

Israel Constructs its History

Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research

edited by
**Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer
& Jean-Daniel Macchi**

49311

221
1062

SBA 60/306
③

Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
Supplement Series 306



R279 335260

DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY (DH):
HISTORY OF RESEARCH AND DEBATED ISSUES

Thomas Römer and Albert de Pury

Anyone who is interested in the redaction of the Hebrew Bible will inevitably be confronted with the hypothesis of 'Deuteronomistic Historiography'.¹ This theory, due to Martin Noth, stipulates that the books from Deuteronomy to Kings constitute a redactional unity elaborated during the Babylonian exile. Unlike the Torah, DH therefore is not a corpus marked out by tradition but consists of an end result—nothing but an end result, though certainly a well established one—of modern exegetical research.

We might be surprised that exegetes took so long to discover the existence of such a work. However, this is easily explained. As a matter of fact, the elaboration of the theory of a DH roughly coincides with the period in which exegesis began to be interested in *Redaktionsgeschichte*, that is to say in the work of redactors arranging and editing the biblical text from older material. Before the use of this method, the so-called 'historical' books were read with a certain naivety, and it was assumed that their authors were content to describe or reproduce authentic events. It was accepted certainly that the authors in question gave a theological interpretation of the history, but hardly any interest was shown in (what could be) their literary project. This methodological shift was to a great extent brought about by Noth's research on DH. Even if Noth, as we shall see, was quite conservative in his conclusions, his initiative made it possible to understand the historical books and Deuteronomy above all as ideological constructions, and only then as sources for the history of Israel. For modern exegesis of the historical books, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, in which Noth elaborated in 1943 the thesis of a DH constitutes a major turning

point. That is why we will divide up the history of research into a 'before' and an 'after' Noth.

Our overview is intended to help the reader understand the present debate and to make clear what is involved. The discussion on DH and Deuteronomism in general is in no way an intellectual occupation reserved to a few experts. The various hypotheses presented imply strongly divergent views on the evolution and status of the books going from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings. To understand better how Israel constructed its history is the real intellectual challenge of this debate.

We should note too that in the upheaval of the last 20 years or so with regard to theories on the formation of the Pentateuch, we have often been tempted to present DH as *the* unshakeable pillar that still offered Old Testament studies relatively certain reference points. However, as we will see, the Noth thesis has been very quickly modified and the Deuteronomist (Dtr) of Noth is not inevitably that of his successors. Besides, today it must be noted that DH is suffering from fissures. Must these be plastered over or must the pillar be left to crumble? We will try to take a bearing and bring out the perspectives that the Deuteronomistic question opens up in the current exegetical discussions.

1. 'Prehistory'

1.1. *The Traditional View of the Books of Joshua to 2 Kings*

The books of Joshua to 2 Kings, which Jewish tradition referred to under the name of 'Former Prophets' and Christian tradition under that of 'Historical Books', did not have in traditional exegesis, it must definitely be stated, the same impact as the books of the Pentateuch, and consequently scarcely aroused the same exegetical frenzy. The reason for this relative lack of interest evidently lies in the fact that the Torah, like the Former Prophets, insists on the difference in 'canonical level' that separates these two collections of books: the entire Law is contained in the books of the Torah (Deut. 4.2; 13.1); Joshua is presented as the successor of Moses, but of inferior rank (Num. 11.28; Deut. 31.1-8, 14-23; Josh. 1.1-9), and the Pentateuch closes with a passage that declares that in any case, 'Never since has there arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses, whom Yhwh knew face to face...' (Deut. 34.10-12). For Jewish tradition at any rate, the exegetical stakes are therefore less important when beginning with the book of Joshua, and, on this point, Christian tradition—in spite of the New Testament insistence on the

1. Abbreviated henceforth in this volume to DH.

prophetic nature of the Scriptures—tended to follow it. We will note however that the passage from Deut. 34.10f. to Joshua 1, the opening of the collection of the *Nebiim*, clearly implies that the normative mediating authority for the transmission of the Torah as well as of the historical books is that of the prophets.

The first text to have taken up openly the question of the authority of the historical books is the famous passage of *B. Bat.* (§§14b-15a) in the Babylonian Talmud:

Who wrote the Scriptures?—Moses wrote his own book and the section about Balaam as well as Job. Joshua wrote the book that bears his name and [the last] eight verses of the Pentateuch. Samuel wrote the book that bears his name and the book of Judges as well as Ruth... Jeremiah wrote the book that bears his name, the book of Kings and the Lamentations...

In a paragraph farther on, in the same context, the Talmud raises some possible objections:

[You say that] Joshua wrote his book. But is it not written, *And Joshua, son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died?* [Josh. 24.29]. [The book] was completed by Eleazar. But it is also written *And Eleazar, son of Aaron, died* [Josh. 24.33]? Phinehas completed [the book]. [You say that] Samuel wrote the book that bears his name. But is it not written *Now Samuel had died?* [1 Sam. 28.3]. The book was completed by Gad, the seer, and Nathan, the prophet.

There are several interesting points in this passage: on the one hand, each book is attributed to an author contemporaneous with the reported events—and even, as far as possible, to the principal hero in these events—but only insofar as the hero is a ‘prophet’! Furthermore, we detect some beginnings of a diachronic sensibility, since the possibility is accepted that other hands might have contributed to the completion of the book. On the other hand, we perceive hardly any sensitivity in regard to thematic or stylistic characteristics: nothing is said, for example, about the specific bond that unites Deuteronomy to the historical books. At the very most we can wonder whether the attribution to Jeremiah of the book of Kings does not convey an awareness of the literary affinity between the prophetic book and the compilation of the book of Kings.

1.2. Early Problems, First Critical Questions

Right from the beginning of rabbinic and patristic exegesis, a certain number of questions came up in regard to the coherence and internal

logic of the biblical books. In the case of the Former Prophets, these questions had to do in particular with the following problems:

- Some biblical statements are at variance with human experience. Example: the sun stopped in its course by Joshua (Josh. 10.2-14).
- Some of the behaviour of biblical heroes is contrary to Judeo-Christian ethics. Examples: Jephthah sacrificing his daughter (Judg. 11.29-40); David bringing about the death of Uriah (2 Sam. 11-12).
- Some texts contradict others. Examples: Joshua 1-12 and Judges 1 give very different versions of the conquest of Canaan. The books of Samuel and Kings have many details that contradict the books of Chronicles.

In a context where the direct inspiration of the Scriptures is never doubted, these observations, however, did not really lead to a critical analysis, but on the contrary served to bolster and consolidate an apologetic approach.

A good example of this approach is given in the *Quaestiones* of Theodoret of Cyrene (d. 457) on the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Kings, Ruth and 1 Chronicles,² or again in the *Thirty Questions* on the book of Kings to which Venerable Bede responded (d. 735); he is also the author of a commentary on 1 Samuel.³ We see appearing in these writings, besides the search for a spiritual interpretation of the historical books, a pronounced interest in questions of history and geography.

This apologetic tendency will continue moreover until the Reformation and the humanistic period, and even well beyond. We can cite as an example the Lutheran Abraham Calov, a sworn enemy of Grotius,⁴ who vehemently rejected the poetic interpretation (*phrasis poetica*) proposed by Grotius for Josh. 10.13 and insisted on the historical veracity of the stopping of the sun without any regard for the discoveries of

2. *Theodoretii Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum* (critical edition; Madrid: Seminario filológico Cardenal Cisneros, 1991). Cf. L. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche* (Jena: Mauke, 1869), pp. 133-34.

3. Bede Venerabilis, *In Regum Librum XXX Quaestiones: In Primam partem Samuelis*; cf. H. Graf Reventlow, *Epochen der Bibelauslegung. II. Von der Spätantike bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 1994), p. 122.

4. Cf. in this connection, H.-J. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 3rd edn, 1982), p. 53.

Copernicus.⁵ Calov will have his successors throughout the history of exegesis: Hengstenberg and many others. It is understandable that this limited and essentially 'defensive' approach would have impeded in these circles any serious inquiry in regard to the stylistic and theological features of the historical books, despite the interest shown by the humanists and Reformers in the study of the Hebrew language.

1.3. *The Question of the Authors and the Formation of the Books Raised in the Period of the Reformation*

As we have seen, already in Judaism's traditional thought, it was possible to accept the intervention of a second hand after the death of the presumed author of each of the books going from Deuteronomy to Samuel. Jewish exegesis in the Middle Ages was particularly attentive to these diachronic problems. Thus, to justify his doubts regarding the provenance of Isaiah 40–66 from the hand of the prophet Isaiah, Ibn Ezra chose the example of the book of Samuel: the death of the prophet is reported in 1 Samuel 25, which proves that all the remaining chapters have been compiled by others.⁶ The Reformers who, in spite of the doctrine of divine inspiration, remained aware of the human form of Sacred Scripture, likewise raised the question of authors. In the introduction to his commentary on the book of Joshua, Calvin rejected the accepted tradition according to which Joshua himself would have been the author of his book.⁷ For Calvin, that idea was not defensible, any more than the attribution of the book of Samuel to the prophet Samuel.⁸ The book of Joshua could have been composed from documents compiled by the priest Eleazar.⁹ Thus, even if Calvin had a contemporary of Joshua intervene, we see that the production of the book was situated for him in a later period. Still more radical theses were defended by the Catholic jurist Andreas Masius (1516–1573). In his book *Josuae imperatoris*

5. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testament in der christlichen Kirche*, pp. 404–405.

6. Cf. Reventlow, *Epochen der Bibelauslegung*, II, pp. 250–51.

7. For what follows, cf. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung*, p. 17.

8. Already in 1520, A.B. Karlstadt (1486–1541) had declared that the author of Samuel was unknown. Cf. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung*, p. 30.

9. In a certain way, Calvin takes up and radicalizes a Talmudic opinion (cf. above).

historia illustrata et explicata (1574), Masius first presents a critical edition of the *text* of Joshua, challenging the authority of the LXX. And in his commentary we find for the first time such terms as 'compilation' and 'redaction'.¹⁰ For him, it was Ezra who, with others 'remarkable for their piety and erudition', had compiled not only the book of Joshua, but also the books of Judges and Kings. The works of Calvin and Masius indicate therefore the realization of a historical distance, and also the beginning of a sensibility about the 'priestly' character of some parts of Joshua.

1.4. *The Criticism of the Rationalists and Deists*

From the eighteenth century onward, the study of biblical texts was useful, in 'enlightened' circles, for contesting the authority of the Church. Questions of a historical and stylistic type developed. But alongside these 'classical' questions there arose a new area of inquiry, an area which would be called today ideological criticism. It became possible to take a critical stance in regard to the heroes of the historical books, even to read the accounts concerning them in a sense contrary to what was put forward by the biblical authors. Thus Thomas Morgan finds fault with the behaviour of Samuel facing Saul.¹¹ The prophet acted out of pique, suspecting Saul of wishing to reduce his influence over the people. As for Ahab and his wife Jezebel, Morgan considers them authentic humanists and heroes of tolerance up against the fanaticism of prophets and zealots of the Elijah type. The Babylonian Exile, finally, was nothing else but the result of a poor foreign policy.

This polemical reading of the historical books served in a way to set up the distinction between a historical event and its (often subsequent) interpretation. We become aware of the fact that the account of the institution of the monarchy in 1 Samuel 8–12, for example, is made up of different and contradictory versions of the same event and express irreconcilable opinions about it. Likewise, we find that between the books of Samuel–Kings and those of Chronicles there are differences that cannot be harmonized.¹² Thus, Spinoza, in his *Tractatus* of 1670, observes:

10. Such is at least the view of Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung*, p. 39.

11. T. Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher* (1737–40); cf. the presentation of Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche*, pp. 545–46.

12. Cf. the presentation of Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche*, pp. 520–21.

Anyone who compares the narratives in Chronicles with the narratives in the books of Kings, will find many similar discrepancies. These there is no need for me to examine here, and still less am I called upon to treat of the Commentaries of those who endeavour to harmonize them. The Rabbis evidently let their fancy run wild.

Spinoza reached the conclusion that 'we are compelled to confess that these histories were compiled from various writers without previous arrangement and examination.'¹³

Parallel with this first historical criticism of the contents of the books, the traditional point of view about their authors was abandoned. Thomas Hobbes (1651) insists on the fact that research on the dates of the biblical books should be carried out in total independence with respect to tradition.¹⁴ In Deuteronomy, for example, only the legislative code comes from the Mosaic period, while the discourse framework as well as the books of Joshua and Samuel must have been written much later than the period to which they refer. This is especially shown by the formula 'to this day' that recurs time and again.¹⁵ For the books of Judges and Ruth, Hobbes seems to be the one who for the first time is thinking of a date in the exilic period. In fact, in Judg. 18.30, it is said that 'Jonathan son of Gershom, son of Moses, then his sons were priests to the tribe of the Danites until the time of the deportation from the land'. For the book of Kings, a dating in the period of the exile is, at any rate, evident.¹⁶

Spinoza produces roughly the same reflection—even if, for the book of Judges, he thinks rather of the monarchic period—but he goes beyond Hobbes when he raises besides the question of the coherence between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets:

Evidently if we consider the continuation and object of all these books, we will have no difficulty in recognizing that they are the work of a single historian, who set out to write Jewish antiquities from the most remote times up to the first destruction of Jerusalem. These books, in fact, are so closely linked that it is evident, from this point alone, that

13. Cited from B. de Spinoza, *A Theologico-Political Treatise* (trans. R.H.M. Elwes; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1951), pp. 138-39 (138).

14. On this point, cf. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, pp. 57-58.

15. We already come across this same argument in Masius and in Spinoza.

16. T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Chapter 33. Cf. the edition of R. Tuck (Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 262-63.

they form one and the same account, composed by one and the same historian.¹⁷

Spinoza recognized too that the books from Joshua to Kings serve to confirm all the predictions of Moses in Deuteronomy: 'It is therefore evident that all these books work together for one purpose alone, which is to make known the words and commandments of Moses and to prove their excellence through an account of the events'.¹⁸

As far as we know, Spinoza is the first to have sensed clearly this link between Deuteronomy and the historical books, as well as the 'nomistic' character of these latter. If Deuteronomy constitutes their centre, Spinoza nevertheless supposed a great historiographical work going from Genesis to the end of 2 Kings. And this thesis, we must say, has never since lacked supporters, and this even in the most recent discussions. The idea that the author of this great historiography could be Ezra is certainly not the most original idea of the Jewish philosopher, since it probably came to him from the rabbinic tradition. It is nevertheless a fact that based on this idea, it was the postexilic period that henceforth came to mind as the most probable historical setting for the composition of the historical books, without denying, to be sure, the existence of more ancient documents.¹⁹

In the Catholic ecclesiastical context, it is Richard Simon who defends, in his *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (1678), similar theses. Rationalist and anti-Protestant at the same time, Simon postulates the existence of a chain of traditions extending from Moses up to Ezra. In this way, he introduces as it were the idea of *Überlieferungsgeschichte*. By attributing to the 'scribes' an important part in the process of organizing and editing the historical books, Simon advances an idea that will only reappear in the debate two centuries later. It is for this reason that some like to see in Simon the founder of historical-critical exegesis.²⁰ We must point out, however, that his ideas on the authors of the Former Prophets were quite conservative, since he regarded Samuel as the initial author of Judges and Ruth and Jeremiah of Samuel and Kings.

17. Saisset (trans.), *Oeuvres de Spinoza*, p. 164.

18. Saisset (trans.), *Oeuvres de Spinoza*, p. 165.

19. Saisset (trans.), *Oeuvres de Spinoza*, pp. 169-70. Cf. also P. Gibert, *Petite histoire de l'exégèse biblique* (Lire la Bible, 94; Paris: Cerf, 1992), pp. 204-11.

20. Cf. Kraus, *Geschichte der Historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, pp. 65, 70; P. Gibert, *Petite histoire de l'exégèse biblique*, pp. 211-22.

1.5. Summary: *The Books of Joshua—Kings on the Eve of the Birth of Historico-Critical Exegesis*

Until the end of the eighteenth century, the historical books continued in their role as 'poor relatives' in respect to the great debate that was so concerned about the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch. The few questions that the experts considered in regard to them focused on the following problems:

- *the author*: outside of orthodox circles, the tradition that attributed the historical books to their respective heroes or to some of their contemporaries was refuted. The chronological interval that separated the period referred to from the period of the first writing was stressed.
- *the formation of the books*: from the observation of material contradictions and stylistic differences arose the idea of the existence, in the beginning, of multiple sources or documents. The merging of these documents by compilers is the best explanation of the formation of the books.
- *the internal coherence of the books and their connection with Deuteronomy, even with the Pentateuch*: this question especially comes up in Spinoza. It is he who, even if he does not yet use the term 'Deuteronomist', discovers that the books Joshua—Kings conform to a common 'Deuteronomic' spirit.

On the eve of the birth of the historico-critical method itself, almost all the crucial points that are going to be found in research on the Prophets up to the present have thus already been turned up. But we note too the extent to which the research of that period is still prompted by intuitive judgments.

2. *The Discovery of the Deuteronomic Phenomenon*

2.1. *De Wette and Vater*

The work of the young Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1780–1849) probably represents the first decisive step in the process that had to lead to the discovery of Deuteronomistic historiography, and perhaps proves Rogerson right when he sees in de Wette the 'founder of modern biblical criticism'.²¹ The contribution of de Wette to research on the

21. On the bibliography of W.M.L. de Wette, cf. in particular R. Smend,

Pentateuch has been emphasized many times, but we are less frequently reminded that de Wette seems to have been, with Vater, the first to have used the term 'Deuteronomic' to characterize the redactional texts of the historical books.²² Let us recall that in his 1805 thesis, de Wette—in a note at the bottom of the page!—established that the book that, according to 2 Kings 22–23, was at the origin of the reform of Josiah must correspond to the biblical book of Deuteronomy or, at least, to an earlier form of this book. Such an identification in itself was not new—the Church Fathers had already ventured assumptions going in this direction—but what was new, incontestably, was the historical conclusion that de Wette drew from his observations: 'primitive' Deuteronomy, he maintained, had been composed, then introduced in the Temple, as a propaganda document at the service of the Josianic reform! The book cannot therefore be dated to a period prior to the reign of Josiah (640–609). For the first time, biblical criticism had an anchorage point for the dating of the documents of the Pentateuch.²³ At the same time, de Wette divided the Pentateuch into Tetrateuch and Deuteronomy: he considered Deuteronomy, whose special character he emphasized in comparison with the other books of the Torah, as the most recent document of the Pentateuch and saw it as especially linked with the book of Joshua. He had intended to develop his ideas in the *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, but then the third volume of the commentary on the Pentateuch of Johann Severin Vater was published,²⁴ a commentary in which the latter insisted on the close bond

Deutsche Alttestamentler in drei Jahrhunderten (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), pp. 38–52; and J.W. Rogerson, *W.M.L. de Wette, Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism: An Intellectual Biography* (JSOTSup, 126; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).

22. In most manuals, the origin of the idea of a Deuteronomistic redaction is not pinned down. O. Kaiser, for example, is content to write: 'Die Einsicht, dass...die Bücher Dtn—II Reg eine im Geist des Deuteronomiums tätige deuteronomistische (dtr) Bearbeitung erfahren haben, lässt sich bis in das 19. Jh. zurückverfolgen', (*Grundriss der Einleitung in die kanonischen und Deuterokanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments. I. Die erzählenden Werke* [Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1992], p. 86).

23. For more details, cf. S. Loersch, *Das Deuteronomium und seine Deutungen: ein forschungsgeschichtlicher Überblick* (SBS, 22; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967), pp. 18–20; Rogerson, *W.M.L. de Wette*, pp. 39–42.

24. Cf. J. Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany* (London: SPCK, 1984), pp. 35–36.

between Deuteronomy and the historical books and 'recognized what today are regarded as Deuteronomic glosses'.²⁵

De Wette therefore rewrote his *Beiträge* in accordance with the book of Vater and published it in 1806.²⁶ In this work there comes to the fore—as later on in Wellhausen—a pronounced interest in the evolution of religious concepts, an interest behind which we conjecture the influence of Schelling and de Fries.²⁷ From then on, for de Wette, it was a question of understanding better the history of Israel, and he began his approach through a comparison between Samuel–Kings and the books of Chronicles. De Wette situated Chronicles about 330 BCE and questioned their whole historical credibility: they would have had as their only source Samuel–Kings that, for their part, must have been composed about 550 BCE. All the differences and contradictions are to be explained as ideological alterations on the part of the Chroniclers. It is interesting to note that, almost 130 years later, Noth too would follow up on his development of Deuteronomistic historiography with an analysis of the work of the Chronicler. This evaluation of the relation between Samuel–Kings and Chronicles, as Rogerson notes, was essential for modern exegesis,²⁸ at least up until the most recent years.²⁹

It was especially in the analysis of the book of Joshua that de Wette became aware of the Deuteronomic phenomenon. Joshua is for him a late book and, as he points out in a note, permeated with the Deuteronomic style and theology.³⁰ It is this style that de Wette was the first to find in the other historical books as well.³¹

25. Cf. Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 35.

26. W.M.L. de Wette, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament. I. Kritischer Versuch über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Bücher und Gesetzgebung* (Halle, 1806); II. *Kritik der israelitischen Geschichte. Erster Teil: Kritik der mosaischen Geschichte* (Halle, 1807; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971).

27. Cf. Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 42; Smend, *Deutsche Alttestamentler*, pp. 40, 47.

28. Rogerson, *W.M.L. de Wette*, p. 57.

29. S.L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM, 33; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985); A.G. Auld, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).

30. de Wette, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, I, p. 137 n. 2.

31. Cf. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, p. 176.

The work of the young de Wette makes the period of Josiah stand out as a crucial time both for the history of the religion of Israel³² and for the formation of the historical books. By entrenching the birth of Deuteronomic ideology in the period of Josiah, de Wette has—perhaps without himself assessing the impact of his discovery—profoundly marked subsequent research.

2.2. Towards the Idea of a Deuteronomic Composition of the Historical Books

One of the first to take up de Wette's observations and to follow in the steps traced by him was Gramberg. In his *Histoire critique des idées religieuses de l'Ancien Testament*,³³ he presents the exilic period as fruitful for the production of Old Testament literature (Isa. 40–66; Proverbs; Job; Jonah). It is precisely in this period as well that there would have been compiled the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua and Kings, in which the whole history of the people is interpreted in light of the centralization of cult.³⁴

In the same period, Karl-Heinrich Graf (1815–69) discovered the link between the books of Samuel and Kings. In a letter in 1840 to Eduard Reuss, his teacher and friend, Graf wrote: 'The books of Samuel contain a history of David in which a redactor has made additions; this redactor is at the same time the author of the books of Kings, that make up with Samuel a single work'.³⁵ By isolating in the books of Samuel an ancient history of David, edited in the same style found at each step in the books of Kings, Graf discovers a piece of information that will play an important role in the description of DH by Martin Noth.

Such observations were synthesized by Heinrich Ewald,³⁶ *enfant terrible* of German exegesis of the nineteenth century. Exactly one

32. The outline proposed by de Wette, absolute freedom of cult—a cult controlled by the monarchy—centralization of cult (cf. Rogerson, *W.M.L. de Wette*, pp. 59–60) is surprisingly close to that developed later by J. Wellhausen.

33. C.P.W. Gramberg, *Geschichte der Religionsideen des Alten Testaments* (2 vols.; Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1830), I, pp. 146–50.

34. For a presentation of the theses of C.P.W. Gramberg, cf. Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 59–62.

35. K. Budde and H.J. Holtzmann (eds.), *Eduard Reuss' Briefwechsel mit seinem Schüler und Freunde Karl Heinrich Graf* (Giessen, 1904), p. 99.

36. Cf. J. Wellhausen, 'Heinrich Ewald', in *idem, Grundrisse zum Alten Testament* (ed. R. Smend; TBü, 8; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1965), pp. 120–38 (138).

hundred years before Noth, Ewald postulated a double Deuteronomic compilation of the historical books. In the first volume of his *History of Israel*, Ewald refers to the books of Genesis to Joshua as 'the great book of origins' and to those of Judges to 2 Kings (+ Ruth) as 'the great book of kings'.³⁷ The formation of this second 'great book' is reconstructed in the following manner: about 30 years after the separation of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah, a Levite compiles, in a prophetic spirit, a history of the beginnings of the monarchy. This history begins with the birth of Samuel and ends perhaps in 1 Kings 12.³⁸ His goal would have been to describe the blessed period of the kingdom united under David.³⁹ The period of the Judges would have formed the subject of an initial historiographical presentation under the reign of Asa (912–871) or of Josaphat (870–846), and this would have served as a prologue to the history of the beginnings of the monarchy. Traces of this prologue would be preserved in Judges 1 and 17–21.⁴⁰ Another book referring to the period of the Judges would be hidden behind Judg. 3.7–12.15, and the Samson cycle (Judg. 13–16) would have a still different and much later origin. In the books of Kings, other documents, and especially the Elijah and Elisha cycles would have appeared between the ninth and eighth centuries.⁴¹

The first great compilation of the historical books combines the documents from the period of Samuel and the kings and edits them according to the 'Deuteronomic ideas' (*deuteronomische Ansichten*).⁴² This

37. H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus* (6 vols.; Göttingen: Dieterich, 1843–59). ET *History of Israel* (London, 1867–86).

38. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, I, pp. 174–90. According to Ewald, the end of this ancient history would have been suppressed at the time of the intervention of the compilers.

39. Cf. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, p. 180.

40. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, pp. 190–92.

41. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, pp. 192–95.

42. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, p. 196. We may note that Ewald accepts a Deuteronomic compilation likewise for 'the great book of origins' (Genesis–Joshua), and it is that compiler whom he refers to as the *Deuteronomiker*. This first 'Deuteronomic' compiler should not be confused however with the authors (*Schriftsteller*) influenced by Deuteronomy who are at work in 'the great book of kings' (Judges–2 Kings). The work of the first 'Deuteronomic' compiler is distinguished by the role played by the theologoumenon of 'the love of Yhwh' (up to Josh. 22.5; 23.11), whereas in the second great book, this theme is expressed by the phrase 'serve Yhwh with all your heart' (1 Sam. 7.3; 12.20, 24; 1 Kgs 2.4; 8.23,

compilation, as 1 Samuel 12 shows, must still have been produced under the monarchy, and consequently, the period of Josiah offers the most probable setting.⁴³ Its influence would account for the insertion especially of 1 Sam. 7.3–4; 12; 1 Kings 3; 6.11–13; 8.22–61, as well as other pieces in the same spirit.⁴⁴ In the second half of the Babylonian Exile (cf. 2 Kgs 25.27–30), a second redactor edited Judges–Kings, joining to them the book of Ruth (written by one of the exiles).⁴⁵ This exilic redactor sets out to answer 'the great and grave questions of the period: why the people found themselves subject to such great misfortunes'.⁴⁶ His hand is easily recognizable in some parenetic texts such as Judg. 2.6–23 or 2 Kgs 17.7–23.⁴⁷ It is this exilic redactor then, who prefaced the history of the monarchy with a prologue on the pre-monarchical period, the book of Judges, edited in a Deuteronomic spirit.⁴⁸ With Judg. 2.6–10 this redactor picks up the thread from the end of the book of Joshua and connects it to the final verses of the '*Deuteronomiker*' of Genesis–Joshua (Josh. 24.28–33). Despite the evidence of this explicit bond between Joshua and Judges, Ewald insists on the autonomy of his 'great book of kings' and declares in a peremptory tone: 'We would be wrong to come to the conclusion that the author would have wished to join his history book, using the book of Judges, to the book of Joshua and to the Pentateuch as a whole'.⁴⁹ The only

48; 14.8; 2 Kgs 10.31). Cf. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, p. 96 n. 1.

43. Cf. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, pp. 197–98.

44. For example 1 Sam. 2.1–10; 17; 18*; 21.11–26; 24 + 26; 28.3–5; cf. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, pp. 198–200.

45. In counting the book of Ruth among the historical books, Ewald follows, like most of his colleagues, the arrangement of the LXX (cf. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, p. 203). In a general way, the LXX is often preferred to the MT. 'Die LXX welche nach dem Buch der Richter 4 Bücher der Könige zählen, zeigen wenigstens noch mehr Bewusstseyn von dem ursprünglichen Zusammenhange des grossen Werkes' (pp. 211–12).

46. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, p. 204. Noth will formulate, a hundred years later, the project of the Deuteronomist in quite comparable terms.

47. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, p. 205 n. 1.

48. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, pp. 206–207.

49. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, p. 210: 'Man würde hieraus mit Unrecht folgern, der Verfasser habe das Geschichtsbuch über die Richter mit dem B. Josua und dem Pentateuche in ein Ganzes verbinden wollen, denn er knüpft rein um eines passenden Anfanges willen an jenes Ende an, und dass jene

conclusion that Ewald draws from this assertion is that the Deuteronomistic redaction of Joshua must be prior to that of Judges–Kings.

Ewald's theses received a large response in historico-critical exegesis of the nineteenth century and were vehemently discussed. A good example of Ewald's influence can be seen in the *Historisch-critisch Onderzoek*⁵⁰ of Abraham Kuenen (1828–91). Kuenen begins by subscribing to the observation that 'the books Judges–Kings are closely connected together',⁵¹ but he has no hesitation in expressing serious reservations with regard to the conclusions of Ewald, without however definitively rejecting them.⁵² He objects, for example, that in Samuel, the Dtr redaction is extremely restrained (limited to 1 Sam. 7; 8 and 12⁵³), whereas it is present everywhere in Judges and Kings. He points out moreover that the transition from Judges to Samuel does not take place without a break. The fact that Judges as well as Samuel ends with appendices is evidence instead of the autonomy of each of these books.⁵⁴ Such objections will reappear in the stands of Fohrer, Würthwein or Westermann,⁵⁵ opposed to the unity of the DH. Kuenen is 'modern' too when he thinks of a sort of Deuteronomistic 'school', and mentions 'redactors' who 'while being different persons', would have 'worked at almost the same period and surely in the same spirit'.⁵⁶ On reading Kuenen's work, we realize as well that the presence of the 'Deuteronomist' in the book of Joshua has become a common-place for exegesis,⁵⁷ but the dating of this redactor still poses a problem. Refus-

Bücher in früheren Zeiten je zusammenhängen ist...unbeweisbar: aber gewiss folgt daraus, dass zur Zeit des Verfassers der Deuteronomiker längst sein Werk vollendet hatte.'

50. A. Kuenen, *Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds* (Leiden, 1885 [1861]). The first volume was translated into French: *Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament* (Paris, 1866).

51. Kuenen, *Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament*, p. 438.

52. Kuenen concludes (*Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament*, p. 441): 'Let us acknowledge that we lack the facts in order to come up with a satisfactory solution'. On several occasions, moreover, Kuenen returns to the ideas of Ewald, in particular when he postulates a double redaction of the book of Kings (Josianic, then exilic).

53. Kuenen, *Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 389–94.

54. Kuenen, *Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 439–40.

55. Cf. below, §7.3.4.

56. Kuenen, *Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament*, p. 440.

57. Kuenen, *Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 333–41.

ing to locate him in the exilic period,⁵⁸ Kuenen favours a slightly pre-exilic date. But, like Ewald and most of the historico-critical exegetes, Kuenen does not manage to become aware of the 'organic' link between the Dtr redaction of Joshua and that of the following books.

How can this inability to perceive the link between Joshua and Judges be explained? The reason is probably the dominant position that the thesis of a primitive Hexateuch had acquired in exegetical circles. Inasmuch as exegetes were convinced that the 'great book of beginnings' extended from Genesis to Joshua, it was not possible to consider the Former Prophets as a unit.

2.3. *The Source 'D' and the Hexateuch*

Since de Wette⁵⁹ and Ewald,⁶⁰ the debate concerning the different explanatory models of the formation of the Pentateuch was focused, in an almost axiomatic way, on the Hexateuch and therefore had immediately incorporated the book of Joshua in its perspective. Not only did they assume that they were meeting up with the continuation of the sources of the Pentateuch in Joshua, but that they could also avail themselves of the closeness of the link between Deuteronomy and Joshua as well as of the fact that the promises of the land found their fulfillment only in the book of Joshua. There was no doubt for anyone then that Joshua should be joined to the first part of the canon and that the first great literary collection of the Bible was indeed the Hexateuch.⁶¹

Within this great corpus, they had set apart the source 'D', that was limited, they thought, to the 'primitive Deuteronomy' (Deut. 6.4–30.20). But what was to be done in that case with the texts that, in Genesis–Numbers, showed an undoubted affinity with 'D' (Gen. 26.5; Exod. 13; 16; 19–24; 32–34, etc.⁶²)? In order to reply to this question,

58. Cf. Kuenen, *Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament*, p. 337 n. 1, where he cites Masius, Le Clerc, Herzfeld and others.

59. W.M.L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel* (Berlin, 1817).

60. H. Ewald, 'Rec. of J.J. Stähelin, "Kritische Untersuchungen über die Genesis" (1830)', in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 4 (1831), pp. 595–606.

61. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, p. 178.

