

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, “Deuteronomismforschung 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 umgreifende Redaktion der Vorderen Prophe-

largely from two primary and supposedly clear premises: early on, leaning toward a Tetrateuch and in the wake of Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, scholars *separated* Deuteronomy from the preceding books; later, leaning toward the Former Prophets and through the influence of Martin Noth, scholars *unified* Deuteronomy with these books and analyzed them as a Deuteronomistic History extending from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings. According to Noth, Deuteronomy is linked above all with the redaction history of the following books of Joshua–2 Kings. As for the preceding context, he claimed the opposite: “In the books Genesis through Numbers, there is no trace of a ‘Deuteronomistic redaction,’ as it is generally acknowledged.”³ The issue seemed

ten unter Einschluß des Richterbuches als negatives Gegenstück zum Pentateuch einerseits und zum *corpus propheticum* andererseits ist längst postdtr, setzt die Pentateuchredaktion im 5. Jh. voraus und hat in Zuge der Kanonsformierung eine als protoapokalyptisch zu bezeichnende Geschichtsinterpretation zur Voraussetzung [...]. Die endgültige Formierung der Vorderen Propheten als Verbindungsstück zwischen Tora und *corpus propheticum* unter Einschluß des von der Pentateuchredaktion abgetrennten Josuabuches und der dtr Grundschichten in den Samuel- und Königsbüchern ist bereits ein Akt der Kanonsbildung im 3./2. Jh. v.Chr.” (*Deuteronomium im Pentateuch*, 235 n. 7; see on this T. VEIJOLA, “Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und im Hexateuch,” *TRu* 68 [2003], 374–382). According to Otto, Josh 24 concludes a formerly literarily independent Hexateuch. As an argument, he presents the finding that, within Gen–2 Kgs as a literary unit, there are no explicit cross references such as the hexateuchal thread of the transfer and burial of Joseph’s bones (Gen 50:25; Exod 13:19; Josh 24:32). Certainly, hexateuchal lines come to a close in Josh 24. But simultaneously in this very chapter – and not literarily isolable from hexateuchal perspectives – new lines open up that continue in Judg–2 Kgs (simply consider Judg 6:7–10; 10:10–16; 1 Sam 7:3f.; 10:17–19; 12:10; additionally, E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* [WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1984], 45–61). Interpretations concerning their chronological location may vary, but they most likely did not emerge only as late as the third/second c. B.C.E. The contention that Josh 24:19f. as well contains no “Hinweis auf eine Fortsetzung des Hexateuch in den Vorderen Propheten” (OTTO, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch*, 220) should instead be understood in view of Josh 23:15f. (Otto’s “DtrL”). This reading, on the one hand, clearly conflicts with Otto’s argument by indicating a corresponding narrative continuation in the text’s meaning; and, on the other hand, Josh 23:15f. already clearly leads into the Former Prophets: “Was Jos 23,16a als Warnung formuliert werden musste, wird 2K 17,15a als negative Erfüllung konstatiert: das Verschmähen (נאס) und das Übertreten (עבר) der ברית” (L. PERLITT, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* [WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969], 19).

³ M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1943), 13 n. 1 (“[I]n den Büchern Gen.–Num. fehlt jede Spur einer ‘deuteronomistischen Redaktion’, wie allgemein anerkannt ist”), with this small restriction: “Dass es einzelne Stellen gibt, an denen der alte Text im deuteronomistischen Stile erweitert worden ist, wie etwa Ex. 23,20ff. und Ex. 34,10ff., hat mit Recht meines Wissens noch niemand für ein Merkmal einer durchgehenden ‘Redaktion’ gehalten” (on this issue, see also A. GRAUPNER, *Der Elohist: Gegenwart und Wirksamkeit des transzendenten Gottes in der Geschichte* [WMANT 97; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2002], 5).

clear: the deepest break in the narrative continuity of Genesis–2 Kings lies between Numbers and Deuteronomy, suggesting that the two fundamental blocks of the great historical work of Genesis–2 Kings consist of the non-Deuteronomistic Tetrateuch, Genesis–Numbers, and the Deuteronomistic History, Deuteronomy–2 Kings. Deuteronomy was originally the beginning of the Deuteronomistic History, prior to being added as an ending to the Tetrateuch during the process of the Torah’s formation.

Nonetheless, in spite of being masked by the long-term acceptance of the theory, several points have proven problematic for this thesis, which is as simplistic as it is widely accepted. Chiefly, it depends on an astonishingly implausible literary-critical theory that must postulate a massive loss of text: the context of Genesis–Numbers running from creation to Balaam was the surviving remnant of an older (Yahwistic) account complete with a report of the conquest, which purportedly disappeared in the process of its combination with the Deuteronomistic History. It is hardly convincing that *within the same theoretical framework* one must assume that, as the redactors compiled sources, they included virtually everything from the flood narrative (Gen 6–9) or the passage through the sea (Exod 13f.) in order to preserve their source material, whereas in the combination of the Hexateuch and the Deuteronomistic History, the redactors were simply able to delete an entire conquest account.

It appears, then, that the standard theses representing Genesis–Numbers as “non-Deuteronomistic” and Deuteronomy–2 Kings as “Deuteronomistic” cannot withstand scrutiny. There has been an oversimplification not only of the problem of defining the term “Deuteronomistic”⁴ but also of the issues surrounding the characteristic linguistic orientation and argumentative thrust⁵ of the (multilayered) book of Deuteronomy. A great number of “Deuteronomisms” occur especially in Exodus and also in Numbers. In contrast, not everything in Deuteronomy–2 Kings that sounds “Deuteronomistic” necessarily belongs in this category in terms of content. Linguistic and theological “Deuteronomisms” do not always coincide. To cite just one example, the expansive, so-called “Deuteronomistic Judges schema,” with its combination of the motifs of the “outcry” (זעק, Judg 3:9, 15; 4:3; 6:6; 10:10) and the subsequent

⁴ See K. SCHMID, *Buchgestalten des Jeremiabuches: Untersuchungen zur Redaktion und Rezeptionsgeschichte von Jer 30–33 im Kontext des Buches* (WMANT 72; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1996), 31–33. Additionally, see the discussion in R. COGGINS, “What Does ‘Deuteronomistic’ Mean?” in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (ed. L.S. Shearing and S.L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 22–35; also note VEIJOLA, “Deuteronomismusforschung” (see n. 2), 26f.; as well as W. DIETRICH, “Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk,” *RGG* 2.688–692.

⁵ Here, we go beyond NOTH’s postulated “linguistic evidence” (*Studien* [see n. 3], 4).

assistance,⁶ resembles the Priestly source (e.g. Exod 2:23–25*) much more closely than it resembles “Deuteronomism.” This schema is probably not pre-Priestly but rather belongs to the sphere of post-Priestly composite “P”-“D” texts.⁷ At any rate, Genesis–Numbers is not consistently “non-Deuteronomistic,” and Deuteronomy–2 Kings is not consistently “Deuteronomistic.” To the contrary, both textual blocks should be judged as variegated.

Furthermore, in the classical model of the Deuteronomistic History, scholars already disputed whether the Deuteronomic law (Deut 12ff.) was part of the work from the beginning or whether its incorporation only occurred later, as, for example, Julius Wellhausen, Gerhard von Rad, Hans-Walter Wolff, and Jon D. Levenson have suspected.⁸ Indeed, the theological history in Joshua–2 Kings, particularly in 2 Kings, coheres to a degree, but not precisely, with the wording and argumentative thrust of the Deuteronomic law.⁹ Specifically, significant differences appear concerning the royal ideology, as for example Bernard Levinson¹⁰ and Gary Knoppers¹¹ have clarified.

⁶ Also, the motif of “pity” in no way belongs primarily among the Deuteronomisms, whether in terms of statistics or content. Rather, it presupposes a Priestly motivated transformation (מִנָּחָם, Judg 2:18; see the parallels in H. SIMIAN-YOFRE, “מִנָּחָם” *ThWAT* 5.366–384, esp. 375; J. JEREMIAS, *Die Reue Gottes: Aspekte alttestamentlicher Gottesvorstellung* [BTSt 31; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1997], 45 n. 7; but for both interpreters, Judg 2:18 still qualifies as “Deuteronomistic” by virtue of its being part of the Judg schema).

