

IS SAMUEL AMONG THE DEUTERONOMISTS?

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature



Ancient Israel and Its Literature

Thomas C. Römer, General Editor

Editorial Board

Suzanne Boorer
Victor H. Matthews
Benjamin D. Sommer
Nili Wazana

Number 16

IS SAMUEL AMONG THE DEUTERONOMISTS?

CURRENT VIEWS ON THE PLACE OF SAMUEL IN A DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY

Edited by

Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala

Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

Copyright © 2013 by the Society of Biblical Literature

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, Society of Biblical Literature, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? : current views on the place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic history / edited by Cynthia Edenburg, Juha Pakkala.

p. cm. — (Ancient Israel and its literature / Society of Biblical Literature ; volume 16)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-58983-638-9 (paper binding : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-639-6 (electronic format) — ISBN 978-1-58983-774-4 (hardcover binding)

1. Samuel (Biblical judge) 2. Bible. O.T. Deuteronomy—Criticism, interpretation, etc.

I. Edenburg, Cynthia editor. II. Pakkala, Juha editor.

BS580.S2I82 2013

222'.406—dc22

2013004551

Printed on acid-free, recycled paper conforming to
ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994
standards for paper permanence.



CONTENTS

Abbreviations	vii
Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala	1
The Deuteronomistic Historian in Samuel: “The Man behind the Green Curtain” Richard D. Nelson	17
The Layer Model of the Deuteronomistic History and the Book of Samuel Walter Dietrich	39
The Book of Samuel within the Deuteronomistic History Jacques Vermeylen	67
Reading Deuteronomy after Samuel; Or, Is “Deuteronomistic” a Good Answer to Any Samuel Question? A. Graeme Auld.....	93
1 Samuel and the “Deuteronomistic History” Philip R. Davies	105
Is the Scroll of Samuel Deuteronomistic? K. L. Noll	119
Samuel among the Prophets: “Prophetical Redactions” in Samuel Ernst Axel Knauf.....	149
The Distinctness of the Samuel Narrative Tradition Jürg Hutzli	171

1 Samuel 1 as the Opening Chapter of the Deuteronomistic History? Reinhard Müller	207
1 Samuel 8 and 12 and the Deuteronomistic Edition of Samuel Christophe Nihan.....	225
“Long Live the King!”: Deuteronomism in 1 Sam 10:17–27a in Light of Ahansali Intratribal Mediation Jeremy M. Hutton.....	275
The Numerous Deaths of King Saul Hannes Bezzel.....	325
Contributors.....	349
Index of Ancient Sources.....	353
Index of Authors.....	367

ABBREVIATIONS

AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible
ABG	Arbeiten zur Bibel und Ihrer Geschichte
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOS	American Oriental Series
AOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
<i>AmA</i>	<i>American Anthropologist</i>
<i>AE</i>	<i>American Ethnologist</i>
<i>Annales</i>	<i>Annales: Économies Sociétés Civilisations</i>
ABE	Asociación Bíblica Española
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BBB</i>	<i>Bulletin de bibliographie biblique</i>
<i>BBKL</i>	<i>Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon</i>
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
BVB	Beiträge zur Verstehen der Bibel
BevT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BLH	Biblical Languages: Hebrew
BE	Biblische Enzyklopädie

BIOSCS	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament
b. Meg.	Babylonian Talmud, tractate Megillah
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BS	Biblical Seminar
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten and Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CAT	Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblical: Old Testament Series
DSB	Daily Study Bible Series
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
EdF	Erträge der Forschung
ET	English translation
ETS	Erfurter theologische Studien
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FB	Forschung zur Bibel
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
HeBAI	<i>Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel</i>
HSM	<i>Harvard Semitic Monographs</i>
HTKAT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
JMVL	<i>Jahrbuch des Museums für Volkerkunde zu Leipzig</i>
JANES	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>

