

Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History

Edited by
KONRAD SCHMID
and RAYMOND F. PERSON, JR.

*Forschungen
zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe*

56

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
2. Reihe

Edited by

Bernd Janowski (Tübingen) · Mark S. Smith (New York)
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen)

56



Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History

Edited by

Konrad Schmid
Raymond F. Person, Jr.

Mohr Siebeck

KONRAD SCHMID is Professor of Old Testament and Ancient Judaism at the Faculty of Theology at the University of Zürich, Switzerland.

RAYMOND F. PERSON JR. is Professor of Religion and Chair of the Department of Philosophy and Religion at Ohio Northern University, USA.

e-ISBN 978-3-16-152423-3

ISBN 978-3-16-151008-3

ISSN 1611-4914 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2012 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	V
Abbreviations.....	VII
<i>Raymond F. Person, Jr. and Konrad Schmid</i>	
Introduction	1
<i>Konrad Schmid</i>	
Deuteronomy within the “Deuteronomistic Histories” in Genesis–2 Kings.....	8
<i>Reinhard G. Kratz</i>	
The Headings of the Book of Deuteronomy.....	31
<i>Jeffrey Stackert</i>	
Mosaic Prophecy and the Deuteronomic Source of the Torah.....	47
<i>Sandra Richter</i>	
Placing the Name, Pushing the Paradigm: A Decade with the Deuteronomistic Name Formula.....	64
<i>Christophe Nihan</i>	
The Literary Relationship between Deuteronomy and Joshua: A Reassessment	79
<i>Cynthia Edenburg</i>	
Joshua 9 and Deuteronomy, an Intertextual Conundrum: The Chicken or the Egg?	115
<i>Juha Pakkala</i>	
Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings in the Redaction of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets.....	133
List of Contributors	163

Source Index	164
Author Index	176

Abbreviations

AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible
ABG	Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte
<i>Ahw</i>	<i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . W. von Soden. 3 vols. Wiesbaden, 1965–1981
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AS	Assyriological Studies
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
ATD.A	Das Alte Testament Deutsch. Apokryphen
AYBRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
<i>BDB</i>	Brown, F., S.R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford, 1907
BE	Biblische Enzyklopädie
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums
BET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BTSt	Biblich-theologische Studien
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAR	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
<i>COS</i>	<i>The Context of Scripture</i> . Edited by W.W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden, 1997–2002
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert

<i>DNWSI</i>	<i>Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions.</i> J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling. 2 vols. Leiden, 1995
EdF	Erträge der Forschung
EHS.T	Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe XXIII, Theologie
<i>EncJud</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica.</i> 16 vols. Jerusalem, 1972
<i>ETR</i>	<i>Etudes théologiques et religieuses</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GTA	Göttinger theologische Arbeiten
<i>HALAT</i>	Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J.J. Stamm. <i>Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament.</i> Fascicles 1–5, 1967–1995
<i>HALOT</i>	Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J.J. Stamm. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.</i> Translated and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, 1994–1999
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HSAT	Das Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>JANER</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JPSTC	Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
MdB	Le Monde de la Bible
NCB	New Century Bible
NEB.AT	Neue Echter Bibel. Altes Testament
NSK.AT	Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar. Altes Testament
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
ÖBS	Österreichische biblische Studien
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>

<i>RGG</i>	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft.</i> Edited by H.D. Betz <i>et al.</i> 4th edition. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998–
RIME	The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods
SAAS	State Archives of Assyria Studies
SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SBTS	Sources for Biblical and Theological Study
SHCANÉ	Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SKG.G	Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft. Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
TB	Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.</i> Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Translated by J.T. Willis, G.W. Bromiley, and D.E. Green. 15 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1974–
<i>ThPh</i>	<i>Theologie und Philosophie</i>
<i>ThWAT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.</i> Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart, 1970–
<i>Transeu</i>	<i>Transeuphratène</i>
<i>TRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
<i>TSK</i>	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
TThSt	Trierer theologische Studien
UTB	Uni-Taschen-Bücher
<i>VF</i>	<i>Verkündigung und Forschung</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum: Supplement Series
VWGTh	Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZAR	<i>Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Introduction

Raymond F. Person, Jr. and Konrad Schmid

Since Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette's *Dissertatio critica*,¹ Deuteronomy has been the major historical anchor for the analysis of both the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. Dating Deuteronomy's first edition to the Josianic period is still the option most often chosen by scholars, although some recent discussion has included the option for exilic dating,² taking up a classical dispute from the beginning of the twentieth century.³ Either way, Deuteronomy still serves as one of the most important reference points for the dating of biblical texts with regard to the following question: Do the Pentateuch and Former Prophets, or parts thereof, presuppose Deuteronomy's program of cult centralization or not?

