DEUTERONOMY–KINGS AS EMERGING AUTHORITATIVE BOOKS

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature

Ancient Near East Monographs

Number 6

DEUTERONOMY–KINGS AS EMERGING AUTHORITATIVE BOOKS

A CONVERSATION

Edited by

Diana V. Edelman

To the memory of my father, Arthur T. Vikander, who was
so proud of my scholarly pursuits and accomplishments.

The final editing of this volume was completed
during our last weeks together.

Contents

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1992.
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AnBib	Analecta biblica
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
GAT	Grundrisse zum Alten Testament
GKC	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by Emil Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1910.
ESHM	European Seminar in Historical Methodology
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testaments
FOTL	Forms of Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testament

HKAT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament.
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JHS	*Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
NCBS	New Century Bible Series
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP	*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände, Altes Testament
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLAIL	Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Israel and Its Literature
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SCSS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Studies Monograph Series
STAR	Studies in Theology and Religion

STW	Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Wissenschaft
STTSB	Suomalainen Tiedakatemie Toimituksia, Sarja B.
TB	Theologische Bücherei
ThWAT	*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970–2006.
TransSup	Supplément à Transeuphratène
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZAR	*Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZBKAT	Zürcher Bibelkommentare Altes Testament

Introduction

Diana V. Edelman

The existence of a "Deuteronomistic History," consisting of the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, is under review.[1] Is this scholarly construct an accurate understanding of what ancient writers of the Hebrew Bible conceived to be a coherent sequence of books that should be read together? Did the books ever form an independent collection, without Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers prefixed, or without Genesis-Numbers prefixed? If we are not as certain as past generations that they ever formed a recognized literary unit,[2] why ask what was deemed

---

1. For convenient summaries of the history of the theory of the existence of Deuteronomistic historiography, see Douglas A. Knight, "Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomists," in *Old Testament Interpretation Past, Present, and Future: Essays in Honour of Gene M. Tucker* (ed. James L. Mays, David L. Petersen and Kent H. Richards; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 61–79; Thomas Römer and Albert de Pury, "Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues," in *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic History in Recent Research* (ed. Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 24–141.

2. For essays and studies dealing with various aspects of this debate, see conveniently, A. Graeme Auld, *Joshua, Moses and the Land: Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch in a Generation since 1938* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980); Claus Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* (TB 87; Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1994); James R. Linville, *Israel in the Book of Kings: The Past as a Project of Social Identity* (JSOTSup 272; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 46–73; Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Bible* (trans. J. Bowden; New York: T&T Clark, International, 2000), 1–5, 153–221; Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds., *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic History in Recent Research* (JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Christian Frevel, "Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk oder Gechichtswerke? Die These Martin Noths zwischen Tetrateuch, Hexateuch und

authoritative about these five books in the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods, by which time it is generally agreed they existed close to their current final forms?

The purpose of the present volume is not to focus on the important debate about the status of the so-called Deuteronomistic History, though the results might contribute toward framing arguments on one side or the other. Instead, it is to try to understand the element of authority in relation to each book, which can be construed in two different ways. On the one hand, it can lead us to ask why we have each of the five individual books and what concerns led to their creation using which older materials to address those issues, because these earlier traditions carried some weight of authority for the community of scribes who penned the narratives as well as for their implied target audience(s). Currently, the dates of composition for the various books are generally assigned to the late monarchic period, the Neo-Babylonian period, or the early Persian period. In all three cases, a second question naturally arises then that needs a reasoned response: once created, why would the concerns addressed have had ongoing relevance and resonance for audiences in the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods?

On the other hand, the concept of authority can lead us to ask why the five individual books gained authoritative status, regardless of the age or of the materials in them; why was it desirable to give authority to written narratives about YHWH's relation to the people of Israel? Many of the essays in the volume emphasize the close connection between authority and group identity, where the texts can help define a group by serving as a written, authoritative depository of valued social memories that are

---

Enneateuch," in *Martin Noth: Aus der Sicht heutiger Forschung* (ed. Udo Rüterswörden; biblisch-theologische Studien 58; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 60–94; Philippe Guillaume, *Waiting for Josiah: The Judges* (JSOTSup 385; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 227–36; Eckhard Otto and Reinhard Achenbach, eds., *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004); Markus Witte et al., *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk: redaktions- und religionsgesichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"- Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (BZAW 365; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006); Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid, eds., *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (SBLAIL 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011); Konrad Schmid and Raymond F. Person Jr., eds., *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History* (FAT 2/56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

to be learned and passed on by those considering themselves to belong to the group. In this case, the book of Deuteronomy had audiences in both Samaria and Yehud/Judea who considered themselves to belong to Israel, while Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings eventually were considered authoritative only for Judean-rooted Israel. Thus, the volume is primarily concerned with the issues of authority, identity, and social memory, though only that of authority is addressed directly in each contribution. The other two will surface in varying degrees as each scholar seeks to answer "why" their book gained authority.

The five essays by C. Levin, Y. Amit, E. A. Knauf, K.-P. Adam, and T. Römer were initially presented at the European Association of Biblical Studies Meeting in Tartu, Estonia, July 25–29, 2010, in a session of the research program "Israel and the Production and Reception of Authoritative Books in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods," co-chaired by Ehud Ben Zvi and myself. The announced theme was "What made these books authoritative within the discourse of Persian Yehud/early Hellenistic Judah?" It was worthwhile to commission a second set of essays on each book from scholars who would not likely agree with the first group, as a way of teasing out issues and beginning a conversation about why the books of Deuteronomy–2 Kings became authoritative as individual compositions and, it was hoped, secondarily, as part of a larger grouping, whether that be conceived as a Deuteronomistic collection or the traditional "Deuteronomistic History." Ehud had many other commitments at the time, and thus I took full and sole control of this project. The current volume is the result of my efforts. The authors of the first five papers were encouraged to make any necessary revisions to ensure they engaged directly with the thematic question while the second group was being assembled. The most successful conversations have been initiated when both essays on a given book have focused the majority of their discussion on the central theme.

The contributors were asked to focus on a single book as an individual unit, though they were encouraged to explore links between their book and the other four. Two essays are devoted to each book. What was deemed authoritative in or about Deuteronomy? Joshua? Judges? Samuel? Kings? Individual scholars have been encouraged to state whether they believe the author of their book also wrote one or more of the other books, or whether one or more editors joined together independently created compositions to create a larger, intentional literary unit. Like the debate about the existence of a "Deuteronomistic History," the compositional and redactional history of these books is not the primary focus.

