

The 'Deuteronomistic History' as a Story of Israel's Leaders

Mark A. O'Brien, O.P.

The mark of a great hypothesis is its ability to provide explanations, sustain detailed investigation and endure. For a considerable time one could have said that Martin Noth's hypothesis of a Deuteronomistic History (DtrH), proposed in 1943, had filled all these requirements admirably.¹ Nevertheless there have been some important developments in more recent study which, if they are correct, have serious implications for the hypothesis. These developments impinge on it in three key areas. The first is Noth's proposal that DtrH was composed during the exile; the second, that it was a unified and well planned whole, the work of a skilled author; the third, that it was constructed via a judicious combination of source material and redactional commentary.

Noth's proposal that the history was composed during the exile has been challenged by Frank Moore Cross's arguments in favour of a pre-exilic date, during the reign of Josiah.² Whereas Noth saw DtrH principally as a document of judgment and condemnation of Israel, Cross sees it as a call to conversion and the hope of a new era under Josiah. He thinks that Noth did not take sufficient cognizance of the promise to David in 2 Samuel 7 of an enduring dynasty. According to Cross's hypothesis the Josianic historian regarded the survival of the Davidic dynasty and Judah, in contrast to the end of the northern kingdom, as a verification of Nathan's prophecy. The disaster of the exile necessitated a reworking of the history, and it is in this reworking that one can discern an overall negative assessment of Israel's history.³

Cross's understanding of DtrH has had considerable impact on subsequent studies and commentaries in the area. Unfortunately his proposal—

¹Noth's work appeared in English translation as *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 15: Sheffield; JSOT, 1981)

²Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1973) 274-89.

³Cross identifies the exilic revision of DtrH in Deut 4:27-31; 28:36-37, 63-68; 29:27; 30:1-10; Josh 23:11-13, 15-16; 1 Sam 12:25; 1 Kgs 2:4; 6:11-13; 8:25b, 46-53; 9:4-9; 2 Kgs 17:19; 20:17-18; 21:2-15; 23:26-25:30 (*Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 285-87).

made in an essay length study—has not yet been worked out in the sort of detail required to replace Noth's hypothesis of an exilic DtrH.⁴

The second key area of Noth's hypothesis—the unified and well planned nature of the work—is threatened by developments based on a seminal study of the subsequent redaction history of DtrH by Rudolf Smend.⁵ This line of investigation accepts Noth's hypothesis of an exilic DtrH but claims that a considerable amount of material which he included in the history was in fact the work of two subsequent redactors. The first was a prophetic dtr redactor, designated DtrP, who inserted a number of traditional prophetic stories into the history and accompanied them with suitable redactional comments. Another redactor, whose additions are identifiable by their marked interest in the law, then carried out an extensive revision of the now expanded history. This dtr redactor is designated DtrN (nomistic).⁶ Like Cross, the work of Smend and his followers has had considerable impact on commentaries and studies in the area.

For the Smend school then a considerable amount of source material and redactional commentary, which Noth regarded as an integral part of his DtrH, was in fact the work of later redaction. This necessitates a re-

⁴The most detailed subsequent study has come from Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18; Sheffield; JSOT, 1981). However the bulk of this work is devoted to clarifying the extent and distinctive linguistic features of the exilic revision.

⁵Rudolf Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker; Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," *Probleme biblischer Theologie* (ed. H. W. Wolff; Munich: Kaiser, 1971) 494-509. Smend's initial analysis of selected texts in Joshua and Judges has been taken up and developed, principally by Walter Dietrich (*Prophetie und Geschichte* [FRLANT 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972]) and Timo Veijola (*Die ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* [Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, B 193; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975], also *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* [Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, B 198; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977]).

⁶Dietrich, whose study focuses on the books of Kings, assigns the following texts to DtrN: 1 Kgs 2:4; 8:14-26, 28-30a, 53-61; 9:1-9; 11:9-13, 32, 33b, 34b, 35b β , 36, 37aa, 38aba; 14:8b-9a, 15-16; 15:30; 16:13; 2 Kgs 8:19; 9:36b-37; 10:10, 30-31a; 13:4-6, 23; 14:15-16, 26-27; 15:12; 17:12-19; 18:6-7a, 12; 21:4, 7b-9, 15-16, 21; 22:17a β , 19b; 23:26-27; 24:3-4, 20a; 25:22-30. Veijola's two monographs examine dtr redaction in the books of Judges, Samuel, and 1 Kings 1-2.

examination of the underlying text to determine whether it can be described as a well planned and unified whole, something which has so far not been done. Without this check the Smend school's understanding of the subsequent redaction history of DtrH must be viewed with caution. For it is only when the contours of DtrH have been traced with sufficient accuracy that one can hope to gain a clear idea of the nature and extent of subsequent redaction.

The third key area of Noth's hypothesis, the composition of the history via a combination of source and redaction, has come under threat from two directions. On the one hand a number of recent studies have identified much more of the text as pre-dtr than Noth did.⁷ On the other hand there are a number of studies which reject the source-redaction model for the composition of DtrH. They would recognize that DTR drew on traditional material, but claim it has been so thoroughly integrated that one can no longer accurately distinguish between source and redaction.⁸

⁷Wolfgang Richter has proposed that the framework of the judges' stories was not, as Noth thought, from the exilic DTR, but a two stage deuteronomic reworking in the pre-exilic period (*Die Bearbeitung des "Retterbuches" in der deuteronomischen Epoche* [BBB 21; Bonn: Hanstein, 1964]). In his commentary on the books of Samuel P. Kyle McCarter has expanded an earlier hypothesis by Bruce C. Birch of an eighth century prophetic edition in 1 Samuel 7-15. McCarter proposes this prophetic edition extended from 1 Samuel 1 to 2 Samuel 5, included an edition of 2 Samuel 7, and all of 2 Samuel 9-20 (*I-II Samuel* [AB 8-9; Garden City: Doubleday, 1980, 1984]). For the books of Kings Helga Weippert has argued there are three layers of redaction discernible in the judgment formulas for the kings of Israel and Judah, two of them being pre-exilic ("Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher," *Bib* 53 [1972] 301-39). Most recently Antony F. Campbell has proposed the existence of a ninth century Prophetic Record which reached from 1 Sam 1:1 to 2 Kgs 10:28. This document stemmed from northern Israel. Campbell proposes two additional hypotheses. The first is that the Prophetic Record was supplemented by a northern expansion which continued its account of the northern kings from Jehu (2 Kgs 10:29) to the northern exile (2 Kgs 17:23b). The second is that the expanded Prophetic Record was later paralleled by a Southern Document which charted the course of the Davidic dynasty from the schism (1 Kings 12) to the reign of Hezekiah (2 Kings 18-19). Campbell revises Weippert's analysis of the judgment formulas to show that they formed the basis respectively of the northern expansion and the Southern Document (*Of Prophets and Kings. A Late Ninth-Century Document [1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10]* [CBQMS 17; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986]).

