

RBL 11/2005

**Otto, Eckart, and Reinhard Achenbach, eds.**

***Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk***

Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 206

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.  
Pp. vi + 222. Hardcover. € 59.00. ISBN 3525530706.

A. Graeme Auld  
Edinburgh University  
Edinburgh, EH1 2LX, United Kingdom

Fundamental reexamination of the origins of both the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History has come very much back into vogue in recent years. And for many scholars, including the participants in the two-stage colloquium, under the auspices of the SBL International Meetings in Berlin (2002) and Cambridge (2003), which gave rise to this volume, the two issues belong closely together. Achenbach (1–13, German) introduces the topic and provides an overview of the ten papers that follow. (Four of these are in German and six in English; however, almost three-quarters of the text of the collection is in English.) Deuteronomy is part of two literary units, the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History; further, from the perspective of a synchronic reading of the final text, it is part of a narrative cycle from Genesis to Kings. Recent pentateuchal study starts not from source criticism in (the first book) Genesis but from the central book of the law, which, since de Wette, has provided the Archimedic point of Old Testament literary history.

Otto (14–35, English) insists that the Old Testament authors both were conscious that narrative time and narrated time were not contemporaneous and strove to connect these in proper fashion. In particular, they distinguished between the Mosaic authorship of the Book of the Covenant and of Deuteronomy as its exposition, and the work of an anonymous author of the patriarchal, exodus, and wilderness narrative, who lived in the land of Israel and knew the period of the kingship. Equally, when they claimed that “Yahweh led us out of Egypt,” they consciously identified two different generations. This implies that even a canonical reading cannot avoid diachronic perspectives. One of the key questions is whether the connection of Deuteronomy to the Tetrateuch consciously interrupted a narrative continuum between Deuteronomy and Joshua (so Noth), or

whether it consciously integrated it, thus creating a Hexateuch. Otto claims that a thorough correlation of the inner layering of Deuteronomy with that of the Deuteronomistic History has not succeeded, whether in the context of a layer model or of a block model. Dtr Deuteronomy has different relations with the Dtr books from Joshua to Kings and with the Tetrateuch. Otto credits Albert de Pury with the recognition of two different myths of Israel's origins: Dtr had achieved the conceptual and literary integration of the wilderness and conquest narratives; and P, the connection of patriarchal and exodus narratives. Postexilic scribes combined these two programs by "exegetical scribal-protahalachic techniques," and this compilation assumed or created a hexateuchal perspective (creation to settlement). The resulting recrudescence of the Hexateuch question has less to do with sources reaching from Genesis to Joshua and more with questions posed about redactional history. P had a Diaspora perspective—while the Pentateuch redactors shared this, they were interested not in a sanctuary but in the revelation of Torah. The Holiness Code, as "the middle of the Torah," proved to be constitutive of the Pentateuch. H takes up the basic positions of P and radicalizes the requirements of D. Because it represents an element of discontinuity with the narrative context (which reaches beyond the Pentateuch), it thus provides the basis for the Pentateuch as Torah.

Molly M. Zahn (36–55, English) draws on David Carr's development of empirical criteria in his demonstration (2001) that the calendar in Exod 34 is later than Exod 23. Her study of the *mazzot* and firstlings legislation in Exod 13:1–16 seeks to correct Carr's in one respect: Exod 13:1–16 is not one of the sources of the composite Exod 34 but is in fact dependent on it. In the first of two contributions, Achenbach (56–80, German) insists, on the basis of a comparison of elements of Exod 24–34 with Deut 9–10, that the development of the Sinai periscope cannot be understood on the basis of underlying documents but only of successive phases of redaction

Christophe Nihan's important study of "the Holiness Code between D and P" is the longest in the volume and is, appropriately, centrally placed (81–122, English). While he agrees with Otto that H is the work of a Pentateuch redactor and that it was intended to complete the divine revelation on Sinai—and hence to downgrade Deuteronomy (which was maintained simply as a supplement)—he argues against him that there was no single redactor of the Pentateuch. Numbers was a still later composition, designed in part to build a bridge between the completed Sinai legislation in Exodus-Leviticus on the one side and Deuteronomy on the other, which had been maintained as a supplement to it and commentary on it. Aspects of Numbers are then dealt with by Achenbach (123–34, German) and Gary N. Knoppers (135–52, English). Achenbach finds evidence in Numbers of a Hexateuch-redaction, then a Pentateuch-redaction, and finally a theocratic

revision. Knoppers discusses the composition of Num 33:50–56 as a sample of complex relationships between Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and DtrH.