A case has been made for seeing a set of theologically coherent ideas and certain idiomatic words or phrases in these five books, suggesting they formed a literary unit or subunit.[3] Yet, ultimately, Judaism identified the first five books, Genesis-Deuteronomy, as a literary unit and joined Joshua-Kings with the ensuing collection of prophetic books to create a unit dubbed "The Prophets." Taking a closer thematic look at the initial nine books in the Hebrew Bible, it can be argued that Exodus-Deuteronomy comprise a "biography of Moses," a "Quatrateuch," to which a narrative about the forefathers was prefaced—Genesis—creating the authorized "Pentateuch." But it has also long been debated whether originally, a Pentateuch was envisioned by the ancient authors or a Hexateuch that included Joshua, since the promise of the land is a prominent theme in Genesis that only finds it final fulfilment in the occupation of Canaan in Joshua.[4] Still others propose that Genesis–Kings comprises a single, coherent narrative that should not be subdivided, because Judges, Samuel, and Kings cannot stand independently from what precedes. They, too, exemplify the theme of the Promised Land, justifying its eventual loss for the repeated failure of the people of Israel and its leaders to keep the terms of the covenant made by YHWH with the ancestors. It has even been suggested that an original Pentateuch included Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Joshua, with Deuteronomy being placed in its current position later on, when the Enneateuch was created, to extend the original narrative later in time, to the exile.[5]

In these many debates, Deuteronomy plays a pivotal role, creating a bridge between the ancestors and a series of divine covenants made outside the land and the failure to observe the terms of many of the covenants once inside the land. It becomes somewhat moot whether the book ends

---

3. See the classical formulation of the hypothesis of the existence of a Deuteronomistic History developed by Martin Noth in *The Deuteronomistic History* (2d ed.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991; German original *Überlieferungs-geschichtliche Studien* I [Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1943]). For a list of allegedly Deuteronomic phraseology, see Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 320–65; idem, *Deuteronomy 1–11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 35–37. For unifying techniques amongst the books, see e.g. Richard D. Nelson, *The Historical Books* (Interpreting Biblical Texts; Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 70–77.

4. For an evaluation of the Hexateuch hypothesis, see, for example, Frevel, "Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk oder Gechichtswerke," 80–86.

5. E. Axel Knauf, *Josua* (ZBKAT 6; Zürich: TVZ, 2008), 18.

a plot-line that began in Genesis or begins a new plot-line that ends in Kings, with exile.[6] Endings are beginnings; the introduction of idiomatic language that will recur throughout the story developed in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings can come at the beginning of a new direction in which the plot moves or can be anticipated already in the ongoing plot before dramatic new events unfold. After all, there is arguably a single story being narrated from Genesis-Kings, whether a preconceived one meant to be developed over a multivolume project or an *ad hoc* one that evolved over time as individual compositions that worked with similar themes, motifs, and concerns were placed side by side, resulting in the emergence of a series of successive, discrete periods.[7] Bearing this in mind, it is possible to examine the five books of Deuteronomy–2 Kings as a subunit of a larger whole, whether or not one chooses to designate them officially by the scholarly moniker, "The Deuteronomistic History," with all the presuppositions that label and construct entails.

Authority

The ten contributors have understood authority in different ways. These include: a socially constructed interpretative framework into which a readership places texts they consider to embody truths or insights considered to be necessary or valuable resources for public discourse on socially sig-

---

6. One should take note with E. A. Knauf of how the end of Kings is a very weak conclusion to the proposed Enneateuch but serves well as an opening to a continuing history instead, consituting an excellent introduction to the prophetic books ("Does 'Deuteronomistic Historiography' Exist?" in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic History in Recent Research* [ed. Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 388–98 [397]). As such, it could be seen to occupy a pivotal role, similar to Deuteronomy.

7. An interesting question is whether the literary technique of interweaving has been used to join together two formerly independent cycles; a "Pentateuch" that included Gen-Num + Josh, and a "Quatrateuch" that included Deut + Judg-Kgs. To combine the two, the first book of the second unit has been placed immediately before the last book of the first cycle, creating anticipation. It is noteworthy that the internal justification given to explain the two law-giving accounts in Exod and Deut is that two sets of laws were revealed to Moses by God: the first was to apply while the people remained outside the Promised Land, and the second was to come into force once the people were settled in the Promised Land. Thus, Exod applies to the narrative through the occupation in Josh, while Deut applies through to the exile.

nificant topics such as matters of religious practice, belief, the symbolic boundaries of society, and social order; the final form of the text; the definitive version of certain past events; the torah-based ethic expressed in many texts in the Hebrew Bible; a text that has become established by virture of having being read and reread; an established text that is updated to maintain its authority; an established text that prompts the composition of a new text that leaves it intact but creates an updated version as an independent compostion, as in the cases of Deuteronomy and Chronicles; and the ability to understand the enigmas and the disjunctions in a collection of texts containing a matrix of stories and myths that allowed different views of what makes an ideal society and its norms to be considered and debated. This fluidity opens a vital conversation about who created these books initially, for whom, why, and when, and additionally, who were subsequent audiences who read them, and why? Were the books authoritative from their inception and creation or did they only become so over time, and if so, why? Who had authority to "update" the texts for subsequent audiences?

The essay by T. Bolin situates their authoritative use as educational texts for the children of priests, Levites, and the influential families of Yehud, on analogy with the Greek and Hellenistic educational system in particular, as opposed to former scribal training in Mesopotamia and Egypt. Certainly, Ben Sira indicates that the texts were being used to educate Jewish youth whose fathers could afford to send their children to a private tutor by ca. 190 B.C.E. But it is unclear if this were a relatively new development during the Hellenistic period, which emulated the Greek system but used "native" texts instead of Homer to enculturate Jewish youth, emphasizing Jewish ideals, morals, and ethics, or if it had begun already during the Persian Empire or earlier. The depiction of Ezra's memorization and interiorization of YHWH's teaching in Ezra 7:10 so that he was "skilled" in it (Ezra 8:6) and of his study of it with priests, Levites, and the heads of the ancestral clans of all the people with in Neh 8:13 seems to presume a Hellenistic educational system.

Like most biblical books, the dating of Ezra and Nehemiah is disputed. While many presume a Persian-era date close to the events depicted, a minority favor a Hellenistic date.[8] The former group would likely see the books to provide evidence for the use of such an educational system in

---

8. For the varying dates of composition and the rationales underlying them, see, for example, Jacob M. Myers, *Ezra Nehemiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 14; Garden City, N.Y.: 1965), lxviii-lxx; Leonard H. Brockington, *Ezra, Nehemiah and*

the mid-fifth century, under Persian imperialism, while the latter group would see them to confirm the picture presented in Ben Sira. They would argue it is logical to associate this educational system with social memories about the group's "new beginning," when Jerusalem was reinhabited, the temple was rebuilt, and Torah was to play a new, central role in defining the people.

