to claim that "Judah could and would support only the offspring of David—a political situation created and sustained to perfection within the deuteronomistic narrative propaganda" (p. 28). Mullen is quick to point out several possible historical reconstructions of Athaliah's reign, but then stresses the limitations of the biblical text for making final decisions on these matters. The concerns of the biblical writer are first of all didactic and ideological. In summary form Mullen concludes: "By way of narrative reenactments of ritual performances, the deuteronomistic author could reintegrate the genealogical ascription of a kingship unilineally descended from David into the social world view of his group. With Jehoiachin and his sons still alive, the reliance on the promises to David could be maintained and the disaster blamed on the failure of the offspring of David to fulfill their covenantal obligations" (p. 53).

Chapters 3–5 take up segments of the DtrH in literary order. Deuteronomy is an ideological definition of what Israel should be, a "social manifesto of Israelite ethnic identity" (p. 55) or a "ritual manifesto of ethnic boundary formation for ancient Israelite identity" (p. 87). Mullen interprets Deut 18:15f. to the effect that prophecy is a central Israelite social institution for the biblical writer. The book of Joshua is an "ethnogenic myth" (p. 118), projecting the ideals of Deuteronomy. "The book of Judges depicts the narrative dissolution of that community [depicted in Joshua] through a series of vignettes that illustrate the dangers of failing to appropriate and maintain the ethnic boundaries established by Deuteronomy" (p. 122).

Chapter 6 is entitled "The Necessity of Kingship: The Failures of the Past." Mullen argues persuasively that monarchy is a legitimate institution for the biblical writer and his social group. Secondly, he proposes that not only was the Davidic line considered the recipient of a divinely sanctioned covenant, but that the depiction of David as king is a literary portrait of a "golden age," during which the ideals of the deuteronomic conceptualization of the nation had been realized" (p. 164). This is developed in various ways in chaps. 6–8. Although Mullen argues his case well, one is left with the impression that he describes David's reign in this way because sociological studies say a "golden age" myth is important to ethnic identity. David is certainly depicted in positive terms vis-à-vis Saul, and he is a model for later rulers, but the account of his affair with Bathsheba, the recognition of political discontent among his family and subjects, and the frank admission that he did not build a temple for Yahweh are not elements of a typical golden age. Would not the period depicted for Joshua fit the scheme of a "golden age" better?

A real strength of this work is the careful attention to literary detail in the biblical text (Hebrew and Greek), along with judicious references among the footnotes to secondary literature. There are numerous insightful comments concerning literary allusion and wordplay. Mullen knows his subject matter well and includes a wide range of comments on other scholarly work.

J. Andrew Dearman
Austin Presbyterian Seminary, Austin, TX 78705


Knoppers adds to the recent spate of studies of the Deuteronomistic History (Dtr) by reexamining significant kings toward the beginning (Solomon and Jeroboam) and
end (Josiah) of the monarchical period, and he makes important redactional proposals that take full account of text-critical data.

He begins by reviewing past studies of Dtr, including Noth, Jepsen, von Rad, Wolff, the new literary critics, and the multi-edition hypotheses from the Göttingen and Harvard schools. His own position resembles that of Cross and especially McKenzie: There was a Josianic and an exilic edition of Dtr (the latter primarily in 2 Kings 24-25) and a number of other minor additions. In vol. 2 the author argues that Josiah's reforms were an antidote to the unrequited sins of Judahite kings, but also to the sins of Jeroboam; in the present volume he suggests that both Judah and Israel share a common heritage and the common cultic obligation to the Jerusalem Temple, but their separate polities are divinely ordained. This divine ordination clause justifies "the two nations under God" in the book's title.

1 Kings 1-10 is a Deuteronomic legitimation of Solomon's imperial monarchy, portraying it as a utopia—Solomon is the legitimate heir to the Davidic promises. In this view the Deuteronomic contribution far exceeds that identified by Noth, though it was not completely clear to me why this emphasis was attributed to the Deuteronomist rather than his source—ibn 'adne 'al yit ta'd 'al me ha ne'em. More extensive vocabulary studies might bolster his case. His conclusion (p. 104) that the reasons adduced for a preexilic dating of Solomon's prayer in 1 Kings 8 are "generally sound" depends more on assertion than on sustained argument. While he concedes that vv. 25-26 and 46-51 in the present form of 1 Kings 8 are indeed exilic, he claims v. 34 for the earlier edition since its petition for Yahweh to restore the land which was given to the ancestors "does not imply that the entire people are in exile." If "two nations under God are permissible," cultic diversity is not: "By portraying the enthusiastic endorsement of the Temple by all Israelites in the time of Solomon, he underscores the need for such enthusiastic support by all elements of the people in his own day [the seventh century]" (p. 122).

