The foreword dedicates this work to the memory of Volkmar Premstaller, S.J., whose “liveliness as a preacher” and pastoral activities are mentioned along with the professional and intellectual. The occasion of the papers was a September 2010 conference on the book of Deuteronomy held at the University of Innsbruck, Austria, organized by Georg Fischer. Several contributors are Jesuit priests; others are involved in research of the divinity (e.g., monotheism, depictions of God acting as a person), biblical pastoral studies, and Bible studies associated with children. Yet another is writing an additional dissertation in the area of Bible and pastoral care. The book contains a foreword, six-page introduction with German summaries of the papers; it ends with English abstracts of the papers, a scripture index (including indices of SAA and Sefire texts) and author biographical information. There is no author index.

An ambiguity pervades the book of Deuteronomy. It belongs inseparably within the Pentateuch and at the same time contrasts markedly with Genesis through Numbers. Georg Fischer focuses on this dual character in “Peculiarity and Significance of Deuteronomy in the Torah,” beginning with an acknowledgement of E. Otto’s profound impact on the study of Deuteronomy. The essay then divides into sections A–C with numbered subsections. In A, there are with three steps, the elements of discontinuation, accents of content, and problems in the portrayal. In step two, Fischer notes how the
profound usage of the verb “to love” אהב marks a change in the internal relationship between Yhwh and Israel in Deuteronomy; new for the torah is the notion that God loves his people (Deut 4:37; 10:15). The changing relationship moreover depends on the concept of the covenant already present in Exod 19–24, renewed in 34:10, but which Deuteronomy broadly develops with help from ancient Near Eastern treaty texts. In step three, the “canon formula” of Deut 4:2 (//13:1) is shown to be problematic, since Deuteronomy itself violates the prohibition by expanding and delimiting early legislation (22).

The inconsistency with respect to the plenary reception of revelation by Israel shows itself in the “mediated immediacy” that Deut 5:5 finagles in an attempt to counteract the immediacy of verse 4 (cf. 4:10; 11:7). The result is an “ambivalent combination” (22). Deuteronomy’s idealistic conceptions come up for critique as well, for example, for promising that there would be no one in need (אפס כי לא ייהיה אבון 15:4). Fischer characterizes the covenant in Deut 26–30 as vague because it lacks an explicit statement of agreement by the people (cf. 29:9–14). Section B treats the integration of Deuteronomy into the torah (for example the spy narrative in Num 13–14 worked over by the Hexateuch redaction delivers the basis for Deut 1:19–40 [25 and n. 54]), and section C offers a few points on why the book is so important both within the Pentateuch and the Bible as a whole. Fischer’s essay neither repeats the overly familiar nor cajoles the reader down a technical path to the arcane. With several references to other essays in the volume, one would be hard pressed to find a more suitable opener for the present volume.

In “Redefining the Plot of Deuteronomy—From End to Beginning: The Import of Deut 34:9,” Jean-Pierre Sonnet expounds on a passage routinely labeled “the end of P.” Deuteronomy 34:9b plays a crucial role both in the Pentateuch and within Deuteronomy itself, prompting readers to redefine its overall plot. Assisted by the reading theory of Paul Ricoeur, Sonnet adopts the point of view of a reader who comes to the end of Deuteronomy and looks backward. To “understand” the story is to understand how the successive episodes lead to its conclusion. An echoing dynamic obtains between Deut 34:9b and 1:3 that “keeps the unfolding of Deuteronomy’s thirty-four chapters within the span of a single act of communication, between its enunciation and its reception” (39). The end of a story often impacts the writing of the introduction and the shaping of the middle.

The narrative arch in Deuteronomy accomplishes a major shift from the mediation of Moses to Joshua. The former commands the people to listen to the latter in the literary and storyline context of “a prophet like Moses (18:15). Sonnet perceives a “mediate immediacy” unique to Deuteronomy. Such divine communication is capable of reaching “a new audience in its original immediate force.” Mosaic mediation is not intended as a
onetime event but rather “a continued mediation” (47, emphasis original). Deuteronomy is rife with the interplay between immediacy and mediation (46). It sets forth a narrative theory “of a continued ‘voicing,’ beyond the founding event” (47).

