Redaction Criticism: 1 Kings 8 and the Deuteronomists

Thomas Römer

What Does "Redaction Criticism" Mean? A Short History of the Method

The idea of redactors and redaction is probably as old as the historical and critical investigation of the Bible. It can be traced back to Richard Simon's critical history of the Old Testament, where he claimed that the original texts of the Bible had been altered by "public scribes" who added new ideas to, or sometimes shortened, the text they were rewriting.[1] According to the Documentary Hypothesis as established by Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen, redactors are distinguished from the original authors of the documents, or "sources." The original sources of the Pentateuch, or the Hexateuch, are: JE (the Jehovist); D (the first edition of the book of Deuteronomy); and P (the Priestly document). These documents were put together, in the light of this model, by different redactors who worked more or less mechanically.[2] They neither invented the chronological framework of the first books of the Bible, which already existed in the oldest document (J [Yahwist]), nor did they add new stories. Their main concern was to harmonize the different sources by intermingling the parallel accounts (as, e.g., in Exod 14) or putting them side by side (in Gen 1:1–2:3; 2:4–3:25). As Otto Eissfeldt puts it: "There is a distinction, for the most part clearly recognizable, between the author, organically shaping the material, and the redactor working mechanically."[3]

Until the middle of the twentieth century, biblical scholars were not much interested in the work of the redactors. They were concerned with discovering the oldest sources in the narrative books or the *ipsissima verba* in the prophetic books. The focus on the "authentic" prophetic

words led Bernhard Duhm in his commentary on Jeremiah to disqualify more than 60 percent of the book as stemming from *Ergänzer* (supplementers), who were unqualified scribes. The opposite of talented authors, these confused the clear thoughts of Jeremiah.[4] Duhm rightly recognized the importance of later revisions of older texts or documents, but the time was not yet ripe for a positive or even neutral evaluation of such redactional activity.

In a sense, Martin Noth was not only the "father" of the Deuteronomistic History; he may also be considered the earliest promoter of redaction criticism, even though he titled his book about the Deuteronomistic History *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (*Studies in the History of Transmission/Tradition*).[5] The interest in transmission of written or oral traditions is less concerned with the exact reconstruction of the oldest sources. Rather, its focus is to explain the development and the formation of larger units such as the Pentateuch, the Former Prophets, the Latter Prophets, Chronicles, and so on. It must be noted that the importance of Noth's Deuteronomistic History hypothesis does not reside in the identification of Deuteronomistic texts in the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. Such texts had been identified since the time of Heinrich Ewald and Wellhausen, but no one really took interest in them, since they were just "late additions." Noth was the first to emphasize that those Deuteronomistic texts belonged to a coherent and unified redaction, due to one redactor, whom Noth called the Deuteronomist (Dtr). According to Noth, Dtr wrote the first history of Israel, by making use of older traditions and documents, which he arranged in a coherent chronology and narrative. In this view, the Deuteronomist's attitude toward his traditions was that of an "honest broker": he integrated in his work all of the older documents available to him, even when they contradicted his own theology.[6] Noth is indeed convinced that "Dtr's transmission of old traditional documents and accounts makes his work a most valuable historical source."[7] Thus for Noth, Dtr was not only a redactor but also an author who "brought together material from highly varied traditions" and "apparently arranged the material according to his own judgment."[8]

Thus, Noth's view of Dtr parallels the conception of the Evangelist Mark advanced by Willi Marxsen (who is often considered the real founder of redaction criticism).[9] Noth's Dtr and Marxsen's Mark were both redactors, but not in the sense that they mechanically edited the former traditions. On the contrary, as mentioned above, in the view of

redaction criticism a redactor can almost be considered an "author," but not, of course, according to the meaning of modern authorship, which does not apply to the historical context of the Hebrew Bible.