<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
<i>JNAS</i>	<i>Journal of North African Studies</i>
<i>JRAI</i>	<i>Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute</i>
<i>JPS</i>	Jewish Publication Society
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
<i>JSJSup</i>	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series
<i>JSNTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>KAT</i>	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>KHC</i>	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
<i>KKAT</i>	Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften: Alten und Neuen Testamentes
<i>KUB</i>	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi
<i>L.A.B.</i>	<i>Liber antiquitatum biblicarum</i>
<i>LDiff</i>	<i>Lectio Difficilior</i>
<i>LSTS</i>	Library of Second Temple Studies
<i>LXX</i>	Septuagint
<i>MES</i>	<i>Middle Eastern Studies</i>
<i>MdB</i>	<i>Le Monde de la Bible</i>
<i>MT</i>	Masoretic Text
<i>NEA</i>	<i>Near Eastern Archaeology</i>
<i>NICOT</i>	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NRSV</i>	New Revised Standard Version
<i>OBO</i>	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
<i>ÖBS</i>	Österreichische biblische Studien
<i>OG</i>	Old Greek
<i>OL</i>	Old Latin
<i>OTE</i>	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
<i>OTL</i>	Old Testament Library
<i>OTS</i>	Old Testament Studies
<i>PFES</i>	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>

SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBLAIL	Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Israel and Its Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLStBL	Society of Biblical Literature Studies in Biblical Literature
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLBE	Biblical Encyclopedia Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SEÅ	<i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>
SHCANE	Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
<i>S. 'Olam Rab.</i>	<i>Seder 'Olam Rabbah</i>
SR	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
ST	Studia theologica
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<i>SubBi</i>	<i>Subsidia biblia</i>
SNR	<i>Sudan Notes and Records</i>
Syr.	Syriac
TA	<i>Tel Aviv</i>
TB	Theologische Bücherei
<i>Transeu</i>	<i>Transeuphratène</i>
<i>TRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
UTB	Uni-Taschenbücher
VF	<i>Verkündigung und Forschung</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
Vulg.	Vulgate
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZABR	<i>Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

IS SAMUEL AMONG THE DEUTERONOMISTS?

Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala

1. INTRODUCTION

According to Martin Noth, all the books from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings were written by one author or editor, who combined various traditions into a coherent literary work that presented the history of Israel and Judah from Moses till the destruction of the Judean monarchy. Although Deuteronomistic redactions had been recognized in many books of the Hebrew Bible since early critical research in the nineteenth century, Noth argued that the same author was behind all the Deuteronomistic redactions¹ or additions in the books from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings. This redaction aimed to create unity and continuity of the traditions that were included in the composition, but it also provided a coherent theological interpretation of these traditions. Noth explained the apparent contradictions and inconsistencies in the complete composition as deriving from the use of a variety of traditions that functioned as sources for the Deuteronomist. Most of the Deuteronomist's editing is concentrated in some key passages and turning points in Israel's history, while elsewhere he mainly adopted the sources as they were without any major changes.

Noth's Deuteronomistic History hypothesis has been highly influential; others developed and modified it further, but it has also been subject to criticism.² The criticism has become increasingly vocal in recent schol-

1. In this volume, "redaction" primarily refers to a comprehensive revision of an older literary work. Traces of a redaction may be found in several parts of the work so that they form a coherent literary layer with certain ideological conceptions and goals. A single addition does not form a redaction unless it can be connected with other later additions that were probably added by the same redactor.

2. For a clear and brief description of the research, see Thomas Römer, *The So-*

arly discussion, although the general theory still finds active proponents, as also seen in this volume. Paradoxically, the refinement of Noth's theory has undermined it. As the followers of Noth's theory found more and more Deuteronomistic redactions, some of which contradicted each other,³ the original idea of a coherent redaction was weakened. The picture has become even more complex as different scholars have found that some late additions employ Deuteronomistic language without advancing Deuteronomistic ideology (or even when countering Deuteronomistic ideology). These types of revisions are best considered post-Deuteronomistic and/or non-Deuteronomistic redactions.⁴ Scholarship is faced with the ever more difficult question of what is Deuteronomistic, and this is directly relevant for the hypothesis. While scholarship has made other advances in the books under discussion, it has become apparent that there are many variables in determining the validity of the theory of the Deuteronomistic History. Scholars approach the issue from different perspectives, which do not necessarily converge. Nonetheless, the debate about the relevance of Noth's theory has continued unabated in recent years. Rather than trying to include a discussion about the entire Deuteronomistic History and its unity, this volume seeks to focus on one section of the proposed composition, the book of Samuel, often characterized as a weak link in the theory of the Deuteronomistic History.⁵

Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 13–43.

3. For example, Timo Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (AASF B, 198; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977), 115–22, argued that the relationship of the Deuteronomists toward monarchy was partly contradictory. The original Deuteronomist would have been positively disposed towards the monarchy (and its reestablishment), the later Deuteronomists would have been more critical.