⁸Cf. Hans Detlef Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen* (ATANT 66; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980); John Van Seters, *In Search of History:*

Each of these rival explanations has important implications, not only for the way the history was composed but also for the conceptual plan which guided its composition.

In sum Noth's hypothesis is in urgent need of a thorough reassessment. Either there is a history whose nature and extent can be ascertained with reasonable certainty, or the developments outlined have effectively undermined the foundations on which he constructed the hypothesis. In that case our understanding of the growth of the historical books would need to be drastically revised.

The purpose of this article is to outline the results of a reassessment which I have carried out, with particular attention being given to the three areas of concern discussed above, and to where I believe fresh insight has been gained. The reassessment has led me to the conclusion that there was indeed a DtrH and that the text of it can be recovered from the present text of Deuteronomy–2 Kings with sufficient accuracy. On the basis of this one can also trace the course of the subsequent redaction history of DtrH. A detailed presentation, with accompanying exegetical arguments, is provided in a forthcoming monograph.⁹

THE STRUCTURE AND CONCEPTUAL PLAN OF DTRH

In my judgment DtrH was composed during the reign of Josiah, principally as a story of Israel's leaders.¹⁰ Its purpose was to promote allegiance to the deuteronomic reform which had been initiated by Josiah. In order to do this the Deuteronomist (DTR) constructed a story of Israel's

Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical Historiography (New Haven: Yale University, 1983); and Brian Peckham, *The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM 35; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985). Hoffmann and Van Seters accept that DtrH was composed in the wake of the exile. Peckham proposes that an initial history of the pre-exilic period extended from Deuteronomy to Hezekiah. This was later incorporated into a larger work reaching from Genesis to 2 Kings 25.

⁹See Mark A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires, 1989). The monograph contains a discussion and assessment of the recent studies of the redaction history of DtrH by A. D. H. Mayes (*The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* [London: SCM, 1983]) and Iain W. Provan (*Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* [BZAW 172; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988]).

¹⁰The Josianic provenance of DtrH is in agreement with Cross. Where I would differ from Cross is in my description of DtrH principally as a history of Israel's leaders, in the understanding of important aspects of its structure and conceptual plan, and in the nature and extent of subsequent dtr redaction.

leaders from the time of Moses to Josiah, aimed at demonstrating the validity of the deuteronomic code as the divinely sanctioned programme for Israel's life in the land. DTR's support of the royal policy meant that the success of the undertaking depended on how well the story of Israel under the monarchy, in particular the Davidic dynasty to which Josiah belonged, was able to be incorporated into an interpretation of Israel's life in the land based on the deuteronomic code. This was achieved by organizing the history into three periods, each one dominated by a particular form or forms of leadership.

The first period reached from the time of Moses to the death of Joshua, the leader who completed the conquest begun by Moses.¹¹ It may be described as the period of Israel under Moses and Joshua. The second period reached from the appearance of the saviour judges after the death of Joshua to the establishment of Saul as king under the aegis of the prophet Samuel. It is therefore best described as the period of Israel from the judges to the monarchy.¹² The third period encompassed the history of the monarchy from the time of Saul (1 Sam 13:1) to the reign of Josiah, ending with the report of the celebration of Passover in 2 Kgs 23:21-23. What is central to DTR's portrayal of this period is the authority of the prophets to guide and interpret the course of the monarchy. The essential lines of this authoritative function of the prophets are laid down at the end of the second period, in the account of Samuel's designation of Saul in response to the people's demand for a king in 1 Samuel 8. This third period is best described therefore as the period of Israel under the prophets and kings.¹³

While there are these distinct periods in the history, it also exhibits a high degree of unity in terms of its conceptual plan and structure. As well there is an integral relationship between each of the periods in the

¹¹The text of the history for this period is Deut 1:1, 4, 6-8, 19-20, 22-35, 39*, 40-45; 2:1-6, 8, 13b, 14-16, 17, 24aa, 26-28, 29*, 30a, 32-36; 3:1, 3-8, 10, 12, 13a, 18-20, 23-28; 5:1-28:46*; 31:1, 7-8, 9aa, 24-26a; 34:1-6*; Josh 1:1-6, 10-18; 2:1-12:24*; 21:43-45; 22:1-4, 6; 24:29-31; Judg 2:10.

¹²The text for this period of the history is Judg 2:11, 14, 15aab, 16, 18aβb, 19aab; 3:7-10:5*, 6aa, 7-8*, 9b, 17-13:1; 1 Sam 1:1-7:17*; 8:1-6a, 11-17, 19-22; 9:1-10:16; 10:17, 20-27; 11:1-15.

¹³Limitations of space prevent a detailed breakdown of texts for this period. An indication of what constitutes DtrH may however be gained by observing that the following passages are the main ones assigned to later redaction; 1 Kgs 2:3, 4aβ; 6:11-13; 8:29b-53, 54, 57-61; 9:6-9; 11:9-13, 32-33, 39; 14:14-15; 2 Kgs 13:3-6; 17:7-19; 24-41; 18:12, 14-16; 20:12-19; 21:8-16, 21-22; 22:16-17, 18a, 19, 20aβ; 23:15-20 (with 1 Kgs 13:1-32 and 12:30a, 31, 32b-33; 13:33a), 24-25:30.

way continuity is maintained within a larger trajectory of change and development. A more detailed description of each period will serve to illustrate this.

ISRAEL UNDER MOSES AND JOSHUA

The history begins with Moses' address to Israel as it was poised to cross the Jordan and conquer the land. The focus on Israel's leaders is immediately evident in the high profile given to Moses, who exercised his divinely sanctioned authority in three ways. The first involved his authority to interpret the course of Israel's history, demonstrated in the review of past events in Deuteronomy 1-3. The second involved his authority to lay down the programme for Israel's future life in the land, demonstrated in the proclamation of the deuteronomic code with its promises and responsibilities. The third involved his authority to install a leader—Joshua—as his successor (Deut 3:28; 31:7-8). Each aspect of Moses' authority also became an occasion for DTR to set out the interpretative criteria which govern the history. The effect of this was that Moses became the paradigmatic leader for the history. Subsequent leaders exercised one or more aspects of Moses' authority, albeit of course in a way that was appropriate to the particular period of Israel's life in the land.

