

## The “Proto-Deuteronomist”: Fifty Years Later

HANS AUSLOOS (F.R.S.-FNRS – UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE DE LOUVAIN  
– UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE)

### ABSTRACT

*Fifty years ago, in 1963, the concept of the so-called proto-Deuteronomistic “redaction” was introduced by Chris Brekelmans and Norbert Lohfink. In reaction against a “pandeuteronomism” which was pervading OT exegesis, both scholars presented the hypothesis that it is improbable that the stereotypical theological motifs and stylistic features characterising the Deuteronom(ist)ic literature could simply have fallen out of the blue. On the contrary, Brekelmans and Lohfink argued that the Deuteronom(ist)ic style and ideology/theology should be considered the result of a longstanding development. Moreover, in their view, traces of this development could be detected within certain passages in the books of Genesis, Exodus and Numbers that have been considered prima facie evidence of a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of the Pentateuch. In order to understand Brekelmans’s and Lohfink’s démarche, firstly a concise summary of the position of the Deuteronomist during the final decades of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries is given. Secondly, the rationale behind their hypothesis will be presented, paying particular attention to the criteria upon which they relied. Thirdly, it will be investigated to which extent the hypothesis of a proto-Deuteronomistic redaction of the Tetrateuch still dominates the landscape of historical-critical Pentateuch studies after fifty years. To conclude this contribution, an appraisal of the hypothesis of the proto-Deuteronomist will be given.*

### A INTRODUCTION

This year – 2013 – we celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of a turning point within historical-critical research into the Pentateuch.<sup>1</sup> In 1963, Chris Brekelmans and Norbert Lohfink introduced the concept of the so-called proto-Deuteronomistic “redaction” of the Pentateuch. Independently of each other, the two scholars presented the hypothesis that it is improbable that the stereotypical theological motifs and stylistic features characterising the Deuteronom(ist)ic

---

<sup>1</sup> A draft of this paper, that has been written during a research stay at the University of the Free State (Bloemfontein, South Africa – December 2012 until June 2013), was read at the symposium of the *Societas Studiorum Pentateuchi* (ProPent), held at Bass Lake Conference Lodge (Pretoria, South Africa) from 31 August - 02 September 2013. I am deeply thankful to prof. S. D. Snyman for the opportunities he created during my stay in Bloemfontein and to prof. J. H. le Roux for his kind invitation to participate at the specialists’ meeting of ProPent.

literature could simply have fallen out of the blue.<sup>2</sup> On the contrary, both scholars argued that the Deuteronom(ist)ic style and ideology/theology should be considered the result of a longstanding development. Moreover, in their view, traces of this development could be detected within certain passages in the books of Genesis, Exodus and Numbers that have been considered *prima facie* evidence of a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of the Pentateuch.

In order to understand Brekelmans’s and Lohfink’s *démarche*, we must first make a concise summary of the position of the Deuteronomist during the final decades of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries because it is precisely against this background that the two scholars worked (1). Second, we will present the rationale behind Brekelmans’s and Lohfink’s hypothesis, paying particular attention to the criteria upon which they relied (2). Third, we will question the extent to which their hypothesis of a proto-Deuteronomistic redaction of the Tetrateuch still dominates the landscape of historical-critical Pentateuch studies after fifty years (3). To conclude this contribution, we will give an appraisal of the hypothesis of the proto-Deuteronomist (4).

## **B THE PREDOMINANCE OF THE DEUTERONOMIST DURING THE FIRST HALF OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY**

The roots of the hypothesis of an encompassing Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of the Pentateuch can be situated in the beginning of the 19th century when A. Geddes<sup>3</sup> and J. S. Vater<sup>4</sup> pointed to interpolations in the Samaritan version of the book of Exodus in which a scribe seemed to have harmonised pericopes of

<sup>2</sup> On the use of the term Deuteronom(ist)ic, see Hans Ausloos, “Les extrêmes se touchent . . . Proto-Deuteronomistic and Simili-Deuteronomistic Elements in Genesis–Numbers,” in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature: FS C. H. W. Brekelmans* (ed. Marc Vervenne and Johan Lust; BETL 133; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 341-366. The expression “proto-Deuteronomist” is used as a generic name that fits into the encompassing Deuteronomistic/Deuteronomistic line of tradition, thus referring to the beginnings of that tradition, that also may be found outside the compositional unit Deut–Kings.

<sup>3</sup> Alexander Geddes, *Pentateuch and Joshua* (vol. 1 of *The Holy Bible or the Books Accounted Sacred by Jews and Christians, Otherwise Called the Books of the Old and the New Covenants, Faithfully Translated from Corrected Text of the Originals; with Various Readings, Explanatory Notes and Critical Remarks*; London: J. Davis, 1792); *Containing Remarks on the Pentateuch* (vol. 1 of *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures, Corresponding with a New Translation of the Bible*; ed. Alexander Geddes; London: J. Davis, 1800).

<sup>4</sup> Johann Vater, *Commentar über den Pentateuch mit Einleitungen in den einzelnen Abschnitten der eingeschalteten Übersetzung von Dr. Alexander Geddes’s merkwürdigen kritischen und exegetischen Anmerkungen und einer Abhandlung über Mose und die Verfasser des Pentateuchs* (2 vols.; Halle: Waisenhaus, 1802).

Exodus with the book of Deuteronomy.<sup>5</sup> Although, strictly speaking, Geddes and Vater were not yet talking about a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of Exodus, their suggestion of harmonising interpolations implicitly marks the birth of the concept of the Deuteronomist as a “redactor” of books outside the book of Deuteronomy.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, Geddes and Vater did not systematically deal with the specific issue of Deuteronom(ist)ic language, style and theology within the books of Genesis–Numbers. It was F. Bleek who really introduced this topic,<sup>7</sup> but in light of the later development of the issue, it is remarkable that Bleek only indicated traces of the Deuteronomist in Leviticus (Lev 17; 26:3-45). A. Bertheau would be the first one to point to the Deuteronomist’s activity in Exodus, paying particular attention to the Sinai pericope in Exod 19–24. However, he did not automatically consider every verse within this section that resembles Deuteronomistic literature to be a Deuteronomistic insertion. In fact, only Exod 23:9-13 was argued to have been written under “Deuteron. Einfluss.”<sup>8</sup> On the contrary, and despite the close resemblances between Exod 23:20-33 and Deut 6–7, for example, he saw the epilogue of the Book of the Covenant as the *Vorlage* of the Deuteronomistic text.<sup>9</sup> The two main positions which would later determine the discussion with regard to the presence of so-called Deuteronom(ist)ic elements within Genesis–Numbers can already be seen in Bertheau’s tentative analysis of the problem: either these passages

<sup>5</sup> On the history of research into the Deuteronomistic reworking of the Pentateuch, see in particular Johan Leman, “Kan en moet er van een deuteronom(ist)isch redactie-, herschrijvings- of inlassingswerk gesproken worden in de eerste vier boeken van de Pentateuch? Een literatuurstudie van de exegese van de negentiende eeuw,” (STL diss., KU Leuven, 1973); Hans Ausloos, “Deuteronomi(sti)sche Elementen in Genesis–Numeri: Een Onderzoek naar Criteria voor Identificatie op Basis van een Literaire Analyse van de Epiloog van het ‘Verbondsboek’ (Exodus 23,20-33).” (Ph.D. and STD diss., KU Leuven, 1996), 1-166.

<sup>6</sup> Vater, *Commentar über den Pentateuch*, 84-85; 98. Without suggesting a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of the book of Exodus, almost a century later, August Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1893) and August Dillmann, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus* (KEHAT 12; Leipzig: Hirzel, <sup>3</sup>1897) have also dealt with harmonising interpolations in Exodus. As for the implications of harmonising interpolations in the context of the characterisation of so-called Deuteronom(ist)ic language in Genesis–Numbers, see Hans Ausloos, “Traces of Deuteronomistic Influence in the Septuagint: A Text-Critical Analysis of Exodus 33:1-6,” *JNSL* 35 (2009): 42-43.

<sup>7</sup> Friedrich Bleek, “Einige aphoristische Beiträge zu den Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch,” in *Biblisch-exegetisches Repertorium oder die neuesten Fortschritte in Erklärung der heiligen Schrift* (vol. 1; ed. Ernst F. K. Rosenmüller and Georg H. Rosenmüller; Leipzig: Baumgärtner, 1822), 45-55.

<sup>8</sup> Ernst Bertheau, *Die sieben Gruppen mosaischer Gesetze in den drei mittleren Büchern des Pentateuchs: Ein Beitrag zur Kritik des Pentateuchs* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1840), 47.

<sup>9</sup> Bertheau, *Die sieben Gruppen*, 72-76.

within the Tetrateuch revealing a relationship with Deuteronom(ist)ic literature are an insertion by a “redactor” who was working under the influence of Deuteronom(ist)ic literature, or these verses were used by the Deuteronom(ist)ic authors and therefore have to be considered “pre-Deuteronomic.”<sup>10</sup>

It is also worth mentioning J. J. Stähelin, whose work followed a few years later, particularly within the context of the so-called Supplement Hypothesis. On the basis of theological and linguistic similarities, he suggested that the “Jehovist,” who supplemented the (Elohistic) basic narrative, was identical to the author of the book of Deuteronomy.<sup>11</sup> However, Stähelin was also aware of some differences between the Jehovistic “Ergänzer” and the book of Deuteronomy, though he considered these differences to be related to the specific nature of Deuteronomy as Moses’ exhortative farewell speech.<sup>12</sup> The particular relationship between the “Jehovist” and the Deuteronomist, to which Stähelin tentatively pointed, would play an important role in the work of A. Kuenen, among others, and would also become important within the argumentation of the proponents of a proto-Deuteronomic redaction of Genesis–Numbers.

Although other 19th century scholars such as F. Delitzsch and A. Knobel also contributed valuable insights,<sup>13</sup> J. W. Colenso’s seven-volume magnum opus *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined* (1862–1879) was undoubtedly one of the most significant in the exploration of an encompassing Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of the Pentateuch. Colenso was one of the first scholars to devote considerable attention to the book of Deuteronomy’s characteristic vocabulary. As such, he can be seen as a pioneer in the systematic creation of an inventory of typical deuteronomic phraseology.<sup>14</sup> He enumerated words and expressions that were frequently used by the Deuteronom-

<sup>10</sup> On the terminology, see Ausloos, “Les extrêmes se touchent. . .,” 341-366.