⁷ See K. SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel’s Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible* (trans. J.D. Nogalski; Siphut 3; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 203f.; trans of *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 81; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999), 220. For the position of Judg in Gen–Kgs, see P. GUILLAUME, *Waiting for Josiah: The Judges* (JSOTSup 385; London: T&T Clark, 2004); W. GROSS, “Das Richterbuch zwischen deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk und Enneateuch,” in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011), 177–205.

⁸ See SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus* (see n. 7), 164 n. 658, for bibliography.

⁹ See the earlier observations of J.D. LEVENSON, “Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?” *HTR* 68 (1975), 203–233, here 221–231.

¹⁰ B.M. LEVINSON, “The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History’s Transformation of Torah,” *VT* 51 (2001), 511–543, here 525: “The double denial by the Deuteronomic author that there should be any connection between king and cult is reversed by the Deuteronomistic Historian.” It should, however, be investigated whether or not the conceptual differences unfold in the opposite direction: the Deuteronomic authors do not necessarily precede the Deuteronomistic Historians.

¹¹ G.N. KNOPPERS, “The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship,” *ZAW* 108 (1996), 329–346; IDEM, “Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings,” *CBQ* 63 (2001), 393–415.

Finally, it makes little narratological sense to sever the account of the exodus and the wilderness wandering in Exodus–Numbers so sharply from the overall literary context of Deuteronomy–2 Kings, which is logically what results from the hypothesis of a Deuteronomistic History. Firstly, the overarching chronological framework of Deuteronomy–2 Kings is based on the exodus as a starting point (see most prominently 1 Kgs 6:1: “In the four hundred eightieth year after the Israelites came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon’s reign over Israel, in the month of Ziv, which is the second month, he began to build the house of YHWH”). Secondly, the numerous references back to the exodus in both Deuteronomy¹² and Joshua–2 Kings¹³ cast doubt upon the exclusion of Exodus–Numbers.¹⁴ This position is further exacerbated by interpreters such as John Van Seters, Erhard Blum, and Martin Rose, who tend toward the view that the redactional combination of Genesis–Numbers is post-Deuteronomic, since the retrospective summary in Deut 1–3 would otherwise lack its narrative foundation.¹⁵

¹² See further S. KREUZER, “Die Exodustradition im Deuteronomium,” in *Das Deuteronomium und seine Querbeziehungen* (ed. T. Veijola; PFES 62; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 81–106.

¹³ See further C. WESTERMANN, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* (TB 87; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1994), 39f.; 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), 9–125, here 85; SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus* (see n. 7), 77f. (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 70); KRATZ, *Komposition* (see n. 2), 174 with n. 77 (*Composition*, 170f.; see 1 Kgs 6:1; 8:9, 16, 21, 51, 53; 9:9; 12:28; 2 Kgs 17:7, 36; 21:15). See also S. MITTMANN, *Deuteronomium 1:1–6:3: Literarkritisch und traditions-geschichtlich untersucht* (BZAW 139; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 177f.

¹⁴ With E.A. KNAUF (“Does ‘Deuteronomistic Historiography’ [DtrH] Exist?” in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* [ed. A. de Pury et al.; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 388–398, here 398; trans. of “‘L’Historiographie Deutéronomiste’ [DtrG] existe-t elle?” 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], 409–418, here 418) as well as A.G. AULD (“The Deuteronomists and the Former Prophets, or What Makes the Former Prophets Deuteronomistic?” in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* [ed. L.S. Schearing and S.L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999], 116–126, here 121), it should be stressed that in the historical summaries in the Psalter, the narrative sequence of Gen–Deut, Gen–Josh, Josh–Kgs, and/or Gen–Kgs is thematized – but not that of Deut–Kgs.

¹⁵ See SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus* (see n. 7), 36f. (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 31–33). For a discussion of the composition history of Deut 1–3, see J.C. GERTZ, “Kompositorische Funktion und literarhistorischer Ort von Deuteronomium 1–3,” in *Die deuteronomisti-*

In light of this situation in the scholarly debate, we must therefore begin anew with the question of the literary integration of Deuteronomy in its contexts. To this end, the following observations may serve as starting points:

1. In its current form, Deuteronomy is part of a larger, continuous narrative context that reaches from Genesis to 2 Kings.¹⁶
2. This narrative context has undoubtedly evolved literarily.
3. The reconstruction of this development is in dispute, a status also applicable to what have been, until now, established fundamental conclusions. Contrary to the classic approach, Deuteronomy (ff.) cannot from the outset be detached from Genesis–Numbers, nor can a sixth-century Deuteronomistic History in Deuteronomy–2 Kings be assumed matter-of-factly.¹⁷
4. There are lexical¹⁸ “Deuteronomisms” in Genesis–2 Kings as a whole, though they need not be conceptual “Deuteronomisms” at the same time.

schen 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; E. OTTO, “Deuteronomiumstudien I: Die Literaturgeschichte von Deuteronomium 1–3,” *ZAR* 14 (2008), 86–236; IDEM, “Deuteronomium 1–3 als Schlüssel der Pentateuchkritik in diachroner und synchroner Lektüre,” in *Die Tora: Studien zum Pentateuch; Gesammelte Schriften* (BZAR 9; Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 2009), 284–420.

¹⁶ For overarching structures, see SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus* (see n. 7), 19–26 (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 17–23); IDEM, “Une grande historiographie allant de Genèse à 2 Rois a-t-elle un jour existé?” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l’Hexateuque et de l’Ennéateuque* (ed. T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 35–45; trans. of “Buchtechnische und sachliche Prolegomena zur Ennéateuchfrage,” in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Gen–II Reg* (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 1–14. On Gen–2 Kgs as a large-scale historical work, see also VEIJOLA, “Deuteronomismusforschung” (see n. 2), 30.

¹⁷ See SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus* (see n. 7), 367 (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 342). Alternatively, J. NENTEL, *Trägerschaft und Intentionen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks: Untersuchungen zu den Reflexionsreden Jos 1; 23; 24; 1 Sam 12 und 1 Kön 8* (BZAW 297; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 4f. Useful discussions of the current state of research are provided by C. FREVEL, “Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk oder Geschichtswerke? Die These Martin Noths zwischen Tetrateuch, Hexateuch und Ennéateuch,” in *Martin Noth aus der Sicht der heutigen Forschung* (ed. U. Rütterswörden; BTSt 58; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004), 60–95; T. RÖMER, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (New York: T&T Clark, 2005); M. WITTE et al. (eds.), *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur “Deuteronomismus”-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (BZAW 365; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006); H.-J. STIPP (ed.), *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ÖBS 39; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011).

¹⁸ See M. WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 320–365, whose glossary is widely accepted (see for example R.F. PERSON, Jr., *The Deuteronomic School: History, Social Setting and Literature* [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002], 19 n. 5).

Therefore, interpreters must carefully distinguish between them according to both core concepts and literary horizons. Historically, they can date anywhere between the Assyrian period and the close of the canon; texts as late as Dan 9, the apocryphal book of Baruch, and *4 Ezra* can still employ Deuteronomistic idiom.¹⁹

5. The literary core of Deuteronomy, which is presumably to be found in Deut 6–28*, seems to have been written for its own sake, although with knowledge of other texts. Despite the proposal of Kratz,²⁰ it is hardly explainable in its context as a continuation (“Fortschreibung”).

How, then, can we understand the integration of Deuteronomy into its wider contexts? In the following discussion I will respond briefly to this question, covering a few basic observations within the limited scope of this study.

2. The Preceding Context of Deuteronomy

In the narrative sequence of Genesis–Deuteronomy, it is clear that Deuteronomy is fashioned as the farewell speech of Moses on the final day of his life (Deut 31:2; 34:7; 34:48). In the speech, Moses conveys to the people of Israel the laws that they must observe in the land to which he is bringing them. From a reception standpoint, it is crucial that the legal material that Moses imparts in Deuteronomy apparently corresponds to what he previously received from God at the mountain in Exod 20, though he does not convey it before this point. While there are some minor indications in Exod 20ff. that Moses communicates something to Israel – perhaps the “Book of the Cove-

¹⁹ Still standard for the long-term tradition history of Deuteronomism is O.H. STECK’s *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1967); RÖMER, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History* (see n. 17), 165–183; see also K. SCHMID, “The Deuteronomistic Image of History as Interpretive Device in the Second Temple Period: Towards a Long-Term Interpretation of ‘Deuteronomism,’” in *Congress Volume: Helsinki, 2010* (ed. M. Nissinen; VTSup 148; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 369–388. On the English-speaking context of the Deuteronomism discussion, see VEIJOLA, “Deuteronomismforschung” (see n. 2), 28–31.

