

Founded by Othmar Keel

Published on behalf of the BIBLE+ORIENT Foundation

in cooperation with
the Department of Biblical Studies, University of Fribourg Switzerland,
the Institute of Egyptology, University of Basel,
the Institute of Archaeology, Near Eastern Archaeology section,
University of Berne,
the Institut romand des sciences bibliques, University of Lausanne,
the Institute of Religious Studies, University of Zurich and
the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies

by
Susanne Bickel, Thomas C. Römer, Daniel Schwemer
and Christoph Uehlinger

Editor

Innocent Himbaza (1965) is Senior Lecturer in Old Testament studies at the Faculty of Theology, Department of Biblical Studies, of the University of Fribourg, Switzerland. His main research interests include textual criticism and textual history of the Hebrew Bible. He is the editor of the book of Leviticus for the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* project. Currently he serves as curator of the Fribourg-based «Institut Dominique Barthélemy pour l'Histoire du Texte et de l'Exégèse de l'Ancien Testament». Among his books are: *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte* (OBO 207), 2004; *L'Écrit et l'Esprit* (ed. with D. Böhler, Ph. Hugo; OBO 214), 2005; *Un carrefour dans l'histoire de la Bible* (with A. Schenker; OBO 233), 2007.

Innocent Himbaza (ed.)
with the collaboration of Mary-Gabrielle Roth-Mouthon

Making the Biblical Text

Textual Studies in the Hebrew
and the Greek Bible

Publications of the Institut Dominique Barthélemy, 1

Academic Press Fribourg
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen
2015

FROM DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY TO NEBIIM AND TORAH

Thomas RÖMER, Collège de France/University of Lausanne

1. Introduction: The Persian period and the threefold construction of the Hebrew Bible

If one reads the three parts of the Hebrew Bible one gets the impression that it ends with the Persian period. In the *Nebiim*, the last of the twelve Prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi are situated under the Persians and the *Ketubim*, according to most Hebrew manuscripts end with the Book of Chronicles (see also *Baba bathra* 14b)¹ and the permission of the Persian king for rebuilding the Temple and the appeal to come back to Jerusalem:

Thus says King Cyrus of Persia: Yhwh, the God of heaven, has given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he has charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Whoever is among you of all his people, may the Lord his God be with him! Let him go up. (2 Chr 36:23)

Like in Deutero-Isaiah Cyrus appears to have been chosen to restore Judah and to invite the Babylonian Diaspora to do their *Aliyah*. It is interesting that this “open end” of the *Ketubim* does not respect chronology since the story about the restoration of Jerusalem, its Temple and the promulgation of the Law is told in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah which were placed before Chronicles.

As Sara Japhet has convincingly shown² we should dissociate the book of Chronicles from Ezra-Nehemiah and it might be possible that Chronicles have been written later, perhaps even during the Hellenistic time, as has been suggested by Peter Welten and others.³ Still it is interesting that there are no

¹ S. Japhet, *1 Chronik* (HTKAT; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 2002), 27.

² S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (2nd rev. ed.; BEATAJ 9; Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 1997).

³ P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern* (WMANT 42; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); G. Steins, *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen. Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie von 1/2 Chronik* (BBB 93; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum Verlag, 1995); idem, “Die Bücher der Chronik,” in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (8th ed.; ed. C. Frevel; Studienbücher Theologie 1/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012), 313-331; H.-P. Mathys, “Chronikbücher und hellenistischer Zeitgeist,” in

direct allusions to events from the Greek period. The same holds true for the Latter Prophets. Several scholars have argued that the latest redactions of many prophetic books were undertaken during the Hellenistic period,⁴ and that the scroll of Jonah was written at that time, but here again the redactors did not introduce clear allusions to that time.⁵ To this compares the idea found in the Talmud that prophecy ended in the Persian period (*Baba bathra* 12a).

The Persian period is apparently considered as an accomplishment of a sort. This fits well the fact that the Persian kings and the Persian Empire are, in the Bible, never abominated or condemned as it is the case for the Egyptians, the Assyrians or the Babylonians. There may be some Persian individuals who act badly, as narrated in the book of Esther, but once their intrigues are thwarted, the Persian king will act favorably with regard to the Jews.

Even if there is little extra-biblical evidence for the theory of the so-called Imperial Authorization in order to explain the publication of the Torah,⁶ the fact remains that the biblical accounts about the promulgation of the Law present Ezra as acting in conformity with the will of the Achaemenid ruler. According to Ezra 7, Ezra is sent by order of the Persian king in order to publish a Law, which is the law of Ezra's God and also the law of the Persian ruler (v. 28), whereas Ezra's God is also the God of heaven (v. 23: אֱלֹהֵי שָׁמַיִם הוֹלֵלֵנוּ).

Would Ezra's accreditation letter be a creation from the early Hellenistic period, as argued by S. Grätz,⁷ it is all the more interesting, that it reveals an attempt to identify Ezra's law with the law or at least the will of the Persian king.

What are the reasons for this very positive view of the Persians? The answer may be twofold. First, the Judeans considered them as "liberators" since they had vanquished the Babylonians, who had destroyed the Temple and deported important parts of the population. Second, the Persians were apparently quite liberal with regard to internal affairs of the people incorporated in the Empire, as long as those were loyal and paid their taxes.

Vom Anfang und vom Ende: fünf alttestamentliche Studien (BEATAJ 47; Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 2000), 41-155.

⁴ See for instance O. H. Steck, *Der Abschluss der Prophetie im Alten Testament. Ein Versuch zur Frage der Vorgeschichte des Kanons* (BThSt 17; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991).

⁵ M. Gerhards, *Studien zum Jonabuch* (BThSt 78; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2006).

⁶ See on this debate G. N. Knoppers and B. M. Levinson, eds., *The Pentateuch as Torah. New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007).

⁷ S. Grätz, *Das Edikt des Artaxerxes. Eine Untersuchung zum religionspolitischen und historischen Umfeld von Esra 7,12-26* (BZAW 337; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2004).

