

Appendix to Lecture Note Part V: **Redaction Criticism**

(ref. Barton, also Perrin, What is Redaction Criticism?; Dillard & Longman)

by Jintae Kim

Associate Professor, Nyack College

1. Method and Purpose

1) Method

They look at smaller units, simple and composite, oral and written, as put together to form larger complexes. It seeks to determine the point of view of the author by ascertaining what he did to the sources.

2) Purpose

Purpose is to elucidate the theological point of view of a composition.

3) Sources

Redaction criticism is most useful if you have the sources: Gospels and Chronicles. But the lack of sources has not stopped scholars from positing the sources and applying Redaction Criticism.

4) Form Criticism

It needs Form Criticism to precede it, even though they say that Form Criticism is inadequate.

History

1) Term

Term from '56 by Billy Marxen regarding the Gospel of mark;...as seen in the collection, arrangement, editing, as well as the composition of material and creation of new forms.

2) Precedents: R.H. Lightfoot or Stonehouse?

Perrin talks about RH Lightfoot as anticipator, but Silva says Stonehouse preceded all of them, in talking about the tendency of Matthew.

3) Real beginning: Immediate Post-WWII

Just as Bultmann, Dibelius, and Schmidt started Form Criticism after WWI, It began in earnest by Bornkamm, Conzelman, and Marxen immediately after WWII.

4) Bornkam's Matthew

Bornkamm said Matthew exegeted the tradition.

5) Conzelmann's Luke

Conzelman was more important, looked for Luke's theological motivation; Lk 13:31ff and 16:16 are pivotal texts.

6) Marxen's Mark

Marxen contrasts (1956):

a. Stresses differences between evangelists. While Form Criticism says evangelists are collectors, Redaction Criticism says they are authors with creative aspects.

b. Form Criticism breaks down the tradition into small parts, Redaction Criticism is concerned with larger units, including the whole gospel, and asks questions about the purpose of the larger composition.

c. Form Criticism, with focus on minutiae, cannot do justice to the bold new step of Mark, who creates the new genre of "gospel."

d. Redaction Criticism says there are three settings (Form Criticism only worried about one original setting, whichever that is).

a) In the life of Jesus

b) In the life and work of the early church

c) In the work and purpose of the evangelist

3. Critique

1) Chronological?

Though the "Gospel" genre is new, we can read it because it has connections to other genres. Yet there are still problems; is it chronological?

2) Respect to editor's role

a. Before Redaction Criticism

Before these three scholars, this concern of traditions had overlooked or maligned the editor. Because of his poor job, you could detect the sources.

It was as if they slapped things together, without much thought to order. Their main contribution was the links.

b. Redaction Criticism

They came to be appreciated for their creativity in making their theological points.

Note that we are moving closer to literary analysis, because of the concern for final form. The editors selected, combined, altered. What was their concern?

They are now attributing some literary skill to the redactor.

4. Redaction of Deuteronomic History

(Redactional activity, Our view of inspiration and canonicity)

1) Bodies of literature in redaction criticism.

The manipulation and presentation of various pre-existing sources.
Arrangement but also perspective imparted (thus it is a false dichotomy between redactor and author.).

2) Redaction Criticism looks for the editor's *tendenz*, especially the final editor, thus the theology of the book (the perspective given to the earlier sources).

a. Sources in Chronicles and gospels

Since we have source of Chronicles, that is the prime ground for Redaction Criticism (also the gospels, though they are more complicated with the discussion about Q and Markan priority and what was available to Luke, etc.).

b. No sources in Deuteronomic history

The Deuteronomist editor is on shakier ground, yet. There are a putative (hypothetical) series of redactions of its earlier versions, and we don't have any sources; i.e. we have confidence for Chronicles, because we have the sources and we know what the changes were from the source that was certainly prior. But Deuteronomic history is more difficult because we don't have independent attestations of the sources, either of the whole history, or of the individual books (the sources mentioned, e.g., the "Ark Narrative" in Samuel). These sources may or may not have been, that is not the point, but nevertheless, such attempts are much more speculative in Deuteronomic history.