<sup>11</sup> Johann J. Stähelin, *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch, die Bücher Josua, Richter, Samuels und der Könige* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1843), 80.

<sup>12</sup> Stähelin, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 82.

<sup>13</sup> Franz Delitzsch, *Die Genesis ausgelegt* (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1852); Franz Delitzsch, *Commentar über die Genesis* (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1860); August Knobel, *Die Genesis* (KEHAT 11; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1852); August Knobel, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus* (KEHAT 12; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1857); August Knobel, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua erklärt nebst einer Kritik des Pentateuch und Josua* (KEHAT 13; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1861).

<sup>14</sup> Other 19th century scholars paying particular attention to Deuteronom(ist)ic phraseology are Carl Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium: übersetzt und erklärt* (HKAT 1/3/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1898), xxxii–xli, and Paul Kleinert, *Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Rechts- und Literaturgeschichte* (Bielefeld: Velhagen und Klasing, 1872), 214-235.

omist but only rarely appear in the other books of the Pentateuch.<sup>15</sup> According to Colenso, the numerous D-elements within Genesis–Numbers (in the seventh part of his *The Pentateuch*, more than 400 verses are assigned to the Deuteronomist) originate from the author who also wrote the book of Deuteronomy, namely Jeremiah.<sup>16</sup>

The similarities between Deuteronomy and some pericopes within Genesis–Numbers became an important issue again in the new Documentary Hypothesis as consolidated by scholars like Kuenen and J. Wellhausen. Furthermore, thanks to Wellhausen’s hypothesis of four independent sources which were combined by various redactors (R<sup>JE</sup> combined J and E, R<sup>D</sup> was responsible for the combination of JE and D, and finally R<sup>P</sup> combined JED and P) the Deuteronomist’s redactional activity in the first four books of the Bible came to be widely accepted during the first decades of the 20th century. Nevertheless, the founding fathers of the classical Documentary Hypothesis were rather reserved as to the presence of Deuteronom(ist)ic passages within Genesis–Numbers. Kuenen strongly emphasised the resemblances between the redactor who combined J and E on the one hand, and D on the other; although R<sup>JE</sup> is not directly dependent on the Deuteronomist, both corpuses are closely related to each other. Moreover, it seems that in some instances R<sup>JE</sup> used passages that originated within a Deuteronomistic circle.<sup>17</sup> Against the background of the verification that R<sup>D</sup> thoroughly reworked the book of Joshua, and referring to Colenso, Kuenen asked whether this Deuteronomistic reworking was limited to that book or whether it could also be seen in Genesis–Numbers.<sup>18</sup> Kuenen’s answer was positive: within Genesis–Numbers, R<sup>D</sup> is present in Gen 26:1a(?).3b-4(?).5 and Exod 15:26.<sup>19</sup> Precisely due to the close relationship between JE and R<sup>D</sup>, it is not always clear whether a verse should be attributed to either JE or R<sup>D</sup>. For example, with regard to the list of nations in Exod 23:23, Kuenen says that the language of JE shows close affinities with D<sup>1</sup> and his successors.

Wellhausen’s attitude towards a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of Genesis–Numbers was also rather ambivalent. On the one hand, he was convinced

<sup>15</sup> For a detailed presentation of Colenso’s vision of the Deuteronomist, see Hans Ausloos, “John William Colenso (1814–1883) and the Deuteronomist,” *RB* 113 (2006): 372-397; Hans Ausloos, “Deuteronomistic Elements in Numbers 13–14: Colenso’s View on the Deuteronomist,” *OTE* 19 (2006): 558-572.

<sup>16</sup> John W. Colenso, *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined* (vol. 7; London: Longmans, 1879), 145.

<sup>17</sup> Abraham Kuenen, *De thora en de historische boeken des Ouden Verbonds* (vol. 1 of *Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds*; Leiden: Akademische Boekhandel van P. Engels, 2<sup>1884</sup>), 242.

<sup>18</sup> Kuenen, *De thora*, 135.

<sup>19</sup> Kuenen, *De thora*, 252.

that some passages certainly have to be attributed to R<sup>D</sup>.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, similar to Kuenen, he pointed to the close relationship between JE and D, which made it difficult to distinguish clearly between the two corpuses (see e.g. Exod 13:3-16,<sup>21</sup> Exod 15:26,<sup>22</sup> Exod 34\*,<sup>23</sup> and Exod 20<sup>24</sup>).

In line with Kuenen and Wellhausen, H. Holzinger and S. R. Driver should also be mentioned. They were also aware of the presence of elements in Genesis–Numbers that are related to Deuteronomy. Nevertheless, they pointed to the difficulty of clearly distinguishing between JE and D. Holzinger, for example, considered the relationship between R<sup>JE</sup> and D to be an indication of a tendency – Holzinger even utilises the expression “dt’ischen Schule”<sup>25</sup> – resulting in the book of Deuteronomy. In his view, the combination of J and E should be situated within the “dt’istische Zeit.”<sup>26</sup> He even went one step further, suggesting that “man im einzelnen oft schwanken kann, ob ein sekundäres Stück R<sup>JE</sup> oder dem dt’istischen Bearbeiter zuzuweisen ist (. . .). Man muss sich fragen, ob es unter diesen Umständen nicht überhaupt einfacher ist, R<sup>JE</sup> mit R<sup>D</sup> zu identifizieren.”<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, Holzinger generally considered J+E and JE+D as two distinct redactional stages.<sup>28</sup>

Driver also believed that there are “certain sections of JE (in particular, Gn. 26; Ex. 13:2-16; 15:26; 19:3-6, parts of 20:2-17; 23:20-33; 34:10-26), in which the author (or compiler) adopts a parenetic tone, and where his style displays what may be termed an approximation to the style of Dt.”<sup>29</sup> Moreover, in Driver’s view, the parenetic sections of JE “show a tendency to approach it [i.e. the style of the Deuteronomic discourses – H. A.], not exhibiting the complete Deuteronomic rhythm or expression.”<sup>30</sup> As was the case for Kuenen, Wellhausen and Holzinger, Driver therefore also showed a particular interest in the relationship between the so-called older JE-passages and D: “Many of these [i.e.

<sup>20</sup> Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Reimer, <sup>3</sup>1889), 205-206.

<sup>21</sup> Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, 74.

<sup>22</sup> Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, 79.

<sup>23</sup> Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, 86.

<sup>24</sup> Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, 89.

<sup>25</sup> Heinrich Holzinger, *Einleitung in den Hexateuch, mit Tabellen über Quellenscheidung* (Freiburg im Breisgau/Leipzig: Mohr, 1893), 490.

<sup>26</sup> Holzinger, *Einleitung*, 491.

<sup>27</sup> Holzinger, *Einleitung*, 490.

<sup>28</sup> Holzinger, *Einleitung*, 491. Holzinger considers Gen 15:18\*; 18:17-19; 19:18-19; 26:3a-5; Exod 3:8, 12b; 10:2; 15:26; 23:27-28; 24:3-8\*; Num 14:44\*; 21:33-35; 32:17, among others, as R<sup>D</sup> passages. Nevertheless, he sometimes hesitates between R<sup>D</sup>, JE<sup>S</sup> and R<sup>JE</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> Samuel R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (Edinburgh: Clark, <sup>3</sup>1902), LXXVII-LXXVIII.

<sup>30</sup> Driver, *Deuteronomy*, LXXXV.

R<sup>JE</sup>-passages – H.A.] approximate in style and tone to Deuteronomy; these are, no doubt, pre-Deuteronomic.”<sup>31</sup> This, however, does not imply that Driver would have denied the possibility of Deuteronomistic insertions within Genesis–Numbers. For example, Exod 20:2b, 4b, 5a, 10b, 12 “will have been written under the influence of Dt., and be post-Deuteronomic.”<sup>32</sup>

To summarise, it can be argued that the pioneers of the Documentary Hypothesis, which would take a leading position in 20th century biblical exegesis, were highly nuanced on the issue of the Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of Genesis–Numbers. Kuenen and Wellhausen, as well as Holzinger and Driver who followed in their footsteps, left some space for the possibility that the so-called typical Deuteronom(ist)ic language, style and theology were the result of a development and were drawn out of older materials that can still be found within the first four books of the OT.

However, although R<sup>D</sup> was seen as dynamic and closely linked with JE in the research of Kuenen, Wellhausen, Holzinger and Driver, one comes to the conclusion that R<sup>D</sup> soon came to be considered a static and not very creative “redactor.” During the first decades of the 20th century, the concept of R<sup>D</sup> was used to explain every verse, part of a verse, expression, and even individual word within Genesis–Numbers that had any connection to Deuteronom(ist)ic language. More and more, one became convinced that Deuteronomy should be considered as “die Mitte des Alten Testaments.”<sup>33</sup> Every single verse which resembles Deuteronomic language, style or theology had to be explained as influenced by Deuteronom(ist)ic literature. Therefore, the hypothesis of an encompassing Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of Genesis–Numbers, as initially made by Colenso, became truly omnipresent during the first half of the 20th century.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Samuel R. Driver, *The Book of Exodus in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes: The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges* (Cambridge: University Press, 1911), xvii.

<sup>32</sup> Driver, *Exodus*, xvii-xviii.