62. These texts are cited by J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin, 3rd edn, 1899; repr. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1963), p. 205. According to him, the Deuteronomistic

they began to speak of the *Deuteronomist* (Ewald, Kuenen and others), with this Deuteronomist being understood as the author/redactor of 'who fitted Deuteronomy into the narrative framework of the Hexateuch and who reworked the latter in a Deuteronomistic perspective'.⁶³ Some wanted to identify this author/redactor with the 'Yahwist',⁶⁴ but others thought that a distinct contributor was involved, and (for Wellhausen, at any rate) one later than the 'Yahwist'. What is striking for us is the designation 'Deuteronomist' being used first in the framework of the Hexateuch, and not in regard to the historical books.⁶⁵ Furthermore, this Deuteronomist is considered to be a 'personality', since a thesis could be devoted to his concept of history.⁶⁶ While at it, they suddenly realized as well that there was a diachronic problem within Deuteronomy. Reuss's remark, for example, that Joshua 1-12; 22-24 'is later than the Deuteronomy-Code, but contemporaneous with, or rather an integral part of the Deuteronomy-Book',⁶⁷ illustrates well the necessity of defining the link between 'Deuteronomy' and the 'Deuteronomist'.⁶⁸ Thus,

redaction is most strongly represented however in Numbers and Joshua.

63. 'Der Deuteronomist, d.h. der Schriftsteller, der das Deuteronomium in das hexateuchische Geschichtsbuch eingesetzt hat, hat zugleich das letztere in deuteronomischem Sinne überarbeitet; von dieser Überarbeitung ist nun aber nicht Q [=P], sondern vielmehr JE betroffen' (Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*). Cf. before that de Wette, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, pp. 168-70, and the authors cited by him. Cf. also J.W. Colenso, *The Pentateuch and the Book of Josua Critically Examined*, Part 5 (London, 1865), p. 53.

64. For example, J.J. Stähelin, *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch, die Bücher Josua, Richter, Samuelis und der Könige* (Berlin, 1843).

65. As we have seen, Ewald had warned about the confusion between the 'Deuteronomist' of the Hexateuch and the Deuteronomistic redaction of Judges-Kings. Cf. above, pp. 32-34.

66. H.W. Kusters, *De historie beschouwing van het Deuteronomist met den berichten in Genesis-Numeri vergeleken* (Utrecht, 1868).

67. E. Reuss, *La Bible: Traduction nouvelle avec introductions et commentaires. Ancien Testament*. III. *L'histoire sainte et la Loi* (Paris: G. Fischbacher, 1879), p. 216.

68. We must mention too the thesis of A. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua* (KAT; Leipzig: Hirzel, 2nd edn, 1886), and of C. Steuernagel, *Übersetzung und Erklärung der Bücher Deuteronomium und Josua* (HAT I/3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900), pp. 136-40, according to which the Deuteronomic texts of Joshua are not redactional elements but constitute an autonomous source.

even if all the energy put into the research concentrated on the problem of the formation of the Pentateuch, and consequently of the Hexateuch, the Deuteronomistic problem could from now on no longer be ignored by researchers.

2.4. *Jeremiah and the Deuteronomists*

Soon, the 'Dtr' phenomenon was going to extend even beyond the framework of the Pentateuch and the historical books. It was in the book of Jeremiah that exegetes initially noted the presence of texts strongly resembling Deuteronomy and the other Deuteronomistic texts, as much by their style as by their themes. For Kuenen, that simply meant that the redactors of the historical books 'are individuals of the same mind as Jeremiah, acquainted with and imitating his writings'.⁶⁹ But towards the end of the 19th century, such an explanation was no longer enough to satisfy historico-critical exegesis. It was Bernhard Duhm⁷⁰ (1847-1928) who set out, in his commentary on Jeremiah,⁷¹ the thesis of Deuteronomistic redaction of this book, leaving only some 60 brief poems for the 'historical Jeremiah'. For Duhm, this Deuteronomistic redaction, that gives itself away by its style, its repetitions and its theological platitudes, stretches from the exilic period down to the first century BCE. Inspired by Smend, Duhm attributed the announcement of the new covenant in Jer. 31.31-34 to this Dtr milieu and described this pericope as 'written in a style that is shoddy, clumsy, imprecise'; it appears to be the 'fantasy of a scribe for whom the highest ideal would be to have the whole Jewish people knowing the Law by heart'.⁷² This quotation clearly shows the low esteem that Duhm had for the Dtr redaction. In his commentary, moreover, the redactional texts are rarely analyzed in detail. Likewise, Duhm rules out any compositional intentions on the part of the Dtr redactors: 'the book has slowly expanded,

69. Kuenen, *Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament*, p. 428. Bishop Colenso goes further since he favoured the hypothesis that Deuteronomy would have been written 'as some suppose, by the hand of Jeremiah'. Cf. Colenso, *The Pentateuch and the Book of Josua Critically Examined*, Part 2, p. 359.

70. In regard to him, cf. Smend, *Deutsche Alttestamentler in drei Jahrhunderten*, pp. 114-28.

71. B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia* (HAT, 11; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1901).

72. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia*, pp. 255, 258.

like a forest growing wildly... It is impossible to speak of any methodical composition'.⁷³

The contempt shown by Duhm for the Dtr redactors, who were for him 'scribes', and even 'Pharisees', is quite typical of the intellectual and philosophical climate of his time, characterized by a mixture of romanticism and rationalism, by a constant search for origins to escape from 'decadence'. The achievement from this phase of the research is that it had become commonplace to assume a Dtr redaction for some of the prophetic books as well, even if they still did not go so far as to raise the question of a possible redactional link between the historical books (the Former Prophets) and the prophetic books (the Latter Prophets).

2.5. 'Deuteronomism' in the Wake of the Triumph of the Wellhausen Paradigm

As the theory of sources gained acceptance, thanks to Wellhausen, as the best model to explain the Hexateuch,⁷⁴ it became common to speak of 'D', of the Deuteronomist and of 'redactions in the spirit of Deuteronomy'. But in the case of the historical books, the dominant position of the 'Hexateuch' concept seems to have deprived the researchers of the leeway that would have been necessary for them to embark on an original and thorough investigation of the redactional process responsible for the present form and arrangement of these books.

At the dawn of the twentieth century, the most common position on the origins of the Pentateuch and the historical books is that set out in a classical way in *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, the great synthesis of Wellhausen.⁷⁵ Here are its main tenets:

73. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia*, p. xx.

74. For more details, cf. A. de Pury and T. Römer, 'Le Pentateuque en question: Position du problème et brève histoire de la recherche', in A. de Pury (ed.), *Le Pentateuque en question: Les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes* (Le Monde de la Bible, 19; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2nd edn, 1991), pp. 9-80 (22-29).

75. J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1899), pp. 208-300 and the summary pp. 300-301.

- (a) The books of Judges, Samuel and Kings⁷⁶ underwent Dtr redactions in several stages (Josianic, then exilic).
- (b) The books of Judges and Samuel were in existence before undergoing editing by the Dtr redactors;⁷⁷ this was not the case for the book of Kings.⁷⁸
- (c) It is impossible to determine if whether, throughout the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings, we are in the presence of the same Dtr redaction or different redactions, but that question is judged unimportant.⁷⁹
- (d) The Hexateuch underwent a Dtr redaction when the 'D' source was inserted. However, the link between this Dtr redaction of the Hexateuch and Dtr redactions of Judges-Kings did not really interest the researchers. At most, some exegetes touched on the idea of a 'great Dtr history extending from Genesis to 2 Kings'.⁸⁰

76. Contrary to a fairly widespread position, Wellhausen (*Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, pp. 234-35) excludes from this sequence the book of Ruth, a book that he considers late and taken into the *Ketubim* at a time when the canon of the *Nebiim* was already closed.

77. In the case of the book of Judges, Wellhausen (*Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 214) speaks of a *vordeuteronomistisches Richterbuch* that would have contained the accounts of Ehud, Deborah, Gideon, Jephthah and Samson. The typically Dtr passages are Judg. 2.6-3.6 and 10.6-16. As for Judg. 17-21, they would be post-Dtr and postexilic. Fundamental to the books of Samuel, Wellhausen (*Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, pp. 262-63) sees two stories about David, a 'Josianic' redaction in 1 Sam. 2.27-36 and, perhaps, 2 Sam. 7. The texts of 1 Sam. 7.2-8.22; 10.17-27; 11.12-14; 12.1-25, that criticize the monarchy, depend on the Dtr edition. Next come post-Dtr additions like 2 Sam. 21-24.

78. For the book of Kings, Wellhausen is certainly willing to acknowledge sources, but he considers that the composition of the book results from the Dtr redaction. Here, Wellhausen distinguishes, following Ewald and his successors, a pre-exilic Dtr redaction and exilic and postexilic redactions. For example: 2 Kgs 17.18-21 presupposes the existence of the kingdom of Judah, whereas 17.19-20 is a Dtr insertion of the exilic period (cf. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 298). The difference between the two Dtr redactions is perceptible not only from their divergent historical contexts, but also in their different concepts of the Torah. For example: in 2 Kgs 17.13, the Torah is sent by the prophets, whereas in 17.37, there is question of a written Torah.

79. 'Ob sie überall von der selben Hand oder von den selben Händen herrührt, ist gleichgiltig' (Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 301).

80. Along this line, cf. already Ernst Bertheau, *Die Bücher Richter und Ruth* (Leipzig, 1845), pp. xxiii-xxvii; E. Sellin, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*

In conclusion, we notice that already in the time of Wellhausen almost all the observations had already been formulated on which Noth and his successors were going to build their hypothesis.⁸¹ The fact that it was necessary to wait almost half a century for this is explained, not only by the a priori assumption that the 'Hexateuch' inevitably represented a basic unit, but also by the methodological predominance of literary criticism (source criticism), a method for which *Formgeschichte* and *Redaktionsgeschichte* were soon going to provide the necessary corrective.

3. The Thesis of a Deuteronomistic Historiography

When Noth published his *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (ÜSt) in 1943, he could therefore take advantage of a good number of observations made from the time of de Wette up to that of Wellhausen. The utilization of these observations in the service of an original concept and their integration in a system of new coordinates were made possible by the following phenomena.

3.1. The Antecedent Conditions for *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*

3.1.1. The Overtaking of *Literarkritik* by *Formgeschichte*

In the Wellhausenian system, the approach to the books of the Old Testament took place exclusively from the perspective of literary criticism.⁸² Of course, the proposed solutions too remained within the

(Leipzig, 1910), pp. 67-68; A. Meinhold, *Einführung in das Alte Testament* (Gies-sen, 3rd edn, 1932 [1919]), p. 219 (where he notes that the Dtr redaction is very limited in the history of the patriarchs).

81. In French-speaking countries, Wellhausen's theses on the Dtr question had been disseminated as early as 1905 by Lucien Gautier, who, in his *Introduction à l'AT*, summarized its position as follows: 'The Deuteronomistic school has strongly made its imprint on the narratives in the book of Joshua; it has drawn up the plan of the book of Judges...it has not remained peripheral to the redaction of the book of Samuel, where, it is true, its intervention is felt to a lesser degree; finally, it was given a free hand in the composition of the book of Kings... Fortunately the work of the Deuteronomistic school has remained at a more superficial level. It has not transformed the traditional narratives and has not even made them undergo important modifications.' Cf. L. Gautier, *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*, 1 (2 vols.; Lausanne: Payot, 3rd edn, 1939 [1905]), pp. 309-10.

82. In the sense of German 'Literarkritik.'

confines of this method. Scholars thought they could explain tensions, contradictions and inconsistencies by regarding them as resulting from the combination of parallel documents and by attributing them to redactors who were not very talented. This model was applied as well to the historical books. It mattered little whether the same documents were found there as in the Hexateuch⁸³ or if other documents were found to be present there;⁸⁴ in any case, the explanatory model remained the same. This model, based on methodological dogmatism,⁸⁵ suffers in particular from the lack of any sociological reflection on the circumstances of the production and formation of the biblical books.

The criticism of literary genres or form criticism (*Formgeschichte*) endeavours to provide a remedy for this shortcoming. Thanks to this method, it became possible to appreciate better the stylistic and ideological features of different literary collections. Thus Hugo Gressman, who like his teacher Hermann Gunkel, continued to support the Wellhausenian paradigm in addition to (or in spite of) his interest in forms, published a commentary on Joshua in which he insisted on the etiological nature of the conquest legends and postulated a preliterary origin for these legends.⁸⁶

For the books of Samuel, the new orientation in exegesis appears in an exemplary way in the study of Leonhard Rost on the literary work devoted to the Davidic succession.⁸⁷ Rost presents 2 Samuel 6-2 Kings

83. In this case they spoke of an Octateuch or of an Enneateuch. Cf. K. Budde, *Das Buch der Richter* (KHCAT, 7; Freiburg, 1897), pp. xii-xv; G. Hölscher, 'Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion', in H. Schmidt (ed.), *Eycharisterion: Studien zur Literatur des Alten und des Neuen Testaments* (Festschrift H. Gunkel; FRLANT, 36; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), pp. 158-213. For other supporters of this theory, cf. G. Hölscher, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel: Untersuchungen zum Jahwisten und Elohisten* (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1952), pp. 7-17.

84. R. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harpers, 3rd edn, 1950 [1941]), pp. 314-412; H.H. Rowley, *The Growth of the Old Testament* (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950). These two authors used the sigla 'J' and 'E' for Judges and Samuel without claiming the identity of these sources with those of the Hexateuch.

85. Each problem of internal logic presented by a text was resolved immediately by the distribution of 'contradictory' elements over several documents.

86. H. Gressmann, *Die Anfänge Israels* (SAT I/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn, 1922).

87. L. Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (BWANT, 3,6; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926), reprinted in L. Rost, *Das Kleine Credo und andere*

2 as an independent literary unit with its own prehistory. The author of this history, whom Rost sometimes compares with Herodotus,⁸⁸ would have had available the following documents (*Unterquellen*): the history of the ark, the oracle of Nathan, the account of the war against the Ammonites and the history of the succession. Rost's conclusions happen to be in sharp contradiction to those that come from the application of the theory of sources to Samuel–Kings,⁸⁹ but in particular they reveal a new sensitivity to the stylistic and theological characteristics of the historical books. It is certainly not an accident that Noth, in his analysis of the books of Samuel, frequently cites Rost's work.

3.1.2. Albrecht Alt and the Work on Joshua

For the Dtr question, the book of Joshua has for a long time had a decisive role. It was in Joshua that the presence of texts of a 'Deuteronomistic' type was first detected. Next, the joining of Joshua to the Pentateuch blocked research on the historical books for a long time, as we have seen. It is due to the research of Gressmann, Alt and Noth⁹⁰ on Joshua that freedom from the Hexateuch straitjacket was finally possible.

In 1936, Albrecht Alt, Noth's teacher, published an article on Joshua in which he emphasized the independence of the Benjamite collection that he detected behind the narratives of Joshua 2–9 and that he surmised to have been handed down at the sanctuary of Gilgal.⁹¹ Ten years earlier, in the second part of the book of Joshua, Alt had detected the presence of a list of tribal boundaries going back to the premonarchical period, as well as a survey document from the period of Joshua.⁹²

In his commentary on Joshua that appeared in 1938 and had been prepared for in the edition of the fascicle of Joshua for the BHK in 1936,

Studien zum Alten Testament (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1965), pp. 119–253.

88. Rost, *Das Kleine Credo*, p. 213.

89. Rost takes note of this himself: *Das Kleine Credo*, p. 243.

90. Cf. E. Jenni, 'Zwei Jahrzehnte Forschung an den Büchern Josua bis Könige', *ThR* 27 (1961), pp. 1–32, 97–146 (120–22).

91. A. Alt, 'Josua', in P. Volz et al. (eds.), *Wesen und Werden des Alten Testaments* (BZAW, 66; Berlin, 1936), pp. 13–29 = A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I (3 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1953), pp. 176–92.

92. A. Alt, 'Das System der Stammesgrenzen im Buche Josua', in A. Jirku (ed.), *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte und Archäologie Palästinas* (Festschrift E. Sellin; Leipzig: 1927), pp. 13–24, = A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften*, I (Munich: Beck, 1953), pp. 193–202; *idem*, 'Judas Gaue unter Josia', *PJ* 21 (1925), pp. 100–16.

Noth took up again all the theses of his teacher. But unlike Alt, he was also interested in redactional and compositional questions, and he reached the conclusion that the thesis of the presence of sources of the Pentateuch in the book of Joshua is untenable.⁹³ Noth thus dealt a 'fatal blow'⁹⁴ to the theory of the Hexateuch. But what should be put in place of the late Hexateuch? Five years later, it is Noth himself who will give the answer.

3.2. Deuteronomistic Historiography according to Martin Noth

In the midst of the Second World War, cut off at Königsberg, far from the great university libraries, Martin Noth conceived of, composed and published, under a delightfully unimaginative title, a brilliant little work: *Studies on the History of Traditions: First Part*.⁹⁵ In retrospect, we can say that it is probably the book that, in the course of this century, will have influenced most profoundly and most enduringly Old Testament studies. The novelty of this work resides in the fact that for the first time, it was a matter not so much of identifying or of distinguishing the redactional layers but of raising a question about the *literary plan* that had controlled that redaction.

Noth's fundamental thesis is set out in the first 12 pages of the book. The historical tradition of the Old Testament, Noth points out, has come down to us in great works of 'compilation' (*Sammelwerke*): on each occasion, older literary materials have been collected and placed in a redactional setting that determined their arrangement, presentation and interpretation. Three great *Sammelwerke* have come down to us: the Pentateuch, the Deuteronomistic historiography and the Chronicles historiography. But unlike the Pentateuch and the Chronicles historiography, whose outlines are obvious at a first glance, the Deuteronomistic historiography needs first of all to be 'discovered', before being

93. M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT, I.7; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 2nd edn, 1953 [1938]), p. 16.

94. This expression comes from A. Gelin, *Josué traduit et commenté* (LSTB, III; Paris, 2nd edn, 1955 [1949]), p. 12.

95. M. Noth *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. I. Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft. Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 18; Halle, Germany: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1943; repr. Tübingen, 1957; Darmstadt, 1963) (cited as *ÜSt*). ET *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup, 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 2nd edn, 1991 [1981]).

able to be grasped in its unity and coherence.⁹⁶ And it is precisely to this discovery that Noth invites his reader in the first part of his *Studies*.⁹⁷

It has been a very long time since anyone continued to question, Noth points out, the presence in the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Ruth of a certain number of passages, long or short, that indicate a close relationship with the law of Deuteronomy and with the parenetic discourses that surround that law. Moreover, it is because of that 'filiation' that these passages have been called 'Deuteronomistic'. Noth accepted this usage, but established—in a note at the bottom of the page⁹⁸—the system of sigla that was going to establish itself, at least in German exegesis, until the present day. The siglum 'Dtr' designates not only the collector/author responsible for having conceived and constructed the great historiographical work, but also the passages within that work that must be attributed to him in particular. This siglum 'Dtr'—for Deuteronomist—takes over from the more vague siglum 'D' generally used by Noth's predecessors to refer to the strata similar to Deuteronomy. After Noth, when exegetes began to try to distinguish within the Dtr redaction the successive literary strata, the Dtr of Noth will become 'DtrG' (*die deuteronomistische Grundschrift*, the Basic Deuteronomistic Text) or 'DtrH' (*der deuteronomistische Historiker*, the Deuteronomistic Historian), in order to distinguish the originator of the work from the later revisers, who will find themselves attributed sigla such as DtrP, DtrN, DtrL, and so on (cf. below). For Noth, the siglum 'Dt' refers to the Law of Deuteronomy with its parenetic framing passages, and the siglum 'Dtn' refers to the canonical book of Deuteronomy. In these last two cases, the adjective (Dt) is Deuteronomic!

The Dtr passages detected long ago in the historical books are recognizable by linguistic and thematic criteria. The style of these passages is very simple, repetitive, full of stereotyped expressions, and Noth gives up on making anew an inventory of them. What holds his attention on

96. Noth, *ÜSt*, p. 2.

97. Noth, *ÜSt*, pp. 3-110. The second part of the book (pp. 110-80) is given over to the Chronicler. The inquiry into the history of the traditions of the Pentateuch is taken up, in a proleptic way, in an appendix entitled 'Die "Priesterschrift" und die Redaktion des Pentateuch' (pp. 180-217), but it was to be the subject, principally, of a new book that appeared five years later, and that, rather than being entitled *ÜSt Zweiter Teil*, as would be expected, had as its title *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948; Darmstadt, 1960).

98. Noth, *ÜSt*, p. 4 n. 1.

the other hand, and in this his approach is original, is the *function* of these passages in their broad context. Noth observes, in fact, that the most representative of these passages takes the form of a *discourse* put in the mouth of the principal heroes of the narrative, and that these discourses, interspersed throughout the history from the entrance of the Israelites into the land under the leadership of Joshua up to the dedication of the Temple of Solomon, make it possible to structure and interpret the succession of historical periods, and that in a form that looks to the past as well as to the future. Thus, the entry of the Israelites is introduced, in Joshua 1, by a discourse of God, then of Joshua, setting the goal of conquest of the land; and this conquest finds its outcome in the farewell discourse of Joshua in Joshua 23. In this discourse of Joshua are formulated Yhwh's requirements so that Israel can live in the land in peace. The period of the Judges itself will be marked again by a discourse. In 1 Samuel 12, Samuel draws up an outline of the history since the coming out of Egypt and addresses a serious warning to the people and to ('their') king. Finally, after the construction of the Temple, king Solomon gives a discourse in the form of a prayer (1 Kgs 8.14-53), while insisting on the meaning of the Temple for the present and for the future.

Alongside these discourses, Noth finds some personal historical *reflections* formulated by the narrator. In Joshua 12, there is a recapitulation of the conquest of Canaan; in Judg. 2.11-23, a foreshadowing of the period of the Judges, characterized by the recurrent failings of Israel and the salvific interventions of Yhwh raising up the Judges. In 2 Kgs 17.7-23, we have a retrospective reflection on the ruin of the Northern Kingdom. Perhaps Dtr has recourse to these 'considerations' when there was no hero sufficiently important available to shoulder responsibility for the discourse.

Noth thinks that there emerge, as much from the discourses as from the reflections, such a unity of perspective and such a linguistic homogeneity that we must be in the presence of a real *author*. More precisely, the one who presents these discourses is an artisan of a presentation of Israel's past that conforms to a perfectly coherent theology of history. The principal *leitmotiv* of this history is the obedience or disobedience of Israel. Each time the stake is to know if Israel has 'listened' to the voice of God.

The Dtr is an author too in the sense that he does not work, like the redactors who will succeed him, with a pre-existing narrative frame-

work, but that he himself arranges among themselves the blocks of previously autonomous narratives and *constructs* the presentation of the history and prescribes the limits of its periods. That delimitation still does not coincide with that of the future biblical books, since the period of the 'conquest' comes to an end in Joshua 23, the period of the Judges in 1 Samuel 12, and that of the first kings in 1 Kgs 8.14-53.

The ancient materials used by the Dtr to construct his history, are of a very diverse nature. We find there among other things etiological narratives of conquest in Joshua 2-9, the heroic deeds of the book of Judges, the monarchical narratives of 1 and 2 Samuel, prophetic legends as well as royal annals in 1 and 2 Kings. These traditional materials reveal points of view totally different from those of the redaction and seem to have scarcely ever been connected among themselves before the work of the Dtr. Consequently, the assembling and the structuring of the collection should be exclusively attributed to the Dtr. The Dtr is at the same time a redactor and an author completely on his own, who makes use, with great sense of respect,⁹⁹ of numerous pre-existing pieces but links them together and gives them a coherence thanks to textual links of his own. He thus creates a truly original historiographical work. By the way, Noth elsewhere compares the Dtr to Greek historians of the fifth/fourth centuries BCE whom he considers his closest colleagues.¹⁰⁰

3.2.1. *End, Beginning and Coherence of DH*

For Noth, the ending of the DH corresponds to that of the Second Book of Kings. In fact, 2 Kgs 25.26 appears to him to be its 'natural' ending, since all the events driving Israel into exile have then been recounted. The final note about the rehabilitation of Jehoiachin (2 Kgs 25.27-30), although it could be considered mitigating, in no way represents a fundamental change in destiny for Israel. It too, therefore, can be attributed to the Dtr. It is on this basis that Noth can determine its terminus *a quo*, namely 562, after the rehabilitation of Jehoiachin.¹⁰¹

The beginning of the DH is, for its part, more difficult to establish, and we can consider that Noth situates it in Deuteronomy 1 because he could imagine it nowhere else. In his investigation of the incipit of the

99. Noth compares his Dtr to an 'honest broker'.

100. Noth, *ÜSt*, p. 12.

101. Noth, *ÜSt*, p. 12.

DH, he essentially proceeds by *via negationis*. On the one hand, the beginning cannot be between Genesis and Numbers, since, in spite of some secondary Dtr alterations, he detects no trace of a coherent Dtr redaction comparable to that found between Deuteronomy and 2 Kings. On the other hand, the DH cannot really open with the first chapter of Joshua, since this book presupposes at the same time the Mosaic history and the conquests by the Transjordanian tribes related in Deuteronomy. Furthermore, Joshua contains a certain number of explicit cross-references to Deuteronomy.¹⁰²

Deuteronomy, presented as a long discourse of Moses culminating in the proclamation of the Law, provides an altogether logical programmatic introduction to Joshua-2 Kings. Therefore it is the historical summary of Deuteronomy 1-3 that constitutes the real introduction to the DH. That introduction was placed by the Dtr before the proclamation of the Deuteronomic law (Deut. 4-30) that, according to him, is made up in large part of Deuteronomic material going back to the eighth or seventh century. The farewells and the account of the death of Moses in Deuteronomy 31 and 34, composed by the Dtr, introduce the conquest by Joshua, while insisting repeatedly on the importance of fidelity to 'this law' (Deut. 12-26). Moreover, it is this fidelity that will constitute the decisive criterion according to which the conduct of Israel will be judged throughout the entire DH.

3.2.2. *The Governing Ideas of the Dtr Concept of History*

For Noth, the DH is essentially aimed at understanding and explaining the end of the kingdom of Judah as well as the exile in Babylon. Faced with these dramatic events of which he had been a witness and that seemed to bring an end to the existence of the people of Yhwh, the Dtr tries to interpret the catastrophe: he sees in it the fruit of the apostasy of the people. Neither the warnings nor the repeated chastisements of God had led the people to a lasting change in conduct. One could say that the lessons of history had turned out to be useless for Israel. The end of Judah is seen by the Dtr as the ultimate chastisement of God, the final expression of divine justice.

The great theological themes of the proposal of a covenant between God and the people or the promise of a land flowing with milk and honey are subject according to the Dtr to one condition: the people must

102. For example, Josh. 8.30-35 refers to Deut. 11.29-30.

in return be faithful to the Law. Now, it is the infidelity of the people that is going to permit the Dtr to justify the divine sanction of the exile. In this sense, the DH can be considered a *theodicy*.

While the Dtr insists frequently, as we have seen, on the importance of the Law, he shows on the contrary a very restrained interest in the cult. Thus, the ark is just a receptacle for the tablets of the Law, and the temple is the place where God makes his name reside, the place of prayer rather than the place of sacrifices (cf. 1 Kgs 8).

In Noth's eyes, the Dtr pronounces such a sombre judgment on the history of Israel that he seems to preserve no perspective on the future, and, especially, to be sustained by no hope about the future restoration of Israel. On this point, Noth's Dtr is sharply distinguished from his contemporaries, Second Isaiah or the prophet Ezekiel. Like them, he tries to make sense of the catastrophe, but unlike them, he does not allow himself to go beyond the spirit of the great pre-exilic prophets: the end is the expression of divine chastisement.

Noth also ponders over the identity of this Dtr. Now, contrary to the conclusions of many later works, he does not think that he should distinguish several Dtr layers nor even envisage the existence of a Dtr milieu. For him, the author of DH is just one person, who is neither a member of the clergy nor of the official intelligentsia. He depends on no institution and has to render an account to no one. The reasons impelling the Dtr to compose his work remain therefore personal and unknown. Noth apparently thought of Dtr as a solitary intellectual who, on the day following the catastrophe, cut off in his study,¹⁰³ set to work to draw up an assessment of the situation. We cannot refrain from thinking that Dtr's vision of the situation reflects a little the very situation of Noth himself. In fact, Noth composed his *ÜSr* just as the war of extermination instigated by his own people was ravaging Europe and Germany. Just like his Dtr, Noth felt himself indebted to no institution, and it is tempting to think that the pessimism facing the future that he attributes to Dtr corresponded to his analysis of the contemporary situation.

The historical and sociological situation of the author of the *ÜSr* therefore makes it possible, perhaps, to understand better some of his statements on Dtr that are challenged today. However, as the history of

103. Noth locates his author rather in Palestine than in the Babylonian exile where access to the sources would have been less easy; cf. *ÜSr*, p. 110 n. 1.

the reception of Noth's thesis will show, this putting of its author in context does not permit on any account discrediting it globally (cf. below). What is more, Noth's redactional approach was to find itself supported, in an independent way, by the publication of A. Jepsen's book on the history of the redaction of the books of Kings.

3.3. Confirmation of Noth's Thesis by A. Jepsen and I. Engnell

In 1939, Alfred Jepsen completed his work on the sources and formation of the book of Kings. Because of the war and then the economic situation of East Germany, this book did not appear until 1953.¹⁰⁴ Meanwhile, Noth's studies had been published, and Jepsen could make himself acquainted with them. As Jepsen notes in the postscript to his book and in some additional notes composed in 1953,¹⁰⁵ his view of the redactional history of the book of Kings entirely confirms the existence of the DH as Noth imagined it.

At the origin of the book of Kings there were, according to Jepsen, two documents: a royal chronicle and some annals of the kings of Israel and of Judah. The royal chronicle, containing a synchronic enumeration of the different reigns, of which Jepsen proposes a reconstruction,¹⁰⁶ would have been written between 705 and 701, after the fall of the Northern Kingdom.¹⁰⁷ As for the royal annals, they would relate in more of a narrative form the history of the kings and, especially, that of the Temple beginning with the reign of Solomon. Jepsen thinks that that work came out during the reign of Manasseh, at a time when Assyrian domination loomed as a grave threat to the survival of the kingdom of Judah and the cult of Yhwh.

In terms of the analysis of Jepsen, these two sources had been combined and reworked by two successive redactors. After the catastrophe of 587 (towards 580), a redactor from priestly circles (R¹) wrote a history of the kingdom: he took as a base the royal chronicle,¹⁰⁸ that he

104. A. Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (Halle: Niemeyer, 2nd edn, 1956 [1953]).

105. For example, pp. 105 and 116.

106. Jepsen, *Die Quellen*, pp. 30-36.

107. Jepsen, *Die Quellen*, p. 38.

108. Jepsen envisages the possibility that that history of the monarchy already includes a part of the Davidic traditions as well as Judg. 1 and 17-21; cf. *Die Quellen*, p. 68.

enriched with excerpts from the book of annals, by imprinting on the whole his own pessimistic vision of the history of the worship of Yhwh during the reign of the kings. The ending of that edition is found in 2 Kgs 25.21.¹⁰⁹ This royal history is reworked about 550¹¹⁰ by a redactor of prophetic inspiration (R^I), influenced especially by Hosea and Jeremiah. R^I was not content with a new edition of the book of Kings but, by taking the Deuteronomy revised by his hands as a foundation, he constructed a presentation of the history of Israel going from the Mosaic period up to the end of the kingdom of Judah. Thus, R^I had augmented the history of the kings with an immense prologue containing Deuteronomy, the accounts of the conquest in Joshua, the traditions on Samuel, the history of David and especially the history of the succession, as well as the prophetic accounts of Northern origin.¹¹¹ R^{II} therefore closely resembles Noth's Dtr, and Jepsen expressly proposes to see there the same author.¹¹² Like Noth, Jepsen considers R^{II} = Dtr as an individual and places his activity in Palestine, more precisely at Mizpah.¹¹³ The two researchers are also in agreement in considering the post-Dtr redactional interventions rather minimal.¹¹⁴

In a very laudatory review that Jepsen devotes to *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*,¹¹⁵ he furthermore affirms even more strongly than Noth the literary consistency of the DH. We can actually only find great convergence between the results of Jepsen's research and that of Noth. However, Jepsen goes much further than Noth in the preciseness with which he thinks he can identify, in the book of Kings, the sources and a pre-Dtr redaction. Furthermore, he postulates two exilic redactors for 1 and 2 Kings. It was in this way that, without wanting to, he prepared the way not only for those who postulate two or several Dtr

109. Jepsen, *Die Quellen*, pp. 60-77.

110. Like Noth, Jepsen considers that the account of the rehabilitation of Jehoiahin (561) provides the terminus *a quo*, and the end of the Babylonian Empire in 539 the terminus *ante quem*; cf. *Die Quellen*, p. 94.

111. Jepsen, *Die Quellen*, pp. 76-101.

112. Jepsen, *Die Quellen*, p. 105.

113. Jepsen, *Die Quellen*, pp. 94-95.

114. Jepsen especially envisages a Levitical redaction toward the end of the sixth century. He attributes to this redaction texts such as 1 Kgs 12.21-24, 31-13.34; 2 Kgs 17.24-33, 41; cf. *Die Quellen*, pp. 102-104.

115. Published in *DLZ* 71 (1950), cols. 481-85.

layers,¹¹⁶ but also for those who distinguish pre-Dtr redactions within the historical books (cf. below).

The great Scandinavian exegete Ivan Engnell provides an indirect confirmation of the Nothian concept.¹¹⁷ While rejecting literary criticism and considering Old Testament literature to be thoroughly 'oral', Engnell makes, like Noth, a very clear distinction between the Tetra-teuch on the one hand, (called the 'P-work'), and on the other the books of Deuteronomy to 2 Kings (called the 'D-work'). In his work which appeared two years after that of Noth,¹¹⁸ Engnell insists as well on the fact that D = Dtr went back to many older traditions while managing to maintain a great consistency in style and thought.

