ces built by Solomon which are located "east of Jerusalem, to the south of the Mount of Destruction" (cf. 1 Kgs 11 : 7). The topographic data clearly points to the Mount of Olives (Küchler: 790–97), which could also be designated as the Mount of Anointment (*har hammišḥâ*). Although the respective designation is first explicitly attested in the Mishnah (e.g., *mRH* 2 : 4; *mMid* 2 : 4), this does not necessarily exclude the possibility that it is already alluded to in 2 Kgs 23 : 13 (Cogan/Tadmor: 288; Sweeney: 449). In this case, the author of the verse would have introduced the Mount of Destruction (*har hammašḥît*) as a play on words on *har hammišḥâ* in order to express his polemics against the cultic abominations practiced at the site (cf. Deut 4 : 16, 25; 31 : 29; Judg 2 : 19 where the *hipʿil* of the root *š-ḥ-t* is used in references to Israel's worship of foreign deities and their idols). Alternatively, one could also argue that the designation of the place as *har hammišḥâ* reflects a later tendency to avoid the negative connotations of the term *har hammašḥît* by changing the last consonant (Küchler: 791). Although the case cannot be decided with any certainty, there can be no doubt about the fact that by referring to the Mount of Destruction, the author of 2 Kgs 23 : 13 strongly polemicized against illegitimate worship on the Mount of Olives. Additional evidence for the fact that these polemics reflect a certain historical reality is provided by 2 Sam 15 : 32. The verse mentions the "summit where God/Deities were worshipped" and thus indicates that the Mount of Olives may have enjoyed a long history as a cultic site.

Bibliography: ■ Cogan, M./H. Tadmor, *II Kings* (Anchor Bible 11; New York 1988). ■ Küchler, M., *Jerusalem* (Orte und Landschaften der Bibel 4/2; Göttingen 2007). ■ Sweeney, M. A., *I & II Kings* (OTL; Louisville, Ky. 2007).

Christoph Berner

Detective Story
→Crime Fiction

Determinism
→Fate

Deuel
Deuel (MT *Dĕʿûʾēl*; LXX Ραγουηλ) is the father of Eliasaph, a leader of the Israelite tribe of Gad during Israel's wilderness journey (Num 1 : 14; 7 : 42, 47; 10 : 20). He was also called Reuel (MT *Rĕʿûʾēl*; Num 2 : 14). The dual names were interpreted by medieval Jewish commentators as encoding a special teaching.

Bibliography: ■ Ron, Z., "Eliasaph Ben-Deuel/Reuel: A Rabbinic Interpretation," *JBQ* 33 (2005) 191–95.

Daniel Stulac

Deuterocanonical
→Apocrypha, Apocryphal Writings

Deutero-Isaiah
→Isaiah (Book and Person)

Deuteronomist (D) Source
→Deuteronomy, Book of; →Pentateuch (Torah); →Pentateuchal Criticism

Deuteronomistic History
The book of Deuteronomy stands at the end of the Torah (Pentateuch) in the canonical shaping of the HB/OT, but it also contains many links to other OT books. In Moses' final speech, the crossing of the Jordan as well as the coming conquest of the land are repeatedly pointed at, though their stories are recorded in Joshua. Deuteronomy also contains allusions to the time of the Judges (compare Deut 6 : 12–15 and Judg 2 : 12–14) and the monarchy (see the law of the king in Deut 17). In addition, the exile described at the end of 2 Kgs is already perceivable in the curses of Deut 28. These close relations between Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets had already led Spinoza to the theory that all these books (but also the books of Genesis–Numbers) are the work of one single editor who lived after the events of 587, and who wanted to produce an explanation for the fall of Judah with his historical account. At the beginning of the 19th century, W. M. L. de Wette was probably the first scholar to explain the interrelation between Joshua–Kings and Deuteronomy with the concept of "Deuteronomistic (Dtr)" texts or editors. By identifying, as had been suggested before him, the book discovered in 2 Kgs 22 with the first edition of Deuteronomy, he fostered the idea that "Deuteronomism" started in the time of King Josiah. H. Ewald, J. Wellhausen, and others, who identified Dtr texts in the Former Prophets, further developed this idea. Wellhausen presumes a first Dtr redaction in the time of Josiah, which is followed by exilic additions and revisions.