I cannot pick up in this paper the interesting question why the Hebrew Bible in its three parts presents history as having found its end or its accomplishment in the Persian period. I would like instead to focus on the Former Prophets and to investigate the question of the last edition of the so-called Deuteronomistic History (DtrH) in the first half of the Persian period and its splitting up into Torah and Former Prophets, which also raises the question about the relationship between Torah and *Nebiim*.

2. Persian period edition of the so-called Dtr History

M. Noth's idea that the books of Deuteronomy to Kings constitute a historiography written shortly after the catastrophe of 587 (around 560)⁸ has known several modifications, and recently especially in German scholarship a rejection. An important number of scholars argue nowadays that a "Deuteronomistic History" never existed. It is impossible here to comment in a detailed way on the present debate. Suffice it to say that the opponents to the theory do not present an alternative solution for the presence of dtr texts in the former Prophets and the idea of several uncontrolled and unrelated dtr creates in my view not a progress but a regression of a sort back to Wellhausen.⁹ For our purpose we do not need to discuss the question of the starting point of the DtrH, which in my view lies in the end of the 7th century B.C.E. Like Noth scholars have often considered that the DtrH received its final shape around 560, since the last event reported in 2 Kgs 25:27-30, the release of Jehoiachin under the short reign of Amel-Marduk (in the Bible Evil-Merodach) can be dated around 562. Interestingly Noth here almost identified the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* because of his idea that the Dtr was an "honest broker,"¹⁰ who transmitted all the information and sources available to him. So if he had known of events from the Persian period he would have told them. But this view may be inappropriate. As Graeme Auld stated in a kind of mockery: "The fact that Kings ends with the fate of Judah's last king tells us no more about the date of composition (generally believed to be exilic) than the fact that the Pentateuch ends with the death of Moses."¹¹ Despite the exilic perspective of Deuteronomy to

⁸ M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967). English translation: *The Deuteronomistic History* (2nd ed., JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

⁹ For this discussion see T. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 26-43.

¹⁰ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 26, 128.

¹¹ A. G. Auld, "Prophets through the Looking Glass: Between Writings and Moses (1983)," in *Samuel at the Threshold. Selected Works of Graeme Auld* (ed. A. G. Auld; SOTSMS; Aldershot/Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 45-61, 61.

Kings there is some evidence that the DtrH underwent one or several redactions in the Persian period. Suffice it to point out the following examples:

- Whereas the DtrH ends with the narration of Judah's deportation, which is present in many dtr parenetical texts and speeches that explain the exile as Yhwh's ultimate judgment there are some passages that announce the possibility of a return to Yhwh (Deut 4:29-31) and of a return into the land of the fathers (Deut 30:1-10) or of a good life in the land of deportation (1 Kgs 8:46-53).¹²
- Whereas many dtr texts warn the addressees not to follow the אלהים אחרים, there are other texts with a "monotheistic" statement, claiming by using a terminology reminding of Deutero-Isaiah that Yhwh is the only God, and that the gods of the nations do not exist (Deut 4:32-40; 28:63; 1 Kgs 8:59-61).
- There are, especially in the book of Deuteronomy, passages that express an idea of segregation from the "other people" (Deut 7:1-6.22-26; 9:1-6; 12:2-7.29-31), which have their closest parallels in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah (see Ezra 9:1-3; Neh 9:2; 13).

In the following I would like to focus on other although related points that indicate a re-edition of the DtrH in the Persian period:

- (1) The construction of a Diaspora identity
- (2) From Temple religion towards a "book-" or a "torah-religion"
- (3) The construction of a "prophetic" history
- (4) Hexateuch or Pentateuch?
- (5) From Deuteronomistic History to the Former Prophets;
- (6) The relation between Pentateuch and Prophets.

2.1. The construction of a Diaspora identity

Even if some late additions, as those we already mentioned, envisage the possibility of the exiles' return to their land, other and probably more texts seem to suggest that the addressees should accept the possibility of a "longue durée" exile, that means to make their life outside the land, and according to the dtr redactors, especially in Babylon. During the first half of the Persian period, the economic and religious power in Yehud was under the control of the Babylonian Golah. There were those who had returned from Babylonia or their descendants, who considered themselves as the "true Israel," as we can see in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.¹³ But those books also indicate

¹² See on this already H. W. Wolff, "Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks," *ZAW* (1961): 171-186. English translation: "The Kerygma of the Deuteronomistic Historical Work," in *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions* (ed. W. Brueggemann and H. W. Wolff; Atlanta, Ga.: John Knox, 1975), 83-100.

¹³ C. E. Carter, *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period. A Social and Demographic Study* (JSOTSup 294; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

the fact, well attested by extrabiblical sources, that not all of the Babylonian Judean elite was eager to return to Yehud. Therefore the dtr redactors of the Persian period had to deal with a double bind of a sort. On the one hand they emphasize the fact that all "Israel" should live in the land that Yhwh has already promised to the forefathers and has given through the conquest related in the book of Joshua (and as Axel Knauf and others have shown the book of Joshua underwent an important redaction in the Persian period).¹⁴ By the identification of the addressees in the book of Deuteronomy with the generation of the conquest, the return from exile can be read as a new conquest (and this is the idea that underlies the books of Ezra and Nehemiah).¹⁵

On the other hand there was the reality that members of the "true Israel" preferred to stay in Babylonia, as we can see among others in the Murashu tablets of the 5th century from Nippur¹⁶ which indicate that Judeans living in Babylonia were considered creditworthy and integrated into the society (see also Jer 29).

The "Golah redaction" of the DtrH tries to handle this dilemma in legitimating together with the promotion of the return in the land, the possibility to live outside the land, i.e. outside the province of Yehud.