The fact that three researchers, working with very different exegetical methods and presuppositions, would have ended up with the discovery of a Dtr redaction affecting the whole complex of Deuteronomy-2 Kings could only confirm the birth of a new explanatory model for the historical books of the Old Testament.

4. *The First Reactions to Martin Noth's Thesis*

Since the *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* appeared during the war and in a very limited printing, we find practically no reaction to the initial publication of this work. It was only after the appearance of a reprint in 1957 that the book really started its 'career'. And Ernst Jenni¹¹⁹ is right in emphasizing that it was only at the beginning of the 1960s that the DH thesis became largely dominant, at least in exegesis in the German-speaking world. In this context, therefore, almost 20 years after the appearance of the book, the first reactions can be classified in three categories: (1) acceptance of the thesis with minor

116. The priestly redactor from the beginning of the exile, according to Jepsen, would be responsible for a certain number of texts that Noth had attributed to the Dtr (for example, 1 Kgs 8.31-61*; 12.28; the assessment of kings in comparison to David).

117. Unfortunately Engnell's publications are not easily accessible. We may mention the English translation of some of his major articles: *A Rigid Scrutiny: Critical Essays on the Old Testament* (trans. and ed. J.T. Willis; Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969).

118. I. Engnell, *Gamla testamentet, en traditionshistorik inledning*, I (Stockholm: Svensk Krykans Diakonistyrelse, 1945); cf. especially, pp. 168-259.

119. Jenni, *Zwei Jahrzehnte Forschung an den Büchern Josua bis Könige*, pp. 116-17.

modifications; (2) positive reaction to the thesis but at the price of modifications on basic questions; and (3) total rejection.

4.1. *Acceptance of the Thesis with Minor Modifications*

Noth's thesis was taken up without alteration in a majority of the commentaries on the historical books as well as in numerous articles in theological dictionaries.¹²⁰ Among the most loyal Nothians, we may mention Fichtner, Macholz and Boecker.¹²¹ Boecker, in particular, endeavours to confirm Noth's thesis according to which the variations in perspective on the origins of the monarchy in 1 Samuel 8–12 are explained by a dialectical, if not ambivalent, attitude of the Dtr to the subject of the monarchy. Some Dtr texts (1 Sam. 8; 10.17–19; 12) alternated with older narratives taken up by the Dtr to underscore the ambiguity of this institution.¹²² Curiously, these are precisely the texts that will prove to be one of the 'Achilles heels'¹²³ of Noth's thesis.

Most of the researchers who sided with Noth's thesis did not do it, however, without proposing some modifications in perspective, and that especially on three points: the question of the author, the localization of the undertaking and the aim of the work.

4.1.1. *The Question of Author*

In his commentaries on Joshua, Judges and Samuel,¹²⁴ Hertzberg expresses doubts on the possibility of considering the Dtr to be a unique individual. Rather than postulate an individual author, Hertzberg thinks

120. For more details, cf. Jenni, 'Zwei Jahrzehnte Forschung an den Büchern Josua bis Könige', p. 117.

121. J. Fichtner, *Das erste Buch der Könige* (BAT, 12.1; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1964), pp. 15–31. This work was edited posthumously by K.D. Fricke. Fichtner actually combines the conclusions of Jepsen and of Noth; G. Chr. Macholz, 'Israel und das Land' (unpublished habilitation thesis) (Heidelberg, 1969); H.J. Boecker, *Die Beurteilung der Anfänge des Königtums in den deuteronomistischen Abschritten des 1. Samuelbuches: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der 'deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks'* (WMANT, 31; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969).

122. On this subject, cf. T. Römer, 'Le mouvement deutéronomiste face à la royauté: monarchistes ou anarchistes?', *Lumière et Vie* 178 (1986), pp. 13–27.

123. The expression comes from A.N. Radjawane, 'Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk: Ein Forschungsbericht', *ThR* 38 (1974), pp. 177–216 (191).

124. H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth* (ATD, 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), p. 9.

of Dtr 'circles',¹²⁵ people recruited from among Judeans who had not been exiled.

4.1.2. *The Problem of Localization*

The majority of authors in the 1960s supported Noth's idea (contained in a footnote!) that the Dtr did not belong to the exiles and composed his work in Palestine, the reason given being the documents to which they supposed he must have had access. In his thesis of 1957,¹²⁶ Hermann was one of the first to situate the Dtr in the Babylonian *Golah*. He was followed on this point by Soggin,¹²⁷ Ackroyd¹²⁸ (with some hesitations) and others.¹²⁹

4.1.3. *The Perception of the Intention of the Work*

Noth, as we have seen, considered that the Dtr was motivated above all by the need to explain the national catastrophe, and that there was no indication in his work enabling us to presuppose that he had any hope about the re-establishment of the people.¹³⁰ But earlier Enno Janssen, who nevertheless worked hard to establish Noth's thesis definitively, had some hesitations on this subject. As he saw it, the Dtr went back to the parenetic style of the Deuteronomic preaching, and this style in itself was not compatible with an exclusively negative objective.¹³¹ Hans-Walter Wolff¹³² and Walter Bruggemann¹³³ took a still further

125. Several other authors move in the same direction; cf. Radjawane, 'Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk', p. 212.

126. W. Hermann, 'Die Bedeutung der Propheten im Geschichtsaufriß des Deuteronomisten' (Dissertation, Berlin, 1957), pp. 7–8.

127. J.A. Soggin, 'Deuteronomistische Geschichtsauslegung während des babylonischen Exils', in F. Christ (ed.), *Oikonomia: Heilsgeschichte als Thema der Theologie* (Festschrift O. Cullmann; Hamburg: Bergstedt, 1967), pp. 11–17.

128. P.R. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1968).

129. Cf. for example, E.W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), pp. 118–23.

130. Noth developed this perspective in his article 'Zur Geschichtsauffassung der Deuteronomisten', in A.Z.V. Togan (ed.), *Proceedings of the 22th Congress of Orientalists* (Istanbul: Yalçın Matbaası, 1951), pp. 558–66.

131. E. Janssen, *Juda in der Exilzeit: Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Judentums* (FRLANT, 51; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), pp. 73–76, 107–109.

132. H.W. Wolff, 'Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks',

step: embarking on research into the 'kerygma' of Dtr, Wolff found it in the theme of the invitation to return (שׁוּב), that is to say in the call to conversion of the persons addressed in the work (cf. for example Deut. 4.25-31; 30.10; 1 Kgs 8.51). It must be noted, however, that most of the passages referred to by Wolff had been considered by Noth as 'secondary', which Wolff, moreover, did not question. But on the question of the intention of the Dtr, it is von Rad who took a position most distant from that of Noth. For the Lutheran theologian, the DH quite naturally integrated the Law *and* the Gospel, with this being expressed particularly in 2 Samuel 7. Did not Nathan's oracle indeed confer—after the catastrophe—on the Dtr enterprise a messianic and eschatological meaning? These messianic tones are perceived by von Rad at the end of the work as well,¹³⁴ in 2 Kgs 25.27-30. In fact, the position of von Rad in regard to Noth's thesis in general could have led us to situate him instead under the following heading.

4.2. Positive Reaction to the Noth Thesis, but at the Cost of Fundamental Modifications

For von Rad, we may suspect, the thesis of a Dtr historiographical work could only run counter to the idea that he himself had developed on the primitive form of the Hexateuch.¹³⁵ Even if Noth continued to hold as probable that the ancient sources of the Pentateuch would have ended with an account of the conquest of the land,¹³⁶ he no longer thought that these accounts would have been present in the book of Joshua, and especially he insisted on the fact that P, itself, had related events only up to the death of Moses.¹³⁷ In spite of this difference, von Rad greeted

ZAW 73 (1961), pp. 171-86 = *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (TBü, 22; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964), pp. 308-24.

133. W. Brueggemann, 'The Kerygma of the Deuteronomic Historian', *Int* 22 (1968), pp. 387-402.

134. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, I (2 vols.; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957), pp. 355-56; French translation: *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament*, I (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1957); English translation: *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols.; trans. D.M.G. Stalker; New York: Harper & Row, 1962).

135. G. von Rad, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* (BWANT, 78; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938) = *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (TBü, 8; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 4th edn, 1971), pp. 9-86.

136. Noth, *ÜSt*, pp. 211-17.

137. Noth, *ÜSt*, p. 205.

the publication of Noth's work as 'closing a shameful gap' in Old Testament studies.¹³⁸ This did not prevent him from remaining very critical with regard to the view of sources following from Noth's theory.¹³⁹ For von Rad, the book of Joshua remained the natural outcome of the Pentateuch, and in his opinion, the existence of the Hexateuch had to be reaffirmed for reasons provided by literary criticism as well as by the history of forms. Perhaps too Noth's thesis fitted in poorly with the (Barthian) history of salvation theology,¹⁴⁰ as von Rad continued, certainly in modified forms, to retain it in his thinking.¹⁴¹

Aage Bentzen too will consider that the weak point in Noth's theory lies in the idea of a Tetrateuch: this would remain 'a torso without the scopus (*sic*) so clearly indicated in the Patriarchal and Mosaic Story'.¹⁴² Bentzen consequently became the advocate of a compromise: the Dtr would have integrated into his work the end of the Hexateuch (Joshua). It is this ending (Joshua and Judges 1) as well that would represent the nucleus from which J and E would have constructed their narrative.¹⁴³ This proposal, probably premature,¹⁴⁴ achieved no success at the time.

Otto Kaiser, in the first edition of his introduction to the Old Testament,¹⁴⁵ affirmed his agreement with the theory of the DH, but hastened to specify everything in this theory that presented problems for him. Three objections especially were made to Noth's hypothesis: (1) If, as Noth claims, the DH takes its inspiration from Dt, it cannot be dated to the exilic period, since Kaiser, following Hölscher and others, places

138. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomium-Studien* (FRLANT, 58; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947), p. 52; *ET Studies in Deuteronomy* (London: SCM Press, 1953); cf. as well *idem*, 'Hexateuch oder Pentateuch', *VF* 1 (1947-48), pp. 52-56.

139. Von Rad blames Noth, among others, for an arbitrary attribution of many texts to 'P3', namely, to layers not belonging to the original priestly document. Cf. von Rad, 'Hexateuch oder Pentateuch', p. 54.

140. Smend, *Deutsche Alttestamentler in drei Jahrhunderten*, p. 259, notes also Noth's reservations in regard to Barth's theology.

141. Cf. A. de Pury and E.A. Knauf, 'La théologie de l'Ancien Testament: kérygmatisque ou descriptive?', *ETR* 70 (1995), pp. 323-34.

142. A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, II (2 vols.; Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1948), p. 75.

143. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 76, 85.

144. As we will see, the idea that J and E developed from Joshua, namely, from the Dtr construction, is today one of the great theses at the centre of the debate.

145. O. Kaiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1969), pp. 100-40.

the origin of Dt itself in the exilic period.¹⁴⁶ (2) In many texts the problems of literary criticism are so complex that they cannot be resolved merely by a distinction between a 'source' and a 'Dtr redaction'. (3) The Dtr redaction proves to be of a completely different nature according to the books where an attempt to pick it out is made: present everywhere in Kings, it is practically nonexistent in the books of Samuel. These two latter observations are frequently found in authors who reject Noth's theory.

4.3. Total Rejection of Noth's Thesis

The critical voices raised most strongly against Noth's thesis were those of Eissfeldt, Weiser and Fohrer.

4.3.1. Eissfeldt and the Priority of *Literarkritik*

In the criticisms of Eissfeldt¹⁴⁷ and Fohrer,¹⁴⁸ we meet right away the problem of the Hexateuch-Tetrateuch alternative already mentioned by von Rad, but this is no longer perceived as being surmountable by compromise measures. In a more global way, it is the hierarchy of exegetical methods in Noth's work that is contested: he is criticized for putting *Redaktionsgeschichte* before *Literarkritik*. Eissfeldt who, in every aspect of exegesis, found himself at opposite poles from Noth,¹⁴⁹ criticizes him for his neglect of diachronic problems. Thus, for example, in Joshua 1-3: if Joshua 1 and 3.2-4b are derived from the Dtr, how in that case can the tension between 1.11 (announcement of the crossing of the Jordan the third day) and 3.2 (after three days the scribes announce the future crossing) be explained, and that without even taking into account the story of the spies in Joshua 2 (that

146. Kaiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, pp. 108-109. Today he seems to have changed his opinion; cf. O. Kaiser, *Grundriss der Einleitung in die kanonischen und deuterokanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments. I. Die erzählenden Werke* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1992), pp. 96-97.

147. O. Eissfeldt, *Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament: Ein kritischer Bericht* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1948); *idem*, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 3rd edn, 1964), pp. 321-30.

148. G. Fohrer, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1969), pp. 209-11.

149. According to the formulation of Smend, *Deutsche Alttestamentler in drei Jahrhunderten*, p. 268.

presupposes an even longer lapse of time)?¹⁵⁰ In a general way Eissfeldt cannot see how a historiographical work could have come into existence in the period of the exile, a period when literary activities, according to him, were exclusively of a cultic and ritual order.¹⁵¹ As we see, the theory of the decadence of Judaism still had a bright future before it, even after the Second World War.

4.3.2. Weiser and the Independence of the Dtr Redactors

Artur Weiser for his part stressed the different character of the Dtr redaction in each of the historical books.¹⁵² In his opinion, the following observations were essential: the book of Joshua is linked to the Pentateuch, with the Dtr redaction being limited and secondary. The book of Judges, in 2.6-16.31, shows clearly the signs of a Dtr redaction; this one took place during the exile, using a pre-Dtr source. As for the books of Samuel, they display a complex redactional history in the midst of which the Dtr redaction scarcely appears at all. On the other hand, the Dtr imprint is most clearly perceptible in the books of Kings. In Kings, two Dtr redactions are distinguishable, one Josianic, the other exilic. For Weiser (as for Fohrer), a Dtr milieu indeed existed therefore, but a DH did not exist: each book has its own history, and the books extending from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings cannot in any case be considered a historiographical work as Noth had imagined it.¹⁵³

As such, these attempts to question the very existence of a DH remain upon the whole quite marginal. Most of the observations made by the adversaries of Noth on the diachronic level or on that of the history of redaction are, however, going to resurface in the proposals

150. Eissfeldt, *Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament*, pp. 27-29. The other example chosen by Eissfeldt is that of the pro- and antimonarchical texts in 1 Sam. 7-12.

151. Eissfeldt, *Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament*, p. 44.

152. A. Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 117-66; cf. as well von Rad, *Theologie*, I, pp. 340-59; Fohrer, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 211.

153. We may note that this argumentation has recently been updated by Ernst Würthwein and Claus Westermann with the intention of contesting the existence of DH. Cf. C. Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* (TBü, 87; Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Verlag-Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1994).

for modification that will mark the next phase of the history of research in the 1970s and 1980s.¹⁵⁴

5. Proposals for a Diachronic Differentiation in the DH Edifice

Noth himself had already made the observation—without stopping to go into details—that many Dtr texts reveal the intervention of two, even of many hands in the redactional process. Thus, in Joshua 1,¹⁵⁵ Yhwh's address to Joshua ends, in its first phase, with the exhortation of v. 6: 'Be strong and courageous; for you shall give the people possession of the land that I swore to their ancestors that I should give to them.' In Josh. 1.1-6, Joshua is installed as military leader in a spirit entirely in conformity with the account of the conquest that is going to follow. Now, v. 7 continues in these terms: 'Be strong and courageous, being careful to act according to all¹⁵⁶ that Moses my servant laid down for you... This book of the Torah shall not be far from your mouth; you shall murmur it day and night...' In this second passage, Joshua, from a charismatic leader, has become an exemplary follower of the Torah, and the warlike context has almost entirely disappeared.

Let us take another example: Judges 3,¹⁵⁷ a key text for DH, contains a reflection on the fact that all the enemies of Israel have not been wiped out or expelled from Canaan. This text (which moreover contradicts Josh. 21.43-45, a passage, likewise Dtr, that asserts that all the land is handed over by Yhwh to Israel) gives two different explanations of this established fact. According to v. 2, this was only to teach the art of war to the generations of Israelites who had not had the occasion of being initiated into it, whereas according to v. 4, it was a matter of a

154. For this period, cf. as well the following histories of research: L.V. Alexander, *The Origin and Development of the Deuteronomistic History Theory and its Significance for Biblical Interpretation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1993); H.D. Preuss, 'Zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk', *ThR* 58 (1993), pp. 229-64; 341-95; L. Laberge, 'Le Deutéronomiste', in L. Laberge and M. Gourgues (eds.), *De bien des manières. La recherche biblique aux abords du XXI^e siècle. Actes du Cinquantenaire de l'ACEBAC* (LD, 163; Paris: Cerf, 1995), pp. 47-77; D.A. Knight, 'Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomists', in J.L. Mays *et al.* (eds.), *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present, Future. Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995), pp. 61-79.

155. Noth, *ÜSt*, p. 41 and n. 4.

156. MT specifies: 'according to all the Law'.

157. Noth, *ÜSt*, pp. 7-8.

proof 'to know whether the Israelites would obey the commandments that Yhwh had laid down to their ancestors'.

To the observation of these internal inconsistencies in the 'Dtr' texts are added the findings, already mentioned, of differences in the Dtr attitude in regard to the monarchy and, more particularly, in regard to personages like David or Solomon, or again the absence of clear indications on the possibility of a future after the catastrophe. We notice in addition a certain alternation between optimistic, even triumphalistic texts, and texts that are irremediably pessimistic.

There comes up too the problem of where the work ends. Would the Dtr historian, who is usually quite long winded and comments on each period with a detailed 'meditative discourse', really be satisfied with an episode as marginal and an ending as abrupt as that offered us in 2 Kgs 25.27-30 for the closing of his work? Or must we seek the 'real end' elsewhere?

The systematization of all these questions and of the observations that are connected to them has led, starting from the end of the 1960s, to two explanatory models that, while being presented as prolongations of Noth's thesis, nonetheless modify its parameters, each in its own way.

5.1. *The School of F.M. Cross and the Thesis of a Double Dtr Redaction*

In a 1968 article, republished in 1973, Frank M. Cross¹⁵⁸ returned to the old idea¹⁵⁹ of a double redaction of the Dtr historiography, the first Josianic, the second Exilic. His arguments were the following:

The books of Kings and Samuel are marked by two major themes: the sin of Jeroboam, which culminates in the fall of Samaria (2 Kgs 17.1, 23) and the promise of an eternal Davidic dynasty (2 Sam. 7). These two thematic lines converge in the reign of Josiah,¹⁶⁰ because Josiah is the one who definitively demolished the altar at Bethel, and thus abolished the sin of Jeroboam (2 Kgs 23.15). He is also the exemplary Davidic offspring (2 Kgs 22.2; 23.25). The reign of Josiah

158. F.M. Cross, 'The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History', in *idem*, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 274-89.

159. Cf. above, §2.2. The same approach is found for example in the commentaries of John Gray: J. Gray, *I & II Kings* (OTL; London: Oliphants, 1970); *Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1967; rev. edn. 1986).

160. Cross, 'The Themes of the Book of Kings', pp. 283-84.

corresponds therefore with the logical finale of the first edition of the DH, whose conclusion is found in 2 Kgs 23.25 (this verse forms besides an *inclusio* with Deut. 6.4-5). From this perspective, DH seems to be originally a piece of propaganda in favour of Josiah, a work meant to celebrate his political and religious innovations. Consequently, 2 Kgs 23.26-25.30 comes from a different hand: these two chapters belong to a second edition of DH, an edition in the exilic period from the hand of a redactor (Dtr²) who, because of the shock of the disaster, would have provided the work with a laconic ending and thus transformed the propaganda document into an announcement of mourning.

If Cross can develop such a thesis, it is because he attributes in the setting of the DH, unlike Noth (but in secret agreement with von Rad?), a decisive role to Nathan's oracle (2 Sam. 7).¹⁶¹ We will take note too that the thesis is almost exclusively constructed from the book of Kings. This book will play from now on a more and more central role in the debate on the profile of the DH. The thesis of Cross—and in particular the idea of a first Josianic redaction—will be confirmed and refined by the works of many researchers. Thus Nelson, who will try to support the thematic arguments of Cross through detailed literary analyses, carries out at the beginning of his 1973 work¹⁶² an investigation of the formulas of appreciation of the monarchy in 1 and 2 Kings, an investigation that will lead him to take note of an obvious break in style for the reigns that follow that of Josiah: the formulas, after that point become more rigid, less 'Deuteronomistic', and their rubber-stamp character gives away their provenance from an 'Exilic editor'. Nelson attributes to this layer among others the following texts: Deut. 4.19-20; Josh. 24.1-28; Judg. 2.1-5; 6.7-10; 1 Kgs 8.44-51; 9.6-9; 2 Kgs 17.7-20, [24-34a], 34b-40; 22.16-17, 20b; 23.4b-5, 19-20, 24[?], 26-30; 23.21-25.30. In the description of the two editions, Nelson is in total agreement with Cross: the Exilic editor would have transformed a triumphalist writing¹⁶³ into a doxology of judgment.¹⁶⁴ Friedman, for his part,

161. Contrary to the older criticism (Kuenen, Nowack), Noth had decreed that it was impossible to attribute 2 Sam. 7 to the Dtr. Only vv. 13a and 22-24 were, for him, of Dtr origin. Later, Noth also added vv. 8-10. Cf. M. Noth, 'David und Israel in 2 Sam 7', in *idem*, *Gesammelte Studien zum A.T.* (TBü, 6; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960), pp. 334-45.

162. This work was only published in 1981: R.D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup, 18; Sheffield: JSOT Press), 1981.

163. Nelson points out that the Josianic editor sets up numerous parallels among

makes the same observations as Nelson, without apparently knowing the work of the latter.¹⁶⁵ For him too, the ending of the Josianic edition (Dtr¹) is found in 2 Kgs 23.25, since we no longer encounter the theme of the high places (*bamôṭ*) nor the reference to David as an ideal king. In regard to the Exilic tradition (Dtr²), Friedman considers that it ends in 2 Kgs 25.26 with the mention of the descent of the people to Egypt.¹⁶⁶ It is actually with the return to Egypt that the curses of Deuteronomy 28 are realized: 'Dtr² tells the story from Egypt to Egypt'.¹⁶⁷ The appendix of 2 Kgs 25.27-30 would consequently be considered an addition due to a member of the Babylonian *golah*. Nelson and Friedman have a tendency besides to reduce somewhat the number of texts attributed by Cross to Dtr².¹⁶⁸ For them, the fact that the Davidic promise would be conditional does not necessarily presuppose the exile, since that conditionality can be explained in the Josianic period by taking into account the events of 722. Besides, the threat of exile does not necessarily presuppose the reality of the latter, since the announcement of such a calamity is not only a standard element but practically an obligatory one in vassal treaties.¹⁶⁹

That being said, there are, among the disciples of Cross, those too who take the opposite position and very massively increase the portion attributed to the Exilic redaction. In this direction, we will mention among others the works of Levenson,¹⁷⁰ Boling,¹⁷¹ Peckham¹⁷² and Mayes.¹⁷³

Moses, Joshua and Josiah; cf. Nelson, *The Double Redaction*, p. 125.

164. Nelson, *The Double Redaction*, pp. 121-23.

165. R.E. Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Codes* (HSM, 22; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981).

166. Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, p. 35.

167. Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, p. 36.

168. Cf. the list of Dtr² texts in Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, pp. 25-26.

169. For a more detailed presentation of these arguments, cf. S.L. McKenzie, 'Deuteronomistic History', *ABD*, II, pp. 160-68 (164).

170. J.D. Levenson, 'Who inserted the Book of the Torah?', *HTR* 68 (1975), pp. 203-33; *idem*, 'From Temple to Synagogue: 1 Kings 8', in B. Halpern and J. Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (Festschrift F.M. Cross; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981), pp. 143-66.

171. R.G. Boling, *Judges* (AB, 6A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975); *idem*, *Joshua* (AB, 6; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982).

What is appealing in the hypothesis of Cross and his students, all lumped together, is that it works from a simple model: a Josianic historiography taken up again by an Exilic editor! It is a thesis that puts us in the presence of two Dtr editions, each having its own outlook and belonging to two clearly distinct phases of the history of Israel. However, we cannot help noticing a certain cleavage between Anglo-Saxon and German exegetes. Whereas the thesis of Cross has largely become established in the United States and in the English-speaking world, it has few supporters among German specialists, almost all of whom have remained sceptical in regard to a Josianic DH. Among those who have openly gone over to it are Helga Weippert¹⁷⁴ and Rendtorff.¹⁷⁵

We will go back over the evaluation of Cross's model, but we can already point out the main questions that have been raised by critics of this model: is an end of the work in 2 Kgs 23.25 conceivable? How do

172. B. Peckham, *The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM, 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985). Peckham is difficult to 'classify', since he has a quite eccentric view of things. For him, Dtr¹ was composed in the period of Ezekiah with the goal of providing a continuation of the Yahwist. P would have been composed following this, in order to offer an alternative to J. As for E, it would be a work intended to compete with Dtr¹. In the exilic period, it was Dtr² that would have gathered together all these sources so as to form the great work that extends from Genesis to 2 Kings. For a critique of this theory ('creative but highly idiosyncratic'), cf. McKenzie, 'Deuteronomistic History', p. 164. In his later book, *History and Prophecy: The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1993), Peckham has become more prudent in regard to sources and insists instead on Dtr² as an 'author'.

173. A.D.H. Mayes, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London: SCM Press, 1983). Mayes has provided a detailed reconstruction of the redactional history of DH. His approach can be considered a 'model' of compromise and will be presented later.

174. H. Weippert, 'Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk: Sein Ziel und Ende in der neuen Forschung', *ThR* 50 (1985), pp. 213-49.

175. R. Rendtorff, *Das Alte Testament: eine Einführung* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983); ET *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (London: SCM Press, 1985); French translation by F. Smyth and H. Winkler, *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* (Paris: Cerf, 1989), pp. 313-15. Rendtorff remains prudent and describes Cross's thesis as 'attractive'. Recently, several German works seem to have been won over to Cross's model. Cf. A. Moenikes, 'Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des sogenannten deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', *ZAW* 104 (1992), pp. 333-48; H.-J. Stipp, *Jeremia im Parteienstreit: Studien zur Textentwicklung von Jer 26, 36-43 und 45 als Beitrag zur Geschichte Jeremias, seines Buches und jüdischer Parteien im 6. Jahrhundert* (BBB, 82; Frankfurt a.M.: Hain, 1992).

we explain the omnipresence of allusions to the exile in the DH? Is not the effect of the attempt to reduce the genesis of DH to two main steps an improper simplification of the diachronic and thematic complexity still perceptible within this great historiographical corpus? Questions of this sort have led to a model of what is currently called 'the Göttingen School', of which we must now speak.

5.2. *The Göttingen School and the Theory of Successive Layers*

The second diachronic model proposing a modification of Martin Noth's thesis comes from Göttingen, insofar as it was elaborated by Rudolf Smend, Jr and his students Walter Dietrich and Timo Veijola. The starting point for this model can be located in a 1971 article, in which Smend presented an analysis of Joshua 1; 13; 23-24, as well as of Judg. 1-2.5.¹⁷⁶ In those texts recognized by Noth as Dtr, Smend discovered additions in Josh. 1.7-9; 13.1bβ-6; 23; Judg. 1.1-2.9, 17, 20-21, 23. In these passages, a conception of the conquest actually different from that which characterized the surrounding verses was expressed. According to the first edition of the DH, Joshua had conquered the entire country and had completely exterminated the ancient inhabitants. In the secondary passages detected by Smend, on the contrary, the conquest was not considered complete, and a great number of the former inhabitants were living in the land. Furthermore, these additions were seen to be preoccupied with the obedience of the Israelites with regard to the Law. Smend proposed therefore to subdivide the Dtr redaction into two successive layers, for which he assigned the following sigla: DtrH¹⁷⁷ (Deuteronomistic historian, the creator of the work in its first edition) and DtrN (the Nomistic redactor insisting on the role of the Law, who re-edited DtrH, correcting it and adding other material). For Smend, there was no doubt that DtrH should be situated in the exilic

176. R. Smend, 'Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte', in H.W. Wolff (ed.), *Probleme biblischer Theologie: G. von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971), pp. 494-509.

177. Following Noth, Smend had at first, in his 1971 article, called the first redactor 'DtrG', but subsequently and to avoid confusion between *Geschichtsschreiber* (the historiographer) and *Geschichtswerk* (the historiographical work), Smend adopted Dietrich's suggestion: 'DH' (*der deuteronomistische Historiker*, therefore the historiographer). Cf. W. Dietrich, 'David in Überlieferung und Geschichte', *VF* 22 (1977), pp. 44-48 (48 n. 11).

period, and more precisely around 560.¹⁷⁸ In spite of his insistence on two redactional levels, it was well and truly a different model to that of Cross—and basically closer to Noth's—that made its appearance in the exegetical debate. DtrH as a matter of fact took over from the Dtr of Noth, not only with regard to the initial literary project, but also with regard to its theological intention. For Smend as for Noth, the goal of DtrH was to explain to the people the catastrophe of the exile, even if Smend relativized somewhat the darkness of the picture painted by Noth.¹⁷⁹

Smend had elaborated his thesis from a very small number of texts, and these texts, moreover, had always been the subject of divergent diachronic explanations.¹⁸⁰ It remains no less true that with this brief article, Smend provided a base for the construction of a new diachronic hypothesis that made it possible to integrate better the texts that Noth had often described as 'secondary additions'.

The way opened by Smend has been followed by his students Dietrich and Veijola. It really seems that the book of Kings must contain the solution to the problem of the dating of the first Dtr. Consequently, it is that book which Dietrich chooses as his starting point.¹⁸¹ Throughout 1–2 Kings, Dietrich discovers—making use of literary-critical techniques—a series of discourses containing prophetic judgments structured according to a recurrent outline and followed, generally some chapters later, by a notice reporting the fulfilment of the predicted judgment (*Erfüllungsvermerke*).¹⁸² These texts, which are distinguished by a Dtr style and an intense interest in the role of the prophets and in the prophetic word, constitute, according to him, a specific Dtr redactional layer that he designated by the siglum 'DtrP' (the prophetic Deuteronomist). The texts that Dietrich attributed to DtrP are the following:¹⁸³

178. Cf. R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978), p. 124.

179. Cf. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*, p. 124.

180. Cf. the remark of McKenzie, 'Deuteronomistic History', p. 163.

181. W. Dietrich, *Prophezie und Geschichte: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT, 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).

182. In this connection, cf. already G. von Rad, 'Die deuteronomistische Geschichtstheologie in den Königsbüchern', in *idem, Deuteronomium-Studien*, Teil B; also in *Gesammelte Studien zum A.T.*, pp. 189–204.

183. For a detailed summary of the diachronic operations of Dietrich, cf.

Judgment Discourse:	Notice of Fulfilment
1 Kgs 14.7, 8a, 9b–11, 13b	1 Kgs 15.29
1 Kgs 16.1–4	1 Kgs 16.11–12
1 Kgs 21.19b, 20bβ–24; 22.38	2 Kgs 10.17a
2 Kgs 9.7–10a	2 Kgs 9.36
2 Kgs 21.10–14	2 Kgs 24.2
2 Kgs 22.15–18	

For Dietrich, DtrP is at the same time author and redactor, since he has integrated into DH pre-Dtr material (for example, the Elijah and Elisha cycles) but also, in 1–2 Samuel, accounts of his own choice, among others the nucleus of 2 Samuel 12. DtrP would be prompted by the need to instil in the reader the conviction that the word of Yhwh's prophet was accomplished without any exception.¹⁸⁴ According to DtrP, history would be nothing else but the fulfilment of predictions (*Weissagungen*). Because of his tendency to systematize the prophetic word, he would have confined it within a 'rigid corset'.¹⁸⁵ As Dietrich saw it, DtrP is situated between DtrH and DtrN and would hardly have come up before the book of Samuel. For the three layers of DH, Dietrich proposes a quite tight dating:¹⁸⁶ DtrH, that (contrary to Smend's opinion) would have its ending in 2 Kgs 25.21, would have been composed about 580, while the epilogue concerning the rehabilitation of Jehoiachin would be the work of DtrN, itself dated about 560, which leaves space for DtrP between these two dates. Dietrich localizes his DtrP in Palestine, probably at Jerusalem, but on this point he seems to remain under the influence of Noth, since he does not present any new arguments in favour of this assertion.

Veijola, for his part, devotes himself more particularly to DtrN, especially in the books of Samuel and Kings.¹⁸⁷ While practising *Literarkritik* as well, Veijola gives an important place to *Ideologiekritik*, to underscore the differences in ideological sensitivity among the

F. Langlamet's review, *RB* 81 (1974), pp. 601–604.

184. Dietrich, *Prophezie und Geschichte*, p. 107.

185. Dietrich, *Prophezie und Geschichte*, p. 109.

186. Dietrich, *Prophezie und Geschichte*, pp. 143–44.

187. T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (STAT.AASF, 193; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975); *idem, Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (STAT.AASF, 198; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977).

redactors of the DH. It is therefore in relation to their view of the monarchy that the 'voices' perceptible in the Dtr redaction will be appraised.¹⁸⁸ The texts favourable to the establishment of the monarchy in 1 Samuel 8–12—and therefore favourable to the Davidic dynasty—are due to DtrH. He would make an effort to legitimate the Davidic dynasty by repeated referrals to a divine promise made to David (1 Sam. 25.28, 30; 2 Sam. 3.9–10, 18; 5.2; 7.11b, 13, 16), without however thinking it necessary to provide the readers with the *foundation* of these 'reminders' (*Textgrundlage*).¹⁸⁹ DtrP, on the other hand, would have a negative vision of the monarchy and it is he who would have painted the portrait of David in the grip of sin. As for DtrN, he too would judge the monarchy in a very critical manner (1 Sam. 8.6–22; 1 Sam. 12). But, unlike DtrP, he would attempt to 'whitewash' the royal founders of the dynasty, David and Solomon, as can be seen in 1 Kgs 1.35–37, 46–48; 2.3, 4aβ. DtrN would therefore not exclude future prospects for the Davidic dynasty, on condition that the descendants of the Davidic line obeyed the Mosaic law.