²⁰ See KRATZ, “Literarische Ort” (see n. 2), 120; IDEM, *Komposition* (see n. 2), 128f. (*Composition*, 123–126). The basic argument here is that, on the one hand, the centralization formula “to the place that I will choose” cannot be separated from “Ur”-Deuteronomy, and on the other hand, the formula’s future wording already presupposes the occupation of the land. This conflicts with the literary and conceptual unity of the Deuteronomic law and its rather uneven integration into the narrative context.

nant” (20:22–23:33; see Exod 24:7,²¹ announced in 24:3), the Sabbath commandment (Exod 31:12ff., announced in 35:1–3), and the instructions for constructing the Tent of Meeting (Exod 25ff., announced in 34:32, 34; 35:4ff.) – the wider narrative context of Exodus–Numbers contains no unambiguous claim²² that Moses actually complies with what God repeatedly instructs him to do: “Speak to the Israelites and say to them [...]”²³ In the present narrative sequence of the Torah, Deuteronomy is the first portrayal of Moses definitively explaining the divine law. This impression is based not only on textual arrangement but also on the support of specific textual evidence.

Firstly, the double tradition of the Decalogue from both Sinai and Transjordanian legislation is difficult to explain as something other than an attempt to identify each legislative corpus with the other in terms of substance, as their respective authoritative summaries demonstrate. How the twofold embedding of the Decalogue has emerged diachronically is a well-known, controversial question – but this debate changes nothing about the mutual identifying function of the Sinai and the Transjordanian legislation.²⁴

²¹ See already J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuch* (3rd ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1899), 194f. n. 1.

²² Differently, N. LOHFINK, “Prolegomena zu einer Rechtshermeneutik des Pentateuch,” in *Das Deuteronomium* (ed. G. Braulik; ÖBS 23; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2003), 11–55, here 37, with n. 111. Moses allegedly gave all instructions “stets weiter, obwohl das selten ausdrücklich gesagt wird.” Lohfink refers to Exod 34:34; Lev 26:46; Num 36:13, “und in deren Licht vielleicht auch schon Ex 25:22.” Lohfink discusses these passages based on the textual evidence of Num 30:1: “And Moses told the Israelites all that Yahweh had commanded him.” But arguably, this statement applies only to the limited horizon of Num 28f. For Exod 34:34, see above in the text. It is neither compelling nor natural to understand Lev 26:46 and Num 36:13 as suggesting that the mediation of the laws to Israel “by the hand of Moses” has already occurred. The concern is not the unfolding of the story itself; rather, the narrator is speaking in these verses. As “colophons,” one may appropriately regard Lev 26:46 and Num 36:13 as falling among the latest textual additions to the Pentateuch. Historically speaking, then, they are essentially of importance for the final textual hermeneutic of the Pentateuch (which Lohfink decidedly favors). This problem of the announcement of the commands from Sinai is also relevant for the preceding layers of formation. At any rate, the fact that the overall pentateuchal context expects an execution of the command “Speak to the Israelites and say to them” ([דבר אל בני ישראל + ואמרת אלהם/לאמר]) may be seen in the short scenes of Num 16:23–26 and Num 17:16–22. The command in Num 16:24 corresponds to Moses’s action in v. 26 (וידבר/דבר). The same is true in Num 17:16–22. Here, the instructions for Moses (דבר) at the beginning of v. 17 are reported as an executed command (וידבר) in v. 21. On this issue, see also J. JOOSTEN, “Moïse a-t-il recélé le Code de Sainteté?” *BN* 84 (1996), 75–86.

²³ דבר אל בני ישראל (+ ואמרת אלהם/לאמר), etc. Lev 1:2; 4:2; 7:29; 11:2; 12:2; 15:2; [17:2, etc.]; 18:2; 19:2; 20:2; 21:1; 23:2, 10, 24, 34; 24:2; 25:2; 27:2; Num 5:2, 12; 6:2; 15:2, 18, 38; 19:2; 28:2; 34:2; 35:2; see also Lev 6:2, 18; 22:2, 18; Num 6:23; 8:2.

²⁴ Based on the reasoning of the central Sabbath commandment in the Exod Decalogue, which harks back to the beginning of the Torah in Gen 1, one wonders whether the Exod Decalogue found its place in Exod 20 specifically as a result of the Torah’s formation. For

Secondly, the current Mosaic fiction of the Deuteronomic law is difficult to explain unless one views it in close connection with the divine law from Sinai. A Mosaic law as such is not a plausible construct in the context of ancient Near Eastern legal theories.²⁵ Instead, the Mosaic fiction of Deuteronomy, which is probably not primary,²⁶ becomes intelligible as part of a presentation that regards Deuteronomy already as an interpretive text (whether it be an explanation of the Decalogue alone or of the Sinai legislation likewise promoted through the Decalogue).

Thirdly, Deuteronomy itself includes texts supportive of the theory that this final book of the Torah comprises²⁷ the explanation of the revelatory law from Sinai. Especially notable here is the caption of Deut 1:5: “Beyond the Jordan in the land of Moab, Moses began to clarify/expound this law” (באר).²⁸

this theory, see F.L. HOSSFELD, *Der Dekalog* (OBO 45; Fribourg: Academic Press, 1985), 161; and E. OTTO, “Die nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus* (ed. M. Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 61–111, here 78. On this discussion, see also M. KÖCKERT, “Wie kam das Gesetz an den Sinai?” in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik* (ed. C. Bultmann et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 13–27, who estimates that “die Zitierung des Dekalogs in Dtn 5 setzt eine ältere Vorlage voraus, die schon mit dem Sinai verbunden war” (22); IDEM, *Die Zehn Gebote* (Munich: Beck, 2007), 38–44; and E. BLUM, “The Decalogue and the Composition History of the Pentateuch,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 289–302.

²⁵ See OTTO, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch* (see n. 2), 123: “Alles Recht ist in Babylonien wie im gesamten Alten Orient Königsrecht.”

²⁶ See N. LOHFINK, “Das Deuteronomium: Jahwegesetz oder Mosegesetz?” *ThPh* 65 (1990), 387–391 = IDEM, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur III* (SBAB 20; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995), 157–165; E. OTTO, “Deuteronomium,” *RGG* 2.693–696, here 695. Additionally, see the discussion in E. REUTER, *Kultzentralisation: Entstehung und Theologie von Dtn 12* (BBB 87; Frankfurt am Main: Hain, 1993), 213–226; N. LOHFINK, “Kultzentralisation und Deuteronomium: Zu einem Buch von Eleonore Reuter,” *ZAR* 1 (1995), 117–148 = IDEM, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur IV* (SBAB 31; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000), 131–161; see also S. CHAVEL, “The Literary Development of Deuteronomy 12: Between Religious Ideal and Social Reality,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 303–326; P. ALTMANN, *Festive Meals in Ancient Israel: Deuteronomy’s Identity Politics in Their Ancient Near Eastern Context* (BZAW 424; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 72–132.

²⁷ OTTO, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch* (see n. 2), 173f.

²⁸ The lexeme באר is indeed semantically difficult to determine, since it only appears elsewhere in Deut 27:8 and Hab 2:2, each time in conjunction with כרה (see *HALAT* 1.102). But the interpretation of *HALAT* remains plausible: “to make clear/explain.” N. LOHFINK (“Prolegomena” [see n. 22], 30f. with n. 30; for Hab 2:2, see D. TSUMURA, “Hab 2:2 in the Light of Akkadian Legal Practice,” *ZAW* 94 [1982], 294f.) proposes באר from *bāru* III D (see *AHW sub voce*), understood here as “eine Sache in Geltung setzen, einer Sache Rechtskraft

But according to this statement in Deut 1:5, Deuteronomy is already established as law – that is, as an explanation of the Sinai legislation. Deuteronomy 4 explicates the claim even more clearly, particularly in the opening verses (vv. 1–5).

Fourthly and finally, 1Q22 (“Dibre Moshe”)²⁹ is noteworthy in this discussion. Through the location of Moses’s speech after Deut 1:3³⁰ as well as through the mandate for Moses to “command” (וְצִוִיתָהּ) the “sons of Israel” ([א] הַבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) “the words of the Torah that I commanded you on Mount Sinai” ([ד] בְּרֵי הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר צִוִיתִי אֹתְכֶם בְּהַר סֵינַי), this Qumran text articulates this relationship between the Sinai and the Transjordanian legislation. This example illustrates that later receptions as well could accent the relationship of the Sinai legislation and Deuteronomy as divine law and its Mosaic explanation.