In addition, Deuteronomy has significantly influenced much of later biblical literature. Since Noth's inauguration of a "Deuteronomistic History" in Deuteronomy–Kings, biblical scholarship has recognized that the theology and language of Deuteronomy had a special impact on the books of the Former Prophets, Joshua–Kings. The assumption of a close redactional link be-

¹ See the text and comments in H.-P. MATHYS, "Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes *Dissertatio critico-exegetica* von 1805," in *Biblische Theologie und historisches Denken: Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studien aus Anlass der 50. Wiederkehr der Basler Promotion von R. Smend* (ed. M. Kessler and M. Wallraff; Basel: Schwabe, 2008), 171–211.

² R.G. KRATZ, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 114–133; trans. of *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments* (UBT 2157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 118–138; J. PAKKALA, "The Date of the Oldest Edition of Deuteronomy," *ZAW* 121 (2009), 388–401; N. MACDONALD, "Issues in the Dating of Deuteronomy: A Response to Juha Pakkala," *ZAW* 122 (2010), 431–435; J. PAKKALA, "The Dating of Deuteronomy: A Response to Nathan MacDonald," *ZAW* 123 (2011), 431–436. See also the discussion in P. ALTMANN, *Festive Meals in Ancient Israel: Deuteronomy's Identity Politics in Their Ancient Near Eastern Context* (BZAW 424; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 5–36.

³ See W. BAUMGARTNER, "Der Kampf um das Deuteronomium," *TRu* 1 (1929), 7–25; see also S. LOERSCH, *Das Deuteronomium und seine Deutungen: Ein forschungsbeschichtlicher Überblick* (SBS 22; Stuttgart: Bibelwerk, 1967), 50–67; E. OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien* (BZAW 284; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 6ff.

tween those books and Deuteronomy has become a well-established position since then, although it has been differentiated in redaction-historical terms in several ways.⁴ The acceptance of redactional relations between Deuteronomy and Joshua–Kings and the notion of a “Deuteronomistic History” is so common that, for example, in John J. Collins’s *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*,⁵ the Deuteronomistic History becomes a historical-critical substitute for the traditional “Former Prophets” section of the Old Testament canon. Collins’s *Introduction* is organized in four parts, out of which the second is entitled not “Former Prophets” but “Deuteronomistic History” and deals with Joshua–Kings:

- Part One: The Torah/Pentateuch
- Part Two: The Deuteronomistic History
- Part Three: Prophecy
- Part Four: The Writings

Deuteronomy has long been perceived to have had considerably less influence on Genesis–Numbers. To a certain extent, the relationship between them was widely neglected in the wake of Noth’s assumption that there was no Deuteronomistic redaction in Genesis–Numbers: “It is generally recognised that there is no sign of ‘Deuteronomistic editing’ in Genesis–Numbers.”⁶ But Jul-

⁴ See, e.g., R.F. PERSON, Jr., *The Deuteronomistic School: History, Social Setting and Literature* (SBL Studies in Biblical Literature 2; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 2–9; T. RÖMER, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction* (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 13–43; A detailed survey of scholarship is provided by T. RÖMER and A. DE PURY, “Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues,” in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (ed. A. de Pury et al.; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 24–141; trans. of “L’historiographie deutéronomiste (HD): Histoire de la recherche et enjeux du débat,” in *Israël construit son histoire: L’historiographie deutéronomiste à la lumière des recherches récentes* (ed. A. de Pury et al.; MdB 34; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1996), 9–120; and T. VEIJOLA, “Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch,” *TRu* 68 (2003), 374–382; IDEM, “Deuteronomismussforschung zwischen Tradition und Innovation (I),” *TRu* 67 (2002), 273–327; IDEM, “Deuteronomismussforschung zwischen Tradition und Innovation (II),” *TRu* 67 (2002), 391–424; IDEM, “Deuteronomismussforschung zwischen Tradition und Innovation (III),” *TRu* 68 (2003), 1–44. See also A. MOENIKES, “Beziehungssysteme zwischen dem Deuteronomium und den Büchern Josua bis Könige,” in *Das Deuteronomium* (ed. G. Braulik; ÖBS 23; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003), 69–85.