4. See, for example, Thilo Rudnig, *David's Thron: Redaktionskritische Studien zur Geschichte von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (BZAW 358; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), and Reinhard Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik* (FAT 2/3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

5. The relationship between the book of Samuel and the Deuteronomists was recently discussed in Christa Schäfer-Lichtenberger, ed., *Die Samuelbücher und die Deuteronomisten* (BWANT 188; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010). However, the present volume is more focused in perspective and mainly presents contributions by other scholars.

It is apparent that the book of Samuel uses less Deuteronomistic idiom and appears to be less influenced by Deuteronomistic ideology than the rest of the books that comprise Noth's Deuteronomistic History. Some scholars have noted that the thematic and idiomatic contrast with the book of Kings is particularly evident.⁶ Here one should mention, for example, the contradiction concerning cult centralization. While the location of the cult is a central theological motif in the book of Kings (and Deuteronomy), it is not only ignored in the book of Samuel, but many passages imply that local sacrifices were a common and accepted practice (e.g., 1 Sam 9:18–25). Many passages in Kings are immersed in Deuteronomistic language (e.g., 1 Kgs 11; 2 Kgs 17 and 23), but such language is rare or lacking in Samuel. In any case, "Deuteronomisms" seem to be limited in the book of Samuel. Noth solved these problems by assuming that in the book of Samuel the Deuteronomist adopted most of his sources unchanged and made only some minor additions. Nevertheless, some scholars, such as Timo Veijola, have argued that the book of Samuel is more Deuteronomistic than Noth assumed. Veijola found several layers of Deuteronomistic redactions that would connect with those found in the other books of the Former Prophets. Despite its challenge to the coherence of the Deuteronomistic redaction, this was assumed to corroborate Noth's core theory.⁷

More recent scholarship, however, has shown that post-Deuteronomistic or non-Deuteronomistic redactions are more common in the book of Samuel than what earlier proponents of the Deuteronomistic Samuel assumed. Here one should mention, for example, investigations by Thilo Rudnig and Reinhard Müller, who have found successive redac-

6. For example, Jürg Hutzli, *Die Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel: Textkritische und literarische Analyse von 1. Samuel 1–2 unter Berücksichtigung des Kontextes* (ATANT 89; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2007), 222–65; Juha Pakkala, "Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings in the Redaction of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets," in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Ray Person and Konrad Schmid; FAT 2/56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 133–63 (147–53).

7. See Timo Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (AASF B.193; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedakatemia, 1975), and *Das Königtum*. Nevertheless, even Walter Dietrich, a proponent of the Deuteronomistic History, has criticized Veijola of exaggerating the Deuteronomistic redactions in the book of Samuel. See "Tendenzen neuester Forschung an den Samuelbüchern," in Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Samuelbücher und die Deuteronomisten*, 9–17 (10).

tions in these books.⁸ Although solutions differ, the redaction history of the book of Samuel now appears more complicated than what Noth, Frank Moore Cross,⁹ or Veijola assumed.

Furthermore, text-critical approaches, by scholars like Jürg Hutzli and Philippe Hugo, have shown that part of the redactional activity is reflected in the textual witnesses. These findings have far-reaching implications, since they show that editing continued in the last centuries B.C.E. and perhaps even beyond. In many cases the Masoretic text (henceforth MT) contains later additions, while the main Greek witnesses or some Greek manuscripts preserve an older textual stage. The importance of the Greek is highlighted by the manuscripts of the book of Samuel from Qumran, which often agree with a Greek witness against the MT. At the same time, some of the later additions in the MT seem to reflect theological conceptions attributed to the Deuteronomists.¹⁰ These relatively recent developments within textual criticism of the book of Samuel undermine many conventional theories and complicate the comparison between Samuel and the other books of the Former Prophets. One has to ask, were the connections between Samuel and the rest of the Former Prophets already created by the original author or editor, or were they established by later editors? Are the Deuteronomistic elements integral to the book of Samuel? Or, were they added at a late stage, perhaps in the last centuries B.C.E., under the influence of other more Deuteronomistic books of the Hebrew

8. Rudnig, *Davids Thron*, and Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft*. For example, Müller finds no less than eleven different literary layers in 1 Sam 10–11 (see 261); some of them are connected to the traditional Deuteronomistic layers.

9. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274–89.