Read in conjunction with Genesis–Numbers, Deuteronomy should therefore be understood as the divine Sinaitic law’s Mosaic interpretation, whose correspondent trajectory is secured by the two Decalogues. One could even venture to say that the current narrative sequence of events coincides with the actual conditions behind the formation of Deuteronomy, the design of which reformulates the “Book of the Covenant” under the guiding principle of cult centralization.³¹ The theory that Deuteronomy is secondarily, not originally,

verleihen.” A critical evaluation is provided by E. OTTO, “Mose, der erste Schriftgelehrte: Deuteronomium 1,5 in der Fabel des Pentateuch,” in *L’écrit et l’esprit: Études d’histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (ed. D. Böhler et al.; OBO 214; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 273–284 = IDEM, *Die Tora: Studien zum Pentateuch; Gesammelte Schriften* (BZAR 9; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 480–489, who opts for the same meaning as HALAT (“explain”).

²⁹ D. BARTHÉLEMY and J.T. MILIK, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 91–96.

³⁰ The date אָרְבַּעִים is added in 1Q22 1:1, but can be deduced reliably from 2:6.

³¹ See W.S. MORROW, *Scribing the Center: Organization and Redaction in Deuteronomy 14:1–17:13* (SBLMS 49; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1995); B.M. LEVINSON, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); E. OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien* (BZAW 284; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999); IDEM, *Gottes Recht als Menschenrecht: Rechts- und literaturhistorische Studien zum Deuteronomium* (BZAR 2; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001). There is a new debate on whether this principle of cult centralization still belongs to the late monarchic period, as the majority of scholars think, or whether it is an exilic concept; see R.E. CLEMENTS, “The Deuteronomic Law of Centralisation and the Catastrophe of 587 B.C.,” in *After the Exile: Essays in Honour of Rex Mason* (ed. J. Barton and D. Reimer; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1996), 5–25 (earlier authors, 7 n. 4); KRATZ, *Komposition* (see n. 2), 137 (*Composition*, 132); IDEM, “The Idea of Cultic Centralization and Its Supposed Ancient Near Eastern Analogies,” in *One God – One Cult – One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (ed. R.G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann; BZAW 405; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 121–144; J. PAKKALA, “The Date of the Oldest Edition of Deuter-

an explanation of the Sinai legislation does not require special confirmation: Deuteronomy is too unwieldy for its Sinai template to qualify as a text of linear continuation in its pentateuchal context. Furthermore, one would then expect Deuteronomy to be structured according to the Decalogue, which is only the case at a secondary, redactional level of the book.³²

Chronologically locating this view of Deuteronomy is certainly a more difficult task.³³ It may be that Deuteronomy was first brought into an interpretive relationship with the Decalogue in Deut 5, only at a later stage being considered also as an explanation (because of the corresponding Exod Decalogue) of the Sinai legislation. But alternatively, if one identifies the insertion of the Deuteronomy Decalogue as secondary, then Deuteronomy in its embedded context would immediately be considered the explanation of the Sinai legislation. The question must remain open. Noteworthy for the present context is the “Decalogically” conceived connection of Deuteronomy to its preceding context.

3. The Subsequent Context of Deuteronomy

How is Deuteronomy interlinked with the books following it?³⁴ Here as well, space restrictions only permit some basic comments. Differently from other important studies, the following discussion emphasizes conceptual rather than linguistic questions, not as an alternative but as a supplement to existing approaches. We may proceed from the observation that the Former Prophets (Josh–2 Kgs) in their narrative context may be described as a great proclama-

onomy,” *ZAW* 121 (2009), 388–401. Critical responses are provided by N. MACDONALD, “Issues in the Dating of Deuteronomy: A Response to Juha Pakkala,” *ZAW* 122 (2010), 431–435; E. BLUM, “Das exilische deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk,” in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011), 274–276.

³² See OTTO, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch* (see n. 2), 115 (“DtrD”), who provides a differentiated reception of G. BRAULIK, “Die Abfolge der Gesetze in Deuteronomium 12–26 und der Dekalog,” in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. N. Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: Peeters, 1985), 252–272 = IDEM, *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums* (SBAB 2; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 231–255.

³³ See above, n. 24.

³⁴ See further the selective and rather insecure literary-historical classifications of A. MOENIKES, “Beziehungssysteme zwischen dem Deuteronomium und den Büchern Josua bis Könige,” in *Das Deuteronomium* (ed. G. Braulik; ÖBS 23; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2003), 69–85.

tion of judgment:³⁵ they propose reasons for the national catastrophes of both the northern and the southern kingdoms’ collapse.

The current version of the Former Prophets portrays the history of Israel in its land as a story of accumulating transgressions. The northern kingdom did not depart from the transgressions of Jeroboam, the southern kingdom did not abolish their multitude of high places, and with the transgressions of Manasseh the situation grew so grave that not even the pious Josiah could prevent the impending disaster. So Yahweh rejected both Israel and Judah.

This sketch briefly outlines the admittedly very complex logic of Joshua–2 Kings. Upon even closer inspection, one is compelled to make a conceptual distinction, which itself calls for further differentiation: 1) What exactly is the offense of which the guilty parties are accused? and 2) Who in general is counted among those responsible for the national disasters?³⁶

1) *What is the offense?* This question does not receive a consistent answer in Joshua–2 Kings. Three positions are distinguishable:

First, the royal assessments suggest that the problem of cult centralization originally stood firmly in the foreground.³⁷ The standard criteria for assess-

³⁵ See G. VON RAD, *Theologie des Alten Testaments, Band 1: Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels* (Munich: Kaiser, 1957), 355; STECK, *Israel* (see n. 19), 138.

³⁶ For a critical discussion of my proposal (referring to the German original of this text [see n. 1]), see BLUM, “Exilische deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk” (see n. 31), 269–295, esp. 273–283. He maintains the classical position of Noth and refuses the differentiations proposed here: “(1) Weder die Forderung der Kulteinheit und der ‘Kultreinheit’ noch die Anklage des Volkes neben dem der betreffenden Könige lassen sich literargeschichtlich voneinander scheiden, ohne das literarische Gefüge aufzulösen. (2) Dem korrespondiert, dass sowohl Kulteinheit und ‘Kultreinheit’ als auch die Verantwortung von König und Gottesvolk jeweils einen unauflöselichen Sachzusammenhang bilden. Sie lassen sich konzeptionell ‘unterscheiden’, aber sachlich und kompositionell nicht ‘scheiden’. (3) Die dtr Königsbeurteilungen geben eine hochgradige Orientierung an vorgegebenen Überlieferungen zu erkennen: Wo der dtr Verfasser/Kompositor in den Vorlagen Anhaltspunkte für eine Profilierung im Sinne seiner Programmatik findet, zögert er nicht, diese Anhaltspunkte auszugestalten und deuteronomistisch zu deuten. Er kann auch Reflexionsstücke etc. einbauen; an keiner Stelle sind jedoch freie Transformationen älterer Überlieferung nachweisbar” (283). Yet, it is noticeable that Exod 32 is “democratizing” “Jeroboam’s sin” from 1 Kgs 12, so that at least in this respect, two clearly separable perspectives (“people”/“king”) can be distinguished. As for the alleged unity of “Kulteinheit” and “Kultreinheit,” a decision depends on how much literary-critical distinction one allows regarding the texts in question. In addition, it is comprehensible that the gauge of cult centralization implies a certain *implicit* amount of “Kultreinheit,” but this does not yet amount to an equivalent of the first commandment of the Decalogue.