Were the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings created as educational texts, or did they eventually come to serve that as one purpose among others, as they gained authoritative status? Here we return to the conundrum about their original purposes and audiences. The early work by A. Lemaire on scribal schools argued there was a widespread educational system in monarchic Judah that featured royal scribal schools in various cities as well as local schools in outlying sites like Arad, Kadesh-Barnea and Kuntillet ʿAjrud and separate schools for the training of priests and prophets. He argued the biblical canon developed from the curricula used in these various schools.[9] His theories have not gained wide support. E. Ben Zvi has proposed a model for their composition and early use that sees them to be created for the small circle of "literati" as a means of exploring vital issues and pressing concerns in the present and future by drawing on lessons from the past, without pushing for a consensus view.[10] He emphasizes the didactic and socializing roles of reading and rereading these works within that group. D. M. Carr similarly thinks that the original intended audience was a small group. He defines its members as scribes, priests, administrators, and kings. He also argues that the purpose was educational. According to him, students memorized and recited long passages from an authoritative curriculum, which simultaneously served as templates for the composition of new texts. The written corpus served at the same time as a means of enculturation and preservation of national tradition. For Carr literacy was training in and mastery of the tradition

---

Esther (NCBS; London: Thomas Nelson, 1969), 24–25; Hugh G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1985), xxv-xxxvi.

9. André Lemaire, *Les Écoles et la formation de la Bible dans l'ancien Israël* (OBO 39; Fribourg: University Press, 1981).

10. See, for example, Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Concept of Prophetic Books and Its Historical Setting," in *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophets and Prophecy in Yehud* (ed. Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi; BibleWorld; London: Equinox, 2009), 73–95; idem, "Reconstructing the Intellectual Discourse of Ancient Yehud," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 39 (2010): 7–23.

and not necessarily alphabetic competency.[11] He concludes that much of what is currently contained in the literature of the Hebrew Bible had served as key parts of an indigenous curriculum for early Israelite scribes and other literate members of the upper class.[12]

K. van der Toorn considers the biblical texts to have been created for the scribal community by Levitical scribes attached to the temple, though the contents of the scrolls became more widely disseminated and known due to oral recitation. He identifies six ways scribes produced written texts: transcription of oral lore, invention of a new text, compilation of existing lore, either oral or written, expansion of an inherited text, adaptation of an existing text for a new audience, and integration of individual documents into a more comprehensive composition and then asserts no text in the Hebrew Bible is the explicit invention of a scribe.[13] However, he has not attempted to understand scribal compositional techniques, *per se*, and has not addressed the purpose of the creation of this written literature.

J. A. Sanders, on the other hand, has identified seven modes of inter-textuality that were involved in the creation of the biblical literature. The literature is presumed to be be made up of previous literature, which is reflected through citation, allusion and paraphrases of the preceding literature so that the existing texts serve as the "generating force" underlying the elaboration of narrative or other textual expansion.[14] These include: citation with or without formula, weaving of scriptural phrases into newer composition, paraphrasing scriptural passages, reflection of the structure of scriptural passage, allusions to scriptural persons, episodes, or events, and echoes of Scripture passages in a later composition.[15] Unlike van der

---

11. David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 116–73.

12. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 156. Although the approaches of Carr and Ben Zvi share significant similarites, key differences emerge from their different dating of the texts and from Carr's willingness to address forerunners or earlier versions of texts and Ben Zvi's reticence to do so.

13. Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 92, 110, 115.

14. James A. Sanders, "Canon as Dialogue," in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. Peter W. Flint; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 7–26 (17).

15. James A. Sanders, "Intertextuality and Canon," in *On the Way to Nineveh: Studies in Honor of George M. Landes* (ed. Stephen L. Cook and Sarah C. Winter; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 316–33; idem, "Canon as Dialogue," 19.

Toorn, whose list seems to address what scribes typically did when working with texts, Sanders has addressed how they created literature.

P. Davies notes that some texts, like Esther, Ruth and Jonah, appear to have been written for enjoyment by a wider public and not just scribes, but he also notes this might have arisen in the Hellenistic setting, where the spread of literacy led to the adaptation of scribal education and its "canon" to a wider nonprofessional education, which led to changes to the "canon." He cautions against assuming the Masoretic-rabbinic canon represented solely a school curriculum and notes that the canonizing process seems to have involved debate over the movement of history, internationalizing, and universalizing, with a deliberate move to include texts that prevented a consensus view.[16] This brief survey demonstrates our lack of information about formal or informal education in Judah during the monarchy or in Yehud in the Persian period as well as the ultimate purpose behind creating a collection of written works of literature to be read and reread.

Authority, Identity, and Social Memory

A shared common past is a typical trait along with perceived kinship, a common language, a common religion, shared culture and customs, and sometimes regionalism, which help a group establish its identity and define who is an ethnic "insider" and who is an "outsider."[17] Those in

---

16. Philip R. Davies, *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Library of Ancient Israel; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 85, 124.

17. So, for example, Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz* (New York: Basic Books, 1973); especially germane are "The Integrative Revolution," The Interpretation of Cultures," 255–310 (261–63) and "Politics Past, Politics Present: Some Notes on the Uses of Anthropology in Understanding the New States," 327–41 (331–35); Harry C. Triandis, "Theoretical and Methodological Approaches to the Study of Collectivism and Individualism," in *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications* (ed. Uichol Kim *et al.*; Cross-Cultural Research and Methodology Series 18; London: Sage, 1994), 41–51; Anthony D. Smith, "Culture, community, and territory: the politics of ethnicity and nationalism," *International Affairs* 72/3 (1996): 445–58; Steve Fenton, *Ethnicity* (2nd rev. and updated ed.; Key Concepts in the Social Sciences; Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2013), 63–64. For a discussion of characteristics of collectivism in social groups in contemporary Indian culture, see Jai B. P. Sinha, "Collectivism, Social Energy, and Development in India," in *From a Different Perspective: Studies of Behavior Across Cultures* (ed. Isabel Reyes Lagunes and Ype H. Poortinga; Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1985), 109–19. For the relationship between individual and gender identity and ethnic identity, see Peter Wein-

power or with authority tend to control what is remembered and how, as well as what is forgotten in the collective memory of the larger group. They also are involved in the means used to make those memories familiar to, and inculcated in, members across society, which usually involves institutionalizing them to provide a material as well as intellectual existence in society.[18]

