CHAPTER FIFTEEN

DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY AND THE HERITAGE OF THE PROPHETS

Rainer Albertz

The ratio of Deuteronomistic literature to the heritage of the prophets appears to be contradictory. On the one hand, the Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy 1–2 Kings 25*) almost ignores the "classical prophets" of doom; on the other hand, the heritage of several of these prophets was maintained and fostered by editors, which have to be characterized by their style and ideas as Deuteronomistic, too. Since no less than three Deuteronomistic editions of prophetical books could be reconstructed and identified during the last decades,[1] the vivid interest of certain Deuteronomistic editors in the literary heritage of the prophets becomes obvious. By comparing the Deuteronomistic History with these Deuteronomistic editions of prophetical books with regard to their individual theological shape, their specific political interest and their social orientation, the present article tries to offer a better answer to the intriguing question of how the phenomenon of "Deuteronomism" should be determined.

1. The Problem of Prophecy in the Deuteronomistic History

Prophets play a prominent role in the books of Joshua to Second Kings in their present form. The word נביא, 'prophet,' is mentioned no less than 100 times, supplemented by the feminine נביאה, 'prophetess,' which occurs twice. The related term איש האלהים, 'man of god,' is mentioned 57 times, and the word חזה, 'seer,' twice. Taking all designations for diviners together (161 occurrences), we arrive at a similar

[1] The Deuteronomistic Book of Jeremiah (JerD), the "Book of the Four" (Hosea, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah), and the "Book of the Two" (Haggai, Zechariah), see below pp. 352–61.

frequency of these designations in all the prophetical books including Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezechiel, and the 12 Minor Prophets, which total 163 instances. Thus, as far as the frequency of terms for diviners is concerned, Former Prophets and Latter Prophets are nearly equal.

If we turn to the historical critical hypothesis of the Deuteronomistic History, which is supposed to underlie the Former Prophets, but which also included according to its discoverer Martin Noth (1967)—at least in its later stages—most of the book of Deuteronomy, the prominence of prophets is reduced to some degree in this reconstructed literary unit. In the last decades, it has become apparent that the majority of the prophetical narratives found in the books of Kings have to be regarded as post-Deuteronomistic insertions.[2] According to Susanne Otto (2001, 41–149), only the Naboth story (1 Kgs 21), the Ahasiah story (1 Kgs 1*), and the story about the Jehu-revolution (2 Kgs 9–10) originally reflected the prophetical activity of Elijah and Elisha in the Deuteronomistic History. Apart from these, only the narratives on early prophets such as Samuel (1 Sam 1–3; 7–15*) or Nathan (2 Sam 12; 1 Kgs 1), and parts of the story about Isaiah's resistance in the Assyrian crisis (2 Kgs 18–20*)[3] probably constituted integral parts of the Deuteronomistic History. Thus, the number of prophetical narratives in the Deuteronomistic History was rather limited.

Nevertheless, even in this reduced shape, there is a considerable influence of prophetical traditions on the Deuteronomistic History. Its authors did not only constantly allow many prophets to appear on the stage of history during the entire monarchic period, stylizing them as fellow or counter actors of the kings, but they also knew no less than ten male and two female of these prophets by name.[4] The his-

---

[2] The famous drought composition around Elijah (1 Kgs 17–18) and the narrative on Elijah at Mount Horeb (19) are post-Deuteronomistic insertions, as Otto (2001, 151–96) has convincingly shown. The same is also true for the collection of war stories, in which different prophets are acting (1 Kgs 20:1–43; 22:1–38; 2 Kgs 3:4–17; 6:24–7:20, see already Schmitt 1972, 32–51, 68–72, and Otto 2001, 202–19); moreover, as the interconnection with 1 Kgs 19 shows, the entire "Elisha Biography" (2 Kgs 2–8*; 13:14–21), although of older origin, was not included in the Deuteronomistic History before the postexilic period, see Otto 2001, 220–46.

[3] According to Hardmeier (1990, 87–138), the narrative originally comprised 2 Kgs 18:9–19:7, 32aβ–34, 8–9a, 36aβ–37. 2 Kgs 20:12–19* constitutes, in his opinion (1990, 454–64) an epilogue to it.

[4] Thus, the prophets Samuel (1 Sam 3:20), Gad (22:5), Nathan (2 Sam 7:2), Shemaiah (1 Kgs 12:22), Ahijah the Shilonite (11:29), Jehu (16:1), Elijah (21:17), Elisha (2 Kgs 9:1), Jona (14:25), and Isaiah (19:2); and the prophetesses Deborah (Judg 4:4) and Huldah (2 Kgs 22:14).

torians were fully familiar with prophetical formulae such as כה אמר יהוה "so speaks YHWH" or ויהי דבר יהוה אל "then the word of YHWH happened to," which they not only transmitted in the prophetical material picked up, but also used in their own phraseology.[5] Likewise, they knew and used all kinds of prophetic oracles, announcements of judgment, conditional (for example, 1 Sam 12:14–15) and unconditional (for example, 2 Kgs 21:12–15), announcements of salvation, conditional (for example, 1 Kgs 11:37–38) and unconditional (for example, 2 Kgs 19:32–34). Moreover, as many scholars have already pointed out, the Deuteronomistic historians shared the prophetic concept that YHWH governed the course of history by his word, mostly revealed to the prophets. Therefore, they did not only let all important events of Israel's history be announced by prophets, but also explicitly demonstrated that through certain historical events, those announcements of the prophets were fulfilled.[6] What Walter Dietrich (1972, 107–8) has written with regard to his prophetical Deuteronomist (DtrP), is true for the entire history:

> [Die] Geschichte ist für ihn nichts anderes gewesen als das Wirkungsfeld zukunftsmächtigen Prophetenwortes. Kein Ereignis … tritt aufgrund irgendwelcher außenpolitischer, soziologischer, personal bedingter oder ähnlicher Konstellationen dieser Art ein, sondern weil Jahwe es durch einen Propheten hat ankündigen und festmachen lassen. Israel wird vom Prophetenwort zu den Meilensteinen seiner Geschichte getrieben.

Similar ideas can also easily be detected in different prophetical books;[7] thus the Deuteronomistic historians share a basic prophetic concept.

However, although the Deuteronomistic historians are obviously familiar with prophetic traditions, rhetoric and thought, so familiar that scholars such as Hans Walter Wolff (1964, 323) felt entitled to characterize them as pupils of Jeremiah, they seem to have a fundamental problem with parts of the prophetic heritage. In line with the classical prophets of doom such as Jeremiah, Ezechiel, Amos, or Micah, the historians attributed the destruction of the Northern and the Southern Kingdoms to prophetical oracles, the former already to

---

[5] Cf. for the former, 1 Kgs 12:24; 2 Kgs 21:12; 22:15–18, and for the latter, 1 Sam 15:10; 1 Kgs 6:11; 16:1.

[6] Cf. 1 Kgs 14:10–14 → 15:27–29; 16:7 → 16:12; 21:21–22, 24–25 → 2 Kgs 9:7*, 8–9; 10:10, 17*; 1 Kgs 21:23 → 2 Kgs 9:10a, 36–37 etc.; most of the passages were already listed by von Rad 1961, 193–95.

[7] Cf., e.g., Am 3:1–7; Isa 9; Mic 1:3–9; Jer 36–39 etc.

an oracle of Ahijah the Shilonite to King Jeroboam I (1 Kgs 14:15–16), the latter to an oracle of anonymous prophets under King Manasseh (21:10–15, [16]). Both oracles are more or less explicitly said to have come true (2 Kgs 17:21–23 and 23:26–27; 24:2b–4, 20a). At any rate, in contrast to this general correspondence, the Deuteronomistic historians did not mention those prophets of doom in their work. Among the classical prophets, they mentioned only the prophet Isaiah (2 Kgs 18–20*) by referring to a tradition where he was mostly described as a prophet of salvation during the Assyrian siege of Jerusalem; his oracle that the city would be saved (19:1–7, 32aβ–34) was proven true (vv. 36aβ–37). Only at the end of the story, when Isaiah noticed that King Hezekiah had shown all his treasury to the Babylonian king Merodach-Baladan, it is said that Isaiah announced the loss of the royal treasures and the deportation of members of the royal family (20:17–18), which was later reported by the Deuteronomists after the surrender of King Jehoiachin (24:13, 15).