³⁷ See E. AURELIUS, “Der Ursprung des Ersten Gebots,” *ZTK* 100 (2003), 1–21, here 4.

ment include the northern kingdom's persistence in the transgression of Jeroboam³⁸ and the southern kingdom's multitude of cultic sites.³⁹

It is worth noting that the (multilayered⁴⁰) royal assessments probably originated in a preexilic version of (*Samuel?–)Kings. This was already observed by Julius Wellhausen⁴¹ and then by a broad line of research in the wake of Frank Moore Cross's work,⁴² and in contrast to classic twentieth-century German-speaking "Deuteronomism" research. This preexilic setting is especially apparent in view of these assessments' matter-of-fact organization around the problem of cult centralization. That is, they originally functioned not to explain the catastrophe of 587 B.C.E. but rather to explain the necessity of the Josianic reform based on the negative evaluations of all northern (and some southern) kings and based on the destruction of the northern kingdom.⁴³ In addition to the conspicuous "until this day" passages (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:8;

³⁸ See 1 Kgs 12:25–30 (Jeroboam I); 15:25f. (Nadab); 15:33f. (Baasha); 16:18f. (Zimri); 16:25f. (Omri); 16:*29–33 (Ahab); 22:52f. (Ahaziah); 2 Kgs 3:1–3 (Jehoram); 10:29 (Jehu); 13:1f. (Jehoahaz); 13:10f. (Jehoash); 14:23f. (Jeroboam II); 15:8f. (Zechariah); 15:17f. (Menahem); 15:23f. (Pekahiah); 15:27f. (Pekah); 17:1f. (Hoshea).

³⁹ 1 Kgs 3:2f. (Solomon); 14:22 (LXX: Rehoboam; MT: Judah); 15:1–3 (Abijam); 15:*11–15 (Asa); 22:41–45 (Jehoshaphat); 2 Kgs 8:16–19 (Jehoram); 8:25–27 (Ahaziah); 12:1–4 (Jehoash); 14:1–4 (Amaziah); 15:1–4 (Azariah); 15:32–35 (Jotham); 16:1–4 (Ahaz); 18:*2–7 (Hezekiah); 21:1f. (Manasseh); 21:*19–22 (Amon); 22:1f. (Josiah); 23:31f. (Jehoahaz); 23:36f. (Jehoiakim); 24:8f. (Jehoiachin); 24:17–20 (Zedekiah).

⁴⁰ See further H. WEIPPERT, "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher," *Bib* 53 (1972), 301–339; A. LEMAIRE, "Vers l'histoire de la rédaction des livres des Rois," *ZAW* 98 (1986), 221–236; E. AURELIUS, *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (BZAW 319; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 21–70.

⁴¹ WELLHAUSEN stated "dass die eigentliche Abfassung des Buches Könige noch vor dem Exil statt gefunden hat und nur nachträglich noch eine exilische oder (wenn nicht und) nachexilische Überarbeitung hinzugekommen ist" (*Composition* [see n. 21], 298). The more relevant culmination point of the royal assessments is the account in 2 Kgs 22f.: "Der Schriftsteller, der dies Skelett des Buchs der Könige gebildet hat, steht mit Leib und Seele zu der Reformation Josias" (295).

⁴² See F.M. CROSS, "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274–289; subsequently, R.D. NELSON, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981); G.N. KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies* (2 vols.; HSM 52–53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1993–1994), 1.51f.; E. EYNIKEL, *The Reform of Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OTS 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996); M.A. SWEENEY, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001). For an extensive history of research, see RÖMER and DE PURY, "L'historiographie deutéronomiste" (see n. 13), 47–50.

⁴³ Differently, and consistent with the mainstream of German-speaking scholarship, see the detailed treatment of AURELIUS (*Zukunft* [see n. 40], 39–57, 207f.), who supports the problematic exilic dating of the demand for cult centralization (40f., 44). Contra Aurelius (41 n. 77, there opposing OTTO's *Deuteronomium* [see n. 31], 72), the Deuteronomic attachment of Israel to Yahweh (instead of to the king, as one would expect with the Neo-Assyrian norm)

9:21; 10:12; 12:19; 2 Kgs 8:22) that seem to presuppose the situation of the monarchy,⁴⁴ the following points support a preexilic setting: 1) the observation that a reflection on the downfall of Judah in the style of 2 Kgs 17 is absent in the book of Kings⁴⁵ (in 2 Kgs 17, vv. 19f. have been inserted); and 2) the apparently secondary attempts in the Manasseh passages (2 Kgs 23:26; 24:3) theologically to annul⁴⁶ the contribution of the Josianic reform, as well as

is explainable not from the collapse of the monarchy but more likely from pan-Israelite interests. The oft-cited and not easily dismissible problem that 2 Kgs 23 contains no persuasive literary conclusion (on 2 Kgs 23:25f., see AURELIUS, *Zukunft*, 48f.) should not be granted too much weight. The supposition that literary beginnings and endings each should have survived word for word is, from a historical perspective, neither generally assumed nor securely demonstrated. On the discussion of the Josianic reform, see M. ARNETH, “Die antiassyrische Reform Josias von Juda: Überlegungen zur Komposition und Intention von 2 Reg 23:4–15,” *ZAR* 7 (2001), 189–216; W.B. BARRICK, *The Kings and the Cemeteries: Toward a New Understanding of Josiah’s Reform* (VTSup 88; Leiden: Brill, 2002); O. LIPSCHITS, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem: Judah under Babylonian Rule* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eidenbrauns, 2005), 11–29; C. UEHLINGER, “Was There a Cult Reform under King Josiah? The Case for a Well-Grounded Minimum,” in *Good Kings and Bad Kings: The Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE* (ed. L.L. Grabbe; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 279–316; M. PIETSCH, “Steine – Bilder – Texte: Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Archäologie und biblischer Exegese am Beispiel der josianischen Reform,” *VF* 53 (2008), 51–62.

⁴⁴ See WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 21), 298; A. MOENIKES, “Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des sogenannten Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks,” *ZAW* 104 (1992), 333–348, here 335f.; J. GEOGHEGAN, “‘Until this Day’ and the Preexilic Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History,” *JBL* 122 (2003), 201–227; IDEM, *The Time, Place, and Purpose of the Deuteronomistic History: The Evidence of “Until this Day”* (BJS 347; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 2006). The evidence is differently assessed by F. BLANCO WISSMANN, “*Er tat das Rechte ...*”: Beurteilungskriterien und Deuteronomismus in 1Kön 12–2Kön 25 (ATANT 93; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2008), 242; PERSON, *Deuteronomic School* (see n. 18), 113–116.

⁴⁵ On 2 Kgs 24, see K. SCHMID, “Manasse und der Untergang Judas: ‘Golaorientierte’ Theologie in den Königsbüchern?” *Bib* 78 (1997), 87–99; alternatively, C.R. SEITZ, *Theology in Conflict: Reactions to the Exile in the Book of Jeremiah* (BZAW 176; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), 164–200.

⁴⁶ On the question of a preexilic “Deuteronomistic History,” see the works in the wake of CROSS’s “Themes” (see n. 42), which fostered the different approaches of WEIPPERT, “‘Deuteronomistischen’ Beurteilungen” (see n. 40); W.B. BARRICK, “On the ‘Removal of the High Places’ in 1–2 Kings,” *Bib* 55 (1974), 257–259; LEMAIRE, “Vers l’histoire” (see n. 40); I. PROVAN, *Hezekiah and the Book of Kings* (BZAW 172; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988); B. HALPERN and D.S. VANDERHOOF, “The Editions of Kings in the 7th–6th Centuries B.C.E.,” *HUCA* 62 (1991), 179–244; MOENIKES, “Zur Redaktionsgeschichte” (see n. 44); RÖMER, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History* (see n. 17), 67–103; H.-J. STIPP, “Ende bei Joschija: Zur Frage nach dem ursprünglichen Ende der Königebücher bzw. des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks,” in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011), 225–267, see also VEIJOLA, “Deuteronomismusforschung” (see n. 2).

the post-Josiah assessments' (23:32, 37; also, 24:9, 19) sweeping condemnation⁴⁷ of all kings after him. After the destruction of Judah, this editorial activity – consistent with ancient Near Eastern royal ideology that holds the king accountable for the state's well-being and trouble alike – enabled the royal assessments in their reception to be understandable as grounds for the catastrophe of 587 B.C.E.

Second, at the next level, the charge of having contravened the principle of a single cultic site expands into the charge of idolatry, connoting a violation of the first (and depending on one's counting, the second) commandment.⁴⁸ Interesting at this point is the observation that the cult of the high places that previously qualified as permissible, albeit improperly located (i.e. noncentralized) Yahweh worship – the Judean kings who “did what was right in Yahweh's eyes” could receive positive assessment without abolishing the high places – now falls into the category of “idolatry” and is interpreted accordingly (see esp. 2 Kgs 17:9–12 and 1 Kgs 14:22–24).⁴⁹

Third and finally, one can observe a conceptual level for which the criterion for evaluations is “all that Moses the servant of Yahweh had commanded” (2 Kgs 18:22). This language points not to the violation of a primary commandment but rather to the violation of the Torah's commandments in general.⁵⁰

This three-pronged conceptual schema seems *prima facie* to find parallels with the basic phases of Deuteronomy's literary development.⁵¹ Just as cult centralization originally stood in the foreground of Deuteronomy, so also the kings were initially gauged according to this measure. Next, based on its connection with the Decalogue, Deut 5⁵² promoted the first commandment as the criterion for assessment even in the narrative books. At a later time, when the Torah including Deuteronomy was formed, the Torah's observance as a whole became necessary.