The review in Deuteronomy 1-3 opens with a reference to the covenant at Horeb. The exodus generation had entered into this (deuteronomic) covenant with Yahweh and had received the promise that they would conquer the land (Deut 1:6-8). They had subsequently rebelled against Yahweh in the wilderness, an act which, according to deuteronomic criteria, merited divine retribution. In Deut 2:14-15 Moses claims that divine retribution had indeed struck the exodus generation; they had all died in the wilderness. What is important to notice here is that the deuteronomic criterion of retribution for sin is validated by the use of the prophetic schema of promise (Yahweh's oath in 1:35) and fulfilment (2:14). It is this that gives authority to Moses' interpretation of events. At the very outset of the history therefore DTR forged an alliance of interpretative criteria which then exercised a normative function for its subsequent stages, in particular the crucial period of Israel under the prophets and kings.

Moses goes on to review the successful conquest of Transjordan by the succeeding generation (Deut 2:17-3:13*). In terms of the criteria employed for the preceding review their successes contrast sharply with the disastrous end of the exodus generation. They are in effect Yahweh's

reward for the fidelity of this emergent conquest generation.¹⁴ Furthermore they demonstrate that the Israelites of the conquest generation are worthy heirs of the promise which their fathers had forfeited. Hence in Deut 5:2-3 the privileges and responsibilities of the Horeb covenant as enshrined in the deuteronomistic code (Deut 5:1-28:46*) are transferred to them.¹⁵

The authority of Moses to lay down the programme for Israel's life in the land is quite evident from an initial reading of the text. What may escape an initial reading however is the way DTR established the deuteronomistic code's status as the norm for Israel and then applied it to the remainder of the history. The status of the code is secured via the sequence leading up to Deut 5:2-3. Moses' interpretation of the exodus and conquest generations is made within the context of the deuteronomistic covenant at Horeb. That is, the failures and successes of the past were integrally bound up with Israel's fidelity or infidelity to the stipulations of the covenant. Hence, as the code had been the norm in the past, so it would be the norm for the future, namely the remainder of the history.

It would have been impossible for DTR to construct a history which monitored Israel and its leaders' fidelity or infidelity to the details of the deuteronomistic law. In order to make the history manageable, yet at the same time a convincing demonstration of the validity of the law, DTR focused on three criteria which constituted its essence. These were; fidelity to the exclusive worship of Yahweh, fidelity to centralized worship at the place chosen by Yahweh, and fidelity to the word of Yahweh's appointed leaders.

A text which expressed these essential elements of the code for DTR is Deut 12:8-12.¹⁶ In vv 9-10 Moses affirms the promise of conquest of the land and rest from Israel's enemies. Verse 11 then goes on to spell out the sort of life Israel is to live in the land once this rest has been attained.

¹⁴The conclusion is drawn here from the context. However at the end of this period, in Josh 24:31, DTR comments explicitly on the fidelity of the conquest generation.

¹⁵The proposal that it included 5:1-28:46* (minus some additions) is a cautious one (see *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 56-64). A detailed examination of the composition of the code was beyond the scope of my study.

¹⁶Deuteronomy 12 has four sets of instructions dealing with centralized worship of Yahweh, 12:4-7, 8-12, 13-19, 20-28. A. D. H. Mayes (*Deuteronomy* [NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981] 222) assigns 12:8-12 to DTR. Horst Dietrich Preuss (*Deuteronomium* [Erträge der Forschung 164; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982] 51) distinguishes an earlier dtr redaction in 12:8-12 with 12:2-7 a later dtr addition.

It is to be faithful to the exclusive worship of Yahweh at the place which he shall choose. The execution of this command of Israel's leader would be a sure sign of the people's fidelity to Yahweh. Such fidelity would in turn be rewarded by the blessings expressed in the promises. As the history unfolds DTR identifies an important stage in the realization of the deuteronomic programme with the completion of the conquest of the land under Joshua (Josh 21:43-45). The programme was regarded as fully realized with the construction and dedication of the temple during the reign of Solomon (1 Kgs 8:56). Enjoyment of it was however short lived, due to Solomon's infidelity to the exclusive centralized worship of Yahweh (cf. 1 Kgs 11:1-7*). Nevertheless DTR believed that the reform of Josiah had given Judah an opportunity to recapture it and once again enjoy its blessings.

Moses' authority to designate a successor is evident in the account of his installation of Joshua (Deut 31:7-8). This not only enhanced his status as the paradigmatic leader for the history but also anticipated the later role of prophets in the third period of the history. They functioned in an analogous way to Moses in their designation and rejection of kings. In relation to Joshua himself DTR saw his task as completing what Moses had begun, namely the conquest of the land (Deut 3:28; 31:7-8; Josh 1:2-3). Moreover Joshua did not proclaim any modification or extension of the deuteronomic programme upon the completion of the conquest, a point which served to underscore the status of the programme proclaimed by Moses as normative for Israel's life in the land.¹⁷ DTR's presentation of Joshua thus gives a strong sense of unity to the conquest theme, and indeed to the whole period of Israel under Moses and Joshua.

DTR's concluding comment on this period is to be found in Josh 24:29-31; Judg 2:10.¹⁸ What is particularly noteworthy in these verses

¹⁷In contrast note how the later addition of Josh 24:1-28 reports that Joshua established a statute and ordinance for the people (v 25).