Years ago, Klaus Koch (1981) coined the striking expression "das Profetenschweigen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks."[8] Koch showed convincingly that Noth's (1967, 97–98) explanation of this phenomenon through the arguments that the prophets were not mentioned in the royal diaries used by the historians, or that collections of their sayings were not available to them, does not hold true. The spectacular activities of Jeremiah during the reigns of Jehoiakim (Jeremiah 36) and Zedekiah (Jeremiah 27–28) should especially have been known by everyone. Moreover, as far as we can reconstruct the formation of the prophetic traditions, we have to suggest that several collections of sayings of the prophets of doom already existed during the sixth century BCE.[9] If such prophetical material was available, Koch (1981, 118) rightly raises the question: "Warum werden sie [that is, the messages of the classical prophets] dann konsequent in einem Buch verschwiegen, das die Katastrofe Israels gerade als Erfüllung profetischer Voraussagen beschreiben will?" From the fact that the decisive oracle of judgment over Jerusalem is ascribed to anonymous prophets (2 Kgs 21:10), Koch correctly concluded that the Deuteronomistic

[8] A decade earlier, Crüsemann (1971, 57–58) already addressed the ratio of the Deuteronomistic History to the classical prophets as a mystery; but he focused the general problem on the limited question of whether the Deuteronomistic historians intended to oppose Amos in 2 Kgs 14:27 (contra Am 8:2).

[9] See, e.g., Albertz 2003b, 204–37, 302–45; Wöhrle 2006, 125–35, 188–93, 221–26.

historians deliberately wanted to conceal the actual message of the prophets of doom. However, he failed to offer a sufficient explanation for this strange behavior. Considering different possibilities, Koch suggested that the Deuteronomistic historians intended to always reserve the possibility of conversion; therefore, they rejected the unconditional and unchangeable announcements of doom, which had been uttered by the classical prophets (Koch 1981, 127–28). But this explanation is not really convincing. One may ask: Is the oracle of judgment over Jerusalem, which the Deuteronomists formulated in 2 Kgs 21:10–16, not likewise unconditional and unchangeable, so unchangeable that even the pious king Josiah was not able to change it (2 Kgs 23:25–27)?[10]

The problem of the relation of the Deuteronomists to the heritage of the prophets becomes even more severe if we take into consideration that authors, who shared a similar style and a set of similar concepts with the Deuteronomistic historians, obviously cared for the heritage of a number of classical prophets.[11] Winfried Thiel (1973; 1981) already convincingly demonstrated that the book of Jeremiah did not only contain many passages written in a Deuteronomistic style, but also received its basic structure from a Deuteronomistic redaction (JerD). According to my own investigation (Albertz 2003, 312–45), we can even distinguish three Deuteronomistic editions of the book of Jeremiah ($JerD^1$, $JerD^2$ and $JerD^3$),[12] which probably were composed

[10] In contrast to Koch, other scholars tended to give more specific reasons why particular classical prophets are not mentioned in the Deuteronomistic History. While Pohlmann's suggestion (1979, 100–9) that Jeremiah with his hopes for those who remained in Judah, did not fit the alleged Golah-oriented intention of the Deuteronomistic History, seems to be doubtful, C. Begg's considerations about reasons why the prophets Hosea, Amos and Micah were passed over by the Deuteronomistic historians seems to be on the right track. Begg (1986, 43–53) pointed out that Hosea's negative assessment of the Jehu revolution (Hos 1:4) does not fit the historian's appraisal of it (2 Kgs 9–10), or that Amos' social critics and condemnation of Jeroboam II (Am 7:9) does not agree with the criteria of the Deuteronomistic historians and their evaluation of the period of that king (2 Kgs 14:23–29), or that Micah's radical negative oracle of judgment on Zion (Mic 3:12) conflicts with the historian's great respect for Hezekiah and the Jerusalem temple (2 Kgs 18–19). These correct observations need to be placed in a wider context.

[11] This was already correctly emphasized by Crüsemann (1971, 116) and Begg (1986, 43).

[12] Cf. the two concluding passages (Jer 25:1–13abα*; 45:1–5) and the three different editorial remarks in Jer 25:13bα; 30:2; 45:1, which refer back to the written book of Jeremiah and identify it with the—amplified—scroll of Jer 36. The concluding speech of $JerD^1$ (25:1–13abα*) was secondarily reworked in vv. 9aβ, 11b–12, 13bβ, 15–38, when the oracles of foreign nations were moved to this place (after v. 13), a stage of tradition, which is still apparent in the LXX. Verse 25:14, which is still absent in the

between 550 and 520 BCE. After Werner H. Schmidt (1965) noted that the book of Amos shows traits of a Deuteronomistic redaction, James Nogalski (1993a, 278–80; 1993b, 247–48), Aaron Schart (1998, 156–233), myself (2003, 204–37) and Jacob Wöhrle (2006, 51–284) have elaborated that it belongs to a broader Deuteronomistic editing, which connected the heritage of the prophets Hosea, Amos, Micah and Zephaniah to a Book of the Four from the late exilic period. Finally, Rüdiger Lux (2002) and Jacob Wöhrle (2006, 285–386) have argued that those passages of the book of Zechariah 1–8, which had already been regarded as Deuteronomistic in some way,[13] belong to a redaction which connected the book of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 to a Book of the Two. Thus, what the latter called "Wort-Redaktion", seems to constitute a late Deuteronomistic composition from the early fifth century BCE.

If there are no doubts that several groups of authors, who can be determined as "Deuteronomistic" by style and content, were interested in saving and elaborating the heritage of the prophets, how can it be possible that the authors of the Deuteronomistic History ignored most of that heritage, especially that of the prophets of doom? Do we just have to do with a division of labor in the common Deuteronomistic school?[14] Is it conceivable that some of its members worked on history and some on different prophets, but none of them felt obliged to exchange their views? Or have we to conceptualize a plurality of different Deuteronomistic groups who, although they shared a common style and set of convictions, differed in their political, social and religious targets and therefore also in their recognition of different parts of the prophetic heritage? The fact that the Deuteronomistic historians ignored Jeremiah and the four minor prophets of doom, but recognized Isaiah, the only one of those "classical" prophets who did

---

LXX, was inserted when the oracles were removed at the end of the book, see already Thiel 1973, 262–75 and Albertz 2003, 319–21.

[13] Cf., e.g., Schöttler 1987, 438–40; Albertz 1994/II, 455; Lux 2002, 212; Wöhrle 2006, 363–64 in contrast to W. A. M. Beuken (1967, 84–138), who localized this redactional layer to a Chronistic milieu, see below p. 359.

[14] Dietrich (1994, 170, n. 4) seems to argue in this direction, when he imagined a kind of Deuteronomistic library, which included, e.g., the Deuteronomistic book of Jeremiah, stating: "…extensive deuteronomistically redacted books were at the disposal of the deuteronomistic school. Why should they combine everything? The quest for material reasons for the Deuteronomists' rejection and suppression of the message of Amos, Hosea and Micah…seems to me not only unnecessary but also inappropriate."

not totally reject the Davidic dynasty and the Jerusalem temple, points in the direction of different political and religious targets.[15] Therefore, I would like to present an overview of the theological design and the political, social and religious intentions of the four Deuteronomistic works mentioned above. It may be the case that the recognition of the differences among these four Deuteronomistic works can provide us with an explanation of the strange phenomenon of the "Prophetenschweigen" in the Deuteronomistic History and may lead us to a better solution of how the so-called Deuteronomism should be imagined.