⁵ Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004, v–vi.

⁶ M. NOTH, *The Deuteronomistic History* (trans. J. Doull et al.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1981), 12–13. See on this K. SCHMID, “The Emergence and Disappearance of the Separation between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in Biblical Studies,” in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch: Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; SBL Ancient Israel and Its Literature 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 11–24, esp. 14–15.

ius Wellhausen had already noted the kinship of JE in some passages with Deuteronomistic language and theology.⁷ Hans Heinrich Schmid saw his “J” in close relationship to Deuteronomism,⁸ and in the wake of Rolf Rendtorff and Erhard Blum,⁹ the notion of a Deuteronomistic layer or composition in the Pentateuch became a common assumption in scholarship (at least in Europe).¹⁰ Subsequently, the redactional links between Deuteronomy and the other books of the Pentateuch have been explored in more detail.¹¹ Several scholars thereby assume “Deuteronomistic” redactional texts – or texts that traditionally have been seen as “Deuteronomistic” – that even postdate the Priestly Code.¹² Erhard Blum, for example, has revised his position regarding D-texts in Genesis, which he now separates from those in Exodus–Numbers and which he dates after P.¹³ Due to the lack of consensus in pentateuchal exegesis, however, these explorations have not yet yielded reliable results.

⁷ J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1899), 94–95.

⁸ H.H. SCHMID, *Der sogenannte Jahwist: Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976), 166.

⁹ R. RENDTORFF, *Das Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW 147; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), 75–79; E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1984), 362–419; IDEM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 101–218.

¹⁰ For an example from the American context, see J. BLENKINSOPP, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 233–237.

¹¹ See E. OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens* (FAT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); J.C. GERTZ, “Kompositorische Funktion und literarhistorischer Ort von Deuteronomium 1–3,” in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur “Deuteronomismus”-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (ed. M. Witte et al.; BZAW 365; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 103–123; VEIJOLA, “Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch” (see n. 4), 374–382; R.G. KRATZ, “Der literarische Ort des Deuteronomiums,” in *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium* (ed. R.G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann; FRLANT 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 101–120. See also IDEM, *Composition* (see n. 2), 114–133 (*Komposition*, 118–38); IDEM, “Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J.C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–323.

¹² See, e.g., E. OTTO, “Die nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction – Reception – Interpretation* (ed. M. Verenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 61–111, and the overview in IDEM, “Forschungen zum nachpriesterschriftlichen Pentateuch,” *TRu* 67 (2002), 125–155.

¹³ E. BLUM, “Die literarische Verbindung von Erzvätern und Exodus: Ein Gespräch mit neueren Endredaktionshypothesen,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J.C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 119–156.

The current situation is complicated by the fact that it has become increasingly clear that Deuteronomy in itself is a multilayered composition that has grown over a long period. The composite character of Deuteronomy – that is, the existence of multiple redactional layers – applies no longer simply to the fringes of Deuteronomy in Deut 1–3 and 30–34, but also to the main body of the book.¹⁴ Some scholars even believe that Deuteronomy was never an independent text,¹⁵ although the traditional view still prevails.

Therefore, the subject of Deuteronomy in its contexts is very open for discussion. Because of these recent challenges, the Pentateuch Section and the Deuteronomistic History Section of the Society of Biblical Literature held two joint sessions at the 2010 annual meeting in Atlanta; the sessions were devoted to the question of how the book of Deuteronomy related to the larger literary works of which it may have been a part, including but not limited to the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History. The present volume grew out of those two joint sessions. All but one of the following essays – that is, excluding the essay by Schmid – are revisions of papers given in these sessions.

In the current scholarly environment, a consensus cannot be expected to result from such an enterprise. Research on the Pentateuch, on the one hand, and on the Deuteronomistic History, on the other hand, is simply too diverse for such an outcome. The essays in this volume, therefore, represent the continuing diversity of approaches to the question of the role of Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, the Hexateuch, and/or the Deuteronomistic History.

