The Distinctness of the Samuel Narrative Tradition*

Jürg Hutzli

1. Introduction: The Question

The question whether the book of Samuel is Deuteronomistic implies several distinct questions and problems. Scholars agree that Samuel contains texts with Deuteronomistic themes and language, but such texts are rather rare and are considered late. In comparison with the other books of the presumed "Deuteronomistic History" (DtrH), it is striking that the book of Samuel *lacks a visible Deuteronomistic editorial structure* covering the main part of the book like that in Judges and Kings. Furthermore, the prominent Deuteronomistic themes like the possession of the land (important in Joshua, Kings), the centralization of cult (predominant in Deuteronomy, Kings), or the exclusive veneration of YHWH (see Judges) are either not in the main focus of the book of Samuel or are even totally absent of the book. Nevertheless, the various theories concerning the earliest form of a "Deuteronomistic History" agree in according a place to Samuel within this *oeuvre*, whether it is perceived as a work of a "Nothian" extent (Deuteronomy–Kings) or as a shorter account limited to the history of the kings of Israel and Judah in the main parts of Samuel–Kings. But is the inclusion of Samuel in such an *oeuvre* justified? Given the lack of Deuteronomistic themes and signs of ongoing Deuteronomistic editing, is it imaginable that the first edition of Samuel was "Deuteronomistic"? Is, in the eyes of a Deuteronomistic author, Samuel compatible with Deuteronomy or the Deuteronomistic book of Kings?

* Many thanks to Peter Altmann of Zurich for revising my English and providing valuable feedback.

These questions should be answered by a comparison of the predominant Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic themes found in Deuteronomy–Kings with the theological orientations of the Samuel tradition. Are these themes present in the book of Samuel and, if so, to what extent? Or are they absent? To which redaction layer do they belong? Does the book of Samuel contain texts that are in tension with or even contradict different Deuteronomistic principles?

Notably important in the context of this problem is the question of the literary historical relationship between the book of Samuel and the book of Kings, which has a clearly Deuteronomistic editorial profile and which seems to be the smooth continuation of the book of Samuel. Yet, an indication that the unity of Samuel–Kings is not self-evident is the fact that the genres of the books differ considerably. I shall argue here that the original Deuteronomistic History dealing with kingdoms of Israel and Judah did not include the texts now found in the book of Samuel. In an earlier article I outlined an alternative model for the literary historical relationship between the two books.[1] In the present contribution I will summarize my reflections and supplement them with further arguments. They are centered on the theory concerning a distinctly Deuteronomistic work in Samuel–Kings; yet in many respects the arguments may also be applied to the traditional model of Martin Noth and his followers, which suggests a more extensive DtrH.

The complex problem of the existence, the origin, and the developments of the Deuteronomistic scriptures in the section Deuteronomy–Kings is widely debated. In order to answer the above questions, it is therefore necessary to shed light on the current discussion about the origins and the development of so-called "Deuteronomistic" scriptures in ancient Israel.

2. Some Presuppositions: The Composition of the First Deuteronomistic Scriptures and the Genesis of the Samuel Tradition in Today's Scholarship

Many recent scholars have abandoned the different models of a comprehensive Deuteronomistic History running from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings

1. Jürg Hutzli, "The Literary Relationship between I–II Samuel and I–II Kings: Consideration Concerning the Formation of the Two Books," *ZAW* 122 (2010): 505–19.

in favor of several smaller Deuteronomistic redactions in the section Deuteronomy–Former Prophets. These redactions are limited to only one or two books: Deuteronomy*, Joshua*, or Deuteronomy*–Joshua*, Judges*, Samuel–Kings*.[2] There are indeed important theological differences in Deuteronomy–2 Kings that have to be taken into account. Thus, for example, the idea of cult centralization dominates Deuteronomy and Kings but is lacking in the other books. So, too, Judges blames the people for the apostasy from YHWH, whereas in Kings the disobedient king is held guilty. Additionally, in Judges the predominant actors in Israel's history are those with the charisma of the judges, while in Kings this role is attributed to the creative divine word.[3] This assumption of distinct Deuteronomistic redactions applying only to single books or sections for early Deuteronomistic scribal activity is shared by the present study. A wide-ranging redaction that combines earlier distinct redactions of various sec-

2. See, among others, Iain W. Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 172; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988), 159–60; Claus Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* (TB 87; Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1994); Norbert Lohfink, *"Kerygmata des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks"* in *Die Botschaft und die Boten: Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Jörg Jeremias and Lothar Perlitt; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981); repr., in *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur II.* (SBAB 12; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk 1991), 125–41; Ernst Würthwein, "Erwägungen zum sog. Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk: Eine Skizze," in *Studien zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (BZAW 227; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 1–11; Erik Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OTS 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 362–64; Hartmut N. Rösel, *Von Josua bis Jojachin: Untersuchungen zu den deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments* (VTSup 75; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 71, 75; Ernst A. Knauf, "Does Deuteronomistic History (DtrH) Exist?" in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (ed. Albert de Pury et al.; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 388–98; Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History* (London: T&T Clark, 2005). See also the research summaries in Thomas Römer and Albert de Pury, "Deuteronomistic History (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues," in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (ed. Albert de Pury et al.; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 24–141 (101–4); Timo Veijola, "Deuteronomismusforschung zwischen Tradition und Innovation (III)," *TRu* 68 (2003): 1–44 (24–44).

3. This incongruity is already noted by Gerhard von Rad in his *Old Testament Theology* (trans. David M.G. Stalker; 2 vols.; New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 1:347.

tions should be seen a result of as a *later* development in the exilic or, more probably, the Persian period.[4]

There are important arguments for the composition of the first Deuteronomistic scriptures during the Neo-Assyrian epoch (first editions of Kings, Deuteronomy, and Joshua [or Deuteronomy–Joshua]). Judges probably was later inserted in the collection of Deuteronomistic literature.[5] In all books, additions were made until the Persian period.[6] These additions are partly related to one other and belong to wide-ranging redactions. The various Deuteronomistic redactions have distinct interests and do not treat every Deuteronomistic theme.

Methodologically, the question arises as to how texts can be classified as "Deuteronomistic"[7] or "non-Deuteronomistic."[8] In the current scholarly debate, the use of the term "Deuteronomistic" is rather vague and subjective. After the publication of Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* and the subsequent overwhelming success of his hypothesis of Deuteronomistic Historiography in the 1950s and 60s, the term mainly designated texts belonging to the Deuteronomistic redaction in the Former Prophets.[9] Since the questions concerning the extent and even the existence of a Deuteronomistic History are controversial, this use of the term has become problematic. Different scholars propose starting from the approach of Heinrich Ewald, Abraham Kuenen, and Julius Wellhausen,[10] who applied it to texts in the Former Prophets that they

4. A clue for the existence of such a comprehensive redaction is the chronology with the key date 480 years in 1 Kgs 6:1 (see below 3.8).

5. See Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 90–91.

6. According to Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 178–81, the Deuteronomistic movement disappeared in the time of the editing of the Torah in the Persian period.

7. See Christophe Nihan, "'Deutéronomiste' et 'deutéronomisme': Quelques remarques de méthode en lien avec le débat actuel," in *Congress Volume : Helsinki 2010* (ed. Martti Nissinen; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 408–41.

8. See Cynthia Edenburg, "'Overwriting and Overriding,' or What Is *Not* Deuteronomistic," in *Congress Volume: Helsinki 2010* (ed. Martti Nissinen; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 443–60.

9. Nevertheless, the term was also used for Deuteronomistic texts, for example, in the Tetrateuch, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

10. Heinrich Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus (6 vols.; Göttingen: Dieterich, 1843), 1:196–200; Abraham Kuenen, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des alten Testaments hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung und Sammlung: Die historischen Bücher des alten Testaments* (Leipzig: Schulze, 1890), 90; Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963), 294–300.

considered to have been influenced by the book of Deuteronomy. Thus, the point of orientation is the book of Deuteronomy itself. One might object to this approach by pointing to the possibility that certain scriptures with a marked "Deuteronomistic" ideology existed even before the emergence of Deuteronomy and then influenced later biblical authors. Such a possibility exists, especially for the book of Kings. Certain authors proposed that an early, Deuteronomistic ("proto-Deuteronomistic") book of Kings was produced before Deuteronomy.[11] Also significant for this terminological problem is the possibility that the preexilic book of Deuteronomy was already supplemented by a form of the book of Joshua. "Deuteronomistic" texts should therefore be defined as entities which stylistically and theologically parallel passages of the book of Deuteronomy and certain "proto-Deuteronomistic" texts and have been influenced by them. The application of this definition questions the classification of certain texts as Deuteronomistic. For instance, the oracle in 1 Sam 2:27–36 about the rejection of the Levites actually contradicts the Deuteronomy's positive attitude toward the Levites, while the polemically antimonarchical texts 1 Sam 8:7; 10:19; 12:6–25 conflict the view of the Deuteronomis-

11. Ronald E. Clements, "The Deuteronomic Law of Centralisation and the Catastrophe of 587 B.C.," in *After the Exile: Essays in Honour of Rex Mason* (Macon, Ga.:Mercer University Press, 1996), 5–12 (13–14); Konrad Schmid, "Das Deuteronomium innerhalb der 'deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke' in Gen–2Kön," in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (ed. Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach; FRLANT 206, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 193–211 (205 n. 53). This argument concerns the different formulations of the call for cult centralization, which appears predominantly in both books. Because the phraseology of the book of Kings (about "the sin of Jeroboam," who created illegitimate sanctuaries in the north) does not contain any elements of the formula in Deuteronomy (במקום אשר־יבחר יהוה ["the place which YHWH will choose"]; see 12:14, 18; 14:23 and passim), Schmid ("Deuteronomium," 205 n. 53) argues that the latter was unknown by the author of the early Kings edition. If this author was acquainted with Deuteronomy, he would have adopted the formulation of the law text of Deuteronomy. Against this argument, it might be stated that the author contributing to the distinct *genre* of Kings could have felt free to create his own formulation instead of adopting the phraseology from Deuteronomy. Worthy of consideration is also the opinion of Nihan ("'Deutéronomiste' et 'deutéronomisme,'" 431–32), who argues that the different formulations point to two distinct *milieux producteurs* (but not necessarily to different temporal settings).

tic book of Kings (which did not include 2 Kgs 24–25).[12] If one continues to label them "Deuteronomistic," then one should specify just how they are "Deuteronomistic" and clarify their relationship to the "initial" Deuteronomistic writings.