In a general way, we see that Veijola considerably increases the proportion of texts attributed to different phases of the Dtr redaction, especially in Samuel.¹⁹⁰ The pronounced presence of Dtr redactional interventions in 2 Samuel 5–8 would tend to prove, according to him, that the great pre-Dtr collections, the history of the rise and the history of the succession of David, would only have been joined one to the other at the time of the Dtr redaction. Following the example of Noth and Smend, Veijola thinks he can localize the literary activity of the Dtr redactors in Palestine, probably at Mizpah.¹⁹¹

188. For a summary of the distribution of Dtr layers according to Veijola, cf. Dietrich, 'David in Überlieferung und Geschichte', p. 49.

189. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie*, pp. 79, 133.

190. As a 'precursor' in this attempt, we could cite R.A. Carlson, *David, the Chosen King: A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964). Influenced by the Scandinavian school, Carlson all the same renounces processes of the 'literary critical' type. Cf. in regard to this, T. Veijola, 'Remarks of an Outsider Concerning Scandinavian Tradition History with Emphasis on the Davidic Tradition', in K. Jeppesen and B. Otzen (eds.), *The Productions of Time: Tradition History in Old Testament Scholarship* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1984), pp. 29–51.

191. Thus, what Noth had indicated as a possibility in the last footnote of his foundational book was transformed little by little into certitude for a good number of his 'faithful'. 'The fact that the Dtr had access to such a variety of literary

Many researchers were won over to this thesis of a triple edition of the DH. We may mention, among others, Hermann Spieckermann,¹⁹² Christoph Levin,¹⁹³ Fabrizio Foresti,¹⁹⁴ Ernst Würthwein,¹⁹⁵ J. Alberto Soggin,¹⁹⁶ Rainer Bickert,¹⁹⁷ Otto Kaiser,¹⁹⁸ Uwe Becker,¹⁹⁹ and in the English-speaking world, Ralph Klein,²⁰⁰ Wolfgang Roth,²⁰¹ Ehud Ben-Zvi.²⁰² Of course, all these exegetes do not understand Smend's model in an exactly identical way: differences come up particularly over the question of localizing the redactions (Palestine or Babylon?) and even more, with regard to the notion of DtrN. Whereas Dietrich and others date DtrN to the exilic period, Smend, Würthwein, Kaiser and Levin understand DtrN rather as a siglum covering redactional interventions

sources might suggest that he had stayed behind in the homeland rather than being deported'. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, p. 142 n. 9.

192. H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (FRLANT, 129; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

193. C. Levin, *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja: Ein Kapitel zur Geschichte Judas im 9. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (SBS, 105; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1982).

194. F. Foresti, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School: A Study of 1 Sam. 15 and Related Texts* (SHT, 5; Rome: Ed. del Teresianum, 1984).

195. E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige. I Kön 1–16* (ATD, 11.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977); *I Kön 17–2 Kön 25* (ATD, 11.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

196. J.A. Soggin, *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972). In his *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Louisville, KY: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1989), pp. 178–84, he seems much more reserved.

197. R. Bickert, 'Die Geschichte und das Handeln Jahwes: Zur Eigenart einer deuteronomistischen Offenbarungsauffassung in den Samuelbüchern', in A.H.J. Gunneweg and O. Kaiser (eds.), *Textgemäss, Aufsätze und Beiträge zur Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments* (Festschrift E. Würthwein; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), pp. 2–27.

198. O. Kaiser, *Grundriss der Einleitung in die kanonischen und deuterokanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments*, I (3 vols.; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1992), pp. 85–139.

199. U. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Richterbuch* (BZAW, 192; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990).

200. R.W. Klein, *1 Samuel* (WBC, 10; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983).

201. W. Roth, 'Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk/Deuteronomistische Schule', *TRE* 8 (1981), pp. 543–52.

202. E. Ben-Zvi, 'The Account of the Reign of Manasseh in II Reg 21, 1–18 and the Redactional Unity of the Book of Kings', *ZAW* 102 (1991), pp. 335–74.

that could have taken place all through the Persian period.²⁰³ According to Smend, DtrN should perhaps be identified with the Dtr redaction of the Pentateuch and would have therefore attempted to edit the great history extending from Genesis to 2 Kings.²⁰⁴ The most extreme dates are those that have been proposed by Levin, who situates the final interventions of DtrN in the second half of the fourth century.

The risk in this new tendency is that the Dtr layers begin to multiply. We notice too some inflation of new sigla to catalogue all the levels and sublevels that need to be recognized: to refer, for example, to the final Dtr interventions in Deuteronomy—2 Kings, Lohfink²⁰⁵ speaks of 'DtrÜ' (*deuteronomistischer Überarbeiter*) and Kaiser²⁰⁶ of 'DtrS' (*Spätdeuteronomistische Redaktion*). This tendency cannot help but recall the exacerbation with the literary criticism that was produced in Pentateuchal studies three-quarters of a century earlier and that likewise had as a consequence a multiplication of sources and sigla.²⁰⁷ The attribution of texts to one of these multiple levels risks therefore being done according to more and more arbitrary criteria and leads to allocations that are less and less verifiable. Besides, we note that the terminus *a quo* for the starting up of the DH invariably remains, for the Göttingen school, the first deportation of 597. The possibility of a pre-exilic date for certain texts with a Dtr appearance is not even considered. All this indicates that his theory—just like that of Cross—could have ideological presuppositions, but these have rarely been explained or discussed.

5.3. *The Exegetical and Ideological Presuppositions of the Models of Cross and Smend*

The supporters of a first edition of the DH under Josiah often emphasize the fact that their model remains close to that of Noth since they simply

203. Smend ('Das Gesetz und die Völker') had already proposed subdividing DtrN into DtrN₁, DtrN₂, ...etc.

204. We will go back over the problem of a Dtr redaction (or redactions) of the Pentateuch; cf. below, §6.2.

205. N. Lohfink, 'Kerygmata des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', in J. Jeremias and L. Perliitt, *Die Botschaft und die Boten* (Festschrift H.W. Wolff; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), pp. 87-100.

206. Kaiser, *Grundriss der Einleitung*, I, p. 85.

207. On this subject, cf. de Pury and Römer, 'Le Pentateuque en question', pp. 29-31.

distinguish between the main edition (Dtr¹) and secondary additions.²⁰⁸ The fact nonetheless remains that moving the origin of the DH to the reign of Josiah entirely changes the vision that Noth had of the Dtr undertaking. The DH that, according to Noth, had as its goal—and its entire reason for existing!—the offering of an explanation for the catastrophe of the exile, indeed a theodicy facing the disaster that had struck Israel, is transformed by Cross into a triumphal historiography, indeed into a document of royal propaganda! Cross develops his whole argument from texts that highlight the Davidic monarchy, whereas Noth was not excessively preoccupied with the role of the monarchy in the DH. Whereas for Noth's DH the exile was the central event, from which the very Dtr enterprise was set in motion, for Cross and his students, the texts that bring up the exile are to be understood as theological additions of little significance.

We cannot refrain from questioning the role played in the genesis of the Anglo-Saxon model by the great admiration that Cross clearly has for king Josiah and his reform projects. It is almost a fascination, and we perceive in his work an optimistic theology, not so distant, after all, from the spirit of American Puritanism. The approach to the texts is positivist: Cross and his students consider that, with only some exceptions, the book of Kings relates events that are really historical. On the methodological level, literary criticism does not play an important role, and the arguments from which the theory is constructed are most often of a thematic order.

The Smend school, on the other hand, bases all its efforts on dividing up the text into layers, whereas the description and evaluation of the overall *project* as well as its geographical and socio-historical circumstances instead remain on the fringe. Under some of its aspects, the triple redaction of the DH common to this school can be put in relation with the analysis of the book of Kings as it has been elaborated by Jepsen, who too had ended up distinguishing three main editions.²⁰⁹ What is particularly interesting is—as Smend himself had observed²¹⁰—that

208. In reality, Cross is closer to Kuenen, Wellhausen and some of their contemporaries who had postulated a first pre-exilic redaction of Kings, followed by a second exilic redaction.

209. For Jepsen (*Die Quellen des Königsbuches*), it is true, the first of these three editions was still pre-exilic.

210. R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1978), p. 124.

the description of DH according to the stages DtrH—DtrP—DtrN implies the chronological sequence 'History—Prophecy—Law', a sequence that surprisingly resembles the Wellhausenian idea on the religious evolution of Israel through its Old Testament history, and we can even ask whether Smend's model does not attempt, without realizing it, to apply the Pentateuchal documentary theory to the historical books.²¹¹ At least we see that a clear choice has been made in favour of the priority of *history* in relation to the *Law*, and that option goes so far as to persuade some exegetes to question the presence of the Deuteronomistic code within the first edition of the DH—thus Preuss²¹² among others—a position that is quite difficult to defend.²¹³

The two principal modifications of the Noth thesis, as we see it, are not free from theological and exegetical presuppositions, presuppositions that the protagonists of modifications have not really explained.

6. The Broadening of Deuteronomistic Redactions to Other Literary Corpora

For Noth, the work of the Dtr was clearly limited to the edition of the books Deuteronomy–2 Kings. Of course, in his commentaries on Exodus and Numbers, he noted for certain texts some 'additions in the Dtr style', without however bringing these texts together with the Dtr edition of the historical books.

For certain books, in particular Jeremiah, the redaction of a very large number of texts has long been attributed to Dtr hands.²¹⁴ But it is only when *Redaktionsgeschichte* gains the entire attention of Old Testament

211. The 'J' historian of the classical documentary theory would correspond quite well to the DtrH of Smend. 'E', whose relationship with the prophetic movement has often been emphasized, would have its counterpart in DtrP, and 'D' and 'P', whose legalism Protestant exegesis always liked to stress, would find their parallel in the legalism of DtrN.

212. H.D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium* (EdF, 164; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982), pp. 22, 84. This idea is met as well among some representatives of the Cross school; cf. J. Levenson, 'Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?', *HTR* 68 (1975), pp. 203–33.

213. Cf., for example, the critical remarks of M. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO, 92; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), pp. 56–66.

214. Especially since Duhm's commentary on Jeremiah (*Das Buch Jeremia*, 1901); cf. above, n. 71.

exegesis that the question of such Dtr redactions (and their links with DH) comes up with some vehemence.

6.1. Deuteronomistic Redactions in the Prophetic Corpus

6.1.1. Amos

It was probably an article of W.H. Schmidt²¹⁵ that attracted the attention of researchers on the Dtr phenomenon in the prophetic books. In this study, Schmidt detected in verses 1.1*, 2, 9–13; 2.4–5, 10–12; 3.1*, 3, 7; 5.25–26 ideological and stylistic parallels with DH and attributed them to a Dtr redaction. Gese added to these 9.7–8 as well.²¹⁶ Thus, the rare evocations of history (such as the coming out of Egypt and the sojourn in the desert) in Amos would be due to a Dtr revision. The idea of a Dtr redaction in the book of Amos was taken up again by a majority of exegetes thanks to the commentary of Wolff.²¹⁷ As for Vermeylen, he detects in Amos a Dtr redaction from the period of Josiah and another from the exilic period.²¹⁸ The debate on the book of Amos at present has not really reached a consensus about the formation of the book, but the presence of Dtr elements is no longer really questioned.²¹⁹ What the relation is between these texts and the DH still has to be made clear.

6.1.2. Hosea

Traditionally, the similarities existing between the book of Hosea and that of Deuteronomy (for example, covenant theology, the importance of the Exodus, the polemic against the high places...²²⁰), even the books

215. W.H. Schmidt, 'Die deuteronomistische Redaktion des Amosbuches: Zu den theologischen Unterschieden zwischen dem Prophetenwort und dem Sammler', *ZAW* 77 (1965), pp. 168–93.

216. H. Gese, 'Das Problem von Amos 9, 7', in A.H.J. Gunneweg and O. Kaiser (eds.), *Textgemäss: Aufsätze und Beiträge zur Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments* (Festschrift E. Würthwein; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), pp. 33–38 = H. Gese, *Alttestamentliche Studien* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1981), pp. 116–21.

217. H.W. Wolff, *Joel und Amos* (BKAT, 14.2; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985). ET *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

218. J. Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique*, II (2 vols.; EBib, 1; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1978).

219. For a general survey of the present discussion, cf. O. Kaiser, *Grundriss der Einleitung in die kanonischen und deuterokanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments*, II (3 vols.; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1992), pp. 118–26.

220. Cf. the synopsis in M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomical*

of DH, were accounted for by imputing to Hosea the spiritual paternity of the Deuteronomistic movement.²²¹ The texts to be assigned to later (Dtr) redactions were therefore not very numerous.

But as the thesis of a Deuteronomy originating from Northern levitical-prophetic circles was no longer self-evident, it became possible to return to the problem of the Dt or Dtr construction of the book of Hosea. As a result, Gale A. Yee in 1978 reached a conclusion diametrically opposed to the classical consensus.²²² The book of Hosea would first and foremost be the result of two important Dtr redactions: R₁ (in the time of Josiah) and R₂ (in the period of the exile); R₂, whom Yee considers to be the final redactor of Hosea, would in particular have especially framed the book with 1.1 and 14.10, and would have inserted the salvation oracles as well. In Hosea 12, Jacob becomes the symbol of a necessary repentance and the Exodus appears as the image of the liberation from exile.²²³ The importance of the Dtr texts is underscored too in the analysis of chs. 4 and 11 by Nissinen,²²⁴ to such an extent that it becomes almost impossible to detect the specifically Hosean texts. Unlike Yee, he opts for late Dtr redactions, from the end of the exile, even from the beginning of the postexilic period.

At present, most exegetes remain sceptical when faced with such a reversal of values.²²⁵ We find a diametrically opposite position to Yee or Nissinen in Naumann,²²⁶ who attributes only a half-verse (8.1b) of

School (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), pp. 320-64 (364).

221. This was the classical thesis defended especially by A. Alt, 'Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums', *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II (Munich: Beck, 1954), pp. 250-75.

222. G. Yee, *Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea: A Redaction Critical Investigation* (SBLDS, 102; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

223. Yee attributes the following texts to R₂: 1.1, 5, 6bβ-7; 2.1-3, 8-9, 10b, 15b-18aa, 19-20, 22b-25; 3.1-5; 4.3, 6a, 7-12a.bβ-13a, 14, 16b, 17b; 5.2b, 4, 13b, 15-6.3; 6.5, 11b-7.1*; 7.4, 10b, 12a*.b, 15*, 16; 8.4b-5aa, 6*-7, 13-14; 9.2-4, 6, 8-9, 14, 17; 10.9-10, 12, 13b-14; 11.1-11; 12.1b, 5-7, 10-12, 14; 13.14; 14.2-10; cf. the summary table, pp. 315-17.

224. M. Nissinen, *Prophezie, Redaktion und Fortschreibung im Hoseabuch: Studien zum Werdegang eines Prophetenbuches im Lichte von Hos 4 und 11* (AOAT, 231; Kevelaer: Buxton & B.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991).

225. Cf. A. de Pury, 'Osée 12 et ses implications pour le débat actuel sur le Pentateuque', in P. Haudebert (ed.), *Le Pentateuque: Débats et recherches* (LD, 151; Paris: Cerf, 1992), pp. 175-207 (181-82).

226. Cf. T. Naumann, *Hoseas Erben: Strukturen der Nachinterpretation im Buch*

the book of Hosea to the Dtr! Hosea is thus a typical example of the difficulty we encounter in finding criteria for differentiating the pre-Dtr, Dtr, even late Dtr texts within the prophetic corpus.

6.1.3. *Jeremiah*

There is no doubt about the presence of Deuteronomistic texts in Jeremiah and many works have been devoted to this subject.²²⁷ It suffices to compare, for example, the discourse on the Temple in Jeremiah 7 with the Dtr discourse on the Temple put in the mouth of Solomon in 1 Kings 8. The similarities between the prose discourses (source 'C' of Mowinckel and of Rudolph) have sometimes been explained as the use of a 'theological language' fashionable in the seventh / sixth centuries (H. Weippert and others²²⁸). However, this thesis, aimed perhaps at saving the prose texts for the 'historical Jeremiah', does not sufficiently take into account the differences between the oracles in verse and the sermons in prose, nor the close parallels that we can observe between these latter and the style and phraseology of DH. It seems consequently wiser to postulate, with Nicholson, Thiel and others,²²⁹ one, even two important Dtr redactions. There too the following question comes up: can we put these redactions into contact with the circles producing

Hosea (BWANT, 131; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1991). For a rather conservative view, cf. as well D.R. Daniels, *Hosea and Salvation History: The Early Traditions of Israel in the Prophecy of Hosea* (BZAW, 191; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990).

227. For the history of research, cf. S. Herrmann, *Der Prophet Jeremia und das Buch* (EdF, 271; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990).

228. H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches* (BZAW, 132; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1973); W.L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah 1-25* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); *idem*, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26-52* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989); A. Weiser, *Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia: Kapitel 1-25.13* (ATD, 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952); *idem*, *Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia: Jeremia 25.15-52.34* (ATD, 21; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955).

229. E.W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970); W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25* (WMANT, 41; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); *idem*, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45* (WMANT, 52; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981). Cf. as well the commentaries of J.P. Hyatt, *The Book of Jeremiah* (JB; New York: Doubleday, 1956), and S. Herrmann, *Jeremia* (BKAT, 12.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986).

DH²³⁰ or must we instead, with McKane or Carroll, adopt the 'snow-ball' hypothesis (*rolling-corporis-hypothesis*) and postulate additions and successive updatings—that we really cannot precisely localize?²³¹

Textual criticism of the book of Jeremiah²³² could confirm this theory. The text of Jeremiah represented by the Greek versions (20 per cent briefer than the MT) seems to be based on a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the MT. The 'pluses' of the MT are often composed in a Dtr style (but differing from the DH),²³³ which indicates that there was use of Dtr phraseology during the Persian and even the Hellenistic periods. On the other hand, there exist intentional cross-references between certain Dtr texts (for example, between the breaking of the covenant in Jeremiah 11 and the announcement of the new covenant in 31.31-34,²³⁴ or between chs. 7; 25 and 35)—which would be a point in favour of a redactional activity with a global intention. Kaiser is probably right in observing that the Dtr redactions of Jeremiah share with the DH the concern to provide a theological explanation of the catastrophe of the

230. According to Thiel, the Dtr redaction of Jeremiah presupposes DH in its exilic form. Römer had put forward the hypothesis that the first Dtr redaction of Jeremiah could have come from the same hands as the exilic edition of DH, while JerD² would be later than Dtr² (cf. *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* [OBO, 99; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990], pp. 485-91).

231. W. McKane, *Jeremiah*, I (ICC, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986). R.P. Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant: Uses of Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah* (London: SCM Press, 1981); *idem*, *Jeremiah* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1986); *idem*, *Jeremiah* (OTG, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989). Cf. as well C. Levin, *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt* (FRLANT, 137; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).

232. On this subject, cf. among others Y. Goldman, *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil: les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie* (OBO, 118; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992); E. Tov, 'L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie', *RB* 79 (1972), pp. 189-99; P.-M. Bogaert, 'Le livre de Jérémie en perspective: Les deux rédactions antiques selon les travaux en cours', *RB* 101 (1994), pp. 363-406; S. Sonderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis* (JSOTSup, 47; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).

233. Cf. the work of L. Stulman, *The Prose Sermons of Jeremiah: A Redescription of the Correspondences with Deuteronomistic Literature in the Light of Recent Textcritical Research* (SBLDS, 83; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

234. Cf. T. Römer, 'Les "anciens" pères (Jér 11, 10) et la "nouvelle" alliance (Jér 31, 31)', *BN* 59 (1991), pp. 23-27.

exile.²³⁵ There are, however, differences between the DH and some Dtr texts of Jeremiah (which insist a great deal, for example, on the 'sin of the ancestors'—see among others 7.25-26; 44.9-10—while being much more optimistic than the DH in regard to the future—see, for example, 16.14-15; 31.31-34). We must point out as well the problem of the absence of the prophet Jeremiah from the DH (see on the other hand 2 Chron. 36!). That perhaps indicates that the message of the 'historical Jeremiah' was not entirely in conformity with Deuteronomistic ideas. How must we in that case interpret the redaction of certain parts of the book 'in the spirit of the *golah*', as it has been interpreted by Pohlman and Seitz?²³⁶ Must it be classified as a Dtr redaction or not? Or again, must we imagine that within the 'Dtr party', there would have been a number of different tendencies?

6.1.4. Other Prophetic Books

Among the pre-exilic prophets, it is especially for Micah that some exegetes have postulated a Dtr redaction.²³⁷ Otto considers that the collection Micah 1-3 comes from an exilic redactor who would have had at his disposal a few prophetic oracles.²³⁸ Likewise, the collection Micah 6-7 is constructed round the Dtr indictment of 6.9-16*, introduced in 6.2-8 by a sermon containing a typically Dtr vision of history. We find a similar opinion in Vermeylen, who thinks there were two Dtr redactions and attributes 6.2-8 to 'Dtr 575'.²³⁹ The hypothesis that the present book of Micah would have stemmed from one or several Dtr

235. Kaiser, *Grundriss der Einleitung*, II, p. 72.

236. K.F. Pohlmann, *Studien zum Jeremiabuch* (FRLANT, 118; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978). C.R. Seitz, *Theology in Conflict: Reactions to the Exile in the Book of Jeremiah* (BZAW, 176; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1989). Pohlmann situates his redaction centred on the *golah* in Jer. 24 and 37-44 in the period of Ezra-Nehemiah, while Seitz thinks that the Jeremiah tradition favourable to the non-exiles would have been reinterpreted in circles of the Babylonian *golah* during the exile.

237. For example, J. Jeremias, 'Die Deutung der Gerichtsworte Michas in der Exilszeit', *ZAW* 83 (1971), pp. 330-54; B. Renaud, *La formation du livre de Michée: tradition et actualisation* (EBib; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1977), pp. 387-99; Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalypptique*, II, pp. 570-600.

238. E. Otto, 'Techniken der Rechtssatzredaktion israelitischer Rechtsbücher in der Redaktion des Prophetenbuches Micha', *SJOT* 2 (1991), pp. 119-50.

239. J. Vermeylen, *Le Dieu de la promesse et le Dieu de l'alliance* (LD, 126; Paris: Cerf, 1986), p. 130.

redactions seems to be to some extent the general opinion.²⁴⁰ Such is not the case for the book of Zephaniah. Seybold²⁴¹ thought he could identify a Dtr redaction in this book, unlike E. Ben-Zvi²⁴² who, for his part, considered Zephaniah an apocryphal book from the exilic to post-exilic period without managing however to identify in it a typically Dtr style or ideology.

The question of a Dtr redaction of the book of Isaiah, and particularly of Isaiah 1–39, is the subject of intense debate. Barth had situated the unconditional oracles of salvation in Isaiah 1–39 in the period of Josiah and had thus made conceivable the existence of a connection with the Dtr milieu.²⁴³ In the same period, the thesis of Vermeylen²⁴⁴ came out in which he identified several Dtr redactions in Isaiah, for example ‘Dtr 575’: 1.2-7 (lawsuit against the people after the catastrophe); 1.18-20 (Yhwh had offered one last chance of salvation that the people did not grasp). ‘Dtr 525’: 1.21-26 (+ 1.10-17?) (the misfortune is no longer caused through the fault of all the people but by the corrupt leaders). Kaiser, Sweeney and others²⁴⁵ have considerably increased the number of (post)exilic texts in Isaiah 1–39, while remaining quite vague regarding the connections of these redactions with the Dtr milieu. But the tendency to postulate Dtr redactions in a more or less abstract way in

240. Cf. again recently M. Alvarez Barredo, *Relecturas deuteronomísticas de Amos, Miqueas y Jeremías* (Serie Mayor, 10; Murcia: Publicaciones del Instituto Teológico Franciscano, 1993), pp. 83-122.

241. K. Seybold, *Satirische Prophetie: Studien zum Buch Zefanja* (SBS, 120; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985).

242. E. Ben-Zvi, *A Historical-Critical Study of the Book of Zephaniah* (BZAW, 198; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1991).

243. H. Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josia-Zeit: Israel und Assur als Thema einer produktiven Neuinterpretation der Jesajaüberlieferung* (WMANT, 48; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977). See as well R.E. Clements, *Isaiah and the Deliverance of Jerusalem: A Study in the Interpretation of Prophecy in the Old Testament* (JSOTSup, 13; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984).

244. Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique*. Cf. especially vol. II, pp. 693-709 and likewise *Le Dieu de la promesse*, pp. 128-31.

245. O. Kaiser, *Das Buch des Propheten Jesaja: Kapitel 1–12* (ATD, 17; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981); *Der Prophet Jesaja: Kapitel 13–39* (ATD, 18; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983); M.A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–4 and the Postexilic Understanding of the Isaianic Tradition* (BZAW, 171; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1988). Cf. as well W. Werner, *Eschatologische Texte in Jesaja 1–39* (FzB, 46; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986); and R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–12* (NEB, 17; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986), pp. 14-17.

the book of Isaiah (1–39) has been sharply criticized by Perliitt and Brekelmans.²⁴⁶ The arguments put forward by these researchers do not lack weight: can we be satisfied with interpreting every report of infidelity to Yhwh or every exhortation to take stock of themselves as the infallible sign of a Dtr hand, and that, even in the absence of any phraseology, any style or any other link making it possible to establish a connection with the Dtr?²⁴⁷ Do we not run the risk of falling into a sort of pan-Deuteronomism or of a ‘Deuterono-mystique’, a danger that some have already perceived in the debate on the Pentateuch? That discussion at any rate underscores the need to define clearly the criteria making it possible to identify a redaction as Deuteronomistic.

The book of Ezekiel presents a similar problem. Despite the absence of a consensus in regard to the formation of the book,²⁴⁸ many researchers agree on the existence of one or more redactions defending the interests of the *golah*.²⁴⁹ Is there a link with Deuteronomistic milieus? Some texts, as for example Ezek. 2.3-7 or Ezekiel 20 reflect the Dtr style and ideology. Must they for all that be qualified as Dtr (thus Liwak²⁵⁰), or should we see in Ezekiel 20²⁵¹ a polemic against the Dtr

246. L. Perliitt, ‘Jesaja und die Deuteronomisten’, in V. Fritsch et al. (eds.), *Prophet und Prophetenbuch: Festschrift für O. Kaiser zum 65. Geburtstag* (BZAW, 185; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1989), pp. 133-49 = *Deuteronomium-Studien* (FAT, 8; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994), pp. 157-71; C. Brekelmans, ‘Deuteronomistic Influence in Isaiah 1–12’, in J. Vermeylen (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah: Le livre d'Isaïe. Les oracles et leurs lectures. Unité et complexité de l'ouvrage* (BETL, 81; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), pp. 167-76.

247. Can we really declare, as Vermeylen does, that the ‘Song of the Vineyard’ in Isa. 5 is a Dtr text?

248. Cf. for example the state of the question by K.F. Pohlmann in Kaiser, *Grundriss der Einleitung*, II, pp. 82-102.

249. See in particular J. Garscha, *Studien zum Ezechielbuch: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung von Ez 1–39* (EHS.T, 23; Bern: Peter Lang, 1974); T. Krüger, *Geschichtskonzepte im Ezechielbuch* (BZAW, 180; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1989); K.F. Pohlmann, *Ezechielstudien* (BZAW, 202; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1992).

250. R. Liwak, ‘Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Probleme des Ezechielbuches: Eine Studie zu postezechielischen Interpretationem und Komposition’ (Dissertation; Bochum, 1976).

251. Entire monographs have been devoted to this chapter. Cf. J. Lust, *Traditie, redactie en kerygma bij Ezechiel: Een analyse van Ez., XX, 1–26* (VVAW, L 31.65; Brussel: Paleis der Academiën, 1969); F. Sedlmaier, *Studien zur Komposition und Theologie von Ezechiel 20* (SBB, 21; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990).

school (thus Pons²⁵²)? This last text is especially interesting, since it seems to combine Dtr and priestly preoccupations: this would be an indication of a possible revival or imitation of the Dtr style and ideology other than in the Dtr milieu *stricto sensu*.

The 'survival' of Dtr themes toward the end of the Persian period, even in the Hellenistic period, is clearly attested moreover in the last books of the Twelve Prophets, particularly Zechariah and Malachi.²⁵³

6.1.5. Brief Summary

The fact that some prophetic books (Jeremiah, Amos, Micah, Hosea) would have undergone one or several Dtr redactions seems to be accepted by a large number of exegetes. Consequently, we can ask whether the circle that edited the DH did not likewise produce a first 'canon' of prophetic books, with the objective of supporting its theological program not only on the presentation of the history of Israel but also in the publication of the preaching of the great prophets. The determination of the nature and of the bonds uniting the Dtr redactions of the prophets and those of DH remains a *desideratum* of current research.

6.2. Deuteronomistic Redactions in the Tetrateuch

Noth had situated the beginning of DH in the book of Deuteronomy, and this by *via negationis*. According to him, there were no important traces of Dtr style in Genesis–Numbers, which would rule out these books belonging to DH. Of course, since Wellhausen, and even before him, it had been pointed out that certain texts, particularly in Exodus and Numbers, had a Dt or Dtr construction; the Yahwist had often been compared to the Deuteronomist, but it is only since the 1970s that exegetes began to focus their attention on the phenomenon of Dtr texts in the Tetrateuch.²⁵⁴

252. 'Le vocabulaire d'Ez 20: Le prophète s'oppose à la vision deutéronomiste de l'histoire', in J. Lust (ed.), *Ezekiel and his Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation* (BETL, 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters, 1986), pp. 214–33.

253. For Zechariah, cf. R.F. Person, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomist School* (JSOTSup, 167; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993); for Malachi, cf. A.S. van der Woude, 'Seid nicht wie eure Väter! Bemerkungen zu Sacharja 1,5 und seinem Kontext', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Prophecy* (Festschrift G. Fohrer; BZAW, 150; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1980), pp. 163–73.

254. For the review that follows, we will make do with a brief survey since we

6.2.1. The Classical Solution: 'Proto-Deuteronomist' Texts

The existence of 'proto-Deuteronomist' texts was and still is defended by some researchers who hold the traditional documentary hypothesis (J—E—D—P) to explain the formation of the Pentateuch (Brekelmans, Loza, Skweres and, very recently, Chan²⁵⁵). The 'Dt' texts of the Tetrateuch are then considered the 'missing link' between JE and D and as the precursors of the Dt movement. In the framework of the theory of documents, this way of thinking had a certain logic, but with a closer examination of the supposed proto-Dt texts, numerous problems become apparent.²⁵⁶ Thus the so-called proto-Dt verses of the spy episode in Numbers 13–14 are doubtless later than the Dtr version of Deuteronomy 1. But Deut. 1.19–33 actually makes no allusion to the great intercessory prayer of Num. 14.13–19 and the remark about Yhwh being angry with Moses (Deut. 1.37) would be hard to understand if the version of Numbers 13–14 was already known to the author of Deuteronomy 1.²⁵⁷ Or, to take another example, when a text such as Exod. 13.3–16 includes at the same time Dtr turns of phrase and phrases dear to P, frequent in postexilic literature,²⁵⁸ can we still consider this pericope as proto-Dt? Because of problems of this kind it has become necessary to propose other solutions to the question of the presence of

have dealt with this point in detail in *Le Pentateuque en question*, pp. 58–67.

255. C. Brekelmans, 'Éléments deutéronomiques dans le Pentateuque', in C. Hauret (ed.), *Aux grands carrefours de la révélation et de l'exégèse de l'Ancien Testament* (RechBib, 8; Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967), pp. 77–91; J. Loza, 'Exode XXXII et la rédaction JE', *VT* 23 (1973), pp. 31–55; A. Reichert, 'Der Jehowist im Buch Exodus' (Doctoral Thesis; Tübingen, 1972); D.E. Skweres, *Die Rückverweise im Buch Deuteronomium* (AnBib, 79; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1979); M.Z. Brettler, 'The Promise of the Land of Israel to the Patriarchs in the Pentateuch', *Shnaton* 5–6 (1978–79), pp. vii–xxiv; T.-K. Chan, *La vocation de Moïse (Ex 3 & 4). Recherche sur la rédaction dite deutéronomiste du Tétrateuque* (Brussels: Thanh-Long, 1993).

256. Cf. for example the remarks of E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW, 189; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990), pp. 166–76.

257. Cf. in particular M. Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke* (ATANT, 67; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981), and *idem*, 'La croissance du corpus historiographique de la Bible—une proposition', *RTP* 118 (1986), pp. 217–36.

258. Cf. M. Caloz, 'Exode XIII, 3–16 et son rapport au Deutéronome', *RB* 75 (1968), pp. 5–62; Caloz defends the idea of a 'proto-Dt' redaction while taking note of the connections of this text with postexilic literature.

Dtr elements in the Tetrateuch. Thus in 1962, Fuss²⁵⁹ already spoke, in a general way, of a 'Dtr redaction of the Pentateuch', leaving open the question of the connection of this redaction with DH. Others attempted to clarify the nature of this connection.

