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FOREWORD

WHICH FUTURE FOR THE DEUTERONOMIC HISTORY?

Contrary to the Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Writings the so-called “Deuteronomistic History” is a construction of modern research. It is very difficult to know who first invented the term “deuteronomistic”. It was certainly “in the air” already in the nineteenth century; this is clear enough in the works of de Wette1 and many others. All these scholars recognized that texts in the style of Deuteronomism exist both in the historical books and also in the Tetrateuch. Ewald in the middle of the XIXth century had the idea of a double deuteronomistic (Josianic and exilic) edition of the books of Judges through Kings (followed by Wellhausen and others) with the Hexateuch likely having been edited by (another) deuteronomistic redactor2. Duhm then found a multiplicity of deuteronomists throughout the book of Jeremiah3. Hence, everything was in place when Noth invented the Deuteronomistic History. And even Cross’ modification of Noth’s hypothesis by locating the first edition of the Deuteronomistic History under Josiah has its roots in the nineteenth century4.

For a long time the only real problem concerning the Deuteronomistic History was the choice between two alternatives: an original Josianic or a exilic edition. But in the last decade things have become more complicated. The adherents of the Göttingen school are multiplying redactional layers in the Deuteronomistic History, adding new initials such as DtrB, DtrS, DtrU and others to DtrH, DtrF, DtrN. This approach makes it
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5. See for instance J. PAGANO, Intelligenz Mythologis in der Deuteronomistischen Geschichte.
the Pentateuch and the work of the Chronicler. Diana Edelman ("The Deuteronomist’s David and the Chronicler’s David: Competing or Contrasting Ideologies?") addresses the question of Davidic ideology in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. Her work stands in stark contrast to Auld’s conclusions. Félix García López ("La muerte de Moisés, la sucesión de Josué y la escritura de la Tórah (Deuteronomio 31-34)") explores the relationship between the so-called deuteronomistic redaction of the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History, finding support for a late "D-composition" in the Pentateuch. Michaela Bauks ("La signification de l’espace et du temps dans l’historiographie sacerdotale") and Ernst Axel Knauf ("Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte der Deuteronomisten") investigate the Priestly tradition, which appears more and more as an ideological counterpart to deuteronomistic theology.

The arrangement of the contributions is simply by alphabetic order since many articles cannot be reduced to one of the three main themes that I have briefly presented. Each article offers a valuable entry into one of the most important discussions of Old Testament scholarship at the end of the twentieth century. Some readers may feel a frustration of sorts at the apparent lack of consensus. Nevertheless, all the papers collected in this volume underline the importance of what we call the deuteronomists10 for the formation of the Hebrew Bible.

This foreword gives me the opportunity to express my gratitude to Professor F. Neirynck for having accepted this manuscript in the BETL series, to the Publishers Peeters for their careful work, and last but not least to Mr. Christophe Nihan and Mrs. Renée Girardet for their hard work on the indexes.

Thomas C. Römer

10. Some scholars identify the deuteronomists with the Shafan family. Although the proposal is appealing for its attempt to grant incarnation to this elusive group, it is very hypothetical.