While subgroups exist that can have different understandings of communal memory that challenge hegemonic ones, they still are reacting to the established authoritative accounts that are accepted by either a majority of the wider group or those in power, who control what is considered to be "orthodox." Subgroups also often create and perpetuate a set of their own additional memories that they recall in particular gatherings and contexts, which are meaningful primarily for them. These, in turn, influence their understandings of the "orthodox" texts. An individual in a given society will assign meaning to the common social past, however it is expressed, on the basis of his or her cumulative experience and memories, individual and shared.[19] But even though the human brain operates in this way, socialization and enculturation from the time of birth predispose individuals to assign similar values and meanings to "concepts" consisting of semantic and sensory patterns that derive from interaction with one's environment.[20]

---

reich, "The Operationalization of Ethnic Identity," in *Ethnic Psychology: Research and Practice with Immigrants, Refugees, Native Peoples, Ethnic Groups and Sojourners* (ed. John W. Berry and Robert C. Annis; Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1988), 149–68.

18. For the content of knowledge and mode of thought in traditional social settings, see Robin Horton, "African Traditional Thought and Western Science: Part 1: From Tradition to Science," *Africa* 37 (1967): 50–71; idem, "African Traditional Thought and Western Science: Part 2: The Closed and Open Predicaments," *Africa* 37 (1967): 155–87.

19. For essays from multidisciplinary perspectives on how an individual's self-concept and constructed identity affect his or her behavior, see, e.g., Anita Jacobson-Widding (ed.), *Identity: Personal and Socio-Cultural* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Uppsala Studies in Cultural Anthropology 5; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wicksell International, 1983).

20. For a study of how mother-child communication helps impart the prevailing socio-cultural system, see Soo Hang Choi, "Communicative Socialization Processes: Korea and Canada," in *Innovations in Cross-Cultural Psychology: Selected Papers from the Tenth International Conference of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology* (ed. Saburo Iwawaki, Yoshihisa Kashima and Kwok Leung; Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1992), 103–22; more generally, see James Fentress and Chris Wick-

One of the most common ways to remember is narrative emplotment, oral or written. It is generally recognized amongst those engaged in memory studies in various disciplines that facts and details relating to selected events and experiences are lost in the early stages of the formulation of social memory as stories are created so the group can easily recall the incidents. There is a filtering process at work in the transformation of experienced events into images and "concepts" that will be easy to grasp, which will evoke a shared value-system and meaning amongst the group, and which will be capable of transmission.[21] By definition then, social memory is a deliberately simplified version of the past that has eliminated specific, nontypical details for the sake of easy recall, using standard elements and plot-lines that will evoke shared meanings that have been inculcated through socialization and informal or formal education.

The move to create a canon of authoritative texts within a society involves the selection and organization of certain texts from a larger group and putting in place a means to ensure their transmission.[22] Canons serve multiple functions in a society. They create collective identities, legitimate political power, and uphold or undermine value systems.[23] As the collective self-identity or value systems of the group change over time, the corpus of texts can be modified or adapted to reflect the new situation. The Hebrew Bible represents such a canon for emergent Jewish communities that self-identified as "children of Israel" and eventually, for Jewish-Christian and Christian communities as well, with modifications via truncation and expansion over time.

---

ham, *Social Memory* (New Perspectives on the Past; Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 47; Pascal Boyer, *Religion Explained*: *The Human Instincts that Fashion Gods, Spirits, and Ancestors* (London: Vintage Books, 2002), 21, 47–51; Astrid Erll, *Memory in Culture* (trans. S. B. Young; Palgrave Macmillan Memory Studies; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 82–89.

21. See, for example, Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Themes in the Social Sciences; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 76; Fentress and Wickham, *Social Memory*, 47–48, 71–74. It has also been noted that the inclusion of an element that does not fit with an expected plot-line or which is counter-intuitive makes it more memorable.

22. For the role of literature more generally in individual and social memory, see Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 75–82, 89–91, 160–71.

23. For these functions, see, for example, Jan Assmann, *Religion and Culture Memory: Ten Studies* (trans. R. Livingstone; Cultural Memory in the Present; Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2006).

Chapter Summaries and Conversation Openers

Deuteronomy

P. Davies begins his investigation of Deuteronomy by examining questions of authorship before moving on to questions about its growing authority. He notes its author blends the two genres of vassal treaty and law code and has the suzerain, unusually in this case, the deity YHWH, use an intermediary patron, secondarily identified as Moses, to address the vassal Israel directly, rather than its king, as would have been standard. In contrast to the call for the centralization of the temple cult in the book, the administration of Torah is not centralized or located in that temple cult; it is separate. He posits the need to give careful consideration to the book's creation in Samaria rather than in Yehud in the early Persian period.

He then argues that Deuteronomy did not have intrinsic authority when it was composed but gained it subsequently, through giving it secondary endorsement via the two institutions that are central to the book of Kings: kingship (King Josiah) and prophecy (Huldah). Deuteronomy envisages a society in which the token king rules by the law book (Deut 17:14–20) and in which prophets can only give messages that are consistent with the commandments in the law book (Deut 13). It also envisages Levites working in towns and villages throughout Samaria and Yehud to implement the law book, in accordance with requirements of the Persian Empire. Yet, Davies also argues the book of Deuteronomy was never *taught* outside the scribal schools in Jerusalem and Samaria or Gerizim; the text remained for the most part the domain of the clerics and educated laity. He thinks we can infer from the move to give it added authority by introducing it into the book of Kings that its contents did not carry sufficient authority or that they were challenged by another group, such as those responsible for Chronicles.

Deuteronomy is seen to be a utopian book in its vision of an Israel bound by a religious treaty to create a specific, "ideal" society. It represents a program for the new religion of YHWH and its new "Israel" to become not just a cult but a *culture*, in which Torah replaces monarchy and prophecy and indeed almost everything else, and its ministers are Levites—priests, but mostly without a sanctuary. It advocates a new pattern of religion in which the people become responsible for their own behavior and fate by choosing or not choosing to observe the community and domestic laws commanded by YHWH, which serve as the condi-

tional basis of his election of Israel. Its authority resides in its ethic, the set of principles it contains, by which its reenvisioned, new "Israel" was to define itself.

The pilgrimage festivals, especially Passover, become the most important element of the envisioned ongoing, centralized temple cult; its daily priestly rituals are of little or no import. Deuteronomy has Moses deliver the "book of the law" as part of a larger speech that recalls the exodus. It thus identifies the exodus story as the founding event and the law book as the founding constitution of the new nation and in the process, assigns itself the status of a foundational *text*.