2. The Theological Design and the Political Intentions of the Deuteronomistic History

The theological design of the Deuteronomistic History is characterized by a certain ambiguity. On the one hand, it is shaped by the theology and ethics of Deuteronomy, including the Exodus, Israel's election, and the commitment of Israel to YHWH's laws within the covenant; on the other hand, it is indebted to the Davidic kingship ideology, including the election of David, the election of Jerusalem as the central cult place, and the promise of an everlasting existence of the Davidic dynasty (cf. Albertz 2003a, 263–76). This ambiguity was already mirrored by controversy between Noth (1967, 108–9) and von Rad (1961, 198–203), whether the Deuteronomistic History only intended to explain the catastrophe of 587 BCE or also included some kind of "messianic" expectation. It also shaped several literary critical attempts at distributing those different tendencies on different literary levels.[16] I, however, have my doubts whether a diachronic approach

[15] This suggestion would be supported by the thesis of Hardmeier (1990, 285–97) that the Isaiah story (2 Kgs 18–20*), taken up by the Deuteronomistic historians, originally functioned as a means of political propaganda during the siege of Jerusalem by the Neo-Babylonians in 588–587 BCE, by which the nationalistic party, who trusted in the salvific significance of the temple, claimed that the interruption of the Neo-Babylonian siege due to an Egyptian attack in the spring of 588 (cf. Jer 37:5) would lead to a withdrawal of the enemies similar to the situation of 701 BCE.

[16] For example, Cross (1973, 278–85) assigned the pro-Davidic kingship theology to an earlier edition which he characterized "as a propaganda work of the Josianic reformation and imperial program" (p. 284), while he attributed the explanations of the catastrophe, on the basis of Deuteronomic theology to a later exilic edition, thus founding his "block model." On the basis of the "strata model" of the Göttingen school, Veijola (1975, 127–42) ascribed the topic of the everlasting Davidic dynasty to

will be able to offer a sufficient solution.[17] Even if the Deuteronomistic History received several different expansions, which is highly probable, and even if it was expanded from smaller units, which is possible, that ambiguity cannot be resolved; it is too deeply rooted in the structure of the entire unit. In my opinion, Noth's (1967) position is still valid in the respect that the Deuteronomistic History can be read and understood as a compositional unit, although it shows traits of a longer growing process, some internal disputes and a number of post-Deuteronomistic additions.[18]

It is mostly acknowledged that the period of Moses and Joshua (Deuteronomy 1–Joshua 23*), when Israel received its two great gifts, the gift of the Torah and the gift of the land, was described by the Deuteronomistic historians as period of well-being; Israel was still mostly obedient to YHWH's law and YHWH fulfilled all his promises (Josh 21:42–45; 23:1–3, 9, 11). The period of Israel's disobedience did not start before the death of Joshua (Judg 2:6–12). It is, however, sometimes overlooked that the Deuteronomistic History is aware of a second positive foundation period, the period from the establishment of the Davidic monarchy until the construction of the Jerusalem temple by Solomon (1 Sam 16–1 Kgs 8), which was introduced by an extensive conversion of the people to YHWH (1 Sam 7:3; cf. 1 Kgs 8:61). It is important to notice that both positive foundation periods were deliberately paralleled by the historians: After the construction of the temple was finished, they let King Solomon say (1 Kgs 8:56):

> Blessed be YHWH, who has given his people security (מנוחה), as he has promised. Not one of the good promises has failed, which he made through his servant Moses.

These words directly refer back to the statement made at the end of the first foundation period (Josh 21:44–45):

---

the Deuteronomistic Historian (DtrH), whereas he regarded the Prophetical Deuteronomist (DtrP) as critical of the monarchy along the lines of Deuteronomic theology, and the Nomistic Deuteronomist (DtrN) as seeking a compromise. But neither in the "block model" nor in the "strata model" was an all convincing solution found up to now. For example, Veijola himself later (1977, 119–21) regarded DtrN as an opponent of kingship.

[17] Here is not the place to enter into the discussion on the formation of the Deuteronomistic History, see the good overview of Römer 2009.

[18] For the reasons for my position, see Albertz 1994, 387–99; 2003a, 258–363; 2003b, 274–80; a similar position is shared by Thiel 2007, 79.

> YHWH gave them security (נוח hif.) on every side as he has sworn to their forefathers…Not one of the good promises has failed, which YHWH made to the house of Israel; they all came true.

A similar statement is given by Joshua himself in Josh 23:1, 14. As can be demonstrated by the use of the verb נוח (hif.) and the noun מנוחה in Josh 21:44; 23:1 and 2 Sam 7:1, 11; 1 Kgs 5:18; 8:56, both periods are aligned. The "rest," which Joshua could give to the people by his conquest of the land, was only preliminary; it was not fully established until the victories of David over Israel's neighbors (2 Sam 7:11; cf. Albertz 2003a, 263–70).

According to the Deuteronomistic History, the second foundation period also provided Israel with two salvific gifts, the Davidic kingdom and the temple of Jerusalem. Although the historians continued to assess the monarchical history of Israel and Judah along the lines of the criteria of the Deuteronomic legislation, especially on the basis of the First and Second commandments, as they did for the earlier periods, they were eager to demonstrate that the election of the Davidic dynasty (1 Kgs 11:12–13; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19; 19:34) and the election of Jerusalem (1 Kgs 11:32, 36; 14:21) were able to ameliorate YHWH's judgment on Judah, while the Northern Kingdom, which forfeited these divine favors after its separation from the Davidic Kingdom, was heading for disaster much more quickly (2 Kgs 17:21–23).

Thus, in contrast to the Deuteronomistic editors of the book of Jeremiah, who denounced—as will be shown—the entire history Israel as characterized by apostasy and disobedience (Jer 11:1–13), the Deuteronomistic historians intended to distinguish between better and worse phases and branches of Israel's history. Over a longer period, from Asa to Jotam, they described the course of Judean history quite positively. According to them, it should not necessarily come to a bad end. King Hezekiah, however, was rescued from the Assyrian threat because of his piousness and those divine favors. The main theological problem the historians had to face, was the fact that Judah was finally destroyed like the Northern Kingdom, although King Josiah cleared away all foreign elements from the temple of Jerusalem from and stopped all kinds of apostasy (2 Kgs 22–23). This is the reason why they constructed an extraordinary denunciation of King Manasseh (2 Kgs 21:1–9), which provoked YHWH's verdict that Jerusalem and Judah should be destroyed (2 Kgs 21:10–16), which even the pious King Josiah was not able to alter (22:26–27).

In spite of the catastrophe of Judah, the Deuteronomistic historians adhered to the unconditional divine promise for the Davidic dynasty (2 Sam 7:11b–16), which they interpreted (1 Kgs 2:2–4; 8:25; 9:4–5) and reduced to some degree after the split-off of the Northern Kingdom (11:36; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19), but never abolished. Recently, Wolfgang Oswald (2008, 89–101) has pointed out that the Deuteronomistic historians knew several divine oracles for certain kings of the Northern Kingdom, in which the abolition of their dynasty is announced (1 Kgs 14:7–16; 16:1–4, 7; 21:19–24). The positive dynastic oracle for Jeroboam I was conditional from its beginning (1 Kgs 11:29–39); the dynastic oracle granted to Jehu was limited to only four generations (2 Kgs 10:30; cf. 15:12). Such negative or limited dynastic oracles are completely absent from the Kingdom of Judah. This striking difference supports the suggestion that the Davidic dynasty was of central importance for the Deuteronomistic historians. In this respect, the report of the release of Jehoiachin from a Babylonian prison at the end of their history (2 Kgs 25:27–30) is not coincidental. Although it does not express messianic hopes, it makes a political claim for the future. According to the Deuteronomistic historians, the reconstruction of the Jerusalem temple in accordance with the rules of the Torah of Moses under the leadership of a Davidic king would be the lesson which one should learn from their view of Israel's former history. Therefore, they had strong reservations against those prophets who undermined this view.