6.2.2. *The Yahwist as Deuteronomist*

It was through the influence of his teacher Schmid,²⁶⁰ who had insisted on the stylistic and theological closeness of 'J' and DH, that Rose²⁶¹ made a revolutionary proposal for that time: should not the Yahwist be later than DH? Should not the Yahwist be considered a Dtr of the second or third generation? By insisting on the fact that the 'J' texts that have parallels in Deuteronomy or in Joshua presuppose the latter, Rose tries to establish that 'J' was from the beginning a prologue for DH and its principal goal was to correct or tone down the Dtr insistence on the law. Thus, if 'J' adds the patriarchal narratives and the epic of the Exodus, it was to bring to the fore the primacy of divine grace. And if he places the history of beginnings as the opening of his work, it was to show that humans are incapable of fulfilling the law. A similar hypothesis had already been envisaged by Bentzen, who thought that the accounts of the Patriarchs and of the Exodus had been placed ahead of the accounts of the conquest as a sort of prologue.²⁶²

Van Seters reaches a similar conclusion,²⁶³ but, unlike Rose, he insists on the parallels that exist between 'J' and the Greek historians. While maintaining that 'J' is later than DH, Van Seters points out that important differences exist between 'J' and DH, so much so, that it

259. W. Fuss, *Die deuteronomistische Pentateuchredaktion in Exodus 3–17* (BZAW, 126; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1962).

260. H.H. Schmid, *Der sogenannte Jahwist: Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976).

261. Rose, *Deuteronomist and Jahwist*.

262. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, II, p. 85: 'They both (= JE) wrote their "History of Salvation" as "pre-history" to the story of the fulfilment of the promises'.

263. Among Van Seters's numerous publications, see especially: *Der Yahwist als Historiker* (ThSt, 134, Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1987); *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1992); *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus—Numbers* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press; Kampen: Kok, 1994).

should not be too necessary to compare one with the other.²⁶⁴

The positions of Rose and Van Seters have been adopted by some exegetes,²⁶⁵ but they are far from being unanimous. Can we actually say that all the texts formerly called J/E are Dtr or (post)exilic? Is there still need to subject the non-priestly material of the Tetrateuch to a more differentiated analysis?

6.2.3. *The 'D' Composition*

The term 'D composition' was coined by Blum. In two voluminous works,²⁶⁶ this author attempted to explain the formation of the Pentateuch starting from a blending process. The Pentateuch would be the result of the fusion between two *Kompositionsschichten*: D and P. Blum is here taking up again an idea of his teacher Rendtorff,²⁶⁷ for whom the 'major units' of the Pentateuch, independent from one another, would have been linked up thanks to two redactions: 'Deuteronomistic' (with the exception of the cycle on origins) and 'Priestly'. For Blum, there was no doubt that the *D composition* is later than DH. He admits of course that the authors of this composition (on whose identities he remains quite vague) had integrated older texts (for instance, a *Vita Moses*, or an exploit of Jacob), but he foregoes delimiting these

264. Cf. J. Van Seters, 'The So-Called Deuteronomistic Redaction of the Pentateuch', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (VTSup, 43; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), pp. 58–77; *idem*, 'The Theology of the Yahwist: A Preliminary Sketch', in I. Kottsieper et al. (eds.), *'Wer ist wie du, HERR, unter den Göttern?'* *Studien zur Theologie und Religionsgeschichte Israels* (Festschrift O. Kaiser; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), pp. 219–28. Recently, C. Levin (*Der Jahwist* [FRLANT, 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993]) has gone even further, since he considers his Yahwist as a 'liberal' theologian—as Van Seters had already done to some extent—defending popular religion against the Dtr orthodox.

265. Cf. F.H. Cryer, 'On the Relationship between the Yahwistic and the Deuteronomistic Histories', *BN* 29 (1985), pp. 58–74; R. Kilian, 'Nachtrag und Neuorientierung: Anmerkungen zum Jahwisten in den Abrahamzählungen', in M. Görg (ed.), *Die Väter Israels: Beiträge zur Theologie Patriarchenüberlieferungen im Alten Testament* (Festschrift J. Scharbert; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989), pp. 155–67.

266. E. Blum, *Die Composition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT, 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984) and *idem*, *Studien zur Composition des Pentateuch* (BZAW, 189; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990).

267. R. Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW, 147; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1976); *ET The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (JSOTSup, 89; Sheffield: JSOTPress, 1990).

sources in detail and is content to describe their 'diachronic reliefs'. This model, that has been adopted by Johnstone, Albertz, Crüsemann and others,²⁶⁸ makes it possible to situate in a coherent way the Dtr texts of the Tetrateuch while avoiding the danger of 'pan-Deuteronomism'. But can we consider that the texts attributed to the D 'composers' all belong to the same literary level? Lohfink, for example, has criticized Blum for examining the relation between the D composition and DH without taking into consideration the diachrony within Deuteronomy itself.²⁶⁹

Blum considers that his D composition is actually later than DH, but he admits also that *subsequent* to that there had been redactional interventions, at the same time in the collection that goes from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings (for example, Joshua 24 that, according to Blum, would be a post-Dtr attempt to create a sort of Hexateuch) and in the D composition itself (for example, Exod. 18).²⁷⁰ He speaks several times of redactional intrusions between the D composition and DH. The debate focusing on the existence of a 'great Dtr historiography'²⁷¹ going from Genesis to 2 Kings is thus revived.

6.2.4. *The Connection between DH and the 'Deuteronomistic Tetrateuch'*

R. Smend had foreseen the possibility that DtrN had intervened as well in Genesis-Numbers, editing in this way the collection of Genesis to 2 Kings.²⁷²

A comparable position was adopted by Vermeylen²⁷³ who distinguished four Dtrs that he thinks he can date quite precisely: Dtr 585;

268. W. Johnstone, *Exodus* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990); R. Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit* (ATD Ergänzungsreihe 8.1-2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), pp. 504-35; F. Crüsemann, *Die Tora: Theologie und Sozialgeschichte des alttestamentlichen Gesetzes* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1992), pp. 381-425.

269. N. Lohfink, 'Deutéronome et Pentateuque', in P. Haudebert (ed.), *Le Pentateuque: Débats et recherches* (LD, 151; Paris: Cerf, 1992), pp. 35-64 (37).

270. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, pp. 363-65.

271. Cf. as well Rendtorff, *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 313-14.

272. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*, p. 125.

273. Vermeylen, *Le Dieu de la promesse*; cf. as well *idem*, 'L'affaire du veau d'or (Ex 32-34): Une clé pour la "question deutéronomiste"?' ZAW 97 (1985), pp. 1-23 and 'Les sections narratives de Deut. 5-11 et leur relation à Ex 19-34', in N. Lohfink (ed.), *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (BETL, 68; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), pp. 147-207.

Dtr 575; Dtr 560; Dtr 525. His proposal, 'as a hypothesis', is 'to attribute the formation of the "Deuteronomistic history" to the same redactors'²⁷⁴ as for the Dtr texts of the Tetrateuch. Furthermore, he finds these redactors in some prophetic books as well (cf. above). With regard to the Pentateuch, only Dtr 585 is clearly identifiable, according to Vermeylen, in the rereading of the Decalogue (Exod. 20.2-6) and in the episode of the golden calf.²⁷⁵ For Dtr 585 and for 575 too, it was a matter of responding to the questioning of Yahweh following the disaster. Dtr 575 began his work in Genesis 3. He insists on the fact that the divine sanction is not arbitrary, but fits in with human responsibility. The end of Dtr 575 is found in 2 Kgs 25.21. Among the many texts that must be attributed to this great author would be: Gen. 18.16-33, the episode of the confrontation between Pharaoh and Moses and the plagues in Egypt, the first framing of the Deuteronomistic Code (Deut. 4.44-5.27*; 9.9-29*; 10.1-15; 31.9-12*), the presentation of the period of the Judges (Judg. 2.11-19), the notices evaluating the kings of Israel and Judah, and the commentary on the fall of Samaria (2 Kgs 17.7-23) that 'justifies at the same time the fall of Judah, that takes no notice of this terrible warning'.²⁷⁶

Dtr 560 expresses the perspective of the second generation of the exilic period. It comes up first of all in the account of the call of Moses (Exod. 3.7-8*; 4.1*, 5, 8-9) and in the Pentateuchal texts addressed to the generation that has the possibility of entering the land (for example, Exod 13.3-16; 34.8-10a, 11-12, 14-28a). It was Dtr 560 as well that elaborated the most important part of Deut. 1-4; 6.2-9.6* as well as the 'we' texts, in which the redactor insists on the distinction of generations (5.2-3; 29.13-14, 28). In Joshua to 2 Kings, the following texts, among others, come from Dtr 560: Joshua 23; Judg. 2.6-10 (arrival of a new generation); 1 Kgs 8.22-61. Finally, it is most certainly Dtr 560 who composed the conclusion in 2 Kgs 25.22-30. According to Vermeylen, the rehabilitation of Jehoiachin 'appears as a sort of presage of the imminent end of the nation's misfortune'.²⁷⁷

As for Dtr 525, it is to be situated at the time of the return of the deportees and serves as a vehicle for an 'anti-golah' (!) ideology aimed

274. Vermeylen, *Le Dieu de la promesse*, p. 123.

275. Vermeylen attributes to it: 32.7-8a, 9-15*; 19-20ba, 20-32a, 34*; 34.1, 4*; 28b-29a*.

276. Vermeylen, *Le Dieu de la promesse*, p. 125.

277. Vermeylen, *Le Dieu de la promesse*, p. 126.

at establishing 'that the deportees form... the wicked group responsible for the misfortunes of Israel'.²⁷⁸ Thus, Dtr 525 contrasts in Gen. 4.17-24 the group of the wicked, who must disappear, with Enosh invoking the name of Yahweh (4.25-26) and with Noah the Just (5.28b-29, since these verses constitute, in the Dtr work, the immediate continuation of 4.26). In the cycle of Patriarchs, Dtr 525 develops the motif of the promise, and it is probably he who gave to Deuteronomy its definitive look and made it the conclusion of the Pentateuch in its present form (Vermeylen unfortunately does not specify the reasons for this). In Joshua-2 Kings, Dtr 525 elaborated the anti-monarchical texts (1 Sam. 8 + 12). He tends also to be critical of the cult and the Temple.

The approach of Vermeylen is, as far as we know, one of those that examines in the most precise and comprehensive way the bond uniting the Dtr texts of Genesis-Numbers and those of the Deuteronomy-2 Kings corpus. The very ambition of his project perhaps explains the fact that his thesis does not give the impression of being very complete as yet, with assertions often taking precedence over argumentation. Several questions would call for further study: the criterion for attributing a text to such or such a Dtr, if not to the Dtr redaction in general. Can we really distinguish so clearly four Dtr redactions? And what is it that makes possible the affirmation that the (final) Dtr redaction was hostile to the Babylonian *golah*? Let us simply recall that for many exegetes, it is precisely the *golah* that has a better chance of corresponding to the milieu in which the Dtr redactions originated. This leads us directly to the present debate on DH.

7. Deuteronomistic Historiography in the Current Debate

7.1. The Problem of the Transmission of the Text of DH

Textual criticism is a discipline as old as the Masoretes, who were fully aware of the problems that the transmission of the text could pose.

During the period of the Reformation and of Humanism there was a strong awareness of the diversity of manuscripts as well as of the disparity that could exist, especially between the Greek translations (LXX) and the MT. But these observations were especially made by those who challenged the doctrine of inspiration. On the other hand, the Reformers for their part favoured the *Veritas hebraica* (under the form

278. Vermeylen, *Le Dieu de la promesse*, p. 117.

of the *textus receptus*), and that hardly contributed to the creation of a favourable climate for research on the other witnesses to the biblical text.

For the books of Joshua-2 Kings, modern textual criticism began in the nineteenth century. Mention must especially be made of the commentary of Thenius on the books of Samuel²⁷⁹ and the investigation by J. Hollenberg on the Alexandrian translation of Joshua.²⁸⁰ The books of Deuteronomy and Judges (and in a certain way those of Kings) presented fewer problems for the exegetes and philologists: the MT is quite well preserved in their case and the disparities between the different textual witnesses did not immediately attract attention.

According to Pisano,²⁸¹ it is Thenius who is behind the high evaluation of the text of the LXX. For Joshua, it is Holmes, followed by Cooke, who advocates the superiority of the Greek text.²⁸² We notice subsequently some enthusiasm for the attempts to reconstruct the 'original' text, even correcting the MT according to the LXX. However, already in 1863, de Lagarde remarks that the supposed LXX is the result of many recensions, and therefore it is necessary to elucidate the history of these recensions before being able to utilize the Greek versions for the reconstruction of a 'better' text.²⁸³ Thus begins a long and exacting study of the internal history of the LXX. But that research hardly affects the exegetical work dealing with the books of DH, for which, as Auld

279. O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels* (KAT, 4; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1864).

280. J. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Wert* (Moers, 1876). For Jeremiah, it was F.C. Movers who, from 1837, had postulated that the 'minuses' of the LXX in the book of Jeremiah were to be explained by a *Vorlage* earlier than that of the MT (see *De utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Ieremiae* [Hamburg, 1837]).

281. S. Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Book of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO, 57; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), p. 3. Cf. pp. 2-10, for a history of the research on the textual criticism of the books of Samuel.

282. S. Holmes, *Joshua, the Hebrew and the Greek Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914); G.A. Cooke, *The Book of Joshua* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917). Cf. as well, on this subject, A.G. Auld, 'Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (VTSup, 30; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), pp. 1-14.

283. Cf. Paul de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverben* (Leipzig, 1863), p. 2. Cf. as well J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871).

points out, researchers go back to take the *Veritas hebraica* for a starting point.²⁸⁴

It is the discovery of the Dead Sea Hebrew manuscripts that causes interest to be revived in the Greek witnesses of the biblical text. Some Qumran biblical manuscripts have more affinities with the Greek text than with the Masoretic text. For fifteen years or so, specialists in textual criticism have pointed out that for some of the books compiled by the Dtr, the differences between the LXX* (*prima manus*) and the MT could have effects on the question of the internal diachrony of the Dtr redactional work. But, strangely, exegetes who are non-specialists in the LXX have scarcely taken advantage of these observations. We cannot present this volume of work in detail here;²⁸⁵ so we will make do with some general remarks.

The clearest case is doubtless that of Jeremiah.²⁸⁶ It seems to be accepted today that the Greek text (A version) of Jeremiah reflects a different Hebrew text (B version) to that of the MT (C version). According to Stulman,²⁸⁷ the texts of Jeremiah belonging to Mowinckel's source 'C' would have a more pronounced Dtr character than version A (short text). The MT would have a tendency to 'dilute' the Dtr style by using a more stereotyped language, a language that would indicate a later stage in the redaction and would point to late redactors that we should for that reason no longer call Dtr. According to Stulman, the LXX would reflect the text of the Dtr redaction in the period of the exile, while the Hebrew text (B version) would express the preoccupations of the descendants of the *golah* returned to the land. Goldman has confirmed the thesis of two successive redactions of the book of Jeremiah (cf. Bogaert and Schenker as well²⁸⁸): the *Vorlage* of the LXX would have undergone a Dtr redaction during the exile, while the Hebrew text would present a 'restoration redaction' that should be situated between 515 and 445.

284. Cf. Auld, 'Joshua', p. 2.

285. Cf. on this subject too the contributions of Pisano and Schenker in this volume.

286. For a brief presentation, cf. Goldman, *Prophétie et royauté*, pp. 1-3.

287. Stulman, *The Prose Sermons of Jeremiah*.

288. P.M. Bogaert, 'Les mécanismes rédactionnels en Jér 10, 1-16 (LXX and MT) et la signification des suppléments', in P.M. Bogaert (ed.), *Le livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu. Les oracles et leur transmission* (BETL, 54; Leuven: Leuven University Press; Peeters, 1981), pp. 222-38; A. Schenker, 'Nebukadnezars Metamorphose vom Unterjocher zum Gottesknecht', *RB* 89 (1982), pp. 498-527.

Even if the dating of the final form of the MT to the Persian period remains debatable,²⁸⁹ such studies doubtless make it possible to work out better the redactional stages of the book. Unfortunately, Thiel who personally postulates two redactions of the Dtr type in the book of Jeremiah, has not tried to confront that idea with the works on the LXX; quite the contrary, he regards, almost systematically, the LXX as secondary compared to the MT, and he is not alone to do so.

Let us turn to the books of the DH: the LXX* of the book of Joshua (whose text is shorter than the MT by 5 per cent) could have been based on a Hebrew text earlier than the MT, but it is just as possible that the relationship between the LXX and the MT would be more complex.²⁹⁰ We note in the 'pluses' of the MT some elements of stereotyped Dtr vocabulary; thus, these passages strengthen the designation of Yhwh as אֱלֹהֵינוּ (five times).²⁹¹ Likewise, Moses is called 'servant of Yhwh' more often in the MT than in the LXX,²⁹² as is shown, for example, in the case of Josh. 1.15:

LXX*: 'You shall return to the land that is yours to possess that Moses gave you'.

MT: 'You shall return to the land that is yours to possess that Moses, the servant of Yhwh, gave you, and you will take possession of it'.

289. A. Schenker, 'La rédaction longue du livre de Jérémie doit-elle être datée du temps des premiers Hasmonéens?', *ETL* 70 (1994), pp. 281-93, now looks to the Hasmonaean period for the MT.

290. See among others: Auld, 'Joshua'; E. Tov, 'The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation', *Scribner* 31 (1986), pp. 321-39; A. Rofé, 'The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4Q Josh.ª', in G.J. Brooke and F. Garcia Martínez (eds.), *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992* (STDJ, 15; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 73-80. For a more balanced view, cf. S. Sipilä, 'The Septuagint Version of Joshua 3-4', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leuven 1989* (SBLSCS, 317; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), pp. 63-74; K. Bieberstein, *Josua—Jordan—Jericho: Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen. Josua 1-6* (OBO, 143; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995). V. Fritz, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT, 1.7; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994), pp. 1-2 wishes, in the present state of research, to give the priority to the MT.

291. Cf. the chart of Auld, 'Joshua', p. 11; however, in Josh. 1.11, the phrase 'the God of your ancestors' (LXX) has become 'your God' in the MT.

292. Cf. the list in E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992), p. 328.

Let us mention Joshua 20 as well, much briefer in the text of the LXX. According to Tov, the expansions in the MT would be very close to Deuteronomy (especially Deuteronomy 19), while the rest of the chapter reflects priestly style (see the parallels in Numbers 35). We would have then the trace of a post-priestly redaction, taking up again the Dtr style. According to Tov, the variations between the LXX and the MT would indicate two different stages of the Dtr edition of the book.²⁹³

The history of the LXX text of the books of Samuel is very complex,²⁹⁴ and its status compared to the MT is vigorously discussed by the specialists.²⁹⁵ The most striking case is the story of David and Goliath (1 Samuel 16–18²⁹⁶), where the text of the LXX is 40 per cent shorter than the MT. According to Barthélémy, Pisano and others, the LXX here would have shortened a longer text corresponding *grosso modo* to the MT; on the other hand, Tov, Lust and others think that there is little probability that a translator would have taken such an initiative.²⁹⁷

293. Cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, p. 332. For Joshua 20, cf. also A. Rofé, 'Joshua 20 Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated', in J.H. Tigay (ed.), *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), pp. 131–47.

294. Cf. in particular, A. Aejmelaeus, 'The Septuagint of I Samuel', in *idem*, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Kampen: Kok, 1993). In French, see A. Caquot and P. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT, 6; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1994), pp. 9–12.

295. For the problems of the so-called 'Proto-Lucian' recension, cf. D. Barthélémy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup, 10; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963), pp. 92–109; *idem*, 'A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam. 11, 2–1 Kgs 2, 11 in the Light of Certain Criticism of *Les devanciers d'Aquila*', in R.A. Kraft (ed.), *Proceedings Nineteen Hundred and Seventy-Two* (SCSt, 2; Missoula, MT: University of Montana), pp. 16–89.

296. We could of course mention as well 1 Sam. 11, where 4Q Sam.—close to the 'Proto-Lucian version'—presents a long and coherent text, that would have been lost in the MT through corruption. Cf. F.M. Cross, 'The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 Found in 4Q Samuel¹⁰¹', in E. Tov (ed.), *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel: 1980 Proceedings IOCS* (Jerusalem: Academion, 1980), pp. 105–19; A. Rofé, 'The Acts of Nahash According to 4Q Sam.¹⁰¹', *IEJ* 32 (1982), pp. 129–33; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, pp. 342–44. But this problem does not have direct relevance for the question of Dtr redactions.

297. Cf. in particular the discussion in the collective work: D. Barthélemy et al., *The Story of David and Goliath, Textual and Literary Criticism* (OBO, 1973; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

As for the books of Kings, we will merely mention the most remarkable example: that of the LXX supplement in 3 Kgs 12.24 a–z, dealing with details of the reign of Jeroboam (we find some parallels to this text in 1 Kgs 11; 12 and 14 MT).²⁹⁸ Contrary to the classical vision which maintains that we would be dealing with a sort of late midrash, Debus²⁹⁹ and Trebolle³⁰⁰ have shown that the 'plus' of the LXX stands out because of the absence of all Dtr language and thus would indicate a pre-Dtr stage (according to Trebolle, a prophetic redaction) in the composition of the book of Kings. Now, McKenzie has re-examined this text which, according to him, is based on a Hebrew *Vorlage*. For him, it leaves no doubt that the expansion of the LXX already presupposed a Dtr redaction.³⁰¹ For Talshir, 3 Kings 12 LXX definitely had at his disposal a Dtr type Hebrew *Vorlage*, somewhat different from the Dtr redaction of the MT.³⁰²

These few examples show to what extent the domains of the history of the text and of the history of redactions can end up interpenetrated.³⁰³ If it should come about that, with the help of comparisons among different textual witnesses, to ascertain the existence of several stages of Dtr (or post-Dtr) redaction could be ascertained, the historico-critical study of DH could free itself a little more from part of the subjectivity inevitably inherent in all stylistic analysis and would have surely acquired a tool for renewed work.

298. This text is presented and discussed in detail in the contribution of Schenker in this volume.

299. J. Debus, *Die Sünde Jeroboams* (FRLANT, 93; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), p. 90.

300. J.C. Trebolle Barrera, *Salomón y Jeroboán. Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reges 2-12, 14* (Bibliotheca Salmanticensis, Dissertationes 3; Salamanca, 1980).

301. S.L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup, 42; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), pp. 21–40.

302. Zipora Talshir, 'Is the Alternate Tradition of the Division of the Kingdom (3 Kgs 12:24a–z) non-Deuteronomistic?', in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 599–621.

303. Cf. on this subject Tov, *Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, p. 169.

7.2. *The Problem of the Dating of DH and of its Original End*

The question of the dating of DH continues to divide the schools of Cross and Smend. To defend their respective dating, the supporters of a Josianic DH are obliged to put the original end at the latest in 2 Kgs 23.25, and the defenders of a first exilic edition somewhere in 2 Kings 24 or 25. However, even within the two schools, the opinions remain divided on the subject of the *precise* end of the first edition of the DH.

Thus, among recent authors of the Cross school, Provan³⁰⁴ places the end of the Josianic DH in 2 Kgs 19.37 (reign of Hezekiah), while McKenzie and O'Brien have in mind 2 Kgs 23.23 (celebration of the Passover).³⁰⁵ As for Vanoni, he returns to the classical thesis of an end in 2 Kgs 23.25.³⁰⁶

Among those who favour the hypothesis of a first exilic edition, we find too a multitude of proposals:

According to Seitz, the first Dtr edition of the book of Kings would have ended in 2 Kings 24,³⁰⁷ immediately after the first deportation of 597. For Würthwein, the first Dtr layer in Kings ended in 2 Kgs 25.7* (exile of Zedekiah).³⁰⁸ Dietrich, Spronk and others set the original end of DH in 2 Kgs 25.21 ('Thus Judah was deported far from its land').³⁰⁹

304. I.W. Provan, *Hezekiah and the Book of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW, 172; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1988). Cf. too B. Peckham, *History and Prophecy: The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1993), pp. 49-51.

305. S.L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM, 33; 2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), p. 191. See on the other hand McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, p. 115. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, p. 267. See now too G.N. Knoppers, *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies* (HSM, 52; 2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993-1994), II, p. 215.

306. G. Vanoni, 'Beobachtungen zur deuteronomistischen Terminologie in 2Kön 23,25-25,30', in N. Lohfink (ed.), *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (BETL, 68; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), pp. 357-62. Cf. as well Preuss, 'DtrG', p. 387.

307. Seitz, *Theology in Conflict*, pp. 167-69.

308. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*. Cf. the reconstruction of this layer, pp. 505-15.

309. Dietrich, *Prophezie und Geschichte*, pp. 140-41; K. Spronk, 'Aanhangsel of uitvloeiisel', *GThT* 88 (1988), pp. 162-70; K.F. Pohlmann, 'Erwägungen zum Schlusskapitel des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk. Oder: Warum wird der Prophet Jeremia in 2 Kön 22-25 nicht erwähnt?', in Gunneweg and Kaiser (eds.),

unlike the Nothian vision for which, as we have seen, the present end of the book of Kings (rehabilitation of Jehoiachin) coincides with the end of the DH.

These various options have, of course, consequences for the way in which the authors conceive the intention and the ideology of the DH.

For a very long time, the confrontation between the supporters of a Josianic dating and those of an exilic dating took on the appearances of a holy war. But recently some works have been published that could open the door to a compromise between the Harvard and Göttingen schools.

We thus take note that some exegetes influenced by the Cross approach acknowledge increasingly a number of Dtr texts as *exilic*. Mayes certainly postulates a Josianic historian, but he attributes more texts to a 'Deuteronomistic editor' close to Second Isaiah.³¹⁰ The insistence on the Law in this editor brings him remarkably close to the DtrN of Göttingen. O'Brien too finds—after a Josianic edition—three important exilic redactions of the DH.³¹¹ The work of McKenzie on the books of Kings likewise effects a modification of Cross's model,³¹² insofar as the Josianic version of DH is extremely reduced. McKenzie actually attributes to the post-Dtr redactors numerous texts that were formerly considered ancient texts integrated by the first Dtr into his narrative framework. Incidentally, he continues to advance (or recall) solid arguments that argue in favour of a *Josianic* edition of the books of Kings. Whence the question: does this still necessarily imply a Josianic DH (Deuteronomy-2 Kings)?

For this problem, the work of Provan is especially worthy of our attention. Provan too starts from a study of the book of Kings. His analysis of the mentions of the בְּמִוֶּה, the 'high places', leads him to situate the end of the Josianic edition in 2 Kings 18-19 (see above). But what was the extent of this first pro-monarchic edition of DH? For Provan, it only included, besides the books of Kings, the stories of the rise to power and the succession of David, themselves introduced by the story of Samuel (without the anti-monarchic texts in 1 Sam. 7-12). So,

Textgemäss. Aufsätze und Beiträge zur Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments, pp. 94-109.

310. Mayes, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile*.

311. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*.

312. See the remarks on this subject of Preuss, 'DtrG', pp. 376-77.

in the time of Josiah, DH consisted of just Samuel and Kings³¹³. Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges were only added to it by exilic editors! So can we still speak, for the period of Josiah, of a DH in the sense intended by Noth, when, if we follow Provan, more than half of this historiography still does not appear in it?

Provan's results moreover come close in an interesting way to the point of view of Lohfink on DH: in an article in 1981, Lohfink had introduced the new siglum 'DtrL' (*Länderoberungserzählung*, 'narrative of the conquest'),³¹⁴ by which he intends to designate the edition of Deuteronomy 1–Joshua 22*, an edition that he proposes to situate in the time of Josiah. In Lohfink's view, this collection would be a propaganda document in favour of the expansionist policy of Josiah. Lohfink accepts as well the idea of a Josianic edition of the book of Kings, without the latter already making up a unit with 'DtrL'.

We could eventually therefore come to a sort of compromise³¹⁵: by situating the beginnings of the literary activity of the Dtr milieu in the time of Josiah (perhaps even before, as far as the primitive Deut. is concerned?), it is possible to imagine the establishment of a small library of texts containing propaganda in favour of the ('Dtr') policy of Josiah. That library would comprise Deuteronomy, perhaps a version of the conquest account exactly copying the Assyrian model (Joshua), and an edition of Kings (+ Samuel*?) showing that Josiah is a worthy successor of David. To this even some texts of the Tetrateuch could have been added, for example, a *Vita Mosis* (such as that made plausible by Blum³¹⁶). The organization of some of these collections into a great history (DH) would only have taken place in the period of the exile, and it is after the catastrophe that a literature, conceived originally as propa-

313. Provan, *Hezekiah and the Book of Kings*, p. 168 n. 30, envisages the possibility that Judg. 17–21 would have formed part of it.

314. Lohfink, 'Kerygmata des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes', pp. 87–100 = *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur*, II (SBAB, 12; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991), pp. 125–41; cf. as well his 'Deutéronome et Pentateuque', in Haudebert (ed.), *Le Pentateuque*, pp. 38–42, where he appears however more critical with regard to the Göttingen model.

315. For an appeal for compromise, cf. too E. Cortese, 'Theories Concerning Dtr: A Possible Rapprochement', in C. Brekelmans and J. Lust (eds.), *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress Leuven 1989* (BETL, 94; Leuven: Leuven University Press & Peeters, 1990), pp. 179–90.

316. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, pp. 208–18.

ganda, would have been put at the service of an attempt at a theodicy.³¹⁷

Could such a consensus come to pass? It is doubtless too early to say. We notice at present among the supporters of the Smendian model as well as among the 'neo-Nothians' (Hoffmann, Van Seters; see below) some reluctance about considering (save for Deuteronomy) the possibility of an important literary activity at the time of Josiah.

The discussion of the dating of DH especially revolves around the pre-exilic / exilic alternative. Noth had decided that the end of 2 Kings 25 (the release of Jehoiachin) definitely attested to an exilic redaction of DH, all the more so since there is no indication in it about the arrival of the Persians or the possibility of a return from exile. That *interpretatio exilica* of 2 Kgs 25.27–30 has been taken up by the majority of exegetes.³¹⁸ Now however, Würthwein has drawn attention to the fact that this passage contains neither typically Dtr style nor its preoccupations.³¹⁹ But why then would it have been added to DH? We can compare the fate of Jehoiachin in these verses to that of a Mordecai, or of a Daniel or of a Joseph having a career in foreign courts.³²⁰ It could have been a justification of the diaspora, that would bring us round to the thesis of a (Dtr or post-Dtr) revision of DH in the Persian period. However, it must be clearly acknowledged that we find scarcely any allusions to the Achaemenid period in Deuteronomy to 2 Kings.

7.3. The Problem of the Unity and Coherence of the Work

7.3.1. The Proliferation of Dtr Layers

As we have already remarked, some scholars at present are fond of multiplying Dtr layers. New sigla are created (DtrÜ, DtrS and so on), when DtrN is not being divided into DtrN¹, DtrN² and so forth. Thus, Stahl ended up distinguishing ten Dtr layers,³²¹ while Perlit's students,

317. On this subject see T. Römer, 'Historiographies et mythes d'origines dans l'Ancien Testament', in M. Detienne (ed.), *Transcrire les mythologies* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1994), pp. 142–48 and 236–37.

318. Cf. recently for example B. Becking, 'Jehoiachin's Amnesty, Salvation for Israel: Notes on 2 Kings 25, 27–30', in Brekelmans and Lust (eds.), *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies*, pp. 283–93.

319. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige*, p. 484.

320. Cf. T. Römer, 'Transformations in Deuteronomistic and Biblical Historiography: On "Book-Finding" and other Literary Strategies', *ZAW* 109 (1997), pp. 1–11.

321. In an unpublished dissertation: 'Aspekte der Geschichte dtr Theologie. Zur

in helping their teacher prepare his commentary on Deuteronomy, identified so many layers in it that it became impossible to count them or attribute sigla to them.³²²

Faced with this situation where the results of criticism risk getting beyond any control, it is very easy to understand the scepticism of Albertz³²³ who proposes making do with the idea of a Dtr group. The 'tensions' that can be discerned within some Dtr texts would simply be the echo of internal debates in Dtr circles, without it being possible to identify the spokespersons for such or such an opinion. For Rofé, the ideological contradictions within the historical books bear witness to the reunion of two historiographical works: an Ephraimite history originating in the North and a Josianic DH.³²⁴

These last few years, we notice besides an increasing number of publications favouring the 'final' form of such or such a part of the DH (for example, Eslinger on Joshua–2 Kings,³²⁵ or Berges and Diana Edelman on the story of Saul³²⁶). What we have here—at least partially—is a reaction to a diachronic criticism that runs the risk of losing sight of the biblical text in its completed form.

7.3.2. Priority Given to Synchronic Methods

Under the impact of structuralism in the French and English-speaking worlds or in rallying, more simply, to the concept of 'close reading' or

Traditionsgeschichte der Terminologie und zur Redaktionsgeschichte der Redekomposition" (Jena, 1982). Cf. the review in *TLZ* 108 (1983), cols. 74–76.

322. Cf. in particular R. Achenbach, *Israel zwischen Verheissung und Gebot: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zu Deuteronomium 5–11* (EHS.T, 422; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1991).

323. R. Albertz, 'Die Intentionen und Träger des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', in R. Albertz, F.W. Golka and J. Kegler (eds.), *Schöpfung und Befreiung: Für Claus Westermann zum 80. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1989), pp. 37–53.

324. A. Rofé, 'Ephraimite Versus Deuteronomistic History', in D. Garrone and F. Israel (eds.), *Storia e tradizioni di Israele: Scritti in onore di J. Alberto Soggin* (Brescia: Paideia, 1991), pp. 221–35.