This is effectuated in several ways. One way is to add to texts dealing with the conquest a description of the borders of the promised land, which extend as far as the Euphrates, but interestingly not as far as the Egyptian delta: Deut 1:7b adds to the description of the land to be conquered "the land of the Canaanites and the Lebanon, as far as the great river, the river Euphrates." For Perlitt this is a "unsinnige Synthese von Kanaaniten und Euphrat,"¹⁷ but this synthesis may tend to combine the land of Canaan with the land of the Babylonian Golah; a similar effort is made in Deut 11:24-25 and Josh 1:3-4. These verses that broaden the land to be conquered as far as the Euphrates, an extent not mentioned again in the following conquest accounts, can easily be recognized as an interpolation since they are in the second person singular and interrupt the speech addressed to Joshua (vv. 2 and 5) which is in the second person plural. This description apparently wants to present the whole Persian satrapy of "Eber-Nari" ("Beyond-the-River") as a land where Judeans could live.

¹⁴ E. A. Knauf, *Josua* (ZBK.AT 6; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2008), passim; K. Bieberstein, *Josua-Jordan-Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1-6* (OBO 143; Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

¹⁵ P. Abadie, *Le livre d'Esdras et de Néhémie* (CEv 95; Paris: Cerf, 1996).

¹⁶ M. W. Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire: the Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia* (Uitgaven van het Nederlands historisch-archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 54; Istanbul: Nederlands historisch-archaeologisch Instituut, 1985).

¹⁷ L. Perlitt, "Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?" *ZAW* 100 (1988) Supplement: 65-88 = *Deuteronomium-Studien* (FAT 8; Tübingen: Mohr, 1994), 97-108, 103.

The Diaspora perspective also includes a new definition of the (rebuilt) Jerusalem Temple. This is the case of Solomon's inauguration speech in 1 Kgs 8 in which one can quite easily distinguish three dtr layers, the last stemming from the Persian period.¹⁸ The Persian period redactors also reworked Solomon's prayer, which is now structured in seven occasions of prayers towards Yhwh, as indicated in the following schema:

Vv.	Occasion	Place of prayer	Invocation	Divine intervention
31-32	oath	before your altar in this house	hear in heaven	judge your servants
33-34	defeated before an enemy	in this house	hear in heaven	forgive the sin of your people Israel, and bring them again to the <i>land that you gave to their fathers.</i>
35-36	no rain	towards this place	hear in heaven	forgive the sin of your servants ... grant rain on your <i>land, which you have given to your people as an inheritance</i>
37-40	plagues	towards this house	hear in heaven your dwelling-place	forgive ... they may fear you all the days that they live in the land that you gave to our fathers.
41-43	foreigner ... from a distant land	towards this house	hear in heaven your dwelling-place	do according to all that the foreigner calls to you
44-45	war	towards the city that you have chosen and the house that I have built for your name	hear in heaven	maintain their cause
46-51	sin and deportation	towards their land, which you gave to their ancestors, the city that you have chosen, and the house that I have built for your name	hear in heaven your dwelling-place	maintain their cause, forgive your people who have sinned against you and <u>grant them compassion in the sight of their captors</u> , so that they may have compassion on them

¹⁸ T. Römer, "Redaction Criticism: 1 Kings 8 and the Deuteronomists," in *Method Matters, Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L. Petersen* (ed. J. M. LeMon and K. H. Richards; SBLRBS 56; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 63-76. The idea of three layer is accepted by many scholars, see among others: I. Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Könige* (KHC 9; Freiburg i. Br./Leipzig/Tübingen: Mohr, 1899), 59; E. Talstra, *Solomon's Prayer. Synchrony and Diachrony in the Composition of I Kings 8, 14-61* (CBET 3; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993).

The first draft of this passage may stem from the Babylonian time, but in its present form a Persian period setting is more likely. Interestingly the prayer brings together the gift of the land and the fact of living outside the land. The expression "the land given to the fathers" appears for the first time in DtrH in 1 Kgs 8 (vv. 34.40.48) while in the Books of Deuteronomy and Joshua the land "promised to the fathers" appears constantly. It is only after the building of the Temple that the divine oath is fulfilled.¹⁹ But in spite of the importance of the Temple, Solomon underlines in his prayer Yhwh's optional separation from his sanctuary: he could be worshipped outside of the Temple. This is obvious in the prayer occasions of vv. 31-51. Contrary to the almost identical call to Yhwh ("hear from heaven"), the place from which the prayer is spoken varies in an interesting manner. In the first case, it is clearly the Temple, before the altar (v. 31). Then (v. 35), the prayer is addressed towards the sanctuary. Finally, people pray from another country, raising their request towards the fathers' land, the city, and the Temple (vv. 46-51). That means that during the dedication of the Temple, Solomon predicts the loss of the land and the deportation.²⁰ At the same time, Solomon gives the rebuilt Temple a new role: it becomes a *qibla*, and prayers towards the Temple replace the sacrifices. In this last prayer there is no mention of a return. The dtr redactor envisages that Yhwh will listen from heaven, but will not bring the people back from exile; rather, he will grant them compassion from those who deported them. The root is rare in the context of the DtrH,²¹ the closest parallel occurs in Deut 30:3, which also belongs to a Persian period text:

Deut 30:3 וְשָׁב יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־שְׁבוּתְךָ וְשָׁב יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
1 Kgs 8:50 וַיִּתְחַנֵּן לְפָנָי שְׁבִיחָם וְיִתְחַנֵּן

In Deut 30 the divine compassion leads to the return in the land, whereas in 1 Kgs 8, Yhwh provokes compassion among Israel's vanquishers in order that they can live in the foreign land.

¹⁹ T. Römer, *Israels Väter. Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 372-384.

²⁰ It is significant that the prayer occasions in vv. 33-40 and 46-51 correspond to the curses of Deut 28: defeat (1 Kgs 8:33; Deut 28:25), no rain (1 Kgs 8:35; Deut 28:25), famine, plague, blight, mildew, locusts or caterpillars, enemies (1 Kgs 8:37; Deut 28:21-22.38.25), deportation and exile (1 Kgs 8:46; Deut 28:64-65); see C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920), 112-115.