3. The Theological Design and the Political Intentions of the Deuteronomistic Book of the Four (Hosea, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah)

In contrast to the Deuteronomistic historians, the Deuteronomistic editors of the books of Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah endeavored to save and interpret precisely that heritage of those radical prophets, which their colleagues had ignored. They provided the four books with similar headings (Hos 1:1; Amos 1:1*; Mic 1:1; Zeph 1:1), which reveal that they wanted to follow the way of the word of YHWH in history, which was imparted—in different ways—by these four prophets of doom from the time of Jeroboam II up to the time of Josiah (ca. 760 to 609 BCE). Wöhrle (2006, 256) has rightly concluded: "Durch die Datierungen der Buchüberschriften gestalten die dtr. Redaktoren ihre

Sammlung gewissermaßen als Geschichte der Prophetie.... Das dtr. Vierprophetenbuch ist demnach geradezu ein theologischer Kommentar zur vorexilischen Geschichte der beiden Teilreiche von Jerobeam II. bis Josia." Thus, the Book of the Four comes closer to the *Gattung* of historiography than normally thought.[19]

By stressing the singularity of YHWH's word (דבר יהוה), the prophetic editors emphasized, similarly to the historians, the unity of the divine power[20] which determined the course of history. In contrast to the Deuteronomistic historians, however, who had tried hard to distinguish between the histories of Judah and Israel, the prophetic editors connected two prophets from the North and two from the South in order to demonstrate that both histories belong to one continuous line: Israel and Judah had equally sinned against YHWH (for example, Am 2:4–8); so just after Samaria met with disaster, it immediately knocked at the gates of Jerusalem (Mic 1:5b–7, 9). The Deuteronomistic editors learned from the prophets an overall Israelite concept of YHWH's people and denied any advantage to Judah, which their historian colleagues had emphasized.

The editors of the Book of the Four agreed with the Deuteronomistic historians that the disobedience to the Mosaic Torah has led to doom (Am 2:4), and like them, they blamed the veneration of foreign deities and idolatry (Hos 3:4; 8:4b–6; 13:2; Am 5:26; Mic 1:7; 5:11–13; Zeph 1:4–5). But they also emphasized that the social and economic

---

[19] After the observations already made by Nogalski (1993a; 1993b), Schart (1999), and Albertz (2003), Wöhrle (2006, 51–284) reconstructed the entire redactional history of the four prophetical books and therefore was able to identify the contribution of the Deuteronomistic editors to them with a much higher degree of probability in the following passages (p. 245): Hos 1:1; 3:1–4, 5*; 4:1abα, 10, 15; 8:1b, 4b–6, 14; 13:2–3; 14:1; Am 1:1*; 2:4–5, 9–12; 3:1b, 7; 4:13*; 5:11, 25–26; 7:10–17; 8:5, 6b, 11–12; 9:7–10; Mic 1:1, 5b–7, 9, 12b; 5:9–13; 6:2–4a, 9aα,10–15; Zeph 1:1, 4–6, 13b; 2:1–2, 3*, 4–6, 8–9a; 3:1–4, 6–8a, 11–13. According to my view, perhaps also those secondary passages, which condemn the false trust in weapons and fortresses (Hos 1:5, 7; Mic 1:13b; Zeph 1:17aβ) should be assigned to these editors, although this is not a typical Deuteronomistic, but an Isaianic topic (Isa 31:1–3 etc.). In spite of these and other smaller uncertainties, the textual basis of the Deuteronomistic Book of the Four is now settled enough for determining its message and comparing it with other Deuteronomistic literature.

[20] The preference for using of the term דבר יהוה in the singular is one of the common theological features, which the Deuteronomistic editors of the Book of the Four (Hos 1:1; 4:1; Am 7:16; 8:12; Mic 1:1; Zeph 1:1; 2:5 [7 times]; plural only Am 8:11) share with the Deuteronomistic historians (1 Kgs 2:27; 12:24; 14:18; 15:29; 16:1, 7, 12, 34; 21:17, 28; 2 Kgs 1:17; 9:26, 36; 10:10, 17; 23:16; 24:2 et al. [altogether 35 times]; plural only Josh 3:9; 1 Sam 8:10; 15:1).

misbehavior likewise belonged to the sins against YHWH, as one could learn from the prophets Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah (Am 5:11; 8:5; Mic 6:10–12; Zeph 3:1–4). On this point, they agreed with the Deuteronomistic editors of Jeremiah (Jer 7:1–15). Thus, it becomes apparent that the authority of the social legislation of the book of Deuteronomy was disputed among the different Deuteronomistic groups. For the editors of the Book of the Four, the sins against YHWH perhaps also included the trust in weapons and fortresses (Hos 1:5, 7; 8:14; Mic 1:13b; 5:9–10, 13; Zeph 1:16aβ), which they could have learned from Hosea (Hos 5:12–14; 7:8–9) and perhaps from Isaiah (Isa 30:1–5, 15–17; 31:1–3).

Interpreting the unconditional announcements of doom of the four prophets as a series of purgatorial judgments which YHWH would carry through in order to separate his people from all objects of false trust (Hos 3:1–5; Am 9:7–10; Mic 5:9–13; Zeph 1:4–9; 3:9–11), be it idols (Hos 3:5; Mic 5:12), the sacrificial cult (Hos 3:5; Am 5:25), professional oracles (Hos 3:5; Mic 5:11), weapons (Hos 1:5, 7b; Mic 5:9), fortresses (Hos 8:14; Mic 5:10; Zeph 1:16aβ), state officials (Hos 3:5; Zeph 3:3, 11), or even the kingship (Hos 3:5; Am 9:8), the Deuteronomistic editors totally deviated from that view of history evolved by the Deuteronomistic historians. Wöhrle (2006, 257–71) has shown in detail that the editors of the Book of the Four, although they generally followed the sequence of the events described by the Deuteronomistic historians with regard to content, they, nevertheless, conceptualized an explicit counterhistory to it. To mention just two examples: The reform of Hezekiah, which is praised by the Deuteronomistic historians in 2 Kgs 18:4, and the Sennaherib invasion, whose disastrous results are played down in 18:13; both are interpreted by the prophetic editors as a terrible purgative judgment of YHWH, who intended to separate Judah from all its military power and idols by means of these events (Mic 5:9–11). In Zeph 1:4–6, a passage, which has close references to 2 Kings 23, the prophetic editors did not even shrink from evaluating the reform of King Josiah, so much celebrated by the Deuteronomistic historians, in a negative way; it was nothing else than a divine purgative judgement. Thus, in contrast to the Deuteronomistic History, all positive activities of the kings are denied.

The Deuteronomistic editors of the Book of the Four learned from the prophet Zephaniah (Zeph 1:8–13a) that the high officials and the upper class of the capital were responsible for the final destruction of Judah (3:1–4, 6–8a). They regarded their deportations as YHWH's

final purgatorial judgment, which cleansed Jerusalem of all arrogant citizens in order to give the poor and humble people a better chance to survive (3:11–13). The prophetic editors did not hesitate to bestow the honorary title "remnant of Israel" on the poor people who remained in the country. That means that the part of population, which the Deuteronomistic historians disparagingly called "the weakest of the land" (2 Kgs 24:14; 25:12), represented for the prophetic editors the true people of God.

Thus, the lesson which one should learn from this prophetic commentary on history, differed greatly from the one which the Deuteronomistic historians intended to teach. The Deuteronomistic editors of the Book of the Four wanted to demonstrate that the relatively poor conditions in the Babylonian province of Judah, without kingship and a temple, exactly corresponded to the will of God; YHWH himself had deliberately created these sub-state conditions. While the Deuteronomistic historians pinned their hopes on the reestablishment of the Davidic monarchy and the Deuteronomistic editors of the book of Jeremiah expected an improvement—as will be shown—with the return of the Babylonian exiles, the editors of the Book of the Four defended the *status quo* and denied any restoration of the preexilic conditions.