10. See Jürg Hutzli, *Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel* and “Mögliche Retuschen am Davidbild in der masoretischen Fassung der Samuelbücher,” 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, 2004), 102–15; Philippe Hugo, “The Jerusalem Temple Seen in Second Samuel according to the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint,” in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Ljubljana, 2007* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 183–96. For example, in 1 Sam 1:9, 14, the idea that Hanna entered the temple and stood before (the statue of) Yahweh has been omitted in the Masoretic text, while the Greek text preserved the more original reading. For a detailed discussion of the textual witnesses, see Hutzli, *Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel*, 141–45.

Bible, particularly Deuteronomy and the book of Kings? At any rate, while earlier research primarily considered the MT as the starting point of investigation, it has become increasingly difficult to neglect text-critical considerations in discussing the relationship between the book of Samuel and the rest of the Former Prophets.

The book of Samuel has enjoyed increased attention in the past decade, as demonstrated by the number of edited volumes,¹¹ literary- and redaction-critical investigations,¹² commentaries,¹³ text-critical studies,¹⁴ and other approaches¹⁵ that have been published on the book, mostly in European languages. The publication of the Samuel scrolls from Qumran Cave 4 has certainly contributed to the rise in textual approaches.¹⁶ Although literary- and redaction-critical investigations have primarily been conducted by continental European scholars and are often written in German, the authors of this volume believe that interaction between the Continental and Anglophone scholarship is essential. The selection of articles in this volume includes contributions from American and British scholars,

11. For example, Dietrich, *David und Saul im Widerstreit*; Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Samuelbücher und die Deuteronomisten*; Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker, eds., *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

12. E.g., Jacques Vermeylen, *La loi du plus fort: Histoire de la rédaction des récits davidiques de 1 Samuel 8 à 1 Rois 2* (BETL 154; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000); Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft*; Alexander A. Fischer, *Von Hebron nach Jerusalem: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zur Erzählung von König David in II Sam 1–5* (BZAW 335; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004); Rudnig, *David's Thron*; Klaus-Peter Adam, *Saul und David in der jüdischen Geschichtsschreibung: Studien zu 1 Samuel 16–2 Samuel 5* (FAT 51; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

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

14. E.g., Hutzli, *Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel*.

15. E.g., A. Graeme Auld, *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld* (Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2004); Klaus-Peter Adam, *Saul und David in der jüdischen Geschichtsschreibung*; John Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009); André Heinrich, *David und Klio: Historiographische Elemente in der Aufstiegs Geschichte Davids und im Alten Testament* (BZAW 401; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009).

16. Frank Moore Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005). The Samuel scroll from Cave 1 was published already by Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).

along with essays in English from Continental scholars, and demonstrates our commitment to enhance this encouraging development. The articles reflect the narrowing of the gap between different approaches. Literary critics are increasingly taking text-critical evidence into consideration, and text critics are developing their approaches towards the traditional questions raised by literary and redaction critics.

2. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THIS VOLUME

The first three essays of this volume all accept the notion of a comprehensive Deuteronomistic History as a working hypothesis that best accounts for the narrative and thematic continuity between the book of Samuel and the other books from Deuteronomy to Kings. Richard D. Nelson notes the paucity of Deuteronomistic language, ideology, and editorial structure in the book of Samuel, and yet he argues that the Deuteronomist is present behind the scenes, manipulating sources, themes, overarching structures, and plots. The Deuteronomist's work was directed towards imparting compositional unity to the whole of the Deuteronomistic History and more importantly towards driving home the lesson to be learned from the history of Israel from premonarchic times to the demise of the northern kingdom. Nelson traces a network of cross references that firmly anchors Samuel in place between Judges and Kings. His views of the intrinsic unity of the Deuteronomistic History and of the Deuteronomist as the master at work behind the scenes are probably the closest within this volume to those of Noth.

So, too, Noth provides the starting point for Walter Dietrich, and he agrees with Nelson that the book of Samuel interacts with the other sections of the Deuteronomistic History and plays a key role in developing its plot. However, in contrast to Noth and Nelson, he narrows the scope of the work that should be attributed to the author of the History. Dietrich, like others who work within the framework of a "layer model," thinks that the Deuteronomistic Historian's composition was revised by later generations of Deuteronomistic scribes who incorporated the concerns of their period into the History, namely, the themes of prophetic authority (DtrP) and obedience to law (DtrN). At the same time, Dietrich moves back in the direction of Noth's position regarding the extent of prior sources and traditions that were at the disposal of the initial Historian. Dietrich's dialogue with the late Timo Veijola sharpens the criteria for distinguishing source material from Deuteronomistic composition and once more brings the

criterion of Deuteronomistic idiom to the fore. Most significantly, Dietrich returns to the earlier view of the Deuteronomist's negative estimation of the monarchy, a step that has important consequences for how we perceive the purpose and motivation of the Deuteronomist as a historian.