In “Moses’ Role as Prophet in Deut 5; 18; 34: Structural Turning-Points of Legal-Hermeneutical Importance,” Dominik Markl reconstructs Moses’ role as prophet in key turning-point texts in Deuteronomy (5:23–31; 18:15–20; 34:10–12) in relation to the structure and legal hermeneutics of the book. The three texts connect intertextually and construct “a structural spine” for the book and bring into relief the notion of the prophetic succession of Moses. In spite of Deuteronomy’s accentuation of the permanency of Mosaic torah, the Moses epitaph of 34:10–12 promotes post-Mosaic prophecy linked to the succession motif in Deut 18. The inevitability and authorization of such prophecy is asserted. Chapter 18 is the center of Deuteronomy, and Moses functions as the prototype of an Israelite prophet (53). Markl discourses on the metapragmatic function of Deuteronomic texts that reference other texts “metatextually.”

Eleonore Reuter begins “Concepts of Authority: Forms and Functions of the Moses-fiction” by gathering instructive details about Moses’ speech events in Deuteronomy. In contrast to Exodus–Numbers, in which God is usually the speaker and Moses the addressee, the latter becomes the speaker in Deuteronomy, often addressing Israelite en masse. While on the one hand Moses’ speeches bring Yhwh closer to Israel (71), they also bring the people closer to Yhwh. They gain audience with the divine and in some cases engender close-range responses. This becomes evident as Moses interjects his own words (in, e.g., Deut 1:27–31; 3:23–26a, 27b–28; 5:23–27), which in my view serve elite interests.2 Reuter upholds Otto’s hypothesized differentiation between time of narration and narrated time but questions the view (of Otto and Georg Braulik) that Ur-Deuteronomy (6:4–5, 12–26*) contains no hint of a Moses figure, or that preexilic law would have an “immediate expression of God’s will … disconnected from the Moses fiction” (Otto cited in Reuter, 75). The Moses fiction had to be a part of the original Deuteronomy for several reasons. With the Covenant Code having been revealed directly, Deuteronomic law had

---

1. On this concept, see the review of Markl’s second paper below.
to be mediated to forestall attempts to replace the former (76). The Moses fiction also allowed the attribution to the Covenant Code and the integration into the treaty situation toward the end of the monarchy (77). Finally, Moses turns out to be the unnamed speaker from the early period of Israel in Ur-Deuteronomy, his anonymous presence functioning akin to the king in the Neo-Assyrian treaties. Reuter’s essay provides a thoughtful and clearly presented abridgement of recent German scholarship on complex issues in Deuteronomy. The effort to imbed the Moses fiction in Ur-Deuteronomy and the early period of Israel is laudable but will receive sturdy critique, especially in Europe.

Nathan MacDonald writes on “Edom and Seir in the Narratives and Itineraries of Numbers 20–21 and Deuteronomy 1–3.” The solution to the taxing problems of Deut 1–3 requires analysis of how the text relates to parallel accounts and larger compositional units. “The literary critic must take account of sources of the Tetrateuch and how these chapters relate to them, most especially in Num 13–14, 20–21, she must also explain the relationship to texts in the subsequent history of Israel, most especially in the book of Joshua, which means some account of the ‘Deuteronomistic History’ and its redaction, and she must also relate these chapters to the growth of the book of Deuteronomy itself, as [Eckart] Otto himself has pressed for most strongly” (83). Regarding the shared material in Deut 1–3 and parallel narratives in Numbers, scholarship has a better grasp of the function of the former.