In the second article on Deuteronomy, C. Levin accepts that the earliest nucleus of Deuteronomy is a reworking of the Covenant Code to emphasize centralization of the national cult; it contains social-ethical intentions in its paraenetic sections, like the Covenant Code. This nucleus dates from the time of Josiah at the end of the seventh century B.C.E. and, by implication, was to give divine weight to the desired centralization program by associating its promotion by YHWH himself as a part of the stipulations to be obeyed by Israel when the covenant was made at Mt Sinai. It is presented as something that is to apply once the people enter the Promised Land, revealed to the people by Moses only on the eve of the conquest, when the need for cult centralization would become directly relevant. Subsequently, at the beginning of the sixth century when the country was under impending Neo-Babylonian conquest, the code was set into its historical framework. He then argues that, at the end of the sixth century B.C.E, after Yehud had become a Persian province and hope for the rebirth of the Davidic monarchy had died, the cultic community of Jerusalem considered itself to be YHWH's direct vassal in place of the former Davidic line and the law code of Deuteronomy was revised to take on the form of a treaty between YHWH Elohim and Israel directly, and thus, to serve as a code of behavior toward YHWH Elohim himself.

The main thrust of the paper focuses on further adaptations to the book undertaken in the Persian and Hellenistic periods that center on two themes: the ethics of brotherhood and the care of the poor. Careful, analytical readings of Deut 15:1–6, 7–11, 12–18; 19:16–21; 22:1–4; 23:20–2; 24:7, 10–13, 14–15; 25:1–3 in various versions are undertaken to tease out editorial layers. Levin argues that passages that develop the theme of the ethics of brotherhood assume the presence of the covenant theology revisions and so reflect a chronologically subsequent development. They were not part of the original law code, as commonly assumed. Rather, they

reflect the morality of the Jewish temple community, which constituted an ethno-religious minority within the larger population of Yehud in the Persian period. The theme of the care of the poor reflects links with the "devout poor" in the Psalms and similar supplements also made to the prophetic books that identify "the poor" as a religiously devout group with a special closeness to God who will survive the eschatological judgment. It reflects concerns that developed in the Hellenistic period.

There is little direct conversation between the two papers, yet together, they raise a number of important issues for futher reflection. One posits the monarchic era as the time of composition and the other the Persian period; each provides a rationale for the proposed socio-historical context. How does a decision about origin impact on the book's authority? How does purpose relate to authority? While one sees authority from the beginning, inherent in the book's composition, the other posits authority being a secondary development, which accounts for the story of the finding of the law scroll during temple renovations in the reign of King Josiah. What clues can be used to deduce or understand a text's primary or secondary authority? When can we identify the existence of something we would call a book of Deuteronomy; would it only be once the law code was set in its narrative framework? How did authority work in emerging Jewish communities such that it was possible to alter the text of an authoritiave book over centuries, on the one hand, and yet create a different book from Exodus, rather than simply updating that book? Why did this book form a core for both the Samarian and Judean communities?

Joshua

E. A. Knauf tackles the twofold question of authority relating to the book of Joshua: why the Joshua character grew in authority, and why his story was formulated as a book, which became authoritative. He answers the first by noting that the narrative beginning either in Genesis or Exodus needs an ending other than what is in Deut 34, where the Israelites are still in the desert, outside time and space. The account of how they came into their land and possessed it under Moses' appointed prophetic successor, Joshua (Deut 31–34 if not Exod 15–Deut 34), is required. Its specific format as a book derives from the growth of the corpora of texts that eventually became the two collections that comprise Torah and Prophets. As the first book of the latter corpus, it exemplifies the role of the prophets who will succeed Moses but never be his equal: God talks to them and they

may perform miracles but primarily, they are to learn, teach, and apply Torah and write down their divine encounters. The core of the book is the distribution of the land for Israelite tenure. This theology was particularly germane to two developments in the Persian period: 1) the imperial bureaucracy was interested in confiscating communal land to create military fiefs; and 2) once money was introduced, land could be used to secure agricultural credit. The book offers its intended Persian audience a utopian political vision of every person under his or her vine and fig tree, forever. Jerusalem is conspicuously absent but is implied: a new Jerusalem, regulated by Torah and associated with the Second Temple.

In the second article on Joshua, S. Frolov argues that, like the book of Judges, Joshua is not likely to have been read independently. It cannot be known if it were created as a separate unit prior to the formation of the canonical Enneateuch, but the internal use of the opening formula, "And it happened after the death of PN" in Josh 1:1; Judg 1:1; 2 Sam 1:1 and 2 Kgs 1:1suggests it was part of an integral composition. It also fits the roughly symmetrical distribution of the most prominent genres (narratives, genealogies, commandments and admonitions) in the Enneateuch. As a result, he thinks we can only ask how Joshua affected the reception of the larger corpus of Genesis–2 Kings, of which it was an integral part. He notes it functions in the larger whole by highlighting the rewards that come from observing Torah, especially keeping the First Commandment, in contrast to the transgression of Torah and the associated punishment and decline in Judges-Kings. As such, it serves to represent blessing, as opposed to curse, matching blessing in Lev 26:3–39 and curse in Deut 28:1–68 and helping to shape the Enneateuch as a suzerain treaty, with the preamble in Gen 1–Exod 19; the stipulations in Exod 20–Deut 34, and the blessings and curses in Joshua-Kings.

For Frolov, the reassurance that YHWH will reward those who observe Torah with uncontested control over land of their own and "rest round about" was particularly important for a group whose collective memory included forced relocation. Yet, he also notes how the political situation in the Persian period did not correspond to what is depicted in either Joshua or in Kings, which could generate doubts about the portrayed causal link between land and Torah observance as well as doubts that the entrenched imperial system could ever change. At the same time, by the later Persian period, Joshua's depiction of a nondynastic, non-Davidic leader working in tandem with the high priest could provide a working model for Israel beyond monarchy, even if it originally were

meant to be an inadequate, temporary solution. In the Hellenistic period, however, the "transformative" plot-line of the book, where the Canaanite landscape becomes reapportioned to Torah-observant Israelites, but not under Davidic leadership, was closer to experienced reality. As a result, an original Enneateuch, which had been truncated in the Persian period to create a Pentateuch without a problematic link between land and Torah observance, could be restored, but now as two collections instead of one: the Torah and the Former Prophets.