<sup>33</sup> Rudolf Smend, *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments: Exegetische Aufsätze* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

<sup>34</sup> Already at the end of the 19th century, this tendency can be seen in the work of Jülicher, who gave a very extensive argumentation in favour of R<sup>D</sup>, whose hand he saw in Exod 8:18b; 9:14, 16, 29; 10:1b-2; 12:21-27, 42; 13:3-10, 11-17a; 15:25b-26; 16:4-5, 20, 27, 28-30, 32-34; 17:14, 16b; 19:3b-8, 9b; 20:1-17\*, 22, 23; 22:19-26; 23:8-12; 23:20-33\*: Adolf Jülicher, *Die Quellen von Exodus i-vii,7*. Halle, s.n., 1880; Adolf Jülicher, “Die Quellen von Exodus vii,8-xxiv,11,” *JBT* 8 (1882): 79-127; 273-315. See also, among others, Benjamin W. Bacon, “JE in the Middle Books of the Pentateuch: Analysis of Exodus vii.-xii.,” *JBL* 9 (1890): 161-200; Benjamin W. Bacon, “JE in the Middle Books of the Pentateuch: Analysis of Exodus i.-vii.,” *JBL* 10 (1891): 107-130; Benjamin W. Bacon, “JE in the Middle Books of the Pentateuch: From Egypt to Sinai: Analysis of Exodus xii.37-xvii.16,” *JBL* 11 (1892): 177-200;

During the first decades of the 20th century several important new insights were developed with regard to the formation of the Pentateuch. The Elohist almost completely disappeared, and disciplines such as form criticism and tradition criticism made important modifications to the Documentary Hypothesis. Nevertheless, with regard to the Deuteronomist's presence in Genesis–Numbers, there was almost complete unanimity on the idea that the JE parts had been combined by one or more Deuteronom(ist)ic redactors with a form of the book of Deuteronomy. These Deuteronom(ist)ic redactor(s) made some minor and major changes to this JE-composition. It has sometimes been argued that R<sup>D</sup> was just making some minor retouches to the JE-work in order to harmonise it with his own language and style. At other times, it was also said that R<sup>D</sup> would have inserted complete pericopes which he had created himself. In this way, the concept of a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of Genesis–Numbers followed naturally. This, however, does not exclude the fact that many commentaries and introductions to the Pentateuch during the first decades of the 20th century do not even mention the presence of Deuteronom(ist)ic elements in Genesis–Numbers, or that an extensive reworking by R<sup>D</sup> has sometimes been questioned.<sup>35</sup>

Even M. Noth's theory of the Deuteronomistic History (1943) did not fundamentally change the situation. The full consequences of Noth's hypothesis would only become clear several decades after he had launched it. Having made a rigid distinction between Genesis–Numbers and the book of Deuteronomy, he nevertheless accepted that some pericopes in the Tetrateuch did show traces of Deuteronomistic characteristics<sup>36</sup> without, however, accepting an encompassing Deuteronomistic redaction of the Tetrateuch: “In den Büchern Gen.–Num. fehlt jede Spur einer ‘deuteronomistischen Redaktion.’”<sup>37</sup>

Notwithstanding the tendency of “pan-Deuteronomism” during the first half of the 20th century, several scholars continued characterising these so-

---

Benjamin W. Bacon, “JE in the Middle Books of the Pentateuch: Sinai – Horeb: Analysis of Exodus xviii.–xxxiv.,” *JBL* 12 (1893): 23-46; Bruno Baentsch, *Das Bundesbuch Ex. xx,22–xxiii,33: Seine Ursprüngliche Gestalt, sein Verhältnis zu den es umgebenden Quellschriften und seine Stellung in der alttestamentlichen Gesetzgebung* (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1892); Edgar I. Fripp, “Note on Genesis xviii.xix.,” *ZAW* 12 (1892): 23-29.

<sup>35</sup> J. Estlin Carpenter and George Harford, *The Composition of the Hexateuch: An Introduction with Select Lists of Words and Phrases* (London: Longmans, 1902), 336.

<sup>36</sup> Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (SKGG; GWK 18; Halle: Niemeyer, 1943), 32-33.

<sup>37</sup> Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 13.



called Deuteronom(ist)ic passages as “ancient,” in line with the theories that characterised them as Yahwistic, Elohist or composed by R<sup>JE</sup>.<sup>38</sup>

However, in the meantime, a new tendency appeared, largely in reaction to the almost self-evident characterisation of an increasing number of verses and passages in Genesis–Numbers as Deuteronom(ist)ic, which again seemed to be in line with the reservations of the classical Documentary Hypothesis’ protagonists, who had pointed precisely to the close relationship between JE on the one hand and D on the other. It is precisely this context that was the impetus for the use of the concept “proto-deuteronomistic” within Pentateuch studies.

### C PROTO-DEUTERONOMIC ELEMENTS IN GENESIS–NUMBERS

Although some weak voices questioned the encompassing Deuteronom(ist)ic redactional activity in Genesis–Numbers during the first decades of the 20th century, and taking into account the fact that the Deuteronomistic style did not fall out of the blue, one had to wait until the sixties to see some major movements within the situation.<sup>39</sup> It was H. Cazelles in 1962 who, though still working within the paradigm of source criticism, was the first scholar to explicitly point again to the close relationship between the JE-redaction and Deuteronom(ist)ic literature. In his analysis of Gen 15 – where he distinguished a J and E narrative – he argued that R<sup>JE</sup>, who had combined the two narratives, shows some relationship to Deuteronomy. Despite these similarities, Cazelles did not deem it advisable to identify R<sup>JE</sup> with the author of Deuteronomy. On the contrary, he denied the possibility of a Deuteronom(ist)ic reworking of Gen 15. According to him, many passages within Genesis–Numbers, which are usually attributed to a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction, should be considered “prophetic,” “Elohistic” or “pre-Deuteronomistic.”<sup>40</sup>

In his survey of research into the Pentateuch published in 1966 in the *Supplément* to the *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Cazelles clarified his own posi-

<sup>38</sup> According to W. Beyerlin, for example, Exod 32:7-14, which in general has been considered as D, has to be attributed to E: Walter Beyerlin, *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaïtraditionen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1961), 27. Muilenberg went even further in arguing that “it is doubtful, whether the hand of the Deuteronomist is to be found anywhere in the Tetrateuch”: James Muilenberg, “The Form and Structure of the Covenant Formulations,” *VT* 9 (1959): 351. With respect to the so-called JE-materials D has made use of, see Joel S. Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* (FAT 68; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 99.

<sup>39</sup> According to Artur Weiser, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (ATD 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), xxxvii, for example, the liturgical-parenetical style cannot have originated within Deuteronomistic circles, “da diese schon im Deuteronomium als vorgegebene Stilform zu erkennen gibt.”

<sup>40</sup> Henri Cazelles, “Connexions et structure de Gen., xv,” *RB* 69 (1962): 334-335.

tion.<sup>41</sup> In his view, the Elohist should not be considered a “source,” but rather a “redaction” in a prophetic spirit. It is important to note that Cazelles pointed to some similarities between this E-redaction and R<sup>D</sup>.<sup>42</sup> Following this E-redaction, the JE-redactor (R<sup>JE</sup>) would have combined J and E, trying to retain the particularities of both J and E. Nevertheless, it is precisely within the passages that Cazelles identified as R<sup>JE</sup> (Exod 12:25-27; 23:21-33\*; 34:14-26\*) that the most typical Deuteronom(ist)ic language comes to the fore. Cazelles therefore concluded that the JE-redactor has to be situated within a Deuteronom(ist)ic “school.”<sup>43</sup>

In sum, Cazelles on the one hand considered traditionally Deuteronom(ist)ic-labelled texts as part of an E-redaction, without, however, calling these texts Deuteronom(ist)ic, as Deuteronomy’s central themes are not (yet) present.<sup>44</sup> On the other hand, Cazelles observed strong Deuteronom(ist)ic language within R<sup>JE</sup>, which led him to situate this redaction within a Deuteronomistic “school.”

Although Cazelles already showed a renewed interest in the complexity of the presence of Deuteronom(ist)ic elements within the Tetrateuch, it would be Brekelmans and Lohfink who in 1963 gave a particularly new impetus to the quest for the Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of Genesis–Numbers.<sup>45</sup> The two exe-

<sup>41</sup> Henri Cazelles, “Pentateuque, IV: Le nouveau ‘status quaestionis,’” in *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément Tome 7* (ed. Henri Cazelles and André Feuillet; Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1966), 736-858.

<sup>42</sup> Cazelles, “Pentateuque,” 812.

<sup>43</sup> Cazelles, “Pentateuque,” 821.

<sup>44</sup> The proximity between E and D also comes to the fore in other publications by Cazelles: “Le Deutéronome est à la fois très proche et très loin de l’Élohiste. Lui aussi est bâti sur le schéma des traités d’alliance et d’une manière beaucoup plus claire. Il connaît un renouveau d’intérêt mérité. Sinon nouvelle alliance (et encore!), c’est une alliance renouvelée et une reprise de la Loi. Ce qui était à peine esquissé dans l’Élohiste sur l’amour de Dieu devient ici le centre de la théologie.” See Henri Cazelles, “Positions actuelles dans l’exégèse du Pentateuque,” *ETL* 44 (1968): 74-75. Moreover, Cazelles’s link between E and D was not unique. Already Leonhard Rost, “Sinaibund und Davidsbund,” *TLZ* 72 (1947): 130-134; G. Ernest Wright, “Deuteronomy: Introduction and Exegesis,” *IB* 2: 320; Georges Auzou, *De la servitude au service: Étude du livre de l’Exode* (ConBib 3; Paris: l’Orante, 1961), 28 and Otto Kaiser, “Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Genesis 15,” *ZAW* 70 (1958): 118, for example, have accentuated their interrelationship.

<sup>45</sup> Chris H. W. Brekelmans, “Die sogenannten deuteronomischen Elemente in Gen.–Num: Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Deuteronomiums,” in *Volume du Congrès Genève 1965* (ed. Otto W. H. L. Eissfeldt; VTSup 15; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 90-96; Chris H. W. Brekelmans, “Éléments deutéronomiques dans le Pentateuque,” in *Aux grands carrefours de la révélation et de l’exégèse de l’Ancien Testament* (ed. Charles Hauret; RechBib 8; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967), 77-91; Norbert Lohfink, *Das*

getes introduced the term “proto-deuteronomic” into the historical-critical analysis of the Pentateuch.<sup>46</sup> In using this terminology, Brekelmans and Lohfink meant that pericopes that had almost too easily been characterised as Deuteronom(ist)ic in the course of exegetical research should in fact be considered an impulse to later Deuteronom(ist)ic language, style and theology. In these passages, one meets initial steps in the development of Deuteronom(ist)ic literature, although the stereotypical Deuteronom(ist)ic characteristics have not yet fully developed.