Jacques Vermeylen also traces the interconnections between the compositional layer in the book of Samuel that may be attributed to the early Deuteronomistic scribe and the other sections of the Deuteronomistic History. He thus validates Nelson's and Dietrich's conclusions, namely, that the story of the initiation of the monarchy and its first two kings was an integral part of the Deuteronomistic History. Vermeylen also adopts Noth's explanation for the perceived inconsistencies in the work, namely, that the Deuteronomist did not revise his sources, but interpolated his own views alongside the source material. He finds a concentric structure that imparts unity to the whole of the basic historical narrative. But since structures may be imposed upon material at a very late stage, Vermeylen works to explain the thematic diversity of the different parts of the composition that is particularly evident in the book of Samuel. Accordingly, he traces the lines of interaction between the original Deuteronomistic layer in Samuel and the rest of the Deuteronomistic History, while distinguishing between the initial DtrH and the later layers (DtrP and DtrN).

The next group of essays takes a critical view of the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis, both with regard to the place of Samuel within a larger narrative framework stretching from Deuteronomy to Kings, as well as with regard to the notion that there is anything Deuteronomistic about Samuel. For Graeme Auld, the correct point of departure is not Noth's thesis, but the comparison between Samuel (along with Kings) and Chronicles. Auld's thesis, which he has developed extensively elsewhere,¹⁷ is that Chronicles and Samuel–Kings developed separately out of a common ancestor and that this common source is represented by the synoptic material shared by both Samuel–Kings and Chronicles. Much of what is commonly considered Deuteronomistic in Samuel has no parallel in Chronicles, and therefore Auld holds that it derives from a much later context than usually thought. Here Auld examines a number of presumed Deuteronomistic characteristics in Samuel in order to show that they do not reflect the influence of Deuteronomy or other supposed

17. A. Graeme Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

Deuteronomistic texts and that it is likely that these Deuteronomisms spread to Deuteronomy through the influence of Samuel.

Philip Davies continues an ongoing dialogue with Graeme Auld over the original shape of the book of Samuel. Auld's supposition that the source behind Samuel-Kings is the synoptic material shared with Chronicles means that the oldest recoverable narrative in Samuel begins with Saul's demise and that virtually all of 1 Samuel is beyond the scope of the original composition. Davies approaches this question from a different starting point, that of cultural memory, and asks how communities in changing circumstances constructed views of a past that would be meaningful to their times. The past constructed in the text is tied to a distinct historical reality, that of the historical author, and therefore inquiry needs to start with trying to identify the first target audience of the different texts: for whom were the different representations of the past constructed, with what purpose, and for whom were they meaningful? In contrast to Auld, Davies finds that the narratives in 1 Samuel about the eponymous founder of the Judean dynasty belong the early layer of the book and that these are at home in the historical context of the late eighth century, while the Saul narratives probably reflect the concerns of the mid-sixth century, when Jerusalem lay in ruins and Mizpah was the center of government. Only at a later stage were the two narratives joined together—to Saul's detriment—and this move was accompanied by considerable exertion on the part of the author-editor to represent David as the legitimate successor to Saul's kingship. Already here it is possible to see how Davies's approach challenges the role attributed to the book of Samuel within the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis. Davies finds a more serious challenge to the notion of a unified Deuteronomistic composition in the utopian pan-Israel vision of Deuteronomy through Judges that is at odds with the representation in 1 Samuel of two separate entities—Israel and Judah. In this case, the concept of a unified twelve tribe Israel that is presumed by Deuteronomy and the rest of the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges (in its canonic form) is separated by one to two centuries from the early core narratives of Samuel. For Davies, Deuteronomism is at home in the Persian period and made little impact on the formation of the book of Samuel.

K. L. Noll rejects from the outset the structural criteria employed by Noth (as well as by Nelson, Dietrich, and Vermeylen in this volume) in affirming the role of the book of Samuel within the postulated Deuteronomistic History. He also rejects the criteria of theme, since conflicting themes have at times been attributed to the Deuteronomistic agenda.

