

Dear reader,

This is an author-produced version of an article published in International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. It agrees with the manuscript submitted by the author for publication but does not include the final publisher's layout or pagination.

Original publication:

Schmid, Konrad

The Deuteronomistic image of history as interpretive device in the Second Temple period
[International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, 2010, Vol. 20: 369-388]
[Leiden, Brill, 2010]

URL: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004221130_017

Access to the published version may require subscription.

Published in accordance with the policy of Brill: <https://brill.com/>

Your IxTheo team

Liebe*r Leser*in,

dies ist eine von dem/der Autor*in zur Verfügung gestellte Manuskriptversion eines Aufsatzes, der in International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament erschienen ist. Der Text stimmt mit dem Manuskript überein, das der/die Autor*in zur Veröffentlichung eingereicht hat, enthält jedoch *nicht* das Layout des Verlags oder die endgültige Seitenzählung.

Originalpublikation:

Schmid, Konrad

The Deuteronomistic image of history as interpretive device in the Second Temple period
International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, 20/2010, 369-388]
[Leiden, Brill, 2010]

URL: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004221130_017

Die Verlagsversion ist möglicherweise nur gegen Bezahlung zugänglich.

Diese Manuskriptversion wird im Einklang mit der Policy des Verlags Brill publiziert:

<https://brill.com/>

Ihr IxTheo-Team

The Deuteronomistic Image of History as Interpretive Device in the Second Temple Period:

Towards a Long Term Interpretation of “Deuteronomism”

Konrad Schmid (Zürich)

1. Deuteronomism and the Deuteronomistic Image of History

The question “what is ‘Deuteronomistic’?” sounds simple, but at the same time is quite difficult to answer. In the era of Martin Noth, “Deuteronomistic” was what was written by the “Deuteronomist,” who was “one man” living in the aftermath of Judah’s and Jerusalem’s catastrophe.¹ Two generations after Martin Noth’s pivotal work and in the wake of works from authors like Gerhard von Rad,² Hans Walter Wolff,³ Rudolf Smend,⁴ Helga Weippert,⁵ Walter Dietrich,⁶ Frank M. Cross,⁷ Timo Veijola,⁸ Norbert

¹ See Noth 1943, 110. About Martin Noth and his theory of the “Deuteronomistic History” see McKenzie and Patrick 1994; Römer and de Pury 1996, 31–39; Veijola 2000; Dietrich 2002; Rütterswörden 2004.

² Von Rad 1958.

³ Wolff 1961/1964.

⁴ Smend 1971/1986; idem ⁴1989, 111–125.

⁵ Weippert 1972.

Lohfink,⁹ R. D. Nelson,¹⁰ Gottfried Vanoni,¹¹ André Lemaire,¹² Iain Provan,¹³ Mark A. O'Brien,¹⁴ Georg Braulik,¹⁵ Mark A. O'Brien,¹⁶ Baruch Halpern and David Vanderhooft,¹⁷ Ansgar Moenikes,¹⁸ Gary Knoppers,¹⁹ Hermann-Josef Stipp,²⁰ Erik Eynikel,²¹ Rainer Albertz,²² Bernard M. Levinson,²³ Marvin Sweeney,²⁴ Ray Person,²⁵ Erik Aurelius,²⁶ Reinhard Kratz,²⁷ Jeffrey Geoghegan,²⁸ Thomas Römer,²⁹ and others,³⁰

⁶ Dietrich 1972; idem 1999.

⁷ Cross 1973.

⁸ Veijola 1975.

⁹ Lohfink 1981, 87–100.

¹⁰ Nelson 1981.

¹¹ Vanoni 1985, 357–362.

¹² Lemaire 1986, 221–236.

¹³ Provan 1988.

¹⁴ O'Brien 1992.

¹⁵ Braulik 1988; idem 2005.

¹⁶ O'Brien 1989.

¹⁷ Halpern, and Vanderhooft 1991, 179–244.

¹⁸ Moenikes 1992, 333–348.

¹⁹ Knoppers 1993/1994, I, 51f; idem 1996; idem 2001, see also the collection Knoppers and McConville 2000.

²⁰ Stipp 1995; idem 1998; idem 2010.

²¹ Eynikel 1996.

²² Albertz 1997; idem 2000; idem 2001/2003.

²³ Levinson 2001.

²⁴ Sweeney 2001.

²⁵ Person 2002.

²⁶ Aurelius 2003.

the necessity to differentiate Noth's "mono-Deuteronomistic" approach is felt in an increasing way. Starting in the seventies of the twentieth century, the modifications to Noth's theory were still comparatively modest and were centered around the discussion of whether the Deuteronomistic texts in Deuteronomy through Kings should be sorted out along the line of Cross or of Smend. In the last two decades, however, it has become clear that neither the confinement to the books of Deuteronomy through Kings nor to the historical era immediately before or after 587 B.C.E is adequate in order to determine "what is Deuteronomistic."³¹ Today, there are many proposals to answer to this question,³² but a consensus is not yet in sight.

²⁷ Kratz 2000.

²⁸ Geoghegan 2003, 201–227; idem 2005, 405–421; idem 2006.

²⁹ Römer 2005; see also idem 2000.

³⁰ See the overall discussion in McKenzie 1992; Shearing and McKenzie 1999; Veijola 2003; Aurelius 2003, 39 n. 67; Braulik 2004; Avioz 2005; 2006; Witte et al. 2006; Hutton 2009, 79–156.

³¹ A good overview is provided by Witte et al. 2006 and Frevel 2004. For the question of the relation of the Pentateuch to the Deuteronomistic History see Otto and Achenbach 2005; Römer and Schmid 2007. For a discussion of the relation of "Deuteronomism" to Jeremiah see Schmid 1996, 346–349; Albertz 1997; idem 2000; idem 2003, 231–260; Römer 1999; idem 2000; Stipp 2010 (differently Fischer 2007 who denies any "deuteronomistic" redactional activity in Jeremiah); to Hosea, Amos, Micah and Zephaniah see Wöhrle 2008.

³² For recent proposals see Lohfink, 1990, 413f.; Shearing and McKenzie 1999; Coggins 1999; Person 2002, 4–7; Blanco Wissmann 2008, 25–27; Stipp 2010, 247f (see also his methodological *caveat* 244: "Die Definition der Kriteriologie ist freilich heikel und verlangt den Einbezug verschiedenartiger Gesichtspunkte. So selbstverständlich es klingen mag, sei doch zur Vermeidung von Missverständnissen zunächst daran erinnert, dass das Etikett 'deuteronomistisch' kein biblischer Terminus ist, sondern eine moderne Ordnungskategorie. Die Abzweckung auf wissenschaftliche Klassifikation ist der Grund, warum

How can this situation be addressed? There are many factors and many good reasons that lead different scholars to come to different conclusions with regard to what the term “Deuteronomistic”—or, as others prefer: “Deuteronomic”³³—means. This contribution will avoid proposing another definition of “Deuteronomistic,” but try to handle the question from a different angle. The question “what is Deuteronomistic?” shall be approached from what might be called “Deuteronomistic” presentations of history in the Hebrew Bible and ancient Jewish Literature. Within the framework of a common sense approach to the term, they are identifiable as “Deuteronomistic” by a specific sequence of events that are listed as being decisive for Israel’s history and by a characteristic phraseology.³⁴

bei der begrifflichen Füllung das Postulat der Gegenstandsangemessenheit auch praktische Erfordernisse einschließt. Die Definition des Deuteronomistischen ist demgemäß nicht essenziell [also am ‘Wesen’ des Gegenstands orientiert], sondern zweckgebunden deskriptiv; sie beantwortet also streng genommen nicht die Frage, was deuteronomistisch ist, sondern was im Dienste analytisch fruchtbarer Kategorisierung so genannt werden sollte. Sie ist folglich Gegenstand der Übereinkunft, was andeutet, welche Freiheiten der Wissenschaft bei der Umschreibung des Deuteronomistischen zu Gebote stehen.”)