From a methodological perspective, Brekelmans’s approach is the most interesting. He tried to formulate some useful criteria in order to judge whether a pericope can be characterised as either a preliminary stage of Deuteronom(ist)ic literature or as dependent on the Deuteronom(ist)ic literature. In an article on Deut 26:5-9, Brekelmans tentatively emphasised the complexity of dating so-called D-passages.<sup>47</sup> The fact that a passage reveals some Deuteronom(ist)ic stylistic features does not necessarily imply that it has to be dated late. He argued that the formalised, liturgical style, which is considered characteristic of D, cannot have fallen out of the blue. On the contrary, it has to be explained as the result of a long tradition of liturgical language.

In reaction “against a kind of pandeuteronomism which is pervading nowadays quite a number of Old Testament studies”,<sup>48</sup> Brekelmans elaborated these vague intuitions in his paper at the 15th edition of the *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense* on August, 27th 1963.<sup>49</sup> In this paper, it was Brekelmans’s intention to examine whether the numerous passages in Genesis–Numbers which, because of their resemblances to Deuteronom(ist)ic style, language and theology, had naturally been considered Deuteronom(ist)ic insertions, would not rather be witnesses to the prehistory of these typical Deuteronomistic char-

---

*Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5–11* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1963).

<sup>46</sup> Actually, the term as such had been used already some decades earlier by Louis Wallis, *God and the Social Process – A Study in Hebrew History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1935), 89. Later, the term would be used outside the scope of Pentateuch studies as well. See e.g. Adam S. van der Woude, *Micha* (POT; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1976), 202-204, who uses the term in the context of the book of Micah, or Andries P. B. Breytenbach, “The Church’s Responsibility Towards the Social Order: An Old Testament Hermeneutic Problem,” *HvTSt* 61 (2005): 877, who talks about “Hosea and other proto-Deuteronomic literature.”

<sup>47</sup> Chris H. W. Brekelmans, “Het ‘historische Credo’ van Israël,” *TvT* 3 (1963): 4.

<sup>48</sup> Chris H. W. Brekelmans, “Deuteronomistic Influence in Isaiah 1–12,” in *The Book of Isaiah – Le Livre d’Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures: Unité et complexité de l’ouvrage* (ed. Jacques Vermeylen; BETL 81; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1989), 176.

<sup>49</sup> Edward Lipiński, “Les quinzièmes journées bibliques de Louvain,” *ETL* 39 (1963): 831.

acteristics. In order to determine whether these texts belong to the prehistory of Deuteronomic phraseology or whether they are dependent on Deuteronomic language, Brekelmans was the first to introduce the enigmatic issue of the development of criteria.<sup>50</sup>

Brekelmans’s criteria for characterising a text as a preliminary stage in the development of Deuteronomic features are threefold.<sup>51</sup> First, the typical Deuteronomic theology in its stereotypical Deuteronomic form must be absent.<sup>52</sup> Second, there have to be correspondences on the stylistic and formal level, although the stereotypical formulation of the Deuteronomic phraseology may not be omnipresent.<sup>53</sup> Third – and within the context of recent research this has become the most problematic criterion – the other elements of the so-called Deuteronomic pericope, which do not resemble Deuteronomic literature, must have some links with other pre-Deuteronomic texts.<sup>54</sup>

Brekelmans applied his criteria to three texts from the book of Exodus which had often and almost self-evidently been attributed to the Deuteronomist: Exod 12:24-27a,<sup>55</sup> Exod 13:3-16,<sup>56</sup> and Exod 23:20-33.<sup>57</sup> These analyses led him to formulate two main conclusions. First, he argued that the study of these so-called Deuteronom(ist)ic passages in Exodus indeed reveal that the language, style and theology of the book of Deuteronomy are the result of a process – traces thereof can be detected in these pericopes. Second, the analysis of the vocabulary of these passages indicates that there is often an explicit relationship with so-called Elohist literature. As remarked at the end of the preceding section, it is precisely this link with other, non-Deuteronom(ist)ic passages that has become problematic in current research.

Next to Brekelmans, and likewise in 1963, Lohfink also gave an impulse to the use of the notion of “proto-Deuteronomic” within the context of an anal-

<sup>50</sup> Brekelmans, “Die sogenannten deuteronomischen Elemente in Gen.–Num,” 92.

<sup>51</sup> Brekelmans, “Die sogenannten deuteronomischen Elemente in Gen.–Num,” 93-94 and Brekelmans, “Éléments deutéronomiques,” 80.

<sup>52</sup> Brekelmans, “Die sogenannten deuteronomischen Elemente in Gen.–Num,” 33, “Die deuteronomische Theologie in ihrer ausgebildeten Form soll fehlen.”

<sup>53</sup> Brekelmans “Die sogenannten deuteronomischen Elemente in Gen.–Num,” 33, “Es sollen Übereinstimmungen in Stil und Form mit dem Deuteronomium auftreten, aber ohne dass immer die Festigkeit der Formulierung des Deuteronomiums vorhanden ist.”

<sup>54</sup> Brekelmans “Die sogenannten deuteronomischen Elemente in Gen.–Num,” 94, “Die übrigen Elemente, die keine Verbindung mit Deuteronomium aufweisen, sollen Verbindungen mit der predeuteronomischen Literatur haben.”

<sup>55</sup> Brekelmans, “Éléments deutéronomiques,” 80-82.

<sup>56</sup> Brekelmans, “Éléments deutéronomiques,” 82-84.

<sup>57</sup> Brekelmans, “Éléments deutéronomiques,” 84-89.

ysis of Exod 13:3-16.<sup>58</sup> Within exegetical research of the first half of the 20th century, Exod 13:3-16 has functioned as a textbook example of the Deuteronom(ist)ic redactor’s hand in Genesis–Numbers. Although Exod 13:3-16 shows numerous similarities with the Deuteronom(ist)ic style, Lohfink argued that the passage as such cannot be characterised as Deuteronom(ist)ic. On the contrary, analysis of the vocabulary clearly indicates that Exod 13:3-16 should be considered a proto-Deuteronom(ist)ic text, and therefore as a preliminary stage within the development of Deuteronom(ist)ic style.<sup>59</sup>

Thanks to Brekelmans’s and Lohfink’s hypothesis, scholars became again sensitive to the possibility that the Deuteronom(ist)ic literature did not come into existence ἀπᾶτωρ ἀμητῶρ καὶ ἀγεννεαλός.<sup>60</sup> On the contrary, Deuteronom(ist)ic literature has a pre-history. Moreover, both scholars deemed it possible and plausible to trace back this pre-history thanks to a meticulous analysis of so-called Deuteronom(ist)ic passages in Genesis–Numbers.

While Brekelmans would only sporadically refer to the Deuteronom(ist)ic quest in his later scientific career,<sup>61</sup> Lohfink continued to deal with the relationship between Genesis–Numbers and Deuteronom(ist)ic literature.<sup>62</sup> In particular, his reaction and doubts against a “statistical” approach – Lohfink uses the terminology “atomistische Sprachstatistik” – is worth mentioning.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot*, 121-124.

<sup>59</sup> Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot*, 121.

<sup>60</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomium-Studien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1947), 25.

<sup>61</sup> Chris H. W. Brekelmans, “Joshua v 1-12: Another Approach,” in *New Avenues in the Study of the Old Testament: A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap and the Retirement of Prof. Dr. M. J. Mulder* (ed. Adam S. van der Woude; OtSt 25; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 94; Brekelmans, “Deuteronomistic Influence,” 176; Chris H. W. Brekelmans, “Wisdom Influence in Deuteronomy,” in *La Sagesse de l’Ancien Testament: Nouvelle édition mise à jour* (ed. Maurice Gilbert; BETL 51; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1990), 31.

<sup>62</sup> Norbert Lohfink, “‘Ich bin Jahwe, dein Arzt’ (Ex 15,26): Gott, Gesellschaft und menschliche Gesundheit in der Theologie einer nachexilischen Pentateuchbearbeitung,” in *‘Ich will euer Gott werden’: Beispiele biblischen Redens von Gott* (ed. Norbert Lohfink et al.; SBS 100; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981), 11-73; Norbert Lohfink, “Gibt es eine deuteronomistische Bearbeitung im Bundesbuch?,” in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the xiii<sup>th</sup> IOSOT Congress Leuven 1989* (ed. Chris H. W. Brekelmans and Johan Lust; BETL 94; Leuven: Peeters, 1990), 91-113; Norbert Lohfink, “Deutéronome et Pentateuque: État de la recherche,” in *Le Pentateuque: Débats et recherches: XIV<sup>e</sup> Congrès de l’ACFEB, Angers (1991)* (ed. Pierre Haudebert; LD 151; Paris: Cerf, 1992), 52-64.

<sup>63</sup> Norbert Lohfink, “Die These vom ‘deuteronomischen’ Dekaloganfang – ein fragwürdiges Ergebnis atomistischer Sprachstatistik,” in *Studien zum Pentateuch: Walter*

Although a meticulous analysis of the vocabulary is substantial, the results of statistical research have to be interpreted prudently. Lohfink referred, for example, to the Decalogue in Exod 20, which, due to a statistical comparison of the vocabulary,<sup>64</sup> is often considered a Deuteronom(ist)ic creation. However, it is significant, according to Lohfink, that the expression יהוה אלהיך (Exod 20:2, 5, 7, 10, 12) occurs 210 times in Deuteronomy, whereas the verb אהב (Exod 20:6) is only used 4 times in the context of human love for God. Therefore, Lohfink called for a deep analysis of the texts to which one refers in order to characterise a pericope as Deuteronom(ist)ic, with particular attention to the combination of different motives.<sup>65</sup> With respect to the Decalogue, Lohfink concluded that Exod 20 cannot be considered a concentration of so-called Deuteronom(ist)ic elements, but rather that Deuteronom(ist)ic literature presupposes Exod 20.<sup>66</sup>

Later, in his 1995 article on the “Deuteronomic movement,” Lohfink again dealt particularly with the quest for criteria for labelling elements in a biblical passage as Deuteronom(ist)ic.<sup>67</sup> In this respect, not only did he again warn against an oversimplified usage of statistical analyses of the vocabulary, but he simultaneously and explicitly pleaded for a detailed analysis of the

---

*Kornfeld zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. Georg Braulik; Vienna/Freiburg/Basel: Herder, 1977), 99-109.