4. The Theological Design and the Political Intentions of the Deuteronomistic Editions of the Book of Jeremiah

In contrast to the Deuteronomists of the Book of the Four, those editors who composed the first Deuteronomistic edition of the book of Jeremiah (Jer 1–25*),[21] did not try to find any positive divine intentions in the destruction Judah, but regarded it—similarly to the Deuteronomistic historians—as a terrible catastrophe. In contrast to the latter, however, they developed Jeremiah's prophecy into a much more negative picture of Israel's history. In their view, Israel's apostasy already started on the day of the exodus (Jer 7:23–24; 11:4, 6–8) and that it

[21] For the reconstruction of this edition, see Albertz 2003b, 312–32; the core of Jer 1:1–25:13bα belongs to it, but not the first commission report in 1:4–10 and chs. 18 and 24. Post-Deuteronomistic additions appear to be: Jer 3:16–18; 9:22–26; 10:1–16; 12:12aβb; 15:21; 16:14–15, 19–21; 17:5–13; 23:5–6, 7–8, 18–20, 33–40; 25:9aβ, 11b–12, 13bβ, 14, 15–29.

did not immediately lead to catastrophe was only because of YHWH's forbearance; he had constantly sent his prophets in order to warn his people (7:13; 11:7; 25:3) and call them to repentance (7:3; 25:25–26). But again and again Israel had refused to listen to the prophetical word (7:13; 11:8; 25:7). Jeremiah was the last of these prophets. After the people had not only rejected his word, but also intended to silence and kill him, their covenant with YHWH was broken (11:10) and the route to destruction became unavoidable (Jeremiah 11–20). Thus, for the first Deuteronomistic editors of Jeremiah, there were no better phases in Israel's past; the history of the Northern and the Southern state equally consisted of a series of missed chances of salvation.

Since Jeremiah warned about false trust in the Jerusalem temple (Jer 7:4) and announced its divine rejection (7:14–15), his Deuteronomistic pupils did not provide it with any salvific significance. In contrast to their historian colleagues, they did not expect a new beginning from a reconstruction of the temple, but from a return of all people to YHWH, which should not only include the renunciation of any apostasy, but also an improvement in social behavior (7:3, 5–7; 25:5).

Moreover, since Jeremiah had already rejected the divine election of the Davidides with regard to King Jehoiachin (Jer 22:24*, 26*, 28*, 30a),[22] his Deuteronomistic pupils felt entitled to generalize this verdict; they emphatically announced that none of his offspring would ever succeed in sitting on David's throne and ruling Judah again (22:29, 30b). While the Deuteronomistic historians adhered to the validity of the dynastic oracle for the Davidides (2 Sam 7:11b–16) and regarded the release of Jehoiachin as a confirmation of their belief, the first Jeremiah Deuteronomists implicitly rejected the Nathan oracle and explicitly intended to prevent any reestablishment of the Davidic rule.[23] Thus, they

[22] For the detailed reconstruction of the original wording see Hermisson 1980, 253–68.

[23] The radicalism of this rejection of the Davidides becomes obvious by the fact that the prophet Haggai felt obliged to repeal Jeremiah's oracle (Hag 2:23) in order to bestow messianic hopes on Zerubbabel. The anti-Davidic impact of the Deuteronomistic editors of Jeremiah on their book was so influential that no messianic hopes were included to it for a longer period. The few positive oracles on the Davidides in the book of Jeremiah belong to post-Deuteronomistic additions, for Jer 23:5–6; 33:14–26 see already Thiel 1973, 248; 1981, 37; the latter passage is even missing in the LXX. The prose passage 30:8–9 is also a later insertion, which alludes to Hos 3:5 and Ez 34:23, see already Rudolph 1968, 190–91. Since the phrase ואת דוד מלכם "and David, their king," which is used in Jer 30:9, also appears in Hos 3:5 and constitutes there a secondary insertion in a passage (Hos 3:1–5*), which Wöhrle (2006, 231–33)

contradicted the theological and political concepts of the historians on a major point.[24]

Those authors, who are responsible for the second Deuteronomistic edition of the book of Jeremiah, which consists of the most of Jer 1–45* including the narratives,[25] raised the question of who was mainly responsible for the catastrophe. They blamed not only the kings Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, but also those officials, priests and prophets, who had supported a nationalistic policy and persuaded Zedekiah to rebel against their Babylonian overlord (Jer 27–29; 36–38). In contrast to this group, the editors draw a lively picture of a group of officials around the Shaphan family, who not only protected Jeremiah (26:24), but also tried to warn the kings about their risky policy and prevent the catastrophe (36:9–26). While the historians described the last decades of Judah as a collective fate, which rested on the entire society since the days of Manasseh and covered up the guilt of nationalists, who were executed by the Babylonians (2 Kgs 25:18–21a), the second editors of Jeremiah insisted upon personal guilt. The clarification of this question gained importance for them, because, for the first time, they pinned their hopes on the return of exiles from Babylonia (Jer 29:10–14aα), whose forefathers had often been deported by the Babylonians because of their nationalistic attitude, which some of them even maintained in the diaspora (29:21–23). Therefore, not all who would return could claim leadership in the Judean community.

On the basis of Jeremiah's prophecy, the second editors expected that YHWH would limit that worldwide rule, which he had vested in the Babylonian empire, to 70 years (Jer 29:10; cf. 27:7; 25:11–12). Moreover, they developed the theory about YHWH's rule in history, which should be valid not only for Israel, but also for all nations and kingdoms of the world (18:7–10): Sometimes, YHWH would decide, to destroy a certain nation or kingdom, but he would announce his intention through his prophets beforehand. If this nation accepted YHWH's

---

has ascribed to the Deuteronomistic edition of the Book of the Four, the post-Deuteronomistic origin of Jer 30:9 seems to be likewise probable.

[24] Hermisson (1980, 280) tries to downplay the political contradiction, because he presupposes a common theological thought in the circles behind the Deuteronomistic and JerD; according to him, because of Jer 22:24–30, the release of Jehoiachin in 2 Kgs 25:27–30 cannot include any messianic hope.

[25] For the reconstruction of this edition, see Albertz 2003b, 315–18; 332–39; it consists of JerD[1] including Jeremiah's call Jer 1:4–10 and Jer 18 plus Jer 26; 27 (LXX); 28; 29:1–14aα, 15, 21–23; 35–36; 37:1–43:7; 44–45.

warnings, he would stay his hand. Sometimes, YHWH would decide to rebuild a certain nation or kingdom; but if this nation rejected YHWH's admonitions and did not take its opportunity, he would revoke his decision. This theory not only offered a suitable explanation of why the rule of the world powers could be limited, but also encouraged their own addressees to take more notice of their possible chances. Moreover, it enabled the Deuteronomistic editors of Jeremiah to integrate Israel's fate into the international history of the Near East in a positive manner, which differs considerably from the Israel-centered view of the Deuteronomistic History. Consequently, the editors regarded Jeremiah as a "prophet for the nations" (1:5), not only for Israel (1:15–19), to whom YHWH gave authority over the entire world (1:10).