²¹ In the sense of compassion only in Deut 13:18, which presupposes the Achan story in Josh 7, and where Yhwh's compassion provokes multiplication of the offspring. In 2 Kgs 13:23 which mentions Yhwh's compassion because of the Patriarchs is clearly an insert into the notice about Hazael's succession, and may stem from a post-dtr redactor, see Benzinger, *Könige*, 164, and M. Rehm, *Das zweite Buch der Könige. Ein Kommentar* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982), 135.

This parallel underlines how the Persian edition of the DtrH tries to combine the interest of the returnees and of those who remained in Babylonia. This also necessitated a redefinition of the Temple, whose central status is acknowledged but which is somewhat replaced by the scroll of the Torah.

Another strategy to integrate a Golah perspective can be found in the last three verses of the book of Kings, which may have been added in the Persian period. The rehabilitation of king Jehoiachin who becomes a privileged guest of the Babylonian king but stays as second to the king in Babylonia "all days of his life" can be read as a short story that tells the transition from Exile to Diaspora, as can be shown by the narrative parallels that exists between 2 Kgs 25:27-30 and the Diaspora novels, like the story of Esther and Mordecai, Joseph and the narratives in the first part of the book of Daniel. In all these texts an exiled person is brought out of prison, becomes in a way second to the king (2 Kgs 25:28; Gen 41:40; Dan 2:48; Esth 10:3) and the accession to this new status is symbolized by changing the clothes (2 Kgs 25:29; Gen 41:42; Dan 5:29; Esth 6:10-11; 8:15). All these stories insist on the fact that the land of deportation has become a land where Jews can live and even manage interesting careers. 2 Kgs 25:27-30 could be interpreted similarly: Exile is transformed into Diaspora.²² This idea is brought forward discretely by the strategy of an open end. It shows that the Dtrs accepted the new geo-political situation and probably tried to come to terms with the Babylonians and then with the Persians.

2.2. From Temple religion towards a "book" or a "torah" religion

The story of Josiah's reform in 2 Kgs 22-23 is a complex text whose first edition (in a very short form) might stem from the Josianic period. In a recent article Nadav Na'aman has argued that the story of the discovered book, the so-called *Auffindungsbericht*, was part of the oldest form of the story, which was according to him an independent narrative, which was later integrated in the DtrH History.²³ According to him the finding of the book was absolutely necessary for the original account, which needed a starting point for Josiah's reform. But in the parallel account in 2 Chr 34 Josiah undertook his reform without any book, which was found only ten years

²² J. D. Levenson, "The Last Four Verses in Kings," *JBL* 103 (1984): 353-361; T. Römer, "La fin du livre de la Genèse et la fin des livres des Rois: ouvertures vers la Diaspora. Quelques remarques sur le Pentateuque, l'Hexateuque et l'Ennéateuque," in *L'Écrit et l'Esprit. Études d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (ed. D. Böhler, I. Himbaza, and P. Hugo; OBO 214; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 285-294; R. E. Clements, "A Royal Privilege: Dining in the Presence of the Great King," in *Reflection and Refraction. Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker; VTSup 113; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), 49-66.

²³ N. Na'aman, "The 'Discovered Book' and the Legitimation of Josiah's Reform," *JBL* 130 (2011): 47-62.

later. In the Chronicler's account, the book is not needed for the reform but for Huldah's oracle. Also in 2 Kings 22:8 the mention of the discovered book interrupts the scene in vv. 7 and 9, a fact that also supports the idea of a later insertion. Therefore I tend to disagree with Nadav on this point, but be it as it may, he also concludes that in the literary context of the DtrH "the 'book of the Law' became an element in the revolutionary concept of the 'book' as the word of God, symbolizing the transition of authority from the prophet and the Temple to the divine written word."²⁴

The origin of the book-finding motif probably needs to be situated in the deposit of foundation tablets in Mesopotamian sanctuaries, which are often "rediscovered" by later kings undertaking restoration works. But interestingly, the foundation stone is in 2 Kgs 22 replaced by the book, which becomes the "real" foundation for the worship of Yhwh. In the present account of 2 Kgs 23, Josiah eliminates all cultic symbols from the Temple to make it the place where the book is to be read to the people. The replacement of the iconic and sacrificial cult by the reading of the book can be understood as a strategy to emphasize the importance of the written scroll. In doing so, the Persian time Dtrs prepare the rise of Judaism as a "religion of the book."²⁵

The same phenomenon occurs in the addition to the Shema Yisrael in Deut 6:8-9 (or 6:6-9). This discourse about the importance of the divine words ends with the exhortation to inscribe the words of the Law on the doorposts of every house. This means that every house can become a temple of a sort since divine instructions are normally written on the walls of sanctuaries.²⁶ In a Persian period setting, 2 Kgs 22-23 and Deut 6:6-9 can also be read as foundation myth of the synagogues. It is difficult to know when the first synagogues were built, but it seems quite logical that the Diaspora situation needed buildings for gathering, for administrative and religious matters.

It has often been argued that the found book in 2 Kgs 22-23 should be identified with the first edition of the book of Deuteronomy, and this is certainly right in the sense that the *Ur-Deuteronomium* was written under Josiah. But in a Persian period context, the reading of the "book" in 2 Kgs 22-23 may already allude to the beginning of the promulgation of the Pentateuch. Some scenes in the reform account, often suspected to be additions, support that view: The eradication of the cult of Molech (23:10) is not based on a law in Deuteronomy but on prohibitions in the book Leviticus (18:21; 20:2-5). Equally, the *teraphim* (23:24) are not mentioned in Deuteronomy

²⁴ Na'aman, "Discovered Book," 62.

²⁵ J.-P. Sonnet, "Le livre 'trouvé'. 2 Rois 22 dans sa finalité narrative," *NRTh* 116 (1994): 836-861.