The question of the literary and historical setting of the book of Samuel is also debated. According to the current model, the book of Samuel gradually grew over a long period of time. The individual stories that may have originated as oral tradition were written down and afterwards combined with other stories that had achieved literary form. Later on, these compositions were merged together to form larger entities (e.g., "Ark Narrative," "History of David's Rise," "Court History"). Still later the narrative blocks were combined and, as final step, integrated with the preexilic book of Kings by the Deuteronomist.[13]

This model has been questioned by scholars for social, historical, and literary reasons. It is doubtful that extensive literary works were composed in the eighth century or before. According to recent estimations, literacy began to become moderately widespread only in the eighth to seventh centuries B.C.E., and this development stemmed from the administrative needs of the formative state in Judah.[14] Another objection was advanced by John Van Seters,[15] who pointed to tensions between certain theological characteristics in the book of Samuel and main features of Deuteronomistic theology. Van Seters proposes that the earliest layer of the book of

12. According to Edenburg ("Overwriting and Overriding," 447), an idiom can only be considered Deuteronomistic when corresponding to Deuteronomistic ideology and concepts. Compositions using Deuteronomistic language but deviating from Deuteronomistic conventions should be classified as "non-Deuteronomistic."

13. See the overview of the state of research in Walter Dietrich, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.* (trans. Joachim Vette; SBLBE 3; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 227–62.

14. See the fundamental work by David W. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-archaeological Approach* (JSOTSup 109; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), whose conclusions were accepted by Philip Davies, *In Search of "Ancient Israel"* (JSOTSup 109; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 69; Thomas Thompson, *Early History of the Israelite People from the Written and Archaeological Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 333–34; Israel Finkelstein, "State Formation in Israel and Judah: A Contrast in Context, A Contrast in Trajectory," *NEA* 62 (1999): 35–52 (39).

15. For his most recent view, see John Van Seters, *The Biblical Sage of King David* (Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 2009). For my own similar yet not identical position, see "Literary Relationship," 508–13, and the discussion below.

Samuel was composed by the Deuteronomist and was then supplemented with large additions that subvert the Deuteronomist's positive view of David and the monarchy in general. However, against Van Seters's argument for a relatively late origin for the Samuel tradition, several recent works argue convincingly for the relative antiquity of some parts or even the main body of the Samuel tradition.[16] First, there are geographical names which are important in the book of Samuel but lose their significance by the postexilic period. The most striking example is the Philistine city of Gath.[17] Like Gath, the places Jabesh-gilead (1 Sam 11; 31), Beth-Shan (1 Sam 31:10, 12; 2 Sam 21:12), and Mahanaim (2 Sam 2:8, 12, 29; 17:24, 27; 19:33) are quite important in the book of Samuel but are of little or no significance in later biblical texts.[18] An important clue to the relative antiquity of the Samuel tradition is also found in the descriptions of sanctuaries and cultic procedures (see 1 Sam 2:13–14; 9:22–24), which do not conform to the later postexilic normative legislation. It seems improbable that stories containing such peculiar and archaic motifs would be *invented* in the postexilic period. They more likely stem from preexilic time and preserve some credible historical reminiscences.[19]

16. E.g., Baruch Halpern, *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 57–72; Walter Dietrich and Stefan Münger, "Die Herrschaft Sauls und der Norden Israels" in *Saxa loquentur: Studien zur Archäologie Palästinas/Israels: Festschrift für Volkmar Fritz zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Cornelis den Hertog et ali; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003), 39–59 (53); Israel Finkelstein and Neil A. Silberman, "Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology," *JSOT* 30 (2006): 259–85.

17. Until the ninth century, this town seemed to play the leading role in Philistine *pentapolis*, a role clearly reflected in the book of Samuel. See 1 Sam 5:8; 6:17; 17:4, 23, 52; 21:11, 13; 27; 2 Sam 1:20; 15:18; 21:20, 22; 1 Kgs 2:39–41. The town later loses its importance and is no longer mentioned among the Philistine towns (which now form a *tetrapolis*). Recent archaeological excavations in Tell es-Safi show evidence confirming the biblical statement that Gath was conquered by Hazael in the middle of the ninth century B.C.E. (see 2 Kgs 12:18), and it appears that the town was destroyed in the late ninth century B.C.E. (see Aren M. Maeir and Carl S. Ehrlich, "Excavating Philistine Gath: Have We Found Goliath's Hometown?" *BAR* 27 (2001): 22–31 [29–31]). Amos 6:2 probably provides an allusion to this event. See also William M. Schniedewind, "The Geopolitical History of Philistine Gath," *BASOR* 309 (1998): 69–77 (73–75).

18. See Dietrich and Münger, "Herrschaft Sauls und der Norden Israels," 53.

19. Of course, this view does not extend to all texts now assembled in the book of Samuel. For several compositions, there are clear indications of a later date of origin in

3. Main Deuteronomistic Themes and Samuel

In the following I shall briefly outline the typical identifying features of Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic texts in Joshua–Kings in order to establish applicable criteria for answering the question concerning Deuteronomism in Samuel. The choice of themes is primarily oriented to the presumably earliest Deuteronomistic redactions of Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Kings.

I shall first investigate whether these themes are present in the book of Samuel and discuss their age and provenance. Are they deeply rooted in the Samuel narrative tradition, or do they belong to a secondary redactional layer? If the second possibility is more likely, then to which Deuteronomistic (or post-Deuteronomistic) redaction should one ascribe the text? Does it belong to an early preexilic redaction or to a later redaction that covers several books? A further step consists of the comparison of the Deuteronomistic theme with operative theological ideas of the stories of the book of Samuel.

3.1. Cult Centralization

Cult centralization is rightly seen as the guiding principle in Deuteronomy and in the book of Kings and should be attributed to oldest strata of these books. The oldest form of this principle in Deuteronomy is probably found in 12:13–19.[20] Several texts in Deuteronomy refer to this stipulation, particularly within the law corpus in chapters 12–26.[21] In the book of Kings, the principle of cult centralization is generally expressed in the regnal formulae of the kings of Israel and Judah in a negative fashion. The formulae for the kings of Israel refer to the "sin of Jeroboam" in establishing and maintaining rival Yahwistic sanctuaries in Bethel and Dan, while the formulae concerning the kings of Judah state that all of the kings,

the Neo-Babylonian, Persian, or even Hellenistic period. These texts are mostly attributed either to a late Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronomistic stratum.

20. See among others Thomas Römer, "Cult Centralization in Deuteronomy 12: Between Deuteronomistic History and Pentateuch," in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (ed. Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achtenbach; FRLANT 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 2004), 168–80.

21. Deut 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21; 12:26; 14:23, 24, 25; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16; 17:8, 10, 15; 18:6; 23:17; 26:2; 31:11.

excepting Hezekiah and Josiah, abrogated this law by tolerating the practice of sacrifice at במות (*bāmôt*).This theme appears only rarely in the later Deuteronomistic layers within the books of the Former Prophets (and those of the Pentateuch and the Prophets as well) and thus apparently lost its importance.[22] In Samuel, this principle is only alluded to once and is otherwise absent. Moreover, the content of several stories stands in tension with this doctrine.

According to McCarter and Van Seters, the idea of cult centralization is found in the background of 2 Sam 6–7.[23] The transport of the ark to Jerusalem by David (2 Sam 6) is seen by these scholars as the first step towards the centralization of the cult. David's desire to build a temple for YHWH (2 Sam 7) is the second step. In my opinion, these texts only provide one clear allusion to the theme of cult centralization in 2 Sam 7:1, 11, where the motif of the rest from the enemies in (נוח *hiphil* + אויב) clearly refers to Deut 12:10: "When you cross the Jordan and live in the land which YHWH your God is giving you to inherit, and he gives you rest from all your enemies around you so that you live in security" (ועברתם את־הירדן וישבתם בארץ אשר־יהוה אלהיכם מנחיל אתכם והניח לכם מכל־איביכם מסביב וישבתם־בטח). The author of 2 Sam 7:1, 11 suggests that the prophecy of Deut 12:10 became reality after David conquered Jerusalem (see 2 Sam 7:1b) and in a more definitive way in the time of David's succession by Solomon (see 2 Sam 7:11).[24] However, in my view it is questionable whether these verses belong to the original account of 2 Sam 7. The opening statement in 2 Sam 7:1 provides a problematic motive for David's wish to build a house for YHWH, since David never does achieve rest during his reign. More likely, David's wish arises from his new residence in Jerusalem: since David lives in a house of cedar, he wishes to offer the deity a similarly luxurious "home." The double motif of rest from the enemies is

22. The assertion that YHWH "has chosen Jerusalem to put his name" (1 Kgs 11:36; 14:21; 2 Kgs 21:7; 2 Kgs 23:27; see also 1 Kgs 11:32), which is related to similar assertions in Deuteronomy (see 12:11, 21; 14:24), is later than the statements concerning cult centralization in the regnal formulae.