William M. Schniedewind (153–67, English) discusses the textualization of Torah in the Deuteronomic tradition. Although he does start by drawing attention to the complex origins of Exod 24, over against most other contributors he writes in a mostly undifferentiating manner about Deuteronomy, P, and so forth. Thomas C. Römer (168–80, English) starts by noting that many elements of Deuteronomy “prepare the reader for what follows.” For example, “the land you will enter when crossing the Jordan” means nothing without the narrative in Josh 3–4. The development of Deut 12 is unusual: 12:13–18 relates to the First Temple and 12:20–28 to the Second; 12:8–12 opens the exilic edition of the code; finally, the links between 12:2–7 and texts in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Malachi demonstrate that this fresh introduction to the topic is no earlier than the Persian period. Römer then correlates the three main layers in each of Deut 12 and 1 Kgs 8. In somewhat convergent manner, Hans-Christoph Schmitt (181–92, German) notes how Deut 34:1–9 picks up elements from other books in the Pentateuch and from each of the books from Joshua to Kings, then claims this as evidence for a “late-Dtr” Enneateuch, with Deut 34 as its hinge. The basic layers of Num 20\* and Deut 32\*; 34\* contain P’s conception of the end of the Moses period, which is specifically different from that of Dtr. However, Num 27:12–14 is later than Deut 32:48–52. Norbert Lohfink had noted the central importance of sin in P, with reference to Gen 6:9–13 and Num 13–14\*; 20:1–13\*, and Peter Weimar demonstrated the importance of these three sin narratives in the structure of P. Numbers 10:11–20:12\* stands in a chiasmic position to the section on sin in the primeval history. And, for Schmitt, that shows the error in more recent research of removing Num 10:11–Deut 34:9\* from the first Priestly draft. The understanding in Deut 34:10–12 of Moses as the unsurpassable prophet interceding for the permanent sin of Israel depends on the Enneateuch redaction that produced the late-Dtr historical work.

In a refreshingly jargon-free essay, Konrad Schmid (193–211, German) starts with a strong critique of Noth: neither is Genesis–Numbers completely un-Deuteronomistic, nor is Deuteronomy to Kings completely Dtr. Several have questioned whether the Deuteronomic law was an original element in Dtr’s presentation: Bernard Levinson and Knoppers have noted significant differences over royal ideology. Schmid states five propositions towards a new start: (1) Deuteronomy stands now in a continuous narrative that extends from Genesis to Kings; (2) this narrative linkage represents a literary growth; (3) the reconstruction of this growth is controversial—and that holds also for long-held views such as the separation of Genesis–Numbers from Deuteronomy and the following books and the thesis of a sixth-century DtrH; (4) there are linguistic Deuteronomisms throughout Genesis–Kings, and these can be dated anywhere between the Assyrian period and the completion of the canon; and (5) Deuteronomy seems to have developed for

itself; it is hardly explicable, as recently considered (e.g., by Reinhard Kratz), as *Fortschreibung* within its context. It became linked to its larger context as the report of Moses finally doing what he had often been asked by God to do: to tell the people what he himself had been told. Yet it is only secondarily that Deuteronomy serves as exposition of the Sinai legislation: had that been its primary function, its original structure would have been based on the Decalogue; but that only came later. Schmid suggests that Joshua–Kings is a doxology of judgment, but with shifting perspectives on the nature of the guilt and the identity of the guilty. Deuteronomy 6–28\* assumes the oldest DtrH in Samuel–Kings but remains unconnected with it. Deuteronomy 5–30\* is part of a larger DtrH from Exodus to 2 Kings—Deut 5 shows that to be monolatric. The insertion of Deut 4 reflects on a total context Genesis–Kings and is strictly monotheistic.

This reviewer's first monograph, *Joshua, Moses and the Land* (1980) had as its subtitle *Tetrateuch–Pentateuch–Hexateuch in a Generation Since 1938*, and he welcomes the return in recent years to discussion of related issues—but not the feverish and often imprecise manipulation of the terms Tetrateuch, Pentateuch, Hexateuch, ... Enneateuch, each of which has to be put in relative order. From this perspective, Nihan, in his deservedly central essay, may have agreed too quickly with Otto's formulation that H is the work of a "Pentateuch redactor." If H (Lev 17–27) did intend to complete the Sinai legislation, then this creative combination and extension of Priestly and Deuteronomic legacies produced at most a "Triateuch," for if Numbers was not yet composed and Deuteronomy had been consigned to supplementary status, then not even a proto-Pentateuch existed. This achievement of H may have determined the path that the final development of the Pentateuch would take, but without the book of Numbers and without the rescue of Deuteronomy from mere supplementary status, talk of "pentateuchal" redaction seems premature. At a time when scholars are increasingly content to think of Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges—and even Genesis and Exodus—as separate books, the notion of a single "Primary History" or "Enneateuch" encompassing Genesis to Kings seems overly monolithic.

Some of the questions which this reader will continue to mull over are these: (1) Should this model of H consigning D to the status of mere supplement be extended to the relationship of Numbers and Joshua—do the late chapters of Numbers really imply a Hexateuch (Achenbach) or only knowledge of (a supplementary) Joshua? (2) Would the methods of Zahn (and Carr) support Schmitt on the relationship of Num 27:12–14 to Deut 32:48–52? (3) Was it more D or P that shaped the latest elements in Numbers? (4) Does "[Deuteronomy] means nothing without" (Römer) imply "must have been an original part of [the books that follow]"? (5) How far do the portions of Deuteronomy that influenced the Holiness Code in Leviticus overlap with those linked with Joshua–Kings? and (6) Is the *kābôd* theme in 1 Kgs 8 really secondary (Achenbach)?