In 1 Kings 11 Dtr orchestrates the transition from the united to the divided monarchy by focusing on Solomon's building of high places and other sins. Only Josiah removed the high places which Solomon had built and which were one of the reasons for the schism. This leads Knoppers to reject the Hezekian date for Dtr proposed by Provan. The Deuteronomic Historian presents a positive view of Jeroboam and his rise to power. Jeroboam is Yahweh's designated king to govern the incipient kingdom of Israel, and he is even given the chance to attain an enduring dynasty. In these respects he is just like David. Knoppers deftly handles the differences between MT and LXX in the accounts of Jeroboam and notes especially the differences between both of these accounts and the so-called "supplement" in LXX (there are two variant redactional traditions describing the Shechem convocation and Jeroboam's rise to power). The historian's views about the legitimacy of the northern kingdom explain the exclusively cultic grounds upon which he evaluates Jeroboam and his successors.

This study greatly clarifies the reasons for the positive and negative pictures of Solomon within Dtr, and it convincingly shows that the northern kingdom is legitimate even if its rejection of the Jerusalem Temple is not. In vol. 2 Knoppers will attempt to show how Josiah in his reform undid the mistakes of Solomon. His reconstruction of the meaning of Dtr in the age of Josiah is possible and plausible, but in my judgment not compelling. Perhaps that case will be built better in the second volume.

There are a number of stylistic infelicities that should have been removed in the
editing and proofreading processes: res gestae (p. 33), the dynasty's unconditional dynasty (p. 41), a prayer for the temple prayer (p. 99), incorrect uses of the definite article (pp. 55 and 103), and the use of untranslated Hebrew and Spanish quotations (pp. 210 and 218). There are several incorrect word choices: form for reform (p. 54), suppression for succession (p. 76), ascription for description (p. 178), tenth century for eleventh century (p. 195), and a misquotation of the Hebrew of 1 Kgs 10:23 (p. 132). He reverses the facts when he states that "the Deuteronomist devalues the temple as a place of prayer, not of sacrifice" (p. 58).

Above all, Knoppers demonstrates that textual criticism becomes foundational to literary, historical, tradition, and redaction criticism.

Ralph W. Klein
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, Chicago, IL 60615


Pierre Auffret, already well known for his prodigious output of studies on the psalms, makes no claim that the analyses of individual psalms in this collection constitute full exegetical studies. Rather, he proposes to focus primarily on one stage of the interpretive process, viz., the uncovering of the psalm's structures on the basis of the evidence the text itself offers. Before the invention of printing, writers could signal the division of a text into sections and strophes by inclusions, repetitions, and chiastic arrangements of key words, themes, or motifs—devices tailored for the ear more than the eye. Modern readers or listeners are usually unaware of such evidence, and Auffret helps rediscover and highlight these clues to a psalm's structures, which in turn can give insight into the meaning of the psalm. Auffret's analyses focus on the surface structures (structurelle) rather than the so-called deep structures of structuralisme. Even though his studies and approach raise some questions, the sheer quantity of his output betokens the vitality of present interest in Hebrew poetry and offers promise for future breakthroughs in our understanding of this literature and its techniques.

Auffret's agenda in this volume includes three elements. First, he presents detailed analyses of twenty psalms: Psalms 52, 54–60, 108, 62, 64–66, 78–80, 91–92, and 119. Second, he attempts, in a preliminary way, to demonstrate how the results of these structural analyses also uncover links among consecutive psalms in the Psalter, e.g., among Psalms 63, 64, and 65, or between Psalms 91 and 92. Third, his detailed analysis of the twenty-two strophes of Psalm 119 further aims at finding clues to the structure and unity of Psalm 119 as a whole, beyond the obvious organization by means of the acrostic device.

Each of the book's eighteen chapters is self-contained and studies a single psalm, except chapter 5, which takes Psalms 57, 60, and 108 together. Auffret attempts to make his studies accessible to nonspecialists by working in translation, usually quite literal, but he does not hesitate to refer directly to the Hebrew when necessary. Auffret puts great emphasis on what he sees as chiastic structures, formed by repetition of words, synonyms, or parallels of various kinds. He is often in dialogue with scholars such as R. L.