Witte, Markus, Konrad Schmid, Doris Prechel, and Jan Christian Gertz, eds.

Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"—Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten

Trent C. Butler
Gallatin, Tennessee

This collection of essays helps update readers on the German perspectives on methodology, presuppositions, and results of research into the book of Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History, and the history of religion background—especially Near Eastern treaties—out of which Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History developed. Konrad Schmid entitles his contribution, "Hatte Wellhausen Recht?" Reading many of these essays may lead to answering his question affirmatively. The essays developed out of an international symposium held in Heidelberg in June of 2005 entitled "The Deuteronomistic History Works in Genesis through 2 Kings: New Redaction- and History of Religion Perspectives in Recent 'Deuteronomistic' Discussion." Materials on treaties, oaths, and covenant were added from a conference held at the University of Mainz in December 2004.

The editors have separated the material into five parts: (1) "History of Religion and Methodological Perspectives"; (2) "The 'Deuteronomistic' Deuteronomy"; (3) "Pre- and Post-Deuteronomistic Material in the Former Prophets"; (4) "History of Religion Aspects"; and (5) "Contexts of the Deuteronomistic Covenant Idea" (Vorstellung). They have also provided a succinct foreword that introduces and briefly summarizes each of the essays. The foreword gives the presuppositions behind the volume, namely, that "the Deuteronomistic History cannot be judged to be a unified literary work and that no

consensus exists in regard to its original beginning and ending" (v). This has violently shaken (erschüttert) the foundation pillars on which the Noth built the hypothesis of *one* Deuteronomistic Historical work reaching from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings.

David Carr's essay on "Empirical Perspectives on the Deuteronomistic History" centers on family-centered education of the elite based on memorizing texts. The process of transmission and expanding texts in this environment accounts for textual variants as shown by a comparison of 1 Kgs 3:2–15 and 2 Chr 1:1–13. He calls for greater attention to redaction studies of texts for which we have multiple examples, such as cuneiform texts and Qumran and nonbiblical texts. This method would also lead to deeper study of the parallel texts in Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles.

Konrad Schmid's "Was Wellhausen Right? The Problem of the Literary Historical Beginnings of 'Deuteronomismus' in the Books of Kings" sees that the idea of an old pre-Deuteronomistic Tetrateuch or Hexateuch underlay Noth's hypothesis but is no longer held. Even the theory of Rudolph Smend and his school that partials out Deuteronomy through Kings to DtrH, DtrP, and DtrN has proved not to reach far enough. Thus for Schmid, the key to the Deuteronomistic question in the historical books of the Old Testament lies apparently in the literary, redaction-historical, and theological-historical differentiation of the texts and contexts assigned to the Deuteronomistical realm. One must hold as wide open as possible the historical and literary horizon of such differentiation, which could run from Esarhaddon to Matthew and Luke. No longer are we talking about authors, only redactors. Schmid agrees with Wellhausen that Deuteronomistic language appears in Genesis–2 Kings. Historically, Deuteronomisms appear from the time of Josiah to the period before the Priestly writing and even beyond to the conclusion of the Old Testament canon as represented by Josh 20. The only question raised in current German discussion is the preexilic origin of Deuteronomistic work in the books of Kings. Schmid argues with Wellhausen for this Josianic origin and invites further textual studies to test the conclusion.

Thomas Römer discusses "Phases in the Origin of the Deuteronomistic History." Working especially with Deut 12, he finds a base text from the seventh century B.C.E., an expansion in the exile, and an updating (Actualisierung) of the text for the Persian period. Römer thus presents three Deuteronomistic Histories, each of which represents a coherent literary structure and theological conception.