²⁶ O. Keel, "Zeichen der Verbundenheit. Zur Vorgeschichte und Bedeutung der Forderungen von Deuteronomium 6,8f. und Par.," in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy. Études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire* (ed. P. Casetti, O. Keel, and A. Schenker; OBO 38; Fribourg: Editions universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 159-240.

but appear as “pagan idols” in Genesis (31:19.34-35). The expression “book of the covenant”²⁷ appears in Exod 24:7 but not in Deuteronomy. The cultic initiatives of Josiah may therefore reflect the beginnings of the compilation of the Pentateuch. In any case it is plausible that the passages, which insist on the written Law of Moses also stem from the Persian period. This is quite certainly the case for David’s testament to Solomon: “keep the charge of Yhwh your God, walking in his ways and keeping his statutes, his commandments, his ordinances, and his testimonies, as it is written in the Law of Moses, so that you may prosper in all that you do and wherever you turn” (2 Kgs 2:2). The first king who explicitly respects the Mosaic book of the Law is Amaziah,²⁸ who “did not put to death the children of the murderers; according to what is written in the book of the Law of Moses, where Yhwh commanded, ‘The parents shall not be put to death for the children, or the children be put to death for the parents; but all shall be put to death for their own sins.’” (2 Kgs 14:6) This reference to the book of the Law is interesting, since it contains a quotation from Deut 24:16. This shows that the redactor thinks of the king as the reader of the תּוֹרַת־מֹשֶׁה interpreting the law of the king in Deut 17:14-20, where the ideal king has to observe אֶת־כָּל־דְּבָרֵי הַתּוֹרָה הַזֶּה לְעִשְׂתָּם הַזֶּה. הַזֶּה אֶת־וְאֶת־הַתּוֹרָה הַזֶּה לְעִשְׂתָּם.

The king is therefore under the authority of the book and kingship can even disappear. Therefore one can read 2 Kgs 22-23 also as a story about the disappearance of kingship in favor of the book.²⁹

The growing authority of the book not only affects the Temple and the king, but also the prophets.

2.3. The construction of a “prophetic” history

The multiple parallels between the discovery of the book and its reading under Josiah in 2 Kgs 22-23, and the “publication” and the reading of Jeremiah’s book under Jehoiakim (Jer 36) have been observed in several publications.³⁰ There is no doubt that both texts are to be read together; they

²⁷ The MT has “this book of the covenant” and suggests an identification of the “book of the covenant” with the “book of the Law.” LXX and Vulg (and one Hebrew ms) read, however, “book of this covenant.”

²⁸ Amaziah belongs to the kings who were not too bad, but nevertheless tolerated the high places (14:3-4).

²⁹ F. Smyth, “When Josiah Has Done his Work or the King Is Properly Buried: A Synchronic Reading of 2 Kings 22.1-23.28,” in *Israel Constructs its History. Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (ed. A. de Pury, T. Römer, and J.-D. Macchi; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 343-358.

³⁰ C. D. Isbell, “2 Kings 22-23 and Jer 36: A Stylistic Comparison,” *JSOT* 8 (1978): 33-45; C. Minette de Tillesse, “Joiakim, repoussoir du ‘Pieux’ Josiah: Parallélismes entre II Reg 22 et Jer 36,” *ZAW* 105 (1993): 352-376; J. Vermeulen, “L’école deutéronomiste aurait-elle imaginé un premier canon des Écritures?” in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. T. Römer; BETL 147; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 2000), 223-240; G. J. Venema,

contrast Josiah, “the good king,” and Jehoiakim, “the bad king.” Both kings are confronted with the discovery of a book, but they act in opposite ways. What has been less observed is the fact that in both narratives the prophet is dependent on the book. The prophetess Huldah, who might be a historical figure, is consulted in order to confirm the message of the book and the oracle she is giving sounds as if she were a female Jeremiah, because of its multiple parallels with the book of Jeremiah. Likewise, Jer 36 is the story of the replacement of the prophet by the scribe.³¹ Yhwh now speaks to Jeremiah, not in order to communicate new oracles, but to ask him to write a scroll with all the words he has communicated to the prophet since the time of Josiah (v. 2); and Baruch, who writes the prophetic scroll, executes this order. The Judeans are not invited, like in Jer 7 or 26, to listen directly to the prophetic word but to the book (v. 3). The prophet disappears and his role is taken over by the book. Contrarily to Jer 7:2 (MT) and 26:2, the Judeans entering the Temple are not confronted with a prophetic speech but with the reading of a book by a scribe. The importance of reading the book is underlined in Jer 36 as well as in 2 Kgs 22. In each narrative the book is read three times.³² In Jer 36, the only time that Jeremiah reappears is at the very end of the story when, after the royal burning of the scroll, Yhwh commands him to write a new scroll, on which many other oracles were written (vv. 27-32). This might be understood as a reflection about the different stages in which the book of Jeremiah was edited. But above all, the conclusion of the story underlines once again the idea that prophetic orality is only accessible through the book produced by scribes.

The parallels in 2 Kgs 22-23 also suggest that the dttr revised the book of Jeremiah in order to constitute an appendix to the DtrH.³³ This is indicated likewise by the fact that Jer 52 constitutes a parallel to 2 Kgs 24-25. Even if both texts reveal a number of (interesting) differences, there is no doubt about a redactional intention to conclude both books in the same way. Such a phenomenon is unique in the whole Hebrew Bible. Probably 2 Kgs 24-25 and Jer 52 were not added at the same time. One may follow Ray Person and argue that the *Vorlage* of JerLXX 52 was taken over from a perhaps earlier version of 2 Kgs 24-25 and appended to the Jeremiah scroll by a dttr redac-

Reading Scripture in the Text. Deuteronomy 9-10; 31 – 2 Kings 22-23 – Jeremiah 36 – Nehemia 8 (OTS 48; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004).

³¹ R. P. Carroll, “Manuscripts don’t burn – Inscripting the Prophetic Tradition. Reflections on Jeremiah 36,” in «Dort ziehen Schiffe dahin...» *Collected Communications to the XIVth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Paris 1992* (ed. M. Augustin and K.-D. Schunck; BEATAJ 28; Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 1996), 31-42.

³² In 2 Kgs 22-23 twice by Shaphan and once by Josiah, in Jer 36 twice by Baruch and once by Jehudi.

