WHAT DOES 'DEUTERONOMISTIC' MEAN?*

Richard Coggins

Half a century ago 'Deuteronomy' and 'Deuteronomic' were words applied in biblical studies either specifically to the book of Deuteronomy, or to the proposed Pentateuchal source D. In practice the difference between the two usages was not great, for in most versions of Pentateuchal criticism D was largely confined to the book of Deuteronomy. Even as recently as 1951 the well-known survey of current developments in Old Testament scholarship, *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, contained just one index reference to the Deuteronomic history work.[1]

Today all is changed. The additional adjective 'Deuteronomistic' has been coined, and its influence is all-pervasive. Graeme Auld refers to Deuteronomism (*sic*) as 'an internationally traded currency'.[2] I myself wrote recently that 'the Deuteronomists have sometimes been praised or blamed for virtually every significant development within ancient Israel's religious practice', and tried to warn against the danger of 'pan-Deuteronomism'.[3] The problem has been steadily increasing. Not just the book of Deuteronomy and the Pentateuchal source D (if a four-document hypothesis relating to the Pentateuch is still accepted), but also

* Except for minor authorial changes, this article is the same one that originally appeared in Jon Davies, Graham Harvey and Wilfred G.E. Watson (eds.), *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer* (JSOTSup, 195; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 135-48.

1. H.H. Rowley (ed.), *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 374.

2. A. Graeme Auld, 'Reading Joshua after Kings', in Davies, Harvey and Watson (eds.), *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed*, pp. 167-81 (170).

3. R.J. Coggins, 'Prophecy—True and False', in H.A. McKay and D.J.A. Clines (eds.), *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Festschrift for R.N. Whybray* (JSOTSup, 162; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 80-94 (85).

the Former Prophets, Joshua–2 Kings, the editing of Jeremiah, the editing of other pre-exilic prophetic collections (?Amos ?Hosea ?parts of Isaiah ?a major part of the Book of the Twelve) can all be attributed to the work of Deuteronomists. In addition Deuteronomistic influence is claimed for or detected in practically every part of the Hebrew Bible, so that one may note with an element of surprise that the books of Job or Ecclesiastes are said to be free from, or perhaps are only rebelling against, Deuteronomistic influence or tendencies. When a word or a concept has taken over so much of our thought it seems only right to pause and explore its appropriate meaning; is it as pervasive as at first appears? Is the orthodoxy of ancient Israelite religion really laid down along Deuteronomistic lines, as has recently been claimed?[4] What in practice do we mean when we use the term Deuteronomistic? In what follows a number of references will be made to recent authors and contemporary usage; it should be understood that these are intended only as illustrative, rather than as offering negative judgments upon the books and articles referred to.

I

Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic. One bone of contention can probably be removed quite quickly. There has been dispute as to whether we need two adjectives at all, and some scholars have suggested that 'Deuteronomistic' is an unnecessary coinage. But the sheer prevalence of the usage would suggest that two words are necessary, one to describe that which pertains specifically to the book of Deuteronomy, the other more general, to denote the influence or thought-forms associated with the work of the Deuteronomists and expressed more widely and diffusely in the literature. The usage followed in this essay will largely be dependent on that of the particular authors being referred to; no element of consistency can as yet be detected.

II

An issue that is often discussed, but from which no satisfactory conclusions are reached, is that of dating. Once again the conventional

4. M. Barker, *The Older Testament* (London: SPCK, 1987), pp. 142-60; *idem*, *The Great Angel* (London: SPCK, 1992), pp. 12-18.

wisdom used to be relatively straightforward.[5] Northern origins could be traced in Deuteronomy through its sceptical view of kingship, its understanding of the prophets as 'covenant mediators', its links with Hosea and its use of 'love' terminology rather than the terminology associated with the Jerusalem tradition. It was thought likely, therefore, that following the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 722/721 religious leaders had fled to the South, and had encapsulated their ideas in what would later become the book of Deuteronomy, but had been forced to hide the results because of the persecution under Manasseh. Only in the new atmosphere brought about by Josiah's reform was it safe for them to bring those ideas out into the open. On such an understanding as this, Deuteronomy—or at least its nucleus—was clearly pre-exilic: certainly no later than the seventh century, when the law-book was discovered, and perhaps significantly earlier, if the northern connection were taken seriously.