With regard to the Deuteronomistic History, the emphasis on redaction-critical approaches grew in light of two major modifications that succeeded Noth's theory.[10] Frank Moore Cross's model of the double redaction of the Deuteronomistic history, which still dominates scholarship in the Anglo-Saxon world, distinguishes two blocks or layers. The first redactor—which Cross, contrary to Noth, locates under Josiah—organizes the older material in order to write a work of propaganda for the Judean king and its politics of centralization. After 587 B.C.E., a later redactor added 2 Kgs 24–25, as well as other texts, in order to update the history in the light of the downfall of Jerusalem and the Babylonian exile. The model of the "Göttingen school," which is now very popular in European biblical research, distinguishes three Deuteronomistic redactors, each of them having his own theological profile: (1) the Deuteronomistic Historian (DtrH), who is a diminished version of Noth's Deuteronomist and who wrote Israel and Judah's history in order to explain the reasons for Judah's fall; (2) the Prophetic Deuteronomist (DtrP), who added prophetic stories and was eager to show that everything that YHWH announced through the prophets finally did come true; and (3) the Nomistic Deuteronomist (DtrN), who was responsible for those passages that emphasize obedience to the law. Both models, even if they seem to be contradictory, are interested in investigating the different intentions of the Deuteronomistic redactors. On the other hand, recent criticisms of the Deuteronomistic History fail to explain the function of Deuteronomistic texts in Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets, whose existence is not denied by the opponents of the Deuteronomistic History.

Space does not allow for a comprehensive discussion of the growing importance of redaction criticism. Suffice it to underline the frequent use of this method in current research on the prophetic books, the Pentateuch, and the Psalms.

There is some evidence for one or several Deuteronomistic redactions of the book of Jeremiah that organized and edited prior editions of the book, and the same may apply to Hosea and Amos.[11] The book of Ezekiel seems to have been edited with a "Golah-oriented" redaction.[12] The current debate on the Book of the Twelve also emphasizes the possibility that the scrolls of twelve Minor Prophets were not just juxtaposed in order to obtain one big scroll. One may observe an important number of cross-ref-

erences and themes (e.g., "the Day of YHWH") that indicate the existence of comprehensive redaction(s) of the Twelve.[13]

The same focus on redaction criticism applies to recent pentateuchal research. Since (at least in European scholarship) the traditional Documentary Hypothesis has been radically modified or even given up,[14] several recent models attribute the chronological framework of the Pentateuch (and the Hexateuch) not to the Yahwist but to redactors of the Persian period.[15] Generally speaking, there is a shift of interest from the reconstruction of the oldest units to the understanding of the methods and intention of the (latest) redactors of the Pentateuch, the Hexateuch,[16] and even the Enneateuch (the so-called Primary History).[17] If the framework of the Torah is the work of redactors working during the Persian period, special attention needs to be given to their work, to their literary strategies, to their editorial techniques and the way they used and transformed older material.

This development in biblical research has been sharply criticized by John Van Seters, who refutes the idea that redactors or editors (Van Seters uses both terms promiscuously) played any part in the formation of the Hebrew Bible. According to him, the method of redaction criticism should be given up altogether: "all talk of 'redactors' and 'redactions' should be scrupulously avoided in biblical studies."[18] For Van Seters, the formation of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets may be ascribed to three authors: the Deuteronomist; the Yahwist; and the Priestly writer. Van Seters considers Dtr and the Yahwist to be historiographers and authors who freely composed their works; therefore, any attempt to reconstruct documents or traditions they may have had at their disposal is entirely useless. For P, the case is a bit more complicated, because Van Seters argues "that P merely supplemented the older tradition as he received in the written form of J."[19] Contrary to Van Seters's claim, editors and redactors were as real in the biblical world as they were in the ancient Near East. We have material evidence for the editing of the Gilgamesh Epic that can hardly be denied.[20] The Hebrew Bible (except perhaps the book of Qoheleth) does not result from the work of individual authors who signed their writings; it is anonymous literature that has been transmitted in several literary stages.[21] Therefore, redaction criticism remains a major method in biblical scholarship.

How Does One Do Redaction Criticism?

The tools of redaction criticism are those of diachronic analysis. These

can be found in several introductory handbooks and do not need to be detailed here, but let us recall some important points.