23. P. Kyle McCarter Jr., *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB 9; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984), 217–18; John Van Seters, "The Court History and DtrH," in *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids. Neue Einsichten und Anfragen* (ed. Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer; OBO 176; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 70–93 (72).

24. The expression והניחתי לך in 2 Sam 7:11 should be understood as a consecutive perfect (*wĕqāṭal*).

not a necessary element of the story in 2 Sam 7 and could well have been added in order to refer to Deut 12:10 and related verses.[25] It is noteworthy that nowhere in the wider context of the story of 2 Sam 7 (and as far I am concerned, in the book of Samuel) is the motif of cult centralization present. In particular, *there is no statement either about the divine election of Jerusalem as only legitimate place for the worship or about David's intention to centralize the cult.* In this respect, it is noteworthy that other sacred sites are also mentioned without any negative undertone in the sections following the chapters about David's conquest of Jerusalem and the transfer of the ark. According to 2 Sam 15:32, David himself worships God outside of Jerusalem. The king also allows others to do so. For example, Absalom receives permission from his father to fulfill a vow in Hebron which he previously vowed there (15:7–9). The fact that the allusion to Deut 12 in 2 Sam 7:1b, 11 is the sole allusion to the cult centralization law in the book of Samuel supports the likelihood that these verses are secondary.

Furthermore it is interesting to note that the authors of the book of Samuel seem to distinguish between distinct geographical manifestations of YHWH.[26] The YHWH of Shiloh is not the same as the YHWH of Gilgal or Hebron. While 1 Sam 1:3 mentions "YHWH *ṣĕbā'ôt* in Shiloh" (ליהוה צבאות בשלה), we find in 1 Sam 11:15 and 15:33 the notion of "YHWH in Gilgal" (יהוה בגלגל) and in 2 Sam 15:7 the allusion to "Yahweh in Hebron" (יהוה בחברון).

A literary approach might explain these place names as a means to shape the setting for the action, without any reference to a local manifestation of YHWH. However, if this were so, then we should not expect a second mention of Gilgal in 1 Sam 11:15, just six words after the first occurrence of the toponym. So, too, in 2 Sam 15:7, the fact that Absalom made his vow in Geshur shows that the mention of "Hebron" does not designate the place of the action. Instead, it specifies a local manifestation

25. In my view, Deut 12:10 is related first of all to a set of texts in Deuteronomy and Joshua (Deut 3:20; 25:19; Josh 1:13, 15; 21:44; 22:4; 23:1). According to these texts, the Transjordan tribes achieved their heritage and "rest" in a first stage of conquest, and only afterwards did the Cisjordian tribes reach the same goal under Joshua's guidance. These texts probably address the situation of the exiled Israelites. Second Samuel 7:1, 11, and 1 Kgs 5:18 are part of a later redaction layer. It is noteworthy that 1 Chr 17 does not allude to the theme of "rest"; the lack of the motif, however, probably is due to a deliberate omission (v. 17:1) and a word substitution (v. 17:10).

26. On this point, see also McCarter, *II Samuel*, 356.

of the deity. On the basis of these two examples, I am inclined to adopt the same meaning for the two others instances as well. Furthermore, foreign deities bear similar designations, such as "Dagon in Ashdod" (1 Sam 5:5) and "Ashtarte in Sidon" in an Ammonite inscription.[27]

Moreover, it is noteworthy that one finds several texts in the book of Samuel that demonstrate a positive interest in various cult places and their procedures. According to the first four chapters of Samuel, the temple of Shiloh functioned as a regional cult center. The first two chapters of the book describe the distinct customs of the old YHWH sanctuary in detail. A peculiarity of the cult described in Shiloh consists in the "annual sacrifice" (זבח הימים). This celebration is mentioned only once again in 1 Sam 20:6 where Jesse's clan holds an "annual sacrifice" in Bethlehem. During the celebration in Shiloh, the *pater familias* distributes meat to every member of his family. "Eating in Shiloh" (e.g., 1 Sam 1:9) seems to have been a *terminus technicus* for a sacrificial meal. In addition to Shiloh, we hear of sanctuaries in Mizpah (1 Sam 7:6; 10:17), Bethel (1 Sam 10:3), Gilgal (1 Sam 11:15; 13:8), Nob (1 Sam 21), and Hebron (2 Sam 5:3; 15:7–9). Samuel and Saul are also reported to have built altars for YHWH (1 Sam 7:17, 14:35). In 1 Sam 9, Samuel invites Saul to a cultic meal upon the high place near a town.

This plurality of Yahwistic cult places in the book of Samuel stands in noticeable tension to the doctrine of cult centralization, which is of central significance in the books of Deuteronomy and Kings. Although one might argue that the mention of a variety of cult sites in the book of Samuel would not necessarily irritate a Deuteronomistic author since the Temple had not yet been built, I think that we should expect the Deuteronomist(s) to add explanatory-apologetic remarks like those found in 1 Kgs 3:2–3[28] if the ideology of cult centralization was indeed inherent to a Deuteronomistic narrative in Samuel. However, no such apologies are to be found.

27. See Nahman Avigad, "Two Phoenician Votive Seals," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 243–51 (247–51 and illustration 26), and McCarter, *II Samuel*, 356. For a further biblical example, see Ps 99:2: "Yhwh in Zion." See Matthias Köckert, "YHWH in the Northern and Sothern Kingdom," in *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (ed. Reinhard Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann; BZAW 405; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 357–94 (387).

28. 1 Kgs 3:2: "Only the people sacrificed in high places, because there was no house built unto the name of YHWH, until those days." 1 Kgs 3:3: "And Solomon loved YHWH, walking in the statutes of David his father: only he sacrificed and burnt incense in high places." See also 1 Kgs 22:44; 2 Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4; 15:35a.

3.2. Demand of Passionate, Exclusive Adherence to YHWH and Polemic against Foreign Gods

A prominent feature of Deuteronomistic literature is the call for exclusive adherence to YHWH, which appears regularly throughout most of the books. In the book of Kings, this claim is directed primarily towards the king. In the other books, the command is addressed towards the people.[29] In the book of Samuel, however, this demand occurs but rarely and usually in conjunction with antimonarchical polemic (1 Sam 7:3–4; 8:7–9a, 18; 10:18aγb–19a; and 12:7–25).[30]

Generally, the book of Samuel presents YHWH as the only god of Israel, and we never encounter the veneration of another deity by the Israelites.[31] In fact, with the exception of the few passages above, there is *no polemic* against other gods. Accordingly, due to the style and uncommon expression in these verses, they are frequently thought to be late nomistic (DtrN) insertions. While YHWH is present in the book of Samuel, he remains mostly in the background. Some stories do not even mention him (1 Sam 31; 2 Sam 13); others contain only scant and discrete allusions to him (for instance, in 1 Sam 1:5, 19; 2:21; 4:3, 11:13; 14:6, 12). The deity seems not to be as demanding as in Deuteronomy and in the book of Kings, and one does not find any demand of "love" of YHWH or passionate veneration of the deity. Instead, adherence to him seems rather a matter of fact.

29. See already Gerhard von Rad, "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings," in *Studies in Deuteronomy* (trans. David Stalker; SBT 9; London: SCM Press, 1953), 74–91 (347); Nihan, " 'Deutéronomiste' et 'deutéronomisme,' " 421.

30. See Timo Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (AASF B.198; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977), 30–38, 57, 83–84; Juha Pakkala, *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History* (PFES 76; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999), 148–49; Walter Dietrich, *1 Samuel 1–12* (BKAT 8.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2003–), 316–17, 359–61, 460–62, 532–34.

31. It is striking that some personal and geographical names contain the name "Baal." It is not clear if it represents the proper name of the deity or is a title equivalent to "lord." In the second case, the expression might refer to YHWH. In any event, the name is evoked without any polemical undertone and only was changed at a post-Chronistic stage.

3.3 The Theme of the Land

The theme of the conquest or possession of the land is central to Deuteronomy and Joshua. The loss of the land already plays a role in the first edition of the book of Kings (see 2 Kgs 17). The importance of this concept increases in the exilic edition of Kings and in later layers of Deuteronomy and Joshua as well. The theme of the land is one that comes to bind the three books together.[32] While Deuteronomy offers the promise of the land, the book of Joshua reports its successful conquest, and the book of Kings relates its loss.