But then problems arose. The theory of a Deuteronomistic History, as the appropriate description for the books Joshua–2 Kings, first propounded by M. Noth in 1943 (ET 1991) has won all but universal acceptance, and this brings the dating down to the middle of the sixth century, since the last event referred to is Jehoiachin's restoration to at least partial favour at the Babylonian court (2 Kgs 25.27-30). Now we have to assume that the Deuteronomists survived for some 60 years at least after the discovery of the law-book under Josiah. For Noth the concept was still manageable, since he was convinced that one editor was responsible for the whole of the Deuteronomistic History, and he suggested that the final verses of 2 Kgs 25.27-30 were added by the Deuteronomist 'from his own knowledge'.[6] But for the most part this view of unitary authorship is the one aspect of Noth's thesis which has not been accepted. Instead there have arisen various theories of levels of Deuteronomistic redaction which can be traced in the Deuteronomistic History, and that has led to proposed dates even further into the sixth century as the most likely background.

Two main types of proposals have been put forward. On the one hand, and largely in the USA, F.M. Cross and his pupils have suggested

5. E.W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967), pp. 58-82.

6. M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, 18.2; Halle: Niemeyer, 1943), pp. 1-110; *The Deuteronomistic History* (ET; JSOTSup, 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), p. 117.

that the basic form of Joshua–2 Kings is pre-exilic, but that it underwent a further redaction during the period of the exile. Alternatively, and this time mainly in Europe, those who have followed R. Smend have taken the view that the whole work is essentially exilic, and that particular prophetic and 'nomistic' redactions (DtrP and DtrN) took place at a later stage. Thus, to give but one example of many that could be put forward, J. Vermeylen has claimed to detect three redactional levels which he identifies as 'Dtr 575', 'Dtr 560' and 'Dtr 525', the numbers referring to the dates of supposed activity.[7] A very useful sum–mary of the main views of the development of the Deuteronomistic History is provided by Provan.[8]

Difficulties have also arisen in assessing our knowledge of the earlier stages of this movement. In many reconstructions of the history of Israel, Josiah's reform and the discovery of the law-book have been taken as fixed points which could be relied upon where much else was controverted. But is this as firmly based as is sometimes assumed? We need not doubt that Josiah, rejoicing in new-found opportunities of showing his independence of Assyrian control, engaged in a religious reform which cleared his cultic places of what were deemed to be alien practices. But the story of the finding of the law-book, as has often been noted, fits somewhat awkwardly into the overall account. Could it be that this is an editorial construct, aimed in part at least at providing an acceptable contrast in behaviour over against the wicked Jehoiakim, who when he was confronted with a scroll rent the scroll (Jer. 36)? Josiah by contrast rent his garments and showed himself a model of deuteronomistic piety. Parallels also exist between the account of Josiah's reaction to the words of the Torah and the picture offered in Nehemiah 8 of Ezra reading from the Torah to the assembled congregation. How much in all of this is ideology and how much history must remain open to further scrutiny. The survey by Ahlström seems not to be wholly self-consistent, as the existence of a scroll at the time of Josiah appears to be sometimes affirmed, sometimes denied, but his work still offers a valuable introduction to the problems posed by the account in 2 Kings 22–23.[9]

7. J. Vermeylen, *Le Dieu de la promesse et le Dieu de l'alliance* (LD, 126; Paris: Cerf, 1986), pp. 123-27.

8. I.W. Provan, *Hezekiah and the books of Kings* (BZAW, 172; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1988), pp. 2-31.

9. G.W. Ahlström, *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Palestinian*

Whatever conclusion we reach in these matters, the fact remains that the exilic and even postexilic periods are now regarded as the age at which Deuteronomistic influence was at its height. Thus R.F. Person, writing on Zechariah 9–14, is concerned to show that 'the Deuteronomistic school', defined as 'a scribal guild active in the exilic and post-exilic periods' was responsible for the final redaction of those chapters, commonly regarded as among the latest additions to the prophetic corpus. He devotes the first part of his study, entitled 'Deuteronomic Redaction in the Post-Exilic Period', to establishing that traces of Deuteronomic redactional activity can be found in the post-exilic period, and affects books generally regarded as postexilic in origin. His argument is based both on specific textual usage and on themes regarded as characteristically Deuteronomic.[10] This concentration on the 'postexilic' period has been a feature of much Hebrew Bible study in recent years. Thus, for example, P.R. Davies's search for 'Ancient Israel' has led him to conclude that much of the material once regarded as embodying ancient traditions was the product of 'scribal schools' and may be as late as the third century. As he rightly sees, it then becomes almost meaningless to talk of a 'Deuteronomistic history', a usage which he suggests should be abandoned.[11]