325. L. Eslinger, *Into the Hands of the Living God* (JSOTSup, 84; Bible and Literature Series, 24; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989).

326. U. Berges, *Die Verwerfung Sauls: Eine thematische Untersuchung* (Fzb, 61; Würzburg: Echter, 1989); D. Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah* (JSOTSup, 121; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

'narratology',³²⁷ some authors have begun to reject, in a more or less categorical manner, the differentiation of literary levels within DH. Thus, Polzin, in elaborating a trilogy on DH,³²⁸ strongly criticizes historico-critical exegesis for being an obstacle to an appropriate perception of the structure of DH and of the message of the Dtr—through its shallow and useless pursuit of redactional layers, that are themselves illusive. It is this message that he proposes to bring out by means of a 'holistic' analysis. The efficacy of his method, however, is not clearly evident. When Polzin observes, for example, that the author of Deut. intends, by means of the Mosaic fiction, to present himself as the true mediator of the divine word, what else is he doing but repeating evidence recognized by everybody (and brought to light in the first place by historico-critical exegesis)? And when, while describing diachronic exegesis, he can write: 'That corpus of the Hebrew Bible that stretches from the Book of Deuteronomy through 2 Kings is called the Deuteronomistic History',³²⁹ he is depending on a result from historico-critical exegesis and not on the traditional tripartition of the Hebrew Bible.

Hoffman too favours a synchronic reading of DH, while at the same time recognizing the possibility of later redactional interventions in the first edition of the DH.³³⁰ He wonders about its structure and reaches the conclusion that this great literary work ensures its consistency through the theme of cultic 'reforms and counter-reforms', with DH being framed by two exemplary reformers, Moses and Josiah. For Hoffmann, the reform of Josiah constitutes the apotheosis of the entire work. That does not imply in any way, however, the pre-exilic origin of DH, since the idealized presentation of the reign of Josiah has the precise goal of proposing a model for a new start after the exile. Hoffmann criticizes Noth for some ambiguity in his description of the Dtr—does

327. Cf., for example, D.N. Fewell and D.M. Gunn, *Gender, Power and Promise: The Subject of the Bible's First Story* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993).

328. R. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History. I. Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges* (New York: Seabury, 1980); *idem*, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History. II. I Samuel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989); *idem*, *David and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History. 2 Samuel* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature; Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993).

329. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, I, p. 18.

330. H.-D. Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen: Untersuchungen zu einem Grundthema der deuteronomistischen Geschichtsschreibung* (ATANT, 66; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980).

he see in him an author or a redactor?—and he himself very clearly opts in favour of a Dtr-author, who conceives and realizes a historiographic project in the service of a well-defined cause. In this, Hoffmann comes very close to Van Seters.³³¹

7.3.3. *The Deuteronomist as a Historian*

In his 1983 work, *In Search of History*, John Van Seters stands firmly by the idea of one Dtr 'historiographer' only, thus showing himself faithful to Noth. Nevertheless, his position differs from Noth's on two important points:

1. Van Seters is much more sceptical than Noth as regards the existence of ancient written sources that the Dtr would have taken up and retouched slightly; he is thinking rather of traditions whose outlines remain quite blurred. In this context, Van Seters considers that the so called 'history of the succession of David' does not represent in any case, as the common opinion would have it, the beginnings of historiography in Israel, but is on the contrary a postexilic addition to DH in order to underline the negative aspects of the figure of David and counter the Davidic messianism of the Persian period.³³² In a general way, Van Seters sees in DH more of an ideological construction than a source that makes it possible to reconstruct the 'true' history of Judah.

2. According to Van Seters, it is by turning our eyes toward Greece that we discover the most revealing parallels to DH. Like Herodotus, of whom he was perhaps even the precursor, the Dtr was both an author and an editor, collecting and organizing different traditions in order to make the first historiographical work of the ancient Near East. But, unlike Noth's Dtr, that of Van Seters does not simply play the role of an 'honest broker' in relation to the sources; he is rather a creative writer who does not hesitate to fill in the gaps in tradition with his own ideas.

Since he understands Dtr as an individual historian, Van Seters does not attach too much importance to the eventual additions that would

331. An approach comparable to Hoffmann's has just been proposed by E.T. Mullen, *Narrative History and Ethnic Boundaries: The Deuteronomistic Historian and the Creation of Israelite National Identity* (Semeia Studies; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993). He considers the DH under its final form as an exilic work that constitutes a 'two-way vision: it looks to the past to understand the present and to the future to restore the ideals that have been described as part of that past' (p. 228).

332. Cf. J. Van Seters, *In Search of History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 317-21, for more details; cf. below §7.5.4.4.

have been made to the *editio princeps* of DH. A similar position is adopted by McKenzie (with the difference that for him—at least in his publications prior to his contribution to the present volume³³³—the Dtr is Josianic). According to his analysis, the 'Dtr²' texts in Kings are not an indication of a second redaction elaborated in a systematic way: they are instead isolated additions.³³⁴ Being content with a distinction of a general nature between 'Dtr¹' and 'Dtr²', can actually seem profitable. This is also the position of Rose, who advocates a distinction between an 'ancient Deuteronomistic level' and a 'recent Deuteronomistic level'.³³⁵ 'Dtr²' would therefore group together all the additions to the first edition of the DH. There would remain in suspense the question, a perfectly legitimate one, of knowing whether behind the siglum 'Dtr²' there was not hidden a second great historiographical project, a second redaction that too would have had as its goal a coherent presentation of Israel's history. It would in that case be conceivable that the edition of the 'great Dtr history', namely Genesis–2 Kings, should be attributed to 'Dtr²'.

That brings up again the question of the coherence, if not the existence, of the Dtr redaction(s). Now, it is precisely this coherence that has recently found itself under critical fire, even total contestation.

7.3.4. *The Questioning of the Cohesion, even the Existence of DH*

Recently, Würthwein³³⁶ has challenged the coherence of DH. In his opinion, we would not be dealing with a unified work, but with a blend of successive Dtr redactions.³³⁷ This literary activity would have begun with an exilic edition of the history of the monarchy (from Solomon to Zedekiah). Other Dtr redactors would then have preceded this history of

333. Cf. however his contribution to this volume.

334. Cf. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, pp. 135-45.

335. Cf. Rose, 'La croissance du corpus historiographique de la Bible', pp. 224-25. Cf. as well T. Römer, 'Le Deutéronome à la quête des origines', in Haudebert (ed.), *Le Pentateuque*, pp. 65-98 (71).

336. E. Würthwein, 'Erwägungen zum sog. Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk. Eine Skizze', in E. Würthwein, *Studien zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (BZAW, 227; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1994), pp. 1-11.

337. Cf. now as well E. Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OTS, 33; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996). According to him: 'At best we can speak of a dtr redaction in which the historical books are parenetically interpreted' (p. 361). But in what way is that parenetic interpretation opposed to the idea of a DH?

the monarchy with some traditions on the rise to power and the succession of David (Würthwein speaks of a 'second block'). Later, other postexilic Dtr redactors would have created the history of the Judges by way of a new prologue (Judg. 2.11–12.6*, a 'third block'). Each time the theological idea was changed. In the book of Judges, for example, the concept of history is cyclic, unlike that of the book(s) of Kings; furthermore, it is the entire people who do evil in the eyes of Yhwh and not only their kings. Finally, well after the end of the exile, the hope of being free again in the homeland would have given rise to the Dtr composition of Joshua 1–11 ('fourth block'). In this fresco painted by Würthwein, we indeed witness the growth, with the passing epochs, of a literary corpus, but it is no longer a question of the birth of a coherent historiographic project. The whole thing becomes more complicated when Würthwein distinguishes within these blocks several Dtr redactors, whom he designates with the sigla DtrP and DtrN. The big absentee from the debate is the book of Deuteronomy itself. In elaborating his theory, Würthwein does not express an opinion on the status of this book.

We will notice that Würthwein takes up again the first objections that had been raised against Noth's thesis by authors such as Fohrer, Weiser or von Rad. This is likewise the situation with Westermann,³³⁸ whose challenging of DH appeared at almost the same time as the article of Würthwein. Westermann too insists on the differences in character and ideology that separate the Dtr texts in Judges, Samuel and Kings. His perspective is, on the other hand, more 'conservative' in as much as he thinks that he can, by insisting on the role of oral tradition, remain in contact with the 'events related'.

The questioning of the existence of DH is becoming more extensive.³³⁹ Is it a brief burst of 'deconstructionism', or must the idea of a coherent literary collection going from Deuteronomy to the historical books be finally abandoned? In any case, it will always be necessary to explain the many internal cross-references to Deuteronomy–2 Kings, references that would make no sense, it seems to us, if they did not fit into a comprehensive redactional project covering the whole Dtr complex.

338. C. Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments*.

339. Cf. A.G. Auld, 'What Makes Judges Deuteronomistic?', in *idem*, *Joshua Retold: Synoptic Perspectives* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), pp. 120–26; cf. as well the contribution of E.A. Knauf in the present volume.

The problem of the introduction to DH must be taken up again as well. Let us recall, once again, that Noth had proposed Deuteronomy as an opening, by *via negationis*. Würthwein himself speaks of the collection Joshua–2 Kings as if Deuteronomy did not exist.

Already in 1975, Mittmann had challenged the thesis of Noth, who saw in Deuteronomy 1–3(4) the introduction to DH.³⁴⁰ For Mittmann, these chapters introduced the Deuteronomistic Code alone. In fact, one could ask whether Deut. 1.5–18 (reminder of Horeb) provides an adequate introduction to a historiographical work that continues to the end of 2 Kings. Would it not be more judicious, Mittmann asks, to begin this great history with the events related in the book of Exodus?³⁴¹ From this perspective, would the solution not be to consider Deuteronomy 1–3 as an addition that had been made at the time of the insertion of Deuteronomy into the Torah?³⁴² DH would thus be deprived of its classical introduction. But that would practically lead us back to the start. One should not forget that there actually exist many links between the basic Dtr layer in Deuteronomy 1–3; 31 and Joshua 1.³⁴³ Joshua 1.6 actually repeats almost word for word Deut. 31.7. The order that Joshua gives to the Transjordanian tribes in Josh. 1.12 corresponds to Deut. 3.18–20 (cf. the reference in Josh. 1.13). And Deut. 3.12–22, which reports the conquest of Transjordan, gives orders for the future conquest and relates the investiture of Joshua, makes sense only if this discourse leads on to a sequel such as we find developed in the book of Joshua. Thus, Deuteronomy serves as an introduction, at least partially, to a literary collection that immediately surpasses the limits of the book of Deuteronomy alone.³⁴⁴ The existence of a link—of whatever sort it

340. S. Mittmann, *Deuteronomium 1,1–6,3: Literarkritisch und traditions-geschichtlich untersucht* (BZAW, 139; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1975), especially pp. 177–78.

341. Mittmann, *Deuteronomium*, 1,1–6,3, p. 178.

342. As Fohrer had envisaged in his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*.

343. Cf. the arguments of L. Schmidt, 'Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk', in H.J. Boecker *et al.*, *Altes Testament* (Neukirchener Arbeitsbücher; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983), pp. 101–14 (104). Cf. as well his explanations of the different 'conceptions' of history in DH.

344. We could cite still other cross-references within Deuteronomy that prepare for and presuppose the subsequent books: the construction of a sanctuary on Mt Ebal at the time of the entry into the land (Deut. 11.29) is carried out in Josh. 8.30; the warnings of Deut. 6.12–19 very clearly prepare for the remarks on the subject of the disobedience of the people in Judg. 2.12–23 (cf. Römer, *Israels Väter*, p. 301).

might be—between Deuteronomy and the books that follow it seems to us therefore difficult to question.

7.4. *The Problem of the Localization and Identity of the Deuteronomists*

In the recent publications, the question of the location and identity of the Deuteronomists has often been relegated to footnotes. The response to this question, however, has considerable significance for our way of understanding DH and of visualizing an eventual succession of Dtr redactions. After the publication of Weinfeld's book in 1972, a number of scholars were won over to the hypothesis according to which the first Deuteronomists were courtiers in Jerusalem who had begun their activities in the reign of Ezekiah.³⁴⁵ The idea of a Northern origin of the Deuteronomists, seen as refugees stemming from a prophetic-Levitical milieu,³⁴⁶ lost its attraction. This idea is still defended, however, by Roth, who thinks of Levites located just about everywhere in the country and oriented towards the Jerusalem temple.³⁴⁷

The insistence of Weinfeld and his supporters on the activity of 'scribal circles' has been considered somewhat excessive. If the analogies between Deuteronomy and the Wisdom literature, presented by Weinfeld, are actually indisputable, the fact remains that the Wisdom literature, unlike the books of the DH, is in no way interested in the historical traditions. Albertz and others have therefore proposed thinking instead of a sort of Dtr 'coalition'³⁴⁸ that would have grouped together Jerusalemite priests, prophets and 'laity' (generally high-ranking officials). By using 2 Kings 22-23 and some texts in Jeremiah (especially chs. 28 and 36) as historical documents, Albertz can even

The curses of Deut. 28 prepare for the exile of the people related in 2 Kgs 17 and 25. See besides the many allusions to the crossing of the Jordan in Deuteronomy.

345. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, pp. 148-71; Weinfeld especially bases his argument on the strong influence and assimilation of Assyrian culture in Deuteronomy. See too N. Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology: A Discussion of Theology as a Cultural and Sociological Phenomenon Based on the Example of Deuteronomistic Law', *BTB* 7 (1977), pp. 12-22.

346. Cf. as well E.W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967).

347. Roth, 'Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk/Deuteronomistische Schule', p. 547.

348. Albertz, 'Die Intentionen und Träger des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', pp. 48-49; R.E. Clements, *Deuteronomy* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, pp. 341-42.

name these Deuteronomists: after the failure of the Josianic reform, we find among them the descendants of the priest Hilkiah, prophets like Hananiah (who announces the imminent return of Jeconiah, Jer. 28.1-4), families of royal officials like that of Malchiah and Shemaiah, who are hostile to Jeremiah, as well as that part of the Jewish aristocracy (צָרִיפִים) who supported, before 587, a nationalist and anti-Babylonian policy. After the catastrophe of the exile, this group edits the DH while trying to assume responsibility for the failure of its nationalist policy: they accepted the judgment while maintaining a certain 'nationalist' ideology. The thesis of Albertz is appealing, since it manages to give some depth to the Deuteronomists. However, it raises some questions: if the Deuteronomists were at this time royalists, why does the only text mentioning the king in Deuteronomy (Deut. 17) transform him into a reader of the Torah? If the Deuteronomists taken as a whole were hostile to Jeremiah, why does the book of Jeremiah show traces of a Dtr redaction? Albertz,³⁴⁹ Stipp³⁵⁰ and others speak of a conflict within the Dtr movement. Another question: can we really describe the editors of DH as 'thoroughgoing oppressors' if we take into account the interest that some Dtr texts show in peasant debtors and in the disadvantaged of society (Deut. 15)?³⁵¹ We must think too about an adequate sociological definition of these Deuteronomists. We note a great lack of clarity on this subject in the present discussion. Is it a matter of a 'school', of a 'group', of a 'party', of a 'movement'?³⁵² Perhaps the exegetes should work in a more interdisciplinary way on this point.

If we accept the hypothesis of activity by the Deuteronomists before the exile, there is (almost) no doubt about their localization in Jerusalem. As for the question of the location of the *exilic* Deuteronomists, that is still the object of great debate. Noth and a good number of his students postulated a localization of the Deuteronomists in Palestine,

349. Cf. 'Die Intentionen und Träger des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks'.

350. Stipp, *Jeremia im Parteienstreit*.

351. Cf. in particular Crüsemann, *Die Tora*, pp. 311-14, as well as the remarks of Blum (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, pp. 342-43) with regard to Albertz.

352. Cf. on this subject N. Lohfink, 'Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?', in W. Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'Deuteronomistische Bewegung'* (BBB, 98; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1995), pp. 313-82, ET: 'Was There a Deuteronomistic Movement?', in L.S. Shearing and S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (JSOTSup, 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 36-66.

more precisely at Mizpah (residence of Gedaliah). Their principal argument was that the redaction of a historiography like the DH would presuppose recourse to a great number of documents. Now, access to the documents was easier to imagine in the homeland than in distant Babylon. But this idea, while it still appears in recent authors (for example, in Albertz, Veijola³⁵³), is nevertheless contested more and more (Pohlmann, Blum and others).³⁵⁴ Many texts of DH actually reveal a viewpoint of exiles (for example, the temple as the place in which direction they pray, 1 Kgs 8.33-53; or, in the same text, as already in Deut. 28, the curses announcing the expulsion outside the country). If 2 Kgs 25.21-26 is part of the exilic edition of DH, we do not see how that vision of a total depopulation of the country could have been that of non-exiled Judeans. We definitely have here the trace of a pro-*golah* ideology, of an attitude that appears too in some Dtr texts of Jeremiah. Consequently there are strong presumptions for situating the Deuteronomists among the exiles in Babylon; however, the discussion is not closed.

7.5. The Problem of Sources

The question of sources available to the Dtr redactor(s) is likewise the subject of various hypotheses with regard to the function and genius of the Deuteronomists. Furthermore, the questions of pre-Deuteronomistic sources or documents comes up in a different way for each book. In the limits of this article, we must be content with a brief survey.

7.5.1. Deuteronomy³⁵⁵

7.5.1.1. *Numeruswechsel and Primitive Deuteronomy*. For a long time, Old Testament criticism has considered that the alternation of the

353. Albertz, 'Die Intentionen und Träger des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', p. 49; T. Veijola, *Verheissung in der Krise: Studien zur Literatur und Theologie der Exilszeit anhand des 89. Psalms* (STAT.AASF, 220; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1982), pp. 177-90.

354. Pohlmann, 'Erwägungen zum Schlusskapitel des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks'; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, pp. 339-40; J.A. Soggin, *Introduzione all'Antico Testamento* (Brescia: Paideia, 1987), p. 215; Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, p. 34.

355. For more details, cf. T. Römer, 'The Book of Deuteronomy', in S.L. McKenzie and M.P. Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth* (JSOTSup, 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), pp. 178-212, and *idem*, 'Approches exégétiques du Deutéronome: Brève histoire de

address formulas of Deuteronomy, sometimes in the second person singular, sometimes in the second person plural, constitutes a criterion that makes it possible to determine the stages in the formation of the book.³⁵⁶ In 1962, Minette de Tillesse, who considers himself one of the most faithful continuators of Noth,³⁵⁷ systematically applied this principle to Deuteronomy, maintaining that all the sections of Deuteronomy 5-30 containing plural addresses were due to the Deuteronomist, and that the passages written in the singular went back to the original Deuteronomy that the Dtr would have had at his disposition.³⁵⁸ But quite rapidly, the work of Minette de Tillesse has proved too schematic, and literary criticism, making use of the criterion of the *Numeruswechsel*, produces a multiplicity of Deuteronomistic and Deuteronomistic layers³⁵⁹ escaping all control. What is more, there have been several voices maintaining that this alternation should be explained differently. For Buis and Leclerq, this phenomenon reflects a strategy of oral discourse and is found in other cultures.³⁶⁰ Lohfink interpreted the *Numeruswechsel* as a result of the style of the authors of Deuteronomy.³⁶¹ It actually seems risky to make use of the *Numeruswechsel* as an automatic criterion to reconstruct the pre-Deuteronomistic

la recherche sur le Deutéronome depuis Martin Noth', *RHPR* 75 (1995), pp. 153-75; M.A. O'Brien, 'The Book of Deuteronomy', *CRBS* 3 (1995), pp. 95-128.

356. For the history of the research on the *Numeruswechsel* before Noth, cf. C. Beggs, 'The Significance of the Numeruswechsel in Deuteronomy: The "Pre-History" of the Question', *ETL* 55 (1979), pp. 116-24.

357. Cf. what he writes in the 'supplements' to the Portuguese translation of the *Studien in der Revista Biblica Brasileira* 10 (1993), pp. 229-67.

358. G. Minette de Tillesse, 'Sections "Tu" et Sections "Vous" dans le Deutéronome', *VT* 12 (1962), pp. 29-87; *idem*, 'Martin Noth et la "Redaktionsgeschichte" des livres historiques', in C. Hauret (ed.), *Aux grands carrefours de la révélation et de l'exégèse de l'Ancien Testament* (RechBib, 8; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967), pp. 51-75.

359. Cf. in particular F. García López, 'Analyse littéraire de Deutéronome V-XI', *RB* 84 (1977), pp. 481-522; 85 (1978) pp. 5-49, and Y. Suzuki, *The 'Numeruswechsel' Sections in Deuteronomy* (Ann Arbor, MI; London, 1982); *Linguistic Studies in Deuteronomy* (in Japanese) (Tokyo, 1987); he finds ten different layers in Deuteronomy; cf. the presentation of K.-H. Walkenhorst, 'Neueste Deuteronomiumforschung in Japan', *BZ* 33 (1989), pp. 81-92.

360. P. Buis and J. Leclerq, *Le Deutéronome* (SB; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1963), p. 9.

361. N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11* (AnBib, 20; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1963), pp. 239-58.

Deuteronomy. That however does not mean that *all* the occurrences of the *Numeruswechsel* are to be explained on the basis of stylistic arguments, as Lohfink, Braulik and others maintain.

But let us return to the problem of the primitive Deuteronomy. For many researchers the first edition was written in the time of Ezekiah.³⁶² Others consider as more probable the idea that the original had been produced by supporters of Josiah as a propaganda document for his reform.³⁶³ Even if the link between the book mentioned in 2 Kings 22 and the book of Deuteronomy has remained a near certainty in critical exegesis, the research on this subject since Noth has prompted some doubts. Recently, Eleanore Reuter has questioned this link, arguing that the book of the Josianic reform must be the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20.22–23.33).³⁶⁴ According to her, the original Deuteronomy was written just at the time of the Josianic reform or a little later. But it is difficult to support this thesis owing to the fact that there is no precise relationship connecting Exod. 20.22–23.33 to the account in 2 Kings 22–23,³⁶⁵ a text which, for its part, would clearly make an allusion to Deuteronomy. The real problem is that of the historicity, even the function of 2 Kings 22–23. It has been realized for a long time that the account, in its present form, is due to a Dtr redactor who attempted to endow the Deuteronomistic movement with an origin myth.³⁶⁶ Now, as Diebner and Nauerth have shown, the motif of the discovery of a 'divine' book actually corresponds, in antiquity, to a classical literary strategy whose goal is in general to legitimate changes in the social and religious order.³⁶⁷ Even if a 'reform' was carried out in Josiah's reign

362. For example N. Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology'; M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy* (AB, 5A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1991), pp. 44–54; F. García López, *Le Deutéronome: Une loi prêchée* (Cahiers Evangile, 63; Paris: Cerf, 1988), p. 10.

363. Clements, *Deuteronomy*, p. 71; Y. Suzuki, 'A New Aspect of the Occupation Policy by King Josiah', *AJBI* 18 (1992), pp. 31–61.

364. E. Reuter, *Kultzentralisation: Entstehung und Theologie von Dtn 12* (Athe-näums Monographien, Theologie, BBB, 87; Frankfurt: A. Hain, 1993), pp. 243–58.

365. Cf. N. Lohfink, 'Gibt es eine deuteronomistische Bearbeitung im Bundesbuch?', in Brekelmans and Lust (eds.), *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies*, pp. 91–113.

366. We cannot enter here into the debate on the redactional history of this text; cf. K. Visaticki, *Die Reform des Josija und die religiöse Heterodoxie in Israel* (Dissertationen, Theologische Reihe, 21; St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1987).

367. B.J. Diebner and C. Nauerth, 'Die Inventio des התורה בִּסְפֵר הַכֹּהֲנִים in 2Kön 22.

(and there is no need to doubt it), it is not certain that such a reform had been activated by the discovery of a book. It is more likely that the original Deuteronomy would have been written with the intention of accompanying and legitimating the policy of Josiah.³⁶⁸ However that may be, the reconstruction of an *Ur-Deuteronomium* remains an open question. Recently, Achenbach has analysed Deuteronomy 5–11. He has detected there an impressive number of Deuteronomistic, late Deuteronomistic and post-Deuteronomistic layers,³⁶⁹ which he gives up even counting. In one sense, Achenbach confirms the quite common idea that the original introduction to the Deuteronomistic law begins in Deut. 6.4–5, 10–13. But this text already belongs to the exilic period.³⁷⁰ Finally, there is not, according to him, a pre-exilic introduction to the Deuteronomistic Code in Deut. 12.2–26.15, the code that forms the essential nucleus of the primitive Deuteronomy.³⁷¹ Now, even within this Code, the exegetes discover more and more exilic texts.

7.5.1.2. *The Diachronic Works on the Law Code.* Numerous works have been devoted to the legislative collections from which the Deuteronomistic code was born. Merendino, Seitz, L'Hour and others,³⁷²

Struktur, Intention und Funktion von Auffindungslegenden', *DBAT* 18 (1984), pp. 95–118.

368. Cf. for this opinion A.D.H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: Morgan & Scott, 1981) pp. 102–103, and Reuter, *Kultzentralisation*, p. 258.

369. Achenbach, *Israel zwischen Verheissung und Gebot*. This author has recourse quite often to the *Numeruswechsel* criterion. According to him, the basic text, written in the singular, was reworked with a redaction in the plural before several new redactions in the singular would have taken place.

370. Achenbach thinks that Deut. 6.4–5, 10–13 is more recent than Josh. 24 and older than Josh. 23. See *Israel zwischen Verheissung und Gebot*, pp. 180–82.

371. A consensus in regard to the original Deuteronomy can only be hoped for in an eschatological perspective. Cf. the different reconstructions of Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, p. 48; Preuss, *Deuteronomium*, pp. 49–61; O. Kaiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1984), pp. 134–35.

372. R.P. Merendino, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz: Eine literarkritische, gattungs- und überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Dtn 12–26* (BBB, 31; Bonn: P. Hansen, 1969); G. Seitz, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium* (BWANT, 93, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1971); J. L'Hour, 'Une législation criminelle dans le Deutéronome', *Bib* 44 (1963), pp. 1–28; cf. as well G. Nebeling, 'Die Schichten des deuteronomischen Gesetzeskorpus: Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Dtn 12–26' (Dissertation, Münster, 1970). The

postulated the existence of the following collections: the *tô'ebâ* ('abhorrent') laws (Deut. 16.21–17.1; 18.10–12a; 22.5; 23.18–19b; 25.13–16); the *bi'artâ* ('purging') laws (13.2–6; 17.2–7; 19.16–19; 21.8–21; 22.13–21, 23–27; 24.7), the warfare laws (20; 21.10–14; 23.10–15; 25.17–19), the 'social laws' (15.22–24) and the laws on centralization (12; 14.22–27; 15.19–23; 16.1–15; 17.8–13; 18.1–8; 26.1–11). Very quickly, it becomes clear that some 'collections' (on centralization, war, social issues) were closely connected to Deuteronomistic ideology, which presents difficulties for the idea of a possible pre-Deuteronomistic origin. Even if the possibility of pre-Deuteronomistic laws in Deut. 12.2–26.15 cannot be excluded and remains fairly probable, today's research is clearly more cautious with regard to the existence of ancient collections. We notice therefore a marked tendency to date certain parts of the legislative material in the exilic period. Lohfink, Braulik and others consider that the laws about those in authority (16.18–18.22) as well as the collection in chs. 19–25 come from exilic and postexilic redactions,³⁷³ which considerably reduces the dimensions of the book of Josianic or pre-Josianic law. Most of the prescriptions contained in the Deuteronomistic code can therefore no longer be interpreted as concrete legal measures—that would have had, at a certain point, 'force of law'—but they are understood rather as theoretical and theological postulates, describing the ideal Deuteronomistic society.³⁷⁴ McBride and Crüsemann³⁷⁵ vigorously take issue with this view. For these authors, the law of Deuteronomy is not utopian but reflects the political

existence of independent pre-Dtr collections has already been postulated by Steuernagel. For a history of the research cf. Preuss, *Deuteronomium*, pp. 103–48.

373. N. Lohfink, 'Die Sicherung der Wirksamkeit des Gotteswortes durch das Prinzip der Schriftlichkeit der Tora und durch das Prinzip der Gewaltenteilung nach den Ämtergesetzen des Buches Deuteronomium (Dt 16, 18–18, 22)', in H. Wolter (ed.), *Testimonium Veritati* (Festschrift W. Kempf; Frankfurt: Knecht, 1971), pp. 143–55 = *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur*, I (SBAB, 8; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990), pp. 305–23; G. Braulik, *Die deuteronomischen Gesetze und der Dekalog: Studien zum Aufbau von Deuteronomium 12–26* (SBS, 145; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991). U. Ritterswörden has a more qualified approach, *Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde: Studien zu Dt 16, 1–18, 22* (BBB, 65; Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1987).

374. This was a common interpretation of Deut. 12.2–26.15 at the beginning of the twentieth century.

375. S. McBride, 'Polity of the Covenant People: The Book of Deuteronomy', *Int* 41 (1987), pp. 229–44; Crüsemann, *Die Tora*.

constitution of the landowners who backed the Josianic reform. This debate brings to light a methodological problem affecting the interpretation of the legal texts of the Old Testament. Were they written to serve as a constitution or with a homiletical view? What are the criteria that make it possible to situate them in history?

7.5.1.3. *The Assyrian Influences.* It is Weinfeld³⁷⁶ who, followed by many others, has brought out the influence of Assyrian treaties on the composition of Deuteronomy. Since then, the structure of Deuteronomy has often been described as being a copy of an Assyrian treaty, but that approach as well runs into serious objections and has given rise to criticisms.³⁷⁷ On the one hand, almost all the known Assyrian treaties³⁷⁸ have come down to us in fragmentary conditions, so that it is difficult to draw up a standard model for these texts. On the other hand, the structure proposed for Deuteronomy on the basis of this supposed model is quite superficial and presupposes the book in its Deuteronomistic and exilic form. The original Deuteronomy (6.4–9; 12–26^a; 28–30* [?]) does not really display all the elements that we find in the Assyrian (or other) vassal treaties. But it is clear as well that significant convergences exist between Deuteronomy and the tradition of Near Eastern treaties; we easily recognize there some elements of the terminology proper to vassal treaties. The cursing formulas in Deut. 28.20–57, for example, have such pronounced affinities with the treaties of Esarhaddon³⁷⁹ that there is necessarily a literary influence. We must therefore admit 'that treaty forms and vocabulary have influenced the form, vocabulary and the ideas of the book';³⁸⁰ there is therefore an affinity about which it is

376. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, pp. 59–157.

377. Cf. L. Perliit, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT, 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), in particular pp. 93–101.

378. We have at our disposal recent French and English translation of these treaties: S. Parpola and K. Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths* (State Archives of Assyria, II; Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1988); J. Briand et al., *Traité et serments dans le Proche-Orient Ancien* (Supplement au Cahier Evangile, 81; Paris: Cerf, 1992).

379. Cf. the synopsis of Preuss, *Deuteronomium*, pp. 72–73 and, in a detailed way, H.U. Steymans, *Deuteronomium 28 und die adê zur Thronfolgeregelung Assarhaddons: Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel* (OBO, 145; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

380. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, p. 34.

consequently legitimate to analyse the ideological implications. If the Josianic or even exilic authors of Deuteronomy borrow their rhetoric and their ideology from Assyrian treaties and rethink the Yahwistic religion according to the model of a vassal treaty, they can only do it, as Lohfink has suggested, with a subversive intention:³⁸¹ the suzerain of Israel is not the king of Assyria or of Babylon, but Yhwh, the unique Lord of his people!

7.5.2. *The Book of Joshua*³⁸²

As we have recalled, it was in working on Joshua that Noth came to postulate the existence of DH, particularly after having taken note of the absence of the Pentateuchal sources in this book. The genesis of the book presented itself to him in a quite simple manner. Noth distinguished two parts (chs. 2–12 and 13–22), as well as a Deuteronomistic introduction and conclusion (1; 23[24]). The narrative part in chs. 2–12 was originally for him a Benjaminite collection of conquest accounts, etiological in nature, going back to the premonarchic period. These accounts were edited and adapted for a pan-Israelite perspective by a ninth-century *Sammler* (collector) who introduced Joshua as the principal hero. Four centuries later, the Deuteronomist went back to this collection and reworked it (for example, 8.30-35). Chapters 13–22, which contained documents of the premonarchic and Josianic periods, did not yet form part of the book but were introduced afterwards by an *Ergänzer* (supplementer), just like Joshua 24. The end of the Deuteronomistic edition of the book is found in 21.43-45; 22.1-6 and 23.