1. The discovery of the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH) by Martin Noth. In contrast to his predecessors, when M. Noth wrote his "History of Traditions" in 1943, he aimed to determine the function of Dtr texts in Deuteronomy and in the Former Prophets. He detected in these texts a unity in terms of content and composition. They are the work of an anonymous author, whom Noth called the "Deuteronomist" ("Dtr"). The Dtr composed his work shortly after 560 BCE (the last event in 2 Kgs 25 can be dated to ~562), providing an etiology of the collapse of Judah. By doing so, he provides the books of Deuteronomy–Kings with a "unified his-

torical theology," introducing explanation speeches and comments into the course of the narration. In this way, Dtr is the author of a complex tradition, who for the first time conceives a thoroughgoing history of Israel and Judah from their Mosaic beginnings until the destruction of Jerusalem. The closest relatives of Dtr are those historians of Hellenistic and Roman times, who, using older and mostly anonymous narrative material, wrote histories not of their own time but of more or less former times. Dtr writes his history to point out that the exile is a punishment from YHWH for the continuous disobedience of his people and their kings. In doing so, he obviously saw the events of 597 and 587 as something irreversible and final. The hand and the theology of Dtr can easily be detected in texts that Noth labelled "reflection-chapters" (esp. Josh 23; Judg 2 : 11–3 : 6; 1 Sam 12; 1 Kgs 8; 2 Kgs 17), in which Dtr has important personalities or himself holding speeches that provide interpretation for the past and for coming events. These speeches also distinguish different periods of the Dtr History (Deut 1–Josh 23: Moses and the conquest; Judg 2–1 Sam 12: the time of the Judges; 1 Sam 12–1 Kgs 8: the origins of monarchy; 1 Kgs 8–2 Kgs 17: the two kingdoms; 2 Kgs 17–25: the last days of Judah). This theory was well received in scholarship, but soon underwent two major modifications.

2. A Josianic origin of the DtrH: The so-called block-model. This model, which is dominant in Anglo-Saxon research, goes back to Frank Moore Cross, who picks up an idea of Wellhausen and others. Cross locates the first edition of the DtrH in the Josianic period, originally ending in 2 Kgs 23 : 25. This edition was completed after ~587 by the addition of 2 Kgs 24–25. Cross bases his theory on the observation that two main themes characterize the DtrH (in fact the books of Samuel–Kings): the sin of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 12), the first Northern king who built YHWH sanctuaries outside Jerusalem (in Dan and Bethel) and the promise of an everlasting Davidic dynasty in 2 Sam 7. Those two lines come to a conclusion in the narration of the reform of Josiah (2 Kgs 22–23), because Josiah destroys in 2 Kgs 23 : 15 the sanctuary of Bethel, and by this puts an end to the sins of Jeroboam. Furthermore, Dtr presents him as a new David, the best of all kings. Consequently, Cross distinguishes between Dtr[1] (the redactor of the Josianic edition of the DtrH) and Dtr[2] (mainly responsible for the addition of 2 Kgs 24–25 after ~587 and a few other texts). Other members of the "Cross-school" increased the texts to be to ascribed to the exilic Dtr (e.g., R. D. Nelson), but they all agree that the first edition of the DtrH is not an etiology of exile but a propaganda for Josiah's reform.

3. A DtrH in several exilic (and "post-exilic") steps: the so-called "layer model." This theory is due to Rudolf Smend, who pointed out, that in the Dtr YHWH-speech in Josh 1, v. 6 draws a first conclusion. In vv. 7–9 there is an addition (also in Dtr style) that turns the military speech into an exhortation to obedience towards the Mosaic Law. This brings Smend to the assumption of a later Dtr redactor, whom he calls "DtrN," a Dtr "nomist." W. Dietrich added a "DtrP," a prophetic Dtr, responsible for the insertion of the main prophetic histories in Kings and constructing a theory of prophetic announcement and fulfilment. The so-called "model of Göttingen" (where Smend taught) is therefore characterized by the distinction of three Dtr layers: DtrH (the "historian", responsible for the first edition of DtrH, who writes during the exile), DtrP (a prophetic Deuteronomist, only found in Samuel–Kings) and DtrN (a nomistic Dtr, who at the end of the exilic or the beginning of the Persian period insists on the importance of the law).