We thus find ourselves confronted with dates ranging from the eighth to the third centuries as the suggested period in which Deuteronomistic influence was at its height. (All this, of course, is purely within the range of critical scholarship; if we include within our consideration conservatives who claim to detect signs of traditions going back to Moses himself that will of course extend the range of possible dates still more widely.) Yet of so wide-ranging and influential a movement there is no external evidence of any kind; the whole history of tradition has to be worked out by inference. Deuteronomistic influence may be traced, but there is still no agreement as to who the Deuteronomists were.

Period to Alexander's Conquest (JSOTSup, 146; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 772-77.

10. R.F. Person, Jr, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School* (JSOTSup, 167; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 40-78.

11. P.R. Davies, *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'* (JSOTSup, 148; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), p. 131.

III

It is scarcely possible, in an essay of this kind, to enter in detail into the discussions as to the identity of the Deuteronomists. As is well known, three views have been particularly influential: that the Deuteronomists were Levites;[12] that they were part of, or heirs to, the prophetic tradition;[13] or that they were to be associated with wisdom schools.[14] It is noteworthy that all these theories were proposed in work from at least 20 years ago; more recently the tendency has been simply to take the Deuteronomists on their own terms, as it were, and to decline to identify them with some other group known to us in ancient Israel. Thus R.E. Clements[15] suggests that the most precise designation possible is to call them 'a "Reforming Party" with members drawn from more than one group'. The view of R.E. Friedman, that the Deuteronomist was an individual, either the Baruch of the book of Jeremiah, or 'a collaboration, with Jeremiah, the poet and prophet, as the inspiration, and Baruch the scribe',[16] has not been taken up to the best of my knowledge, and is rebutted by Clements.[17]

Reference to 'schools' has proved another potent source of confusion. Sometimes the 'Deuteronomistic School' is used in terms which imply something analogous to an institution, as in Weinfeld's reference to 'wisdom schools'. (Here again we have the problem of the complete lack of any direct reference to such 'schools'.) But often 'school' seems to mean little more than what we might term a 'school of thought'—a particular mode of expression, a particular theological stance, which is widely found and then described as 'Deuteronomistic'.

IV

Reference has just been made to the supposedly massive programme of redaction in which the Deuteronomists are alleged to have engaged. In

12. G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy* (SBT, 9; London: SCM Press, 1953), pp. 60-69.

13. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 58-82.

14. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), pp. 260-74.

15. R.E. Clements, *Deuteronomy* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), p. 79.

16. R.E. Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?* (London: Cape, 1988), p. 147.

17. Clements, *Deuteronomy*, p. 77.

what follows no attempt is made to be exhaustive; the quotations are given in an illustrative way, to show something of the range of alleged Deuteronomistic literary influence on the Hebrew Bible as it has come down to us.

One can begin at the beginning, with the Pentateuch. In the older days of the four-document hypothesis the amount of D redaction in the first four books was always regarded as minimal; S.R. Driver, for example, analysed the material in Genesis–Numbers, attributing sections to J, E and P, but without leaving any room for a significant input from D.[18] More recently, however, theories of a much more elaborate Deuteronomistic contribution have been put forward. Thus R. Rendtorff identifies a 'whole series of texts dealing with the events of the exodus from Egypt, Sinai, and the beginning of the occupation of the land which refer back to the patriarchal story, and especially to the promise of the land to the patriarchs'. All of these, in his view, are 'stamped with deuteronomic language'.[19] This understanding has been developed further by Rendtorff's sometime pupil, E. Blum, who claims that beneath the present form of the Pentateuch one can detect a Deuteronomistic level of redaction (K^D in his terminology, standing for D-Komposition). In this the different older traditions were shaped into a history stretching forward from Abraham. In Blum's view this was a product of the early postexilic period.[20]

Working in greater detail on a smaller block of material, W. Johnstone has isolated Deuteronomistic cycles of 'signs' and 'wonders' in Exodus 1–13.[21] This takes further an approach he had already adumbrated in outline in his earlier work, where a D version of Exodus was proposed and its characteristic theological concerns set out.[22] Similarly L. Perlitt, in his investigation of the origins of the notion of covenant,

18. S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 9th edn, 1913).

19. R. Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (JSOTSup, 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990 [German original, BZAW, 147; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1977]), pp. 194-95.

