iron Age II (c. 1000–587 BCE) as an emblem of monarchy and priesthood, and as a national "organizing principle." It was the single sacred building that stood throughout the entire Monarchy, United and Divided alike. The other sacred places of the Iron II were of lesser longevity; none spanned both eras and some were comparatively short-lived.

The Hebrew Bible notes that Jeroboam, the first king of the northern nation of Israel in the era of the Divided Monarchy, constructed two royal temples for the northern nation of Israel, at Dan and Bethel (late tenth century BCE; 1 Kgs 12:26–33). Excavations at Tel Dan revealed a prominently sited monumental platform on which, perhaps, Jeroboam's temple with its bull image once stood; it was modified and used throughout the Iron Age and even as late as the Hellenistic period. Cultic objects including seven-wicked oil lamps, clay and faience figurines, ceramic incense stands, a four-horned stone altar, and a sunken stone basin, were associated with it. So, too, were two subsidiary rooms half a dozen meters to the west, which also contained a number of cultic objects. In addition, four *maṣṣebôt* shrines with three to five standing stones and a modest array of cultic materials can be related to Dan's gateway system. References to Bethel, Dan's counterpart to the south, were common in the Bible (e.g., 1 Kings 13; 2 Kgs 17:25–28) even long after the Assyrian destruction of the northern nation, although no physical evidence for a temple (let alone a golden calf) has been uncovered there. Indeed, Bethel became emblematic of all that the Deuteronomists (who gave the narrative in Deuteronomy—2 Kings much of its ideological stance, as well as its final form) and Israel's many prophets (Jer 48:12–13; Hos 10:15; Amos 3:14, 4:4, 5:5, 7:10–13), considered wrong with the nation and with its people.

In addition to these three religious "capitals" (Jerusalem, Dan, Bethel), several other Iron II sites contained places for worship that evoked the tropes, motifs, and symbols of national religion, even as public access to them was unlikely. The sacred places at Arad, Lachish, Megiddo, and (presumably) Beersheba were small, integrated into larger buildings, and were more easily identifiable by their contents than by their physical structure. As a whole, they embodied elements of the nation's formal religion, which included at least some from among the following features and ritual objects: dedicated space for the placement of ritual objects and for worship; stone altars (often four-horned) that were too heavy to move easily; *maṣṣebôt*; chalices and other ritual vessels; unornamented, fenestrated and/or decorated ceramic offering stands and altars; cultic implements; and, storage space.

This informal network of royally sanctioned temples in Israel and Judah fulfilled elements of the monarchic agenda, establishing authority and providing prestige, visibility, and some degree of control over a populace more habituated to kin-based forms of worship. While this was true throughout the Monarchy (Iron IIA–C), it was truer of the Iron IIA (c. 1000–930 BCE), during which time the full extent of governmental organization was still being crafted; in the Iron IIB–C (c. 930–587 BCE), governmental leadership and infrastructure were more fully imposed on the cities of Israel and Judah. The shift in nationally significant places of worship from the Iron IIA to the Iron IIB–C reflects two related political and military phenomena. The first is the split between Israel and Judah subsequent to the death of Solomon, which resulted (as noted above) in the establishment of two new religious centers in the north (Dan, Bethel). The second is the devastation caused by the c. 925 BCE attack on Israel by Egypt's king Shoshenq I (biblical Shishak). Not only was there damage throughout the land, but also the Jerusalem Temple and the nearby palace were plundered (1 Kgs 14:25–26). Just as the consequences of the later 701 BCE attack by the Assyrian King Sennacherib included not only destruction and impoverishment but also religious centralization (2 Kgs 18:13—19:37; Isa 36:1—37:38), so too was religious centralization among the consequences of Shishak's military campaign. As the southern nation of Judah reconstituted itself, official control over religion was to some extent tightened, in consequence of which royally sanctioned worship took place only in Jerusalem, and in several strategic sites along its southern border (Arad, Beersheba); however, the Iron IIA sanctuary at Lachish was never reconstructed. In Israel, the situation was somewhat different since that nation needed to inaugurate its own national sanctuaries (Dan, Bethel). However, with that accomplished, the Iron IIA sanctuaries at Megiddo were not reconstructed and no other prominent place of Yahwistic worship was established.