Some redactional techniques reveal that redactors did not necessarily want to hide their activity. For instance, when they wanted to add something to an existing speech in the text, there is little effort to reduce literary and historical dissonance. In Gen 16, the original narrative of the encounter between Hagar and the divine messenger focused on the birth oracle: "The angel of YHWH said to her, 'Behold, you are with child, and will bear a son. You shall call his name Ishmael, because YHWH has heard your affliction'" (16:11). A later redactor added to this speech an order that Hagar should return to Sarah (16:9), because the redactor needed to prepare the second expulsion story in Gen 21. When introducing this addition, the introduction to the speech was repeated, juxtaposing the addition and the older discourse: "The angel of YHWH said to her, 'Return to your mistress, and submit yourself under her hands'" (16:9).[22]

Redactional reworking may also be detected by literary incoherencies that can result from the insertion of a new passage. Such a case is created by the insertion of Exod 11:1–3, which interrupts the last encounter between Pharaoh and Moses. In Exod 10:28–29 the reader is informed that Moses will never see the king of Egypt again, and in 11:8 Moses leaves the palace. Through the insertion of the divine speech to Moses in 11:1–3, however, 11:4–10 appears to relate a new encounter, contradicting the assertion of 10:29.

Another famous redactional technique is the so-called *Wiederaufnahme* (resumption). At the end of the passage that the redactor has inserted, the text that precedes the insertion is repeated, either in order to strengthen the coherence of the new text or to inform the reader about the extent of the insertion. A good example can be found in the story about Jephthah, in which the episode of the sacrifice of his daughter has clearly been added by a (post-Deuteronomistic) redactor who repeated the final words of Judg 11:29 in 11:32a.[23] This repetition marks the passage about Jephthah's vow as a redactional interruption. Another example can be found in Josh 1:7–9. These verses, which clearly are an addition to the Dtr speech of YHWH to Joshua, are framed by the phrase "be strong and courageous," which repeats the formula from the original end in 1:6. It thus modifies the royal oracle of victory, turning it into an exhortation to follow above all YHWH's law transmitted by Moses.[24] This is a good example showing that we should distinguish different redactional layers inside the so-called Deuteronomistic History.

This is also the case in Deut 12, where the redactors worked by juxtaposition. As in a new edition of a book, the more recent introduction precedes the older ones. There is no doubt that the primitive text of this chapter, dealing with the centralization of the cult, is to be found in 12:13–18*.[25] These verses are mainly concerned with the practical consequences of the centralization law and address an audience that is supposed to live in the land. There is no clear indication in these verses of the fiction of Deuteronomy as a Mosaic testament spoken before the conquest of the land.[26] A later redactor has added a new introduction in 12:8–12 where the addressees are clearly identified as the generation of the desert that has not yet entered the land. These verses try to give a new meaning to the idea of cultic centralization in the context of the Babylonian exile. To this new edition, another introduction has been added in 12:2–7. In this last addition, the theme of the unique sanctuary becomes mainly a pretext for an ideology of strict separation from the "other people" dwelling in the land.

The technique of juxtaposing a more recent text to an older one can also be observed at the end of a book or a longer passage, where the later redactors prefer to put their additions at the very end in order to "have the last word." Examples of this can be found in the two endings of the book of Joshua: chapter 23 is the Dtr ending of the book, whereas chapter 24 is a later addition made when the link between Joshua and Judges was cut off. The redactor who added Josh 24 wanted to separate that chapter from the following book to underline its close link with the foregoing Pentateuch.[27] One could also mention the double ending of the book of Leviticus, where a redactor supplemented the original conclusion in Lev 26 with an appendix in Lev 27.

A good method for distinguishing the work of redactors is to look for changes in style and vocabulary that may indicate redactional reworking of a former text. Judges 6:7–10 interrupts the connection that exists between the cry of the Israelites in response to the Midianite oppression (6:6) and the story about the call of Gideon, whom YHWH establishes as Israel's savior (6:11–24). The speech of an anonymous prophet inserted in 6:7–10 betrays a late Dtr style and also introduces the Dtr idea that, in spite of YHWH's delivery of the people and the gift of the land, they did not obey the divine commandment. The conclusion that this passage is a late insertion is fostered by the fact that the passage is missing in a manuscript of Judges found at Qumran.[28]

One of the clearest examples of redactional reworking of older documents is the so-called Deuteronomistic History. Even though there is no

consensus at the moment on how to modify (or even reject) Martin Noth's hypothesis, there is no doubt that inside the Former Prophets one can distinguish between texts that show Dtr style and topics and those that do not and that may be older documents reworked and edited by the Deuteronomists.[29] There is also much evidence that the abbreviation "Dtr" should not be understood as referring to one individual but to a group or "school" (see above). There were several Dtr redactions of the books of Deuteronomy to 2 Kings, probably starting in the seventh century (under Josiah?) and ending in the Persian period.[30]

I would like to illustrate the diversity of Dtr redactional activity through an analysis of Solomon's inauguration of the temple of Jerusalem, related in 1 Kings 8.