7.5.2.1. *The Accounts of the Conquest.* Noth's theory on the formation of Joshua 2–12, still repeated in a good number of commentaries, is no longer the unanimous opinion. It is particularly the idea of a ninth-century collection (Josh. 2–8) that seems suspect. For Rose,³⁸³ these

381. Cf. the stimulating article of Lohfink, 'Culture Shock and Theology'.

382. For more details, cf. B. Peckham, 'The Significance of the Book of Joshua in Noth's Theory of the Deuteronomistic History', in McKenzie and Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions*, pp. 213-34; A.G. Auld, 'Reading Joshua After Kings', in J. Davies et al., *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of J.F.A. Sawyer* (JSOTSup, 195; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 167-81; A.W.H. Curtis, *Joshua* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

383. Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist*.

accounts are explained much better in a context where the territory of Benjamin and of the North is threatened, which is the case after the fall of Samaria in 722. Otoson, while admitting the utilization of ancient material, attributes the edition of these accounts to a Deuteronomist whom he situates in the Josianic period; the book of Joshua would be a programmatic writing in favour of the restoration of the Davidic dynasty under Josiah.³⁸⁴ The Josianic dating of Joshua 2–12, that Lohfink and Knauf³⁸⁵ defend as well, could be corroborated by its numerous parallels with the Assyrian conquest accounts, as has been brought to light by Younger.³⁸⁶ In this context, we may cite too the commentary of Fritz replacing that of Noth in the HAT series.³⁸⁷ Unlike Noth, Fritz considers the whole basic account of Joshua 1–12 as the work of the Deuteronomistic historian. DtrH would have had at his disposal some oral traditions, but only for the story of the spies (Josh. 2), the conquest of Ai (Josh. 8) and the end of the enemy kings at Makedah (Josh. 10). Fritz, however, leaves the question of the dating (Josianic or exilic) open. Van Seters,³⁸⁸ for his part, comes out in favour of an exilic dating not only for the redaction but also for the nucleus of chs. 1–12: he actually regards these conquest accounts as an invention of an exilic Deuteronomist who would have been inspired by Assyrian and Babylonian accounts of conquest. As for Briend,³⁸⁹ he goes back to Noth's tripartite model by carrying out a chronological displacement: the compiler is situated towards the end of the monarchy, while the Deuteronomistic redaction, characterized by 'a rhetoric of conquest', dates from the beginning of the postexilic period. The debate on the dating of these texts reveals some hesitation in regard to their primary purpose: is it a question of propaganda for Josianic expansionism or are we rather in

384. M. Otoson, *Josuaaboken: en programskrift för davidisk restauration* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, I; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991).

385. Lohfink, 'Kerygmata des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes'; E.A. Knauf, *Die Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (NSK-AT, 29; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994), p. 134.

386. K.L. Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts: A Study in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing* (JSOTSup, 98; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

387. Fritz, *Das Buch Josua*.

388. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, pp. 324-31.

389. Cf. his contribution in this volume.

the presence of a parenthesis destined for an audience demoralized and deprived of its country?

What is more, many authors insist on the literary complexity of these accounts. Floss finds in Joshua 2 a pre-Deuteronomistic layer, two Deuteronomistic layers and the interventions of a final redactor.³⁹⁰ As for Joshua 6, we may discern there, according to Schwienhorst, an ancient account, a Jahwist redaction, then DtrH, DtrP, DtrN as well as various post-Deuteronomistic additions.³⁹¹ There doubtless too would have been numerous post-Deuteronomistic interventions in the rest of the book, particularly in the texts on the crossing of the Jordan (3–4) or in the account of the circumcision. According to Van Seters, in these latter texts, we would have a 'P',³⁹² which could signify in some way a return to the idea of a Hexateuch including the book of Joshua, the very idea that Noth had so vigorously contested! Fritz, on the other hand, describes the post-Deuteronomistic elements in these texts as 'various additions' and thus chooses to put up with a certain vagueness.

7.5.2.2. *The Lists.* The position of Noth, for whom the unit Joshua 13–22 did not form part of DH, raises a difficulty. The programmatic text of Joshua 1 (Deuteronomistic) actually sets forth a double programme for Joshua: conquest and distribution of the land. It seems logical therefore that DH would have included texts relating to the dividing up of the country, as Smend and Auld have emphasized.³⁹³ It remains to be seen whether the Deuteronomist was content with 13.1–7 or integrated other material whose origin still has to be made clear.³⁹⁴ A number of

390. J.P. Floss, *Kunden oder Kundschafter? Literaturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung zu Jos 2* (2 vols.; ATSAT 16 and 26; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1982 and 1986).

391. L. Schwienhorst, *Die Eroberung Jerichos: Exegetische Untersuchung zu Josua 6* (SBS, 122; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1986).

392. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, pp. 325–26.

393. Smend, 'Das Gesetz und die Völker', p. 97; A.G. Auld, *Joshua, Moses and the Land. Tetrateuch—Pentateuch—Hexateuch in a Generation since 1938* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1980), pp. 52–71; cf. on the other hand M. Wust, *Untersuchungen zu den siedlungsgeographischen Texten des Alten Testaments. I. Ostjordanland* (Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, B, 9; Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert, 1975), pp. 213–15.

394. It is often said that lists like those of Josh. 14–22 do not invent themselves. This is possibly true, but that does not solve in any way the problem of their origin. Some authors think, following Noth, of documents going back to the pre-monarchic period, while others would see here various documents covering the period from

commentators, having observed that these documents appear in priestly garb (for example 14.1–5; 19.49–51), have gone back to attributing these texts to P (cf. among others, Mowinckel and recently Van Seters), a current option before Noth. Cortese has re-examined the question.³⁹⁵ According to him, the Priestly redaction in Joshua 13–21 is later than P (P^s), but would have integrated older documents, among others an *Urdokument* of the Salomonic period that he even attributes to the 'J' source. Cortese actually tries to reactivate the idea of a Hexateuch, without wishing to question the thesis of a DH. But the question can be asked differently as well: if there really had been a Priestly intervention in Joshua—but not in the subsequent books of the DH—would that indicate that the Priestly school had wanted to separate Joshua from what followed? Or rather that Joshua was conceived first and that it had—in some circles at least, or in some periods—a circulation independent from that of the following books?

7.5.2.3. *The Problem of the Ending of the Book.* The book of Joshua comes to an end with two farewell discourses. For Noth, Joshua 23 belongs to the Deuteronomistic discourse, while Joshua 24, although pre-Deuteronomistic in origin, was added afterwards.³⁹⁶ Joshua 24 was later considered an ancient text that would have preserved the memory of a pre-monarchic assembly at Shechem,³⁹⁷ an opinion still recently defended by Koopmans.³⁹⁸ However Joshua 24, in its present form,

David to Ezekiah. This is the opinion of Z. Kallai (Kleinmann), *Historical Geography of the Bible: The Tribal Territories of Israel* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986) (cf. as well the presentation of the different options in T. Butler, *Joshua* [WBC, 7; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983], pp. 143–44). As for Fritz, he sees in these lists the reflection of 'administrative measures of the royal period, without it being possible to discern yet their causes and effects' (*Das Buch Josua*, p. 8).

395. E. Cortese, *Josua 13–21. Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (OBO, 94; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990).

396. Cf. Noth, *Das Buch Joshua*, p. 139; *ÜSt*, p. 9.

397. Cf. for example, G. Schmitt, *Der Landtag von Sichem* (Arbeiten zur Theologie I.15; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1964).

398. W.T. Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (JSOTSup, 93; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990). Koopmans offers a very complete history of the research on this chapter. He affirms that Josh. 24 'supports...the historical likelihood of the contention that Joshua held an assembly at Shechem to impress upon the Israelites the need to affirm exclusive allegiance to Yahweh' (p. 419).

contains numerous Deuteronomistic themes and terms, which has led the school of Göttingen to attribute Joshua 24 to DtrH and ch. 23 to DtrN.³⁹⁹ But that solution comes up against the fact that Joshua 24 contains as well some non-Deuteronomistic elements (for example the motif of the ancestors beyond the Euphrates and the priestly vocabulary, in vv. 3 and 4 among others).⁴⁰⁰ Furthermore, a close parallel to Joshua 24 is found in Nehemiah 9. It seems quite logical therefore to attribute Joshua 24 to a post-Deuteronomistic author-redactor, as many exegetes at present do.⁴⁰¹ The Deuteronomistic end of Joshua would be found therefore in 23, while 24 (with Judg. 1.1–2.5) would be an attempt to interrupt the Deuteronomistic thread (and, who knows, to make Joshua 1–24 a separate book?).

7.5.3. *The Book of Judges*⁴⁰²

According to Noth, the Deuteronomist had two sources available to construct an age of the Judges: a list of 'Minor Judges', and a collection of heroic legends. Since Jephthah is the only individual to appear in both documents, we understand that the Deuteronomist would have taken the initiative to combine the two sources. It is he, therefore, who in this way transformed into (judges) the charismatic heroes of the heroic legends. The Deuteronomist introduced the period of the Judges with the programmatic considerations of Judg. 2.6–23 and had the ancient cycle preceded by the story of Othniel, a narrative created *ad hoc*. For Noth, the Dtr edition of Judges only consisted of the corpus

399. Cf. Smend, 'Das Gesetz und die Völker', pp. 501–504.

400. Cf. too J. L'Hour, 'L'alliance de Sichem', *RB* 69 (1962), pp. 5–36.

401. J. Van Seters, 'Joshua 24 and the Problem of Tradition in the Old Testament', in W.B. Barrick and J.R. Spencer (eds.), *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G.W. Ahlström* (JSOTSup, 31; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), pp. 139–58; Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*, p. 59; C. Levin, *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologisch-geschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt* (FRLANT, 137; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), pp. 114–15; Römer, *Israels Väter*, pp. 320–30; U. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Richterbuch* (BZAW, 192; Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1990), pp. 69–70; M. Anbar, *Josué et l'alliance de Sichem (Josué 24:1–28)* (BET, 25; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992).

402. For more details, cf. R. Bartelmus, 'Forschung am Richterbuch seit Martin Noth', *ThR* 56 (1991), pp. 221–59; M. O'Brien, 'Judges and the Deuteronomistic History', in McKenzie and Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions*, pp. 235–59.

Judg. 2.6–13.1. Neither the Samson cycle nor the 'shocking chronicle' of chs. 17–21 formed part of it. This material, although ancient, was added later. Here once again, Noth continues to be extremely evasive about the circumstances that could have brought about these additions.

7.5.3.1. *W. Richter and the 'Book of Saviours'*. If we accept Noth's thesis on the formation of the book, it brings up the question of the Deuteronomist's access to the ancient and scattered material just mentioned. Is it not more logical to suppose an intermediate stage? That stage presents itself, according to Richter,⁴⁰³ in the form of an Israelite 'Book of Saviours' (*Retterbuch*), a narrative cycle that dates from the period of Jehu (ninth century) and arises from a strongly anti-monarchical ideology. This book would have included the story of Ehud (3.15–26) the episode of Jael (4.17–22*), the accounts about Gideon (7.11b, 13–21; 8.5–9, 14–21a) and a conclusion in 9.56. It would have been filled out later by a first redactor especially interested in the theme of the 'war of Yhwh' (3.13, 27–29; 4.4a, 6–9, 11, 17b; 6.2b–5, 11b–17, 25–27a, 31b, 32–34; 7.1, 3–11a, 22–25; 8.3–4, 10–14, 22–23, 29, 31; 9.1–7, 16a, 19b–21, 23–24, 41–45, 56–57). Again, before its insertion into the DH, the Book of Saviours would have gone through two Deuteronomistic editions: RD₁, responsible for the narrative outline (in 3.12, 14, 15a, 30; 4.1a, 2–3, 23–24; 5.31; 6.1–2a; 8.28), and RD₂, author of the exemplary narrative of 3.7–11* placed as an opening to the book. It is all finally taken up again in the DH and completed, subsequently, by the post-Deuteronomistic additions. Unlike Noth, Richter thinks that Judges 13–16 formed part of DH. The Deuteronomist would have integrated the story of Samson in order to demonstrate, as he does too at the beginning of Samuel, that the institution of the Judges had to disappear because of the decadence into which it had eventually sunk.

Richter's thesis had enormous success and marginalized other attempts to retrace the pre-Deuteronomistic formation of Judges.⁴⁰⁴ It is

403. W. Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch* (BBB, 18; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1963); *idem*, *Die Bearbeitungen des 'Retterbuches' in der deuteronomischen Epoche* (BBB, 21; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1964).

404. For example, W. Beyerlin, 'Gattung und Herkunft des Rahmens im Richterbuch', in E. Würthwein and O. Kaiser (eds.), *Tradition und Situation: Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie, A. Weiser zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 1–29; M. Weinfeld, 'The Period of the Conquest and of the Judges as Seen by the Earlier and Later Sources', *VT* 17 (1967), pp. 93–113.

adopted in many commentaries, monographs and introductions.⁴⁰⁵ Nevertheless, for some time now, there has no longer been agreement about the idea of a Saviour Collection (*Retterbuch*). Thus, Van Seters rejects any possibility of reconstructing a pre-Deuteronomistic book of Judges.⁴⁰⁶ The most extensive—and the most detailed—attack against the *Retterbuch* has been led by Becker⁴⁰⁷ who finds no evidence in Judges of a pre-Deuteronomistic collection. According to him, the Deuteronomist would only have had at his disposal some scattered material: Ehud (3.16-26*), the Canticle of Deborah (5*), Gideon (6.11a*, 18-24a*, 7.11-16*, 16-22*; 8.5-21*), Abimelech (9.25-41, 50-54; 9.8-15a), a list of five judges (10.1-5; 12.8-15), Jephthah (11.1-11a), as well as a large part of the Samson cycle. This material would have been gathered together by the author of DH, to be completed by the post-Deuteronomistic redactors and by a redactor close to the milieu of the final redaction of the Pentateuch. Becker's position, also adopted by Lindars,⁴⁰⁸ indicates a return to Noth, even a radicalization of the Nothian position. We seem to have come full circle, but the questions raised by Richter and others remain. In our opinion, the best argument for the existence, in one form or another, of a book or a cycle of pre-Deuteronomistic accounts remains the fact that all the episodes of Judges 3-12 are situated in the geographic horizon of the Northern Kingdom. What Judaeon Deuteronomist, whether Josianic or exilic, would have accomplished the amazing feat of ignoring so completely

Weinfeld defends the old idea that J and E are found in Judges. R.G. Boling, *Judges* (AB, 6A; New York: Doubleday, 1975), postulated four stages: (1) composition of independent narrative units that are gathered together in an epic (when?); (2) an edition of a didactic collection of the eighth century; (3) incorporation in the DH in the Josianic period; (4) revision at the time of the exilic edition of DH.

405. For example, J.A. Soggin, *Le livre des Juges* (CAT, 5b; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1987); J. Gray, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Basingstoke: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1986); Mayes, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile*, pp. 58-80; *Judges*, pp. 20-27; O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, pp. 82-98; Smeend, *Die Entstehung des Alien Testaments*, pp. 126-27; G. Fohrer, *Das Alte Testament*, I (3 vols.; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1980), pp. 94-95.

406. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, pp. 343-44.

407. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum*.

408. B. Lindars, *Judges 1-5. A New Translation and Commentary* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995), p. 174.

the familiar setting of the kingdom of Judah, if he was really the author of these accounts?

7.5.3.2. *The Introduction in 1.1-2.5*. There is quite a consensus on the fact that the Deuteronomistic edition of Judges begins with 2.6-10. The sequence of 1.1-2.5 would not have formed part of DH. Does this text contain ancient material preserving the historical memory of an aborted conquest, as has often been thought, following Noth (for example Cortese⁴⁰⁹)? Van Seters attributes this section to 'P',⁴¹⁰ an opinion that goes against the research current in recent years. Younger compared Judges 1 with Assyrian inscriptions and found there the same formal structure and the same aesthetic criteria.⁴¹¹ According to Auld, we have in this section a post-Deuteronomistic construction that would have attempted to correct the Deuteronomistic conquest-ideology and would perhaps be 'contemporaneous with the division of the long Deuteronomistic History into the now familiar separate book'.⁴¹² Judges 1 remains one of those examples whose probably late literary form does not rule out a certain historical relevance (at least in regard to the late entry of cities into the Israelite orbit).

7.5.3.3. *The Heroic Accounts*. We cannot give a detailed account of the discussion concerning the different heroes of Judges 3-16. We will simply recall the most important points. The Canticle of *Deborah* has certainly caused the most ink to flow. Traditionally considered one of the oldest texts of the Old Testament, we meet today all sorts of dating, going from the twelfth century down to the fourth century BCE. Among the most recent authors, Bechmann has proposed dating it toward the end of the monarchy,⁴¹³ but Knauf has advanced an impressive series of arguments for maintaining a relatively ancient date for this poem: he

409. E. Cortese, 'Gios. 21 e Guid. 1 (TM o LXX?) e l' "abottonatura" del "Tetrateuco" con l' "Opera Deuteronomistica"', *RivB* 33 (1985), pp. 375-94.

410. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, pp. 337-40.

411. K.L. Younger, Jr, 'Judges 1 in its Near Eastern Literary Context', in A.R. Millard (ed.), *Faith, Tradition and History: Old Testament Historiography in its Near Eastern Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), pp. 207-27.

412. A.G. Auld, 'Judges 1 and History: A Reconsideration', *VT* 25 (1975), pp. 261-85 (285).

413. U. Bechmann, *Das Deboralied zwischen Geschichte und Fiktion: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Richter 5* (DiTh, 33; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1989), p. 212: '...perhaps under Josiah'.

puts the origin of Judges 5 in the tenth century, in the sphere of influence of Ishbaal.⁴¹⁴ It is therefore very probable that the Deuteronomist had access to this poem. It remains to be determined whether the account in prose was already attached to it. According to de Pury,⁴¹⁵ Judges 3; 4.17-22; 5.24-27 and 6.25-32 have in common the theme of the breaking of social taboos in the name of Yhwh. We would therefore have there a short collection stemming from anti-clan circles and bearers of an exclusivist Yahwism in the Northern kingdom.

The nucleus of the *Gideon* cycle is also considered to be pre-Deuteronomistic, and Auld's thesis for whom the whole of Judges 6-8 is a post-Deuteronomistic composition from the Persian period⁴¹⁶ is not likely to be followed very much.⁴¹⁷ Nevertheless, there is no consensus on the extent of the pre-Deuteronomistic version;⁴¹⁸ did this come from circles hostile to the monarchy as has often been maintained?

Jephthah was the key personage for Noth in the formation of the book. According to Richter,⁴¹⁹ the story of Jephthah did not form part of the initial 'Book of Saviours' (*Retterbuch*), and the different traditions on this ambiguous personage were gathered together by a redactor (*Bearbeiter*) who was a contemporary of the 'Elohist' (eighth-seventh centuries) and were added to the 'Book of Saviours'. The Deuteronomist would have integrated 10.17-12.6 into his work while providing 10.1-16 and 12.7-15 as a framework. Becker on the other hand considers the story of the sacrifice in 11.30-31, 34-40 as post-Deuteronomistic.⁴²⁰

414. E.A. Knauf, in a study to appear; cf. meanwhile *idem*, *Die Umwelt des Alten Testaments*, pp. 229-30. Cf. as well H.-D. Neef, 'Der Stil des Deboraliedes (Ri 5)', *ZAH* 8 (1995), pp. 275-93, who proposes a date about 1025 BCE.

415. A. de Pury, 'Le raid de Gédéon (Juges 6, 25-32) et l'histoire de l'exclusivisme yahviste', in T. Römer (éd.), *Lectio difficilior probabilior? Mélanges offerts à Françoise Smyth-Florentin* (BDBAT, 12, Heidelberg: Wiss.-theol. Seminar, 1991), pp. 173-205.

416. A.G. Auld, 'Gideon: Hacking at the Heart of the Old Testament', *VT* 39 (1989), pp. 257-67.

417. Cf. for example the critical comments of de Pury, 'Le raid de Gédéon', p. 182-83 n. 27.

418. The accounts of Gideon's vocation and the destruction of the altar of Baal are especially discussed.

419. W. Richter, 'Die Überlieferungen um Jephthah. Ri 10, 17-12, 6', *Bib* 47 (1966), pp. 485-556.

420. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum*, p. 221.

The *Samson* cycle certainly underwent an independent transmission before being inserted—by a Deuteronomist or a later editor—into the book of Judges. What explanation can be given for the parallels with the Hercules traditions as pointed out by Bartelmus and others?⁴²¹ Must it be concluded that Judges 13-16 would be a Hellenistic composition? It is conceivable too that Hercules and Samson both go back to a common mythical background from the end of the second millennium.

7.5.3.4. *The List of 10.1-5 and 12.7-15.* There is no doubt that the names of the 'Minor Judges' in Judg. 10.1-5 and 12.7-15 go back originally to a single list. But where does it come from? Is it really a vestige of the pre-monarchic period and what was its function?⁴²² Noth⁴²³ saw in the 'Minor Judges' magistrates or government officials of the Israelite tribal league, but this interpretation is linked up with another hypothesis of Noth, today abandoned, that of the amphictyony. Today, it is not clear what to do with these individuals. Lemche thinks that 'the names appearing in these lists do not belong to historical personalities but refer to some unknown (to us) ancestors' who were probably venerated round their tombs.⁴²⁴ Görg even speaks of a 'fictitious and post-Deuteronomistic tendency' and he considers that we are in the presence of names invented by an author who wanted to stress the duration of the institution.⁴²⁵

7.5.3.5. *The Appendix in 17-21.* These chapters seem to legitimize the monarchy by presenting the period of the Judges as totally abominable. Notwithstanding Noth, Smend's disciples attributed these texts to DtrH

421. R. Bartelmus, *Heroentum in Israel und seiner Umwelt: Eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung zu Gen. 6, 1-4 und verwandten Texten im Alten Testament und in der altorientalischen Literatur* (ATANT, 65; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1979); O. Margalith, 'The Legends of Samson/Hercules', *VT* 37 (1987), pp. 63-70; C. Nauerth, 'Samsons Taten—motivgeschichtlich untersucht', *DBAT* 21 (1985), pp. 94-120.

422. For the various opinions, cf. H.N. Rösel, 'Die "Richter Israels": Rückblick und neuer Ansatz', *BZNF* 25 (1981), pp. 180-203.

423. M. Noth, 'Das Amt des "Richters Israels"', in W. Baumgartner *et al.* (eds.), *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950), pp. 404-17 = *Ges. Studien zum A.T. I* (TB, 39; Munich: Kaiser, 1969), pp. 71-85.

424. N.P. Lemche, 'The Judges—Once More', *BN* 20 (1983), pp. 47-55 (54).
425. M. Görg, *Richter* (NEB, 31; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1993), p. 6; cf. as well pp. 59 and 70-71.

(which they consider pro-monarchic since they attribute the anti-monarchic passages to DtrN).⁴²⁶ There is actually little Dtr terminology in these chapters; and their 'archaic' character has often been referred to by those who see in them ancient traditions. Their historical content is discussed as well. Niemann,⁴²⁷ for example, thinks that it is possible, on the basis of Judges 17–18, to reconstruct the history of the migration of the Danites in the twelfth century. Dohmen and Amit⁴²⁸ see in these chapters instead a polemic against the sanctuaries of Bethel and Dan: this polemic could date from the seventh century (Amit), but it is also in conformity with the spirit of the Deuteronomists (Dohmen). This account, which makes Dan an anti-sanctuary, actually presupposes the Dtr ideology of the cult centralization, for which reason Görg considers Judges 17–18 a late Dtr work.⁴²⁹

Judges 19 is a defence of the monarchy, as is shown by Jüngling⁴³⁰ who proposes at the same time, but perhaps less convincingly, to date it to the period of David. He thus separates Judges 19 from chs. 20–21 that would themselves be Deuteronomistic.⁴³¹ Judges 19–21 can be read as a caricature of the prehistory of Israel,⁴³² but is this caricature directed at the anarchy that preceded the monarchy—in the sense of 19.1; 21.25—or is it being ironical about what happens when a central power tries to impose its law in the villages?

Judges 17–21 interrupts the continuity of DH and in this way occupies a position analogous to that of the appendix of 2 Samuel 21–24 at the end of the books of Samuel. So Noth was probably right to exclude

426. Cf. among others Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie*, passim.

427. H.M. Niemann, *Die Daniten: Studien zur Geschichte eines altisraelitischen Stammes* (FRLANT, 135; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).

428. C. Dohmen, 'Das Heiligtum von Dan: Aspekte religionsgeschichtlicher Darstellung im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk', *BN* 17 (1982), pp. 17–22; Y. Amit, 'Hidden Polemic in the Conquest of Dan: Judges xvii–xviii', *VT* 40 (1990), pp. 4–20.

429. Görg, *Richter*, p. 90.

430. H.W. Jüngling, *Richter 19—ein Plädoyer für das Königtum: Stilkritische Analyse der Tendenzerzählung Ri 19,1-30a; 21,25* (AnBib, 84; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1981).

431. Cf. the critical remarks of Bartelmus, 'Forschung am Richterbuch seit Martin Noth', p. 252 and Preuss, 'DrG', p. 261.

432. Cf. H. Specht, 'Die Abraham-Lot-Erzählung' (Dissertation; Munich, 1983), p. 152.

Judges 17–21 from the first edition of DH, but that does not prejudice in any way the origin of these accounts.

7.5.4. *The Books of Samuel*.⁴³³

1–2 Samuel are the books in DH in which the Dtr redaction is least perceptible. For Noth and the majority of exegetes, this indicates that the Deuteronomist had available already written documents that were taken over in his work just as they were.

7.5.4.1. *The Traditions about Samuel and the History of the Ark.* The history of the traditions about Samuel arose according to Mommer⁴³⁴ in the following way: We can first of all isolate a brief cycle: chs. 1–4³⁵ and 7* recounting the youth and the career of Samuel;⁴³⁵ this account was produced in the ninth/eighth centuries in prophetic circles. Briend is sceptical of such an early date: according to him the primitive account of chs. 1–3 is 'relatively late' and 'presupposes the prophetic experience of the prophets of the 8th century... We can at best date the text to the end of the 8th century'.⁴³⁶ On the other hand there is a certain unanimity in regard to the unobtrusiveness of the Deuteronomistic

433. For more details, cf. P.K. McCarter, Jr, 'The Books of Samuel', in McKenzie and Graham, *The History of Israel's Traditions*, pp. 260–80; W. Dietrich and T. Naumann, *Die Samuelbücher* (EdF, 287; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995).

434. P. Mommer, *Samuel: Geschichte und Überlieferung* (WMANT, 63; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991).

435. This cycle would have had a prehistory too (cf. Mommer, *Samuel*, pp. 13–15). Mommer sets apart the accounts on the youth of Samuel, 1.1–3a, 4–28; 2.19–21a; 3, from an anti-Shiloh account, 1.3b; 2.12–17, 22–25; cf. in the same sense W. Dietrich, *David, Saul und die Propheten: Das Verhältnis von Religion und Politik nach den prophetischen Überlieferungen vom frühesten Königtum in Israel* (BWANT, 122; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1987), pp. 11–13. We cannot summarize the discussion on the Canticle of Anna. P. Mathys considers this text as a post-Deuteronomistic insertion composed *ad hoc* for its present context (*Dichter und Beter: Theologen aus spätalttestamentlicher Zeit* [OBO, 132; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994], pp. 126–28); cf. also R.J. Tournay, 'Le cantique d'Anne: I Samuel II, 1-10', in P. Casseti *et al.*, *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Etudes bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire* (OBO, 38; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), pp. 554–76.

436. J. Briend, *Dieu dans l'Écriture* (LD, 150; Paris: Cerf, 1992), pp. 51–68 (66). This important study is overlooked in the *Erträge der Forschung* of Dietrich and Naumann (*Die Samuelbücher*).

redaction of this collection, a presence perceptible nevertheless in 2.27-36.⁴³⁷

The story of the Ark in 1 Samuel 4-6 and 2 Samuel 6 is traditionally considered an independent document since Samuel's name does not appear. But to the extent that 1 Samuel 4 presupposes the preceding episodes, it is definitely necessary to raise the problem of the beginning of that story. So Miller and Roberts as well as Dietrich imagine the beginning of the story of the Ark in 1 Sam. 1.3b; 2.12-16. 22-25.⁴³⁸ The dating is a subject of discussion too. According to Schicklberger, it is necessary to think of the end of the eighth century,⁴³⁹ the story of the ark presupposing at the same time classical prophecy and the Exodus epic. Smelik places the account in the sixth century and sees in it a parable of the Babylonian exile.⁴⁴⁰ This might have been the function of the Ark story within DH, but was that its first function?⁴⁴¹ We may note too that Gordon expresses doubts about the original independence of this theme.⁴⁴²

7.5.4.2. *Saul and the Birth of the Monarchy.* Due to the influence of Wellhausen and Noth, the pro-monarchic texts in 1 Samuel 8-12 were generally held to be 'ancient', while the critical texts were attributed to the Deuteronomist. Veijola has transferred the tension between the partisans and opponents of the monarchy in 1 Samuel 8-12 to the very interior of the Deuteronomistic school: the texts favourable to the monarchy he attributes to DtrG, and the critical passages, to DtrN!⁴⁴³ This solution to the problem is not unanimously accepted, even by members

437. Cf. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie*, pp. 35-36; Römer, *Israels Väter*, pp. 277-79.

438. P.D. Miller and J.J.M. Roberts, *The Hand of the Lord: A Reassessment of the 'Ark Narrative' of 1 Samuel* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977); Dietrich, *David, Saul und die Propheten*, pp. 78-80.

439. F. Schicklberger, *Die Ladeerzählungen des ersten Samuelbuches: Eine literaturwissenschaftliche und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung* (FzB, 7; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973).

440. K.A.D. Smelik, 'The Ark Narrative Reconsidered', in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *New Avenues in the Study of the Old Testament* (OTS, 25; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989), pp. 128-44. Cf. before that G.W. Ahlström, 'The Travels of the Ark: A Religio-Political Composition', *JNES* 43 (1984), pp. 141-49.

441. Cf. the remarks of Dietrich and Naumann, *Die Samuelbücher*, p. 138.

442. Gordon, *Samuel*, p. 33.

443. Cf. §5.2, esp. p. 66.

of the Göttingen school. Thus Dietrich and Mommer think that they can find in 1 Samuel 7-8; 10.17-27, even in 12, some pre-Deuteronomistic texts that would have formed part of the story of Samuel and of Saul, originating in the Northern Kingdom.⁴⁴⁴ However, authors such as McCarter or Campbell,⁴⁴⁵ who find in 1 Samuel 'prophetic records' dating from the ninth century, are of the opinion that the anti-monarchic material is better explained in an exilic context. That opinion is shared by McKenzie.⁴⁴⁶

The accounts of the tragic reign of Saul produce the same variety in the assessments. There are those who remain fairly optimistic about the possibility of recognizing, behind the present text, an ancient framework favourable to Saul, an account that was later revised by the supporters of David.⁴⁴⁷ And there are those who would only see, behind the memories of the tragic figure of the first king of Israel, a late composition.⁴⁴⁸

7.5.4.3. *The Rise of David.* As we have seen, Rost considered the whole of 1 Samuel 16-2 Samuel 5 as an independent and very ancient historiographical work. Noth sided with this thesis: for him the Deuteronomist had reproduced this ancient story practically just as it is. The difficulty is that the beginning and end of this narrative are not clearly indicated; in addition, the literary unity of the story is perhaps not as incontestable as Rost thought.⁴⁴⁹ Van der Lingen,⁴⁵⁰ for example, recognized two distinct documents within this collection: a document A that he considered a piece of Davidic propaganda (1 Sam. 17-19*; 23-25; 27; 29-30; 2 Sam. 1-5*) and a document B from the North aimed at explaining the inexplicable destiny of Saul (1 Sam. 11-14*; 16-22*; 26; 28; 31). These two documents would have been combined by a Judaeen redactor (R¹) who, at the same time, made of Saul an

444. Dietrich, *David, Saul und die Propheten*; P. Mommer, *Samuel*.

445. P.K. McCarter, Jr, *1 Samuel* (AB, 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980); A.F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)* (CBQMS, 17; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1986).

446. Cf. his contribution to this volume.

447. Cf. Dietrich, *David, Saul und die Propheten*; Mommer, *Samuel*.

448. Foresti, *The Rejection of Saul*; F. Stolz, *Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel* (ZBK.AT, 9; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981), pp. 99-100.

449. For more details, cf. Dietrich and Naumann, *Die Samuelbücher*, pp. 66-70.

450. A. Van der Lingen, *David en Saul in 1 Samuel 16-II Samuel 5: Verhalen in politiek en religie* (Haag: Boekencentrum, 1983).

incompetent and wicked king. A post-Deuteronomistic redactor (R^{III}) would have accentuated the theological interpretations. For Kaiser, who revives an idea of Wellhausen, there is at the root of 1 Samuel 16–2 Samuel 5 a primitive account that dates from the end of the tenth or from the ninth century.⁴⁵¹ There follows a first redaction, still pre-Deuteronomistic, after the fall of Samaria, then the integration of the whole into DH. We note therefore a certain unanimity regarding the relatively early age of the first setting of this story. There are still two questions remaining: is it simply a matter of a piece of pro-Davidic propaganda, and what part of the present form of this text comes from the Deuteronomists?

7.5.4.4. *The Succession of David.*⁴⁵² The relative unanimity concerning the story of the rise of David disappears when we turn our attention to the so-called history of the succession of David. According to Rost, this collection is made up of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20-23; 7.11b, 16; 9–20 and 1 Kings 1–2. Here again, the first question concerns the beginning and end of the work, especially the beginning. No chapter gives a satisfactory introduction to this collection that could be presumed to be independent of its present context. In that case, must we conclude that the original incipit has been lost⁴⁵³ or altered at the time of the insertion of the collection into DH? Another problem is that of the ideology of the story of the succession: for or against David? For or against Solomon? Or then: for David and against Solomon? Or against the monarchy as an institution? Is it a matter of a 'historiography' or of a novelistic epic? Some resort to a diachronic model to account for the multiplicity of aspects. Thus McCarter⁴⁵⁴ supposes a conglomerate of several documents (revolt of Absalom, the story of the Gabaonites, etc.) that would have been gathered together in the Salomonic period, then revised on three occasions (prophetic redaction, Dtr¹, Dtr²). For Langlamet,⁴⁵⁵ the

451. O. Kaiser, 'David und Jonathan: Tradition, Redaktion und Geschichte in I Sam. 16–20. Ein Versuch', *ETL* 66 (1990), pp. 281–96.