¹⁸Joshua 23 is a later addition to the history, as is the dtr comment in Judg 2:6-9. The secondary nature of Judg 2:6-9 in relation to Josh 24:29-31 is indicated by the following. When Judg 2:6 is compared with its parallel in Josh 24:28 it can be seen to contain two expansions, "the people of Israel went" and "to take possession of the land". Comparison of Judg 2:7 with Josh 24:31 shows that it adds the adjective "great". As well Judg 2:7 contains the verb "to see" in contrast to Josh 24:31 and Judg 2:10 which have "to know". Finally, Judg 2:7-9 reverses the order of Josh 24:29-31. This is probably due to the dismissal notice in Judg 2:6. It made better sense in this context to have the dismissal notice followed by the dtr comment. In DTR's text however there was no assembly and no dismissal. Hence the text followed a simpler sequence: notice of Joshua's death (Josh 24:29); burial (24:30); DTR's comment (24:31).

is DTR's comment in Josh 24:31 on the fidelity of the conquest generation. When taken in conjunction with Josh 21:43-45 one may say that not only was the successful completion of the conquest the fulfilment of the promise (21:43-45), but it was also the reward for their fidelity (24:31). Hence DTR ends the period with the same alliance of interpretative criteria found earlier in Deuteronomy 1-3.¹⁹

ISRAEL FROM THE JUDGES TO THE MONARCHY

The opening chapters of this period of the history provide a sharp contrast to the period of Israel under Moses and Joshua. The movement towards the realization of the deuteronomic programme was threatened by the continued apostasy of the post-conquest generations (Judg 2:11-19*). Moreover, the cyclic pattern of apostasy, oppression by enemies, deliverance by a judge, and return to apostasy seems to conflict with the more linear structure of the preceding and following periods. The problem of how this pattern could form an integral part of DtrH was first pointed out by Gerhard von Rad.²⁰ However I believe a satisfactory resolution of the problem can now be offered.

The principal clue to solving the problem lies in the recognition of a two stage development in DTR's presentation of the times of the judges. The first stage ends with the story of Abimelech's abortive attempt to become king (Judges 9) and the subsequent restoration of order by a return to the judge form of leadership (Judg 10:1-5). In order to construct this first stage DTR made use of an existing document about the troubled times of the pre-monarchical period. This document was the product of successive deuteronomic redactions in northern Israel and Judah which portrayed the pre-monarchical period in terms of the cyclic pattern outlined

¹⁹On the question of sources for the composition of this period of the history, my analysis is in basic agreement with Noth's position that DTR made use of two sources; the deuteronomic code and a pre-dtr account of the conquest of West Jordan under Joshua (Joshua 2-11*). Strategic redactional comments were added to transform this account into a story of the completion of the conquest begun by Moses. Thus there are links with the Transjordan conquest in Josh 2:10b; 9:9b-10, the mention of the Transjordan tribes in 4:12 (cf. Deut 3:12, 13a, 18-20); a concern to show God was with Joshua as with Moses in 3:7; 4:14, 24; an interest in the ark in 3:2-4, 6, 8. There are dtr exhortations in 8:1a; 10:25, and a reference to centralized worship in 9:27b.

²⁰Gerhard von Rad, "The Deuteronomist's Theology of History (The Books of Kings)", *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962) I. 334-47. See especially pp. 346-47.

above.²¹ The end product of the people's repeated apostasy was the disastrous episode of Abimelech.

Within the larger sweep of the history, this material performed two important functions. It highlighted the fragility of Israel's fidelity to Yahweh when there was no leader. When set against the period of Israel under Moses and Joshua this raised the question of what kind of leadership could secure Israel's fidelity to Yahweh and set it back on the road to realizing the deuteronomic programme. Secondly, the Abimelech episode served to introduce the notion of monarchical rule for Israel. However the failure of Abimelech and the return to the judge form of leadership under Tola (Judg 10:1) implied that monarchy could only be established in Israel by Yahweh, and on his terms.²² In relation to this it is significant that monarchy itself is not condemned in the story, but rather the treacherous way Abimelech set out to become king.

In order to portray the movement of Israel's history towards the establishment of a monarchy on Yahweh's terms DTR then constructed a second stage of the story of the judges. It ended with the emergence of a new leader, the prophet Samuel who was to anoint Saul as king. This second stage is recognizable by the fact that it exhibits the same basic structure as the first stage. It begins with an introduction by DTR (cf. Judg 10:6aa, 7-8*, 9b) which picks up key elements of the principal introduction in Judg 2:11-19). This is followed by a cycle of apostasy and deliverance, centred around the story of Jephthah in 10:17-13:1. It then climaxes with the story of the failure of Eli's sons as leaders (1 Sam 1:1-2:36*), a failure which parallels the earlier one of Abimelech.²³ Samuel emerges as a new leader in the wake of the failure of the Elide priesthood (1 Sam 3:1-7:17), a development which parallels the return to the judges in Judg 10:1-5.

This stage was, like the first one, constructed with the aid of source material. Three sources can be identified. There is first of all the story of Jephthah in Judg 10:17-12:6. To this DTR attached the second portion of

²¹The hypothesis of successive deuteronomic (pre-dtr) redactions follows the work of Richter in *Bearbeitungen*, which built on his earlier *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch* (BBB 18; Bonn: Hanstein, 1963). Noth attributed the cyclic pattern in the judges' stories to DTR.

²²The use of the verb "deliver" to describe the leadership of Tola suggests the hand of Yahweh in the return to the judges. Cf. the other occurrences of the verb in Judg 2:16, 18; 3:9, 31; 6:14, 15; 13:5. In agreement with Noth (*The Deuteronomistic History*, 42) the list of so-called minor judges in 10:1-5 and in 12:7-15 was added by DTR.

²³Judges 13-16 (the story of Samson) and the collection of stories in 17-21 are later additions to the history (following Noth, pp. 52, 121).

the list of minor judges (12:7-15), prompted no doubt by the occurrence of Jephthah in 12:7.²⁴ The second source was a late ninth century Prophetic Record from northern Israel, which began with the birth of Samuel, his emergence as a prophet and his anointing of Saul as king. This Record then traced the course of the monarchy through David and Solomon, but after the schism focused exclusively on the northern dynasties of Jeroboam, Baasha and Ahab (Omri). It ended with the coup by the Yahwist zealot Jehu and his elimination of Baal worship from Israel (2 Kgs 10:28).²⁵ Central to the theology of the Prophetic Record was the prophets' claim to have Yahweh's authority to designate and reject kings. DTR adopted this theological viewpoint, enhanced it by employing a schema of prophecy and fulfilment, and integrated it with the deuteronomic schema of reward and retribution. The third identifiable source was the Ark Narrative (cf. 1 Sam 4:1b-7:2 and 2 Samuel 6), a story which DTR apportioned to two strategic places in the history, each concerned with a prophet. The first is the story of the emergence of Samuel in place of the Elides (cf. 1 Sam 3:1-4:1a), the second is Nathan's prophecy to David (cf. 2 Sam 7:1-17).