The authors of the third edition (Jer 1–51*), who included a collection of oracles of salvation (Jer 30–31) and a collection of oracles against foreign nations (Jer 46–51),[26] reorganized the book in order to show an outline of a dramatic history of the entire Ancient Near East from the decline of Assyria to the rise of the Persian Empire (about 640–520 BCE). Within this global horizon, they intended to describe a long history of missed chances of salvation, beginning with the destroyed Northern Kingdom during the decline of Assyrian power (Jer 2:4–4:3) leading through the catastrophe of Judah and many of its neighbors during the rise of the Neo-Babylonian power and ending with the fall of Babylon and the rise of the Persian Empire (Jer 50–51). While listening to the words of their prophetic book, Israelites and Judeans should take their new chance and internalize YHWH's Torah (Jer 31:31–34). The new beginning—like the authors of the third edition clarified—would depend solely on the mercy of YHWH, the universal creator of the world (Jer 32:17–19, 27, 36–41), not on any guarantees tied to the Jerusalem temple or the Davidic dynasty. Thus, the theological design of the Deuteronomistic books of Jeremiah and its political intentions widely differs from those of the Deuteronomistic History, on the one hand, and from those of the Deuteronomistic Book of the Four, on the other hand, in spite of considerable segments with common convictions.

[26] For the reconstruction of this edition, see Albertz 2003b, 318–21, 339–45; it specifically includes the passages: Jer 2:2aβ, 3; 3:14–15; 7:30–8:3; 12:14–17; 19:6–9, 12–13; 23:1–4, 23–32; 30:1–31:34*; 32; 34; 43:8–13; 46:2–51:64.

5. The Theological Design and the Political Intentions of the Late Deuteronomistic Book of the Two (Haggai, Zechariah)

Those editors, who reworked the heritage of the two early postexilic prophets Haggai and Zechariah, should be classified as late Deuteronomistic, because they still use Deuteronomistic phrases and theological concepts, but adapt them in a freer way than their exilic colleagues have done.[27] The editors agreed with the Deuteronomistic editors of the books of Jeremiah that YHWH had been very angry with their forefathers throughout the preexilic history because they did not accept the message of the prophets, who had called for their repentance (Zech 1:2, 4). Consequently, all the announcements of doom and the curses of the Torah came upon them (1:6a). Therefore, the present postexilic generation was requested to obey the prophets and return to YHWH at last, which they actually did (1:6b). Wöhrle (2006, 367–74) has pointed out that this conversion is dated by the chronological framework of Zechariah, which the editors added to the already existing chronological system of the book of Haggai, to a month earlier than the foundations of the temple were laid.[28]

---

[27] Only some typical examples can be given here: Zech 1:6b: "As YHWH Zebaoth has planned to treat us (זמם לעשות) according to our ways and our deeds (כדרכינו וכמעלליגו), he has treated us." The phrase 'to plan to treat somebody' with a divine subject recalls JerD[2] (Jer 18:8; 26:3; 36:3), but it is formulated here by using the verb חשב in the same sense: חשב לעשות 'to intend to treat.' The root זמם, which the Hag–Zech editors also use in Zech 8:14–15, is uncommon in Deuteronomistic literature. It occurs combined with עשה, for example, in Lam 2:17 and Jer 51:12. Nevertheless, the combination of דרך 'way' and מעלל 'deed' strongly again recalls JerD (Jer 7:3, 5; 18:11; 25:5; 26:13; 35:15). Because of those and other deviations from Deuteronomistic style, Beuken (1967, 84–138) wanted to locate the redaction in the neighborhood of the Chronistic literature, which also often use Deuteronomistic phrases in a freer way. The evidence shown by him, however, is not very specific in most cases; and the few cases of verbatim agreement as כתף סררת 'obstinate shoulder' (Zech 7:11; Neh 9:29) or ברוחו ביד הנביאים 'with his spirit through the prophets' (Zech 7:12; Neh 9:30, there with suffixes of the 2nd p. sg.) rather point to the late Nehemiah prayer, which also alludes to many other biblical passages, as the dependent party. The peculiar combination of the divine spirit and prophets in Zech 7:12 can better be explained from the presupposed tradition, which emphasizes the mediating role of the divine spirit (Hag 2:5; Zech 4:6; 6:8), than from the Nehemiah prayer. Thus, Beuken's derivation is not convincing. Between the edition of Haggai–Zechariah, which would better be determined as late Deuteronomistic, and the Chronistic literature, there is a gap of at least 100 years.

[28] Zech 1:1 mentions the 8th month of the 2nd year of Darius; according to Hag 2:10, 15–19*, the foundation of the temple did not start before 24th day of the

By this editorial device, the Deuteronomistic editors of Haggai and Zechariah intended to clarify that the reconstruction of the Second Temple (Hag 2:10, 15–19) already happened on the basis of the repentance of the people (Zech 1:6). They wanted to correct the misunderstanding that the reconstruction of the temple itself, conducted by Zerubbabel the Davidide, would guarantee a salvific development of the postexilic Judean community, an opinion which could not only be derived from the message of Haggai, but also be inferred from the theological convictions of the Deuteronomistic historians. Moreover, the prophetic editors intended to point out that likewise those changes for the better, which the community had already experienced and the editors recorded (Zech 1:15a, 16; 2:14; 8:1–3), for example, YHWH's return to Zion and the reestablishment of its holiness, did not depend on the reconstruction of the temple itself, but on the people's conversion. The Deuteronomistic editors of the Book of the Two almost accepted the theology of the Jerusalem temple, even more than the Deuteronomistic historians, but at the same time they wanted to relativize its unconditional shape and to provide it with an ethical foundation.

The main interest of the prophetic editors, however, aimed at the improvement of the people's behavior for the future. They offered an easy explanation of why the salvific changes, as far as they had taken place, were rather disappointing: Apart from the reconstructed temple, Jerusalem still lay in ruins (Zech 1:16) and suffered from the loss of population (Zech 8:4–5, 7–8). Many Jews still lived under dangerous conditions in Babylonia and other parts of the world (Zech 2:10–12; 8:7), and Judah was plundered by foreign nations (Zech 2:12). According to the Deuteronomistic editors, all these needs depended on the fact that the people had not really listened to the message of the preexilic prophets. And in their view, this message solely consists of a social gospel: As those prophets had requested the people to execute fair judgment, show loyalty, and mercy to one another, not to oppress the orphan, the widow, and the stranger, and not to contrive any evil

---

9th month of the same year. Hag 2:10–14, which separates the dating from the reflections on the foundation, appears to be a later insertion, see Wöhrle 2006, 302–5. Wöhrle, who has thoroughly reconstructed the redaction history of the book of Haggai and Zechariah, assigned the passages Zech 1:1–7, 14aβ–17aα; 2:10–14; 4:9b; 6:15; 7:1, 7, 9–14; 8:1–5, 7–8, 14–17, 19b to his "Wort-Redaktion" (Wöhrle 2006, 362–66), which he also proposed to classify as late Deuteronomistic (ibid., 363–64).

against each other (Zech 7:7–14), everyone in the postexilic community should behave in the same manner (Zech 8:16–17). Referring to the theory of YHWH's rule in history, which the editors of the second Deuteronomistic book of Jeremiah had developed (Jer 18:7–10), the editors of Haggai and Zechariah assured their addressees that YHWH had already made his decision to benefit Jerusalem and Judah (Zech 8:15). Thus, they would have the chance to assist the salvific development through improving their social behavior.

In accordance with the Deuteronomistic editors of the Book of the Four and of Jeremiah, the editors of the Book of the Two emphasized the social message of the prophets, but in contrast to them and similar to the Deuteronomistic historians, they attached importance to the Jerusalem temple and the promises attached to it. They did not only intend to defend those promises against possible doubts (Zech 2:13; 4:9; 6:15), but also amplified and actualized them (Zech 1:14aβ, 17aα; 2:10–14; 6:15; 8:16–17). At any rate, the same editors made all these promises dependent on a social ethical condition. Although they were much less radical than the editors of the Book of the Four, their interest in establishing a just community of solidarity in Jerusalem recalls, in some respect, the ideal picture drawn in Zeph 3:11–13.

