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Introduction

Raymond F. Person, Jr. and Konrad Schmid

Since Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette’s *Dissertatio critica,* 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, taking up a classical dispute from the beginning of the twentieth century. 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-

---


between those books and Deuteronomy has become a well-established position since then, although it has been differentiated in redaction-historical terms in several ways. 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-

---


ius Wellhausen had already noted the kinship of JE in some passages with Deuteronomistic language and theology.\textsuperscript{7} Hans Heinrich Schmid saw his “J” in close relationship to Deuteronomism,\textsuperscript{8} and in the wake of Rolf Rendtorff and Erhard Blum,\textsuperscript{9} the notion of a Deuteronomistic layer or composition in the Pentateuch became a common assumption in scholarship (at least in Europe).\textsuperscript{10} Subsequently, the redactional links between Deuteronomy and the other books of the Pentateuch have been explored in more detail.\textsuperscript{11} Several scholars thereby assume “Deuteronomistic” redactional texts – or texts that traditionally have been seen as “Deuteronomistic” – that even postdate the Priestly Code.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{13} Due to the lack of consensus in pentateuchal exegesis, however, these explorations have not yet yielded reliable results.


\textsuperscript{8} H.H. SCHMID, \textit{Der sogenannte Jahwist: Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung} (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976), 166.


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


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. Some scholars even believe that Deuteronomy was never an independent text, 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

---


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 Deuteronomic 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 au-
thor drawing from a diversity of sources for the purpose of combining various
traditions into one narrative? These and other pressing methodological ques-
tions 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 Kings

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. 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 Phillip Lasater for translating the original German text.