However, from a redaction-historical perspective, Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets do not evince such a straightforward connection. A literary connection is unlikely between “Ur”-Deuteronomy, which the centralization

⁴⁷ Contrary to recent denials, 2 Kgs 23:32, 37 can legitimately be interpreted as the closest correspondence. See further n. 63.

⁴⁸ See Exod 20:2–6; 23:13, 23f.; Josh 23:6f., 16; 1 Sam 7:3f.; 8:8; 12:10; 26:19; 1 Kgs 9:6, 8f.; 11:1f., 9f.; 14:7–9; 16:30–33; 18:17f.; 21:25f.; 22:54; 2 Kgs 10:18; 17:15–35, 38f.; 21:2, 21; 22:17.

⁴⁹ See PROVAN, *Hezekiah* (see n. 46), 60–90.

⁵⁰ See Josh 1:7f.; 8:30f.; 22:5; 23:6f.; 1 Kgs 2:1–3; 6:11–13; 2 Kgs 10:31; 14:6; 18:6, 12; 21:7f.; 22:8, 10f.; 23:1–3, 25.

⁵¹ Taken together, the criteria of R. ALBERTZ (*Die Exilzeit: 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* [BE 7; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001], 220) are too simple, redaction-historically speaking. See his position on the authorship of the “Deuteronomistic History” (214).

⁵² See further OTTO, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch* (see n. 2), 111–129.

principle shapes, and the older royal assessments, which generally predate the first commandment (or even later, the Torah). In the royal assessments, the principle of centralization is indeed the concern, but not for the present formulations. R.G. Kratz contends: “instead of ‘any place’ and ‘your gates’ in Deuteronomy Kings speaks of the ‘high places’; the Deuteronomic ‘place which YHWH has chosen to make his name dwell there’ occurs only in secondary passages in the scheme of 1–2 Kgs (1 Kgs 14.21; 2 Kgs 21.4, 7; 23.26 [sic], also 1 Kgs 8; 9.3; 11.13, 32), and conversely the formula typical of Kings ‘do right/evil in the eyes of YHWH’ occurs in Deuteronomy only in secondary passages (Deut. 6.18; 12.8, 25, 28; 13.19; 21.9.)”⁵³

The framework of Kings does not explicitly endorse Deut 12 as its criterion for assessment. More precisely, with the southern kings⁵⁴ the criterion is usually the conduct of the predecessor – and/or a comparison with David (1 Kgs 3:3; 15:3; 2 Kgs 14:3; 16:2; 22:2) – and with the northern kings it is usually persistence in the way of Jeroboam I. Cult centralization is of course the issue, but merely identifying this issue leaves a great deal unresolved. Moreover, the criterion of Deut 12 plays no role in the reflective Deuteronomistic passages in Joshua and Judges, showing the lack of redactional cohesion between Deuteronomy and Kings. The implication is that the oldest assessments of the kings might not have known a literary Deut 12, and certainly not Deut 12 as the introduction in one and the same literary work. One could therefore ask whether Deut 12 presupposes⁵⁵ these royal assessments and systematizes them based on a “primary command” to be followed above all else. The liter-

⁵³ KRATZ, *Composition* (see n. 2), 163 (*Komposition*, 166: “Statt von ‘jedem Ort’ und ‘deinen Toren’ in Dtn ist in Reg von den ‘Höhen’ die Rede, der deuteronomische ‘Ort’ den Jhwh erwählt hat, um seinen Namen dort wohnen zu lassen’ kommt nur an sekundären Stellen im Schema von I–II Reg [I Reg 14,21; II Reg 21,4,7; 23,27, ferner I Reg 8; 9,3; 11,13,32], umgekehrt die für Reg typische Formel, das Rechte/Böse tun in den Augen Jhwh’s nur an sekundären Stellen im Deuteronomium vor [Dtn 6,18; 12,8.25.28; 13,19; 21,9]”); see also G.N. KNOPPERS, “Solomon’s Fall and Deuteronomy,” in *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium* (ed. L.K. Handy; SHCANE 11; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 392–410, here 402f., and the comprehensive discussion in BLANCO WISSMANN, *Er tat das Rechte* (see n. 44), 31–173.

⁵⁴ Of the southern kings, only Joram and Ahaziah receive negative assessment (2 Kgs 8:18, 27), since they were related to and conducted themselves like Ahab.

⁵⁵ This possibility is especially suggestive if – as considered above – the core of the royal assessments dates back to the monarchic period. The terminological incongruence between Deut 12 and the royal assessments is more plausibly explainable if we understand Deut 12 as a later judicial systematizing of their basic idea in a linguistically unique form, which avoids the assumption that the royal assessments had actually known the purpose of Deut 12 but had not accounted for its wording. CLEMENTS accepts a similar view of the purpose of Deut 12 and “Deuteronomistic texts” in *Sam–Kgs, opting for an exilic setting for Deut 12 (see “Deuteronomistic Law of Centralisation” [see n. 31], 5–25 [esp. 13f.]).

ary horizon of the oldest royal assessments apparently does not extend beyond Samuel–Kings,⁵⁶ which incidentally calls to mind Frank Moore Cross's⁵⁷ famous double theme of the Deuteronomistic History: the dynastic promise to David and the sin of Jeroboam, a motif likewise confining itself to Samuel–Kings (see 2 Sam 7 and 1 Kgs 12).

Only on the level of the first commandment do the formulations in the Former Prophets (now inclusive of Josh and perhaps Judg) accord with those in Deuteronomy and point to a literary cross-linkage, though this linkage probably reaches back beyond Deuteronomy to at least Exodus. For, on the one hand, Deuteronomy offers a syntactic but nonetheless inadequate beginning point and, on the other hand (as shown above in section 2), it exhibits a prominent “Decalogical” connection with the preceding narrative in Exodus–Numbers.

At the end of this development, there can finally be explicit reference to the “law of Moses” and related locutions (Josh 8:31f.; 23:6; 1 Kgs 2:3; 2 Kgs 14:6; 18:6; 21:8; 22:8–13; 23:25). At this point, we find the underlying standard to be the written law, probably referring to the Torah in its entirety.⁵⁸

2) *Who in general is numbered among those responsible?* In the historical books, there are four major perspectives. First, blame for the catastrophe falls on the negatively assessed kings;⁵⁹ second, on all kings;⁶⁰ third, on the people;⁶¹ and fourth, on Manasseh alone.⁶²

The first perspective emerges by and large from the royal assessments: the book of Kings mentions both positively and negatively assessed rulers, the latter of which seem to have been the decisive factor leading to judgment. The people certainly play a role here as well, inasmuch as they are either tempted by the kings or cannot be swayed by them. But the people do not amount to a self-governing agent.

⁵⁶ See AURELIUS, “Ursprung” (see n. 37), 3f. and n. 6.

⁵⁷ See CROSS, “Themes” (see n. 42).

⁵⁸ In the German-speaking realm, these references to the law have often been attributed to “DtrN” (see E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Die Bücher der Könige: 1. Kön 17–2. Kön 25* [ATD 11/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht]), 371, 410). But his proposal is too narrow and is conceptualized within the borders of Noth's “DtrH”; see n. 19. “Deuteronomistic” texts cannot be limited to the time of the Babylonian exile and therefore one has to take into account, for secondary “Deuteronomistic,” texts the developing literary history of Deut in the Pentateuch itself. As a consequence, the “law of Moses” is not necessarily just the text of Deut.

⁵⁹ I.e., all the kings of the northern and southern kingdoms alike, with the exception of Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:*2–7) and Josiah (2 Kgs 22:1f.) and, to a certain extent, Asa (1 Kgs 15:*11–15), Joash (2 Kgs 12:1–4), Azariah (2 Kgs 15:1–4) and Jotham (2 Kgs 15:32–35).

⁶⁰ 2 Kgs 23:31ff.; 23:36f.; 24:8f.; 24:17–20; see further n. 63.