While it is clear that this second stage was constructed to parallel the first, there are a number of differences which are important in terms of preparation for the transition to monarchical rule in Israel. The first difference to note is that the failure of the sons of Eli is not resolved, as in the case of Abimelech, by a return to the judges. Rather, Samuel emerges as a new leader—a prophet—designated by Yahweh (1 Sam 3:20). The second difference concerns the fortunes of the ark. The end of the Elides occurs in the context of the loss of the ark in the war with the Philistines. The subsequent return of the ark and its lodging at Kiriath-jearim (1 Sam 5:1-7:2) creates the expectation of a new divine initiative in Israel's history. This sense of expectation is heightened for the reader by the assembly at Mizpah in 1 Sam 7:5-17, where Samuel mediates a reconciliation of Israel with Yahweh, and intervenes successfully for them against the Philistines. However the end of the second stage of this section of the history finds the ark still at Kiriath-jearim and Samuel functioning in continuity with the judge form of leadership (1 Sam 7:6b, 15), rather than as the prophet of 1 Sam 3:20; 4:1a. The precise nature

²⁴It was probably the description of Jephthah judging Israel in 12:7 that prompted DTR to describe all the saviour figures as judges (cf. Noth, p. 43), a move which gave an added sense of unity to the presentation of this section of the history.

²⁵Following Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*. For his presentation of the text of the Prophetic Record see pp. 64-103.

of Yahweh's initiative, and Samuel's role in it, then unfolds in the description of the transition to the monarchy.²⁶

The transition to the monarchy is integrated with the preceding material by DTR's technique of continuity within a larger trajectory of change and development. There are a number of features which parallel the two stage account of the judges. The failure of Samuel's sons as leaders (1 Sam 8:1-3), the resulting crisis among the people (1 Sam 8:4-5, 19-20), and the resolution of the crisis via the emergence of a different form of leadership clearly echo the arrangement of the preceding two stages. Yet it is a measure of DTR's skill that it is via these similarities that the story of the transition to the new era of monarchical leadership is told.

Thus, in 1 Samuel 8 one finds a number of elements that have an important function within DTR's account of the transition. There is the people's assembly and demand for a king "like all the nations" in 8:4-5, followed by Samuel's diatribe against the ways of such a king in vv 11-17. There is the people's stubbornness in vv 19-20, and Yahweh's subsequent instruction to Samuel to "make them a king" in v 22. The people's assembly and their demand provides a striking contrast to 1 Sam 7:5-17, where it was Samuel who called the assembly and was firmly in control as Israel's judge. As the transition to the monarchy unfolds Samuel reasserts his authority over the people, but this time as prophet. In 1 Sam 10:17, 20-27 he calls another assembly where the people recognize his prophetic authority—thus reversing their rejection in 8:19—and accept the king he presents to them.²⁷ In this way the people are drawn under the umbrella of prophetic authority, an important preparatory step to DTR's presentation of the period of Israel under the prophets and kings.

The divine instruction to Samuel in 1 Sam 8:22 for its part serves two functions. On the one hand it shows Yahweh's response to a situation of crisis in Israel. This is in keeping with the two preceding stages of the story of the judges. On the other hand it inaugurates Samuel's prophetic ministry as well as showing that the establishment of the monarchy in

²⁶The text of DtrH for the transition to the monarchy is 1 Sam 8:1-6a, 11-17, 19-22; 9:1-10:16, 17, 20-27; 11:1-15.

²⁷In DtrH 1 Sam 10:17, 20-27 follows immediately after the story of Samuel's anointing of Saul in 9:1-10:16. Effectively then there is a movement from a prophetic anointing in private (cf. 9:27) to a public manifestation, and acceptance, of the one anointed. 1 Sam 10:18-19 is a later addition, similar to the additions to 1 Samuel 8 in vv 6b-10. That is, the verses qualify a positive attitude to kingship in a passage of DtrH by prefacing it with a divine speech which censures the people for requesting a king.

Israel was the work of Yahweh, not the people, nor for that matter Samuel. Furthermore the story of Samuel's designation of Saul in 1 Sam 9:1-10:16 demonstrates that it was established on Yahweh's terms. As the anointed of Yahweh Saul is anything but a king like all the nations.

A further example of DTR's concern to maintain continuity within a larger trajectory of development occurs in the crisis provoked by the "worthless fellows" in 1 Sam 10:27. They claim that Saul cannot "deliver" Israel—a clear allusion to the role of the saviour judges. However Saul's victory over Nahash in 1 Sam 11:1-11 shows decisively that he possesses the charism of saviour. Moreover his pardon of the troublemakers in 1 Sam 11:12-13 shows that he has the charism of judge. Nevertheless, a development has taken place in relation to the times of the judges. Saul's charisms have been received via his prophetic anointing. Hence he is a new kind of saviour who acts in alliance with the prophet, as 1 Sam 11:7 indicates. Also the setting of 11:12-15 shows that Saul's pardon of the "worthless fellows" in v 13 is an exercise of a new, royal prerogative to dispense justice.²⁸

The transition to the monarchy is sealed in the assembly at Gilgal (1 Sam 11:14-15), summoned by Samuel. There "all the people" unite to make Saul king. A new form of leadership for Israel, that of the prophet and king, is thereby successfully inaugurated. For DTR it was this leadership which enabled Israel to regain the momentum lost at the end of the period of Moses and Joshua, and eventually to complete the realization of the deuteronomic programme (cf. Deut 12:10-11 and 1 Kgs 8:56).

THE PERIOD OF ISRAEL UNDER THE PROPHETS AND KINGS

This, the most extensive section of the history, was constructed by DTR with the aid of three major sources. There was first of all the continuation of the Prophetic Record, which traced the story of the monarchy through David and Solomon to the schism and thereafter followed the course of the northern kings up to the successful coup by Jehu.²⁹ The second source was a northern expansion of the Prophetic

²⁸David also demonstrates the charisms of deliverer (2 Sam 5:17-25) and judge (8:15). However the difference between judges and kings is marked in his case by the use of the noun pair justice and righteousness. These do not occur in the stories of the judges. Solomon's right judgment was a component of his gift of wisdom (cf. 1 Kgs 3:5-14).