At the same time, in response to both the freedom of worship of the Iron Age I (c. 1200–1000 BCE) and the deep clan ties that had developed during those 200 years, much Iron II worship continued to take place in alternate venues, whether outdoors, in houses, or in modest structures integrated into housing compounds. As a whole, they highlight the role of Israel's extended families, and perhaps unexpectedly, of Israel's women, in this more common form of worship. This is because women in particular engaged in religious rituals enacted within the home, housing compound and local community. Most commonly, such rites focused on health and wellbeing, and especially on the hopes and the dangers associated with reproduction and the survival of the very young. It is against not only the more formal sanctuaries described above (exclusive of the Jerusalem Temple), but also against these less formal venues for family and personal worship, that the authors of Deuteronomy direct their attention and disapprobation. They do so as a means of both articulating their insistence on Temple worship officiated over by its formal priesthood, and disenfranchising Israel's commoners and, in particular, the women among them.[69]

Intentions of Deuteronomy

To Prevent the Destruction of Judah and Jerusalem

During the days of Hezekiah and Josiah the intention of Deuteronomy was to offer a strategy for surviving destruction. Scribes crafted Deuteronomy as a policy for Judah to offset the worst possible consequences of developments between Judah and its neighbors. If the fathers and mothers of the households of Judah could recreate the solidarity that characterized the community Moses led to the borders of the land, the Hebrews could face the Assyrians and the Babylonians with the same courage and success that their ancestors faced the indigenous peoples of Syria-Palestine back in the day.

69. Nakhai, "Where to Worship? Religion in Iron II Israel and Judah."

To Explain the Destruction of Judah and Jerusalem

Although the strategy to prevent the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem failed, the royal household deported to Babylon rewrote Deuteronomy into a *Deuteronomistic History* as an explanation for losing their land.[70]

As Moses' last will and testament Deuteronomy serves as both a conclusion to the *Torah* or *Pentateuch* (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers) and as an introduction to the *Deuteronomistic History* (Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings).[71] The Deuteronomists divided their history into four periods: *The Days of Moses*; *The Days of Joshua* (Josh 24:31), *The Days of the Judges* (2 Kgs 23:22), and *The Days of the Kings of Israel and the Kings of Judah* (2 Kgs 23:22). Then, the Deuteronomists crafted speeches (Deut 1–4; Judg 2:11–23; 2 Sam 7:1–29; 1 Kgs 8:22–53; 2 Kgs 17:7–23) to link the four periods. Moses gives speeches to introduce (1:1—4:49) and conclude (26:16—34:12) the promulgation of the *Covenant between YHWH and Israel*. Joshua gives speeches to inaugurate (Josh 1:10–15) and to conclude (Josh 23:1–16) the *Days of Joshua*. Samuel gives a speech (1 Sam 12:1–25) to inaugurate the *Days of the Kings of Israel and of the Kings of Judah*.

A *Review of the Annals for the Monarchs of Israel and Judah* (1 Kgs 11:44—2 Kgs 25:30) audits their annual reports to YHWH on their stewardship of the land and its people once preserved in scrolls like: *Annals of Solomon* (1 Kgs 10:14); *Annals of the Kings of Israel* (1 Kgs 14:19) and *Annals of the Kings of Judah* (1 Kgs 14:19). The audit puts each monarch on trial *in absentia*. With the exception of David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah, the trials find each guilty of breach of covenant and sentence Israel and Judah with the loss of land and people.

The *Deuteronomistic History* concludes that the Babylonians simply executed a divine sentence against Judah for failing to observe the covenant. The literary strategy for reaching this conclusion is a "theodicy"—the study of incomprehensible divine actions. The incomprehensible in Job, *A Sufferer and a Soul* from Egypt and *Man and God* from Sumer is why bad things happen to good people. The incomprehensible in Deuteronomy is

70. **Further Reading (Deuteronomistic History):** Coggins, "What Does 'Deuteronomistic' Mean?"; Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*; Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*; McKenzie and Graham, eds., *The History of Israel's Traditions*; Campbell, "Martin Noth and the Deuteronomistic History"; Person, *The Deuteronomic School*; de Pury and Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues."

71. Noll, "Deuteronomistic History or Deuteronomic Debate?"; Geoghegan, *The Time, Place, and Purpose of the Deuteronomistic History*; van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*; Crüsemann, *The Torah*.

why YHWH allowed the Babylonians to destroy Jerusalem and deport the household of David.

When the Babylonians broke through the walls of Jerusalem and razed its Temple, the people of Judah were devastated. Some biblical traditions conclude that YHWH had abrogated the covenant and was no longer their divine patron (Ezek 8:1–18). Deuteronomy concludes that the Hebrews themselves abrogated their covenant with YHWH by negotiating covenants with outsiders to feed and protect them.

To Prevent the Assimilation of the People of Judah into Babylonian Culture

The Deuteronomy in the *Deuteronomistic History* also became a spirituality for remaining faithful to YHWH. The traditions taught the Hebrews to remember who they were, and all that YHWH had done for them. For this Deuteronomy the only unforgiveable sin is to forget.

To survive some exiles assumed Babylonian names, and accepted positions of authority as Babylonian officials, but while such adaptations were expedient, they did not signify that the exiles believed that YHWH was dead, or that their identity as the people of YHWH had ended.