Redaction Criticism of 1 Kings 8

1 Kings 8 and the Three Deuteronomistic Editions of the Story of Solomon

In its actual shape, 1 Kings 8 is built around the number seven: Solomon summons the people on the seventh month (8:2), feasts last fourteen days (Heb.: seven days and seven days; 8:65), the "fathers" are mentioned seven times, Solomon calls David his "father" seven times, and Solomon enumerates seven prayer occasions. This final redaction took place at the end of a long redactional process, which most exegetes accept. There is, however, less consensus on the precise identification of Deuteronomistic and other layers.

It is clear that the oldest pre-Dtr account should be detected in the narration about the introduction of the ark into the temple in 8:1–13, although these verses underwent an important Priestly and post-Dtr reworking[31] that makes it impossible to reconstruct in detail the oldest account. Inside this account, an even older tradition may be detected in the dedication of the temple in 1 Kgs 8:12–13, which the LXX (3 Kgdms 8:53) puts after Solomon's great prayer. The LXX preserves an older version of this dedication whose Hebrew *Vorlage* seems to reflect the installation of the storm-god YHWH by the solar-god who grants him a place in the Jerusalem temple, in which the two deities co-existed.[32] The primitive story, which had integrated this poetic piece and was probably among the annals of the Jerusalem palace or temple (the "Book of the Acts of Solomon"? see 1 Kgs 11:41), was first used by a Dtr redaction in Josiah's

time. This story underwent a redaction after the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple in 586 B.C.E., then another new Dtr redaction in the first half of the Persian period, and finally a rereading of priestly type from the Second Temple period.[33] The three Dtr redactions are distinguished by their themes, by their different interpretations of the temple, and partly by their style. Roughly, 8:14–20 can be attributed to the Josianic text; 8:22–26, 28–40, 46–51 (?), 54–56 to the Babylonian period; and 8:52–53, 57–61 to the rereading of the Persian period. Verses 41–45 probably belong to a later period, since they presuppose the Diaspora and the idea of proselytes coming from the whole world to Jerusalem; the scene of the sacrifices in 8:63–64 belongs to a Priestly redaction.[34]

1 Kings 8:14–21: Solomon, Worthy Successor of David and Forerunner of Josiah

This prayer shows a parallel between God's choice of David and his dynasty and the choice of the temple. Verse 16 seems to establish the chronological priority of the election of royal lineage: "Since the day that I brought my people Israel out of Egypt, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, that my name might be there, but I chose David to be over my people Israel." The MT probably suggests that the Davidic election precedes the choice of Jerusalem. In the parallel version of Chronicles, Jerusalem as temple location is mentioned before David: "I have chosen Jerusalem in order that my name may be there, and I have chosen David" (2 Chr 6:6).[35] In any case, the first part of the Solomonic prayer suggests an indissoluble link between the Davidic dynasty and the election of the temple of Jerusalem. This points favors the attribution of 8:14–21 to a Josianic edition of the book of Kings. The insistence on God's choice "of a single tribe" recalls the formulation of Deut 12:14.[36] In turn, 8:20 takes up 1 Kgs 3:7 and asserts the Davidic dynasty's stability. By carrying out the building of the sanctuary chosen by YHWH, Solomon acts according to the Deuteronomic law; thus, he is in some way a forerunner of Josiah, who will completely carry out the law of centralization.

The quite triumphant tone of 1 Kgs 8:14–21* makes perfect sense in the context of the Josianic period. This tone changes in the central prayer that follows.