³³ Person 2002, 6; see also Weinfeld 1972, 4 n. 1 and the discussion in Spieckermann 2001, 338; Noll 2007.

³⁴ For the basic elements that will be discussed below in section 4. see Steck 1967, 68: “das ständig ungehorsame Volk (A) hat die ihm gleichwohl zugehenden Vermahnungen Jahwes durch die Propheten (B) stets abgewiesen (C) und so in den Katastrophen 722 und 587 v.Chr. Jahwes Zorngericht über sich gebracht (D).” As Werline 1998, 12–28, observes, also the form of penitential prayer which serves often as context for the presentation of these “Deuteronomistic” images of history has its origins within Deuteronomy and subsequently in 1 Kings 8. For “Deuteronomistic” phraseology see Weinfeld 1972, 320–365; Thiel 1981, 93–99.

I will discuss my subject in conversation with a specific scholarly work concerning “Deuteronomistic” texts and theology that did not, however, attract a great amount of scholarly attention: Odil Hannes Steck’s 1967 dissertation on “Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten.”³⁵ Steck’s book is, despite its age, still an important and substantial contribution that has been by and large overlooked.³⁶ To be sure, there is no need for contemporary scholars to quote every work from the late sixties when dealing with a specific subject. However, it is nevertheless important to note that Steck’s book has not established itself as a landmark in the field of “Deuteronomistic” studies. Various reasons for his modest reception in the field can be adduced. Firstly, Steck’s book is written in a scientific prose that is not easily accessible even for native German speakers. Secondly, Steck’s book was actually a New Testament dissertation, written under the supervision of Günter Bornkamm, so perhaps it was a bit off the radar for Old Testament scholars (the second reader was, however, Gerhard von Rad). Thirdly, its main ideas were hidden to a certain extent by his extensive treatment of the detailed question about the motif of the slain prophets that appears in several biblical passages. Steck attempted to highlight the tradition-historical backgrounds of these texts, and early on in the monograph he felt it necessary to deal with the question of what he called the “Deuteronomistic” image of history as a whole—hence the subtitle of his book. Fourthly, he offers only a sketchy presentation of his own view on the literary and historical questions of the alleged Deuteronomistic History; he seemed to prefer remaining in the shadows of Martin Noth and Gerhard von

³⁵ Steck 1967.

³⁶ For example, there is no reference to this work in McKenzie 1992; Dietrich 1999; Person 2002 or Römer 2005.

Rad for the basic outline while showing sympathies with Hans Walter Wolff's cautious identification of a "second Deuteronomistic hand" in texts like Deuteronomy 4 or 30.³⁷

There is, however, one dissenting voice: Norbert Lohfink attributes quite a significant impact to Steck's work, at least in one specific respect. In a well-known article from 1995 (the English translation was published in 1999), he wrote:

"According to O.H. Steck, the Deuteronomistic movement ... existed over an astonishing period of half a millennium! ... Such a prolonged duration of the "Deuteronomic" or "Deuteronomistic" movement seems also to have been accepted without reservation by Old Testament scholarship."³⁸

As a result he blames Steck for having opened the door wide for what he and others then called "pan-Deuteronomism" in Hebrew Bible studies. Lohfink states:

"Some years ago, in order to be considered good, an Old Testament specialist had to reconstruct a primitive Decalogue or a new festival; today, a self-respecting doctoral student has to find the hand of a Deuteronomist somewhere in the Bible. This is the only way into the guild."³⁹

³⁷ Steck 1967, 66 n. 3; Wolff 1961.

³⁸ Lohfink 1999, 37.

³⁹ Lohfink 1999, 37.

This may or may not be true, but at any rate, Lohfink gives Steck the credit for this situation. However, another specialist in the field of Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic texts, the late Timo Veijola, was probably correct with his more cautious appraisal of Steck's modest impact on biblical scholarship in this regard.⁴⁰ One of the roots of Pan-Deuteronomism may be Steck's book, but it is neither the only, nor the most important one.

The small amount of scholarly attention attracted by Steck's dissertation should not, however, lead to neglect his work. Steck's book developed some groundbreaking ideas, and it is even today helpful in three respects, which include (1) "Deuteronomism" as a long-term phenomenon, (2) "Deuteronomism" as a theological tradition (not based on a specific school or movement), and (3) the transformation and development of "Deuteronomism" in Second Temple Judaism.

What Steck, however, did not perceive sufficiently were the pre-Neo-Babylonian origins of "Deuteronomism" in the reception of Neo-Assyrian vassal concepts,⁴¹ to which especially Weinfeld,⁴² Cross,⁴³ Lohfink,⁴⁴ Dion,⁴⁵ Steymans,⁴⁶ Levinson,⁴⁷

⁴⁰ Veijola 2000, 192f.

⁴¹ See Borger 1956, 10–29; Parpola / Watanabe 1988. A cautious evaluation of the reception process in Judah is provided by Morrow 2005.

⁴² Weinfeld 1972, vii.

⁴³ Cross 1973.

⁴⁴ Lohfink 1977.

⁴⁵ Dion 1978.

⁴⁶ Steymans 1995a; 1995b; 2006.

Otto,⁴⁸ Knauf⁴⁹ and Koch⁵⁰ pointed. Due to the tremendous influence of Cross,⁵¹ the assumption of Neo-Assyrian origins of “Deuteronomism” have never been much disputed in the English-speaking world. Despite the fact that Wellhausen argued for an initial “Deuteronomistic” redaction of the book of Kings already in the time of Josiah,⁵² this perspective was no longer seriously discussed in German scholarship after Noth’s decisive *votum* for the location of the “Deuteronomist” after the fall of Jerusalem, which in some ways was also comparable to his own situation in 1943. Although scholars like Spieckermann,⁵³ Levin,⁵⁴ Kratz,⁵⁵ and Aurelius⁵⁶ might have been attracted by their textual observation to a still preexilic setting of a “Deuteronomistic” core layer in the last chapter in 2 Kings, they decided to follow the basic historical tenets of Noth’s and Smend’s analysis, i.e. an exilic start for the work of the “Deuteronomists.”⁵⁷ Today, there is a growing awareness in German speaking research of a possible preexilic

⁴⁷ Levinson 1997.