After Cyrus (559–530 BCE) restored the household of David to the Persian province of Yehud Deuteronomy continued to play a critical role in helping the people of Judah define their identity as the people of YHWH.[72] In time it became an integral part of the Torah—the core curriculum of biblical spirituality defining what it means to be a people of biblical faith.[73]

The contrast between the theology of Deuteronomy and the preceding Torah scrolls is pronounced.[74] The traditions in Genesis through Numbers are inclusive: Abraham and Sarah welcome outsiders, and outsiders who welcome them are blessed with land and people (Gen 12:1–3). Deuteronomy is exclusive: if the Hebrews take no outsiders as prisoners or plunder the land and goods of outsiders, then YHWH will feed and protect them (7:1–26).[75] The Genesis covenant is unconditional; the Deuteronomy covenant is conditional. YHWH will feed and protect the Hebrews only if they worship one divine patron at the *maqom* sanctuary (4:1–40; 6:4–25; 12:2–28). In other

72. Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism."

73. Nicholson, "Reconsidering the Provenance of Deuteronomy"; Pearce, "New Evidence for Judeans in Babylonia"; Pearce, "'Judean': A Special Status in Neo-Babylonian and Achemenid Babylonia?"; Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and the Babylonian Diaspora"; Stulman, "Encroachment in Deuteronomy"; McBride, "The Essence of Orthodoxy."

74. Nihan, "Rewriting the Torah."

75. J. L. Wright, "Warfare and Wanton Destruction."

traditions the Hebrews worship YHWH at sanctuaries throughout the land: Shechem (Gen 12:7–8), Bethel (Gen 35:1–7), Shiloh (1 Sam 3:1), Ramah (1 Sam 7:17), Dan, Beersheba, and the Carmel Mountains (1 Kgs 18:20–40). In Deuteronomy the Hebrews worship YHWH only at the *maqom* sanctuary (see: 12:2–28) or . . . *the place that the LORD your God will choose out of all your tribes as his habitation to put his name there* (NRSV).

Men and women like Moses use their last wills and testaments to revise the worldviews of their cultures when things have changed.[76] Experiences like the destruction of Israel and the invasion of Judah matured the Hebrews' vision. What the scribes thought about YHWH's great events before Deuteronomy is not what they think about those events in Deuteronomy.[77]

Enlightenment cultures today problem-solve by looking ahead; traditional cultures like ancient Israel problem-solve by looking back. "Traditional" cultures are also known as "simple," "pre-modern," "pre-industrial," "tribal," or "oral" cultures. Greek, Roman, and European empire builders referred to them disparagingly as "primitive," "savage," or "barbarian" cultures.[78] Today "traditional" identifies cultures that have not been influenced by the Enlightenment, Modernism, Positivism, or the Industrial Revolution. Enlightenment and traditional cultures look at the world differently. One is not more accurate than the other.

Deuteronomy is an example of modeling the future by reconstructing the past.[79] Retelling traditions reminds audiences not to forget what they will need to resolve the challenges they face. In Deuteronomy Moses retells Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers to Joshua, his heir, who will lead the Hebrews into the future. Similarly, Esarhaddon uses his *Vassal Treaties* to compel his clients to accept his heir, Assurbanipal, as their new patron.[80]

Deuteronomy empowers fathers to fulfill their responsibility for implementing the *Covenant between YHWH and Israel* in the daily lives of their households. These fathers—not the monarchs of the household of David—were to be responsible for the land and people of Judah. Once local sanctuaries were closed and worship restricted to the Jerusalem Temple, faithfulness to the covenant was no longer measured by liturgical observance, but by a way of living.

76. Rochberg-Halton, "Canonicity in Cuneiform Texts."

77. Weitzman, "Lessons from the Dying," 379.

78. Lévi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind*, 290.

79. Liss and Oeming, eds., *Literary Construction of Identity in the Ancient World*, 370.

80. Zehnder, "Building on Stone?"

Deuteronomy is a call to end the misplaced confidence in elite males of the royal households that does not reflect its vision for a people of YHWH. Membership was no longer to be limited to circumcised males, but extended to all those with circumcised hearts (10:12—11:32). Deuteronomy's new world is still male-centered, but these males were not ruling in palaces, they were fathers of households whose survival depended on the cooperation between males and females, young and old, native and adopted, insiders and outsiders, slave and free, humans and nature.[81] The instructions in Deuteronomy do not envision fathers as emperors surrounded by hundreds of diplomatic wives and serving women, but rather as co-workers with the mothers of their households as well as other childbearing women, males, children, the ill, the disabled, liminal people, slaves, prisoners, outsiders, and even their livestock and crops. Deuteronomy teaches fathers how to maintain households whose members are each in the productive places to which YHWH has assigned them so that their households cannot only make a living, but make a difference in the world around them.

81. P. D. Miller, "Constitution or Instruction?"; McBride, "Polity of the Covenant People."