²⁹Campbell inclines against including 2 Samuel 9-20 in the Prophetic Record (*Of Prophets and Kings*, 82-84). However I see no compelling reason to exclude it from DtrH, despite the Bathsheba episode in 2 Samuel 11-12. David's sin was not apostasy and did not sever his relationship with Yahweh. Moreover David remained faithful to the prophet/king

Record which completed the story of the northern monarchy by providing a succinct account of the reign of each king from Jehu to Hoshea, and an assessment of each one via a judgment formula.³⁰ This expansion was probably carried out shortly after the northern exile. The third source employed by DTR was a Southern Document which supplied a parallel account of the reigns of the Davidic kings from the schism at the time of Rehoboam to the successful resolution of the Assyrian crisis at the time of Hezekiah. Like the northern expansion this document provided an assessment of each king via a judgment formula.³¹

Each of these sources was adapted to advance DTR's own theological enterprise. The Prophetic Record's intention of demonstrating the prophetic guidance of the monarchy was developed by DTR into a prophecy-fulfilment schema which embraced the whole period of Israel under the prophets and kings. Furthermore, this prophecy-fulfilment schema was linked with the opening address of Moses by showing how the completion of the deuteronomic programme under Solomon was the fulfilment of "all the good promise, which he uttered by Moses his servant" (1 Kgs 8:56).

DTR also reworked prophetic speeches where appropriate in order to cast the prophets as Mosaic like figures who interpreted the course of Israel's history during the monarchy according to the three deuteronomic criteria. As outlined above these are; fidelity to the exclusive worship of Yahweh, fidelity to centralized worship at the temple, and—within the period of Israel under the prophets and kings—fidelity to the word of Yahweh's prophets. DTR's alliance of the prophecy-fulfilment schema and the deuteronomic schema of reward and retribution is evident in the way kings who are judged positively according to these criteria are rewarded, whereas kings who are judged negatively are punished, with the prophecy-fulfilment schema supplying the requisite authority in each case.

relationship, shown by his acceptance of Nathan's judgment in 12:13a, and Nathan's announcement of forgiveness in v 13.

³⁰Cf. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 139-57. The hypothesis of the northern expansion is based principally on an analysis of the judgment formulas for these kings. Noth attributed these formulas to DTR.

³¹*Ibid.*, 169-85. This hypothesis is based, like the northern expansion, on an analysis of the judgment formulas. Campbell stresses that the evidence is not as compelling as for the northern expansion. Nevertheless a distinctive feature of the formulas for the Davidic kings is the repeated complaint against the people's worship on the high places, and the failure of the kings to stop this practice (cf. for example 1 Kgs 22:44 [RSV 22:43b]). This, in conjunction with other features examined by Campbell, points to an author with a particular concern. As for the northern expansion, Noth attributed these formulas to DTR.

The model king according to all three criteria was of course David. The stories of David portrayed him as a loyal Yahwist throughout his career. DTR was thus able to utilize these stories, in conjunction with a number of his own comments (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:25; 9:4), to demonstrate David's fidelity according to the first criterion. In relation to the criterion of centralized worship David requested permission in 2 Sam 7:2 to build a house for Yahweh. This request was refused, because the necessary condition of complete rest from enemies had not yet been fulfilled.³² Nevertheless David is commended in 1 Kgs 8:18 for his commitment to the policy of centralized worship.

David's fidelity to the third criterion, the prophet/king relationship, can be seen in the way DTR constructed the section of the history centred around the programmatic prophecy of Nathan in 2 Samuel 7. There are four parts to DTR's construction. The first is the critical event of the entry of the ark into Jerusalem in 2 Samuel 6. The second part is David's response to this event, namely his consultation of the prophet Nathan and his request to build a temple for the ark (2 Sam 7:1-3). The third part comprises Nathan's promise to David of an enduring dynasty, with the assurance that his son would build the temple (cf. 7:14-17). The fourth part is made up of the events related in 2 Samuel 8-1 Kings 8. Within the context these events testify to the realization of the prophecy. 1 Kgs 8:20 states explicitly that Solomon's succession and construction of the temple is the fulfilment of Nathan's prophecy. Within this four-part construction it is David's readiness to consult Yahweh's prophet at a critical point in his reign and to heed the prophet's word which demonstrates his fidelity to the prophet/king relationship. On the basis of this DTR could then portray Nathan's promises and their realization as the reward for David's fidelity.

DTR's presentation of David was also made with a view to integrating subsequent developments in Israel's history into an overall conceptual plan. A critical development of course was the schism in the kingdom. Solomon was censured for his infidelity to Yahweh in the latter part of his reign (1 Kgs 11:1-7). Nevertheless he did not suffer the sort of misfortune that could be identified with divine retribution, and died in peace with his kingdom intact (11:43). It was only after his death that the country split into the rival kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

In order to account for these developments within the framework of his interpretative schema DTR reworked the prophecy of Ahijah of Shiloh in

³²In 1 Kgs 5:18-19 (RSV 5:4-5) Solomon announces that this condition has finally been fulfilled, and so the building of the temple can commence. For a discussion of this text and of the statements about rest in 2 Sam 7:1, 11, see *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 134, 149.

the Prophetic Record.³³ The schism was identified as divine retribution for Solomon's sin, but the fact that it did not take place during his reign was explained in terms of the reward promised to David for his fidelity (1 Kgs 11:31, 34). Likewise the continuation of the Davidic dynasty, now over Judah alone, meant that the reward of an enduring dynasty promised to David was still in place (v 38). The particular distribution of reward and retribution was justified on the authority of the prophetic word.

DTR also incorporated into Ahijah's prophecy two statements which set the agenda for the interpretation of the subsequent history of the two kingdoms. Ahijah announced that the Davidic dynasty would continue to rule over Judah so that it could be the guardian of the exclusive centralized worship of Yahweh. This is evident in 1 Kgs 11:36 which states "to his son I will give one tribe, that David my servant may always have a lamp before me in Jerusalem, the city where I have chosen to put my name".³⁴ As DTR saw it, the troubled times experienced by the kingdom of Judah down to the reign of Hezekiah were due to the kings' failure to eradicate the people's use of the high places and to secure once and for all the practice of centralized worship.³⁵ It was only with the advent of Hezekiah that a reform was carried out against the high places (2 Kgs 18:4).