In Deuteronomy, the term נחלה indicates the land YHWH grants Israel. By contrast, 1 Sam 26:19–20, 2 Sam 20:19, and 21:3 employ a unique expression (נחלת יהוה) that represents the land of Israel as "inheritance of YHWH."[33] In 1 Sam 26:19–20, YHWH seems to be the owner of the land as the "god of the territory." The same idea is also expressed in 2 Sam 20:19–20.[34] This idea is not connected in any way to the occurrences of נחלה in Deuteronomy and Joshua. According to the latter's conception of Israel, it is Israel who owns the land as a result of the conquest of the land.[35] Interestingly enough, we never hear in the book of Samuel that Israel *conquered* the land. Even the late text of 1 Sam 12 does not include the conquest motif or the figure of Joshua in its historical review. The only allusion to the conquest of the land appears in the late story of 2 Sam 21:1–14 (see v. 2: "the remnant of the Amorites").[36]

32. See Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 116.

33. Jürg Hutzli, "Nähe zu David, Nähe zu Jhwh: Fremdstämmige in den Davidererzählungen," in *Seitenblicke: Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch* (ed. Walter Dietrich; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2011), 71–90 (84–85). Besides these three texts in the book of Samuel, the expression נחלת יהוה occurs only in Ps 127:3, but here it refers to children.

34. In 1 Sam 10:1, however, the expression refers to Israel as YHWH's congregation.

35. See Deut 4:21, 38; 12:9; 15:4; 19:10; 24:4; 25: 19; 26:1; Josh 11:23.

36. Verse 2b is considered a secondary insertion by some commentators. See Timo Veijola, "David und Meribaal," *RB* 85 (1978): 338–58 (351–52), and already August Klostermann, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige* (KKAT 3; Nördlingen: Beck, 1887), 168; Karl Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel* (KHC 8; Tübingen: Mohr, 1902), 234; Henry P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898), 374. However, without verse 2b (and Josh 9 in the background) the motif of the (attempted) annihilation of the Gibeonites by Saul "hangs in the air" and is hard to be explained. There are indications, however, that the

3.4. The Attitude toward the Autochthonous Population of the "Promised Land"

The motif of the conquest of the land is connected with the expulsion or annihilation of the autochthonous peoples in the land in a certain Deuteronomistic strand (see Exod 33:2; 34:11; Deut 7:1, 16, 23; 20:17; Josh 3:10; 2 Kgs 17:8; 21:2, 9). Because of their adherence to other deities, they are a threat to Israel (Exod 23:33; 34:12; Deut 7:16, 25; Josh 23:13; Judg 2:3). Having conquered the land, Israel is not allowed to make covenants with them (Exod 23:32; 34:12, 15; Deut 7:2). The secondary nature of the *herem* texts in the book of Deuteronomy is widely acknowledged and is made evident by the conflict between Deut 20:15–18 and its context in the war law.[37] The wide distribution of texts that promote a hostile attitude towards the autochthonous population (in Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, and Kings) indicates their relatively late origin.[38]

The book of Samuel does not reflect any opposition between Israelites and "foreigners" living in the "land." The single exception is the story in 2 Sam 21:1–14, which presumes a conflict between Saul and the Gibeonites, and it probably stems from the Persian period.[39] The book of Samuel identifies aliens as non-Israelites frequently through the use of the *gentilicium* (for Israelites, it is used only in exceptional cases).[40] These non-Israelites stem from within Palestine (Hittites, Jebusites, Archites) and from outside (Philistines, Aramaens). They seem to be well integrated, often playing important roles in the narrative. The Hittites Abimelech (1 Sam 26:6) and Uriah (2 Sam 11–12; 23:39) are elite soldiers in David's army.[41] Ittai the Gittite even serves as one of David's generals in the war against Absalom. Obed-Edom is another Gittite who plays a significant role by caring for the ark at a very critical time, and in reward, he is blessed by the deity (2 Sam 6:10–12). Before the battle against Absalom, David's men are supplied with food by "Shobi the son of Nahash from Rabbah of the sons of Ammon, Machir the son of Ammiel from Lo-debar, and Barzillai the Gileadite from Rogelim" (2 Sam 17:27). Another striking feature is the fact that non-Israelites swear by the name of Israel's deity (in 1 Sam 29:6; 2 Sam 15:19–20), indicating that they recognized YHWH.[42] This predominantly

---

entire story is a late scribal composition. See Jürg Hutzli, "L'exécution de sept descendants de Saül par les Gabaonites (2 S 21,1–14): Place et fonction du récit dans les livres de Samuel," *Transeu* 40 (2011): 83–96.

37. See Martin Rose, *5. Mose 12–25: Einführung und Gesetze* (vol. 1 of *5. Mose*; ZBK 5.1; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1994), 237–52; Eduard Nielsen, *Deuteronomium* (HAT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 199; Walter Dietrich, *"Niedergang und Neuanfang: Die Haltung der Schlussredaktion des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes zu den wichtigsten Fragen ihrer Zeit,"* in *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times* (ed. Bob Becking and Marjo Korpel; OTS 42; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 45–70 (51, 59–60); Richard D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox: 2002), 246–47; Cynthia Edenburg, "The Chicken or the Egg? Joshua 9 and Deuteronomy: An Intertextual Conundrum," in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Raymond Person and Konrad Schmid; FAT 2/56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 115–133 (120–21).

38. The attitude of Deuteronomy towards foreigners is not univocal, since there is also a strand of texts demanding care and relief for the foreign sojourner. See Deut 10:18–19; 14:29; 24:14.

39. On the late origin of the story, see Hutzli, "Exécution de sept descendants de Saül." This story presupposes Josh 9 and related texts in Deuteronomy (Deut 20:15–18; 7:1–2). On the relation between Josh 9 and Deut 20:15–18; 7:1–2, see Edenburg, "The Chicken or the Egg?" 121–22. Following Edenburg's analysis of Josh 9, one might also imagine 2 Sam 21 depending on an earlier, now-lost Deuteronomistic version of the account of Josh 9.

40. Hutzli, "Nähe zu David, Nähe zu Jhwh," 74–76. For instance, in 2 Sam 11–12 the *gentilicium* "Hittite" occurs no less than seven times, while Hushai, David's counselor, is called four times "Archite"; for his antipode Ahithophel, the *gentilicium* "Gilonite" (a Judahite) is used only once. Also, in Ugaritic literature the *gentilicium* is used in order to distinguish foreigners from natives. See Pierre Bordreuil, "A propos des pays de Kanaan," in *Carthage et les autochtones de son empire du temps de Zama, colloque international organisé à Siliana et Tunis du 10 au 13 mars 2004: Hommage à Mahmed Hassine Fantar* (ed. Ahmed Ferjaoui; Tunis, Institut national du patrimoine, 2010), 27–30.

41. "Hittites" is used as a general term for Canaanites by Deuteronomistic texts, P, the Table of Nations (Gen 10:15, post-P), and Neo-Assyrian texts. See John Van Seters, "The Terms 'Amorite' and 'Hittite' in the Old Testament," *VT* 22 (1971): 64–81. However, certain biblical texts use the *gentilicium* differently: 1 Kgs 10:29 and 2 Kgs 7:6 probably refer to the small Neo-Hittite states in Syria that are well known from extra-biblical sources from the end of the second millennium to the time of Shalmaneser III in the ninth century B.C.E. The *gentilicium* "Hittite" in the book of Samuel also seems to be used in this sense. Samuel refers to Canaanites by their local designations (e.g., Jebusites, Archites), and in the texts of 1 Sam 26:6 (Ahimelek) and 2 Sam 11–12 (Uriah), there are no indications favoring such generalized use of "Hittite" for Caananites. For this reason McCarter's (*II Samuel*, 285–86) view that Uriah is designated as a descendant of one of the small Neo-Hittite states in Syria seems probable.

42. See also the astonishing feature of 1 Sam 4:6–9 (LXX) where the Philistines pray to YHWH during the battle against Israel.

positive image of the non-Israelites in Samuel stands in marked contrast to the hostility towards the autochthonous nations in certain texts of Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic literature.

3.5. David as the Ideal King (the Book of Kings)

A further criterion for judging Israelite and Judean kings in the book of Kings consists in the degree to which a king lives up to the ideal model of David. Three formulae are in use: (1) David's "heart was wholly devoted to YHWH" (ולבבו שלם עם יהוה; see 1 Kgs 11:4; 15:3). (2) He "did the right in the eyes of YHWH (ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה; see 1 Kgs 14:8; 15:5, 11; 2 Kgs 14:3; 16:2; 18:3; 22:2). (3) "He did not turn aside (from anything that YHWH commanded him)" (ולא־סר; see 1 Kgs 15:5; 2 Kgs 22:2). The question arises as to whether these phrases all belong to the same redactional level and whether they are (all) part of the oldest Deuteronomistic regnal formulae.[43]

The criteria for comparison in the book of Kings is very general, and concrete achievements of David are nowhere reported. In particular, we note the complete lack of allusions to the exploits of David reported in the book of Samuel. On the other hand, the book of Samuel and the first two chapters of Kings refer in very detailed manner to David's actions and life. They paint an ambiguous and sometimes even dark picture of David. The unequivocal positive judgment of David found throughout Kings is nowhere evident in Samuel.