3) Example: the Abijah narrative in 1 Kgs 15/2 Chr 13.

a. Chronicles makes a point that the strength of David went to Abijah. Chronicles made more of him.

b. Kings call him "my father is the sea" (Abiyam) and Chronicles "my father is YHWH (Abiya). Different mothers, and thus grandparents

In Kings, Abishalom (Absalom) is his ancestor.

c. Different source is mentioned (annals/Iddo)

d. Kings mentions war between Rehoboam (s/b Abijah) and Jeroboam

e. Chronicles focus on the war between Abijah and Jeroboam. Lengthy speech of Abijah. Thus Chronicles puts a more positive spin on Israel's past.

4) Basically Redaction Criticism ("editorial analysis") asks about these differences.

a. Evangelicals: Harmonization first

Evangelicals go on to ask how they can both be true, how they can be harmonized. They tend to do the harmonization first, rather than "starting the contrast in the eyes."

In some cases, e.g., John, you get a feel for the theological bent of the redactor, then you look at the other pericopes and see the hand of the redactor in them.

b. Theological motivation of Kings and Chronicles

a) It is profitable to do this before the harmonistic effort. When the writer calls Ishbaal Ishbosheth he is putting a negative cast on the house of Saul. In this he is being inspired to give God's perspective on history.

b) Value of Redaction Criticism and Inspiration

Redaction Criticism has awakened us to the fact that these books are not just history, but are highly charged theological and political histories. This is not just perspective and presupposition, but a purposeful intention to teach morals through slanted (propagandistic) history.

That does not offend us, because we ultimately argue that that propaganda emanates from God and honors Him, to the denigration of other gods and those who worship them.

5) Dillard:

a. The place to start is at the end of the works, where the editor brings it up the present.

a) Kings ends in the exile

b) Chronicles ends in the post-exilic period (the return to Jerusalem).

b. Theological Motif

We know what must have been going through people's minds at that time. Why? This brings up the issue of centralization, because the answer comes from laws that uniquely in Deuteronomy (thus it is called the Deuteronomic history.):

a) Centralization

1. In Dt 12; every king in Samuel and Kings is judged precisely as to whether they keep this law. 1 Ki 16:15-20 Zimri was judged because he didn't do anything about the golden calves in his seven days.

2. Singleness or Pureness

Wenham and McConville, not singleness of altar but pureness.

b) Laws concerning the king (Dt 17;14f)

c) Laws concerning prophets (Dt 13, 18; Samuel and Kings introduce prophets and show that they were ignored.)

d) Blessings and curses (Dt 28, e.g. v.49f)

c. Why did Samuel/Kings show views of Deuteronomic historian?

Single historian in exile or double redaction in Josiah and in exile?

Concluding voice: Exilic. Why are we here in exile?

Answer #1 Broke the law of centralization and pure worship.

Answer #2 Kings did evil.

Answer #3 Did not hear the divinely inspired prophets.

Answer #4 The prophecy of curses is fulfilled.

d. Term

Some people are uncomfortable with the term "Deuteronomic history," because the liberals used it to mean the book found by Josiah, and actually written at that late time. But even if you find that Deuteronomy was written by Moses, you can still see that the authors of Samuel and Kings might have written their histories with Deuteronomy before them.

e. Distinctiveness of Chronicler from Deuteronomic Historian

a) More positive turn

The Chronicler, on the other hand, put a more positive turn on the material. Lessening concern to sins of Israel, failure of kings. Even Manasseh repented later.

Examples of good kings in the past: Inherent messianism.

b) Exclusion

He also excluded much on the northern kings (Interesting to look at Ahab and Jehoshaphat period in both; in Kings there was a religious crisis because of Jezebel's introduction of Baalism, and the rise of Elijah and Elisha. Chronicler does not mention any of this.

c) Addition

Chronicler mentions temple and cult, has sermons and genealogies.

d) Our task?

The question is, what do we do now, and what is our connection to the Israel of the past?

1. Emphasis on the sins of the kings (in Samuel and Kings) explains why they were in exile, but is unimportant in the connection of the past, rather behavior to be emulated is given.