The first king of northern Israel—Jeroboam—was offered the same opportunity as David to gain an enduring dynasty as a reward for fidelity to Yahweh (1 Kgs 11:38). But, as the subsequent story of Jeroboam shows, he did not obey the prophetic word, was unfaithful to the exclusive centralized worship of Yahweh (1 Kgs 12:25-33*), and therefore failed to gain his reward.³⁶ His cultic innovations at Bethel and Dan were

³³Campbell identifies the Prophetic Record version of the prophecy as 1 Kgs 11:30-31, 37, 38b (*Of Prophets and Kings*, 28-32). In my judgment DTR's redaction is to be found in vv 34-36, 38a, with vv 32-33, 39 as later *dtr* additions.

³⁴Paul Hanson proposed that the Hebrew word rendered in the RSV as "lamp" should be "dominion". This was based on his analysis that the root of *nīr* is *nyr* (yoke) rather than *nwr* ("The Song of Heshbon and David's *Nir*," *HTR* 61 [1968] 304-16). Hanson's position has recently been confirmed by Manfred Görg, "Ein 'Machtzeichen' Davids 1 Könige XI:36," *VT* 35 (1985) 363-67.

³⁵Although it is not so explicitly stated, the Southern Document, with its repeated complaints about the people's worship on the high places, shared DTR's concern for centralization of worship. Hence the Document's formulas could be included in *DtrH* with little change.

³⁶The requirement that Jeroboam and northern Israel adhere to the policy of centralized worship in the temple, unreal as it may appear, seems to be the thrust of 1 Kgs 11:38 and the polemical description of Jeroboam's cultic initiatives in 12:28-32. It gives some indication of the hostile attitude of DTR to this king.

condemned by Ahijah and the promise of an enduring dynasty revoked (1 Kgs 14:7-13). The fulfilment of Ahijah's prophecy in the end of Jeroboam's dynasty is recorded in 1 Kgs 15:29. According to DTR the subsequent dynasties of Baasha and Ahab (Omri) also failed because they walked in the way of Jeroboam. A fulfilment notice marks the end of each dynasty (cf. 1 Kgs 16:12 [Baasha]; 2 Kgs 10:10, 17 [Ahab]). The condemnation and rejection of these dynasties provided an appropriate contrast to the enduring Davidic dynasty in Judah.

The explanation of the demise of the northern dynasties of Jeroboam, Baasha, and Ahab was then extended by DTR to cover the remaining northern kings from Jehu to Hoshea. As pointed out earlier the basic account of this period of the northern kingdom was supplied by the northern expansion. By linking the judgment formulas of the northern expansion to the preceding formulas for the northern dynasties, DTR showed that the infidelity of Jeroboam which had spelt doom for these dynasties, had in fact pervaded the whole line of northern kings.³⁷ What the prophets had spoken concerning these dynasties could therefore be extended to include the end of the northern kingdom itself. Hence the report of the northern exile in 2 Kgs 17:23 was identified by DTR as the fulfilment of what had been spoken "by all his servants the prophets".

The contrast between the two kingdoms reaches its climax in the reign of Hezekiah, who was completely faithful to Yahweh according to DTR's three criteria. 2 Kgs 18:3 testifies that "he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, according to *all* that David his father had done". The only other king to be so described is Josiah in 2 Kgs 22:2. Hezekiah's removal of the high places (2 Kgs 18:4) demonstrated his commitment to centralized worship. His fidelity to the prophet/king relationship was demonstrated by arranging the account of the successful resolution of the Assyrian crisis to reflect the same four-part construction used for David. For Hezekiah the critical event was the Assyrian invasion (2 Kgs 18:9-11, 13, 17-37). In response to this Hezekiah turned to the prophet Isaiah (19:1-4), as David earlier had turned to Nathan. Isaiah prophesied the withdrawal of the Assyrians and the eventual demise of Sennacherib (19:5-7). The realization of Isaiah's prophecy is then reported in 19:8-9a, 36-37.³⁸ The point of the four-part construction here was not only to

³⁷At the level of the Prophetic Record and northern expansion, the sin of Jeroboam seems to have been the indiscriminate appointment of priests, as described in 1 Kgs 13:33b-34 (cf. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 164-66). At the level of DtrH however the sin of Jeroboam becomes one of infidelity to the exclusive centralized worship of Yahweh.

³⁸The analysis here accepts the hypothesis of two Isaian legends, one in 2 Kgs 18:17-19:9a, 36-37, and the other in 19:9b-35 (see for example Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* [SBT 3; London: SCM,

demonstrate Hezekiah's fidelity to the prophet/king relationship, but also to show that his fidelity was rewarded by the withdrawal of the very invader who had brought the northern kingdom to an end. One may even suggest that within the larger context of DtrH, the successful resolution of the Assyrian crisis was further evidence of the reward promised to David.

DTR's presentation of the period of Israel under the prophets and kings to this point had shown clearly the necessity of the kings' fidelity to Yahweh according to the three criteria, and their task of preserving this fidelity among the people. Hezekiah had demonstrated the sort of fidelity required, had sought to establish it in his kingdom, and had been rewarded with a successful reign. However his reforming policies were overturned by his successor Manasseh, who rebuilt the high places and turned to the worship of alien gods (2 Kgs 21:1-2a, 3ab α , 5, 7).³⁹ Moreover, within the larger context of DtrH the sequence of kings from Ahaz to Hezekiah to Manasseh (and his son Amon) warned that the Davidic dynasty was in danger of sliding into a cycle somewhat like that of the judges' period. That is, a period of infidelity with Ahaz was followed by a reform with Hezekiah, only to see a return to infidelity with Manasseh and Amon. For DTR it was the providential discovery of the book of the law, coupled with Josiah's fidelity to Yahweh—demonstrated by his complete commitment to the book—which gave Judah the chance to break out of such a cycle.

DTR integrated this last section into the conceptual plan and structure of the history by employing the technique identified earlier of continuity within a larger trajectory of change and development. There is continuity in the way an unfaithful king (Ahaz and Manasseh respectively) precedes the reign of a reforming king (Hezekiah and Josiah respectively). There is continuity in the judgment formulas for Hezekiah and Josiah (cf. 2 Kgs 18:3; 22:2). There is also continuity in the way DTR utilized the four-part pattern to demonstrate that Josiah, like his predecessors David and Hezekiah, was faithful to the prophet/king relationship. For Josiah the critical event is the discovery of the book of the law (2 Kgs 22:3-10). In response to this he sends a delegation to consult Huldah the prophetess (22:11-13a). Huldah gives a favourable prophecy in 22:15-20, in the

1967]). Campbell identifies a version of 2 Kgs 19:9b-35 as the conclusion to the Southern Document, namely vv 9b-15*, 20, 32, 34-35. DTR used the other legend to construct the pattern, and to encase the one in the Southern Document within it.