This theory remains close to Noth's ideas, because it places the beginnings of DtrH in the exilic period. Other scholars added more layers to this model, as for example "DtrS" ("spät-dtr": late Dtr texts; O. Kaiser) or DtrB ("Bundestheologischer Dtr"; Dtr texts focusing on the covenant; T. Veijola). In regard to this multiplication of layers it is not clear whether their protagonists still presume a coherent DtrH.

Dtr redactions were also detected in the Latter Prophets, especially in Jeremiah (J. P. Hyatt, W. Thiel) and Amos and Hosea (G. A. Yee, R. Albertz). Yet it remained unclear how those redactions were related to DtrH. The fact that there was a trend to discover Dtr redactions in almost every book of the HB provoked criticism and the question how to define the term "Dtr" (L. S. Schearing–S. L. McKenzie).

4. The rejection of the theory. In the last few decades, the theory of a DtrH has been increasingly criticized, especially in European scholarship. The opponents of Noth's idea insist on the old observation that the Dtr texts in the different books of the Former Prophets are extremely different from one another and cannot be assigned to one or two coherent Dtr editions. The Dtr texts in Judges suggest a cyclic conception of history, while Samuel–Kings clearly present a linear story. The Dtr texts in Judges and Samuel are much more discrete than in Joshua or Kings. The idea of cult centralization plays a major role in Deuteronomy and Kings but does not appear in Joshua–Samuel. Therefore C. Westermann, E. A. Knauf and others consider Noth's theory as a major error in biblical scholarship. A. G. Auld, E. Aurelius and others have adapted an idea of E. Würthwein from 1994, according to whom the so-called DtrH should be limited to the sole books of Kings or Samuel–Kings. This goes along to a certain extent with the revival of the idea of a Hexateuch, bringing the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua again in closer relation to Genesis–Numbers than to the books of Judges,

Samuel and Kings. These scholars argue, that many "Dtr" themes are limited to Samuel–Kings, as for example the high places (*bāmôt*).

5. The present state of discussion. This presentation may give the impression of a quite confusing situation of research on the DtrH. Therefore one should take into account the arguments of each of the above positions. We have to agree with the opponents of Noth's theory, that the Dtr passages in Deuteronomy–Kings vary substantially in terms of frequency, use of language, and theological intention. The arguments of the proponents of the "layer model" point in the same direction, since the idea of different layers responds to the necessity of differentiation in regard to style and ideology.

Those who postulate a Josianic DtrH should be approved as far as certain Dtr texts and ideas fit better into the 7th century than into the exilic or Persian period (see for instance the formula "until this day", which often refers to situations of the monarchic period, or the numerous parallels to Assyrian treaty language and ideology).

For M. Noth, DtrH was the work of an intellectual who wrote his history without being related to any institution. This assumption is anachronistic. Almost all texts in the HB are tradition-literature and have passed through the hands of many copyists and editors, who stored the writings in temple or sanctuary "libraries." J. Van Seters claimed that Dtr was the Judean colleague of Herodotus or Thucydides. Contrary to the Greek historians, the authors and/or redactors of DtrH proceed without signing their work and without discussing their sources. They certainly used written sources, specifically annals of kings, whose existence is presumable for Israel and Judah. DtrH could nevertheless be compared to Herodotus in the sense that its redactors aim to clarify the reasons that have led to a present situation (2 Kgs 17 : 7: "This took place, because the Israelites had sinned against YHWH their God"; 2 Kgs 24 : 3 "This took place in Judah due to the order of YHWH, to erase them from his view").

Against the opponents of the DtrH it should be recalled (with J. Van Seters and S. L. McKenzie) that the books of Deuteronomy–2 Kings create a chronological succession in order to construct a history from the Mosaic beginning to the collapses of Israel and Judah. As Noth pointed out, the speeches or evaluations of history (Josh 1 and 23; Judg 2; 1 Sam 12; 1 Kgs 8; 2 Kgs 17), having a model in the great farewell speech of Moses (Deut 1–30), are clearly correlated and structure the books Deuteronomy–2 Kings in distinct time periods. It is difficult to imagine that these texts came into existence without any compositional function.