2. Genealogies shows the continuity, connection to the previous generations.

3. The temple is being rebuilt at this time, and they are doing it the way David and Solomon did it.

4. There is an element of immediate retribution and reward theology, whereas in Kings it may take several generations.

5. Focused on the south (Deuteronomic on south/north)

This is because Kings is showing all the things being built up to lead to the exile (the long-range consequences), while Chronicles is concerned with immediate consequences so they don't make the same mistakes.

f. So these books are sermons, and the text is the historical events (though it is the Kings and Chronicles that are canonical for us).

Kings looks at Abijam and chooses among his options the bad things to highlight.

Chronicles brings out the good things among his deeds and ancestors.

But if our first step had been harmonization, we might have missed the richness of this theological emphasis.

g. Value of harmonization

Yet there is value in harmonization, even though the Bible internally does not emphasize such kind of harmonization (see Dillard's article in the Inerrancy volume, "Harmonization: Help or Hindrance").

Recognize that it is a guess or hypothesis (as evidenced by the fact that there can be several possible good harmonization's of any one question).

Even though it was not a problem for ancient readers, it is a problem with modern readers. They are theological history, not theological mythology. However, keep in mind that Critical scholars see harmonizing as driving the texts

apart, Evangelicals as trying to bring the texts together (see "The Art of Biblical History). Consider what the presuppositions are.

h. They used to think that redactors were clumsy, so you could see their tracks, but others thought that what they did was to smooth out the text.

6) Judges

a. One is struck by the cycles, and the downward spiral.

b. The unity of structure suggests an independent (oral) *Retterbuch* (book of saviors).

c. The recurrent phrases raise the question of what prompted the earlier volume.

a) Two introductory sections came from a later hand, the Deuteronomic editor. The last section is linked by 'in those days there was no king.' These formulae suggest the presence of a particular editor.

b) The period of anarchy is traced to the disorder of anarchy, and it appears sure that 17:1-end was composed when there was a king. This is probably the same reason that the editor included the *Retterbuchap*. He found it applicable, in that the monarchy is the answer to the problem of anarchy.

Judges 17-18: Think about what this book would say at the time of the schism: that the North was idolatrous long before the time of Jeroboam. Perhaps it was written later, since there is mention of 'captivity' (18:30). Jdg 19-21 notes that he is treated royally in Bethlehem, but was abused in Gibeah (AKA 'Gibeah of Saul'). So David's town is safe, Saul's is not.

So the book is a pro-Davidide polemic on one level.

Question: Or was it written during David's reign in Hebron?

Because there are no parallel texts it is hard to be dogmatic.

d. Critique

a) Question: Just because 17-21 are in a different style doesn't mean that they are from a different source?

(Longman is not all that excited about the diachronic dimension, so he thinks you can get all the good stuff from a literary analysis)

Criteria: Difference in style and theology

You can hypothesize such, and call it a 'rule,' but you can't prove it.

They also differentiate based on different theologies or themes.

b) Their assumptions

1. Redactor

This assumes that a redactor is sloppy, and does not harmonize the sources which do not ultimately agree with each other (according to those who have no Inerrancy presupposition).

This also seems to assume that redactors are theologically simple (primitive), and cannot hold themes in tension.

2. Historical-critical mindset

All these evolved out of a historical-critical mindset, which rejected supernaturalism and inspiration.

c) Constructive use

Yet we can still admit that there is a Redactional history in these books.

1. Later inspired editors applied existing materials to their own generation, with theological comment, thus redaction criticism is a valid enterprise, but Noth takes it too far.

2. Theological message

The important goal is to see the theological message of a book. This is seen most clearly in Samuel and Chronicles (along with Judges), but can also be seen in a close reading of the book with redaction-critical methods in mind.

3. Canonical: Our side

Historical criticism says the earlier is better, thus more authoritative but literary criticism says the canonical version is the authoritative one. We sort of reverse the diachronic procedure; e.g., the longer and shorter version of Jeremiah, the longer supersedes, but there is a hypothetical stopping point beyond which nothing can be added.

4. There is a tendency to push these methods to the extreme. It might be more balanced, and not go overboard, if the presuppositions were sound. But even Calvin was taken too far.