Eckart Otto opens the second section with "The Post-Deuteronomistic Deuteronomy as an Integrating Keystone of Torah." In this dense study of the hermeneutics of legal materials in the Pentateuch, he decides that, synchronically, Deuteronomy is to be read only as part of the canonical Torah. Deuteronomy 34 connects back to Gen 12:7; 50:24;

and Exod 33:1 and separates the Torah from the Former Prophets. No other text so clearly marks the end of a literary section. Texts such as Gen 12:6; 13:7; 32:33; 36:31; 40:15; Deut 3:14; 34:6 show hermeneutically that the text with Moses as the time narrated is not the time of the composition of the Pentateuch, which is the narrative time. This provides room to apply the prescriptive texts to the time of the author and of the reader. The different speakers of the Exodus Decalogue and the Deuteronomic Decalogue explained the material for the time of the readers so they could apply the meaning to their own time. Placing the Mosaic Torah in Moab is a motif that had the function in the Deuteronomic theology of the book of Deuteronomy to arouse hope of return for the second generation in exile, but in post-Deuteronomic theology gained the entirely new function as the building stone of the hermeneutic of law of the Pentateuch. Otto concludes that Deuteronomy is for the hermeneutic of law an indissoluble (unlösbar) integrating element of the Pentateuch. Correspondingly, Deuteronomy is the beginning point of the history of literature of the Pentateuch.

In "Compositional Function and Literary-Historical Place of Deuteronomy 1–3," Jan Christian Gertz studies Deut 1–3 and shows how it retells the pre-Priestly narrative of Exodus to Joshua to integrate the Deuteronomic law into the context of the pentateuchal narrative and stylizes the entire book of Deuteronomy as a final departure speech by Moses. This coordinates the giving of the law in Moab with the Sinai giving of the law so they can stand in the same literary context. Deuteronomy has thus originated for its own purpose and not, as Kratz has argued, as a continuation of its context.

Juha Pakkala looks at "The Literary and Religious History Location of Deuteronomy 13." He finds the chapter to be a law-oriented later addition from the exilic period. It and the book of Deuteronomy do not stem from any one certain late Assyrian vassal treaty but do stand in the tradition of Near Eastern treaty ideology. Pakkala shows how such ideology at the end of the Assyrian reign over Judah was taken up into the Old Testament and modified theologically. Thus he speaks of one or more "bundestheologische Redaktoren" (DtrB) who transformed the book from law to a covenant document that helped an intolerant monolatry that demanded exclusive worship of Yahweh to establish itself (durchsetzen). The covenant theology of Deut 13 also clearly reveals the distinction between a covenant/law-oriented and a temple-oriented religion. The latter is found in the older texts in Deut 12 and 14–16. Deuteronomy 13 comes as a vision for the future from authors in the Babylonian exile.

The third section begins with Uwe Becker's "The Contextual Connections of the Final Redaction of the Book of Joshua." Looking especially at chapters 23–24, Becker reveals the multiple literary layers of each chapter and their connections to passages in Genesis– 2 Kings. This leads him to deny an independent history reaching from Deuteronomy to

2 Kings. Using Septuagint and Qumran texts, he finds a changing or flowing boundary between textual criticism and literary criticism. He raises the question as to where the beginning of the Deuteronomistic presentation of the history of Israel is to be found, since it does not appear to be in Joshua or Judges. The basic text behind Josh 24 forms a theological prelude to Judges–2 Kings opposing kingship and most probably connecting back to the Decalogue. Verse 2b–13 tie then to the patriarchal history. Each strata of the text points to an already-present transition between Joshua and Judges, marking a caesura between the Hexateuch and the following historical books, but shows no literary caesura so that a Hexateuch as a separate literary work never existed. Joshua 24 points to DtrN or DtrS, but this notes rather many-layered editorial processes rather than continuous literary strata. Joshua 11:23 and Judg 2:8-9 represent the oldest connection between Joshua and Judges and ties tribal history and monarchical history together for the first time. Joshua was not originally part of a Deuteronomistic History but of a Hexateuch that did not yet contain Genesis or Deuteronomy.