Instead, he limits Deuteronomistic composition solely to instances in which a text employs idioms derived from Deuteronomy. Furthermore, he requires that the idiom be employed in a fashion consonant with Deuteronomistic ideology. Textual criticism also shows that many of the Deuteronomisms derive from a very late stage of scribal transmission and are not represented by the earliest textual witnesses. Noll contends that the very small amount of Deuteronomistic idiom found in the book of Samuel is not evidence of Deuteronomistic composition, but was placed in the mouths of characters within the narrative for ironic effect, since their words and actions in effect undermine Deuteronomistic ideology. At the same time, he does not view the book as either an ideological document, historiography, or even Davies's constructed cultural memory, but rather as a "good story" that was composed as a piece of "sophisticated entertainment."

In contrast to Noll, Axel Knauf affirms the historiographic interest of the book of Samuel (along with Kings) and reminds us that the narrative sequence in which it appears was understood as such at least since the third century B.C.E. Knauf agrees with Dietrich, that the book of Samuel was revised in order to impart to it a prophetic orientation. However, Knauf differs not only on the substance of this redaction and its even later date (fourth century for Knauf compared to mid-sixth century for Dietrich) but also on the question whether it is even Deuteronomistic. In Knauf's opinion, only the books of the Kingdoms (Samuel and Kings) comprised a Deuteronomistic History, but this hypothetical entity was much smaller in scope than the canonical books of Samuel and Kings. Furthermore, much of the material that usually is considered prime examples of Deuteronomistic composition in Samuel, such as 1 Sam 2–3, 8, 12 and 2 Sam 7, is relegated by Knauf to the late prophetic redaction that is more "proto-Chronistic" in outlook than Deuteronomistic. Knauf avoids the pitfalls of circular argumentation, that A is late because it presumes B which is a priori early, by pointing to characteristics of Late Biblical Hebrew that can be found in several of the texts he relegates to his late prophetic redaction in Samuel.

Jürg Hutzli argues that the book of Samuel developed separately from the books comprising the Deuteronomistic History. He agrees with Noll that Deuteronomism should be defined on the basis of the vocabulary, style, and ideology of the book of Deuteronomy and that a text should not be mechanically classified as Deuteronomistic on the basis of idiom, since idiom can be employed in a subversive or ironic fashion as well. Accord-

ingly, Hutzli identifies eight main Deuteronomistic themes that appear to be lacking in Samuel (for example, cult centralization, polemic against other gods, the promise and conquest of the land, and obedience to the law). Moreover, some of the themes of Samuel run counter to Deuteronomistic ideology. On this basis, Hutzli concludes that Samuel was not produced by Deuteronomistic scribes. However, the substance of the book is firmly rooted in the period of the monarchy as evinced by toponyms that fell out of use later on, as well as by details regarding early cult procedures and sanctuaries like Shiloh. Hutzli argues that the paucity of references to events in David's life in the book of Kings indicates that the book of Samuel was not known to the Deuteronomistic author of Kings. In Hutzli's opinion, the best explanation for all these findings is that the book of Samuel originated as oral literature that was transmitted outside the Deuteronomistic circles and that the stories were compiled and achieved fixed written form only after the composition of the book of Kings.

The third group of essays focuses on specific passages within the book of Samuel as a means to approach the question of the Deuteronomistic character of the book. Reinhard Müller takes 1 Sam 1 as a test case for examining the place of a text within the Deuteronomistic History when that text displays no vestige of Deuteronomism. He proposes that the Samuel birth narrative derives from a collection of stories that also included Judg 13, 17, and 1 Sam 9, since all these stories share the same incipit formula. This indicates that the bridge between the period of judges and the beginning of the monarchy dates back to a pre-Deuteronomistic collection that was taken over by the Deuteronomist and anchored in place with the help of editorial comments that reverberate elsewhere within the History.

The story of the foundation of the monarchy is widely viewed as one of the major contributions of the Deuteronomist in the book of Samuel. Christophe Nihan undertakes to examine the role that 1 Sam 8–12 plays in establishing this perception. Nihan finds that the negotiations between the people and Samuel over appointing a king in 1 Sam 8 do draw upon the law of the king in Deut 17:14–20 and accordingly should be characterized as Deuteronomistic, but that the antimonarchic response of YHWH in 1 Sam 8:7–8 is a late expansion, set off by a repetitive resumption (vv. 7a, 9a). A late addition in a similar antimonarchic vein is also found in 10:18–19. Nihan argues that 1 Sam 12 presumes the expanded form of both these chapters and that it works to resolve the tension in the previous chapters between the harsh antimonarchic additions and the view of kingship in the pre-Deuteronomistic narrative. Unlike Müller, Nihan does not

think that traditions regarding a period of judges were combined in a pre-Deuteronomistic stage with the story of the inception of the monarchy; this merging of traditions and related periodization were the contribution of the Deuteronomist(s) in the early Persian period. First Samuel 12, in particular, is closely related to phraseology and ideas of the late supplemental conclusion to the book of Joshua (Josh 24) that might even stem from a postpriestly stage.