20. E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW, 189; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990), pp. 7-218.

21. W. Johnstone, 'The Deuteronomistic Cycle of "Signs" and "Wonders" in Exodus 1–13', in A.G. Auld (ed.), *Understanding Poets and Prophets: Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson* (JSOTSup, 152; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 166-85.

22. W. Johnstone, *Exodus* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), pp. 105-10.

had already identified a later part of Exodus, chs. 32–34, as essentially a Deuteronomistic composition.[23] The whole theme has indeed been taken further by S. Boorer, who explains in her introduction to the discussion of the theme of the promise of the land in the Pentateuch that she uses the symbol 'Dtr' to 'refer broadly and loosely to any text in Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic style'.[24] She also draws attention to the practice of Rendtorff, who, as we have seen, speaks of Dtr texts in Genesis–Numbers without specifying their relation to Deuteronomy itself. Instead he spoke in more general terms of a 'Deuteronomistic school' or 'Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic circles'.[25]

That the books Joshua–2 Kings owe their existing shape to Deuteronomistic editing, so that it is proper to describe them as forming a Deuteronomistic History, has now become part of the received wisdom of Hebrew Bible scholarship, and detailed support for this understanding need not be offered, though Davies's reservations, already mentioned, should be borne in mind. Similarly, among the prophets the presence of a substantial amount of Deuteronomistic editing in the present form of the book of Jeremiah is now widely accepted, and scarcely needs documentation. With the other prophetic collections this Deuteronomistic influence is less widely recognized, yet, as already noted in the introduction, has come to be quite widely proposed. Thus, for Isaiah, Vermeylen's detailed study of the growth of the whole Isaiah tradition, from the figure of the prophet himself down to the apocalyptic imagery of the later parts of the work, led him to find a significant place for Deuteronomistic editing. Many passages which had traditionally been considered as emanating from the prophet himself were regarded as later. Thus, the analysis of the 'Song of the Vineyard' in Isa. 5.1-7 is held to show features which are best explained as arising from a Deuteronomistic milieu at the time of the exile.[26]

Ezekiel, too, has entered into this discussion. Whereas much older scholarship was sceptical as to any connections between Ezekiel and the broad stream of Deuteronomistic tradition, there have been recent

23. L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT, 36; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), pp. 203-32.

24. S. Boorer, *The Promise of the Land as Oath: A Key to the Formation of the Pentateuch* (BZAW, 205; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1992), p. 3.

25. Boorer, *Promise*, p. 31.

26. J. Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique* (2 vols.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1977–78), I, p. 168.

writers who see closer links. Thus R.R. Wilson maintains that, while 'it is not possible to isolate a specifically Deuteronomic editorial layer', the theology of the book as a whole has 'Deuteronomic features'.[27]

When we turn to the Minor Prophets the issue of Deuteronomistic redaction is very much a matter of current debate. It has long been noted that the books of Hosea, Amos, Micah and Zephaniah all have similar introductory verses, in which the activity of the prophet is associated with the reign of a particular king or kings. Since we know of those kings mainly through the books of Kings, and since the books of Kings are part of the Deuteronomistic History, it is natural to regard these four books as having undergone Deuteronomistic redaction, offering them as an alternative and expanded version of the story being unfolded in the books of Kings, even though the lack of reference to them in 2 Kings remains an unexplained puzzle. This has been worked out in considerable detail by J. Nogalski, as part of his reconstruction of the editorial process underlying the complete 'Book of the Twelve'. While acknowledging the 'tentative' nature of this proposal of a Deuteronomistic corpus consisting of Hosea, Amos, Micah and Zephaniah, he nevertheless concludes that 'the language and perspective of this corpus bears signs of Deuteronomistic theology and the use of both Northern and Southern traditions in creating a historical compendium of prophecy'.[28] This point is taken a stage further by T. Collins, in his redaction-critical study of the prophetic corpus. For him, it is not only that 'the theology of those responsible for producing [the final text of the twelve] was broadly in line with that of the Deuteronomist writers', but also some of its later parts 'were written with an eye to the Deuteronomist theology in general, like Malachi, or to the Deuteronomist view of prophecy in particular'.[29]

This perception of Deuteronomistic influence is not, however, confined to the introductory verses of these collections. In Hosea and Amos in particular, more detailed traces of deuteronomistic influence are often claimed. Thus, for Hosea, N.P. Lemche argues that 'the religious message of the book is not far removed from Deuteronomistic theology',

27. R.R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), p. 284.

28. J. Nogalski, *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW, 217; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1993), p. 278.

