

On the Relationship Between  
the Yahwistic and the Deuteronomistic Histories

*Frederick H. Cryer - Aarhus*

Anyone who has followed the recent developments in Pentateuchal criticism will be aware that this discipline is experiencing a great deal of what might be described as very fruitful turmoil. Appearing almost simultaneously, two works by T.L. THOMPSON and J. VAN SETERS<sup>1</sup> have eradicated virtually all grounds for confidence in a historical basis for the patriarchal narratives. Shortly afterwards, H.H. SCHMID proposed to take the Deuteronomist-like passages in the Yahwistic strand of the Pentateuch seriously, and to give the Yahwist his traditio-historical due, as far as the universalism of his theology and his relationship to prophetic thought are concerned, and so dated him to the period of the Exile, more or less contemporary with the Deuteronomist<sup>2</sup>. A year later, Rolf RENDTORFF appeared on the scene with a spirited attempt to deny the very existence of a Yahwistic stratum as such, in favour of a broadly-based traditio-historical (in the German sense of *Überlieferungsgeschichtlich*) analysis of the Pentateuchal traditions<sup>3</sup>. RENDTORFF's analysis arrived at the conclusion that the Pentateuch was assembled for the first time in the course of a Deuteronomistic redaction process. In the same year, an earlier provocative article along these lines by RENDTORFF<sup>4</sup> was published in English in

---

1 Respectively: *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives. The Quest for the Historical Abraham*. BZAW 133, Berlin, 1974; *Abraham in History and Tradition*, New Haven and London, 1975.

2 *Der sogenannte Jahwist. Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung*, Zürich, 1976.

3 *Das Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*. BZAW 146, Berlin and New York, 1977.

4 "Der 'Jahwist' als Theologe? Zum Dilemma der Pentateuchkritik". *SVT* 28 (1975) 158-166.

JSOT, with replies by R.N. WHYBRAY, J. VAN SETERS, N.E.WAGNER, G.E.COATS, and H.H. SCHMID<sup>5</sup>. The same issue of JSOT also contained a review of RENDTORFF's 1977 book by R.E. CLEMENS<sup>6</sup>. In 1978 H. VORLÄNDER published an inner-Biblical comparative study which indicated that none of the Pentateuchal themes is to be found in Biblical literature which can with certainty be said to predate the Exile<sup>7</sup>. In 1981 M. ROSE attempted to account for the seemingly Deuteronomistic elements in the Yahwistic History by the assumption that this historical work was written in the interim between two phases of Deuteronomistic redaction<sup>8</sup>. As a result, ROSE had little difficulty accounting for the seemingly Deuteronomistic aspect of many Pentateuchal passages. Moreover, this view allowed him to regard the materials on Israel's prehistory in the Pentateuch (J) as dependent on such Deuteronomistic materials as Deut 1-3 and the Deuteronomistic Landnahme narrative in Joshua, rather than the other way around. Thus where VON RAD had felt able to argue for the melding of a Hexateuch with the Deuteronomistic materials<sup>9</sup>, whereas NOTH had argued for the integration of a Tetrateuch with the Deuteronomistic Historical Work (DtrH)<sup>10</sup>, ROSE could claim that both were, in a sense, correct.

Far more uncompromising is J. VAN SETERS in his most recent work<sup>11</sup>. Having already argued for the substantial unity of the Yahwistic materials in the Pentateuch, construed as everything in the Pentateuch which precedes P<sup>12</sup>, he launches a similar argument on behalf of the unity of the Deuteronomistic materials stretching from Judges to Kings. Thus VAN SETERS

---

5 JSOT 3 (1977).

6 JSOT 3 (1977) 46-56.

7 Die Entstehungszeit des jehowistischen Geschichtswerkes. Frankfurt am Main, 1978.

8 Deuteronomist und Jahwist. Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke.

9 Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs, BWANT 26 (78), Stuttgart, 1938.

10 Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, Tübingen, 1943.

11 In Search of History. Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History, New Haven and London, 1983.

12 Abraham, pp.154-312.

is able to argue somewhat more convincingly than does ROSE that the various Yahwist-like passages in Joshua are to be assigned to either J or P<sup>13</sup>. Even more recently, VAN SETERS has been able to maintain with some plausibility that Jos 24, long inexplicable as a (superfluous, considering Jos 23) Deuteronomistic conclusion to the Landnahme account, is in reality the Yahwistic conclusion to this account, and in fact later than DtrH<sup>14</sup>. Forced to recognize that there are nevertheless some materials remaining in Jos 24 which seem to be irrefutably Deuteronomistic, VAN SETERS argues that these are merely loans undertaken by the Yahwist; thus his writing is "Deuteronomistic" when he is dependent on the Deuteronomist, and "Yahwistic" when he is on his own.