Both of these essays grapple with the role of the book of Joshua within a story-line that extends from Genesis through 2 Kings. Both authors agree that a main focus in the book is ownership of the Promised Land, which fulfils the Abrahamic promise. Both also tend to argue that Joshua would not have existed as an independent composition set side by side with other existing compositions so that over time, a periodized "time-line" would have developed via juxtaposition; rather, it would have been composed as part of a multivolume project. Yet, as the first book of the eventual prophetic collection in Jewish tradition, it seems odd that Joshua is never called a prophet. His leadership role in Israel after Moses is dependent upon accounts in earlier Pentateuchal books that depict or describe him directly as Moses' "assistant" (*mešeret*) (Exod 17, 24, 33; Num 11, 13, 14; Deut 1:38; 3:21, 28; 31:3, 7; 34:9) and which depict YHWH selecting him to be the new leader (Num 14; 27:18–22) and directly commissioning him (Deut 31:14, 23). The audience is left to infer that Joshua is the "prophet like Moses."

How can we sort out the dual depiction of Joshua as military leader and yet as an obedient Torah-follower and Torah-interpreter, who also follows direct commands from YHWH? Were both an integral part of the original plot and if so, why? Is the opening line of the book original or part of the redactional process that has created the Hexateuch or Enneateuch? Is the unstated prophetic function actually intended at the compositional or redactional level? As noted by Knauf, Jerusalem is not mentioned directly either but certainly is implied.

While both scholars seem to favor a date of composition in the Persian period, neither addresses directly the relationship between purpose and authority. Both, however, seem to assume that the meta-story line was meant to carry social authority as a definitive version of a shared past, lending the book of Joshua authority because of the role it plays in developing a definitive version of the past. Does it also serve to endorse a form of political leadership that is relevant for its originating community as

well as for subsequent communites? Does it both uphold a Torah-based value system and undermine another competing system at the time of writing?

JUDGES

Y. Amit argues that a book of Judges was the earliest composition that is now part of the collected books that can be classified as ancient "history-writing." It was composed in Judah near the end of the eighth century B.C.E. to understand and justify the conquest of Israel by the Assyrians in 722 B.C.E. and its conversion to a province. It was meant to explore how Judah could avoid a similar fate in the future. It also explored whether foreign imperial kings derived their power from YHWH or not, and whether history has meaning or is arbitrary. This preliminary composition, which was authoritative by virtue of having gained a certain status from being read and reread, was subsequently taken up by Deuteronomistic editors and made into a description of the period from the death of Joshua to the birth of Samuel, with chapters 19–21 being a subsequent addition to address concerns of a later audience.

   Evidence of the book's ongoing authority in the Persian and Hellenistic periods is then provided; not only did it enjoy status as part of the so-called Deuteronomistic History, but it dealt with a number of issues the Judean intellectuals of the time deemed central: divine mercy, the status of "the north" vis à vis Yehud; the paradigmatic character of history; divine kingship; Saulide-Davidic rivalry, and the legitimacy of foreign women. It allowed the past to serve as a source of inspiration and brain-storming about central issues of concern in later generations.

   In the second article on Judges, S. Gillmayr-Bucher, on the other hand, argues two central themes in Judges ensured its ongoing relevance in the Persian period, leading to its growing authoritative status: the search for Israel's identity and the question of leadership. While the specific tribes vary within the book, there is, nevertheless, an emphasis throughout on Israel as a distinct ethnic unit to be distinguished from other groups living in the area and defined particularly by its religion. The borders are established, so the issue is not primarily conquest, which is mentioned in chapters 1 and 18–19, but rather, maintaining supremacy over the land in the face of threats from outside nations. Israel's self-identity is reflected in two key elements: a shared origin story—the exodus from Egypt—and solidarity, which is vital to its survival. The same ideas appear in the book of Joshua.

Leadership is also a central focus in the book. By depicting the achievement of individual leaders over a span of time, the book shows they accomplish nothing; the behavior of the people remains wayward and unacceptable to YHWH. Judges 2:11–19 reduces the heroic judges to instruments of God, who fail, ultimately, to guide Israel, raising the question, can anyone do so? It is unclear if the references to the lack of a king in chapters 17–21 are an appeal to an ideal king as a solution to leadership or not, but there is a strong implication that the temporal leader must teach the people Torah so they have a guideline for how to live their lives as a united community of tribes on its land, even if not necessarily as an independent political entity.

Judges offered readers and rereaders in the Persian era a critique of the forms of heroic and royal leadership depicted in the books of Joshua and Kings; neither worked, ultimately. It also offered an alternate vision to that set forth in Ezra-Nehemiah that focuses on Judah/Yehud only; in Judges, Judah is not a leader and is not on its own; it is one of the constituent tribes that comprise Israel. The debate over the relationship and common identity of those living in the adjoining provinces of Samaria and Yehud finds support for wider unity, in spite of its problematic nature, not for isolationism.

Both contributors understand Judges to have as a central focus the issue of leadership; however, is that only leadership by foreign imperial kings, native leaders, or both? How does the other focus on Israelite identity play out and interact with the emphasis on leadership? Does the book ultimately advocate a form of theocracy based on Torah-teaching and group solidarity expressed through torah-observance, without a temporal leader? Or, does it accept that there inevitably will be a temporal leader, native or foreign, who most likely will exhibit many failings and rule inadequately, but that his policies and shortcomings are ultimately irrelevant since the people of Israel have Torah and can survive and even thrive if they, as a group, follow it? Who does this book understand should be the teacher(s) of Torah? Is it civil or religious authorities? Can Israel rely on divine mercy and leniency if the people disobey Torah or is exile from the homeland a possible catastrophe that can be repeated?

How can we firmly identify earlier versions of a current biblical book and locate their period and place of composition? Is the "all-Israel" perspective part of the original shaping of the book or the product of later editing, when Judges found its location amongst other books that resulted in its current place in the periodization of the past that envisioned a twelve-tribe premonarchic Israel? Does the failure of judges who have tribal affiliations

other than with Judah and Benjamin intentionally denigrate Samaria in favor of Yehud? When the past serves as a source of inspiration and brainstorming, should we assume that the past as depicted is historically accurate or might it equally be idealized or fashioned to examine painful or potentially dangerous present situations safely by setting them in a different time period and exploring likely consequences of certain courses of present action? What concerns are addressed by chapters 19–21?