⁴⁸ Otto 1993; 1994; 1997; 1999; 2000; 2001; 2007.

⁴⁹ Knauf 2000, 136f.

⁵⁰ Koch 2008.

⁵¹ See Cross 1973.

⁵² Wellhausen 1899, 294–298.

⁵³ Spieckermann 1982.

⁵⁴ Levin 1984, but see his discussion of Kings in Levin 2008.

⁵⁵ Kratz 2000/2005.

⁵⁶ Aurelius 2003.

⁵⁷ See the detailed discussion in Schmid 2006, 28–36.

beginning of Deuteronomistic editing especially in the book of Kings,⁵⁸ but it is still a minority position. The situation is however complicated, as the dating of oldest edition of Deuteronomy in the Neo-Assyrian period is contested by some scholars as well who want to place it after the fall of Jerusalem 587 B.C.E.⁵⁹ Such a dating, of course, would rule out the option of preexilic “Deuteronomism,” unless one would try to interpret Deuteronomy—especially Deuteronomy 12—as a later substrate of antecedent “Deuteronomisms.”⁶⁰ Given the fundamental similarity of “Deuteronomistic” concepts of history with the findings in preexilic inscriptions, especially the Moabite stone, and their rootedness in traditional wisdom, an “early” dating of its origins in the Neo-Assyrian period seems not to be audacious.⁶¹

2. “Deuteronomism” as a long-term phenomenon

⁵⁸ See Stipp 1995; idem 1998; Arneht 2001; Braulik 2004; Römer 2005; Schmid 2006; Otto 2006. A different position, arguing for the exilic origin of “Deuteronomism” in Kings is held e.g. by Blanco Wissmann 2008.

⁵⁹ Clements 1996; Kratz 2000, 137; idem 2010; Pakkala 2009. For the older discussion about this issue see Hölscher 1922; Baumgartner 1929; Clements 1996, 7 n. 4.

⁶⁰ See the discussion in Schmid 2004b, 204f; 208–211.

⁶¹ On the notions of history in ancient Hebrew (and Moabite) epigraphy see Parker 2006; Kratz 2007; idem 2008.

In his 1967 monograph, Steck opposed the prevalent view of his time that “Deuteronomistic” texts are limited to the period of the Babylonian exile.⁶² According to Martin Noth’s statement—still well respected in 1967—(the last full year of his life),⁶³ the “Deuteronomist” was one real and actual person writing in Mizpah in 562 B.C.E.⁶⁴ Steck, however, argued for the “Deuteronomistic” nature of significantly later portions of the Bible. He noted that texts like Ezra 9, Neh 9 and Dan 9, or even 4 Ezra and the gospels of Matthew and Luke adopt a “Deuteronomistic” view of history and are indebted to this theology.⁶⁵ “Deuteronomistic” thinking is therefore, according to Steck, a long-term phenomenon. Current scholarship seems to be inclined to follow Steck in this regard, at least to a certain extent. Scholars like Gary Knoppers⁶⁶ and Reinhard Kratz⁶⁷ stress the proximity of Chronicles to Deuteronomistic theology, albeit

⁶² It is important to note that already one of the first scholars speaking of “Deuteronomism,” Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, mentioned the longevity of this ideology, see Wette 2008, 188: “Diversa plane atque a prioribus libris dissona religionis et juris doctrina esse videtur, quam liber noster spirat, quippe quae ad sequiorem illam Rabbinorum doctrinam aliquo modo accedere videtur” (ET [K.S.]: “The religious and juridic doctrine which characterizes our book, seems to be clearly different from the preceding books, but seems, in some way, to be akin to the doctrine of the later [books] of the Rabbis”). For a comprehensive treatment of the history of scholarship, see Römer and Pury 1996, 9–120; Römer, Macchi, and Pury 2000.

⁶³ See the biographical sketch in Smend 1989, 255–275.

⁶⁴ See n. 1.

⁶⁵ Steck 1967, 20–58, 290–316, see also Römer/Macchi 1995. For a discussion of LXX-Pluses which seem to be “Deuteronomistic,” see Tov 2008.

⁶⁶ See his contribution in this volume.

⁶⁷ Kratz 1995, 279–303.

there are also significant differences. At least in pentateuchal research, it is a well-established assumption that some “Deuteronomistic” texts should be dated post-Priestly.⁶⁸ Thomas Römer and Ray Person allow the extension of their “Deuteronomistic” school until the closure of the Pentateuch or the mission of Ezra.⁶⁹

Indeed, if one does not adhere to an artificially narrowed down notion of “Deuteronomism,” it makes sense to reckon with “Deuteronomistic” texts not only during the exile, but during the Second Temple period as a whole. It is quite apparent that Persian period texts like the Priestly Code or Chronicles that interpret the situation in Yehud as the fulfillment of God’s will in history—his people dwells in peace in his land and has its own cult—represent only one theological position of that time among others. The main counter position is provided by the “Deuteronomistic” stance, which cannot see the political situation under the Persians as the result of divine salvation.⁷⁰ Large parts of Israel are still in exile, there is no Davidic king but only foreign rulers, the land and cities are not fully restored, etc. The punishment of exile was not over with Cyrus’ conquest of Babylon but was seen as still continuing. In this sense “Deuteronomistic” texts are always “exilic,” but in a theological rather than a historical perspective.

However, Steck’s long-term notion of “Deuteronomism” also triggered some misunderstandings. Lohfink mistakenly blamed Steck for assuming a “Deuteronomistic

⁶⁸ See e.g. Otto 2002; Schmid 2010, 92–116, 347–348. Blum’s D composition in the Pentateuch is nearly contemporaneous with his P composition, see Blum 1990, 333–360.

⁶⁹ Römer 2005, 178–183; Person 1993, 168; idem 2007.

⁷⁰ See the overview in Schmid 2008, 144–146.

movement” that existed over centuries. But Steck never argued for such a movement or such a school.⁷¹ He offered a different explanation for the historically drawn out extension of “Deuteronomistic” texts that shall be discussed in the following section.

3. “Deuteronomism” as a theological tradition

For Steck, “Deuteronomistic” thinking is not the result of a certain school’s or a specific movement’s ideology, but he instead identified “Deuteronomistic” theology as being rooted in a certain “stream of theological tradition,” as he called it.⁷² It is important to grasp what he means by this in order to understand his notion of “Deuteronomism:”

“The phenomenon of *streams of tradition* [emphasis original] comes into view now when we consider these Israelites spheres of tradition in terms of their temporal prolongation. We can see both long-term growth of their genuine traditions and also frequently occurring references to these spheres without literary mediation through older texts already in written form. Both of these [observations, K.S.] show that such

⁷¹ However, according to form-critical methodology, Steck identified specific “Träger” of the “Deuteronomistic” tradition whom he found in the rural Levites (“Landleviten”). They travelled around in Judah in order to teach the law and to preach repentance (“[...] daß sie als Reiseprediger durch das Land ziehen, um das Volk im Gesetz zu unterweisen und zur Umkehr zu führen,” see Steck 1967, 202 and 196–199). Rofé 2002, 97–102; speaks of a “movement,” but without explaining it. Stipp 2010, 245 n. 21 also opts for the term “Bewegung” (contra Lohfink 1995/1999).