Jeremy Hutton also deals with the question of Deuteronomistic editing in the story of the inauguration of the monarchy. He focuses on the central episode in which Saul is designated as king by lot (1 Sam 10:17–27) and employs anthropologic comparison as a means to supplement and validate the results of literary and redaction criticism. Hutton agrees with other recent scholars that the dichotomy of pro- and antimonarchic tendencies is too simplistic a criterion for fruitful analysis of 1 Sam 8–12, since the early sources are not completely favorable towards the monarchy, nor the later sources totally opposed to it (on this, see also the contributions of Dietrich and Nihan in this volume). Underneath 1 Sam 8 and 10:17–27, Hutton finds an earlier narrative that already displayed an ambiguous attitude towards human kingship, and within this earlier narrative the designation of a king by lot is the direct continuation of YHWH's directive in 8:22 to appoint a king. The means for electing tribal leaders among the Berber Ahansal tribe provides Hutton with a model for explaining the nature and the origin of the lot narrative in 1 Sam 10:17–27 and allows him to assign its underlying pre-Deuteronomistic layer to the late ninth–mid-eighth century B.C.E. Hutton intriguingly opens the question whether this narrative was crafted to issue in the inauguration of the monarchy or to cap an earlier collection of deliverer narratives represented in the present book of Judges.

Finally, Hannes Bezzel employs close reading of the narratives dealing with the death of Saul in order to trace the literary history of the traditions regarding the house of Saul within the book of Samuel. His analysis leads to “four (or five) stages” in the evolution of this material. The number of layers Bezzel uncovers is best amenable to a compositional model of *Fortschreibung* in which an original text undergoes revision and expansion on several different opportunities. As Bezzel points out, none of the texts dealing with the death of Saul display Deuteronomistic characteristics, even though the Deuteronomist could have taken advantage of the opportunity to remark on his demise. However, lack of Deuteronomistic idiom or ideology does not necessarily indicate pre-Deuteronomistic

origin. Bezzel concludes that the theology arising from the narratives of Saul's death is closer to the Chronicler's than that of the Deuteronomist.

3. ISSUES FOR FUTURE INVESTIGATION

This survey of the contributions to this volume clearly demonstrates how varied are the approaches to the question of the place of the book of Samuel within the Deuteronomistic History. Many of the contributions also demonstrate an ongoing dialogue within the scholarly community that transverses continents and schools of thought. The fact that the participants in this volume mostly chose to focus on 1 Samuel raises questions for future discussion regarding the second half of the Samuel scroll. Was any account of David's kingship available to the Deuteronomist? Is the bulk of 2 Samuel post-Deuteronomistic? If so, then how do we explain the web of interconnections demonstrated by Nelson that anchor both parts of the book to its place within the Deuteronomistic History?

The essays also drive home the need for a careful definition of Deuteronomism. Previously, many thought that the Deuteronomistic literary corpus was the product of a scribal circle that was active for a limited period of about one hundred years, from the time of Josiah to the middle of the Babylonian period. However, Deuteronomism apparently continues in Deuterocanonical and other later literature, but the implications arising from this have not yet been adequately considered in studies of the roots and history of the Deuteronomistic scribal tradition.¹⁸ This longevity of Deuteronomistic idiom and concepts challenges the earlier views regarding the historical setting of the Deuteronomistic literary production in the book of Samuel.

Furthermore, recent studies have shown that many of the divergent textual readings in Samuel are more than transmission variants and are indicative of lengthy ongoing revision and editing of the book. As several of the contributors point out, at least some of the Deuteronomisms contained in the MT are missing in the LXX (as well as other witnesses) and are thus probably later additions, which may derive from the last centuries B.C.E. Accordingly, it is necessary to bring the text-critical evidence to the

18. For Deuteronomism in later literature, see the contributions by Beentjes, Borchart, Marttila, Pajunen, Voita, and Weeks in Hanne von Weissenberg et al., eds., *Changes in Scripture* (BZAW 419; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011). Deuteronomism can be found, for example, in Baruch, Ben Sira, Judith, 1 Maccabees, and the Temple Scroll.

fore in the discussion about redactions. These caveats highlight the difficulties in identifying the precise stage in which the basic narrative of the book of Samuel was introduced into the historical account that begins in the premonarchic times and ends with the demise of Judah. Text and redaction criticism should also pay close attention to the Chronicler's parallels with Samuel. Why are the Chronicler's parallels closer to the text in Kings than in Samuel? When does divergence in Chronicles stem from the Chronicler's tendencies with regard to his sources? And when can the Chronicler's parallels be used as documented evidence for the type of text that was available for the Chronicler?