Samuel

T. Bolin focuses his essay on those who read 1–2 Samuel in the Persian and Hellenistic periods and what they saw as authoritative in this narrative. He concentrates on the educational system in Jerusalem in Yehud in order better to understand the context in which collecting, copying, and the incorporation of texts, including Samuel, took place. Arguing for the likely clearing away of Persian-era remains in Jerusalem for building projects undertaken in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, he suggests that the population in the city and its environs in the Persian period would have been sufficiently large to have supported an educational system. Noting the presence of Greek imports and, therefore, Greek influence in the southern Levant already in the Persian period, he suggests the Judean educational system was likely to have been modeled already under the Persians on the goals current in Greece and western Asia Minor rather than on those of the older ancient Near Eastern and Egyptian systems, but definitely was set up in this way by the Hellenistic period. While both involved the mastery of a canon of set texts, the latter aimed at acquiring knowledge that was to be used in the ongoing service of kings and gods, while the former aimed at instilling the inherited cultural norms in the next generation of elite priestly and nonpriestly boys.

The only clues we have about how 1–2 Samuel were understood in these two periods are in the partially paralleled sections in 1–2 Chronicles, in the fourteen psalms with superscriptions related to the life of David, twelve of which allude to stories in Samuel, and apparent allusions to events in Samuel found in Qohelet, whose speaker has assumed the persona of Solomon. It is suggested that the fourteen psalms with superscriptions associated with the life of David represent recorded exemplars of the best oral recitations of advanced students who were set the task of generating a response to a morally or theologically problematic episode in the learned canon as the culmination of their years of training.

In the second article on the books of Samuel, K.-P. Adam suggests the way to determine how the books were authoritative in the Persian period is to focus on the themes, Deuteronomistic language, and traditions that grew or were revised in this era. Different versions of the text help establish these later developments. Typical modes of reception also determine their authority. He then examines the contribution the books make to legal debates in the Persian period in a number of narratives that comment in detail on decision-making and legal authority, procedure, and content. These include rights of the king (2 Sam 8:10–22; 2 Sam 7*) and violence between individuals, including homicide and revenge (1 Sam 18–27*; 2 Sam 1–4; 11–14). He examines two legal parables in more depth, 2 Sam 12 and 2 Sam 14:2–22, the latter of which he suggests was created in Yehud in the Persian period. 2 Sam 12:1–4 is considered a secondary unit, invented to reveal the legal liability David bears for Uriah's death, while 2 Sam 12:15–24b is seen to be a later insertion rebutting claims that Solomon had dishonorable origins. It is based on the principle of individual retributive justice typical of the Chronicler but not the Dtr.

A number of other likely Persian-era expansions are identified in the footnotes. These include 1 Sam 8*, 12*; 1 Sam 14:23–46; 1 Sam 17:1–18:5 MT; the feud-like quarrel between the protagonists Saul and David in 1 Sam 18–27*; the theme of the fundamental solidarity of the living with the dead (1 Sam 17:44, 46; 2 Sam 21:1–14); the fascination with heroic scenes of single combat (1 Sam 17; 2 Sam 23:9–12, 20–23); the Greek tradition of lists of heroes (2 Sam 23:24–39), the superiority of prophet over king (e.g.1 Sam 19:18–24) and the tragic character of Saul (1 Sam 10:8; 13:7–13a; 10:17–27; 14:24–46; 26*; 28* and 1 Sam 31*). The reasons for their appeal to a Persian-era audience are not explored, however, since the focus of the chapter is on legal narratives in the book, especially 2 Sam 14.

The incident involving the wise woman of Tekoa in 2 Sam 14:2–22 is identified as an inserted, stylized case narrative or "judicial parable" on various grounds: 1) the change in David's attitude between 13:39 and 14:1, which likely prompted the episode's insertion; 2) the use of generic designations for the protagonists that typify inserted case narrative; 3) the failure of the wise woman episode otherwise to be referenced; 4) the story's consideration of legal aspects of Absalom's return, whose short plot is an excursus on a closely related theme of relevance for key characters in the books of Samuel; and 5) the use of nuanced categories of guilt. The narrative modifies the existing laws on homicide, asylum, and revenge in the Pentateuch while juxtaposing two contrasting images of David in connec-

tion with royal judicial authority in the macro-text. 2 Samuel 14 depicts him as a mellow king, but 1 Kgs 1–2 portrays him as a law-abiding hard-liner who defers the execution of justice in the case of Joab to his successor. The possibility is raised that the judicial parable in 1 Sam 14, which uses the device of entrapment like Greek drama and is framed primarily as direct speech, had an origin in oral performance. Be that as it may, the current written form is directed at a particular audience whose socio-historical, religious and social contexts are acknowledged to need further investigation.

There is no real intersection between these two essays, each of which focuses on aspects of authority or the compositional history of the books of Samuel more than on the issue of the way(s) in which the books of Samuel would have been deemed authoritative by audiences in the later Persian and early Hellenistic periods. Nevertheless, each essay generates a few questions. The date of the use of the texts for scribal education or a more widely based philosophical and moral education has already been raised in an earlier section of the Introduction. What is the relationship between the books of Samuel and the books of Kings, both of which focus on kings during the time of the monarchies of Israel and Judah but which are developed in different ways? Why was the social memory of David shifted over time from being founding hero and warrior to being a paragon of personal piety? Was this a deliberate expansion of David as a memory node, or an attempt to reshape and privilege a new image over an older one? Which social subgroup might have been responsible, and what might be revealed about the issue of the eternal Davidic covenant? How does a focus on the themes, Deuteronomistic language, and traditions that grew or were revised in the later Persian or early Hellenistic period help us determine how the books were authoritative in these two periods?

Were the proposed additions necessary in order for the book to be seen to be relevant and gain some sort of authority, or was the earlier form already authoritative to some degree so that such expansions, which it is assumed reflect live issues in the reading community at the time of their additions, enhance it existing status? Was the administration of law a new key issue in one or both of these time periods, or does 1 Sam 14 help qualify the portrait of David as a fallible human, which might be intended to counter the growing trend in other circles to idealize him, which found expression in the books of Chronicles? Was there a perceived need to undermine royal authority in the administration of justice in favor of priestly or Levitical administration of local law? Why would the bibli-

cal redactors be so open to using Greek literary techniques and trends to shape the shared account of their own group's past, which is meant to define them as an ethnos with a distinctive value system? Would any of these literary techniques or trends have been utilized in a way to oppose Hellenistic culture, or would their use have been an embracing of some of it elements?