<sup>64</sup> See e.g. Heinrich Schmidt, “Mose und der Dekalog,” in *Zur Religion und Literatur des Alten Testaments* (ed. Hans Schmidt; vol. 1 of *EYXAPIΣTHPION: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments: Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstag, dem 23. Mai 1922 dargebracht von seinen Schülern und Freunden*; FRLANT 36; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1923), 85.

<sup>65</sup> Lohfink, “Die These,” 101. Recently, Thomas Römer, “Provisorische Überlegungen zur Entstehung von Exodus 18–24,” in “*Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben*” (*Gen 18,19*): *Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur Religionssoziologie: Festschrift für Eckart Otto zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Reinhard Achenbach and Martin Arneth; BZABR 13; Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2009), 129 argues that word statistics has to be combined with “Tendenzkritik, (. . .) das heißt die Erhebung der Textintention.” In this respect, see also the concept “Deuteronomistic canon” by Norbert Lohfink, “Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?,” in *Jeremia und die »deuteronomistische Bewegung«* (ed. Walter Gross; BBB 98; Weinheim: Beltz, 1995), 318 and Ausloos, “Les extrêmes se touchent. . . ,” 341-366, as well as the concept “controlling framework” by John van Seters, “The So-Called Deuteronomistic Redaction of the Pentateuch,” in *Congress Volume, Leuven 1989* (ed. John A. Emerton; VTSup 43; Leiden/New York: Brill, 1991), 59 and Hans Ausloos, “The Need for a ‘Controlling Framework’ in Determining the Relationship between Genesis–Numbers and the So-Called Deuteronomistic Literature,” *JNSL* 24 (1998): 77-89.

<sup>66</sup> Lohfink, “Die These,” 109.

<sup>67</sup> Lohfink, “Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?,” 323-333.

style.<sup>68</sup> Rather than focussing on separate lexemes, one has to analyse word groups and combinations of words.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, Lohfink concluded that the presence of so-called Deuteronom(ist)ic language within the Pentateuch does not necessarily point to a Deuteronom(ist)ic redactor *stricto sensu*; an author or a redactor who is inspired by Deuteronomistic literature should not automatically be considered a member of an (organised) “movement” of Deuteronomists.<sup>70</sup>

Brekelmans’s and Lohfink’s insights have given strong impetus to a renewed, encompassing and critical study of the presence of Deuteronom(ist)ic elements in Genesis–Numbers. Since 1963, it was no longer possible to simply attribute texts in these books to a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction. Moreover, since that year, the term “proto-Deuteronomic” has become almost omnipresent within scientific literature. In Brekelmans’s and Lohfink’s footsteps, several scholars have been attempting to demonstrate the proto-Deuteronomic character of some pericopes in Genesis–Numbers. Although some authors sporadically investigate parts of Genesis and Numbers (with regard to Gen 12:7, see among others Perlitt;<sup>71</sup> as to Gen 50:23-25, see among others Plöger and Don-

<sup>68</sup> Some years earlier, Norbert Lohfink, “Ich bin Jahwe,” 33-39 argued on the basis of a stylistic analysis that Exod 15:26, another so-called Deuteronom(ist)ic verse, should rather be related to Priestly literature. Whereas Deuteronom(ist)ic rhetorical texts are characterised by an enumeration of infinitives, P makes use of inflected verbs. More recently, and precisely due to the apparent relationship between so-called Deuteronom(ist)ic verses in Genesis–Numbers with both D and P, scholars will consider these elements as traces of a late phase within the redaction process of the Pentateuch (see Römer, “Provisorische Überlegungen,” 133-134 with regard to Exod 19:3-8; 20:1-18; 24:1-11, among others).

<sup>69</sup> In this respect, reference should be made to Weinfeld’s creation of an inventory of deuteronomic phraseology: Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 320-365. With regard to this extremely useful tool, Lohfink, “Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?,” 324, laconically remarks: “Seine Praxis scheint bei den deuteronomistischen Goldsuchern noch kaum Schule gemacht zu haben.”

<sup>70</sup> Lohfink, “Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?,” 371. Against this background, reference can be made to the harmonising tendency which seems to characterise the Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint. See in this respect Hans Ausloos, “The Septuagint Version of Exod 23:20-33: A ‘Deuteronomist’ at Work?” *JNSL* 22 (1996): 89-106; Hans Ausloos, “LXX Num 14:23: Once More a ‘Deuteronomist’ at Work?,” in *Xth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies – Oslo 1998* (ed. Bernard A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 415-427; Ausloos, “Traces of Deuteronomic Influence,” 27-44.

<sup>71</sup> Lothar Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969), 67-68.

ner;<sup>72</sup> for Num 14:9, see Stolz<sup>73</sup>), the specific attention to Exodus is remarkable.

## D IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF BREKELMANS’S AND LOHFINK’S PROTO-DEUTERONOMIST

In the years following Brekelmans’s and Lohfink’s suggestions of a proto-Deuteronomist, several studies dealing precisely with this possibility were published. Simultaneously, and in line with a long-standing tradition, several scholars also labelled texts within the Tetrateuch “pre-Deuteronomic” rather than proto-Deuteronomic. J. L. Ska, for example, argued that Exod 14 was used by the author of Deut 1:29-33; 2:14-15; 20:1-4.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, several authors went even further, denying any link with passages that had traditionally been considered as related to Deuteronom(ist)ic literature. F. Langlamet, for example, argued that Exod 34:11-16 is a parenetic, pre-Salomonic and pre-Deuteronomic text warning against integration with the Canaanites.<sup>75</sup>

Scholars arguing in favour of the presence of proto-Deuteronomic material in Genesis–Numbers almost always follow an identical procedure: an analysis of the vocabulary and the language – in a minor degree of the stylistic features – of the passage under study.

One of the typical elements within studies during the first half of the 20th century that labelled passages as Deuteronom(ist)ic was the accentuation of the *similarities* between their vocabulary and the language of Deuteronomy. Now, arguing against the dependence of Deuteronom(ist)ic literature, the proto-Deuteronomist’s advocates emphasised the linguistic *differences*. For example, in his detailed analysis of Exod 13:3-16, M. Caloz argued that, although several expressions seem to be typical for the book of Deuteronomy, they are simultaneously not completely identical. Thus, in Exod 13:12, the term שגר (“offspring”) plays an important role, as it does in Deut 7:13; 28:4, 18, 51. Nevertheless, within Deuteronomy, Caloz asserted, this term is always accompanied

<sup>72</sup> Josef G. Plöger, *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium* (BBB 26; Bonn: Hanstein, 1967), 71; Herbert Donner, *Die literarische Gestalt der alttestamentlichen Josephsgeschichte* (SHAW 1976/2; Heidelberg: Winter, 1976), 35.

<sup>73</sup> Fritz Stolz, *Jahwes und Israels Kriege: Kriegstheorien und Kriegserfahrungen im Glauben des alten Israels* (ATANT 60; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 70.

<sup>74</sup> Jean L. Ska, “Exode XIV contient-il un récit de ‘guerre sainte’ de style deutéronomistique?” *VT* 33 (1983): 454-467; Jean L. Ska, *Le passage de la Mer: Étude de la construction, du style et de la symbolique d’Ex 14,1-31* (AnBib 109; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 462.

<sup>75</sup> François Langlamet, “Israël et ‘l’habitant du pays,’” *RB* 76 (1969): 321-350. See also e.g. José Loza, “Les catéchèses étiologiques dans l’Ancien Testament,” *RB* 78 (1971): 481-500 and José Loza, “Exode xxxii et la rédaction JE,” *VT* 23 (1973): 31-55 with regard to Exod 12:24-27; 32:7-14.



by אֶלְפִיךָ (“of your cattle” – in *status constructus*), each time within the context of a blessing or a curse.<sup>76</sup> Or in Exod 13:5, זֶבַח is used to indicate offerings in honour of YHWH, whereas in Deuteronomy the term refers to domestic offerings. Moreover, in line with Brekelmans’s criteriology, Caloz argued that several elements of Exod 13:3-16 show similarities with so-called Yahwistic parts of the Tetrateuch – it has to be remarked that Caloz followed Eissfeldt’s Hexateuch-Synopse for the source division. Further, Caloz indicated that the formula בַּחֹק יָד in Exod 13:3, 14, 16 and וְהֵעֲבֵרְתָּ in Exod 13:12 occur exclusively in Exod 13:3-16, and are completely absent from Deuteronom(ist)ic literature. The combination of these elements led Caloz to the conclusion that the terminology of Exod 13:3-16 cannot be characterised as Deuteronom(ist)ic.<sup>77</sup>

Broadening the perspective of the vocabulary, Caloz also paid attention to the literary composition of Exod 13:3-16. Here, he argued that the introductory formulas (Exod 13:5, 11-12a) that are used to embed the legal parts of the pericope (Exod 13:6-7, 11-12a) within a historical frame are not typical for the so-called Deuteronomistic school, but on the contrary seem to point to Priestly literature. Moreover, in nine of the twelve cases where Deuteronomy embeds legal parts within a historical frame, the formula “when YHWH your God. . .” is used – a formula absent in Exod 13:3-16.<sup>78</sup> Finally, the formulas which conclude the parenetical parts of Exod 13 (vv. 9 and 16) not only reveal similarities, but also important differences from Deuteronomy.<sup>79</sup>

On the basis of a combination of the similarities and undeniable differences between Exod 13:13-16 and Deuteronom(ist)ic literature, Caloz concluded that the Exodus pericope must be seen as a proto-Deuteronomistic text, thus indicating that the style and theology of Deuteronomy are the result of a longstanding process and that Exod 13 should be seen as a witness to this.

It was undoubtedly Caloz’s very detailed analysis that gave an impetus to the more extensive elaboration of Brekelmans’s and Lohfink’s suggestion from the seventies until the nineties of the 20th century. In their wake, several scholars – mainly working on Exodus – no longer attribute so-called Deuteronom(ist)ic verses to a Deuteronom(ist)ic redactor on a self-evident basis. Rather, they at least take the possibility of a proto-Deuteronomistic author or redactor into account. For Exod 3–4, the analysis of J. T. K. Chan can be mentioned;<sup>80</sup> for the Book of the Covenant in Exod 20:22–23:33, L. Schwienhorst-

<sup>76</sup> Masséo Caloz, “Exode xiii,3-16 et son rapport au Deutéronome,” *RB* 75 (1968): 42.