1 Kings 8:22–40*, 46–56*: From the Temple Builder to the Foreseer of Exile

The first part of the prayer added in the Babylonian period (8:22–26) provides a transition. It mentions again the "David the father" who will no longer appear in the discourse: 8:25 takes up the promise of an everlasting dynasty but makes it conditional, a result of reflection on the situation after 587 b.c.e. The same situation is presupposed in the verses that preceded the presentation of prayer occasions (8:27–30). Solomon declares that YHWH does not really dwell in the temple but in the heavens; the temple is the place where his name dwells. The same ideology appears in the exilic redaction of Deut 12 (vv. 8–12). Another link with Deut 12:8–12 is found in the theme of rest; as Deut 12:8 states that YHWH has not given his people "rest," Solomon concludes his prayer by thanking God for this rest:

> Deut 12:9: "for you have not yet come into the *rest* and the possession that YHWH your God is giving you."

> 1 Kgs 8:56: "Blessed be YHWH, who has given *rest* to his people Israel according to all that he promised; not one word has failed of all his good promise, which he spoke through his servant Moses."

These are the only two texts in the Hebrew Bible that express the idea that YHWH gives Israel rest.

The very strong link between Deut 12 and 1 Kgs 8:22–56* indicates that for the Deuteronomists of the Babylonian period YHWH gave the land only after the building of the temple. That is why the expression "the land given to the fathers" appears for the first time in the Deuteronomistic History in 1 Kgs 8 (vv. 34, 40, 48), while in the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua the land "promised to the fathers" appears constantly. It is only after the building of the temple that the divine oath is fulfilled. But in spite of the importance of the temple, Solomon emphasizes in his prayer YHWH's freedom from the sanctuary: YHWH could be worshiped outside of the temple. This is obvious in the description of occasions for prayer in 8:31–51. Contrary to the always identical call to YHWH ("hear from heaven"), the place from which the prayer is spoken varies in an interesting manner. In the first case, it is clearly the temple, before the altar (8:31). Then (8:35), the prayer is addressed toward the sanctuary. Finally, people pray from another country, raising their request

toward the ancestral land, the city, and the temple (8:46–51). During the dedication of the temple, Solomon predicts the loss of the land and the deportation. It is significant that prayer occasions in 8:33–40 and 46–51 correspond to the curses of Deut 28: defeat (1 Kgs 8:33; Deut 28:23); no rain (1 Kgs 8:35; Deut 28:25); famine, plague, blight, mildew, locusts or caterpillars, and enemies (1 Kgs 8:37; Deut 28:21–22, 25, 38); and deportation and exile (1 Kgs 8:46; Deut 28:64–65).[37] In this speech, Solomon is thus dressed up with the garments of the Deuteronomistic History redactors from the Babylonian period, since he shows that God kept his commitments. The exile is thus entirely the fault of the people and its kings. At the same time, Solomon gives the temple a new role: from its dedication, it becomes a *qibla*, and sacrifices are replaced by prayers toward the temple.

1 Kings 8:52–53, 57–61: Solomon, Preacher of the Torah

While there is a strategy of distancing in the central prayer, Solomon's last blessing makes the temple completely disappear. These are the laws and commandments (8:58, 61) that in some way replace the temple and the land. This passage also insists on the opposition between Israel, YHWH's people, and other peoples (8:59–60, see also 8:53); this brings these verses closer to the later Dtr layer of Deut 12:2–7, which are also about a very strict separation between Israel and other peoples. Israel's identity is no longer expressed through the temple but through its election and observance of the Torah. The election of the temple and king is definitively supplanted in later texts by the election of the people.[38]

Solomon's prayer thus allows the astute redaction critic to discern the preoccupations of various editions of the Deuteronomistic work: Solomon as king in the image of Assyrian rulers; as an ambiguous king responsible for the collapse of the "united kingdom"; and, finally, as a king who fades away to leave room for the law.

Conclusion

Redaction criticism allows us to retrace the formation of biblical texts (but also of other ancient texts[39]) from their oldest textual forms to their "final" form. Biblical research in the twenty-first century has shifted from fascination with the *Ur*-text to the reconstruction of the work of the biblical redactors, since it is their activity that preserved the texts and transmit-

ted them from generation to generation, showing at the same time that these texts are not static but need constant actualization and interpretation. This necessity of interpretation already occurs within the Hebrew Bible. A famous example is the story of the patriarch pretending his wife is his sister, which is transmitted three times (Gen 12:10–20; 20; 26:1–14). Apparently, Gen 20 can be understood as a revision and interpretation of Gen 12, but the older text is preserved. The same holds true for the transmission of the Covenant Code in Exod 20–23 and the Deuteronomic Code in Deut 12–26 or for the two versions of the story of the monarchy in Samuel–Kings and in Chronicles. These examples also give insight into the hermeneutics of the biblical redactors. They did not want to hide their work, since redactional reworking was simply a way to transmit and actualize older traditions by giving them a new meaning.