⁷² Steck 1978.

spheres of tradition can maintain surprising constancy in the form of lively intellectual movements—despite the considerable developments, expansions, differentiations, and changes to which they are submitted. Apparently, this is due to the stability of the sites where they are preserved, the groups that transmit them, and the needs which they meet. References, for example, to the Jerusalem cult tradition and to wisdom can be detected far into the post-exilic, late-Israelite period, yet for the most part they are not explainable as derivatives from literary models but only because of contacts with an intact, still living sphere of tradition. Thus we encounter here the phenomenon of streams of tradition.”⁷³

It is helpful to include the concept of theological traditions in the discussion about “Deuteronomism” because it might open up new perspectives and new alternatives to enlighten the socio-historical background of “Deuteronomistic” texts. Identifying a specific “Deuteronomistic” school behind “Deuteronomistic” texts is unwarranted with respect to the available sources.⁷⁴ Perhaps scholars identifying with the Cross school and the Göttingen school in the 20th century also find it convincing to identify a Deuteronomic school in biblical times, but there are definitely more options that probably explain the provenance of “Deuteronomistic” texts in the Hebrew Bible better than postulating a “Deuteronomistic” school of which nothing is known.⁷⁵ As Ehud Ben Zvi points out, there are no hints to more than one central school in Persian Period

⁷³ Steck 1977, 196.

⁷⁴ See also McKenzie 1992, 162.

⁷⁵ Person 1993, 168-175 even posits a “Deuteronomic canon.”

Yehud, namely in Jerusalem.⁷⁶ I find myself here at least in partial agreement with Thomas Römer who writes:

“If the expression ‘Deuteronomistic school’ is taken primarily as referring to an educational institution it would be misleading, but if it denotes a (small) group of authors, redactors or compilers who share the same ideology and the same rhetoric and stylistic techniques, then one may speak of a ‘Deuteronomistic school’ (as one may speak also of a school of artists or philosophers). Others may prefer more neutral terms such as ‘group’ or ‘circle’; nevertheless, the term ‘school’ recalls more clearly the scribal and intellectual setting; for that reason, this term will be preferred, but is not to be used exclusively.”⁷⁷

So the term “school” seems to be adequate in some ways, but not really compelling. At this point, it might be helpful to reevaluate Steck’s notion of “Deuteronomism” as a “theological tradition,” a notion he developed in several publications.⁷⁸ He names several other “theological traditions” attested in the Hebrew Bible, for example the wisdom tradition, the Zion tradition, the Priestly tradition, and others. All these traditions were likely transmitted, taught, and developed (at least initially) by particular groups, but these groups were neither schools nor movements. They are less distinct than schools, and they could also share convictions and content with one other. But

⁷⁶ Ben Zvi 1997, 194–209; Schmid 2004a; idem 2008, 43–47. See also Carter 1999 for the modest standard of Persian Period Yehud in terms of cultural evolution and demographic development.

⁷⁷ Römer 2005, 47.

⁷⁸ Steck 1977, 203f; idem 1978, 45f; idem 1995, 127–149.

once the tradition-transmission and scribal process, at least in Judah, became centered in Jerusalem, these traditions were available for the scribal elite as a whole.

This is probably a more plausible explanation for why “Deuteronomistic” texts can be found in different periods of ancient Judah instead of postulating a specific school that should have produced texts that were basically limited to the vocabulary available now in the appendix of Moshe Weinfeld’s well-known book on Deuteronomy.⁷⁹

4. The transformation and development of “Deuteronomism” in Second Temple Judaism

There is another feature of “Deuteronomistic” texts that can be explained better by the tradition model than the school model—the transformation of the picture of the “Deuteronomistic” history that these texts exhibit. “Deuteronomistic” texts presenting Israel’s history do not always do this the same way but instead manifest some striking differences.

Steck noticed that there is something like a core presentation of “Deuteronomistic” histories in the Hebrew Bible consisting of four elements:⁸⁰

- A Israel is disobedient
- B then is confronted by prophets
- C but remains stiff-necked

⁷⁹ Weinfeld 1972, 320–365.

⁸⁰ Steck 1967, 63–64, 67, 71, 123.

D and therefore suffers God's judgment

He finds this basic version of what he calls the "Deuteronomistic image of history" ("deuteronomistisches Geschichtsbild") especially in the main interpretive passages in the Deuteronomistic History (2 Kings 17), in the so-called C-layer of the book Jeremiah,⁸¹ Lamentations 1–2,⁸² and maybe the core of Ezra 9.⁸³

This basic image seems to have been developed further in a second stage, now including also up to three more further elements:

E Israel repents and prays for mercy

F 1 Restitution is made

F 2 And judgment comes upon enemies / sinners

⁸¹ Steck follows in this terminology (C as designation for the "Deuteronomistic" prose sermons in Jeremiah) from Mowinckel 1914 that was prevalent in the German discussion until the 3rd edition of Rudolph 1968. For a discussion of the complex question of "deuteronomistic" redaction (or redactions) in Jeremiah see above n. 31.

⁸² These texts (Steck 1967, 110f n. 6, 185 n. 3) are important, as Lam 1–2 exhibit a "Deuteronomistic" theology without clear "Deuteronomistic" phraseology. If they may be dated to the exilic period (Berges 2002, 94f, 133f; Keel 2007, 786–800), then this is an argument for a wide dissemination of the basic tenets of "Deuteronomistic" thinking in that time, which would not have necessarily been caused by a specific school. See also Keel 2007, 772–854, who describes the contemporaneous theological ideas in the context of the "Deuteronomists" in a historical synthesis (despite some doubtful datings of texts like Ps 102 or Isa 63:7–64:11 to the exilic period; see Steck 1990; Schmid 2008, 195f; Bosshard-Nepustil 2009).

⁸³ Steck 1967, 185 n. 3. On Ezra 9 see also Pohlmann 2004.

These or some of these additional elements are attested, for example, in 1 Kings 8:46–53,⁸⁴ Deut 4:25–31, 28:45–68 + 30:1–10; Lev 26:32–45; Zech 1:2–6;⁸⁵ 7f.; Mal 3.⁸⁶

Finally, Steck identifies a third stage of the “Deuteronomistic” image of history found mainly in texts of the Hellenistic and the Roman period of ancient Judaism. This stage includes the same elements found in stage two, but there are nevertheless some major transformations that can be observed:⁸⁷ (1) The judgment situation is interpreted as prolonged until the present-day situation of the author in the Hellenistic or Roman period.⁸⁸ (2) The catastrophes under Antiochus, Pompey, and Titus are seen as identical with the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E.⁸⁹ (3) The victims of the final judgment (F2) are

⁸⁴ Talstra, 1993.