Samuel's David commits adultery with Bathsheba and orders the murder of Uriah (2 Sam 11) and remains passive toward the crimes of his sons Amnon and Absalom (rape of Tamar by Amnon and Absalom's murder of Amnon in 2 Sam 13). Problematic in the eyes of a Deuteronomist would also have been David's stay at Nob, where he demands the holy

43. Most scholars are assuming this for most of the texts. See Erik Aurelius, *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (BZAW 319; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 25; Felipe Blanco Wißmann, *"Er tat das Rechte...": Beurteilungskriterien und Deuteronomismus in 1Kön 12–2Kön 25* (ATANT 93; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2008), 58. Helga Weippert, "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher," *Bib* 53 (1972): 301–39 (314, 331), believes that the David theme was absent in her first "proto-Deuteronomistic," very limited edition of Kings. However, according to her analysis the comparisons with David occur in the second, "Josianic" redaction layer (see 323–33, particularly 327).

bread (לחם קדש; see 1 Sam 21) by way of a disingenuous explanation,[44] as well as his collaboration with the Philistines (in 1 Sam 27).[45]

In contrast to Van Seters, who emphasizes these obviously divergent and contradicting views of David, I do not consider the portrait of David in the book of Samuel absolutely negative.[46] Positive descriptions of David are found throughout the "History of David's Rise" and may even be found in the so-called Court History (see for instance David's clever actions after the *putsch* by his son Absalom).[47] The multifaceted picture of David challenges Van Seters's assumption that many stories commonly attributed to the HDR and the entire Court History were invented by an author who intended to darken the image of David and to promote an antimonarchic program.

44. According to Robert P. Gordon, "In Search of David: The David Tradition in Recent Study," in *Faith, Tradition and History: Old Testament Historiography in its Near Eastern Context* (ed. A. Alan Ralph Millard et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 285–98 (290), David is depicted as a "lying schemer." It is not clear that David's attitude is seen as negative *by the author of the tale* (see also the estimation of Mark 2:23–28). A Deuteronomist, however, could hardly be interested in showing David as a liar before the high priest and perhaps also as a transgressor of law (if a law like Lev 24:5–9 was normative for the temple of Jerusalem in preexilic times).

45. Concerning the latter, we do not know David's real intentions. However, contra the common explanation that David, at every stage of this relationship, is playing a game with the Philistines, David Jobling, "David and the Philistines: With Methodological Reflections," in *David und Saul im Widerstreit: Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit: Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches* (ed. Walter Dietrich; OBO 206; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg), 74–85 (82), rightly states that this interpretation does not work for chapters 27–30, "because the success of any deep 'game' that David might be playing in these chapters is out of his own hands. He has made his fate depend entirely on decisions to be made by the Philistine leaders."

46. John Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 277–91; idem, "Court History and DtrH"; idem, *Biblical Saga of King David*.

47. See also Erhard Blum, "Ein Anfang der Geschichtsschreibung? Anmerkungen zur sog. Thronfolgegeschichte und zum Umgang mit Geschichte im alten Israel," in *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids: Neue Einsichten und Anfrage* (ed. Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer; OBO 176; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2000), 4–37 (33).

3.6. The Promise of an Eternal Dynasty for David

Nathan's promise of an eternal dynasty for David (2 Sam 7) is often viewed as central text within Deuteronomistic History.[48] However, as Noth rightly saw, the motif of the rejection of David's plan to construct the temple makes it unlikely that the composition was written by a Deuteronomistic author.[49] The wording of the promise has limited resonance in the books of Samuel and Kings: the allusions to the notion that YHWH will "build a steadfast house" for David (see 2 Sam 7:11, 16) occur only in 1 Sam 25:28, 1 Kgs 2:24, 11:38.

In the book of Kings, the notion of the eternal dynasty is also expressed through the metaphor that David will always have a "lamp" (נִיר) in Jerusalem (see 1 Kgs 11:36; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19). Most scholars understand this formulation to refer to Nathan's oracle.[50] But an indication that there are different authors for the text of 2 Sam 7, on the one hand, and for the three occurrences of the phrase "lamp for David" in the book of Kings, on the other hand, is the lack of the term נִיר in 2 Sam 7.[51]

Another formulation is the conditional promise that David "shall not lack a man on the throne of Israel, if his sons are careful of their way" (see 1 Kgs 2:4; 8:25; 9:5).

Related to the theme of the Davidic dynasty is the notion that David was divinely designated as "ruler (נָגִיד) over Israel" (see 1 Sam 13:14; 25:30; 2 Sam 5:2; 6:21; 7:8). This attribute stems from a redactional layer covering Samuel and Kings and is applied not only to David, but also to the divine election and rejection of Saul, Solomon, Jeroboam and Baasha.[52]

48. Von Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 85; Frank Moore Cross, "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274–89 (281).

49. See Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 18; Halle: Niemeyer, 1943), 64. But there are clear traces of Deuteronomistic reworking of the composition (see above).

50. See von Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology," 85; Cross, "Themes of the Book of Kings," 281.

51. In 2 Sam 21:17, the metaphor of "lamp" is also connected with David, but the notion is different.

52. These texts were analyzed thoroughly by Veijola and identified as belonging to "DtrH" (Deuteronomistic Historian) or "DtrN" (Nomistic editor). See Timo Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (AASF B.193; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975), 47–80. He concludes that only the two occurrences concerning Saul (1 Sam 9:16, 10:1) belong to older layers of the text. If so, a redactor picked up the traditional formulation concerning Saul and applied it first of all to David but also to Solomon, Jeroboam, and Baasha. In several instances, the verses fit awkwardly in their contexts and are therefore judged to be secondary addition by scholars. Several texts in the book of Samuel that deal with David's election (2 Sam 3:9–10; 3:17–19; 5:1–2) also seem to be similar to this layer. Closely related to 1 Sam 13:13–14 are the passages 1 Sam 15:27–28; 28:17–19aα that combine the motif of David's election with Saul's rejection. Furthermore, these texts are closely linked with Ahijah's oracle (see 1 Kgs 11:31 with 15:28; 28:17b). Most scholars accept that all these texts in the book of Samuel should be traced to a (very) late layer of the narrative. According to Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (transl. John Bowden; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 173, it already "presupposes the combination of Samuel–Kings with the Hexateuch."

In short, we note that the promise of an eternal dynasty for David in Samuel and Kings is represented in markedly different ways. Some of the formulations deal with an unconditional promise. One layer, however, places emphasis on the conditional character of the promise (1 Kgs 2:4; 8:25; 9:5). One distinct formulation (with the keyword "ruler [נָגִיד] over Israel") occurs in both Samuel and Kings, a fact which is of some significance for the question of the literary relation between the two books.[53] Striking is the fact that the wording of Nathan's promise (v. 11) rarely occurs in either Samuel or Kings. There is no indication that the limited references to Nathan's oracle in Kings are connected to the first Deuteronomistic redaction of Kings. Instead they were probably composed later on, after the merging of Samuel and Kings.[54]

3.7. The Obedience to the Law

Deuteronomy emphasizes throughout the importance of the observance of YHWH's stipulations. This theme also appears quite often in the books Joshua, Judges, and Kings. Scholars agree that these texts come from late Deuteronomistic layers.[55]

53. See below 4.4.

54. See below 4.4.

55. The followers of the Göttingen school label them as either DtrN (nomistic Deuteronomist) or DtrP (Deuteronomistic prophetic redaction).

While the book of Samuel does reflect a certain ethos in some sections (e.g., 1 Sam 30:25; 2 Sam 11:27; 13:12) and accords a role to specific cultic stipulations (e.g., 1 Sam 2:13–14; 3:2–3; 9:22–24; 14:32–35, 21:3–7), these often differ from those of Deuteronomy. In all, there is far less emphasis on cultic observance in Samuel. One has the impression that offenses are represented as rare exceptional irregularities (e.g., the offense of Eli's sons in 1 Sam 2:15–17) and that beside these occurrences the observance of the law was the rule. Likewise, the motif of accurate obedience of the divine statutes never appears. Remarkably, the assertion that "YHWH was with David" ("May YHWH be with David") (1 Sam 16:18; 17:37; 18:12, 14, 28; 20:13; 2 Sam 5:10) is not connected with David's obedience to the law.

In some instances, individuals (Eli's sons, Saul, David) are blamed for offenses whose consequences reverberate for several generations in a fashion similar to the Deuteronomistic scheme of retribution.[56] However, in all of these cases, there are good arguments for attributing these verses to a late Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronomistic layer, since they often disturb the plot of the narrative.

3.8. Structuring of Time and the Use of Dynastic/Regnal Formulae

In the book of Kings, and with less regularity in the book of Judges, time is structured by means of indicating the length of the reign of a king (or judge). As Wellhausen and Noth had recognized, the numbers were devised to point to the key date of 480 years after the exodus (1 Kgs 6:1).[57] Indications of the length of reigns occur also in the book of Samuel (1 Sam 13:1; 27:7; 2 Sam 2:10, 11; 5:4–5; 1 Kgs 2:10); and some of them contain similar elements to those of the book of Kings ("a" was "b" years old when he became king over "c," and he reigned "d" years).[58] However, in certain respects, the formulae of Samuel differ from those of the book of Kings. In contrast to Kings, Samuel lacks the accompanying evaluation. Furthermore, most of the notices in Samuel supply round numbers of years, and

56. The sons of Eli in 2:27–36; Saul in 1 Sam 13:13–14; 15; 28:17–18; David in 2 Sam 12:10–12.

57. See Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher*, 211–213; Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 18–27.

58. As pointed out by Kratz, *Composition of the Narrative Books*, 171, and Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 95–96, 147.

there are striking similarities between the few entries. According to 2 Kgs 5:4, David is thirty years old when he becomes king.[59] Like Solomon, he ruled forty years. The reigns of Saul (see 1 Sam 13:1) and Ishbaal (see 2 Sam 2:10) are short and equal in length (two years), while Ishbaal was forty years old at the beginning of his short reign. Hence, it seems possible that these formulae indicating the lengths of reign in Samuel were inserted at a late stage in order to give the book of Samuel a temporal structure comparable to that of Kings.[60] Many of the round numbers in the book of Judges probably have the same function. They are "calculated with a view to the 480 years of 1 Kgs 6.1."[61] These chronological indications belong to a comprehensive and probably late Deuteronomistic redactional layer.