For Further Reading

Dozeman, Thomas B., and Konrad Schmid. *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation.* SBLSymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Nicholson, Ernest. *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Nogalski, James D., and Marvin A. Sweeney, eds. *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve.* SBLSymS 15. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

Perrin, Norman. *What Is Redaction Criticism?* London: SPCK, 1970.

Petersen, David L. "The Formation of the Pentateuch." Pages 31–45 in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present, Future: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker.* Edited by James Luther Mays, David L. Petersen, and Kent Harold Richards. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.

Römer, Thomas. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction.* 2nd. ed. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Stone, Lawson G. "Redaction Criticism: Whence, Whither, and Why? Or, Going Beyond Source and Form Criticism without Leaving Them Behind." Pages 77–90 in *A Biblical Itinerary: In Search of Method, Form and Content: Essays in Honor of George W. Coats.* Edited by Eugene E. Carpenter. JSOTSup 240. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Notes

1. Richard Simon, *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (1678; new ed. annotated and introduced by Pierre Gibert ; Montrouge: Bayard, 2008), 3. Simon does not speak of "redactors" but of "public scribes." See further idem, *A Critical History of the Old Testament* (London: Walter Davis, 1682), 3.

2. For more details, see John Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century : England and Germany* (London: SPCK, 1984); David L. Petersen, "The Formation of the Pentateuch," in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present, Future: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker* (ed. James Luther Mays, David L. Petersen, and Kent Harold Richards; Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 31–45; Ernest Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

3. Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 240.

4. Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia* (KHC 11; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901), xix–xx.

5. Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (1943; 3rd ed. ; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967); idem, *The Deuteronomistic History* (trans. Jane Doull, John Barton, and Michael D. Rutter; 2nd ed.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

6. Noth, *Deuteronomistic History,* 84.

7. Ibid., 121.

8. Ibid., 26.

9. Willy Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums* (FRLANT 49; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956); idem, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* (trans. James Boyce; Nashville: Abingdon, 1969). Norman Perrin (*What Is Redaction Criticism?* [London: SPCK, 1970], 33) points out that Marxsen "is responsible for the name Redaktionsgeschichte," even if he had some forerunners.

10. For details, as well as for bibliographical references for the works and authors quoted, see Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (2nd ed.; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 21–43.

11. For Jeremiah, see Thomas Römer, "How Did Jeremiah Become a Convert to Deuteronomistic Ideology?" in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists* (ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Linda S. Schaering; JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 189–99.

12. For the recent discussion, see Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, "Forschungen am Ezechielbuch 1969–2004 (III)," *TRu* 71 (2006): 265–309. "Golah" refers to the community that returned to Judah after Cyrus's conquest of the Neo-Babylonian Empire.

13. For an overview, see James D. Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney, eds., *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (SBLSymS 15; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), especially the contribution of David L. Petersen, "A Book of the Twelve?" 3–10.

14. Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, eds., *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (SBLSymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).

15. Interestingly, Christoph Levin, who maintains the idea of the Yahwist as the first creator of a "Pentateuch" (without Leviticus and Deuteronomy), considers this Yahwist more a redactor than a "source" ("The Yahwist: The Earliest Editor in the Pentateuch," *JBL* 126 [2007]: 209–30).

16. For the existence of those redactions, see Thomas Römer and Marc Z. Brettler, "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch," *JBL* 119 (2000): 401–19.

17. Thomas Römer and Konrad Schmid, eds., *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque* (BETL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007).

18. John Van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 398.

19. John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 285.

20. Jeffrey H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982).

21. See also the critical remarks against Eckart Otto in his review of Van Seters's book (*RBL* online: http://bookreviews.org/pdf/5237_5516.pdf) and Jean-Louis Ska, "A Plea on Behalf of the Biblical Redactors," *ST* 59 (2005): 4–18.