⁸⁵ Lux 2004, 569–587.

⁸⁶ Steck 1967, 186 n. 2.

⁸⁷ Steck 1967, 187.

⁸⁸ Dan 9 is a striking example for such a prolongation of the judgment situation into the author’s present, in this case in the Maccabean period. Jerusalem’s destruction will not last 70, but seven times longer, that is 490 years. Interestingly, this multiplication by seven is by no means arbitrary. Instead, it apparently is based on a strict innerbiblical exegesis of 2 Chron 36:21: “All the days that it lay desolate it kept sabbath, to fulfill seventy years.” As Dan 9:2 states, Daniel reads not only the book of Jeremiah, but in “the books”: he studies scripture. There is also the argument in 2 Chron 36:21, which Dan 9 understands in a literal sense: The “seventy years” are not regular years, but sabbath years that occur only every seventh year. Therefore, Jeremiah’s 70 years have to be multiplied by seven. See on Dan 9 e.g. Rigger 1997; Schmid 2008, 208f.

⁸⁹ This is especially evident in 4 Ezra 3:1 (*Anno tricesimo ruinae civitatis eram in Babylone, ego Salathiel qui et Ezras*), which is dated to the thirtieth year after the destruction of Jerusalem. On the level of the narrative, this means the year 557 B.C.E., but it is quite evident that this dating is a hint to the

no longer the foreign nations, but the sinners who also include representatives of the own people.

This stage can be found for example in the Apocalypse of 10 Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1–10; 91:11–17),⁹⁰ the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90),⁹¹ the Book of Jubilees,⁹² CD,⁹³ the Book of Biblical Antiquities (“Pseudo Philo,”)⁹⁴ 4 Ezra,⁹⁵ 2 Baruch,⁹⁶ Dan 9,⁹⁷ and 1 Bar 1:15–3:8.⁹⁸ These texts and writings are of course quite different with regard to their form and content, nevertheless, they presuppose and follow up on earlier “Deuteronomistic” presentations of Israel’s history and develop them further. The texts

historical position of the author some thirty years after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., as well as the fact that Babylon stands for Rome. See Schreiner 1981, 301; Schmid 2002.

⁹⁰ See Leuenberger 2005a, 45–82, 54; VanderKam 2001, 103–104; Schmid 2010, 313–315.

⁹¹ See Tiller 1993; VanderKam 2001, 105–107; Schmid 2010, 309–313.

⁹² Steck 1995; idem 1996; VanderKam 2001, 97–100; Schmid 2010, 302–305.

⁹³ Campbell 1995; Baumgarten et al. 2000; Hempel 1998; eadem 2000.

⁹⁴ Nickelsburg 1981, 265–268.

⁹⁵ Schmid 2002; Schmid 2010, 315–316.

⁹⁶ Murphy 1985; Leuenberger 2005b; Schmid 2010, 316–318.

⁹⁷ There is some discussion about whether the prayer in Dan 9 is a traditional piece “that could have been composed at any time after the exile” (Collins 1993, 359), and is now integrated into a secondary context, alone is “deuteronomistic” (ibid.) or whether this is true for all of Dan 9, including the interpretive passages in 9:24–27 (Steck 1982, 262–290). This is, of course, of importance for the dating of the Deuteronomistic theology of history in Dan 9. Nevertheless, this must not be discussed here because even Collins admits that outside Daniel similar Deuteronomistic notions in are found from that period (2 Macc 7:18; T.Moses 8:1; see Collins 1993, 360).

⁹⁸ See Steck 1967, 187 n. 1–4.

from 1 Enoch (Apocalypse of 10 Weeks and Animal Apocalypse) stand apart to a certain extent because they do not place special emphasis on the law with regard to Israel's history of sin. This is, however, no surprise in the context of the Enoch literature, which draws upon a pre-Mosaic authority.⁹⁹ The recurrence to the law is an important, but not a mandatory element in "Deuteronomistic" presentations of Israel's history.

5. Conclusions

In light of these considerations it is necessary to rethink the currently well-accepted proposal for dating "Deuteronomistic texts" no later than the Persian period, as Römer and Person argue.¹⁰⁰ It is not evident what makes Daniel 9 less "Deuteronomistic" than, for example, Zech 1:2–6 or Mal 3:6–12. Of course, these texts exhibit different theological profiles; nevertheless, they seem to share a common worldview and seem to belong to the same stream of tradition.¹⁰¹ To be sure, Römer also allows for very late repercussions of "Deuteronomistic" theology in the Bible, but this is, according to him, a literary reception, and not a socio-historically relevant production of his "Deuteronomistic school."¹⁰² This differentiation seems problematic in light of the overall problems with the assumption of a "Deuteronomistic school."

⁹⁹ See Bachmann 2010, 143–148.

¹⁰⁰ See n. 69.

¹⁰¹ For a detailed discussion of Zech 1 and Sach 3 see Lux 2004; Meinhold 2008, 288–334.

¹⁰² See e.g. Römer and Macchi 1995, 178–187.

Therefore, it is also imperative to exercise caution with regard to the positing of a “Deuteronomistic school.” It is safe to assume that there were schools in ancient Israel, especially at the sanctuaries and the royal palaces, although they are very scarcely attested (the Bible mentions them only in Sirach 51:23 and Acts 19:9).¹⁰³ But is it plausible or necessary to postulate separate schools for different theologies or ideologies in the Bible? Especially in the Persian Period, given the modesty of the cultural capacities in Jerusalem, there is no reason to reckon with more than the single school at the temple.¹⁰⁴

Thirdly, it might be helpful to paying more attention to the inner transformation of “Deuteronomistic” thinking. This does not have to be in the way Steck did it, but some trajectories of his identification of different elements in the “Deuteronomistic” picture of Israel’s history, as exhibited in the above mentioned biblical and ancient Jewish texts, still seem to be promising.

¹⁰³ See Schmid 2004a; idem, 2008, 43–47.

¹⁰⁴ See n. 76.