³³ T. Römer, “The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah as a Supplement to the So-Called Deuteronomistic History,” in *The Production of Prophecy. Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud* (ed. D. V. Edelman and E. Ben Zvi; BibleWorld; London/Oakville, Conn.: Equinox, 2009), 168-183.

tor. After that the text of Kings and both versions of Jeremiah were supplemented by other additions also in dtr phraseology.³⁴ Be that as it may,³⁵ we have to understand this redactional activity as the will to integrate the book of Jeremiah into a dtr library,³⁶ by giving it an end similar to the DtrH. Interestingly, the Talmud considers Jeremiah to be the author of the book of Kings, which reflects an awareness of the stylistic and theological links between the two books.

The link between historiography and prophetic tradition is also reinforced by the integration of prophetic narratives into the DtrH in the Persian period in order to foster the prophetic character of the book (McKenzie, Otto.)³⁷ These stories often have a prophet confront a king and claim that prophetic authority stands above royal authority. Prophetic authority culminates in the figure of Elijah, who is constructed as a second Moses: He travels forty days and nights to Horeb, the mountain of God (1 Kgs 19) and like Moses in Exodus 33, he is granted a private theophany. This theophany even criticizes or corrects the Mosaic one contrary to the Sinai theophany, Yhwh does not appear with thunder and lightning and earthquake but in “a sound of sheer silence” (1 Kgs 19:12). In the end, Elijah surpasses Moses. The latter’s death is more than remarkable since he is buried by Yhwh himself and his grave remains unknown. Elijah, however, does not experience death but ascends to heaven in a whirlwind (2 Kgs 2). One may ask if the integration of the prophetic texts into the book of Kings tries to transform the DtrH into the first part of a history, which is followed by a collection of prophetic books. The Isaiah story in 2 Kgs 18-20, which has a parallel in Isa 36-39, also binds together the book of Kings with the prophetic scrolls.

Thus in the Persian period, the DtrH became more and more related to a collection of prophetic books and this explains the fact that after the dismantling of the DtrH Joshua-Kings could become the first part of the Prophets.

³⁴ R. F. Person Jr., “II Kings 24,18-25,30 and Jeremiah 52: A Text-Critical Case Study in the Redaction History of the Deuteronomistic History,” *ZAW* 105 (1993): 174-205.

³⁵ Fischer considers that Jer 52MT is the older text and depends on 2 Kgs 24-25: G. Fischer, “Les deux faces de Jérémie 52,” *ETR* 74 (1999): 481-489; idem, “Jeremiah 52: A Test Case for Jer LXX,” in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Oslo 1998* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 37-48.

³⁶ See also N. Lohfink, “Gab es eine deuteronomische Bewegung?” in *Jeremia und die »deuteronomistische Bewegung«* (ed. W. Gross; BBB 98; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum Verlag, 1995), 313-382, 360. This passage is unfortunately lacking in the shorter version of the English translation of Lohfink’s very important piece: N. Lohfink, “Was There a Deuteronomistic Movement?” in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists. The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (ed. L. S. Schearing and S. L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 36-66.

³⁷ S. L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings. The Composition of the Books of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1991); S. Otto, “The Composition of the Elijah-Elisha Stories and the Deuteronomistic History,” *JSOT* 27 (2003): 487-508.

2.4. Hexateuch or Pentateuch?

The decision to promulgate the Pentateuch in the middle of the Persian period was in a certain sense also taken in an anti-eschatological perspective. As already observed by Frank Crüsemann, the Torah does not allot much space to prophecy of salvation.³⁸ It is mainly the work of a compromise between the priestly and the dtr circles. In my view the Pentateuch was due to the decision to separate the book of Deuteronomy from the books of Joshua to Kings, to combine with the pre-priestly and priestly traditions in Gen-Exod* and to make it the end of the Torah.³⁹

There are a few hints to the existence also of the project of a Hexateuch, which would have the “Torah” end with the book of Joshua. As often observed, the last chapter of Joshua (Josh 24) clearly presents itself as the conclusion of a Hexateuch,⁴⁰ and a Hexateuch would certainly also have been acceptable to the Samaritans (see especially the location of Joshua’s final discourse in Shechem). Biblical research has until today neglected the question of the role and the participation of the Samaritan authorities with regard to the process that led to the promulgation of the Torah. One may imagine that there was a minority coalition of priests and lay people, which may have included Samaritan authorities, a coalition, which might have been in favor of Israel’s political restoration.

There is indeed a major ideological difference between a Penta- and a Hexateuch. The theological focus of the Hexateuch is undoubtedly the land, promised by Yhwh to the Patriarchs and conquered by Joshua. A Hexateuch would have constructed a post-exilic identity centered on the possession or the claim of the land. For political, sociological and theological reasons such an idea was difficult to maintain. The majority of the Judean intellectuals accepted Judah’s integration in the Persian Empire and would have been unhappy with a foundation document that ends with a narration of a military conquest of regions that did not even belong to the provinces of Yehud and Samaria. For the members of the Babylonian—but also Egyptian—Diaspora the idea that living in the land is a constitutive part of Jewish identity was unacceptable.

³⁸ F. Crüsemann, “Das ‘portative Vaterland.’ Struktur und Genese des alttestamentlichen Kanons,” in *Kanon und Zensur. Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation II* (ed. A. and J. Assmann; München: Fink, 1987), 63-79.

³⁹ The book of Numbers would then have been created as a bridge of a sort between the “Triateuch” and the book of Deuteronomy, see T. Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn in the Wilderness and the Construction of the Book of Numbers,” in *Reflection and Refraction* (ed. Rezetko, Lim, and Aucker), 419-445.

⁴⁰ E. Blum, “Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter. Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag,” in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature. Festschrift C. H. W. Brekelmans* (ed. M. Vervenne and J. Lust; BETL 133; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1997), 181-212; T. Römer and M. Z. Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch,” *JBL* 119 (2000): 401-419.