452. See now: A. de Pury and T. Römer, *Die sogenannte Thronfolgeggeschichte Davids: Neue Einsichten und Anfragen* (OBO, 176; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

453. Already J. Wellhausen, 'Der Anfang ist nicht erhalten', *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, p. 256.

454. McCarter, Jr, *I Samuel*.

455. Langlamet has developed his hypothesis in numerous articles that appeared between 1976 and 1984 in *RB*. Cf. among others 'Pour ou contre Salomon? La

kernel of the collection is found in a story of Absalom. That story was integrated in the first history of the succession ('S1': 2 Sam. 10–12*; 13–14* (?); 15–20*; 1 Kgs 1–2.35). It is hostile to the usurpation of the throne by Solomon and was edited even during the latter's reign. The same author composed, some years later, a second history of the succession ('S2'), to reinforce the negative image of Solomon. Next comes 'S3', from the hand of a Jerusalem priest, who, for his part, attempts in the seventh century a theological legitimation of Solomon, builder of the Temple. The opposition manifesto becomes a piece of royal propaganda! The collection is later lightly retouched by Dtr redactors. The works of Würthwein and Veijola seem to confirm that the first version of the history of the succession gives a very negative image of David and Solomon. All the texts legitimating the Davidic dynasty would have to be considered Dtr creations. But when must this first version be dated? In the same period as the supposed events? This thesis is being contested more and more. Thus Gunn, following Whybray, Ackroyd and others,⁴⁵⁶ considers 2 Samuel 7–21 not as historiography but as a romance, 'a story told for the purpose of serious entertainment',⁴⁵⁷ written centuries after the birth of the Israelite monarchy, and resembling in some way the royal histories of Shakespeare. Kaiser thinks of a redaction between the end of the eighth and the sixth century.⁴⁵⁸

It is most probably Van Seters who has attempted to shake up most radically the traditional view of things. For him, it is simply impossible that the Deuteronomist, who made use of David, in Kings, as the model for the evaluation of all his successors, could report stories so little flattering of David as that, for example, of the murder of Uriah. He deduces from this that the Court History of David (2 Samuel 2–4; 9–20; 1 Kings 1–2) must be a post-Deuteronomistic insertion that never had an independent existence, and he estimates that this history could not

rédaction prosalomoniennne de IRois I–II', *RB* 83 (1976), pp. 321–79, 481–528; 'David, fils de Jessé: Une édition prédeutéronomiste de l'Histoire de la succession', *RB* 89 (1982), pp. 5–47.

456. R.N. Whybray, *The Succession Narrative: A Study of II Samuel 9–20; I Kings 1 and 2* (SBT, 2.9; London: SCM Press, 1968); P.R. Ackroyd, 'The Succession Narrative (so-called)', *Int* 35 (1981), pp. 383–96; O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 187.

457. D.M. Gunn, *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation* (JSOTSup, 6; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978), p. 62.

458. O. Kaiser, 'Beobachtungen zur sogenannten Thronnachfolgerzählung', *ETL* 64 (1988), pp. 5–20.

have been written before 550, all the more so since 'the events may all be imaginary'.⁴⁵⁹ This 'court history' would have been inserted into DH in order to counter any royal ideology and, at the end of the exile, the first messianic tendencies that might crystallize round the figure of David. For Van Seters, DH went directly from 2 Samuel 8 (with a note about the birth of Solomon?) to 1 Kgs 2.1-4, 10-12, 46b. This hypothesis of Van Seters, appealing because of its radicality and efficacy—it resolves the problem of coherence by doing away with the contentious texts!—raises just as many grave difficulties, and has been met with much scepticism.

7.5.5. *The Books of Kings*⁴⁶⁰

According to Noth, the Deuteronomist had available several sources for recording the history of Solomon⁴⁶¹ and that of the two kingdoms: particularly royal annals, various lists, as well as traditional accounts, such as those of Elijah and Elisha, and so on. In his commentary on 1 Kings 1-16, which appeared in 1968,⁴⁶² Noth makes clear that the link between the history of the succession and the history of Solomon already existed before the intervention of the Deuteronomist. The latter nevertheless remains for him the real creator of the book(s) of Kings, using his sources selectively and with great freedom. It is the Deuteronomist who, according to Noth, created the framework that introduces and concludes each reign and as a result gives its structure to the book. Many exegetes have attempted, however, to give more weight to the sources.

7.5.5.1. *The Reign of Solomon.* Görg has interpreted the history of Solomon according to the Egyptian model of 'royal short stories' (*Königsnovelle*).⁴⁶³ The primitive account in 1 Kings 3-11 could be quite old,

459. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, p. 287.

460. Cf. too S.L. McKenzie, 'The Books of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History', in McKenzie and Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions*, pp. 281-307 and E. Noort, 'Omgaan met Koningen: Tendenzen in de Exegetische Literatuur', *GThT* 88 (1988), pp. 66-81.

461. We may recall that Noth, following Rost, considers 1 Kgs 1-2 as the conclusion of the history of the Davidic succession.

462. M. Noth, *1 Könige 1-16* (BK, 9.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968).

463. M. Görg, *Gott-König-Reden in Israel und Ägypten* (BWANT, 105; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1975).

written to glorify the reign of Solomon. Helen Kenik supports the idea of a pre-Deuteronomistic *Königsnovelle*; she envisages as well oral traditions that would have been available to the Deuteronomist, but insists, however, on the importance of the Dtr redaction. For her, 1 Kgs 3.4-15, an account in which many researchers find a pre-Dtr kernel, was entirely composed by the Deuteronomist to prepare for the accounts of the two exemplary kings, Hezekiah and Josiah.⁴⁶⁴ Wälchli as well thinks of the possibility to reconstruct a pre-Deuteronomistic history of Solomon, put into writing in the period of Hezekiah.⁴⁶⁵ It is difficult therefore to use 1 Kings 3-11 for the historical reconstruction of the reign of Solomon. Likewise, Knauf insists on the fact that the description of the Solomonic empire is modeled on that of Assyria.⁴⁶⁶ The precise reconstruction of an eventual pre-Deuteronomistic Solomonic history turns out to be a difficult undertaking.

7.5.5.2. *The Accounts of the Reigns from Solomon to Josiah.* In the context of this study, it is impossible to discuss the sources for each reign. It is commonly admitted that the Deuteronomist would have made use of annals about these reigns, but there is debate over his fidelity to his sources. We will make do here with the mention of a few accounts of exemplary reigns.

Great confidence in literary criticism enables Minokami⁴⁶⁷ to reconstruct almost to the half-verse, the primitive version on Jehu's reign: 2 Kgs 9.1-6*, 10b-12ba, 13, 16aa, 17-21ba*, 22aba, 23a, 24, 30, 35; 10.1baβ*, 2-3, 7-9, 12a*. This account, contemporaneous with the events, would have been written to justify Jehu's coup. But this coup

464. H.A. Kenik, *Design for Kingship: The Deuteronomistic Narrative Technique in 1 Kings 3:4-15* (SBLDS, 69; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); cf. as well D.M. Carr, *From D to Q: A Study of Early Jewish Interpretations of Solomon's Dream at Gibeon* (SBLMS, 44; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); R.E. Clements, 'Solomon and the Origins of Wisdom in Israel', *PRSt* 15 (1988), pp. 23-35.

465. S.H. Wälchli, *Der weise König Salomo: Eine Studie zu den Erzählungen von der Weisheit Salomos in ihrem alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Kontext* (BWANT, 141; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1999).

466. E.A. Knauf, 'Das zehnte Jahrhundert: Ein Kapitel Vorgeschichte Israels', in *Heidel-Berger-Apokryphen* (Festschrift K. Berger; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1990), pp. 156-61.

467. Y. Minokami, *Die Revolution des Jehu* (GTA, 38; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989); for a summary in French, cf. the review of T. Römer in *ETR* 65 (1990), pp. 435-36.

did not have religious, anti-Baal motivations: this vision of events is the work of many Dtr and post-Dtr redactions that Minokami tries hard to delimit. His reconstruction seems to be somewhat arbitrary, as is shown in the analysis of Barré, for whom the basic account already demanded the exclusive veneration of Yhwh.⁴⁶⁸

We see similar hesitation about the reign and fall of Athaliah, 2 Kings 11–12.⁴⁶⁹ While authors such as Timm have some confidence in the historicity of the sources used by the Deuteronomist, Levin sees in 2 Kings 11–12 a radical reinterpretation of the facts due to Dtr and post-Dtr redactors.⁴⁷⁰

2 Kings 18–20, the account of the reign of Hezekiah, has been extensively analyzed and commented on.⁴⁷¹ Following Stade,⁴⁷² three pre-Dtr sources are distinguished: some annals and two accounts of the liberation of Jerusalem: B₁ (18.17–19, 9a, 36–37*) and B₂ (19.9b–36*). This distribution is met in Gonçalves, Spieckermann and Camp.⁴⁷³ For these authors, 18.13b–16 contains a reliable account of Sennacherib's expedition. As for the reference to Hezekiah's reform, Camp considers it first of all a construction of various Dtr redactors. The ancient sources (18.4, 7–8*; 20.12a, 13) show that it would amount to some symbolic actions of an anti-Assyrian character. The classical dating of the three sources of 2 Kings 18–20 has been abandoned by Hardmeier and Ruprecht. For them, the first version would have been written in 588, on the

468. L.M. Barré, *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion: The Narrative Artistry and Political Intentions of 2 Kings 9–11* (CBQMS, 20; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1988).

469. Cf. L.S. Shearing, 'Models, Monarchs and Misconceptions: Athaliah and Joash of Judah' (PhD dissertation, Emory University, 1992).

470. S. Timm, *Die Dynastie Omri: Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Israels im 9. Jahrhundert vor Christus* (FRLANT, 124; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982); C. Levin, *Der Sturz der Königin Athalia: Ein Kapitel zur Geschichte Judas im 9. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (SBS, 105; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1982).

471. Preuss, 'DtrG', p. 380, thinks that these chapters occupy a key position in the present debate on DH.

472. B. Stade, 'Anmerkungen zu 2 K6. 15–21', ZAW 6 (1886), pp. 156–89.

473. F.C. Gonçalves, *L'expédition de Sennachérib en Palestine dans la littérature hébraïque ancienne* (EBib NS, 7; Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut orientaliste de l'Université catholique de Louvain, 1986); Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit*; L. Camp, *Hiskija und Hiskijabald: Analyse und Interpretation von 2 Kön 18–20* (MTA, 9; Altenberge: Telos, 1990).

eve of the fall of Jerusalem. The author would have recounted the events of 701 in order to encourage its addressees, in despair because of the Babylonian threat.⁴⁷⁴ This account (according to Ruprecht: 2 Kgs 18.13, 17–19.9a, 36–37 + 20.1–18) would have circulated independently at first before being integrated into DH. Ruprecht envisages as well some additions in the postexilic period. If this new approach were to prevail, it would mean that the first account on Hezekiah would be more or less contemporaneous with the beginning of the Dtr school.

The interpretation of the account of the reign of Josiah varies according to the dating of the first edition of DH.⁴⁷⁵ If the latter is situated in the Josianic period, 2 Kings 22–23 is due to the Deuteronomists and constitutes the conclusion of their work; if an exilic date for DH is maintained, the question of a pre-Dtr source for 2 Kings 22–23 must be considered. It is impossible to summarize the countless studies devoted to this subject.⁴⁷⁶ Numerous authors find written sources in 2 Kings 22–23 from the time of Josiah.⁴⁷⁷ Thus, Lohfink finds at the base of this text a 'short historical account' (*historische Kurzgeschichte*), comparable to Jeremiah 26 and 36, that preserved reliable historical information.⁴⁷⁸

474. C. Hardmeier, *Prophetie im Streit vor dem Untergang Judas. Erzählkommunikative Studien zur Entstehungssituation der Jesaja- und Jeremiaerzählungen in II Reg 18–20 und Jer 37–40* (BZAW, 187; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990); E. Ruprecht, 'Die ursprüngliche Komposition der Hiskija-Jesaja-Erzählungen und ihre Umstrukturierung durch den Verfasser des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes', ZTK 87 (1990), pp. 33–66.

475. For further details, cf. above §5.

476. For a recent bibliography, cf. Preuss, 'DtrG', p. 246–50 and McKenzie, 'The Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History', pp. 294–95 nn. 2 and 3. We can add to this: H. Niehr, 'Die Reform des Joschija: Methodische, historische und religionsgeschichtliche Aspekte', in Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'*, pp. 33–54; C. Uehlinger, 'Gab es eine joschijanische Kulturreform? Plädoyer für ein begründetes Minimum', in W. Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'*, pp. 57–89; G.G. Dever, 'The Silence of the Text: An Archaeological Commentary on 2 Kings 23', in M.D. Coogan et al. (eds.), *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays in Honor of Philip J. King* (Louisville, KY: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1994), pp. 143–68; Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*.

477. For example, W. Dietrich, 'Josia und das Gesetzbuch (2 Reg. xxxij)', VT 27 (1977), pp. 13–35; M. Rose, 'Bemerkungen zum historischen Fundament des Josiabildes in II Reg', ZAW 89 (1977), pp. 50–63.

478. N. Lohfink, 'The Cult Reform of Josiah of Judah: 2 Kings 22–23 as a Source for the History of Israelite Religion', in P.D. Miller et al. (eds.), *Ancient*

However, many exegetes have emphasized the 'ideal' and constructed character of the account of the Josianic reform.⁴⁷⁹ Thus, the motif of the discovered book is a widespread literary motif in the ancient Near East.⁴⁸⁰ We have first of all then in 2 Kings 22–23 the 'origin story' of the Deuteronomistic movement,⁴⁸¹ which necessitates great prudence in utilizing this text for a reconstruction of the historical reign of Josiah.

7.5.5.3. *The Prophetic Accounts.* Following Noth, the accounts about Elijah and Elisha in particular were considered to be traditional material integrated by the Deuteronomist into his work. Thus, A. Campbell proposes the reconstruction of a *prophetic record*, that would contain the story of Samuel, the narratives about Elijah and Elisha and would conclude with the revolt of Jehu. This event provides him with an argument on dating.⁴⁸² The reconstruction of such a document going back to the ninth century BCE does not, however, lead to general agreement. Many works have emphasized the late character of some of the prophetic accounts in Kings. Schmitt sees a very complicated redactional history for the Elisha cycle. According to him, the greatest part of the tradition on Elisha was only inserted into Kings after the Dtr edition. In DH, only the account of Jehu's revolt (2 Kings 9–10) alludes to Elisha.⁴⁸³ This thesis was confirmed, despite some differences in detail, by the analysis of Stipp.⁴⁸⁴ Rofé insists on the legendary character of the

Israélite Religion: Essays in Honor of F.M. Cross (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), pp. 459–75.

479. For example, Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen*, pp. 169–203; C. Levin, 'Joschija im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk', ZAW 96 (1984), pp. 351–71. C. Minette de Tillesse, 'Joiqim, repoussoir du "Pieux" Josiah: Parallélismes entre II Reg 22 et Jer 36', ZAW 105 (1993), pp. 352–76.

480. Diebner and Nauerth, 'Die Inventio des ספר הברכה in 2Kön 22'; Römer, 'Transformations in Deuteronomistic and Biblical Historiography'.

481. Cf. J.P. Sonnet, 'Le livre "trouvé", 2 Rois 22 dans sa finalité narrative', NRT 116 (1994), pp. 836–61; cf. too the contribution of F. Smyth in the present volume.

482. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*. He is followed by O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic Hypothesis*. For a mostly historical reading of the texts on Elisha, cf. R.D. Moore, *God Saves: Lessons from the Elisha Stories* (JSOTSup, 95; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), and A. Lemaire, 'Joas, roi d'Israël et la première rédaction du cycle d'Elisée', in Brekelmans and Lust (eds.), *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies*, pp. 245–54.

483. H.C. Schmitt, *Elisa: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur vorklassischen nordisraelitischen Prophetie* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972).

484. Stipp, *Elisha—Propheten—Gottesmänner: Die Kompositionsgeschichte*

accounts on Elijah and Elisha and the anonymous prophet in 1 Kings 13. These accounts, which he considers late, are comparable to the legends of the saints in Christianity.⁴⁸⁵ McKenzie, in his work on the book of Kings, reaches the conclusion that almost all the prophetic accounts contained in 1 Kings 13 and 2 Kings 13 are post-Deuteronomistic insertions.⁴⁸⁶ That means that the Deuteronomistic history of the monarchy was shorter than commonly supposed and that the first Deuteronomist was interested in the prophets only insofar as they transmitted the divine word. If the prophetic cycles were only added afterwards, we should reconsider the link between prophecy and Deuteronomism.⁴⁸⁷

7.5.5.4. *The Problem of a Pre-Deuteronomistic Edition of Kings.* In analyzing the stereotypical appraisals of the different kings, H. Weippert reached the conclusion that these formulas indicate that three redactors were involved, the oldest of whom would be from the period of Hezekiah.⁴⁸⁸ Other exegetes have tried to go back even earlier in the reconstruction of a pre-Deuteronomistic book of Kings. Lemaire proposes a first composition in the period of Jehoshaphat about 850. This book would have been made up of the history of David and Solomon, then the history of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel up to their reconciliation (cf. 1 Kgs 22.45).⁴⁸⁹ The analyses of Weippert and of

des Elisazkyklus und verwandter Texte, rekonstruiert auf der Basis von Text- und Literarkritik zu 1 Kön 20. 22 und 2 Kön 2–7 (ATSAT, 24; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1987).

485. A. Rofé, *The Prophetic Stories: The Narratives about the Prophets in the Hebrew Bible. Their Literary Types and History* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988); *idem*, 'The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and the Message of the Story', VT 28 (1988), pp. 89–104.

486. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*; cf. particularly pp. 80–100.

487. According to McKenzie, these accounts were inserted 'essentially as a group' (*The Trouble with Kings*, p. 99 n. 24). He does not specify, however, whether that insertion was made in the setting of a redaction in a Deuteronomistic style (for example, 'DtrP') or if it was a matter of a redaction that can no longer be characterized as Deuteronomistic.

488. H. Weippert, 'Die "deuteronomistischen" Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher', Bib 53 (1972), pp. 301–39; cf. as well W.B. Barrick, 'On the "Removal of the "High" Places" in 1–2 Kings', Bib 55 (1974), pp. 257–59.

489. A. Lemaire, 'Vers l'histoire de la rédaction des livres des Rois', ZAW 98 (1986), pp. 221–36; cf. as well *idem*, 'Joas, roi d'Israël et la première rédaction du cycle d'Elisée'. We should note in passing that the reference to Provan in this last

Lemaire depend on many exegetical and historical presuppositions.⁴⁹⁰ Most exegetes do not actually venture into the reconstruction of a pre-Deuteronomistic edition of the book of Kings, even if such a possibility is not definitely excluded.

8. Summary and Perspectives

Research on DH, even on Deuteronomism in general, finds itself today in a paradoxical situation. At first sight, we get the impression that the 'Deuteronomistic fact' is well established. But after a closer look, it turns out that the definitions of DH are legion and not always compatible with one another. How can we define what is Deuteronomic, Deuteronomistic and what is not?⁴⁹¹ We must doubtless combine diachronic, stylistic and ideological criteria.⁴⁹² But defining the ideology of a work is a perhaps rash undertaking. Let us then begin our summary with this question.

8.1. Ideology and Theology

To characterize the theology or ideology of the Deuteronomistic work⁴⁹³ depends at least partially on diachronic options. If we accept the existence of a first edition of DH in the period of Josiah, that work very likely displays a 'triumphalist' vision prompted by a promising international situation and the political energy of this monarch. If we consider on the contrary that the first edition of DH dates from the exilic period, the work should then be considered a theodicy.

What is surprising in the whole debate is that the same work could be

article is wrong, since the latter is in no way defending an edition of the book of Kings in the time of Hezekiah.

490. Lemaire's argumentation is circular. He reconstructs the history of Israel and Judah from the book of Kings and then uses this reconstruction to situate in it the different stages of the pre-Deuteronomistic edition of Kings. For a critique of the theses of H. Weippert, cf. E. Cortese, 'Lo schema deuteronomistico per i re di Giuda e d'Israele', *Bib* 56 (1975), pp. 37-52 and Römer, *Israels Väter*, pp. 282-85.

491. Cf. R. Coggins, 'What does "Deuteronomistic" Mean?', in Davies (ed.), *Words Remembered*, pp. 135-48.

492. Cf. A.F. Campbell, 'Martin Noth and the Deuteronomistic History', in McKenzie and Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions*, pp. 31-62 (55).

493. Cf. as well the articles of A.D.H. Mayes and of M. Rose in the present volume.

perceived in two such opposite ways. There is no doubt that the two readings find some points for support in the text itself. The whole question, consequently, is to know how to explain the juxtaposition of these two aspects. Would there have been a transformation of a piece of propaganda into an act of repentance and a theodicy?

The question of future prospects presented in an exilic edition of DH remains very much under discussion. Can we really actually imagine that such a historiography would have been composed in order to explain Judah's national catastrophe? Many authors consider this Nothian hypothesis improbable.

On the basis of texts like Deut. 4.30 or 1 Kgs 8.46-50, it has often been claimed that the hope of a restoration was not foreign to the Dtr programme. Nevertheless, as these texts seem to belong to a late phase of the redaction (Dtr_r or Dtr_N), the question remains open for the first exilic edition. The conclusion of DH in 2 Kings 25 recounting the restoration of Jehoiachin to favour at the Babylonian court plays a preponderant role in the discussion of the intention of the work. Many exegetes see in it the more or less discreet hope of an imminent restoration of Israel.⁴⁹⁴ Nevertheless, it seems difficult to define the intention of a work only on the basis of its conclusion, all the more so since 2 Kgs 25.27-30 probably does not constitute the original conclusion of the exilic edition of DH. We must wonder too about the important role played by the references to the exodus within DH. Do these references to the tradition of the people liberated by Yhwh imply the hope of a new exodus, or is it a matter of merely showing that the people and its heads were incapable of responding to this original salvific act to which Israel owes its birth?

In our opinion, the question is not so much of knowing whether it is hope or rather despair that determines the future prospects of DH. What seems to us more important is to take the measure of the *kairos* (providential moment) of DH—or of the *kairoi*, since there were doubtless several of them. Whether the beginning of the work is situated in the Josianic period or not, quite obviously the fateful hour (*Sternstunde*) of the DH is found in the span of time covering the collapse of the kingdom of Judah, the destruction of the Temple and the exile of the Judeans. These are the events from which the history must be con-

494. Dietrich, *Prophezie und Geschichte*, p. 142; C. Begg, 'The Significance of Jehoiakim's Release: A New Proposal', *JOTF* 36 (1986), pp. 52-53; Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, p. 123.

templated, interpreted, 'constructed'! It is curious that these key events occupy only a marginal and almost negligible place in the work: in the great DH, the account of the fall of Jerusalem does not even fill a chapter. (Imagine how much different things would have been, if it were Flavius Josephus who had been the chronicler!) From this pivotal event onwards, it is therefore no longer the isolated event or the episode, that interests those in charge of DH. They are well aware that it is not a particular strategic decision, a specific act of bravery, or some chance in circumstance that could change the course of events, and it is therefore unnecessary to linger over details. What is of interest to them is that which, in our century, Fernand Braudel has called the 'long duration', the slow, long-lasting, seemingly at times inexorable evolutions: for Braudel, the history of spaces, of commercial routes, of mentalities; for DH, the history of Yhwh and of Israel. What happened in 587—what for the Deuteronomist or the Deuteronomists had just happened—that has been brewing for centuries, and almost since the very beginnings. Such, in spite of their varying positions, is their common conviction.

It is well known, and has often been said, that catastrophe—or the threat of catastrophe—sharpens the perception and provides a stimulus: it is necessary to preserve what has taken place, to recall what is in danger of being forgotten, to preserve what is on the way to foundering. It is at the moment when a dialect is dying that they compose its dictionary, it is once a community disappears that they set out to write its history.⁴⁹⁵ The biblical historiography, as it has come down to us, is born of this catastrophe and lives from the crisis that follows.⁴⁹⁶ But it is precisely then that the choice of a new identity is expressed through the choice for its myths of origin.

Therefore, what are the myths of origin, what are the traditions from

495. Cf. André Chouraqui writing the history of the Jewish communities of North Africa.

496. Research in historical sociology interprets the apparition of descriptive modern historiography as the response of intellectual circles facing the crises provoked by the French or the Industrial Revolutions. Cf. A. Steil, *Krisensemantik: Wissenssoziologische Untersuchungen zu einem Topos moderner Zeiterfahrung* (Opladen: Leske & Budrich, 1993). According to Steil, these intellectuals are reacting to the disappearance of the ancient order, precisely by 'doing history'. The fact of objectivizing the events allows them to distance themselves from them. Cf. too T. Römer, 'L'Ancien Testament—une littérature de crise', *RTP* 127 (1995), pp. 321-38.

which DH draws its inspiration? The Dtr partiality for the exodus has often been observed. According to Van Seters and Römer, the exilic edition of the DH contains no reference to the patriarchal tradition.⁴⁹⁷ It seems that the Deuteronomist would have deliberately chosen to ignore the patriarchs since the 'good' ancestors are not there, and Israel has nothing to expect from them. The 'fathers' or the ancestors so often mentioned in DH, and especially in Deuteronomy, would designate originally the generations in contact with Egypt. These generations constitute an Israel that responded to an appeal and lived up to (or, by its sins, did not live up to) its vocation. If this thesis—which has been very much contested⁴⁹⁸—were confirmed, it would mean that the Dtr ideology is constructed in opposition to a clannish ideology that, for its part, relies first of all on the tradition of the Patriarchs, Abraham to Jacob.⁴⁹⁹ To the 'genealogical' Israel, DH opposes a 'vocational' Israel.

This choice is not simply 'inscribed in the facts'. We can actually note that the books of Chronicles only very rarely allude to the exodus and present, according to Sara Japhet, a clannish and autochthonous Israel.⁵⁰⁰ On this point, a comparison of DH with the Chronicler's historiography would probably open up interesting perspectives, especially since Japhet has shown the fundamentally 'optimistic' character of the ideology of the Chronicles.⁵⁰¹ However that may be, the file on the relation between Samuel / Kings and Chronicles deserves to be taken up

497. J. Van Seters, 'Confessional Reformulation in the Exilic Period', *VT* 22 (1972), pp. 448-59; *idem*, *Prologue to History*, pp. 227-45; Römer, *Israels Väter*, passim.

498. Cf. in particular N. Lohfink, *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium: Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer* (OBO, 111; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991); L. Schmidt, 'Väterverheissungen und Pentateuchfrage', *ZAW* 104 (1991), pp. 1-27.

499. Cf. on this subject A. de Pury, 'Le cycle de Jacob comme légende autonome des origines d'Israël', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Leuven* (VTSup, 43; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), pp. 78-96; *idem*, 'Las dos leyendas sobre el origen de Israel (Jacob y Moisés) y la elaboración del Pentateuco', *EstBib* 52 (1994), pp. 95-131.

500. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher* (HAT, 21; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955), p. ix; S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (BEAT, 9; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989), pp. 379-86; P. Abadie, 'La figure de David dans les livres des Chroniques: De la figure historique à la figure symbolique. Contribution à l'étude de l'historiographie juive à l'époque postexilique' (Dissertation, Institut Catholique & Sorbonne, 1990), pp. 45-59.

501. Cf. her contribution in this volume.

again, in particular after the suggestion of Auld who considers that the two collections are almost contemporaneous and depend on a common source.⁵⁰²

8.2. *DH and Historiography*

On all sides we hear about the desire to see the very term 'historiography' defined more closely. It is especially Van Seters⁵⁰³ who has compared the Deuteronomists with historians of the Greek world. On the other hand, Thompson⁵⁰⁴ has sharply criticized the comparison of Hellenistic historiography and biblical 'historiography', since, according to him, the latter entails nothing like an inquiry on historical facts. It is obvious that Van Seters proposes an entirely different definition of the concept of historiography: this concept will have to be refined and broadened in comparison with the systems of historicity of Mesopotamia, of Egypt and of Greece.⁵⁰⁵

Any historiographical enterprise implies at the same time a search for the past, therefore a certain observation of historical reality, and an interpretation of this past in function of the present, therefore a certain ideology. The 'reading' of the past goes together with the 'construction' (or the reconstruction) of the past. Noth has admirably perceived this, not only in his study of biblical historiography, but in his scientific approach, an approach as reader and builder at the same time. This is why, to our way of thinking, it is wrong to become obsessed with the antagonism between ideology and history. As DH has shown us, all through our journey, historiography is always ideological, but ideology always remains in turn rooted in history.

8.3. *What is the Future of DH?*

At the present time, the majority of scholars continue to work with the DH model. Of course, as we have seen several times, the term DH can be understood in very diverse ways. Nevertheless, all those that are

502. Auld, *Kings without Privilege*.

503. Van Seters, *In Search of History*. Noth, *ÜSt*, p. 12, too makes a remark going in this direction.

504. T.L. Thompson, 'Israelite Historiography', *ABD* III, pp. 206-12.

505. Cf. in this volume the contributions of M. Detienne and of J.-J. Glassner.

based on the Nothian hypothesis agree on the fact that there is a literary plan that unites the books from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings. It is all the same not astonishing that in the context of the destructuring that today affects the social sciences, the existence of a DH is questioned. This questioning amounts to a denial of the compositional unity on which Noth had especially insisted. If we imagine, for example, the process of the formation of the historical books and of Deuteronomy as a single process of gathering together, starting from the book of Kings, how in that case can we explain the presence of a system of Deuteronomistic cross-references that subdivides the history of Israel differently than the present books?⁵⁰⁶ These interrelations really exist and if we want to leave aside the DH hypothesis, it is in that case necessary to find another explanatory model.

With that established, perhaps the Nothian thesis should be radically modified. The question of the beginning of DH is far from being settled. The recent discussion on the Pentateuch has brought out the importance of one or of several Deuteronomistic-type redactions in Genesis-Numbers. The break between Numbers and Deuteronomy is therefore much less clear-cut than it appears in the current presentations of DH. Must we therefore envisage instead a great Deuteronomistic history going from Genesis or Exodus as far as the books of Kings? But then what would be the status of Deuteronomy within this collection? If DH had combined the Pentateuch and the historical books, how can we explain the fact that many of the narrative traditions of Exodus and of Numbers are repeated in Deuteronomy? Deuteronomistic research should perhaps take up the analysis of Deuteronomy from this angle. It is not enough to postulate ten or so Deuteronomistic layers in Deuteronomy without asking about the presence or absence of these same layers in the books that surround Deuteronomy.

506. For the Deuteronomists, the period of the Judges only ended in 1 Sam. 12; next comes the period of the beginnings of the monarchy that is concluded with Solomon's discourse in 1 Kgs 8. The following period is that of the two parallel kingdoms that come to an end with the Deuteronomistic commentary of 2 Kgs 17. The demarcation of the historical books is apparently done by the insertion of non-, even post-Deuteronomistic texts: Josh. 24 and Judg. 1.1-2.5 separate Joshua and Judges; Judges 17-21, Judges and Samuel; 2 Samuel 21-24, Samuel and Kings.

Another open question is that of the chronological duration of DH. Only recently, Dietrich asserted that 'the language and thought of the Persian period as a whole represents a *terminus ad quem* for the Deuteronomistic historical writing'.⁵⁰⁷ Knight, on the other hand, wonders about it in these terms: 'Is the usual Josianic or exilic dating of Dtr much too early, perhaps by several centuries?'⁵⁰⁸ The history of the text shows clearly that the Dtr style is present up to the Hellenistic period. How and where must we then trace the frontier between the 'real' editors of DH and the epigones who merely 'imitate' the Deuteronomistic style? This area of research that is still almost virgin territory deserves attention.

We may conclude with a few remarks on exegetical methods. By hitting on the idea of DH, Noth, as we have seen, awakened the interest of researchers in the history of the redaction. And it is not a coincidence if, at the outset, the harshest critics came especially from those who longed for the return of the old *Literarkritik*. For scholars who use synchronic methods (close reading, narratology, etc.) DH has become a simple abbreviation to designate the unit Deuteronomy-Kings. From then on the often conflicting relation between redaction(s) and received tradition(s) disappears from the horizon of the exegete. Despite the often fairly bitter conflicts engaged in by synchronists and diachronists, these two exegetical currents come together in so far as they both favour working from the text alone. Now, during the last few years, a new exegetical trend is emerging: socio-historical criticism, an approach that seeks to introduce sociological and anthropological methods into exegesis. Socio-historical criticism tries to describe the institutions and social structures that make it possible to locate such and such biblical literature. The application of this method to DH will doubtlessly open new avenues⁵⁰⁹ for understanding better in what historical or cultural context the emergence or the transmission of a historiographical work of this nature can be imagined. Deuteronomism remains, as we wrote

507. Dietrich, 'Martin Noth and the Future of the Deuteronomistic History', p. 159.

508. Knight, 'Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomists', p. 74.

509. Cf. the first attempts of L. Stulman, 'Encroachment in Deuteronomy: An Analysis of the Social World of the D Code', *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 613-32; P. Dutcher-Walls, 'The Social Location of the Deuteronomists: A Sociological Study of Fictional Politics in Late Pre-Exilic Judah', *JSOT* 52 (1991), pp. 77-94.

seven years ago, a 'touchstone' for research on the formation of the Old Testament literature.⁵¹⁰ If Israel was able to construct its history and through that to think of and choose its identity, it owes it to a great extent to the Deuteronomists.

510. De Pury and Römer, 'La Pentateuque en question', p. 67.