Bibliography

- Albertz, R. "Wer waren die Deuteronomisten? Das historische Rätsel einer literarischen Hypothese." *Evangelische Theologie* (1997), 319–38.
- Albertz, R., "In Search of the Deuteronomists: A First Solution to a Historical Riddle." Pages 1–17 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by T. Römer. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Albertz, R. *Die Exilszeit: 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Biblische Enzyklopädie 7. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001. Translated as *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* Studies in Biblical Literature 3. Atlanta: SBL, 2003.
- Arneth, M. "Die antiassyrische Reform Josias von Juda: Überlegungen zur Komposition und Intention von 2 Reg 23,4-15." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 7 (2001): 189–216.
- Aurelius, E. *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 319. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.
- Avioz, M. "The Book of Kings in Recent Research (Part I)." *Currents in Biblical Research* 4 (2005): 11–55.
- Avioz, M. "The Book of Kings in Recent Research (Part II)." *Currents in Biblical Research* 5 (2006): 11–57.
- Bachmann, V., *Die Welt im Ausnahmezustand: Eine Untersuchung zu Aussagegehalt und Theologie des Wächterbuches (1Hen 1-36)*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 409, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Baumgarten, J.M. et al., eds. *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998*. Studies on the texts of the Desert of Judah 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Baumgartner, W. "Der Kampf um das Deuteronomium." *Theologische Rundschau* 1 (1929): 7–25.
- Ben Zvi, E. "The Urban Center of Jerusalem and the Development of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 194–209 in *Urbanism in Antiquity: From Mesopotamia to Crete*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 244. Edited by W. E. Aufrecht et al. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Berges, U., *Klagelieder*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Freiburg: Herder, 2002.
- Blanco Wissmann, F. "Er tat das Rechte ..." *Beurteilungskriterien und Deuteronomismus in 1Kön 12–2Kön 25*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 93. Zürich: TVZ, 2008.
- Blum, E., *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 189, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990.
- Borger, R. *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien*. Archiv für Orientforschung. Beiheft 9. Graz: Selbstverl. E. Weidner, 1956.
- Bosshard-Nepustil, E., "Ferne und Langzeitigkeit Jhwhs. Zur theologischen Auseinandersetzung in Jes 63,7-66,4 und Ps 102." Pages 39–55 in *Diasynchron. Beiträge zur Exegese, Theologie und Rezeption der Hebräischen Bibel. Walter Dietrich zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by T. Naumann and R. Hunziker-Rodewald. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2009.
- Braulik, G. "Theorien über das Deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk (DtrG) im Wandel der Forschung." Pages 191–203 in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 5th edition. Edited by E. Zenger. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 2004.
- Braulik, G. "Zur deuteronomistischen Konzeption von Freiheit und Frieden." Pages 219–230 in *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums*. Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände 2. Edited by G. Braulik. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988.
- Campbell, J. G. *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 228. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.
- Carter, C. E. *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period. A Social and Demographic Study*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 294, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Clements, R. E. "The Deuteronomic Law of Centralisation and the Catastrophe of 587 B.C.," Pages 5–25 in *After the Exile* Edited by J. Barton and D. J. Reimer. Macon: Mercer, 1996.
- Coggins, R. "What Does 'Deuteronomistic' Mean?" Pages 22–35 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Edited by L. S. Shearing and S. L. McKenzie. Journal for

- the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 268. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Collins, J. J. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Cross, F. M. "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 274–289 in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of Religion of Israel*. Edited by F.M. Cross. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Dietrich, W. "Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk." Pages 688–692 in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. 4th. ed. Vol. II, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999,.
- Dietrich, W. "Martin Noth und die Zukunft des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes." Pages 181–198 in *Von David zu den Deuteronomisten: Studien zu den Geschichtsüberlieferungen des Alten Testaments*. Edited by W. Dietrich. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament 156. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002.
- Dietrich, W. *Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 108. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Dion, P. E. "Quelques aspects de l'interaction entre religion et politique dans le Deutéronome." *Science et esprit* 30 (1978): 39–55.
- Eynikel, E. *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. Old Testament Studies 33. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Fischer, G., *Jeremia. Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007.
- Frevel, C. "Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk oder Geschichtswerke? Die These Martin Noths zwischen Tetrateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch." Pages 60–95 in *Martin Noth – aus der Sicht der heutigen Forschung*. Biblisch-theologische Studien 58. Edited by U. Rüterwörden. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004.
- Geoghegan, J. C. "'Until this Day' and the Preexilic Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003): 201–27.
- Geoghegan, J. C. "Additional Evidence for a Deuteronomistic Redaction of the Tetrateuch." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 67 (2005): 405–21.
- Geoghegan, J. C. *The Time, Place and Purpose of the Deuteronomistic History: The Evidence of "Until This Day"*. Brown Judaic Studies 347. Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2006.
- Halpern, B., and D.S. Vanderhooft. "The Editions of Kings in the 7th–6th Centuries B.C.E." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 62 (1991): 179–244.
- Hempel, C. *The Damascus Texts: Companion to Qumran Scrolls 1*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Hempel, C. *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 29. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Hölscher, G. "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 40 (1922), 161–255.
- Hutton, J.M., *The Transjordanian Palimpsest: The Overwritten Texts of Personal Exile and Transformation in the Deuteronomistic History*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 396, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Keel, O., *Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus*. 2 vols., Vol. 4:1 of *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel: ein Handbuch und Studien-Reiseführer zum Heiligen Land*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- Knauf, E. A. "'Wie kann ich singen im fremden Land?' Die 'babylonische Gefangenschaft' Israels." *Bibel und Kirche* 55 (2000): 132–39.
- Knoppers, G. N. *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*. 2 vols. Harvard Semitic Monographs 52–53. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993–1994.
- Knoppers, G. N. "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63 (2001): 393–415.
- Knoppers, G. N. "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108 (1996): 329–46.
- Knoppers, G. N. and McConville, J. G. *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Sources for biblical and Theological Study 8. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

- Koch, Christoph. *Vertrag, Treueid und Bund. Studien zur Rezeption des altorientalischen Vertragsrechts im Deuteronomium und zur Ausbildung der Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 383. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Kratz, R. G. *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Uni-Taschenbücher 2157. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000. Translated as *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Kratz, R. G. "Chemosh's Wrath and Yahweh's No: Ideas of Divine Wrath in Moab and Israel." Pages 92–121 in *Divine Wrath and Divine Mercy in the World of Antiquity*. Edited by R. G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/33. Tübingen: Mohr, 2008.
- Kratz, R. G. "Die Suche nach Identität in der nachexilischen Theologiegeschichte: Zur Hermeneutik des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes und ihrer Bedeutung für das Verständnis des Alten Testaments." Pages 279–303 in *Pluralismus und Identität*. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 8. Edited by J. Mehlhausen. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1995.
- Kratz, R. G. "Geschichten und Geschichte in den nordwestsemitischen Inschriften." Pages 284–309 in *Was ist ein Text? Alttestamentliche, ägyptologische und altorientalische Perspektiven*. Edited by L. Morenz and S. Schorch. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 362. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Kratz, R. G. "The Idea of Cultic Centralization and Its Supposed Ancient Near Eastern Analogies." Pages 121–44 in *One God - One Cult - One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*. Edited by R. G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 405. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Lemaire, A. "Vers l'histoire de la rédaction des livres des Rois." *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98 (1986): 221–36.
- Leuenberger, M. "Die 10-Siebt-Apokalypse im Henochbuch: Ihre Stellung im material rekonstruierten Manuskript, 4QEng und Implikationen für die Redaktions- und Kompositionsgeschichte der Traumvisionen (83-91) und des paränetischen Briefs (92-105). Teil 2." *Biblische Notizen* 126 (2005a): 45–82.
- Leuenberger, M. "Ort und Funktion der Wolkenvision und ihrer Deutung in der syrischen Baruchapokalypse: Eine These zu deren thematischer Entfaltung." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 36 (2005b): 206-46.
- Levin, C. "Die Frömmigkeit der Könige von Israel und Juda." Pages 129–168 in *Houses Full of All Good Things*. Edited by M. Nissinen. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Levin, C., "Joschija im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 96 (1984): 351–71. Levinson, B. M. "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah," *Vetus Testamentum* 51 (2001): 511–43.
- Levinson, B. M. *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Lohfink, N. "Culture Shock and Theology: A Discussion of Theology as a Cultural and Sociological Phenomenon Based on the Example of Deuteronomic Law." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 7 (1977): 12–22.
- Lohfink, N. "Deuteronomistisch." Pages 413–12 in vol. 1 of *Neues Bibellexikon*. 3 vols. Zürich: Benziger, 1990.
- Lohfink, N. "Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?" Pages 313–82 in *Jeremia und die "deuteronomistische Bewegung"*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 98. Edited by Walter Groß. Weinheim: Athenäum, 1995. Translated as "Was there a Deuteronomistic movement?" Pages 36–66 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Edited by L. S. Schearing, and S. L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 268. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Lohfink, N. "Kerygmata des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks." Pages 87–100 in *Die Botschaft und die Boten..* Edited by J. Jeremias, and L. Perliitt. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981.
- Lux, R. "Die doppelte Konditionierung des Heils. Theologische Anmerkungen zum chronologischen und literarischen Ort des Sacharjaprologs (Sach 1,1-6)." Pages 569–87 in *Gott und Mensch im Dialog*. Vol. 1. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 345/1. Edited by M. Witte. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.