MacDonald sets out to clarify problems clustering around the appearance of Edom in Num 20–21. The differences between that account and parallel traditions in Deut 1–3 “arise from a close reading of Deut 1–3.… There is no need to posit the existence of a pre-Deuteronomistic narrative about Edom [as argued by Otto]. The Edom narrative in Numbers is composed using the pre-deuteronomistic story of Sihon and its Deuteronomistic version in Deut 2:24–37.” MacDonald questions J. Van Seters’s recourse to Judg 11 to explain the composition of the stories in Num 20–21. “Rather, the reverse is true, Judg 11 utilizes the stories from Num 20–21” (85). The composers of parts of Num 20–21 found Deut 1–3 to be a particularly challenging text. The struggle to recognize its

4. “Das Bundebuch ist von Gott direct gegebenes Gesetz, das Deuteronomium dagegen die von Mose verkündete Auslegung und Aktualisierung. So und nur so, kann Deuteronomium neben das Bundesbuch treten, ohne es zu ersetzen.” Later, the Temple Scroll of Qumran looks back at an already thoroughly Mosaized Pentateuch. At this point God moves into the place of authoritative interpreter, further updating and in some instances replacing Moses’ updated interpretations of tora in the land of Moab (78).

authority and contextualize it for a later encounter with Transjordanian nations, especially Edom, produced a complicated if not contradictory account (101).

In “Torah for a New Generation in Deut 4: The Heremeneutical Theology of the Change in Number,” Eckart Otto resumes work on Deut 4, a key postexilic text. He engages the long-debated issue of the origin/function of the “change in number” (Numeruswechsel) of second-plural and second-singular address in Deuteronomy. Earlier views of the variation as a literary technique or stylistic device have come up wanting: If the Numeruswechsel is a major literary “technique” employed for the sake of emphasis, why does it play no role in the crucial section Deut 4:29–40?

Otto proposes a fresh explanation for the literary phenomenon. In Deut 4:25a-b–28, which employs plural address, Moses proclaims the apostasy of future nations caused by the making of idols and the consequent exilic and dispersion. In verse 29a the upheaval takes place, and this is reflected by the Numeruswechsel. Neither emending the first phrase to singular (L. Perlitt) nor attributing the variation to an accidental slurring (Verschleifung; Lohfink7) of number provides a satisfying solution. Rather, writers employ the Numeruswechsel to structure the chapter and to differentiate “between aspects of salvation and perdition in both the past and future” (110).

In section four (117–20) Otto elaborates on the prophethood of Moses, which in Deut 4:1–40 towers over any paraenesis. Verses 23–28, for example, are not veiled paraenesis. They are spoken by Moses as a prophecy of disaster, the confirmation of which waits until 31:16–18. The hermeneutical conception in 4:1–40 identifies the “second generation” in the narrated time of Moses with the addressees of Deuteronomy. The postexilic period is the time of narration. Only a remnant will escape the coming disaster brought on by the breaking of the First Commandment. Whereas the escapees of the covenant breach at Baal Peor are addressed in the time of narration, the addressees in Deuteronomy comprise the remnant of the “second generation,” which already knows of the catastrophe. Yhwh bestows mercy upon this postexilic generation and initiates a system of reconciliation based not upon merits but rather ratified by a merciful grant (118). In Deuteronomy, the postexilic addressees (= the second generation) (a) hear the Decalogue


7. Norbert Lohfink used German Verschleifen in this context, which Otto acknowledges (110 n. 27).
for the first time in the land of Moab after the events of Baal Peor, (b) know their role in
“the end of days” according to Deut 4:30, (c1) take to heart that there is no other god (v. 39), which makes possible (c2) the expansion and ratification of the proposal/promise in 30:6 that Yhwh would circumcise their hearts and those of their descendants.

The postexilic scribal authors of the *Fortschreibung* in Deut 4 move beyond the portrayal of Moses as authoritative torah interpreter of the Sinai-Horeb narrative. The construction of the chapter and use of *Numeruswechsel* work together to construct an updated image of Moses: as prophet (119). This became necessary because previous torah promulgation and interpretation failed to curb the people’s rebellion (so, 4:3–4, 23–28).