6. The model of a "Dtr library." The attempt to combine the model of Cross and followers with the Göttingen layer-model may provide a possibility for consensus about the DtrH (see the works of M. A.

O'Brian and N. Lohfink). This combination could be taken a step further by also integrating the arguments of the opponents to the DtrH (T. Römer) and the fact that some Dtr texts seem to fit better into the early Persian period (R. F. Person).

The books of Deuteronomy and Joshua display important parallels to the Assyrian vassal treaties (H. U. Steymans) and military ideology (R. D. Nelson) and may have been composed for the first time in the 7th century as a "counter-history" responding to the Assyrian imperial ideology. The first edition of Samuel and Kings may also have taken place during this time in order to present Josiah as a new David. We may, then, assume a Dtr "library" in the Jerusalem temple composed by several unrelated scrolls. In the Babylonian period, and probably in Babylon, where the older scrolls had been taken, a new edition took place and the book of Judges was added to the dtr scrolls. The scroll of Jeremiah, which is clearly related to Kings (compare 2 Kgs 22 and Jer 36; 2 Kgs 24–25 and Jer 52), was also integrated into the Dtr library. A last revision took place during the Persian period where segregationist (Deut 7) and monotheistic texts (Deut 4 or the last version of 1 Kgs 8) were added.

The centralization law in Deut 12 possibly reflects the three main stages in the development of the DtrH. One can easily distinguish three parallel structured units in this text: The oldest layer can be detected in vv. 13–18 (the practical consequences of the centralization, the Mosaic fiction of Deuteronomy is not clearly presupposed); the second layer is to be found in vv. 8–12 and 28 (the exilic situation of the addressees is emphasized); the last layer occurs in vv. 2–7 and 29–31 (these verses remind of Ezra and Nehemiah and reflect a segregationist ideology of parts of the Babylonian Golah).

The so-called DtrH was, according to this view, the work of a school of scribes, who were in charge of the books of Deuteronomy–Kings (and of others) from the 7th century BCE until the Persian period. Possibly DtrH was never fixed on one single scroll, a fact which would also explain the difference between scrolls in the use of language and syntax. Different Dtr scribes were in charge of different Dtr scrolls. DtrH came to an end, when, in the middle of the Persian Period, the decision was taken to promulgate a Pentateuch. So the book of Deuteronomy was cut off from the following books and became the end of the Torah (without however losing its links to the Former Prophets).

Bibliography: ■ [The references to authors quoted above and not listed here can easily be found in the collective volume edited by de Pury, Römer and Macchi] ■ Albertz, R., *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* (Studies in Biblical Literature 3; Atlanta, Ga. 2003). ■ Aurelius, E., *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (BZAW 319; Berlin/New York 2003). ■ Cross, F. M., "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History,"

in id., *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973) 274–89. ∎ Dietrich, W., *Prophetie und Geschichte* (FRLANT 108; Göttingen 1972). ∎ Geoghegan, J. C., *The Time, Place and Purpose of the Deuteronomistic History: The Evidence of 'Until This Day'* (Brown Judaic Studies 347; Providence, R.I. 2006). ∎ Lohfink, N., "Was There a Deuteronomistic Movement?," in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (eds. L. S. Schearing/S. L. Mckenzie; JSOT Supplement Series 268; Sheffield 1999) 36–66; trans of id., "Gab es eine deuteronomische Bewegung?," in *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'* (ed. W. Groß; BBB 98; Weinheim 1995) 313–82. ∎ McKenzie, S. L., *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Books of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VT Supplements 42; Leiden 1991). ∎ Nelson, R. D., *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, Ky. 1997). ∎ Nelson, R. D., "The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History: The Case is Still Compelling," *JSOT* 29 (2005) 319–37. ∎ Noth, M., *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOT Supplement Series 15; Sheffield 1991); trans. of id., *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Darmstadt ³1967 [= Halle a.d.S. ¹1943]). ∎ O'Brien, M. A., *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Freiburg i.Ue. 1989). ∎ Person Jr., R. F., *The Deuteronomic School: History, Social Setting, and Literature* (Studies in Biblical Literature 2; Atlanta, Ga. 2002). ∎ Pury, A. de et al. (eds.), *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic History in Recent Research* (JSOT Supplement Series 306; Sheffield 2000). ∎ Römer, T., *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London 2005). ∎ Schearing, L. S./S. L. McKenzie (eds.), *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (JSOT Supplement Series 268; Sheffield 1999). ∎ Smend, R., "The Law and the Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (eds. G. N. Knoppers/J. G. McConville; Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 8; Winona Lake, Ind. 2000) 95–110; trans. of id., "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Probleme biblischer Theologie*, FS G. von Rad (ed. H. W. Wolff; München 1971) 494–509. ∎ Van Seters, J., *In Search of History: History in the Ancient World and the Origin of Biblical History* (New Haven, Conn. 1983). ∎ Westermann, C., *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* (TB 87; Gütersloh 1994). ∎ Witte, M. et al. (eds.), *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur 'Deuteronomismus'-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (BZAW 365; Berlin/New York 2006). ∎ Yee, G. A., *Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea: A Redaction Critical Investigation* (SBL Dissertation Series 102; Atlanta, Ga. 1987).