- McKenzie, S. L. and Graham, M. P., eds. *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 182. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- McKenzie, S. L. "Deuteronomistic History." Pages 160–68 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol 2. New York: Doubleday, 1992
- Meinhold, A. *Maleachi*. Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament XIV/8. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2008.
- Moenikes, A. "Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des sogenannten Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks." *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 104 (1992): 333–48.
- Morrow, W. S. "Cuneiform Literacy and Deuteronomic Composition." *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 62 (2005): 204–13.
- Mowinckel, S. *Die Komposition des Buches Jeremia*, Kristiania: Dybwad, 1914.
- Murphy, F. J. *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 78. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Nelson, R. D. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, London: SCM, 1981.
- Noll, K. L. "Deuteronomistic History or Deuteronomic Debate? (A Thought Experiment)." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (2007): 311–45.
- Noth, M. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1943.
- O'Brien, M. A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 92. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- O'Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 92. Freiburg: Editions Universitaires, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Otto E. and Achenbach, R., eds. *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*. FRLANT 206. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Otto, E. "Zur Geschichte der deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Anmerkungen zu einem neuen Entwurf von Thomas Römer." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* (2006): 354–361.
- Otto, E. "Das Deuteronomium als archimedischer Punkt der Pentateuchkritik: Auf dem Wege zu einer Neubegründung der de Wette'schen Hypothese." Pages 321–39 in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature: Festschrift C. H. W. Brekelmans*. Edited by M. Vervenne and J. Lust. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 133. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Otto, E. "Forschungen zum nachpriesterschriftlichen Pentateuch." *Theologische Rundschau* 62 (2002): 125–55.
- Otto, E. "Mose und das Gesetz: Die Mose-Figur als Gegenentwurf Politischer Theologie zur neuassyrischen Königsideologie im 7. Jh. v. Chr.," Pages 43–83 in *Mose: Ägypten und das Alte Testament*. Edited by E. Otto. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 189. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000.
- Otto, E. "Perspektiven der neueren Deuteronomiumforschung." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 119 (2007): 319–340.
- Otto, E. "Vom Bundesbuch zum Deuteronomium: Die deuteronomische Redaktion in Dtn 12–26." Pages 260–78 in *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel*. Edited by G. Braulik, W. Groß, and S. McEvenue. Freiburg: Herder, 1993.
- Otto, E. "Von der Gerichtsordnung zum Verfassungsentwurf: Deuteronomische Gestaltung und deuteronomistische Interpretation im 'Ämtergesetz' Dtn 16,18–18,22." Pages 142–55 in *"Wer ist wie du, Herr, unter den Göttern?": Studien zur Theologie und Religionsgeschichte Israels*. Edited by I. Kottsieper et al. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
- Otto, E. *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und im Hexateuch*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Otto, E. *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 284. Berlin de Gruyter, 1999.
- Pakkala, J. "The Date of the Oldest Edition of Deuteronomy," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 121 (2009): 388–401.
- Parker, S. B. "Ancient Northwest Semitic Epigraphy and the "Deuteronomistic" Tradition in Kings." Pages 215–27 in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen*

- Propheten*. Edited by M. Witte et al. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 365. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Parpola S., and K. Watanabe, eds. *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*. State Archives of Assyria 2. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1988.
- Person, R. *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 167. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Person, R. F. *The Deuteronomistic School: History, Social Setting, and Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Person, R. F. "The Deuteronomistic History and the Books of Chronicles: Contemporary Competing Historiographies." Pages 315–36 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by R. Rezetko, T. Lim, and W. B. Aucker. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 113. Leiden Brill, 2007.
- Pohlmann, K.-F. "Esra als Identifikationsfigur im Frühjudentum: Beobachtungen und Erwägungen zu Esr 9." in *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments*. Edited by F.-L. Hossfeld, and L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger. Herders biblische Studien 44. Freiburg: Herder, 2004, 486–98.
- Provan, I. W. *Hezekiah and the Book of Kings*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 172. Berlin, and New York: de Gruyter, 1988.
- Rad, G. von. "Die deuteronomistische Geschichtstheologie in den Königsbüchern." Pages 189–204 in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. Theologische Bücherei 8. Edited by G. von Rad. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1958.
- Rigger, H. *Siebzig Siebener: Die "Jahrwochenprophetie" in Dan 9*. Trierer theologische Studien 57. Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1997.
- Rofé, A. "The Strata of the Law About the Centralization of Worship in Deuteronomy and the History of the Deuteronomistic Movement." Pages 97–102 in *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002.
- Römer T., and Jean-Daniel Macchi. "Luke, Disciple of the Deuteronomistic School." Pages 178–87 in *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 116. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Römer, T., ed. *The Future of Deuteronomistic History*, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 147. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Römer, T. "How Did Jeremiah Become a Convert to Deuteronomistic Ideology?" Pages 189–99 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*, eds. L. S. Shearing and S. L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 268. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Römer, T. "Is there a Deuteronomistic redaction in the book of Jeremiah?" Pages 399–421 in *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Edited by A. de Pury, T. Römer, and J.-D. Macchi. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 306. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Römer, T., and Pury, A. de. "L'historiographie deutéronomiste (HD): Histoire de la recherche et enjeux du débat." Pages 9–120 in *Israël construit son histoire: L'historiographie deutéronomiste à la lumière des recherches récentes. Le Monde de la Bible* 34. Edited by A. de Pury, T. Römer, and J.-D. Macchi. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1996.
- Römer, T. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*, London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Römer, T., J.-D. Macchi, and A. de Pury. *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 306. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Römer, T. and Schmid K. (eds.) *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 203. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Rudolph, W. *Jeremia*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament I/12. 3d. ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1968.
- Rüterswörden, U., ed. *Martin Noth - aus der Sicht der heutigen Forschung*. Biblisch-theologische Studien 58. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004.
- Shearing, L. S. and S. L. McKenzie, eds. *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 268. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Schmid, K. "Das Deuteronomium innerhalb der 'deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke' in Gen–2Kön." Pages 193–211 in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und deuteronomistischem*