Yet, there are more "genuine" formulae in Samuel that differ from the mentioned "artificial" compositions and might derive from the ancient Samuel narrative tradition. This seems probable for 1 Sam 27:7 ("And the number of days that David lived in the country of the Philistines was a year and four months") and 2 Sam 2:11 ("And the number of days that David was king in Hebron over the house of Judah was seven years and six months"), both which are formulated in a similar fashion.[62]

3.9. Conclusions

To summarize the findings so far, the book of Samuel contains few texts with Deuteronomistic terminology and motifs, and these do not match the theological orientations behind the stories in which they are embedded. They often disturb the narrative flow and also the logic of a story (for instance, 1 Sam 13:13–14; 28:17–18). By this, they are easily recognizable as added passages. In some cases, late Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronomistic redactors added stories and episodes that have an important impact on the understanding of the major narrative as a whole (see, for instance, the assertions about Saul's rejection and David's election, pointed

59. According to $G^{L(mss)}$ of 1 Sam 13:1, Saul was thirty years old when he became king.

60. Against Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 18–27, who believed that some of these numbers already belonged to the tradition at the Deuteronomist's disposal and might be reliable.

61. See Kratz, *Composition of the Narrative Books*, 190.

62. Kratz, *Composition of the Narrative Books*, 171, considers 1 Sam 27:7 as old as well.

antimonarchical statements, the anti-Levitical polemic 1 Sam 2:27–36). Sometimes, they refer to apparently invented commands and "words" (which in fact are nowhere reported in 1–2 Samuel; see 1 Sam 13:14; 25:30; 2 Sam 5:2; 1 Kgs 1:35). According to this investigation, only one layer is common to both Samuel and Kings, and it is limited to these books. This is the layer that contains the key word "ruler [נגיד] over Israel." The other presumably inserted texts are linked also with texts in other books in Deuteronomy–Kings (or even in Exodus–Kings) and belong to a comprehensive, presumably late redactional layer.[63]

On this basis, I conclude that the bulk of the Samuel narrative tradition is not Deuteronomistic. On the contrary, it is apparent that several themes in Samuel (e.g., cultic diversity, tolerant monolatry, perception of the land, relation to foreigners, the image of King David) conflict with central concerns of the Deuteronomistic literature.

4. The Literary Historical Relationship between Samuel and Kings

4.1. Introduction: Mapping Together the Book of Samuel with the Presupposed Deuteronomistic Book of Kings in Recent Scholarship

Scholars who claim that the Samuel narrative tradition was included in the Deuteronomistic book of Kings emphasize the fact that the topic of kingship features prominently in both books.[64] From this perspective, the first two chapters of 1 Samuel seem to provide a suitable beginning for the postulated *œuvre*, since they relate the birth and youth of the man who will appoint the two first kings of Israel. The subsequent narrative of Samuel–Kings records the whole history of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah until their end. The continuity is even more evident in the Septuagint, where the books of Samuel–Kings are called "(books of) the Kingdoms."

At the same time, however, we note a discontinuity insofar as the genres of the two sections are concerned. Claus Westermann rightly noted that the majority of the tales in 1–2 Samuel give attention to human

63. E.g., the texts that are polemically addressed against other deities and the monarchy (1 Sam 7:3–4; 8:7–9a, 18; 10:18aγb–19a; and 12:7–25) and the allusions to the theme of "rest" in 2 Sam 7:1, 11.

64. See Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 159.

concerns and are focused on the fate of individuals, whereas most of the accounts in 1–2 Kings confine themselves to reporting soberly political events.[65] As a result, while the book of Samuel covers only fifty–sixty years, they are about the same length as the book of Kings, which deals with a time period of almost four hundred years. Reinhard Kratz, one among the scholars who proposed that the early Deuteronomistic work comprised Samuel–Kings, recognizes this difference, and yet he argues that this divergence did not hinder the Deuteronomistic author to merge the two traditions together.[66]

However, in the context of this question, other factors should be taken into consideration. As we have seen, certain texts of Samuel contradict main principles of the book of Kings, so it is questionable whether the author of Kings would be ready to accept and to allow them to remain in his work without any correction or comment. For example, since the Deuteronomistic book of Kings is based upon the Deuteronomistic doctrine of cult-centralization, it is unlikely that he would have begun his work with a story in which the distinct customs of an old regional YHWH sanctuary are described in such detail (1 Sam 1–2). Furthermore, the ambivalent and in some respects even dark image of David in the book of Samuel contrasts and also contradicts the absolutely positive image of David in Kings. Finally, some observations question the coherence of the assumed comprehensive redaction of Samuel–Kings. It is striking that the typical judgment formulation of Kings is absent from Samuel. Why did the Deuteronomistic author not apply the stereotype evaluative phrases used in Kings (e.g., "he did the right in the eyes of YHWH") to the David of the Samuel stories? Moreover, why is there no hint in Samuel that David set the standard for evaluating all the other kings? Accounts drawing an advantageous picture exist in Samuel, such as David's victories against the Philistines and his popularity with the people (1 Sam 18; 2 Sam 5:17–25); the conquest of Jerusalem by David (2 Sam 5:6–9); and the transport of the ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam 6). How can we explain the lack of references in the Deuteronomistic book of Kings to all of these episodes?

The above mentioned observations lead to the conclusion that the book of *Samuel did not belong together with the first Deuteronomistic edition of Kings*.[67] We should rather assume that the author of this *œuvre*

65 Westermann, *Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments*, 57–67.

66. See Kratz, *Composition of the Narrative Books*, 170–71.

67. In his analysis of the early Deuteronomisic redaction of Kings, Erik Eynikel

did not know the Samuel traditions concerning Saul and David or that he knew them but did not include them for theological reasons. The first of these two conclusions seems preferable, because the book of Kings not only omits episodes with a problematic view of David but positive reminiscences as well. If its author had known these episodes, one would expect allusions to them. Considered together, these observations and reflections suggest separate origins, formations, and also *milieux producteurs* of the two books. In the following, I will outline my view how the two books could have developed.

4.2. The Formation of the Book of Kings

The Deuteronomistic book of Kings undoubtedly drew upon one or several earlier sources.[68] In my view, there is no reason to doubt the given references to sources, such as "the book of the acts of Solomon" (1 Kgs 11:41), "the book of the acts of the Kings of Israel" (1 Kgs 14:19 et al.), "the book of the acts of the kings of Judah" (1 Kgs 14:29 et al.) and "the book of song" (LXX 1 Kgs 8:53). Surprisingly, no "book of the acts of *David*" is mentioned, neither in the book of Samuel nor in the book of Kings. If the Deuteronomistic author of the book of Kings was wholly dependent upon these named sources, they could have provided but little information about David, which probably derived from "the book of the acts of Solomon."

I think it most likely that the Deuteronomistic book of Kings (and the original version of Deuteronomy as well) was composed in the preexilic

(*Reform of King Josiah*, 362–64) concludes as well that this redaction did not include the Samuel tradition. However, he believes that the author of the early version of Kings knew of an older version of Samuel and wrote his work as a continuation of it.

68. See, e.g., James A. Montgomery and Henry S. Gehman, *The Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951) 30–38; Alfred Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (2d ed; Halle: Niemeyer, 1956); Shoshana R. Bin-Nun, "Formulas from Royal Records of Israel and of Judah," *VT* 18 (1968): 414–32; Mordecai Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 89–92; Lester L. Grabbe, "Mighty Oaks from (Genetically Manipulated?) Acorns Grow: 'The Chronicle of the Kings of Judah' as a Source of the Deuteronomistic History," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. Robert Rezetko et al.; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill), 155–73; Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 103.

period, rather than at some point of time in the exilic period.[69] In the preexilic era, the implementation of Deuteronomistic reforms was possible, since the central power was still intact in Judah and it could still implement drastic measures.[70] In addition, there is no retrospective reflection upon the demise of Judah, unlike the lengthy reflection on the doom of the northern kingdom in 2 Kgs 17 in the first Deuteronomistic edition of Kings.[71] The passage 2 Kgs 17:21–23aα* forms a fitting conclusion to the phrases reporting the "sin of Jeroboam" and of his followers (note the *hiphil* of חטא). Finally, the account of Josiah's reform forms the climax to the narrative in Kings, and the judgment formulas of the kings after him are different from those preceding. This points to a formation of an earlier layer that ends with the account of Josiah and that was subsequently supplemented by a separate, secondary formation of 2 Kgs 24–25. The first Deuteronomistic edition of Kings was probably composed and transmitted by court scribes.[72]

Given the conclusion that the Deuteronomistic book of Kings did not include the Samuel narrative tradition, one has to ask where exactly this book began and furthermore what its extent was. There reigns a broad consensus that the first two chapters of the book of Kings (1 Kgs 1–2) provide the fitting end for the narrative about David's reign. Thus, the open-

69. See Cross, "Themes of the Book of Kings," 274–89; Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981); Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 59–60, 158–63; Gary N. Knoppers, *The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam* (vol. 1 of *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Salomon and the Dual Monarchies*; HSM 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 51; Eynikel, *Reform of King Josiah*, 362–64; Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 147; Schmid, "Deuteronomium," 202. See already Kuenen, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung*, 90–96; and Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher*, 297–99.