29. T. Collins, *The Mantle of Elijah: The Redaction Criticism of the Prophetical Books* (The Biblical Seminar, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), p. 62.

and goes on to 'counter the accusation of "pan-Deuteronomism" by showing how the Deuteronomists themselves tried to monopolize the religious expression of early Judaism'.[30] The conclusion reached by G.A. Yee, in a detailed study of the way in which the book of Hosea reached its final form, is that the final redaction took place in Deuteronomistic circles. She traces two levels of redaction, the first 'very steeped in deuteronomistic ideology', the second also betraying a 'deuteronomistic orientation', but dating from a later period, when the exile had become a reality.[31] The notion of being 'steeped in deuteronomistic ideology' is a point to which we shall need to return.

With Amos the emphasis has been on particular expressions as characteristically Deuteronomistic rather than larger claims for the whole thrust of the theology of the book. Thus, to give but two examples, the condemnation of Judah with its reference to the *torah* of Yahweh and his 'statutes' (*ḥuqqāyw*) (Amos 2.4), and that to 'his servants the prophets' (3.7) are commonly held to be characteristic Deuteronomistic vocabulary.

V

Reference to 'his servants the prophets' invites consideration of yet another area in which the influence of the Deuteronomists in shaping our perceptions has been claimed. R.P. Carroll maintains that our understanding of prophets as those who speak the divine word, who must be listened to and obeyed, is essentially a Deuteronomistic one.[32] At this point it becomes difficult to be certain whether we are meant to think of a particular group of people, identifiable in principle as 'Deuteronomists', who successfully impose this radical shift of perception, or whether the reference is rather in more general terms to the spiritual and intellectual climate of the period of early Judaism, when the search for identity and for the causes of the transformation which

30. N.P. Lemche, 'The God of Hosea', in E. Ulrich *et al.* (eds.), *Priests, Prophets and Scribes: Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp* (JSOTSup, 149; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), pp. 241-57 (255).

31. G.A. Yee, *Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 308-309.

32. R.P. Carroll, 'Coopting the Prophets: Nehemiah and Noadiah', in Ulrich *et al.* (eds.), *Priests, Prophets and Scribes*, pp. 87-99 (90).

had affected the community could broadly be described as 'Deuteronomistic'. This is the same issue as that raised by the terms in which Yee describes the reaction of Hosea: her expression, it will be recalled, was that the process was 'steeped in deuteronomistic ideology', and this more naturally refers to a climate of thought than to a precise literary process of redaction. Similar questions arise with the well-known ascription by Perlitt of the importance of *b^{e}rît* (covenant) to Deuteronomistic influence; at times it is clear that he is engaged in precise analysis of distinctive vocabulary usage;[33] elsewhere a much less specific ideological approach is more characteristic.[34]

This uncertainty is what seems to me to underlie David Clines's judgment, in a private communication, where he expresses doubts whether he believes in Deuteronomists at all. 'Maybe all the "Deuteronomic" language doesn't imply the existence of people called "Deuteronomists", but is just a kind of language', the kind that was thought especially appropriate for writing pompous religious prose. Parts of this are interestingly reminiscent of the argument used by J. Bright in his attempt to challenge the assumption of Deuteronomistic editorial activity in the shaping of the book of Jeremiah. Discussing the prose material in Jeremiah, he wrote that

> the style of these discourses, though indeed closely akin to that of the Deuteronomistic literature, is a style in its own right...it is by no means glibly to be classified as 'Deuteronomistic'. It is, moreover, not a late style, but a characteristic rhetorical prose of the seventh/sixth centuries.[35]

The last point to raise relates to those parts of the Hebrew Bible where there are signs of revolt against the accepted norms of religious belief and practice; most obviously the books of Job and Ecclesiastes. Sometimes these works are seen as rebelling against the norms of the wisdom movement, as exemplified by the book of Proverbs. (And, of course, if the views of Weinfeld and others, that close links should be seen between Deuteronomy and Proverbs, are to be accepted, then what is implied is a rebellion against Deuteronomic 'orthodoxy'.) But it has also not been uncommon to see Job's attitude to the question of suffering, in particular, as a rejection of 'the Deuteronomic doctrine of the

33. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie*, pp. 8-30.
34. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie*, pp. 54-128.
35. J. Bright, *Jeremiah* (AB, 21; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), p. lxxi.

rigid correlation of desert and fortune'.[36] Rowley saw this as an application at the individual level of what the Deuteronomists applied only to the nation, but it may be questioned whether a strictly individual reading of the book of Job is appropriate. Here once again we find belief in a generalized Deuteronomistic ideology shaping the character of Judaism's self-awareness. More generally, however, writers on Job and Ecclesiastes are cautious about defining what precisely is being rejected; instead, they concentrate rather on the viewpoint being expressed by their books, and only speak in more general terms about the Deuteronomistic character of Israel's understanding of its position before God.

VI

Perhaps enough has been said to illustrate the extreme diversity underlying contemporary scholarly usage of 'Deuteronomistic' and related terms. Reference was made at the beginning of the essay to *The Old Testament and Modern Study*. A contrast can be drawn between the views expressed there and those to be found in the successor volume, *Tradition and Interpretation*, in which the editor notes in his introductory essay that 'the range of its [Deuteronomy's] creative influence is seen as so extensive that it is not entirely out of place to speak of a pan-Deuteronomic phase in Old Testament study'.[37] In the same volume W. Zimmerli noted the urgency of the challenge 'to develop criteria more keenly differentiated for the phenomenon of "Deuteronomism", which certainly did not fall suddenly complete from heaven'.[38] J.R. Porter has raised important questions concerning the existence of a 'Deuteronomic school', as a notion which becomes 'more tenuous and vague' as its implications are examined in greater detail, and he goes on to identify as a danger 'the tendency to attribute almost all Israelite literary activity, from the period of Josiah to some time after the exile, to the Deuteronomic school, and thus to ignore the richness and variety of the religious expression in Judah during these years'.[39]

36. H.H. Rowley, *Job* (NCB; London: Thomas Nelson, 1970), p. 22.

37. G.W. Anderson (ed.), *Tradition and Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. xix.

38. W. Zimmerli, 'The History of Israelite Religion', in Anderson (ed.), *Tradition and Interpretation*, pp. 351-84 (380).

39. J.R. Porter, 'The Supposed Deuteronomic Redaction of the Prophets: Some

The questions that Porter raises with regard to the specific question of the redaction of the prophetic collections can, it seems, be extended a good deal further. We need to balance his perfectly legitimate reference to 'richness and variety' with the recognition that there were ideological pressures at work to impose a particular view of Israel's past, of its relation with its God, of the meaning of the various events that had befallen it, culminating in the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of its leading citizens. It is obviously convenient to have some overall name by which to describe and refer to this ideological movement. Whether it is also convenient to describe it as 'Deuteronomistic' must be more open to question, for as we have seen there is then real danger of confusion. In short, it seems as if the use of the terms 'Deuteronomic' and 'Deuteronomistic' may have any one of at least three different implications. First, there is the long-established and traditional usage of that which relates to the book of Deuteronomy itself. Whether the theory of a Deuteronomistic History will continue to attract such widespread support, so that it can in effect be bracketed with this first usage, must be open to question: the points raised by Davies, suggesting a much later date of composition than has been customary, will need to be given fuller consideration than has so far been the case. Secondly, there is the much more disputed issue of Deuteronomistic redaction of other parts of the Hebrew Bible: possibly the remainder of the Pentateuch; more frequently substantial elements of the prophetic literature. Here Deuteronomistic influence is characteristically recognized because of distinctive vocabulary features, but as we have seen there is also a tendency to set down alongside this various ideological features which are regarded as distinctively Deuteronomistic. These should really be regarded as a third usage of the term.

That there is some linkage between these various usages is obvious enough; scholars have not simply applied the term 'Deuteronomistic' to them all in a wilful fashion without some justification. Nevertheless the question must be asked whether confusion is not being increased by applying the same description to what are essentially different phenomena. We need, it seems, to be clearer than we have often been in distinguishing between what can properly be said about a particular book and its immediately related congeners; what can be said by way of describing a literary process through which other pieces of literature reached

Considerations', in R. Albertz *et al.* (eds.), *Schöpfung und Befreiung: Für Claus Westermann zum 80. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1989), pp. 69-78 (71).

their final form; and what can be said about an ideological movement which played a major part in shaping the self-understanding of Judaism. To use the same name for them all is to invite a breakdown in understanding.