Karin Finsterbusch’s “The Decalogue Orientation of Deuteronomic Law: A New Approach” proposes a novel way to conceptualize the development of Deuteronomic law. Her history of research on a Decalogue-structured Deuteronomy includes summary of less familiar publications by, for example, F. W. Schultz (1859) and S. A. Kaufman (1979), which is a boon. For Finsterbusch, the relationship between the Decalogue and Deuteronomic law developed through an *orientation toward* rather than a *structuring by* the Decalogue.

Finsterbusch faults theses of ten-part structure for their lack of linguistic and content connections in Deuteronomic legal texts to commandments eight through ten (127–28). Otto’s reduction to a five-part structure also has problems (128–29). Based on content considerations and/or key words (142), Finsterbusch opts for a seven-unit structure within Deut 12:8–25:19. The number seven commends itself because of its significance for Israelite writers, who combined and inverted the first and second commandments and incorporated the eighth into the fifth. The careful shaping of content and structure of the law was accomplished by a relatively concentrated cooperative (144) in an early phase of development, which took place no later than the exile. (Finsterbusch does not conjecture the identity of the literary team or where they may have worked). It therefore should not be viewed as the product of a large and later redactional reworking of the text.

Paganini Simone argues in “The Changing of the Relationship between God and Moses as Signal of the Composition of the Deuteronomic Narrative” that the final form of Deuteronomy was conceived as a systematic, comprehensive construction of Israelite society. Synchronically read, the events since the exodus from Egypt develop between two poles: the torah received from God at Sinai and written down by God and Moses and the interpretation of this torah written by Moses for the second generation in the land of Moab. This generates an essential dynamic within the Pentateuch.
The structure of Deuteronomy is perceptible on the levels of content and theological development, and Moses’ relationship with God plays a role in its composition. Moses appears in the Pentateuch as privileged speaking partner with God and interpreter of torah par excellence. The conversation in Deut 3:23–28 in which he is both supplicant and sole object of the request (to cross over the Jordan) has no parallel in the Pentateuch. His role here is atypical because of the lack of connecting link between Yhwh and Israel. Instead, the close relationship between Moses (who expresses strong emotions in vv. 24–25) and Yhwh is accentuated, yet Moses’ request—he last as a leader—is brusquely denied (149–52). In chapter 9 Moses averts impending doom for the Israelites. After waiting forty days and nights in the deity’s presence (vv. 18, 25), he must change Yhwh’s mind or else begin again as a new Abraham with a new people of God (vv. 12–14). The dialogues of chapters 3 and 9 reveal Moses’ internal conflict and enhance the dynamic of the synchronically read Deuteronomy. Even though Deut 3 is the later conversation, its canonical placement owes to synchronic considerations: placed first, it is given preference. Whereas Deut 3 leads to an abrupt conclusion, the outcome in Deut 9 remains open. Yhwh however acts similarly in both chapters. His anger toward Moses in the former becomes directed toward Israel in the latter; this leads to a new edition of the covenant, which obtains massive importance in Deuteronomy. Whereas in Exod 34 we see only the narrative of the covenant, Deut 12–25 provides a detailed and indeed paradigmatic description of the covenant’s content.

Hans Ulrich Steymans directs our attention to a Deuteronomistic literary layer in his “DtrB and the adê for the Regulating of Asarhaddon’s Throne-Succession? Covenant Theology and Covenant Formula in View of Deuteronomy 11.” The siglum DtrB hails from a study by T. Veijola. In DtrB the similarity of Deuteronomy with ancient Near Eastern texts, on the one hand, and the lateness of Deuteronomistic layers and covenantal theology, on the other, becomes clear (167). In the third of five sections Steymans details the close parallels between Deut 13 and 28 and §§56 and §§57 in the Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon. Section five contains concise evaluation of the redaction/revision sigla DtrB (Veijola), DtrD (Otto) and DtrL (N. Lohfink, G. Braulik, Otto), DtrN (L. Perlitt) as they pertain to Deuteronomy, particularly chapter 11 (183–87). This essay is a veritable research feast, containing copious quotations throughout its thirty-one pages.