22. Verse 10 is another redactional insertion, using the same literary technique by repeating the introduction to the angel's discourse.

23. For more details, see Thomas Römer, "Why Would the Deuteronomists Tell about the Sacrifice of Jephthah's Daughter?" *JSOT* 77 (1998): 27–38.

24. Rudolf Smend, "The Law and the Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville; Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 8; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 95–110.

25. An asterisk after a verse number indicates an earlier layer found in that verse.

26. It could be argued that v. 14 ("but in the place that YHWH chooses in one of your tribes") is alluding to a perspective of the Mosaic fiction. This, however, is not necessary. Be that as it may, our purpose is to show the threefold redaction of Deut 12.

27. Richard D. Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 266–69.

28. Birgit Lucassen, "Josua, Richter und CD," *RevQ* 18 (1998): 373–96.

29. Even those scholars who do not accept the idea of a Deuteronomistic History recognize the presence of "Deuteronomistic" texts in the Former Prophets. Contrary to Noth, they have some difficulties in explaining the existence and especially the purpose of those texts.

30. For a history of research and overview of the current discussion, see Römer, *So-Called*; Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, *The Time, Place and Purpose of the Deuteronomistic History: The Evidence of "Until This Day"* (BJS 347; Providence, R.I.: Brown University, 2006).

31. Compare vv. 10–11 and Exod 40:34–35 [P]; see also Ernst Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige: 1Könige 1–16* (ATD 11.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 84–91.

32. Othmar Keel, "Der salomonische Tempelweihspruch: Beobachtungen zum religionsgeschichtlichen Kontext des Ersten Jerusalemer Tempel," in *Gottesstadt und Gottesgarten: Zur Geschichte und Theologie des Jerusalemer Tempels* (ed. Othmar Keel and Erich Zenger; Freiburg: Herder, 2002), 9–22.

33. Voir Eep Talstra, *Solomon's Prayer: Synchrony and Diachrony in the Composition of I Kings 8, 14–61* (CBET 3; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993). He distinguishes, after the ancient document, the following layers: three Deuteronomistic redactions (one centered on the character of David, another on the place of worship, the third on the explanation of the deportation) and a post-Deuteronomistic redaction from the Second Temple period.

34. The diachrony of prayer occasions is difficult. Verses 44–51 are often considered a late insertion since they exhibit stylistic differences with vv. 33–40. It is, however, quite plausible that vv. 41–51 (and not vv. 44–51) are interpolated. Contrary to other cases, these verses, with mention of a stranger coming from afar to worship YHWH (the word *nokrî* is rare in Deuteronomistic History: only Deut 14:21; 15:3; 17:15; 23:21; 29:21; Judg 19:21; 2 Sam 15:19; 1 Kgs 11:1, 8), do not have any parallel in Deut 28. In all these texts, the word had a negative connotation, with the possible exception of a late text (Deut 29:21), coming from afar to worship YHWH. This is not a Deuteronomistic concept but better fits the Hellenistic period, when proselytism developed. The mention of war is not very logical after v. 33, where Israel is already defeated. Verses 46–51 mention the idea of a return to YHWH and thus recall Deut 30, which probably dates from the Persian period. But contrary to Deut 30, there is no mention of a gathering from among the peoples and return to the land. This could also be explained by the acceptance of the Diaspora situation, in which case it could also favor a Persian setting. The question can hardly be settled.

35. Either the Chronicler tried to correct a difficult text or the MT of 1 Kgs 8:16 was corrupted by a scribal error (*homoioarkton*). According to A. Graeme Auld, the Chronicler's version would be primitive (*Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994], 59).

36. According to the LXX. The MT has a plural. 1 Kgs 8:16 clearly reflects Deut 12:11, 14, and 18; see Albert Šanda, *Das erste Buch der Könige* (vol. 1 of *Die Bücher der Könige*; EHAT 9; Münster: Aschendorff, 1911), 221.

37. Charles Fox Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1920), 112–15.

38. The affirmation that YHWH alone is God and that there is no other god recalls Deut 4, another late Dtr text from the Persian period.

39. I have already mentioned the Gilgamesh Epic. A more recent example are some writings from Qumran, such as the Rule of the Community, which copies biblical passages and provides a new context with new comments.