70. An exilic setting is hard to imagine. Due to the destruction of the temple and the deportation of an important number of priests, a regular cult in Jerusalem was hardly possible. Though the possibility cannot be ruled out that some cultic procedures took place in a reduced form, one has to take into account that a large proportion of the Judeans in exile would have necessarily been excluded and would not have been able to observe cult centralization. Furthermore, exilic period contemporaries certainly would ask why a sanctuary that was destroyed and given in the hands of the enemy should be the only one where an Israelite is allowed to bring his sacrifices.

71. Most scholars agree that 2 Kgs 17:19–20, the passage referring to the southern kingdom, is an addition.

72. Nihan, " 'Deutéronomiste' et 'deutéronomisme,' " 431–32.

ing of the assumed Deuteronomistic book of Kings can only be found after 1 Kgs 1–2. Quite suitable as a beginning would be 3 Kgdms 2:46l (LXX) which reads: "Solomon, son of David, became king over Israel and Judah in Jerusalem."[73] Assuming that the Deuteronomistic book of Kings had as its oldest source a chronicle about the reign of Solomon, such a beginning would be fitting. The themes of the "construction of temple" and "purge of the temple" (in the time of Josiah) would then mark the beginning and end of this work and form an *inclusio*.

4.3. Formation of the Book of Samuel

The above investigation on the relationship between Samuel and Kings resulted in the conclusion that the author of the Deuteronomistic book of Kings was not acquainted with the narrative tradition of 1–2 Samuel. What are the consequences for the question of the formation of the book of Samuel? At first sight, this conclusion could be taken as support for the contention that the stories of 1–2 Samuel were late inventions of the Babylonian or Persian period (see Van Seter's model).[74] However, the tradition of 1–2 Samuel shows several motifs pointing to the preexilic era as date of origin. In part 2, we listed several indications that the books of Samuel preserve some credible historical reminiscences of ancient Israel. Reliable information concerning geographical data and cultic specificities are found in every part of the book. Therefore, we should look for another explanation. That the authors of the original layer in 1–2 Kings did not know the narrative tradition of 1–2 Samuel might be due to the fact that the stories were transmitted for a long time only in circles that were inaccessible to the author(s) of the Deuteronomistic book of Kings. The reason for this inaccessibility might be due to the fact that the place of the transmission was geographically distant from the place of origin of Kings (Jerusalem), for instance, a site in the northern state of Israel. The stories would have been kept secret by the bearer of the tradition.

Furthermore, we might imagine that during a long period the stories were transmitted only *orally*. This consideration gains certain plausibility with regard to Frank Polak's well-founded estimation that the main part of the stories in the book of Samuel display characteristics found in oral narrative, such as short sentences, parataxis, and rareness of noun strings.[75] Further observation may point to an oral origin of the bulk of the stories in 1–2 Samuel as well: certain imbalances and contradictions between stories and the phenomenon of doublets can be explained by the existence of alternative or parallel traditions, a well-known characteristic of oral tradition, where "different versions exist side by side."[76]

The stories may have been transmitted orally for a long time, because there was no felt need to fix the stories in written versions and also because the bearer of tradition perhaps were illiterate. This might have been changed in the seventh century when literacy spread remarkably in the administrative center and the first comprehensive writings like the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic book of Kings emerged.

The book of Samuel in its early formative stage probably differed in content and extent from the final form of the book. First Kings 1–2 previously belonged to Samuel; the actual book division (2 Sam 24/1 Kgs 1) between the book of Samuel and the book of Kings stems from a rather late time. It is possible that also other texts now found in the book of Kings were part of the "Samuel" collection. For instance, the Elijah and Elisha circles show certain commonalities with the Samuel tradition; they may have originated as oral traditions as well.

73. Reconstructed *Vorlage* שלמה בן דוד מלך על ישראל ויהודה בירושלים from Σαλωμωνυὶὸς Δαυιδ ἐβασίλευσεν ἐπὶ Ισραηλ καὶ Ιουδα ἐν Ιερουσαλημ. G^L deviates from G^B in the beginning (has the plus καὶ). The Septuagint version of 1–2 Kings reflects a distinct Hebrew text, which in some cases preserves the older readings. According to Adrian Schenker, the LXX reflects the text of an earlier stage (in comparison with the MT). See Adrian Schenker, *Septante et Texte Massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (CahRB 48; Paris: Gabalda, 2000); idem, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher: Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher* (OBO 199; Fribourg: University Press Fribourg, 2004).

74. See the assumption of Van Seters above.

75. Frank H. Polak, "The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose Narrative," *JNES* 26 (1998): 59–105 (78–87). See also idem, "The Book of Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Syntactic-Stylistic Analysis," in *Die Samuelbücher und die Deuteronomisten* (ed. Christa Schäfer-Lichtenberger; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010), 34–73.

76. Susan Niditch, "Hebrew Bible and Oral Literature: Misconceptions and New Directions," in *The Interface of Orality and Writing: Speaking, Seeing, Writing in the Shaping of New Genres* (ed. Annette Weissenrieder and Robert Coote; WUNT 260; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 15. For contradictions, see, 1 Sam 19:22–24 and 15:35a; 1 Sam 31:4 and 2 Sam 1:10; 1 Sam 7:1 and 2 Sam 6:2. For doublets, see 1 Sam 24 and 26; 1 Sam 21:11–16 and 27:1–28:2; 1 Sam 10:10–13 and 19:18–24.

The model presented here contradicts the common theory concerning a linear literary progression of the Samuel tradition during a long period. Further investigation must show which model may better explain the literary particularities of the collected stories and narratives in 1–2 Samuel.[77]

4.4. Further Development: The Merging of Samuel and Kings

At some point in the literary history, the two traditions (Kings and Samuel) came together and formed two adjacent books or perhaps two parts of one book. The process of merging the two books involved the transposition of certain texts in order to establish a coherent chronological order in the comprehensive book about the history of Israelite and Judean kings.

The process by which the two books were brought together could have occurred during the exilic period in either Babylon or in the Judean homeland (Mizpah) when members of influential families arranged the fusion of the two complexes. The impetus for such an initiative was to maintain

77. According to the common thesis, small, individual episodes and short narratives were committed to writing and later merged together into larger entities, such as the Samuel–Saul Narrative, the so-called History of David's Rise, and the so-called Succession Story. Still later, these blocks were combined by a pre-Deuteronomistic author or by the Deuteronomist himself. Single stories and narrative blocks have their own linguistic and thematic particularities. However, the following arguments challenge that theory. First, there is no consensus regarding the extent of the presumed large narrative entities. They are mutually linked by certain themes, motifs, and expressions. For instance, 1 Sam 3 and 4 are normally attributed to different narratives (the Narrative of Samuel's Youth and the Ark Narrative), but they are also closely linked by certain shared expressions and motifs. Additionally, the term "Hebrews" for the Israelites occurs not only in 1 Sam 4 (within the Ark Narrative), but also in 1 Sam 13–14 (Samuel–Saul Story) and in 1 Sam 29:3 (the History of David's Rise). Also, the close connection between Saul and Jabesh-gilead marks both the story of 1 Sam 11 and that of 1 Sam 31. The theme of the unrestricted bravado of Zeruiah's sons is a leitmotif that runs throughout different sections of the book (1 Sam 26:6–8; 2 Sam 2:18–24; 3:30, 39; 16:9–10; 19:22–23) and the comparison of David with the angel of YHWH recurs as well (1 Sam 29:9; 2 Sam 14:17, 20; 19:29). The History of David's Rise is the smooth continuation of the Samuel–Saul Narrative (1 Sam 1–14); with its last chapters (2 Sam 2–5), it prepares itself for the Succession Narrative; the chapters of the Ark Narrative (1 Sam 4–6; 2 Sam 6) are closely connected with their context. This diversity and unity in 1–2 Samuel is better explained by a long period of oral evolution and transmission of the stories and narratives that eventually were aligned with each other by the storytellers.

the multifaceted literary heritage of Judah and Israel. Perhaps this decision to combine the two divergent traditions was made only later in the Persian period by a central (authoritative) institution in Jerusalem (consisting of priests and laity).[78] Presupposed is that the authoritative central institution in this later (Persian) period was willing to bring together two formally and ideologically different traditions without harmonizing them. I assume that most of the Deuteronomistic and post-Deuteronomistic additions in Samuel were made *after* the merging of Samuel and Kings. An indication favouring this suggestion is the fact that only one of the supposed redactional layers is present in both Samuel and Kings and at the same time is limited to the complex Samuel–Kings alone: the layer with the key word "ruler [נגיד] over Israel." This layer, along with the regnal formulae in Samuel (1 Sam 13:1; 2 Sam 2:10; 5:4–5; 1 Kgs 2:10), might have been introduced in Samuel–Kings in order to tie the two books together. However, these additions may have been made some time after the two books had been combined.

For the most part, the editor(s) responsible for merging the two books left their contents unchanged and added but a few editorial comments and harmonising texts. This implies that the ideological orientation of the scribal circles who produced the larger Samuel–Kings composition were not properly Deuteronomistic. Instead, they employed a more open ideological conception that could bring together different views of the past.

78. On the importance of the temple in the governmental structure of Judah in the Persian Era, see Lester L. Grabbe, *Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* (vol. 1 of *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 132–55 (142–48).

Bibliography

Avigad, Nahman. "Two Phoenician Votive Seals." *IEJ* 16 (1966): 243–51.