Markus Zehnder, “Curse and Blessing in the Book of Deuteronomy: Observations and Questions,” proffers new insights into blessing and cursing texts of Deuteronomy. As he demonstrates how Deut 28 integrates into the book as a whole, affinities between Deut 28 and the blessing sequence in 7:13–15 come into view. The concurrence makes it unlikely the two were composed independently of the other, and several factors suggest the latter as the secondary text. The theme of blessing makes numerous appearances in the Deuteronomic Code and typically in two basic forms: as motivation for the observance of the commandments in the form of the promise of blessing following their obedience, and as a benchmark for the practicing of generosity. Israel is to pair the receiving of blessings with the willingness to share with the weaker members of society (195). The theme of blessing in the final form of Deuteronomy dominates over the theme of cursing. In this way the book separates itself from putative ancient Near Eastern sources. The theme of cursing appears first in 11:26–8 (כִּלֵל) and then rarely in the Deuteronomic Code (chs. 12–26). Not until Deut 29–33 does the theme of blessing and cursing undergo substantial development.

In second part of the essay Zehnder discusses the linguistic incorporation of the curses into Deut 28 and their relationship to the preceding section of blessings. There follow eight pages elucidating connections to other parts of Deuteronomy. Moving seriatim through Deut 28, Zehnder points out numerous keywords, word combinations, and phrases with explanations of varying length. The result is an extensive outline of the chapter’s profile, where blessing and curse are treated in parallel, yet with the latter clearly predominating. “The final position of the curse confers tendentially more weight” (199). But this is not the case in the book’s final form. Rather, the curses predominate in a condensed way toward the end of the book, namely, in chapters 27–28, where the similarity with other lawcodes and vassal treaties is evident. On balance, Deuteronomy motivates through a mixture of positive inducements and negative warnings. The fear of punishment, however, does not have the loudest or last say.

Ernst Ehrenreich tells of “Torah between Failure and New Beginning: Narrative Legal Hermeneutic in Light of Deuteronomy 30.” Drawing from his dissertation,9 Ehrenreich adumbrates the paradigm change in the Pentateuch, which moves from an unsure history of failures (beginning in Gen 3) to a secure beginning based newly constituted law in, for example, Deut 30 (213). Deuteronomic law is placed within the horizon of failure and new beginning. Exodus 32–34 and Num 13–14 constitute the main narratives of the failures of Israelite society and form a concentric ring around Leviticus and the message of God’s willingness to reconcile in its middle (e.g., Lev 16:21; see 213, 3). Exodus 32–34

contains the precursor to the new beginning; passages such as Exod 33:19; 34:6, 12–26 propose an exceptional, positive answer to the people’s “stiff-necked” nature. Yhwh announces the intention to bestow grace upon whom he chooses, ostensibly without regard to human behavior. Deuteronomy 30:1–10 takes this further: the deity will circumcise the hearts of his people and their progeny (v. 6; see also רחם in 4:31; 30:3 and pp. 221, 223). This postexilic covenant incorporates the Abrahamic covenant of Gen 17. The result is a subtle legal hermeneutic of the Pentateuch Endtext, which makes pentateuchal law into a united “Torah for the new, postexilic generation” (223). Ehrenreich’s insights and conversance in the Tanak make for broad and compelling theses.

For Raik Heckl, “The Presentation of the Transmitted texts in Deuteronomy 31 towards the Revision of the Dtr Theology of History,” Deut 31 no longer lies on the level of Deuteronomy as an independent book but rather on the level of the Pentateuch. At mid-chapter (v. 17a) Yhwh’s anger is expressed against the future disobedience of the people, which leads to his absence (17b) and turning his face from them (v. 18). This is thematized in many other (mostly late) passages in Deut and in the historical books. Heckl would illuminate the historical theology in the background of Deut 31, described as a priestly-hermeneutical concept of older literary traditions. Chapter 31 aims to portray Deuteronomy as an integral part of the Pentateuch and revise Deuteronomistic historical theology. Regarding the latter program, the depositing of the seper into the ark of the covenant (v. 26) ceremonially and symbolically accomplishes the inclusion of Deuteronomy into the Torah.