Thomas Römer

Deuteronomy, Book of

I. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

The book of Deuteronomy, the 5th and final book of the Pentateuch, recounts a series of farewell speeches spoken by Moses before his death (Deut 34) to a new generation of Israelites as they stood on the plains of Moab at the completion of their wilderness journey from Egypt to the promised land of Canaan. The book's English title derives from a Latin translation of the Greek phrase Τὸ Δευτερονόμιον in the LXX in Deut 17:18 (and the LXX of Josh 9:2c [MT/ET 8:32]), a phrase meaning "a second law," or "a copy of the law." Jewish tradition also uses two alternate Hebrew titles for the book: *Mishne Torah* ("Repetition of Torah" – *bMeg* 31b) or, more commonly, ʾēllê haddĕbārîm ("These are the words") or simply *Dĕbārîm* ("Words") drawn from the opening words of the book's first verse.

As a "second law," the book presents itself as Moses transmitting the law first given to him at Mount Horeb/Sinai (Exod 19–24) and then repeated in a second version in the book of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy includes parallels to a number of individual narratives and laws from earlier in the Pentateuch. Thus, for example, about half of the laws in the so-called Covenant Code in Exod 20:23–23:33 are repeated with modifications in Deuteronomy (Levinson).

1. Form. Deuteronomy is the one book of the Pentateuch that refers to itself as "tôrâ" or as "this book of the tôrâ" (Deut 1:15; 4:8, 44; 17:18–19; 27:3, 8, 26; 28:58, 61; 29:20, 28; 30:10; 31:9, 11, 12, 24, 26; 32:46). As such, *tôrâ* may be the best designation of the book's overall form. The Greek LXX translates Hebrew *tôrâ* as νόμος ("law"), but only the material in Deut 12–26 is properly described as a law code. The term *tôrâ* as it is used in Deuteronomy signifies a rich blend of laws, narratives, social and political polity, religious teaching, and catechesis directed from one generation to another (Miller). The role of didactic teaching and rhetorical persuasion is highlighted by the uniquely frequent use of the verb *lāmad* ("to teach") throughout Deuteronomy (4:1, 5, 10 [2x], 14; 5:1, 28; 6:1; 11:19; 14:23; 17:19; 18:9; 20:18; 31:12, 13, 19, 22).

2. Structure. The overall structure of the book is defined by a number of formulaic superscriptions that occur at key transition points: "These are the words" (1:1), "This is the tôrâ" (4:44), "This is the commandment – the statutes and the ordinances" (6:1), "These are the words of the covenant … in the plains of Moab" (29:1 [MT 28:69]), "This is the blessing" (33:1). These superscriptions mark off a brief narrative introduction (1:1–5), three core speeches by Moses (1:6–4:43; 4:44–28:68; and 29:1 [MT 28:69]–32:52) and a conclusion with Moses' final blessing of the twelve tribes of Israel and the narrative of Moses' death on Mount Nebo, overlooking the promised land of Canaan (33:1–34:12).

3. Contents. After a brief superscription (1:1–5), Deut 1–3 provides the first of two introductions to the laws by rehearsing selected narratives from the wilderness wandering tradition in Exodus and