"The Saul Tradition in the Deuteronomistic Book of Samuel (on the Example of 1 Samuel 9–10)" gives Alexander A. Fischer opportunity to distinguish between tradition and redaction and composition. He decides that the oldest Saul material represents a man of God tradition leading to Saul's victory over the Philistines and has nothing to do with the instituting of the monarchy that appeared in a Deuteronomistic redactional level. He also speaks of Deuteronomistic Histories, finding pre-Deuteronomistic traditions and an older Deuteronomistic history of the monarchy stretching from 1 Sam 9 to 1 Kgs 2. First Samuel 8 points to a more recent Deuteronomistic strata created expressly to join Samuel/Kings with Judges. Both the David and Saul traditions were promonarchy, 1 Sam 8 introducing the antimonarchy sentiment.

Klaus-Peter Adam turns to "Thematic, Figures, and Conceptions from Absalom's Rebellion" as a non-Deuteronomistic historical context and an example of the theme of securing the royal power. He finds the Absalom narrative thematically tied through the rebellion to Judah's paradigmatic situation in the Syro-Ephraimite war. Absalom is pictured as one of the court attendants to David, not necessarily as a son, and with ties to Israel in the north. He concludes that already sources of the historical work in the area of the Kings and Samuel books form a reflection on the downfall of the northern kingdom.

In one of two English-language articles, Simon B. Parker describes "Ancient Northwest Semitic Epigraphy and the 'Deuteronomistic' Tradition in Kings." Since no inscriptions show the peculiar vocabulary of the Deuteronomistic materials, Parker does not see the possibility of royal inscriptions serving as sources for the biblical writers. The style of Kings proves freer than that of those who composed memorial inscriptions. Northwest Semitic inscriptions themselves do show a redactional growth. Their content supplements

and indeed corrects the picture of the history of Israel and Judah we find in the biblical books. Parker thinks he has provided a model "for some of the copying, updating, and combining of comparable records in the palaces of Samaria and Jerusalem—and ultimately in the literary adoption of some of the sources used by the Deuteronomists."

Udo Rüterswörden introduces the history of religion section with "The Love of God in Deuteronomy." He begins with the question, "How can an emotion whose essence is puzzling be commanded?" Working with W. L. Moran's study, Rüterswörden points to love as a conventional part of the treaty partners' relationship. Because the commands in Deuteronomy are not preexilic, their relationship to Assyrian treaties is brought in question, the relationship being seen as accidental parallels or possible intellectual exchanges. The mental understanding of love belongs to a developmental series beginning with an outward orientation of actions to an inner disposition.

Juha Pakkala seeks in "The Development of the Conception of God in the Deuteronomistic Redactions from Polytheistic to Monotheistic Ideas" to use a literary and redactional method to shed light on the development of the conception of God in Deuteronomy–2 Kings. He sees the preexilic religion of Judah as polytheistic in line with that of their neighbors, but it had a coloring of monolatry, as may well have been the case with Edom, Moab, and Ammon. Having in the time of the early monarchy been fused with the old Canaanite god El, Yahweh ascended to be the God of the nation, the people, and the dynasty, foreign gods being tolerated but not attacked. The late monarchical centralization of religion brought the exclusion of these gods from official theology, Yahweh having taken over the functions of many other gods. This became a tolerant monolatry, as represented by the authors of the basic texts behind Joshua–Kings and the authors and redactors of Deuteronomy. Prenomistic editors of Deuteronomy and Kings centered on the cult in Jerusalem, while the later nomistic editors replaced the temple with the law. Now worship of other gods was strictly forbidden. Other gods served other nations, not Israel. This represents intolerant monolatry and provides protection for the identity of the Israelite community. Finally, relatively short passages speak for a monotheism in which Yahweh is the only God in the fifth century B.C.E. This is a late stage of the nomistic tradition. These authors, however, did not invite non-Israelites to worship Yahweh. This development had its roots in a strong polemic against images of God, even though at one time images of Yahweh had their place in the temple. The same development appeared in the parallel texts of Deutero-Isaiah.