- Geschichtswerk*. Edited by E. Otto and R. Achenbach. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 206. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004b.
- Schmid, K. "Die Zerstörung Jerusalems und seines Tempels als Heilsparadox: Zur Zusammenführung von Geschichtstheologie und Anthropologie im Vierten Esrabuch." Pages 183–206 in *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels: Geschehen - Wahrnehmung - Bewältigung*. Edited by J. Hahn. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 147, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Schmid, K. "Hatte Wellhausen recht? Das Problem der literarhistorischen Anfänge des Deuteronomismus in den Königebüchern." Pages 23–47 in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke. Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur Deuteronomismuskritik in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Edited by M. Witte, K. Schmid, D. Prechel, and J. C. Gertz. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 365. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Schmid, K. "Schreiber/Schreiberausbildung in Israel." Pages 1001–1002 in vol. 7 of *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. 4th ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004a.
- Schmid, K. *Buchgestalten des Jeremiabuches: Untersuchungen zur Redaktions- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von Jer 30-33 im Kontext des Buches*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 72. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1996.
- Schmid, K. *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008.
- Schmid, K., *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible*. Siphrut 2. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- Schreiner, J. *Das 4. Buch Esra, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit V/4*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1981.
- Smend, R. "Das Gesetz und die Völker." Pages 494–509 in *Probleme biblischer Theologie*. Edited by H. W. Wolff. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1971. Repr. pages 124–37 in *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments: Gesammelte Studien Band 1*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 99. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1986.
- Smend, R. *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*. Theologische Wissenschaft 1. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989.
- Smend, R., *Deutsche Alttestamentler in drei Jahrhunderten*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Spieckermann, H. "Former Prophets: The Deuteronomistic History." Pages 337–52 in *The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible*, trans. and ed. L. G. Perdue. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Spieckermann, H. *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 129. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Steck, O. H. "Theological Streams of Tradition." Pages 183–214 in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*. Edited by D. A. Knight. Philadelphia: Fortress, and London: SPCK, 1977. Translated from "Strömungen theologischer Tradition im Alten Israel." Pages 27–56 in *Zu Tradition und Theologie im Alten Testament*. Biblisch-theologische Studien 2. Edited by O. H. Steck. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978.
- Steck, O. H. "Weltgeschehen und Gottesvolk im Buche Daniel." Pages 262–90 in *Wahrnehmungen Gottes im Alten Testament: Gesammelte Studien*. Theologische Bücherei 70. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1982.
- Steck, O. H. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1967.
- Steck, O. H. *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to Methodology*. Translated by J. D. Nogalski. SBL Resources for Biblical Studies 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Steck, O. H., "Die getöteten 'Zeugen' und die verfolgten 'Tora-Sucher' in Jub 1,12: Ein Beitrag zur Zeugnis-Terminologie des Jubiläenbuches." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 107 (1995): 445–65; 108 (1996): 70–86.
- Steck, O. H., "Zu Eigenart und Herkunft von Ps 102," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 102 (1990): 357–72.
- Steymans, H. U. "Die literarische und theologische Bedeutung der Thronfolgevereidigung Asarhaddons." Pages 331–49 in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 365. Edited by M. Witte, K. Schmid, D. Prechel, and J. C. Gertz. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

- Steymans, H. U. "Eine assyrische Vorlage für Deuteronomium 28,20–44." Pages 119–42 in *Bundesdokument und Gesetz. Studien zum Deuteronomium*. Herders biblische Studien 4. Edited by G. Braulik. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1995b.
- Steymans, H. U. *Deuteronomium 28 und die adê zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons: Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 14. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995a.
- Stipp, H.-J. "Ahabs Buße und die Komposition des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks." *Biblica* 76 (1995): 471–97.
- Stipp, H.-J. "Die sechste und siebte Fürbitte des Tempelweihegebets (1Kön 8,44–51) in der Diskussion um das Deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk." *Journal of North West Semitic Languages* 24 (1998): 193–216.
- Stipp, H.-J. "Das jüdische und das babylonische Jeremiabuch." Pages 239–264 in *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*. Edited by A. Lemaire. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 133. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Sweeney, M. A. *King Josiah of Judah, The Lost Messiah of Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Talstra, E. *Solomon's Prayer: Synchrony and Diachrony in the Composition of I Kings 8,14–61*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 3. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993.
- Thiel, W. *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 52. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981.
- Tiller, P. A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Tov, E. "The Septuagint and the Deuteronomists." Pages 398–417 in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*. Edited by E. Tov. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 121. Tübingen: Mohr, 2008.
- VanderKam, J. C., *An Introduction to Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Vanoni, G. "Beobachtungen zur deuteronomistischen Terminologie in 2Kön 23,25–25,30." Pages 357–62 in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 73. Edited by N. Lohfink. Leuven: Peeters, 1985.
- Veijola, T. "Deuteronomismusforschung zwischen Tradition und Innovation III." *Theologische Rundschau* 68 (2003): 1–44.
- Veijola, T. "Die Deuteronomisten als Vorgänger der Schriftgelehrten: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung des Judentums." Pages 192–240 in *Moses Erben: Studien zum Dekalog, zum Deuteronomismus und zum Schriftgelehrtentum*. Edited by T. Veijola. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament 149. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000.
- Veijola, T. "Martin Noths 'Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien' und die Theologie des Alten Testaments." Pages 11–28 in *Moses Erben. Studien zum Dekalog, zum Deuteronomismus und zum Schriftgelehrtentum*. Edited by T. Veijola. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament 149. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000.
- Veijola, T. *Die ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae B 193. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975.
- Weinfeld, M. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1972. Repr. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Weippert, H. "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher." *Biblica Roma* 53 (1972): 301–39.
- Wellhausen, J. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 3d ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1899.
- Werline, R. A., *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 13. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Wette, W. M. L. de. "Dissertatio critico-exegetica (edited by Hans-Peter Mathys, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Dissertatio critico-exegetica von 1805)." Pages 171–211 in *Biblische Theologie und historisches Denken*. Studien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Basel Neue Folge 5. Edited by M. Kessler, and M. Wallraff. Basel: Schwabe, 2008.
- Witte, M., K. Schmid, D. Prechel, and J.C. Gertz, eds. *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke. Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus“-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 365, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

- Wöhrlé, J. “‘No Future for the Proud Exultant Ones:’ The Exilic Book of the Four Prophets (Hos., Am., Mic., Zeph.) as a Concept Opposed to the Deuteronomistic History,” *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008): 608–27.
- Wolff, H. W. “Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks.” *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1961): 171–86. Repr. in idem. *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. Theologische Bücherei 22. Munich: Kaiser, 1964.