<sup>77</sup> Caloz, Masséo, “Exode xiii,3-16,” 43.

<sup>78</sup> Caloz, Masséo, “Exode xiii,3-16,” 47.

<sup>79</sup> Caloz, Masséo, “Exode xiii,3-16,” 53.

<sup>80</sup> Joseph Tak-Kwong Chan, *La vocation de Moïse (Ex 3 & 4): Recherche sur la rédaction dite deutéronomique du Tétrateuque* (Facultés de Théologie et de Droit Canonique; Travaux de doctorat; Nouvelle série 15/8; Brussels: Thanh-Long, 1993).

Schönberger and Y. Osumi are worth mentioning,<sup>81</sup> and for Exod 34:10-26 J. Halbe plays an important role.<sup>82</sup>

Furthermore, as direct disciples of Brekelmans – one could speak of the Louvain school – M. Vervenne and C. T. Begg should be mentioned. Begg dealt with the proto-Deuteronomist in the context of an analysis of Exod 32:20, the verse that deals with the destruction of the golden calf.<sup>83</sup> Pointing to the similarities and differences between Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21, Begg argued that the version of Deuteronomy is more elaborate and has a richer vocabulary than Exod 32:20. Moreover, the fact that the commandment to drink the water with the ashes of the calf is lacking in Deut 9:21, as opposed to Exod 32:20, led Begg to conclude that Deut 9:21 had been written by the Deuteronomist who was aiming to anticipate the main cultic reforms of the Deuteronomistic history, in which the drinking of water with the ashes does not have any significance. In line with his *Doktorvater* Brekelmans, Begg concluded that “the basic narrative in Exod 32–34\*, to which 32,20 certainly belongs, is better denominated with the term favored by Brekelmans and others for those Hexateuchal passages frequently labelled “Deuteronomistic,” for example Exod 12, 24-27; 13, 3-16; 19, 3-8; 23, 20-33; 34, 11-16; Jos 24, namely “proto-Deuteronomistic.” Such a designation is appropriate in that, in their wording and theological emphases, Exod 32–34\*, and 32:20 in particular, approximate, but do not attain, the fullness, and fixity of the Deuteronomistic and Deuteronomistic strata in Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets.”<sup>84</sup> In his contribution to the *Festschrift* in honour of Brekelmans, Begg continued to promote this hypothesis.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>81</sup> Yuichi Osumi, *Die kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Exodus 20,22b–23,33* (OBO 105; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991); Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33): Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie* (BZAW 188; Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1990).

<sup>82</sup> Jörn Halbe, *Das Privilegerecht Jahwes Ex 34,10-26: Gestalt und Wesen, Herkunft und Wirken in vordeuteronomischer Zeit* (FRLANT 114; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975).

<sup>83</sup> Christopher T. Begg, “The Destruction of the Calf (Exod 32,20/Deut 9,21),” in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. Norbert Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1985), 208-251.

<sup>84</sup> Begg, “The Destruction of the Calf,” 249.

<sup>85</sup> Christopher T. Begg, “The Destruction of the Golden Calf Revisited (Exod 32,20/Deut 9,21),” in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature: Festschrift C. H. W. Brekelmans* (ed. Marc Vervenne and Johan Lust; BETL 133; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1997), 479. E. Eynikel, also one of Brekelmans’ students, would state: “Exod 32,20 can best be called ‘proto-deuteronom(istic).’” See Erik Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OtSt 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 211.

In his doctoral dissertation on the Sea Narrative in Exod 13–14, Vervenne also followed in his *Doktorvater*'s footsteps.<sup>86</sup> Within Exod 13–14, Vervenne recognised two redactions, each of them with its own characteristic style, formal elements, and theology. The A-stratum was considered to be P.<sup>87</sup> On the basis of similarities with other proto-Deuteronomistic texts and contacts with Deuteronom(ist)ic literature, Vervenne called the B-stratum “JE,” which he characterised as “proto-Deuteronomistic.” This stratum was considered to contain the first steps in the formation of a Deuteronomistic school.<sup>88</sup> Trying to give an answer to J. van Seters' objections that it is “methodologically dubious to use the language and terminology of Dtn/Dtr to identify a group of texts as “proto-D” simply because they are imbedded within that part of the Pentateuch that has been considered by the documentary hypothesis as earlier than Dtn.”<sup>89</sup> Vervenne, like his *Doktorvater*, paid special attention to the formulation of solid criteria which could be used in the characterisation of a passage as proto-Deuteronomistic. In addition to a meticulous linguistic analysis taking into account word statistics and expressions, Vervenne emphasised the necessity of a combined analysis of the style, compositional structure and content as necessary criteria.<sup>90</sup>

Later on, and continuing in the line of his *Doktorvater* Vervenne within the context of the same Louvain school, H. Ausloos dealt extensively with the problematic issue of the formulation of solid criteria, which could be helpful in determining whether a text that is related to Deuteronom(ist)ic literature can be considered as either proto-Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronom(ist)ic.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>86</sup> Marc Vervenne, *Het Zeeverhaal (Exodus 13,17–14,31): Een literaire studie: Status Quaestionis van het onderzoek: Tekstkritiek: Vormstudie: Traditie en redactie* (4 parts; Ph.D. and STD diss., KU Leuven, 1986). See also Marc Vervenne, “The Question of ‘Deuteronomistic’ Elements in Genesis to Numbers,” in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden/New York: Brill, 1994), 254-268; Marc Vervenne, “Current Tendencies and Developments in the Study of the Book of Exodus,” *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction – Reception – Interpretation* (ed. Marc Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1996), 47-54; Marc Vervenne, “Le récit de la Mer (Exode xiii 17 – xiv 31) reflète-t-il une rédaction de type deutéronomique? Quelques remarques sur le problème de l'identification des éléments deutéronomiques contenus dans le Tétrateuque,” in *Congress Volume, Cambridge 1995* (ed. John A. Emerton; VTSup 66; Leiden/New York: Brill, 1997), 365-380.

<sup>87</sup> Vervenne, *Het Zeeverhaal*, 784-790.

<sup>88</sup> Vervenne, *Het Zeeverhaal*, 774-830. Later, Vervenne became more hesitant as to the proto-Deuteronomistic redaction of Exod 13–14. See Vervenne, “Current Tendencies,” 41-42 and Vervenne, “Le récit de la Mer,” 379.

<sup>89</sup> Van Seters, “So-Called Deuteronomistic Redaction,” 59.

<sup>90</sup> Vervenne, “Le récit de la Mer,” 373-374.

<sup>91</sup> Hans Ausloos, “The Need for Linguistic Criteria in Characterising Biblical Pericopes as Deuteronomistic: A Critical Note to Erhard Blum's Methodology,” *JNSL* 23

Vervenne not only identified his B-redaction of Exod 13–14 as proto-Deuteronomic, but simultaneously and tentatively accepted traces of an encompassing proto-Deuteronomic redaction in Gen 50:24, Exod 13:19 and Josh 24:32. A similar tendency can be seen in the study of A. Reichert who, after an analysis of Gen 22:18; 26:5; Exod 5:2; 12:24-27; 13:3-16; 15:22-27; 16; 17:1-7; 19–24\*, considered these redactional additions to be proto-Deuteronomic, thus arguing in favour of an encompassing proto-Deuteronomic redaction of the Pentateuch.<sup>92</sup> In his argumentation, the analysis of the vocabulary also occupied an important position. For example, the fact that a word or expression occurs only once in Exodus but repeatedly in Deuteronomy would be indicative for the thesis that Deuteronomy reflects a further development with regard to the use of the lexeme.<sup>93</sup>

Finally, D. E. Skweres came to similar conclusions on the basis of an analysis of the so-called “Rückverweise” (references) in the book of Deuteronomy. In his view, the Rückverweise in Genesis–Numbers are significantly different from the Rückverweise in Deuteronomy. Therefore, the former category should be considered a preliminary stage (“Vorstufe”) within the development of typical Deuteronomic Rückverweise.<sup>94</sup> The study of the Rückverweise in Deuteronomy consequently makes clear, according to Skweres, that Deuteronomic language did not come into existence in an unprepared way.<sup>95</sup>

---

(1997): 47-56; Ausloos, “The Need for a ‘Controlling Framework,’” 77-89; Hans Ausloos, “‘A Land Flowing with Milk and Honey’: Indicative of a Deuteronomistic Redaction?” *ETL* 75 (1999): 297-314; Hans Ausloos, “Exod 23,20-33 and the ‘War of YHWH,’” *Bib* 80 (1999): 555-563; Hans Ausloos, “The Deuteronomist and the Account of Joseph’s Death (Gen 50,22-26),” in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (ed. André Wénin; BETL 155; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters), 381-395; Hans Ausloos, “The ‘Angel of YHWH’ in Exod. xxiii 20-33 and Judg. ii 1-5: A Clue to the ‘Deuteronom(ist)ic’ Puzzle?” *VT* 58 (2008): 1-12.

<sup>92</sup> Andreas Reichert, *Der Jehowist und die sogenannten deuteronomistischen Erweiterungen im Buch Exodus* (Ph.D. diss., Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, 1972), 191.

<sup>93</sup> Reichert, *Der Jehowist*, 73. For example, the fact that *יד בחזק יד* is used three times in Exod 13:3, 14, 16, whereas in Deut *יד חזקה* is frequently used, mostly in combination with *זרוע נטויה* is, according to Reichert, indicative of the proto-Deuteronomic character of the formula (Reichert, *Der Jehovist*, 73). Also Casper J. Labuschagne, *Gods Oude Plakboek: Visie op het Oude Testament* (‘s-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1978), 104-105 favours a proto-Deuteronomic redaction in Gen 20:1-17; 21:8-21; 22:1-18; 35; Exod 3:1, 4b, 6b, 10-15, which has been responsible for the combination of the Yahwistic, Judaeen narrative, with traditions from the North after the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C.E.

<sup>94</sup> Dieter E. Skweres, *Die Rückverweise im Buch Deuteronomium* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979), 217.

<sup>95</sup> Skweres, *Die Rückverweise*, 218.