Christian Frevel asks, "About Whom Do the Deuteronomists Speak? Notes on the History of Religion Content, Fictionality, and Literary Function of the Deuteronomistic Cult Notices." He looks at archaeological and literary finds to deny a continuity between the exilic and postexilic periods. He classifies the late 1970s and the 1980s as dominated by

the "emancipation from the primordial monotheism" debate. Debate in the late 1980s and early 1990s was determined by external evidence. The 1990s turned to increasing erosion in the late dating of "early prophecy," the late dating and new understanding of pentateuchal sources, and the division of Noth's Deuteronomistic History into redactional layers. The new century has turned to a late dating of the first commandment. For the preexilic period, Frevel finds that archaeological, iconographic, and epigraphic finds point to a limited polytheism in Israel. But in the exilic–postexilic period the history of religion, literary, archaeological, iconographic, and epigraphic finds in the province of Yehud stand against recent hypothesis of debates over the exclusivity of Yahweh arising in that period. Such sources show a cult devoted exclusively to Yahweh without images and no evidence of pagan cults. Unlike the period of the monarchy, that of the postexilic period gives no frame of reference for the Deuteronomistic texts concerning foreign gods. He thus claims that linguistic evidence cannot carry the load for a late dating of texts. Late dating, in turn, does not mean ahistorical or fictitious. Determining the tendency or intention of a text rests on three criteria: plausibility, differentiation, and convergence. One can hold at least a minimum of the Josianic reformation as historical and including both cult purity and cult unity. Frevel sees scholarship "on the end" of the Deuteronomistic History as coined by Noth but still on the beginning of the solution to the therein hidden history of religion paradigms.

In the second English-language article, Gary Beckman introduces the fifth section of the volume as he treats "Hittite Treaties and the Development of the Cuneiform Treaty Tradition." Such treaties used family relationship terms to show brothers as equal "great kings" and "father" and "son" to denote overlord and vassal. A small state could not hold out as neutral over against the larger state(s). Stipulations binding the parties and oaths calling the gods as witnesses formed the major sections of the treaties, with no distinction between internal parties within Hatti and outside relationships with other nations. Treaties with peoples not under a monarch were made through oaths by a selected individual among equals or by the entire group. Rulers belong to the Hittite royal family had treaties that did not include provisions concerning troops or fugitives. "Protectorate" monarchs of Arzawa, Kissuwatna, and Mittanni were allowed to save face by disguising their dependence on the Hittites. In parity treaties among equals, neither king imposes obligations on the other. Diplomatic marriages buttressed these. A survey of treaties discovered in the ancient Near East finds its climax in Assyrian treaties concerned with the single objective of assuring the allegiance of the partner or partners to the reigning king of Assyria. Hittite treaties had the essential element of summoning multiple deities to back up contingent curses. The striking peculiarity of these Hittite treaties is a substantial historical prologue seldom found elsewhere.

Lorenzo d'Alfonso researches "The Hittite Treaty Tradition in Syria (Fourteenth to Twelfth Century B.C.E.)." Letters between Hittites and Babylon and between Hittites and Assyrians make no mention of treaties. From the end of the fourteenth and during the course of the thirteenth century B.C.E. the Hittites concluded several treaties with the rulers of various Syrian lands. The examples we have stand in a unified treaty tradition. The structure involves full titles and historical preamble; treatment of enemies with an introduction, mutual help against external enemies, and mutual help against internal enemies; palace officials with introduction, Hittites in the state of the lesser king, subjects in Hattusa, and the conclusion; fugitives with groups, individuals, and conclusion, and dominion with introduction and exclusive recognition of Hittite dominion; and the oath with summons, charge, curses, and blessings. Evidence may point to treaties with Syria being written in Akkadian and translated into Hittite, especially the fact that even in treaties in Hittite the blessings and curses appear in Akkadian. The special type of Hittite treaty conceived for Syrian states does not appear to have been known by Assyrians or Arameans in the first millennium. A few similarities between the Hittite and the late Assyrian treaties can be explained as the heritage of an earlier Mittanni tradition. Alfonso concludes that one can speak of a Hittite legal tradition but that it is more difficult to speak of a Hittite treaty tradition. The Assyrians about 1240 B.C.E. were directly aware of the Hittite legal tradition. The court of Carchemish inherited the Hittite legal tradition, revised it, and used it anew.