Kings

T. Römer begins by noting that the Septuagint translators considered 1–2 Kings to belong together with 1–2 Samuel; they called this history of the monarchies of Israel and Judah 1–4 Reigns, so it is uncertain that Kings was ever intended to be read without Samuel preceding it. In the Persian period, Kings was not authoritative in the sense of its having reached a final, agreed form, as indicated by the divergent form from the MT that underlies the Greek translation. It was also not yet authoritative in Yehud or Babylonia for its implied, intended Judean audiences in the sense of being "the" accepted view of the era of the monarchies or else Chronicles would not have been composed in the later Persian or early Hellenistic period and included in the Hebrew and Christian canons. However, by implication, the story of the monarchies was deemed an important tradition to be preserved and transmitted to future generations. The ambiguous ending allows for different meanings and functions; if Kings is read in isolation or as the end to an Enneateuch, then 2 Kgs 25:27–30 is an acceptance of the exile; but read as part of the Prophets, as it is in Jewish tradition, it is a transition to prophetic oracles concerning an ideal king in Isaiah or a new David in Ezekiel.

The condemnation of Solomon's mingling with foreign women reflects one ideological option in the discussion taking place in the Persian period about how nascent Jewish identity should be built: via segregation. The book relates how kingship finally failed, due to the actions of people and kings, and suggests another authority is needed. Read in the second half of the Persian period, this message would have resonated with the acceptance of the loss of political autonomy by the economic and intellectual leaders of nascent Judaism.

Kings contains a discourse about good kings and bad kings and the limitation of royal authority. Good kings follow two prescriptions from the book of Deuteronomy: the exclusive veneration of YHWH and the acceptance of the temple in Jerusalem as the only legitimate place to worship

him. In the Persian period, most of the prophetic narratives in Kings were added to foster its prophetic character and authority. By the end of the book, prophets move from being messengers of doom to kings to preachers of *tōrâ*. In the Persian period, then, the book of Kings ranks prophetic authority above royal authority for its readers, but both types become relative and subordinate to the final authority of Moses and the Torah, which would have been understood to be the Pentateuch or a forerunner to it. In 2 Kgs 22–23, Torah replaces the traditional markers of religious identity: temple, prophet, and king. For those who accepted integration into the Persian Empire, prophetic proclamations of the restoration of the Davidic kingship would have been seen to be problematic and were to be curbed by making Torah the authoritative word of God.

In the second article on the books of Kings, J. Linville argues that the authority of Kings lay not in its endorsement of certain ideological points but rather, in its being part of a flexible, open-ended social discourse that allowed readers to use ritual episodes and prototypical events to reflect on the differences between their lives and the social constructions found in Kings and other texts. It was part of a larger matrix of stories and myths that allowed different views of what makes an ideal society and its norms to be considered and debated, while also establishing status and authority for those who could understand the enigmas addressed in, and the disjunctions between, different texts. The key to understanding Kings is to compare and contrast it with other myths of Israel's history and identity. The book endorses acceptance of a unified Israel willingly bound to YHWH by a covenant, an ideal that would have been open to debate and reinterpretation in the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods. The ending, which leaves Judah in exile, also would have raised questions about the status of Second Temple Jerusalem.

"Exilicist" thought is not the purview of a single ideology but rather, an ancient Judean way of conceptualizing the past and present that found expression in various forms in the books that now constitute the Hebrew Bible. It was not the only lens used to understand the termination of the monarchic past in the Persian and Hellenistic periods; Chronicles views the exile as the end to Sabbath rest (2 Chr 36:20–21). Kings gained authority from recognizing the authority of Moses but at the same time, produced a new myth at odds with aspects of the old myth in order to provoke new ways of imagining society.

The book, as well as the entire collection of books comprising the Former Prophets, can be seen to constitute a myth about the myth of

how Torah was revealed and how its covenant curses became reality. It turns the myth of exile into the myth of exodus but omits the myth of a new, successful conquest, thereby providing a useful, alternate reality in which readers in the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods could question, affirm, or perhaps subvert both the *status quo* and projected social or political agendas. In its myths concerning the rituals of Sukkot (1 Kgs 8–9) and Passover (2 Kgs 22–23), as well as in stories dealing with regular temple rituals, the book authorizes the ongoing significance of all three types of rituals in the social situations of its readers while also contributing to important discourses on the boundaries, characteristic features, and defining social actions of the group identifying itself as Israel in the target periods, and later.

An interesting dialogue emerges from reading these two articles in succession. There is agreement over an emphasis on Torah and on exile, but a different view of how readers would have interacted with the stories they encountered in Kings and the message they would have taken away. For Römer, the addition of prophetic authority to the texts in the Persian period has resulted in a relegation of royal authority to third-place, with Moses and Torah becoming the central authority taught by the prophets that ultimately replaces king, prophet, and temple, the traditional markers of religious identity. Originally, the book had been a discourse over good kings and bad kings, and so, more generally, about the limitations of royal authority. For Linville, the stories that highlight temple rituals and pilgrimage festivals send a clear signal that the temple and its calendar continued to play a central role in the social fabric of Judeans in the Persian and Hellenistic periods. He agrees that Torah is operative in the book in that the plot-line tells how the covenant curses from Sinai/Horeb were made reality but does not see it to be a central aspect, although he thinks the authority of the book was enhanced by its acceptance of the authority of Moses. Yet Linville also sees scope for readers not only to affirm the implied *status quo* of the temple of their day but also to question or subvert it, offering two additional options that reflect what Römer considered to be the only option. Linville sees the book to allow hearers to reflect over their own situation in contrast to what is found in the texts, as part of a larger flexible discourse over what makes an ideal society, with no endorsement of certain ideologies and rejection of others. Römer, on the other hand, seems to think the book is modeling certain ideologies that it wants hearers to endorse, though perhaps he would agree that some

ideas are floated without necessarily expecting full agreement, as ways to prompt reflection and debate.

Since both Kings and Chronicles, which cover much of the same ground but also differ in terms of overall scope, were accepted as authoritative, can we assume Chronicles could only have been written at a point in time before Samuel had gained authority? Does authoritative status mean no further changes to a given book can be introduced? If so, does this necessitate the writing of a new work if one wants to object to ideas in the authoritative one? How can we infer authorial intent from finished, edited products? Don't authors usually have points of view they want their readers to accept and endorse, over against competing views? If so, does any single composition encourage open reflection and debate, or is this only the net result of a collection of compositions that advocate different views, forcing the reader to reflect and take a personal stand amongst the options on offer? If we were to read Samuel and Kings as a single literary composition, as the LXX translators did, would it modify any of the views expressed by the two contributors or reinforce their points implicitly or explicitly?

It is time for you, the reader, to engage directly with the full text of the ten essays in this volume and discover what questions and further thoughts they trigger in your mind, whether as monologues or as dialogues. There are many interesting ideas on offer here, relating to authority as well as to other aspects of individual books.