Of course, structural considerations also play a crucial role in deciding this matter. How does Samuel relate to the overall structure of the narrative from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings? Is it an integral part of this narrative, without which the rest of the composition would be lame, or is it a thematic, ideological, and/or structural anomaly between Deuteronomy–Joshua–Judges and the book of Kings? The potential thematic tensions will also have to be addressed in any solution to the question. For example, one needs to explain why cult centralization plays a central role in the book of Kings when the book of Samuel seems to ignore the theme. Similarly, why are the other gods a major theme and a concern of successive redactors in Deuteronomy and Kings, while in Samuel the other gods are criticized in isolated verses often assumed to be late additions (e.g., 1 Sam 7:3–4; 12:10, 21)?

The way scholarship addresses the question whether the book of Samuel underwent Deuteronomistic editing or revision or originally belonged to a pre-Deuteronomistic work that included other books of the Former Prophets colors our perception of many aspects of this book (and of the other books in question). Several issues would be viewed differently if the main redaction did not intend Samuel to be read along with Deuteronomy and Kings. A book of Samuel, independent of the Deuteronomists, would have a different social and religious background from a book of Samuel that was essentially composed and transmitted within Deuteronomistic circles. The book of Kings without a “Davidic” prelude would also provide a different perspective to the origins of the monarchy.

In closing, we—the editors—wish to thank all those who participated in the SBL sessions on “What Is Deuteronomistic about Samuel?” that led to this volume and to those who responded to our subsequent invitation to contribute to this collection. We hope that this volume will spark more continued dialogue on the question, “Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists?”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, Klaus-Peter. *Saul und David in der jüdischen Geschichtsschreibung: Studien zu 1 Samuel 16–2 Samuel 5*. FAT 51. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Auld, A. Graeme. *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- . *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2004.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, and Jozef T. Milik. *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Donald W. Parry, Richard J. Saley, and Eugene C. Ulrich. *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel*. DJD XVII. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005.
- Dietrich, Walter. *1 Samuel 1–12*. BKAT 8.1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2011.
- Fischer, Alexander A. *Von Hebron nach Jerusalem: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zur Erzählung von König David in II Sam 1–5*. BZAW 335. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- Heinrich, André. *David und Klio: Historiographische Elemente in der Aufstiegs Geschichte Davids und im Alten Testament*. BZAW 401. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Hugo, Philippe. “The Jerusalem Temple Seen in Second Samuel according to the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint.” Pages 183–96 in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Ljubljana, 2007*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. SBLSCS 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Hugo, Philippe and Adrian Schenker, eds. *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*. VTSup 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Hutzli, Jürg. *Die Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel: Textkritische und literarische Analyse von 1. Samuel 1–2 unter Berücksichtigung des Kontextes*. ATANT 89. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2007.
- . “Mögliche Retuschen am Davidbild in der masoretischen Fassung der Samuelbücher.” Pages 102–16 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, 2004.
- Müller, Reinhard. *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik*. FAT 2/3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Pakkala, Juha. "Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings in the Redaction of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets." Pages 133–63 in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Ray Person and Konrad Schmid. FAT 2/56. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Römer, Thomas. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Rudnig, Thilo. *Davids Thron: Redaktionskritische Studien zur Geschichte von der Thronnachfolge Davids*. BZAW 358. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Schäfer-Lichtenberger, Christa, ed. *Die Samuelbücher und die Deuteronomisten*. BWANT 188. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010.
- Van Seters, John. *The Biblical Saga of King David*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Veijola, Timo. *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. AASF B.198. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977.
- . *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. AASF B.193. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975.
- Vermeylen, Jacques. *La loi du plus fort: Histoire de la rédaction des récits davidiques de 1 Samuel 8 à 1 Rois 2*. BETL 154. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000.
- Weissenberg, Hanne von, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, eds. *Changes in Scripture*. BZAW 419. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.