Hans Ulrich Steymans works on "The Literary and Historical Significance of the Oaths Concerning the Succession to the Throne of Esarhaddon." He finds that each example of the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon was an original whose content was distinct from all others. The subjects of a king making a treaty with Esarhaddon had to carry out civil and military service for Esarhaddon as well as pay tribute. Evidence points toward Manasseh having to sign such a treaty, to provide military and civil service, and to pay tribute to Esarhaddon. This would be the background of 2 Kgs 21:16; 23:2–4. Manasseh had to join Esarhaddon's military marches westward.

Karen Radner looks into the question of "Assyrian *ṭuppi adê* as the Prototype for Deuteronomy 28:20–44?" She finds a long tradition, with treaties being preserved in the temple of Nabu. Those without the royal seal were placed in the archives of the treaty partners. The institution of taking oaths in the framework of concluding covenants is without doubt a proven instrument of Assyrian rulers, much older than the eighth century and the first certain appearance of the term *adê*. Such oath-taking made the until that time independent ruler a servant of the Assyrian king. At times such independent kings approached the Assyrians to initiate such a treaty whereby they became Assyrian servants. Still, they play an especially important role in the discussions of covenant theology. Certainly the seventh-century kings of Judah had to pay tribute to Assyria, were

seen as servants of the Assyrian king, and had to sign Assyrian treaty oaths. The Judean court had an official assigned to it imposed by the Assyrian king and under oath to him. Written texts of such treaties must be assumed for Judah. This still calls for care so that one cannot assume that a certain treaty or curse section from a treaty served as the prototype for passages in Deuteronomy. Parallels could come from older or from more recent exemplars of the Gattung.

Finally, Christoph Koch examines the relationship "Between Hatti and Asshur: Tradition History Observations to the Aramaic Inscriptions from Sefire." He shows that the Aramaic treaties from a tradition-history perspective stand between the Hittites and the Assyrians and represent an amalgam of Aramaic as well as late Hittite and Neo-Assyrian traditions. The Aramaic treaties come from a time before 740 B.C.E., when Tiglath-pileser III destroyed Arpad. The preamble shows contacts with the Assyrian tradition in which both kings, not just the stronger one, as in the Hittite tradition, are mentioned. Neo-Assyrian documents differ from the Hittite tradition in the preamble, naming both parties and leading to a list of gods, lacking a historical introduction and a blessing formula, and showing a certain flexibility in the order of the individual structural elements. The Aramaic treaties appear to have the same differences, though they do show traces of a blessing formula with the Hittite treaties. Other elements of the list of gods also are related to the Hittite tradition, such as omission of the gods of the weaker party and reference to gods of nature. On the other hand, futility curses seem to be of Aramaic origin. The content of these rest on Hittite mythological themes. Ceremonial curses come from ritual curses in the Hittite loyalty oaths. Apparently the Aramaic tradition results from scribes who participated in an intercultural tradition stream. The covenant theology texts in Deuteronomy witness to a similar mixing of traditions that makes a simplistic single cause explanation improbable.

One cannot critique even one of these writings. They do show an awareness of the need for a path that does not lead simply back to Wellhausen, with strong dependence only on literary studies. It shows the dangers of presuming that one can find an original base text by excavating a few verses and half-verses from a long passage without looking at the literary elements that hold the passage together rather than at theoretical theological and tradition-history elements that witness to slight differences. Anyone studying Deuteronomy, Joshua–Kings, or narrative techniques and developments needs to digest this volume with all its complex argument and language.