⁶¹ 1 Kgs 9:6–9; 2 Kgs 17:7–20.

⁶² 2 Kgs 23:26; 24:3; cf. 2 Kgs 21:1–18.

The second perspective is based on the assessments of the last four Judean kings in 2 Kgs 23:26–25:30. As Vanoni has emphasized, the judgments presented here differ linguistically as well as functionally from the other royal assessments.⁶³ Especially noteworthy is the fact that the negative verdict precedes the refrain “just like his fathers had done” (23:32, 37; cf. 24:9, 19, “just like his father/Jehoiakim had done”). Thus, a sweeping judgment categorically targets the kings, assigning, at least implicitly, a negative verdict to them all.

The third perspective, which holds the entire people accountable, is prepared within the historical books by Exod 32, the (“exilic, at the earliest”⁶⁴) narrative of the golden calf that transfers the sin of Jeroboam not only to Aaron as an instigator but also to the people as wholly complicit.⁶⁵ This perspective also turns up in redactional interpretive passages in Joshua and Judges and eventually receives attention again in 1 Kgs 9:6–9 and 2 Kgs 17:7–20 where, unlike the older perspective in 2 Kgs 17:21–23 that attributes the northern kingdom’s demise to Jeroboam’s sin, the blame falls on Israel as a

⁶³ G. VANONI, “Beobachtungen zur deuteronomistischen Terminologie in 2Kön 23,25–25,30,” in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. N. Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: Peeters, 1985), 357–362. Making reference to RÖMER (*Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Literatur* [OBO 99; Fribourg: 1990, 284]), AURELIUS (*Zukunft* [see n. 40], 45–47) contends that the last four assessments distance themselves from the preceding ones and that 2 Kgs 23:32, 37 should be understood as generalizations. But among the texts in question, only one is formulated precisely according to 2 Kgs 23:32, 37 with “fathers” in the plural: namely, 2 Kgs 15:9. It is here that this formulation makes particular sense, since Zechariah is the last visible representative of the Jehu dynasty (see AURELIUS, *Zukunft*, 46). Accordingly, 2 Kgs 23:32, 37 takes as its central theme the Davidic dynasty as a whole. This probably also accounts for the divergent formulations with Jehoiachin (“his father,” 24:9) and Zedekiah (“Jehoiakim,” 24:19), who, following the commencement of Nebuchadnezzar’s domination, could no longer qualify as valid representatives of the Davidic dynasty (correspondingly in Jer 36:29–31, note the demolition of the Davidic dynasty in the fourth year of Jehoiakim and the simultaneous transfer of power to Nebuchadnezzar in Jer 25:1, 9 [“Nebuchadnezzar, my servant”]; see further SCHMID, *Buchgestalten* [see n. 4], 226, and J. WÖHRLE, “Die Rehabilitierung Jojachins: Zur Entstehung und Intention von 2 Kön 24,17–25,30,” in *Berührungspunkte: Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt* [ed. I. Kottsieper et al.; AOAT 350; Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 2008], 213–238). See also L. CAMP, *Hiskija und Hiskijabild: Analyse und Interpretation von 2Kön 18–20* (Altenberge: Telos, 1990), 17–21; B. LEHNART, *Prophet und König in Nordreich Israel: Studien zur sogenannten vorklassischen Prophetie im Nordreich Israel anhand der Samuel-, Elija- und Elischaüberlieferungen* (VTSup 96; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 10f. n. 16, 20.

⁶⁴ J.C. GERTZ, “Beobachtungen zur Komposition und Redaktion in Ex 32–34,” in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10* (ed. E. Blum and M. Köckert; VWGTh 18; Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 2001), 88–106, here 98.

⁶⁵ See GERTZ, “Beobachtungen” (see n. 64), 99.

people. Additionally, in the context of Rehoboam's rise to power in 1 Kgs 14:21f., the description of Judah is relevant: "Now Rehoboam the son of Solomon became king over Judah. Rehoboam was forty-one years old when he became king and he reigned seventeen years in Jerusalem [...]. *And Judah* (LXX: Rehoboam⁶⁶) *displeased Yahweh* [...]." With Judah's first king, Rehoboam, it is not the king but rather the people who undergo judgment, strategically clarifying at the beginning of the reading sequence that all of Judah bears responsibility.

Finally, the fourth perspective, which makes Manasseh alone responsible for the catastrophe, is a special case. It concerns the passages, treated elsewhere,⁶⁷ that imply a *golah*-oriented redaction in 2 Kgs 21–24, similar to what we see in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.⁶⁸ This editorial reworking of the book of Kings perceives the events of 587 B.C.E. as the decisive judgment and explains them exclusively with the sins of Manasseh (2 Kgs 24:3f.), fitting in seamlessly with the needs of the first *golah*: a self-characterization as undeserving of exile insofar as they are the deported "good figs" of Jer 24.

These four perspectives distinguishing between the alleged carriers of responsibility can now be tied back into the question of the underlying standard. It seems rather clear that the first two perspectives are essentially based on cult centralization, whereas the third perspective clearly presupposes the first commandment. The same holds true for the fourth perspective. Moreover, the assignment of blame to Manasseh, the scapegoat of *golah*-oriented theology in Kings, demonstrates conspicuous intertextual connections to the Moab covenant in Deut 29.⁶⁹ In the judicial reasoning of 2 Kgs 24:4, the text says that Yahweh "did not want to forgive" Manasseh (לֹא-רָצָה יְהוָה לְסַלַּח). Although the Mosaic fiction precludes any mention of Manasseh's name, this

⁶⁶ See M. NOTH (*Könige, I* [BKAT 9/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1968], 323): "Am wahrscheinlichsten hat hinter ייִשׂראֵל kein Subjekt gestanden; daher sind sekundär verschiedene Subjekte eingesetzt worden. G hat sachlich richtig ergänzt."

⁶⁷ SCHMID, "Manasse" (see n. 45).

⁶⁸ See the seminal discussion in K.F. POHLMANN, *Studien zum Jeremiah* (FRLANT 118; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978). Additionally, see SCHMID, *Buchgestalten* (see n. 4), 253–269.

⁶⁹ On Deut 29 in current research, see OTTO, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch* (see n. 2), 129–155; for this text at an earlier stage, see N. LOHFINK, "Der Bundesschluss in Land Moab: Redaktionsgeschichtliches zu Dt 28,69–32,47," *BZ* 6 (1962), 32–56, republished in *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur II* (SBAB 12; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991), 87–106; also, A. ROFÉ, "The Covenant in the Land of Moab (Dt 28,69–30,20): Historico-literary, Comparative, and Form-critical Considerations," in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. N. Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: Peeters, 1985), 310–320; A. CHOLEWINSKI, "Zur theologischen Deutung des Moabbundes," *Bib* 66 (1985), 96–111.

formulation in Deut 29:19 constitutes a significant parallel and was probably written about Manasseh from the outset.⁷⁰

For the Torah perspective of 2 Kgs 18:(5–)12 that evaluates Israel through the lens of the Mosaic law, Aurelius has shown that the opening scene for this point of view is in Exod 19:3b–8,⁷¹ which declares Israel a “priestly” people.⁷² In the general context, there is an effort to incorporate all Israelites into the realm of priestly responsibility and to recognize Yahweh as the sole king over Israel. The Torah therefore holds everyone accountable as a member of a “kingdom of priests.”

4. Summary

What provisional conclusions and viewpoints can we now articulate?

1. The connection between Deuteronomy and its preceding context is most evident from the double placement of the Decalogue in Exod 20 and Deut 5 as well as from Deut 1:5 + 4:1, 5f.: Deuteronomy is the Mosaic explanation of the Sinai legislation. The mutual identity of both the Sinai and the Transjordanian legislation is secured by both Decalogues. The diachronic classification of their redacted contextual integration is currently contested and must remain open for the time being.⁷³

2. It appears that the oldest royal assessments use the centralization edict as a gauge but are not familiar with a literary Deuteronomy. Instead, one might even suspect that Deuteronomy with its demand for centralization has been developed from the royal assessments.⁷⁴ Literary connections to Deuteronomy are observable through the standard of the first commandment and, subsequently, through the “Torah of Moses.”