In “Deuteronomy within the ‘Deuteronomistic Histories’ in Genesis–2 Kings,” Konrad Schmid criticizes the traditional understanding, inaugurated by Noth and von Rad, of the Deuteronomistic History’s diachronic relationship to the Pentateuch. According to Noth and von Rad, the book of Deuteronomy was first connected to the Deuteronomistic History and then appended to the Tetrateuch to form the Pentateuch. Schmid’s critique begins with the implausibility of the ideas that, on the one hand, the Deuteronomistic History existed independently of any narrative concerning the patriarchs and the exodus and that, on the other hand, the conquest narratives of the pentateuchal sources would have completely disappeared once the Deuteronomistic History and the Tetrateuch were combined. A more plausible diachronic reconstruction of how Deuteronomy relates to its contexts in Genesis–Kings can be found by asking about the specific theological topics that are highlighted by

¹⁴ See, e.g., for the first sixteen chapters of the book, T. VEIJOLA, *Das 5. Buch Mose: Deuteronomium Kapitel 1,1–16,17* (ATD 8/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

¹⁵ See KRATZ, “Literarische Ort” (see n. 11); IDEM, “The Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 31–61, here 39–45 (he names predecessors on 42 n. 34 [W. Staerk, E. Reuter]).

the relationships between the books. Apparently the first “Deuteronomistic History,” focused on the cult-centralization theme detected in 1 Samuel–2 Kings, was not yet literarily connected to “Ur”-Deuteronomy (6–28*). The subsequent literary linking of Deuteronomy, probably in the shape of chs. 5–30*, with Exodus–Joshua, on the one hand, and with Joshua–Kings, on the other hand, was grounded in particular on the theology of the Decalogue. A final post-Priestly “Deuteronomistic History” can be found in Genesis–2 Kings, which is reflected in Deuteronomy by the addition of Deut 4.

In “The Headings of the Book of Deuteronomy,” Reinhard Kratz examines the four “headings” in Deut 1:1–5; 4:44–49; 5:1; and 6:4. On the basis of this analysis, he reconstructs the redaction history of Deuteronomy in its larger literary contexts as follows: (1) Deuteronomy 6:4 introduced a first edition consisting of Deut 6:4–26:16*, which was probably not an independent text. (2) Deuteronomy 5:1 introduced an expanded Deuteronomy (including 34:5–6) as a part of Exodus–Joshua. (3) Deuteronomy 1:1a* functioned to indicate that Deuteronomy concludes the Pentateuch, while at the same time pointing forward to the continuing narrative in the Former Prophets. (4) Deuteronomy 1:1b–5 and Deut 4:44–49 are later introductions that mutually influence one another in a complex redaction history of their own that is associated with the addition of Deut 1–4.

In “Mosaic Prophecy and the Deuteronomistic Source of the Torah,” Jeffrey Stackert argues for the Wellhausenian order of the pentateuchal sources by suggesting that the D source’s formulation of Mosaic prophecy draws from J and E without knowledge of P. The D formulation allowed future prophetic activity as long as the prophets are “like Moses.” The “like Moses” formulation creates some tension with the other pentateuchal sources and with other “Deuteronom(ist)ic” literature in the Prophets.

In “Placing the Name, Pushing the Paradigm: A Decade with the Deuteronomistic Name Formula,” Sandra Richter returns to her thesis critiquing Name Theology in the context of the ancient Near East. After reviewing how others responded to her earlier monograph, she defends her thesis that the use of Name Theology in D is not a “Deuteronomistic correction” of JE with a more advanced understanding of the deity according to hypostasis, but rather simply means that YHWH’s “placing his name” emphasizes YHWH’s sovereignty over his newly conquered land. Nevertheless, Richter asserts that the “inherited structure” of Wellhausen (JEDP) and Noth’s notion of D as foundational for the Deuteronomistic History remain sound.

In “The Literary Relationship between Deuteronomy and Joshua: A Reassessment,” Christophe Nihan reexamines Lohfink’s hypothesis of a Dtr *Landeroberungserzählung* (DtrL) and Braulik’s revision of DtrL. He reconstructs the redaction history of Deuteronomy and Joshua as follows: (1) The narrative spanning the exodus to the conquest (Exodus–Joshua*) originally contained

no legal material and ended with Josh 10:40–43*. This narrative was produced during the Josianic period. (2) The early form of Deuteronomy (Deut 12–26*) was an independent literary work. (3) The Deuteronomic legal material was incorporated into the exodus-conquest narrative, leading to revisions in Deuteronomy and Joshua, so that the new work ended with Josh 11:16–23*. (4) The exodus-conquest narrative now containing Deuteronomic legal material was then expanded to include Judges–Samuel–Kings*. At this stage a new ending was added to Joshua (21:43–45; 23:1–3, 11, 14–16a) and a new beginning was added to Judges (2:11–19*). The close connections between Deut 12:8–12; Josh 21:43–45; and 1 Kgs 8:56 derive from this postmonarchic redaction.