6. Consequences for the Historical Reconstruction of Deuteronomism

Although the four literary works surveyed above show many similarities in style and content, which entitles scholars to attach to them the same label, "Deuteronomistic," they are so different in their theological design and so contrasting in their political intentions that it appears impossible to ascribe them all to a single Deuteronomistic group or school. Moreover, it has turned out that all Deuteronomistic editors have shaped their theology, drawing from Deuteronomy in some way, according to the material which they had chosen to edit. The theology of those Deuteronomists, who were editing prophetical books, was strongly influenced by the message of those prophets, whose heritage they studied, systematized, interpreted and actualized. But the same is also true for the Deuteronomistic historians, who were editing the legislative and narrative material. One reason why they attached so much significance to the Davidic dynasty simply has to do with fact that they found the Nathan oracle (2 Samuel 7) among their material

and felt obliged to interpret it in a way that fir their reconstruction of the course of history. If this insight is true, we are forced to admit that there is no "pure" Deuteronomistic literary work establishing the norm from which the others would deviate. We have "Deuteronomism" only in a plurality of partly different shapes because all the Deuteronomists were editors. Furthermore, the Deuteronomistic History does not represent the "normal" form of Deuteronomistic thought; it can only claim some precedence because it basically seems to be the oldest of the four works.

The different theological and political options of the four different Deuteronomistic works are schematically summarized in the following table; the plurality of how they combine the main topics is impressive:

Table 1. The different theological and political options of the four different Deuteronosmitic works.

Deuteronomistic literature	Deut./proph. religious	Deut./proph. social	Davidic kingship	Jerusalem temple
Deuteronomistic History (ca. 562–515 BCE, mostly in Babylonia)	+		++	+
Deuteronomistic Book of the Four (Hos, Am, Mic, Zeph) (ca. 539–520 BCE in Judah)	+	+		
Deuteronomistic books of Jeremiah ($JerD^1$, $JerD^2$, $JerD^3$) (ca. 550–520 BCE in Judah)	+	+	≠	
Deuteronomistic Book of the Two (Hag, Zech) (ca. 484–479 BCE in Judah)		++	+	++

In order to do justice to the plurality of the Deuteronomistic literature, I proposed twenty years ago to call "Deuteronomism" "a theological current of the time, which comprised very different groups" (Albertz 1994/II, 382). This somewhat open definition can now be stated more precisely.

I agree with the suggestion of Thomas Römer (2009, 46–47), that all later Deuteronomistic groups had their origin in the central administration of King Josiah in Jerusalem. The common literary,

legal and theological training of officials at the royal court provides a sufficient explanation for the common theological, ethical and rhetorical imprinting of later Deuteronomistic groups. Leading officials, such as the scribe Shaphan and the chief priest Hilkiah, seem to have played a major role in the so-called Josianic reform (2 Kgs 22:3, 8, 12). Since royal offices seem to be inherited within leading families, probably also the scribal, legal and theological training was carried out within those families. This suggestion would explain why the scribal tradition did not cease after the Judean state and its institutions collapsed.

In my view, the decisive reason for the later plurality of those scribal groups was the split-up of state officials, which took place after the death of Josiah in the year 609 BCE.[29] During the reigns of Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, two competing factions emerged: on the one hand, a religious nationalistic party led by the Hilkiah family, who was satisfied with the cultic reform of the Jerusalem temple and promoted an anti-Babylonian policy; on the other hand, a reform party led by the Shaphan family, who still adhered to the entire Deuteronomic reform program, including its social laws, and probably further expanded—now in opposition to the ruling kings—the Deuteronomic legislation and promoted a pro-Babylonian policy. From this split, the contrast between those Deuteronomists who edited the history and those who edited the books of Jeremiah can be explained. The former probably belong to the descendants of the members of the religious nationalistic party, the latter to those of the reform party. There is clear evidence that the editors of the Deuteronomistic books of Jeremiah can be identified with descendants of the Shaphan family, who had already sheltered the prophet Jeremiah, remained in Judah after the destruction of Jerusalem, and cooperated with the Babylonians at Mizpah, the capital of the province.[30] Moreover, there is some support for the suggestion that the Deuteronomistic History was written by those descendants of the nationalistic party, whose parents were deported with Jehoiachin to Babylon and who did their scribal service in the vicinity of the captive king.[31] This suggestion provides an easy explanation of why they

[29] For the political and theological developments in the last decades of the Judean state, see Hardmeier 1990, 409–64; Albertz 1994/I, 231–42; 2002, 23–39.

[30] For more details, see Hardmeier 1991, 174–87; Albertz 2003c, 292–95; also Lohfink (1995, 359) regarded the Shaphan family as the transmitter of the Deuteronomistic literature, but did not distinguish between Deuteronomistic History and JerD.

[31] For more details, see Hardmeier 1991, 187–89; Albertz 2003c, 295–300.

excluded the prophet Jeremiah from their historical reconstruction: He had been one of the most prominent enemies of their fathers. The fact that the scribal training and editorial work happened within different families in separate places explains the development of a slightly different style in both Deuteronomistic groups; the mutual influences may have to do with the diplomatic traffic between the two political centers.[32] The contrasting political intentions between the groups mirror their competing claims for leadership.

The existence of the Deuteronomistic Book of the Four cannot be explained by this political split between scribal families. The fact that in this case, different descendants of the Judean elite chose to save and interpret the heritage of the most radical prophets and identified themselves with the interests of ordinary Judean farmers, denying any claim to leadership of the former officials, is astonishing, indeed, and suggests that the destruction of the Judean Kingdom may have fundamentally loosened the bonds of scribes to any institution. In Judah, unattached scribal intellectuals appear to have existed, and these used the authority of the prophets of doom in order to question the leadership of both Deuteronomistic groups and to contradict explicitly that understanding of Israel's history which was promoted by the Deuteronomistic historians.[33]

Finally, the character of the Deuteronomistic Book of the Two suggests the reverse development of a reintegration of Deuteronomistically trained scribes into postexilic Judean institutions. From the fact that the editors fully accepted the theology of the Jerusalem temple, one can infer that they belonged to the administration of the Second Temple, and, since their language shows only a very small influence of priestly language, probably to its lay segment. The dispute between the Deuteronomistic editors of Jeremiah and the prophet Haggai about the royal claim of Zerubbabel (Hag 2:23 against Jer 22:24–30) seems to be forgotten. The editors of the Book of the Two did not see any harm in using the Deuteronomistic theology of the book of Jeremiah and combining it with the temple ideology promoted by Haggai. Nevertheless, they implanted the Deuteronomistic ethical tradition into it. The

[32] The connections between the Deuteronomistic History and JerD, in spite of all the differences, were the reason why Lohfink (1995, 359) wanted to locate the origin of both works in the same place; he thought of Babylon rather than of Mizpah.

[33] Cf. Wöhrle's considerations about the milieu of this edition (2006, 275–84).

date of this Deuteronomistic composition is not completely settled, but it may best belong to the years of the Babylonian rebellions against Xerxes, between 484 and 479 BCE.[34] When history moved on, the Deuteronomistic adherents to the salvific temple prophecy tried to aid the breakthrough of salvation by calling for ethical efforts.

The reintegration of the descendants of former officials in the administration of the new Judean institutions of the Persian period, be it the council of the elders, the congregation of the priests, or the Persian provincial administration[35] was, in my view, was the main reason why the typical Deuteronomistic thoughts and phrases were intermingled with other elements. The different Deuteronomistic groups probably dissolved during the first half of the fifth century BCE[36] and new transmitters of literature emerged.[37] From this time onwards, the varying Deuteronomistic thoughts and stylistic elements could be used by everyone.

