this usage and that of Ps 76 and other texts, however. Deuteronomy 4:36 and 5:24 rather explicitly locate the deity's self in the heavens, and not in their temple. There seems to be a renegotiation of the sense in which the *šēm* presences the deity. The recognition of this compartmentalization of the loci of divine agency and self, and attempts to make sense of it, have given rise to a concept conventionally called "Name Theology." This is a theory classically promulgated in 1947 by Gerhard von Rad (1947) that holds that D and Dtr significantly altered the conceptualization of divine presence by removing the divine self from the temple and locating it in the heavens, leaving only the deity's name to inhabit the temple as a hypostasis of sorts. This is thought to be reflected in the construction *ləškēn šəmô*, which is understood according to this theory to mean "to cause his name to dwell." This reading is supported by the later Dtr phrase *libnôt bayit ləšēm YHWH*, "to build a house for the name of YHWH" (2 Sam 7:13; 1 Kgs 5:17, 19 [ET 5:3, 5]; 8:16, 17).

A variety of positions regarding "Name Theology" have been developed since Von Rad's initial formulation (see Richter 2002, 26–36). Some have turned to comparative philology to gain better interpretive purchase on the constructions involved, pointing to the Amarna Letters and the broader Akkadian corpora as evidence that the intended sense was not "to cause his name to dwell," but "to put/place his name." This placement was most commonly achieved through the erection of stelai or inscriptions or the depositing of other media that could bear the royal or divine name.[24] These media were ubiquitous in ancient Southwest Asia. William Schniedewind (2009, 76) explains,

> Everywhere a king places his name, he claims exclusive ownership. Kings, in particular, put their names on monuments, stelae, and border inscriptions to claim exclusive ownership of things. It is not a coincidence that Semitic royal inscriptions often begin with the expression, 'I am X, son of Y, king of Z.' The king puts his name in a place and thereby claims ownership and exclusive dominion.

Now, Schniedewind (2009, 78) here did not have available Seth Sanders' (2010, 114; 2015, 72) argument that royal self-identification in inscriptions appears to have developed as a "ventriloquizing" presencing of the king, but he does suggest that Second Temple biblical texts that address this theme appear to reflect a "hypostatization of the Tetragrammaton."[25] Other scholars suggest the "put/place his name" reading supports the continuation of much earlier

[24] Tigay (2017) argues that there was likely an inscription of some kind bearing the divine name in the sanctuary.

[25] He elaborates: "Strikingly, the very symbol of God's presence in the temple, namely the ark of the covenant, was absent from the Second Temple; however, the divine name serves in its stead as the symbol of God's physical presence in the Jerusalem temple" (79).