In “Joshua 9 and Deuteronomy, an Intertextual Conundrum: The Chicken or the Egg?” Cynthia Edenburg analyzes Josh 9 and its intertexts, especially Deut 20. She reconstructs the redactional relationship between Josh 9 and Deut 20 as follows: (1) The original conquest narrative of Josh 6–10* was created to illustrate the limitations placed on warfare in the original law in Deut 20:10–14, 19–20*. (2) With the addition of the idealistic *hērem* stipulation in Deut 20:15–18, the conquest narrative was revised (Josh 6–11*) to lend support to the prohibition against intermarriage in the Persian period. (3) A post-Deuteronomistic revision of Josh 9 created a satirical attack on the *hērem* stipulation with the story of the Gibeonite ruse.

In “Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings in the Redaction of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets,” Juha Pakkala first details the relationships between Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings and then those between Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings, on the one hand, and Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Samuel, and the Tetrateuch, on the other hand. He formulates the following proposal: (1) Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings share a common early redactional development that emphasizes cult centralization and opposes the worship of other gods. (2) This common redactional development was independent of the early redactional histories of Joshua–Judges–Samuel and the Tetrateuch, in that the themes of cult centralization and other gods are lacking. (3) The final form of Joshua–Judges–Samuel and the Tetrateuch included later (although somewhat minimal) revisions of cult centralization in Joshua–Judges–Samuel and opposition to the worship of other gods in pentateuchal versions of Genesis–Numbers.

As the summaries of the individual essays demonstrate, the contributors to this volume approach the question of the role of Deuteronomy in its larger literary contexts from a variety of perspectives. It remains to be seen how these different perspectives will develop in future discussions. Certainly further methodological clarification is necessary. For example, how can we discern the difference between a new literary work that is referring to earlier traditional material and a book or scroll that is written to follow another as an extension of the earlier literary work? Moreover, when should we regard “dis-

junctions” as evidence of multiple redactors rather than as evidence of one author drawing from a diversity of sources for the purpose of combining various traditions into one narrative? These and other pressing methodological questions have occupied scholars for a long time and will likely continue to do so for decades to come; therefore, these tasks need to be left for the moment for other venues and volumes.

We, the editors, wish to thank all of the contributors for their participation in the joint SBL session and the inclusion of their work in this volume. We also want to thank Sarah Shectman for the excellent work she provided us in her careful and thorough copyediting, typesetting, and proofreading of the volume.

Deuteronomy within the “Deuteronomistic Histories” in Genesis–2 Kings¹

Konrad Schmid

1. The Problem of the Literary Interconnectedness of Deuteronomy in Its Contexts

Deuteronomy research traditionally involves four main areas: 1) the question of the literary layers of Deuteronomy (including the problem of the so-called “Ur”-Deuteronomy); 2) the question of the historical context of the literary core of Deuteronomy (traditionally, the connection with the Josianic reform); 3) the relationship between Deuteronomy and the Book of the Covenant; and 4) the question of the literary integration of Deuteronomy into its contexts.

The fourth problem area, which pertains to the question of Deuteronomy’s place between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History, received little attention for quite some time.² In the twentieth century, studies proceeded

¹ This article is a revised and updated version of my article “Das Deuteronomium innerhalb der ‘deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke’ in Gen–2Kön,” in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (ed. E. Otto and R. Achenbach; FRLANT 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 193–211. My thanks go to Philip Lasater for translating the original German text.

² See for example the concise (and at the same time, aporetic) statements of H.D. PREUSS, *Deuteronomium* (EdF 164; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982), 22f. But lately the situation has changed. See the recent work of R.G. KRATZ, “Der literarische Ort des Deuteronomiums,” in *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium* (ed. R.G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann; FRLANT 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 101–120; IDEM, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden; New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 114–133; trans. of *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments* (UTB 2157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 118–138; E. OTTO, “Deuteronomium und Pentateuch: Aspekte der gegenwärtigen Debatte,” *ZAR* 6 (2000), 222–284; and IDEM, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und im Hexateuch* (FAT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001); for a more recent history of research, T. VEIJOLA, “Deuteronomismussforschung zwischen Tradition und Innovation (III),” *TRu* 68 (2003), 1–44. Otto holds an especially pointed position in response to the question of the literary connection of Deut to the books of the Former Prophets after Josh: “Die umfangreiche Redaktion der Vorderen Prophe-