---

[34] According the redactional history of the books of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, the late Deuteronomistic edition belongs to the first part of the 5th century BCE, cf. Wöhrle 2006, 364; 380. Since one of the salvation oracles, which was formulated by the editors, calls for an escape from Babylon (Zech 2:10–11), the Deuteronomistic edition would fit the period of Babylonian rebellions, which are verified during the first part of the reign of Xerxes (486–465 BCE). Although the date of those rebellions is yet not totally settled, a new interpretation of the cuneiform sources makes it rather probable that two Babylonian usurpers, Bēl-Šimanni and Šamaš-erība, rose up against the Persian king during the summer and autumn of the year 484 BCE, see Waerzeggers 2003/2004, 150–73. The suppression of these rebellions was so severe that several archives of central Babylonia broke off during this period, for example, the archive of the famous trading company Egibi in Babylon. Possibly, the rebellion flared again in the year 479, after the defeats of Xerxes at Plataia and Mykale since, according to Greek and Roman historians, Xerxes appears to have surprisingly stopped his campaign against Greece (480–479 BCE), see Briant 2002, 533–35. The danger of a war on two fronts may be reflected in Zech 8:7–8, where the salvation and return of Diaspora Jews from the East and the West is announced.

[35] For the institutions of the province Jehud in the 5th century BCE, see already Galling 1964, 162–63 with reference to the addressees of the letters TAD A 4.7–8 from Elephantine (Porten and Yardeni 1986), and Albertz 1994/II, 446–47.

[36] Thus, "Deuteronomism" should not be conceived as a movement which lasted over several centuries (pace Steck 1982, 310–15); Lohfink (1995, 333) has already pointed out that every movement exists only for a limited time, no matter whether it succeeds or fails.

[37] For example, the authors of the D-redaction or composition of the Pentateuch (cf., e.g., Blum 1990, 101–207), who are still called "late-Deuteronomistic," but introduce so many non-Deuteronomistic topics and new stylistic elements that they should perhaps be given a different label.

Bibliography

Albertz, R. 1994. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period.* 2 vols. OTL. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster & John Knox.

——. 2002. Die Zerstörung des Jerusalemer Tempels 587 v. Chr. Pages 23–39 in *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels: Geschehen—Wahrnehmung—Bewältigung.* Edited by J. Hahn. WUNT 147. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

——. 2003a. Intentionen und Träger des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks (1989). Pages 257–77 in Idem, *Geschichte und Theologie: Studien zur Exegese des Alten Testaments und zur Religionsgeschichte Israels.* BZAW 326. Berlin: de Gruyter.

——. 2003b. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* Studies in Biblical Literature 3. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

——. 2003c. Wer waren die Deuteronomisten? Das historische Rätsel einer literarischen Hypothese (1997). Pages 279–301 in idem, *Geschichte und Theologie: Studien zur Exegese des Alten Testaments und zur Religionsgeschichte Israels.* BZAW 326. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Begg, C. 1986. The Non-Mention of Amos, Hosea and Micah in the Deuteronomistic History. *BN* 32: 41–53.

Blum, E. 1990. *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch.* BZAW 189. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Briant, P. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire.* Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Beuken, W.A.M. 1967. *Haggai–Sacharja 1–8: Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der frühnachexilischen Prophetie.* Assen: Van Gorcum.

Cross, F.M. 1973. The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History. Pages 274–89 in idem, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Crüsemann, F. 1971. Kritik an Amos im Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk. Pages 57–63 in *Probleme biblischer Theologie.* FS G. von Rad. Edited by H.W. Wolff. München: Chr. Kaiser.

Dietrich, W. 1972. *Prophetie und Geschichte: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk.* FRLANT 108. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

——. 1994. Martin Noth and the Future of the Deuteronomistic History. Pages 153–175 in *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth.* Edited by S.L. McKenzie and M.P. Graham. JSOTSup 182. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Galling, K. 1964. *Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Hardmeier, C. 1990. *Prophetie im Streit vor dem Untergang Judas: Erzählkommunikative Studien zur Entstehungssituation der Jesaja- und Jeremiaerzählungen in II Reg 18–20 und Jer 37–40.* BZAW 187. Berlin: de Gruyter.

——. 1991. Die Propheten Micha und Jesaja im Spiegel von Jeremia XXVI und 2 Regum XVIII–XX: Zur Prophetie-Rezeption in der nach-josianischen Zeit. Pages 172–89 in *Congress Volume Leuven 1989.* Edited by J.A. Emerton. VTSup 43. Leiden: Brill.

Hermisson, H.-J. 1980. Jeremias Wort über Jojachin. Pages 252–270 in *Werden und Wirken des Alten Testaments: Festschrift für Claus Westermann zum 70. Geburtstag.* Edited by R. Albertz et al. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Koch, K. 1981. Das Profetenschweigen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks. Pages 115–28 in *Die Botschaft und die Boten.* FS H. W. Wolff. Edited by J. Jeremias and L. Perlitt. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Lohfink, N. 1995. Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung? Pages 313–82 in *Jeremia und die deuteronomistische Bewegung.* Edited by W. Groß. BBB 98. Weinheim: Beltz & Athenäum.

Lux, R. 2002. Das Zweiprophetenbuch: Beobachtungen zu Aufbau und Struktur von Haggai und Sacharja 1–8. Pages 191–217 in *"Wort JHWHs, das geschah…" (Hos 1,1): Studien zum Zwölfprophetenbuch.* Edited by E. Zenger. HBS 35. Freiburg: Herder.

Nogalski, J. 1993a. *The Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve.* BZAW 217. Berlin: de Gruyter.

——. 1993b. *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve.* BZAW 218. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Noth, M. 1967. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament.* 3rd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Oswald, W. 2008. *Nathan der Prophet: Eine Untersuchung zu 2 Samuel 7 und 12 und 1 Könige 1.* AThANT 94. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.

Otto, S. 2001. *Jehu, Elia und Elisa: Die Erzählungen von der Jehu-Revolution und die Komposition der Elia-Elisa-Erzählungen.* BWANT 152. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Pohlmann, K.-F. 1979. Erwägungen zum Schlusskapitel des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes: Oder: Warum wird der Prophet Jeremia in 2. Kön 22–25 nicht erwähnt? Pages 94–109 in *Textgemäß: Aufsätze und Beiträge zur Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments.* FS E. Würthwein. Edited by A.H.J. Gunneweg and O. Kaiser. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Porten, B., and A. Yardeni. 1986. *Textbook of the Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt. Vol. 1: Letters.* Jerusalem: CTS.

Römer, T. 2009. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction.* London: T & T Clark.

Rudolph, W. 1968. *Jeremia.* HAT I,12. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Schart, A. 1998. *Die Entstehung des Zwölfprophetenbuchs: Neubearbeitungen von Amos im Rahmen schriftenübergreifender Redaktionsprozesse.* BZAW 260. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Schöttler, H.-G. 1987. *Gott inmitten seines Volkes: Die Neuordnung des Gottesvolks in Sach 1–6.* TThSt 43. Trier: Paulinus Verlag.

Schmidt, W.H. 1965. Die deuteronomistische Redaktion des Amosbuches: Zu den theologischen Unterschieden zwischen dem Prophetenwort und seinem Sammler. *ZAW* 77: 168–193.

Schmitt, H.-C. 1972. *Elisa: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur vorklassischen nordisraelitischen Prophetie.* Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.

Steck, O. H. 1982. Strömungen theologischer Tradition im Alten Israel. Pages 291–317 in idem, *Wahrnehmungen Gottes im Alten Testament: Gesammelte Studien.* TB 70. München: Chr. Kaiser.

Thiel, W. 1972. *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25.* WMANT 41. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

——. 1981. *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45.* WMANT 52. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

——. 2007. Grundlinien der Erforschung des "Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks" (2003). Pages 63–81 in idem, *Unabgeschlossene Rückschau: Aspekte alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft im 20. Jahrhundert.* BThS 80. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Veijola, T. 1975. *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung.* AASF B 193. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

——. 1977. *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.* AASF B 198. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Waerzeggers, C. 2003/2004. The Babylonien Revolts Against Xerxes and the "End of the Archives." *ArOr* 50: 150–73.

Wöhrle, J. 2006. *Die frühen Sammlungen des Zwölfprophetenbuches: Entstehung und Komposition.* BZAW 360. Berlin: de Gruyter.