⁷⁰ Furthermore, notice that the lexeme *בחה*, “to wipe out,” from Deut 29:19 is featured in Josh–Kgs, with the notable exceptions of Judg 21:17 (Benjamin and Israel) and 2 Kgs 14:27 (the name of Israel), becoming prominent again only in the Manasseh passage, 2 Kgs 21:10–15 (note v. 13), with three occurrences. Indeed, Manasseh’s sins clearly presuppose the first commandment, but evidently Manasseh is also depicted as the one who breaks the Moab covenant of Deut 29.

⁷¹ See AURELIUS, *Zukunft* (see n. 40), 95–110, 141–168; A. SCHENKER, “Drei Mosaiksteinchen: ‘Königreich von Priestern’, ‘Und ihre Kinder gehen weg’, ‘Wir tun und wir hören’ (Exodus 19,6; 21,22; 24,7)” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction – Reception – Interpretation* (ed. M. Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 367–380.

⁷² For extensive discussion of the unique expression *במלכות כהנים*, see AURELIUS, *Zukunft* (see n. 40), 146–149.

⁷³ See above, n. 24.

⁷⁴ See above, n. 55.

3. The literary connections to Deuteronomy, before as well as after it, emerge through one and the same standard – namely, the Decalogue. This observation indicates that Deuteronomy, with its literary incorporation into the historical books, was from the outset adjusted “Decalogically” to the preceding and subsequent contexts. And above all, in contrast to the classical theory of an independent Deuteronomy–2 Kings composition, the redactional integration of Deuteronomy into a literary setting that was probably already determined in terms of what comes before, namely Exodus–Numbers (and later, Gen–Num), since Deuteronomy does not offer a sufficient narrative introduction.⁷⁵

4. Regarding the thesis of a “Deuteronomistic History,”⁷⁶ it is clear in view of these considerations that this expression is only correct in the plural.⁷⁷ There were various “Deuteronomistic Histories” in the Enneateuch. One can discern an initial “Deuteronomistic History” in Samuel–2 Kings that was shaped not by Deut 12 but by the cult centralization in Jerusalem. Another “Deuteronomistic History” is perceptible in Exodus–Joshua + Samuel–2 Kings and is shaped by the first commandment, deriving its theological thrust through the literary arches of Exod 32 and 1 Kgs 12 as well as through the twofold theme of “exodus from Egypt” and “return to Egypt” in 2 Kgs 25:26 (“From Egypt to Egypt”⁷⁸). Finally, a third and, to my mind, post-Priestly⁷⁹ “Deuteronomistic History” is recognizable in Genesis–2 Kings, which is already dominated by the notion of the “Torah of Moses” that it applies to the story. Genesis–2 Kings also coins the great literary inclusion stretching from Joseph in Egypt to King Jehoiachin at the table of the Babylonian king Amel-Marduk, thereby representing a diaspora theology for Israel.

5. From a literary- and theological-historical angle, the following process is discernible for the functional and structural changes of Deuteronomy within

⁷⁵ See above, n. 15.

⁷⁶ For the history of research, see RÖMER and DE PURY, “L’historiographie deutéronomiste” (see n. 13), 9–120; G.N. KNOPPERS, “Introduction,” in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 1–18; IDEM, “Is There a Future for the Deuteronomistic History?” in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. T. Römer; BETL 97; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 119–134; W. DIETRICH, “Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk” (see n. 4).

⁷⁷ See the title formulations of FREVEL, “Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk” (see n. 17), 60–95; WITTE *et al.*, *Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke* (see n. 17).

⁷⁸ See R.E. FRIEDMAN, “From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr¹ and Dtr²,” in *Traditions and Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faiths* (ed. B. Halpern and J.D. Levenson; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1991), 167–192.

⁷⁹ See SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus* (see n. 7), 253–255 (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 236f.). “Post-Priestly” here means temporally *after the integration* of “P” into its narrative context, pointing to a stage later than the origin of “P” itself.

Genesis–2 Kings. The (“mono-Yahwistic”⁸⁰) “Ur”-Deuteronomy in Deut *6–28 may already presuppose the oldest “Deuteronomistic History” in Samuel–Kings and summarize its implicit criterion in Deut 12,⁸¹ though still without a literary connection to Samuel–Kings. In the form of (at least) Deut *5–30,⁸² Deuteronomy becomes part of a larger “Deuteronomistic History” (*Exod–2 Kgs⁸³) governed primarily by the Decalogue in Deut 5 (which is conceived in terms of monolatry, a mentality *presupposing, not denying* the existence of other deities!). Only at this point does the Decalogue editorially mold the internal structure of Deuteronomy.⁸⁴ Finally, Deut 4 reflects on the expansive context of Genesis–2 Kings. In the wake of the Priestly document⁸⁵ that Deut

⁸⁰ See still P. HÖFFKEN, “Eine Bemerkung zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund von Dtn 6,4,” *BZ* 28 (1984), 88–93, which contrasts T. VEIJOLA’s perspective on both Deut 6:4 and the first commandment of the Decalogue in “Das Bekenntnis Israel: Beobachtungen zur Geschichte und Theologie von Dtn 6,4–9,” *TZ* 48 (1992), 369–381; IDEM, “Höre Israel! Der Sinn und Hintergrund von Deuteronomium VI 4–9,” *VT* 42 (1992), 528–541. Although Veijola accepts a redaction-historical connection between these texts, he contends that this meaning is not the primary sense of Deut 6:4. But his case against a mono-Yahwistic understanding of Deut 6:4 is not convincing: the fact that cult centralization is nowhere substantiated explicitly on the grounds of “one Yahweh” is negligible in light of the theological compatibility between Deut 6:4 and a cult centralization that would otherwise lack appropriate conceptual underpinnings. The fact that mono-Yahwism does not undergo further redaction-historical transmission through Deut 6:4 should not be surprising after the first commandment preceding it in Deut 5. AURELIUS (“Ursprung,” [see n. 37], 5–7) rightly identifies the religious-political points of Deut 6:4 but strangely continues to uphold Veijola’s proposed translation using two nominal clauses, even though this translation neither highlights these points clearly nor follows the typically appositional usage of אלהינו in Deuteronomistic literature (a trait that Aurelius unnecessarily relativizes [see “Ursprung,” 5 n. 9]). Note the excellent observations of J. PAKKALA, *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History* (PFES 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 73–84.

⁸¹ See above, n. 55.

⁸² See SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus* (see n. 7), 164f.

⁸³ For a beginning in Exod 2, see SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus* (see n. 7), 152–157 (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 139–144). For the acceptance of an expansive Exod–2 Kgs context as well as the limitation of “KD” to Exod–Deut (+ “DtrG”) which amounts to an overall *Exod–2 Kgs context, see 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; IDEM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* [BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990], 107–110; see also KRATZ, *Komposition* (see n. 2), 331 (“Ex 2–2Reg 25”) (*Composition*, 326).

⁸⁴ See OTTO, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch* (see n. 2), 115 (“DtrD”).

⁸⁵ For P’s basic monotheistic argumentation, especially its use of the indeterminate אלהים as a proper name, see A. DE PURY, “Gottesname, Gottesbezeichnung und Gottesbegriff: Elohim als Indiz zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (eds. J.C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 25–27; K. SCHMID, “Differenzierungen und Konzeptualisierungen

4 presupposes and utilizes,⁸⁶ Deuteronomy becomes a strictly monotheistic standard. Thus, the current textual progression from Deut 4 to Deut 6 mirrors in reverse historical order both the formation and the theology of Deuteronomy in its contexts.⁸⁷

der Einheit Gottes in der Religions- und Literaturgeschichte Israel: Methodische, religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Aspekte zur neueren Diskussion um den sogenannten ‘Monotheismus’ im antiken Israel,” in *Der eine Gott und die Götter: Polytheismus und Monotheismus im antiken Israel* (ed. M. Oeming and K. Schmid; ATANT 82; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2003), 11–38, here 28–38.

⁸⁶ See E. OTTO, “Deuteronomium 4: Die Pentateuchredaktion im Deuteronomiumsrahmen,” in *Das Deuteronomium und seine Querbeziehungen* (ed. T. Veijola; PFES 62; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 196–222; IDEM, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch* (see n. 2), 168f.

⁸⁷ In order to fit the theological profile of Deut’s respective contexts, the orientations of the narrative beginnings define the reading perspectives for the following: Gen–2 Kgs begins in Gen 1 (which Deut 4 knows) with a universalist-monotheistic argument; *Exod–2 Kgs starts in Exod *2–4 with a particularist-monotheistic argument; and in accordance with Deut 6:4, the prelude of Deut *6–28 is conceptualized in terms of mono-Yahwism.