Aurelius, Erik. *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch*. BZAW 319. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

Bin-Nun, Shoshana R. "Formulas from Royal Records of Israel and of Judah." *VT* 18 (1968): 414–32.

Blum, Erhard. "Ein Anfang der Geschichtsschreibung? Anmerkungen zur sog. Thronfolgegeschichte und zum Umgang mit Geschichte im alten Israel." Pages 4–37 in *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids:*

Neue Einsichten und Anfrage. Edited by Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer. OBO 176. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2000.

Bordreuil, Pierre. "A propos des pays de Kanaan." Pages 27–30 in *Carthage et les autochtones de son empire du temps de Zama: Colloque international organisé à Siliana et Tunis du 10 au 13 mars 2004 par l'Institut National du Patrimone et l'Association de sauvegarde du site de Zama: Hommage à Mahmed Hassine Fantar*. Edited by Ahmed Ferjaoui. Tunis: Institut national du patrimoine, 2010.

Budde, Karl. *Die Bücher Samuel*. KHC 8. Tübingen: Mohr, 1902.

Clements, Ronald E. "The Deuteronomic Law of Centralisation and the Catastrophe of 587 B.C." Pages 5–12 in *After the Exile: Essays in Honour of Rex Mason*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1996.

Cogan, Mordechai. *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 10. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Cross, Frank Moore. "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 274–89 in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Davies, Philip. R. *In Search of "Ancient Israel."* JSOTSup 109. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Dietrich, Walter. *1 Samuel 1–12*. BKAT 8.1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2011.

———. *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.* Translated by Joachim Vette. SBLBE 3. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

———. "Niedergang und Neuanfang: Die Haltung der Schlussredaktion des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes zu den wichtigsten Fragen ihrer Zeit." Pages 45–70 in *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times*. Edited by Bob Becking and Marjo Korpel. OTS 42. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Dietrich, Walter, and Stefan Münger. "Die Herrschaft Sauls und der Norden Israels." Pages 39–59 in *Saxa loquentur: Studien zur Archäologie Palästinas/Israels: Festschrift für Volkmar Fritz zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Cornelis den Hertog, Ulrich Hübner, and Stefan Münger. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003.

Edenburg, Cynthia. "The Chicken or the Egg? Joshua 9 and Deuteronomy: An Intertextual Conundrum." Pages 115–33 in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Raymond Person and Konrad Schmid. FAT 2.56. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

———. "'Overwriting and Overriding,' or What Is *Not* Deuteronomistic." Pages 443–60 in *Congress Volume: Helsinki 2010*. Edited by Martti Nissinen. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Ewald, Heinrich. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*. 6 vols. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1843.

Eynikel, Erik. *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. OTS 33. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Finkelstein, Israel. "State Formation in Israel and Judah: A Contrast in Context, A Contrast in Trajectory." *NEA* 62 (1999): 35–52.

Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil A. Silberman, "Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology." *JSOT* 30 (2006): 259–85.

Gordon, Robert P. "In Search of David: The David Tradition in Recent Study." Pages 285–98 in *Faith, Tradition and History: Old Testament Historiography in its Near Eastern Context*. Edited by A. Alan Ralph Millard, James K. Hoffmeier, and David Baker. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

Grabbe, Lester. "Mighty Oaks from (Genetically Manipulated?) Acorns Grow: 'The Chronicle of the Kings of Judah' as a Source of the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 155–73 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by Robert Rezetko, Timothy Lim, and W. Brian Aucker. VTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. *Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah*. Vol. 1 of *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Halpern, Baruch. *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Hutzli, Jürg. "L'exécution de sept descendants de Saül par les Gabaonites (2 S 21,1–14): Place et fonction du récit dans les livres de Samuel." *Transeu* 40 (2011): 83–96.

———. "The Literary Relationship between I–II Samuel and I–II Kings: Considerations concerning the Formation of the Two Books." *ZAW* 122 (2010): 505–19.

———. "Nähe zu David, Nähe zu Jhwh: Fremdstämmige in den Davidserzählungen." Pages 71–90 in *Seitenblicke: Nebenfiguren im zweiten*

Samuelbuch. Edited by Walter Dietrich. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2011.

Jamieson-Drake, David W. *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archaeological Approach*. JSOTSup 109. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Jepsen, Alfred. *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*. 2d ed. Halle: Niemeyer, 1956.

Jobling, David. "David and the Philistines: With Methodological Reflections." Pages 74–85 in *David und Saul im Widerstreit: Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit: Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches*. Edited by Walter Dietrich. OBO 206. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg.

Klostermann, August. *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*. KKAT 3. Nördlingen: Beck, 1887.

Knauf, Ernst Axel. "Does 'Deuteronomistic Historiography' (DtrH) Exist?" Pages 388–98 in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Edited by Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi. JSOTSup 306. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Knoppers, Gary N. *The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam*. Vol. 1 of *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Salomon and the Dual Monarchies*. HSM 52. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Köckert, Matthias. "YHWH in the Northern and Sothern Kingdom." Pages 357–94 in *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*. Edited by Reinhard Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann. BZAW 405. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.

Kratz, Reinhard G. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by. John Bowden. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Kuenen, Abraham. *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des alten Testaments hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung und Sammlung: Die historischen Bücher des alten Testaments*. Leipzig: Schulze, 1890.

Lohfink, Norbert. "Kerygmata des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks." Pages 87–100 in *Die Botschaft und die Boten: Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Jörg Jeremias and Lothar Perlitt. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981. Repr., pages 125–41 in *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur II*. SBAB 12. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk 1991.

Maeir, Aren M., and Carl S. Ehrlich, "Excavating Philistine Gath: Have We Found Goliath's Hometown?" *BAR* 27 (2001): 22–31.

McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*. AB 9. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984.

Montgomery, James A., and Henry S. Gehman, *The Books of Kings*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951.

Nelson, Richard D. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

———. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. JSOTSup 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981.

Niditch, Susan. "Hebrew Bible and Oral Literature: Misconceptions and New Directions." Pages 3–18 in *The Interface of Orality and Writing: Speaking, Seeing, Writing in the Shaping of New Genres*. Edited by Annette Weissenrieder and Robert Coote. WUNT 260. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Nielsen, Eduard. *Deuteronomium*. HAT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.

Nihan, Christophe. "'Deutéronomiste' et 'deutéronomisme': Quelques remarques de méthode en lien avec le débat actuel." Pages 408–41 in *Congress Volume: Helsinki 2010*. Edited by Martti Nissinen. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Noth, Martin. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*. Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 18. Halle: Niemeyer, 1943.

Pakkala, Juha. *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History*. PFES 76. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999.

Polak, Frank. "The Book of Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Syntactic-Stylistic Analysis." Pages 34–73 in *Die Samuelbücher und die Deuteronomisten*. Edited by Christa Schäfer-Lichtenberger. BWANT 188. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010.

———. "The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose Narrative." *JNES* 26 (1998): 59–105.

Provan, Iain W. *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. BZAW 172. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988.

Rad, Gerhard von. "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings." Pages 74–91 in *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated by David Stalker. SBT 9. London: SCM Press, 1953.

———. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by David M. G. Stalker. 2 Vols. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Römer, Thomas. "Cult Centralization in Deuteronomy 12: Between Deuteronomistic History and Pentateuch." Pages 168–80 in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*. Edited by Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach. FRLANT 206. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

———. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Römer, Thomas, and Albert de Pury. "Deuteronomistic History (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues." Pages 24–141 *in Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Edited by Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi. JSOTSup 306. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Rose, Martin. *5. Mose 12–25: Einführung und Gesetze*. Vol. 1 of *5. Mose*. ZBK 5.1. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1994.

Rösel, Hartmut N. *Von Josua bis Jojachin: Untersuchungen zu den deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments*. VTSup 75. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Schenker, Adrian. *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher: Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher*. OBO 199. Fribourg: University Press Fribourg, 2004.

———. *Septante et Texte Massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14*. CahRB 48. Paris: Gabalda, 2000.

Schmid, Konrad. "Das Deuteronomium innerhalb der 'deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke' in Gen–2Kön." Pages 193–211 in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*. Edited by Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach. FRLANT 206. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

Schniedewind, William M. "The Geopolitical History of Philistine Gath." *BASOR* 309 (1998): 69–77.

Smith, Henry P. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898.

Thompson, Thomas. *Early History of the Israelite People from the Written and Archaeological Sources*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Van Seters, John. *The Biblical Saga of King David*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

———. "The Court History and DtrH." Pages 70–93 in *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids: Neue Einsichten und Anfragen*. Edited by Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer. OBO 176. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

———. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

———. "The Terms 'Amorite' and 'Hittite' in the Old Testament." *VT* 22 (1971): 64–81.

Veijola, Timo. "David und Meribaal." *RB* 85 (1978): 338–58.

———. "Deuteronomismusforschung zwischen Tradition und Innovation (III)." *TRu* 68 (2003): 1–44.

———. *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. AASF B.193. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975.

———. *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. AASF B.198. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977.

Weippert, Helga. "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher." *Bib* 53 (1972): 301–39.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 3d ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963.

Westermann, Claus. *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* TB 87. Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1994.

Wißmann, Felipe Blanco. *"Er tat das Rechte..." Beurteilungskriterien und Deuteronomismus in 1Kön 12–2Kön 25*. ATANT 93. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2008.

Würthwein, Ernst. "Erwägungen zum sog. Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk: Eine Skizze." Pages 1–11 in *Studien zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtwerk*. BZAW 227. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.