³⁹2 Kgs 21:2b, 3b β , 4, 6, 8-16 are later additions to the account of Manasseh.

light of which Josiah initiates his reform (23:1-23*).⁴⁰ DTR was too close to the events of Josiah's reign to identify them explicitly as the fulfilment of Huldah's prophecy. Nevertheless the use of the four-part pattern implies that DTR saw the successful implementation of the reform as a sure sign of its veracity.⁴¹

At the same time as maintaining this continuity however DTR was concerned to show that the reign of Josiah marked a transition to a new era for Judah. This is evident in the emphasis given to the discovery of the book of the law. As described it was a providential event, happening in a completely unexpected way during repairs to the temple. It is also evident in the king's reaction to the discovery and the events set in train by the prophecy of Huldah. These were, the commitment to the book in the covenant ceremony in the temple (2 Kgs 23:1-3), the cultic reform in Judah (23:4-12*), and the subsequent celebration of Passover (23:21-23).⁴²

What is also striking in this final section of the history is the way both king and people are wholeheartedly committed to the exclusive centralized worship of Yahweh (cf. 23:3b and 23:21-23). The two previous occasions in the history of the monarchy where a similar sort of unity is described are significantly enough the coronation of Saul (1 Sam 11:15) and the dedication of the temple (1 Kgs 8:14, 55). As well as this the discovery of the book and its proclamation in the temple as the book of the covenant recalls the occasion of Moses' original proclamation. Hence not only was the reign of Josiah portrayed by DTR as something new and significant for the monarchy, it was also portrayed as analogous to the time of Moses and the conquest generation. The reign of Josiah was indeed therefore the beginning of a new era for Judah.

THE SUBSEQUENT REDACTION OF DTRH

DTR's whole theological enterprise, as well as the status of the book of Deuteronomy, was jeopardized by the violent death of Josiah and the subsequent disaster of the exile. The work of subsequent dtr redaction was

⁴⁰The original prophecy of Huldah was rewritten in an attempt to address the disaster of Josiah's untimely death and the subsequent exile. For a full discussion see *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 244-49.

⁴¹My analysis has found little evidence of source material in 2 Kings 22-23 (against the recent study by Hubert Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* [FRLANT 129; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982]). This would be in keeping with an author who was a contemporary of Josiah and was therefore able to compose an account without needing to rely on sources.

⁴²The account of the reform in the north (2 Kgs 23:15-20) is a later addition, along with the story of the man of God in 1 Kgs 13:1-32 (plus 12:30a, 31, 32b-33; 13:33a).

principally concerned with retrieving the history for posterity by updating and adapting aspects of DTR's theology in a way that would satisfactorily account for these events. Three main stages may be discerned in this rescue operation.⁴³

The first move to incorporate the exile into DtrH was made by a redactor of the early exilic period, who gave an account of the last four kings of Judah and the events surrounding the exile. It most likely ended at 2 Kgs 25:21. This redactor used the judgment formulas from DtrH to give a brief assessment of each king's reign. The limited nature of this redaction is evident in the terseness of the judgment formulas, and the stereotyped nature of their condemnation of each king.⁴⁴

A second stage of dtr redaction confronted the problem of the exile more directly, as well as the untimely death of Josiah, by adopting aspects of DTR's critique of the northern kings and applying it to members of the Davidic dynasty. Manasseh was seen by this redaction as the Davidic king most like the evil Jeroboam of northern Israel in that he too had made the people sin (2 Kgs 21:11, cf. 1 Kgs 14:16). The redaction was then able to identify the exile as the retribution for Manasseh's infidelity. In line with DTR's procedure, a prophecy-fulfilment schema was constructed to provide the requisite authority for this interpretation (cf. 2 Kgs 21:10-14; 24:2). For his part the good king Josiah was absolved of any blame for the Judean exile by a reworking of Huldah's prophecy (cf. 2 Kgs 22:19, 20aβ).⁴⁵

The realization that it was unlikely the monarchy would be restored to Judah (cf. 2 Kgs 25:27-30) resulted in a third stage of redaction transferring attention from the kings to the people. This prompted an extensive review of the history, the end product of which may justifiably be called a second edition of DtrH.⁴⁶

The status of the deuteronomic law as the authoritative programme for Israel's life in the land was preserved by showing that critical turning points in Israel's history such as the troubled times after the death of

⁴³Subsequent redaction of the updated and adapted history—after the third stage—may be discerned in such additions as Deuteronomy 32-33; 34:7-9; Joshua 13-21; 24:1-28, 32-33; Judges 1; 13-21; 2 Samuel 21-24.

⁴⁴Cf. 2 Kgs 23:32, 27; 24:9, 19. The identification of these formulas as a distinct group was made by Weippert, "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen," 333-34.

⁴⁵A full list of texts attributed to this redaction is given in *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 279-80.

⁴⁶I would identify this second edition with the DtrH of which Noth wrote. Cross regards the exilic revision of his Josianic DtrH as a second edition (*Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 287-89).

Joshua, the exile of northern Israel, and the exile of Judah, were due to the people's disobedience to the deuteronomic law.⁴⁷ Even the advent of the monarchy was seen by this redaction as Yahweh's merciful concession to a disobedient people (1 Samuel 12). If Israel continued on its rebellious path then the people and its king would be swept away (vv 14-15, 25).

This redaction also reworked DTR's use of prophecy by portraying the prophets as preachers of the law rather than as figures who intervened to interpret the course of Israel's history through their authoritative announcements (cf. 2 Kgs 17:13). As well as this the text of DtrH was expanded by the use of nomistic language at appropriate points to make the links with the deuteronomic law more explicit.⁴⁸ The product of this third stage of redaction would be described more accurately as a history of Israel's disobedience to the law than a history of Israel's leaders.

⁴⁷The respective texts here are Joshua 23 (a warning to Israel, which is borne out in the subsequent history of Israel under the judges); 2 Kgs 17:7-19; 21:8-9, 15; 22:16-17, 18a; 24:20a. It is quite probable that the work of this redaction is also present in such texts as Deut 4:1-40 and Deuteronomy 29-30.

⁴⁸For example Josh 1:7-9; 1 Kgs 6:12; 8:57-58, 61; 14:15; 2 Kgs 18:12. A full list of texts attributed to this stage of redaction is given in *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 282-83.