The central figure and concern of the Pentateuch are Moses and the Law of which he is the mediator. Theologically, the Pentateuch has an open end: Moses is allowed to contemplate the land, which he will not enter. The divine promise is repeated in Deut 34, but inside the Torah it is not fulfilled. This literary strategy opens different possibilities to understand the fulfillment of the promise, which can be read as fulfilled (with the arrival of the Achaemenids) or still to be accomplished in a more eschatological sense. The story of Moses' death outside the land clearly betrays a Diaspora perspective. It is a message to the Jews of the Diaspora who were very concerned about a sepulcher in the land. Probably since the Persian period wealthy Jews were very eager to be buried in Jerusalem or in the "land of their ancestors." Against this practice, Deut 34 claims that one may live and die outside the land, as long as one respects the Mosaic Torah. Moses becomes thus a symbol for an exilic identity, based on the reading and observance of the Law.

2.5. From Deuteronomistic History to the Former Prophets

When the book of Deuteronomy was separated from the following books the DtrH came to an end. Apparently the books of Joshua to Kings were now kept as sorts of "deuterocanonical" books in a constantly growing prophetic library.

The book of Kings being part of the *Nebiim*, 2 Kings 25 was not anymore an absolute ending but more as a transition to the prophetic oracles, which contained all the prophecies of doom to which Israel and Judah had not listened; but the oracles of judgment are followed by oracles of restoration, so that the history from the conquest to the loss of the land is followed by an eschatological perspective.⁴¹

The tradition from doom to salvation and then again back to a more critical view is demonstrated in the book of Isaiah which opens according to the majority of witnesses the collection of the Latter Prophets. After the oracles of judgment that dominate in the Proto-Isaiah, texts in Deutero-Isaiah claim that Yhwh's anger does not last for a long time ("For a brief moment I abandoned you, but with great compassion I will gather you. In overflowing wrath for a moment I hid my face from you, but with everlasting love I will have compassion on you, says Yhwh, your Redeemer." 53:7-8) but that this time of wrath has definitely come to an end. The crisis is here a turning point towards a new creation, the arrival of Cyrus being compared to a messianic era.

⁴¹ K. Schmid, "Une grande historiographie allant de Genèse à 2 Rois a-t-elle un jour existé?" in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque* (ed. T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 35-46, 42-43.

Interestingly the attitude of the author(s) of Isa 40-55 is to take over the official rhetoric of the Cyrus cylinder and to proclaim him, by doing so, Yhwh's messiah for Israel and the world.

<i>Cyrus Cylinder</i>	<i>Deutero-Isaiah</i>
(12) He (Marduk) took the hand of Cyrus, ...	(45:1) Cyrus, whose right hand I took
and called him by his name	(45:3) I, Yhwh, the God of Israel, call you by your name
(13) He made the land of GUTI and all the Median troops prostrate themselves at his feet	(45:1) to subdue nations before him
while he shepherded in justice and righteousness the black-headed people	(44:28) who says of Cyrus, 'He is my Shepherd,'
(13) like a friend and companion, he (Marduk) walked at his side.	(45:2) I will walk before you.
(32) I collected together all of their people and returned them to their settlements.	(45:13) I have aroused Cyrus ... and I will make all his paths straight; he shall build my city and set my exiles free.

The Persian ruler is praised as Yhwh's liberator who will initiate a new future, which according to another passage shall make forget the "former events":

¹⁶ Thus says Yhwh, who makes a way in the sea, a path in the mighty waters, ¹⁷ who brings out chariot and horse, army and warrior; they lie down, they cannot rise, they are extinguished, quenched like a wick: ¹⁸ Do not remember the former things, or consider the things of old. ¹⁹ I am about to do a new thing; now it springs forth, do you not perceive it? I will make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert. ²⁰ The wild animals will honor me, the jackals and the ostriches; for I give water in the wilderness, rivers in the desert, to give drink to my chosen people, ²¹ the people whom I formed for myself so that they might declare my praise. (Isa 43:16-21)

According to Jean-Daniel Macchi this passage was added to the book of Isaiah in the 5th or 4th century B.C.E. into the Isaianic corpus.⁴² The "first things" (ראשונות) allude to the divine judgments and especially to the destruction of Jerusalem. The author claims that they are not worth any longer to be remembered since a new era has arrived and the page of remembering the past can now be turned. This is in fact an anti-dtr position, because, as we will point out, for the Dtrs the fall of Jerusalem and the exile are at the very center of their theological reflection.

Contrary to Deutero-Isaiah where the new era that follows the crisis is understood to happen immediately, the last chapters of the book, often called

⁴² J.-D. Macchi, "'Ne ressassez plus les choses d'autrefois.' Esaïe 43,16-21, un surprenant regard deutéro-ésaïen sur le passé," *ZAW* 121 (2009): 225-241.

Trito-Isaiah adopt a more realistic attitude, and claim that salvation also depends on the right ethical behavior. Another strategy may be detected in the fact that the majority of the prophetic books underwent an “eschatological” or a “salvation” oriented redaction, which often added a new positive ending to the scrolls suggesting that the oracles of doom had been realized and that the disaster can now open to a better future. This is for instance the case of the book of Amos in which the two last verses announce the restoration of Yhwh’s people in their land, or equally the book of Joel, which ends with the promise that Judah and Jerusalem will be inhabited forever and that Yhwh will dwell on his holy mountain.⁴³ This revision continued until the Hellenistic period or even into the Maccabean period, as shown by the additions to the book of Jeremiah. The most obvious case is Jer 33:14-26 which is missing in the LXX and which summarizes important themes of salvation, as David, the Patriarchs and priesthood.⁴⁴ It is unclear, whether the text reflects a concrete situation or a more general expectation of a global restoration. One may conclude that many prophetic books were revised during the Persian and Hellenistic periods in an eschatological perspective; this may partially be understood as a reaction to the fact that the revolutionary announcement of a paradise-like situation in Deutero-Isaiah did not come true.