## E THE PROTO-DEUTERONOMIST AFTER FIFTY YEARS: AN APPRAISAL

Although the term “proto-Deuteronomic” continues to be found within scholarly literature after the eighties, it seems that from this period on, the proto-Deuteronomic redactor of Genesis–Numbers has been fading away very quickly. The reasons for this are twofold. First, since the seventies, the hypotheses of a late (post-)Deuteronomistic “redaction” of the Pentateuch have become more and more prominent. In particular, the scholarly work of J. van Seters,<sup>96</sup> H. H. Schmid,<sup>97</sup> R. Rendtorff,<sup>98</sup> M. Rose,<sup>99</sup> H.-C. Schmitt,<sup>100</sup> and E. Blum,<sup>101</sup> among others, has completely turned the foundations of Pentateuch analysis upside down. What had been accepted for decades – that the Pentateuch is a compilation of more or less ancient materials (sources) – came to be questioned very dramatically. The Deuteronomist, who until the seventies was nothing more than someone who in a rather minimalistic way reworked – or rather disturbed – the texts he was using and pasting together, became from then on a highly esteemed redactor, or even more, a real author. The Deuteronomist became one of the creators of the Tetrateuch/Hexateuch.

Secondly, and against this background, the quest for criteria to characterise passages as proto-Deuteronomic seems to have resulted in an impasse. As indicated above, Brekelmans had been arguing that elements within a so-called Deuteronomic passage of Genesis–Numbers which do not fit within the list of Deuteronomic characteristics must have some links with other pre-Deuteronomic texts. However, in light of the recent hypotheses that consider the Pentateuch a late creation, this “controlling framework” of pre-Deuteronomic texts in particular has become very suspicious.<sup>102</sup> The “pre-Deuteronomic” texts that were referred to by Brekelmans and others are no longer accepted as pre-Deuteronomic; they as well have become part of the corpus of late (post-)Deuter-

<sup>96</sup> Initiated by John van Seters, “The Terms ‘Amorite’ and ‘Hittite’ in the Old Testament,” *VT* 22 (1972): 64-81.

<sup>97</sup> Hans H. Schmid, *Der sogenannte Jahwist: Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976).

<sup>98</sup> Rolf Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW 147; Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1977).

<sup>99</sup> Martin Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke* (ATANT 67; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981).

<sup>100</sup> Hans-Christoph Schmitt, “Redaktion des Pentateuch im Geiste der Prophetie: Beobachtungen zur Bedeutung der ‘Glaubens’-Thematik innerhalb der Theologie des Pentateuch,” *VT* 32 (1982): 170-189.

<sup>101</sup> Erhard Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1984); Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990).

<sup>102</sup> Ausloos, “The Need for a ‘Controlling Framework,’” 77-89.

onomistic texts. Nevertheless, although this criterion seems to have become problematic, it simultaneously points to one of the most important weaknesses of hypotheses attributing major parts of the Pentateuch to a post-Deuteronomistic author or redactor. Actually, they also use circular criteria. A pericope is considered to be part of a late (post-)Deuteronomistic stratum because of its supposed relation to other late passages, which in turn are considered late because of their relationship to the pericope under investigation.

Therefore, even if the hypothesis of the proto-Deuteronomistic redaction of the Pentateuch no longer seems to dominate Pentateuch studies, or even if it has almost completely disappeared from the scholarly scene, its quest for solid criteria that can be used to characterise the relationship between elements in Genesis–Numbers and the so-called Deuteronomistic “canon” in whatever direction remains valid and should continue to be taken seriously, even after fifty years.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ausloos, Hans. “The Septuagint Version of Exod 23:20-33: A ‘Deuteronomist’ at Work?” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 22 (1996): 89-106.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Deuteronomi(sti)sche elementen in Genesis–Numeri: Een onderzoek naar criteria voor identificatie op basis van een literaire analyse van de epiloog van het ‘Verbondenboek’ (Exodus 23,20-33).” PhD and STD diss., KU Leuven, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Les extrêmes se touchent... Proto-Deuteronomistic and Simili-Deuteronomistic Elements in Genesis–Numbers.” Pages 341-366 in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature: FS C. H. W. Brekelmans*. Edited by Marc Vervenne and Johan Lust. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Need for Linguistic Criteria in Characterising Biblical Pericopes as Deuteronomistic. A Critical Note to Erhard Blum’s Methodology.” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 23 (1997): 47-56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Need for a ‘Controlling Framework’ in Determining the Relationship between Genesis–Numbers and the So-Called Deuteronomistic Literature.” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 24 (1998): 77-89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “‘A Land Flowing with Milk and Honey’: Indicative of a Deuteronomistic Redaction?” *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 75 (1999): 297-314.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Exod 23,20-33 and the ‘War of YHWH.’” *Biblica* 80 (1999): 555-563.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “LXX Num 14:23: Once More a ‘Deuteronomist’ at Work?” Pages 415-427 in *Xth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies – Oslo 1998*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Deuteronomist and the Account of Joseph’s Death (Gen 50,22-26).” Pages 381-395 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Edited by André Wénin. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 155. Leuven: University Press – Peeters.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “John William Colenso (1814–1883) and the Deuteronomist.” *Revue biblique* 113 (2006): 372-397.

- \_\_\_\_\_. “Deuteronomistic Elements in Numbers 13–14: Colenso’s View on the Deuteronomist.” *Old Testament Essays* 19 (2006): 558-572.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The ‘Angel of YHWH’ in Exod. xxiii 20-33 and Judg. ii 1-5: A Clue to the ‘Deuteronom(ist)ic’ Puzzle?” *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008): 1-12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Traces of Deuteronomistic Influence in the Septuagint: A Text-Critical Analysis of Exodus 33:1-6.” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 35 (2009): 27-44.
- Auzou, Georges. *De la servitude au service: Étude du livre de l’Exode*. Connaissance de la Bible 3. Paris: l’Orante, 1961.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. “JE in the Middle Books of the Pentateuch: Analysis of Exodus VII.–XII.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 9 (1890): 161-200.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “JE in the Middle Books of the Pentateuch: Analysis of Exodus I.–VII.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 10 (1891): 107-130.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “JE in the Middle Books of the Pentateuch: From Egypt to Sinai: Analysis of Exodus XII.37–XVII.16.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 11 (1892): 177-200.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “JE in the Middle Books of the Pentateuch: Sinai – Horeb: Analysis of Exodus XVIII.–XXXIV.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 12 (1893): 23-46.
- Baden, Joel S. *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 68. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Baentsch, Bruno. *Das Bundesbuch Ex. xx,22–xxiii,33: Seine Ursprüngliche Gestalt, sein Verhältnis zu den es umgebenden Quellenschriften und seine Stellung in der alttestamentlichen Gesetzgebung*. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1892.
- Begg, Christopher T. “The Destruction of the Calf (Exod 32,20/Deut 9,21).” Pages 208-251 in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*. Edited by Norbert Lohfink. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 68. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Destruction of the Golden Calf Revisited (Exod 32,20/Deut 9,21).” Pages 469-479 in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature: Festschrift C. H. W. Brekelmans*. Edited by Marc Vervenne and Johan Lust. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 133. Leuven: University Press – Peeters, 1997.
- Bertheau, Ernst. *Die sieben Gruppen mosaischer Gesetze in den drei mittleren Büchern des Pentateuchs: Ein Beitrag zur Kritik des Pentateuchs*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1840.
- Beyerlin, Walter. *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaïtraditionen*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1961.
- Bleek, Friedrich. “Einige aphoristische Beiträge zu den Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch.” Pages 1-79 in *Biblisch-exegetisches Repertorium oder die neuesten Fortschritte in Erklärung der heiligen Schrift*. Volume 1. Edited by Ernst F. K. Rosenmüller and Georg H. Rosenmüller. Leipzig: Baumgärtner, 1822.
- Blum, Erhard. *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 57. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 189. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990.
- Brekelmans, Chris H. W. “Het ‘historische Credo’ van Israël.” *Tijdschrift voor theologie* 3 (1963): 1-11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Die sogenannten deuteronomischen Elemente in Gen.–Num: Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Deuteronomiums.” Pages 90-96 in *Volume du Congrès Genève*

1965. Edited by Otto W. H. L. Eissfeldt. *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 15. Leiden: Brill, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Éléments deutéronomiques dans le Pentateuque.” Pages 77-91 in *Aux grands carrefours de la révélation et de l'exégèse de l'Ancien Testament*. Edited by Charles Hauret. *Recherches Bibliques* 8. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Joshua v 1-12: Another Approach.” Pages 89-95 in *New Avenues in the Study of the Old Testament: A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap and the Retirement of Prof. Dr. M. J. Mulder*. Edited by Adam S. van der Woude. *Oudtestamentische Studien* 25. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Deuteronomistic Influence in Isaiah 1–12.” Pages 167-176 in *The Book of Isaiah – Le Livre d’Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures: Unité et complexité de l’ouvrage*. Edited by Jacques Vermeylen. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium* 81. Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Wisdom Influence in Deuteronomy.” Pages 28-38 in *La Sagesse de l’Ancien Testament: Nouvelle édition mise à jour*. Edited by Maurice Gilbert. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium* 51. Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1990.
- Breytenbach, Andries P. B. “The Church’s Responsibility Towards the Social Order: An Old Testament Hermeneutic Problem.” *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 61 (2005): 861-881.
- Buttrick, Geoge A. et al. *The Interpreter’s Bible*. 12 vols. New York/Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951-1957.
- Caloz, Masséo. “Exode xiii,3-16 et son rapport au Deutéronome.” *Revue Biblique* 75 (1968): 5-62.
- Carpenter, J. Estlin and George Harford. *The Composition of the Hexateuch: An Introduction with Select Lists of Words and Phrases*. London: Longmans, 1902.
- Cazelles, Henri. “Connexions et structure de Gen., xv.” *Revue Biblique* 69 (1962): 321-349.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Pentateuque, IV: Le nouveau ‘status quaestionis.’” Pages 687-858 in *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément Tome 7*. Edited by Henri Cazelles and André Feuillet. Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Positions actuelles dans l'exégèse du Pentateuque.” *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 44 (1968): 55-78.
- Chan, Joseph Tak-Kwong. *La vocation de Moïse (Ex 3 & 4): Recherche sur la rédaction dite deutéronomique du Tétrateuque*. Facultés de Théologie et de Droit Canonique. Travaux de doctorat. Nouvelle série 15/8. Brussels: Thanh-Long, 1993.
- Colenso, John W. *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*. Volume 7. London: Longmans, 1879.
- Delitzsch, Franz. *Die Genesis ausgelegt*. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1852.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Commentar über die Genesis*. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, <sup>3</sup>1860.
- Dillmann, August. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*. Kurzgefaßtes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 12. Leipzig: Hirzel, <sup>3</sup>1897.
- Donner, Herbert. *Die literarische Gestalt der alttestamentlichen Josephsgeschichte*. Sitzungen der heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 1976/2. Heidelberg: Winter, 1976.



