results the Dtr showed that even with their insufficiently thought out vision of how holding control over power within the religious nation state was a prerequisite for later canonisation, they still pointed out the correct path that had to lead to canonisation. The path to canonisation apparently did not run in a straight line as the biblical tradition generally did but via many strange twists and turns.

Chapter 7. The Period before 560 BCE

7.1 The Issue

7.1.1 The Sources of the Dtr Single Narrative: Hermeneutics of its Pre-history

The presence of the oral and written materials incorporated in the Dtr single narrative requires us to pose the question of their origin and history. The prevailing view had long been that older materials were present in the Dtr opus as well as in other collections. But a growing number of scholars have come to question or even reject this. They go to the extent of minimising the role of ancient oral tradition, even to labelling it a contributio of questionable value. To the extent that this presence of

---

672 The preceding chapters spoke on several occasions of the possible existence of sources and traditions used in the single narrative. This subject is treated directly here in this chapter. All material that preceded compilation of the single narrative during the exile is eligible for this category, including oral tradition. The redaction will also have to be taken into consideration.

673 Diefner, 1974, 38-50; Whybray, 1987, 136-185; Thompson, 1987, 41-59. “He (Soggin, L.Z.) is working with the common assumption in biblical studies that ‘history proper’ can only be written on the basis of written documents” (Whitelam, 1996, 127). Here Lemche, 1988, 54-58; Smelik, 1977, 96-99, and Guest 1998 are distinctively radical (we will return to this later). This goes counter to our view (Koole, 1983, 206-208) and no longer takes sufficiently into account the contribution that tradition history, including the Scandinavian school and its appreciation for oral tradition, has made to the study (De Pury-Römer, 1989, 46-48). Obviously, the relative value of the of the Scandinavian school’s input must be
ancient materials within the Dtr single narrative is still accepted, authors continue to disagree on their identification and their age. Today there is a tendency to stress the creativity with which the redactors compiled the single narrative. This does not prevent all authors – even those who emphasise most strongly the late date of the final literary shape of the Pentateuch – from acknowledging components that originate before the exile, albeit that they confine themselves increasingly to the written form. These older components seem to appear in many if not all the literary genres that enrich the Dtr single narrative: collections of laws, prophetic traditions, historiography, and poems. Even wisdom elements recognised without its being called upon ‘as a last resort’ or ‘at long last’, according to Mulder, 1987, 26. The established biblical text remains a historical source that cannot be ignored. “...il est essentiel de se laisser guider par l’étude attentive du matériel narratif écrit” (Harrelson, 1982, 21-40, esp. 24). For all that, the degree of accuracy with which the author(s) of Kings transmitted oral tradition has been observed occasionally (Becking, 1992, 102).

This is already a problem for Dtr’s own work (Knight, 1985, 263-296, esp. 283-284). We can cite research on this by F. Langlamet in RB 85 (1978), 277-300. The very first thing to be done is to recognise the oral sources. Then come the written sources (Rofé, 2000). A series of author seek them in the prophets: O’Brien, 1989a; Lohfink, 1987b, 463; Ben Zvi, 1978, 100-105. Others search more recent precursors for these written sources: Hardmeier, 1990, 165-184. As for material in the Pentateuch but outside Dtr’s opus: the J and E material used automatically to be considered of earlier origin, but the consensus in unravelling (De Pury-Römer, 1989, 73-75). Yet certain documents are still held to be very old (Cross, 1973; Weinfeld, 1987, 303-314; Freedman, 1987b, 315-335).

Wilson R.R., 1999, 72-73. The Amsterdam School considered this an important fact. McKenzie, 1991. For another view see Westermann, 1994. Stressing the contribution of the individual, the artist, is consistent with modern thinking as offshoot of the Enlightenment. Whybray, 1987, 236, did not automatically exclude any date for the sources. He believed that no data was available to justify precise dating. Van Seters, Polzin and Auld kept to the written form (Wilson R.R., 1999, 72). This is clearly also Smelik’s preference (1954a). This author recognised traces of written sources only when unavoidable (see also Idem, 1977, 76-99).

Whybray, 1987, 238, Crüsemann, 1978, 60-66, Nicholson, 1991, 21 and Carmichael, 1985, 16 invoke the law collections as ancient components. They also believe that ancient legal rules are also present, but that they can no longer be distinguished from those of a later date. Weippert H., 1991 acknowledges the ancient origin of the historiography. Blum, 1984, 181, chooses the Davidic period for the oldest components of the Jacob stories, although he does not exclude a pre-monarchic origin. The author leaves vague which components he has in mind. While Lema, 1988, 117, does not want to go any further back than the 9th century for written historical traditions (he distrusts the oral traditions completely), Lema,1991, 105 and 114 goes back much further for the poetical passages such as the Song of Deborah and Ps 68:9. For another view see Turro-Brown, 1968, 518; Cross, 1973, 103, 113 and Gottwald, 1993, 169, who go back to the 12th century BCE and