2.6. *The relation between Pentateuch and Prophets*

But there is also the attempt to relate the *Nebiim* to the Torah and to underline their deutero-canonical character in regard to the Torah. Thus, in the opening chapter of the book of Joshua, the latter receives the command to “meditate upon” or “recite” (הגה) day and night the “book of the Law” (ספר התורה) of Moses:

⁷ Indeed, be strong and very courageous, so as to act in accordance with all [the Torah—missing in the LXX] that my servant Moses commanded you; do not turn from it to the right hand or to the left, so that you may be successful wherever you go. ⁸ This book of the Torah shall not depart from your mouth, and you shall recite it day and night in order to observe and do all what is written in it: for thus you will make your way prosperous, thus you will succeed. (Josh 1:7-8)

⁴³ J. Wöhrle, *Die frühen Sammlungen des Zwölfprophetenbuches. Entstehung und Komposition* (BZAW 360; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2006), 119-122, 453-456.

⁴⁴ A. Schenker, “La rédaction longue du livre de Jérémie doit-elle être datée au temps des premiers Hasmonéens?” *ETL* 70 (1994): 281-293; P. Piovaneli, “JrB 33,14-26 ou la continuité des institutions à l’époque maccabéenne,” in *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception* (ed. A. H. W. Curtis and T. Römer; BETL 128; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1997), 255-276.

This passage comprising vv. 7-9 was interpolated in Josh 1 through the repetition, in v. 7a, of the beginning of v. 6 (“Be strong and courageous...”), which concluded Yhwh’s exhortation to lead the conquest of the land in vv. 2-5.⁴⁵

Historiography and prophetic literature are from now on under the authority of the Mosaic Law to which both are related.

On the other hand, the Prophets are now framed by the mention of Moses, which appears at the end of Malachi, a passage which works a “compromise” of sorts between “Moses” and the “Prophets.”

²² Remember the Torah of Moses, my servant, that I commanded him for all Israel—statutes and ordinances. ²³ Lo, I will send you the prophet Elijah⁴⁶ before the great and terrible Day of Yhwh comes, ²⁴ he will turn the heart of the father towards their sons, and the heart of the sons towards their fathers,⁴⁷ so that I will not come and strike the land with a *herem*. (Mal 3:22-24)

The opening of Mal 3:22 MT (4:6 LXX) alludes to the insert in Josh 1:7-9 (see above); the two passages frame the *Nebiim*.⁴⁸ The passage Mal 3:22-24 MT⁴⁹ may be dated to the period around 250-200 B.C.E.; a *terminus ad quem* is given by Sir 48:10, which quotes Mal 3:23-24, as well by 4QXIIa (150–125 B.C.E.), where a fragment of Mal 3:24 has been preserved. The MT is probably older than the LXX, where the reference to Moses’ Torah is placed after the reference to Elijah’s return.⁵⁰ The position of the book of Malachi at the end of the *Nebiim*, together with the inclusion between Mal 3:22 MT and Josh 1:7-9, does not necessarily indicate that the prophetic canon was already “closed” at the end of the Persian or the beginning of the

⁴⁵ R. Smend, “Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte,” in *Probleme biblischer Theologie. G. von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. W. Wolff; München: Kaiser, 1971), 494-509. English translation: “The Law and the Nations. A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History,” in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah. Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. G. N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville; Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 8; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 95-110.

⁴⁶ LXX: “Elijah the Tishbite.”

⁴⁷ LXX: “the heart of each man towards his neighbor.”

⁴⁸ J. Wöhrle, *Der Abschluss des Zwölfprophetenbuches. Buchübergreifende Redaktionsprozesse in den späten Sammlungen* (BZAW 389; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2008), 421-427.

⁴⁹ I. Himbaza, “La finale de Malachie sur Elie (Ml 3,23-24). Son influence sur le livre de Malachie et son impact sur la littérature postérieure,” in *Un carrefour dans l’histoire de la Bible. Du texte à la théologie au II^e siècle avant J.-C.* (ed. I. Himbaza and A. Schenker; OBO 233; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 21-44.

⁵⁰ Placing the reference to Moses at the end of the passage in the Greek tradition may have been motivated by the willingness to avoid concluding the book of Malachi with a word of judgment and condemnation (חרם, “ban” or “destruction”), see A. Meinhold, *Malachi* (BKAT 14/8; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2006), 402.

Hellenistic period.⁵¹ In the 4QXIIa fragments Mal 3 was apparently not the conclusion of the *Nebiim* and was followed perhaps by the scroll of Jonah. Nevertheless the ending of Malachi clearly underlines that (at least until the eschatological return of Elijah) the Mosaic Torah is absolutely normative⁵² and the Prophets, which consist of the Former DtrH and the prophetic scrolls, must be read and understood in the light of the Mosaic Torah.

3. Conclusion

The present investigation has shown how the DtrH underwent an important redaction in the beginning of the Persian period. The Persian period edition of the books of Deuteronomy to Kings revised the former history in order to make it suitable for the situation of the (Babylonian) Golah. At the same time the DtrH was more and more linked with prophetic scrolls, starting with Jeremiah, probably also with Isaiah and books of the *Dodekapropheton*. In the middle of the Persian period, the book of Deuteronomy became the conclusion of the Torah and the DtrH was truncated. The books of Joshua to Kings were now kept together with the most prophetic scrolls and became the first part of the *Nebiim*. The coherence of the new collection was underlined by Josh 1:7-9 and Mal 3:22-24. These passages are conceived as a frame around the *Nebiim* and also as an indication that the *Nebiim* only make sense when they are aligned to the Torah.

⁵¹ Steck, *Abschluss der Prophetie*.

⁵² The same phenomenon can be observed for the *Ketubim* in the beginning of the Psalter that places the whole Psalter or the whole Writings under the authority of the Torah. See A. Rofé, "Piety of the Torah-Disciples at the Winding-Up the Hebrew Bible: Josh 1:8, Ps 1:2, Isa 59:21," in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition. Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Merklein, K. Müller, and G. Stemberg; BBB 88; Frankfurt a. M.: Anton Hain, 1993), 78-85.