- Driver, Samuel R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. Edinburgh: Clark, <sup>3</sup>1902.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Exodus in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes: The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*. Cambridge: University Press, 1911.
- Eynikel, Erik. *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. Oudtestamentische Studiën 33. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Fripp, Edgar I. “Note on Genesis XVIII.XIX.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 12 (1892): 23-29.
- Geddes, Alexander. *Pentateuch and Joshua*. Volume 1 of *The Holy Bible or the Books Accounted Sacred by Jews and Christians, Otherwise called the Books of the Old and the New Covenants, Faithfully Translated from Corrected Text of the Originals; with Various Readings, Explanatory Notes and Critical Remarks*. London: J. Davis, 1792.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Containing Remarks on the Pentateuch*. Volume 1 of *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures, Corresponding with a New Translation of the Bible*. London: J. Davis, 1800.
- Halbe, Jörn. *Das Privilegerecht Jahwes Ex 34,10-26: Gestalt und Wesen, Herkunft und Wirken in vordeuteronomischer Zeit*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 114. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975.
- Holzinger, Heinrich. *Einleitung in den Hexateuch, mit Tabellen über Quellenscheidung*. Freiburg im Breisgau/Leipzig: Mohr, 1893.
- Jülicher, Adolf. *Die Quellen von Exodus i-vii,7*. Halle, s.n., 1880.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Die Quellen von Exodus vii,8-xxiv,11.” *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie* 8 (1882): 79-127, 273-315.
- Kaiser, Otto. “Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Genesis 15.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70 (1958): 107-126.
- Kleinert, Paul. *Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Rechts- und Literaturgeschichte*. Bielefeld: Velhagen und Klasing, 1872.
- Klostermann, August. *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1893.
- Knobel, August. *Die Genesis*. Kurzgefaßtes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 11. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1852.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*. Kurzgefaßtes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 12. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1857.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua erklärt nebst einer Kritik des Pentateuch und Josua*. Kurzgefaßtes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 13. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1861.
- Kuenen, Abraham. *De thora en de historische boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. Volume 1 of *Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. Leiden: Akademische Boekhandel van P. Engels, <sup>2</sup>1884.
- Labuschagne, Casper J. *Gods oude plakboek: Visie op het Oude Testament*. ‘s-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1978.
- Langlamet, François. “Israël et ‘l’habitant du pays.” *Revue Biblique* 76 (1969): 321-350.
- Leman, Johan. “Kan en moet er van een deuteronom(ist)isch redactie-, herschrijvings- of inlassingswerk gesproken worden in de eerste vier boeken van de Pentateuch?”

- Een literatuurstudie van de exegese van de negentiende eeuw.” STL diss., KU Leuven, 1973.
- Lipiński, Edward. “Les quinzeièmes journées bibliques de Louvain.” *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 39 (1963): 827-837.
- Lohfink, Norbert. *Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5–11*. Analecta biblica 20. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Die These vom ‘deuteronomischen’ Dekaloganfang – ein fragwürdiges Ergebnis atomistischer Sprachstatistik.” Pages 99-109 in *Studien zum Pentateuch: Walter Kornfeld zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by Georg Braulik. Vienna/Freiburg/Basel: Herder, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “‘Ich bin Jahwe, dein Arzt’ (Ex 15,26): Gott, Gesellschaft und menschliche Gesundheit in der Theologie einer nachexilischen Pentateuchbearbeitung.” Pages 11-73 in *‘Ich will euer Gott werden’: Beispiele biblischen Redens von Gott*. Edited by Norbert Lohfink et al. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 100. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Gibt es eine deuteronomistische Bearbeitung im Bundesbuch?” Pages 91-113 in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the xiiiith IOSOT Congress Leuven 1989*. Edited by Chris H. W. Brekelmans and Johan Lust. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 94. Leuven: Peeters, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Deutéronome et Pentateuque: État de la recherche.” Pages 52-64 in *Le Pentateuque: Débats et recherches: XIV<sup>e</sup> Congrès de l’ACFEB, Angers (1991)*. Edited by Pierre Haudebert. Lectio Divina 151. Paris: Cerf, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?” Pages 313-382 in *Jeremia und die »deuteronomistische Bewegung«*. Edited by Walter Gross. Bonner biblische Beiträge 98. Weinheim: Beltz, 1995.
- Loza, José. “Les catéchèses étiologiques dans l’Ancien Testament.” *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971): 481-500.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Exode xxxii et la rédaction JE.” *Vetus Testamentum* 23 (1973): 31-55.
- Muilenberg, James. “The Form and Structure of the Covenant Formulations,” *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959): 347-365.
- Noth, Martin 1943. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*. Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft. Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 18. Halle: Niemeyer, 1943.
- Osumi, Yuichi. *Die kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Exodus 20,22b–23,33*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 105. Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag /Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Perlitt, Lothar. *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 36. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969.
- Plöger, Josef G. *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 26. Bonn: Hanstein, 1967.
- Reichert, Andreas. “Der Jehowist und die sogenannten deuteronomistischen Erweiterungen im Buch Exodus.” Ph.D. diss., Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, 1972.

- Rendtorff, Rolf. *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 147. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1977.
- Römer, Thomas “Provisorische Überlegungen zur Entstehung von Exodus 18–24.” Pages 128-154 in “*Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben*” (*Gen 18,19*): *Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur Religionssoziologie: Festschrift für Eckart Otto zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Reinhard Achenbach and Martin Arneht. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische and Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 13. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2009.
- Rose, Martin. *Deuteronomist und Jahwist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 67. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981.
- Rost, Leonhard. “Sinaibund und Davidsbund.” *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 72 (1947): 130-134.
- Schmid, Hans H. *Der sogenannte Jahwist: Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976.
- Schmidt, Heinrich. “Mose und der Dekalog.” Pages 78-119 in *Zur Religion und Literatur des Alten Testaments*. Vol. 1 of *EYXAPIΣTHPION: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments: Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstag, dem 23. Mai 1922 dargebracht von seinen Schülern und Freunden*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 36. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1923.
- Schmitt, Hans-Christoph. “Redaktion des Pentateuch im Geiste der Prophetie: Beobachtungen zur Bedeutung der ‘Glaubens’-Thematik innerhalb der Theologie des Pentateuch.” *Vetus Testamentum* 32 (1982): 170-189.
- Schwienhorst-Schönberger, Ludger. *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33): Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 188. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1990.
- Ska, Jean Louis. “Exode XIV contient-il un récit de ‘guerre sainte’ de style deutéronomistique?” *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983): 454-467.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Le passage de la Mer: Étude de la construction, du style et de la symbolique d’Ex 14,1-31*. *Analecta biblica* 109. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.
- Skweres, Dieter E. *Die Rückverweise im Buch Deuteronomium*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979.
- Smend, Rudolf. *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments: Exegetische Aufsätze*. *Analecta biblica* 79. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Stähelin, Johann J. *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch, die Bücher Josua, Richter, Samuels und der Könige*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1843.
- Steuernagel, Carl. *Das Deuteronomium: übersetzt und erklärt*. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 1/3/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1898.
- Stolz, Fritz. *Jahwes und Israels Kriege: Kriegstheorien und Kriegserfahrungen im Glauben des alten Israels*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 60. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.
- Van der Woude, Adam S. *Micha*. De Prediking van het Oude Testament. Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1976.
- Van Seters, John. “The Terms ‘Amorite’ and ‘Hittite’ in the Old Testament.” *Vetus Testamentum* 22 (1972): 64-81.

- 
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The So-Called Deuteronomistic Redaction of the Pentateuch.” Pages 58-77 in *Congress Volume, Leuven 1989*. Edited by John A. Emerton. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 43. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.
- Vater, Johann S. *Commentar über den Pentateuch mit Einleitungen in den einzelnen Abschnitten der eingeschalteten Übersetzung von Dr. Alexander Geddes’s merkwürdigen kritischen und exegetischen Anmerkungen und einer Abhandlung über Mose und die Verfasser des Pentateuchs*. 2 Vols. Halle: Waisenhaus, 1802.
- Vervenne, Marc. *Het Zeeverhaal (Exodus 13,17–14,31): Een literaire studie: Status Quaestionis van het onderzoek: Tekstkritiek: Vormstudie: Traditie en redactie*. 3 Parts. Ph.D. and STD diss., KU Leuven, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Question of ‘Deuteronomic’ Elements in Genesis to Numbers.” Pages 243-268 in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. García Martínez, Antonius Hilhorst, Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten and Adam S. van der Woude. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 53. Leiden/New York: Brill, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Current Tendencies and Developments in the Study of the Book of Exodus.” Pages 21-55 in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction – Reception – Interpretation*. Edited by Marc Vervenne. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium* 126. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Le récit de la Mer (Exode xiii 17 – xiv 31) reflète-t-il une rédaction de type deutéronomique? Quelques remarques sur le problème de l’identification des éléments deutéronomiques contenus dans le Tétrateuque.” Pages 365-380 in *Congress Volume, Cambridge 1995*. Edited by John A. Emerton. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 66. Leiden/New York/ Köln: Brill, 1997.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Deuteronomium-Studien*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 58. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1947.
- Wallis, Louis. *God and the Social Process – A Study in Hebrew History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1935.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Weiser, Artur. *Der Prophet Jeremia*. Das Alte Testament Deutsch 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, <sup>5</sup>1966.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Berlin: Reimer, <sup>3</sup>1889.
- Prof. Dr. Hans Ausloos, F.R.S.-FNRS – Université catholique de Louvain – University of the Free State. *E-mail*: hans.ausloos@uclouvain.be