The Song of Moses (ch. 32) constitutes an independent text marked by its superscription and subscription והזאת השירה, yet it is only indirectly thematized as a written text (several verses earlier, in Deut 31:19–22). In chapter 32 it is cited as an oral speech that the people are to learn. The series of vaticinia ex eventu will witness against them (v. 19). The witness function of the song serves as model of the witness function of the torah (234). On a larger scale, the identity of the ספר of Deuteronomy is thought to be identical with the book written by Moses (235; 243).

Georg Fischer contributes a second essay to the volume: “The Influence of Deuteronomy on the Book of Jeremiah.” Fischer has written extensively on the book of Jeremiah and its parallels with Deuteronomy. He continues work here on Deuteronomy’s “background frameworks.” Deuteronomy 4–5 show close and lengthy parallels with Jeremiah; the anterior framework (chs. 1–3; 6–11) exhibit less. Fischer tends to see Jeremiah as the dependent text. The closest parallel texts in Jeremiah are 7:23; 11:4; 21:5; 29: 13; 32:21, 39, some of which take significant liberties with the source text (248–52). “Exclusive relationship” refers to a word or words exclusive to two books, in this case Deuteronomy and Jeremiah (248 and n. 8). Deuteronomy 4:29 is in exclusive relationship with Jer 29:13.
The literary (inter)dependency is clear. What begins literally as a Mosaic proclamation in Deut 4 becomes God’s personal promise in Jer 29:13, thereby strengthening its authority. That the latter is shorter, consistently formulated in second-person plural, and a concrete realization of “the letter to the exiles,” suggests it as the receptor text (contra Otto, for whom Deut 4 receives 29:13 in a post-Deuteronomistic stage; 250 and n. 15). While I support the post-Deuteronomistic dating of Deut 4:1–40, Fischer makes a good case for Jer 29:13 as secondary in this instance. Another exclusive relationship occurs in the anterior framework, הָלַשׁוֹת יָרוּעָר “for the good” in Deut 6:24; 10:13 and Jer 32:39. Contacts between Jeremiah and the Deuteronomic Code (chs. 12–26, especially chs. 13 and 18) and chapters 26–34 are also discussed. The manner in which Jeremiah texts differ and distance themselves from parallel texts in Deuteronomy suggests a debate between law and prophecy occurring in postexilic Israel, perhaps in the late Persian period.

Markl’s second essay is in English: “Deuteronomy’s Frameworks in Service of the Law (Deut 1–11; 26–34).” In this piece he describes the function of the framing parts of Deuteronomy. It is through framed discourses that the authors teach torah and attempt to “form moral identity” through the use of rhetorical device (277). Markl introduces the concept and function of metapragmatics. “Metapragmatical propositions refer explicitly metatextually to a text and demand its reception” (279). Deuteronomy 4:1 exemplifies this metatextual dynamic: “so now, Israel, give heed” serves as the motivation for text reception and “to the statutes and ordinances” functions as the explicit metatextual reference. More generally, texts function metapragmatically when composed to elicit or influence the reception of other texts.

The creative variety of approaches offered in this book will stimulate new interest in ways to approach and interpret the fifth book of the Torah. A notable novum for English readers may be the unapologetic (re)insertion of theological accents into rigorously critical European “Old Testament studies.” The title phrase “new generation” is a double entendre that refers to the second generation of Israelites out of Egypt, who are the addressees of Deuteronomy with which Yhwh “begins a new era,”¹⁰ and the “new generation” of scholars—particularly perhaps the triumvirate of Markl, Ehrenreich, and Paganini—bringing forward the legacy of N. Lohfink and E. Otto in postulating literary-historical models that can be both atomically complex yet at the same time penetratingly theological.¹¹

¹⁰. Ehrenreich, 213; cf. 223 (in the present volume).
¹¹. The introduction speaks of the new generation of exeges interpreting the texts “in fresh ways, with creativity and sensibility,” which results in the bringing to light facets and nuances of the texts rarely seen previously (9).