At this point in the discussion it is probably too early to decide whether VAN SETERS' or ROSE's view will win the day. It may, and no doubt will, be argued that Rose's two Deuteronomistic phases of redaction, although favoured in one form or another on both sides of the Atlantic, is simply too convenient a solution to the problem of Deuteronomist vs. Yahwist. Conversely, it will no doubt be held that VAN SETERS' protean Yahwist, capable of wonderful imitations of Deuteronomistic style, is at least equally artificial an exegetical convenience. The respective arguments will decide the case in the end, and at present the jury is still balloting. For our purposes, however, what *is* important are the wider implications of both theories for an understanding of the present structure and contents of Judges through Samuel, and perhaps Kings as well.

As is well known, in the heyday (and later) of the Documentary Hypothesis, innumerable attempts were made to trace the continuation of the Pentateuchal sources throughout the historical books of the OT<sup>15</sup>. None of

---

<sup>13</sup> See esp. pp.322-362.

<sup>14</sup> "Joshua 24 and the Problem of Tradition in the Old Testament", in: ed. W.B. BARRICK and J.R. SPENCER, *In the Shadow of Elyon. Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G.W. AHLSTROM*. Sheffield, 1984, pp.139-158.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, O. EISSFELDT, *The Old Testament. An Introduction*, trans. P.R. ACKROYD, New York and Evanston, repr. 1966, pp.132-143; see also E. JENNI, "Zwei Jahrzehnte Forschung an den Büchern Josua bis Könige", *ThR* 27 (1961) 1-32; 97-146.

these many efforts was able to win a scholarly consensus for itself, for the reason that they proved to be too complicated; there was simply too much present in the materials in question that did not strikingly recall either J, E, or P, the hypothetically continuous sources of the Pentateuch. Moreover, even the most determined attempts failed to convince anyone that the doublets and other repetitions which in many cases are obviously present in the texts can be explained by use of the documentary source hypothesis. Thus NOTH had a relatively easy time of it convincing OT scholars that the subdivisions in the historical works from Joshua to Kings were to be drawn laterally, rather than longitudinally: there was a single purposeful and artistic redaction of a wide variety of materials undertaken by a single "Verfasser" sometime after 562 BC. As a result, of course, the forty years which have elapsed since the publication of NOTH's theory have been devoted to attempts to test the limits of his conception of the Deuteronomistic Historical Work.

One sure indication that all was not as well with NOTH's hypothesis as might be hoped is the fact that the unity of his Deuteronomistic Historical Work has been repeatedly challenged. Thus the "Göttingen Triumvirate" of R. SMEND<sup>16</sup>, W. DIETRICH<sup>17</sup>, and T. VEIJOLA<sup>18</sup> have found it necessary to distinguish between all of three different phases of Deuteronomistic redaction because of literary and form critical considerations as well as because of inconsistencies in the contents of the Deuteronomistic narratives themselves. In America, F.M. CROSS has seized on thematic and narrative inconsistencies in the Books of Kings in order to postulate a two-fold redaction of the DtrH, one a programme composed in connexion with the reform of Josiah, and an exilic redaction which had the goal of explaining

---

16 E.g., "Das Gesetz und die Völker", in: ed. H.W. WOLFF, Probleme biblischer Theologie. Gerhard VON RAD zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet, München, 1971, pp.494-509.

17 Prophetie und Geschichte, Göttingen, 1972.

18 Die ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung, Helsinki, 1975; idem, Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der Deuteronomistischen Historiographie, Helsinki, 1977; Verheissung in der Krise, Helsinki, 1982.

why the programme had failed to preserve Judah in her time of trouble<sup>19</sup>. CROSS' initiative has since been followed up by two works by his students R.E. FRIEDMAN<sup>20</sup> and R.D. NELSON<sup>21</sup>. Where FRIEDMAN's effort is merely a provocative essay, NELSON's is a full-length study, buttressed by a fair amount of perspective on the history of scholarship pertaining to the DtrH. In particular, he is careful to point out that at least the notion and the arguments concerning a double redaction of the Deuteronomistic materials in the Books of the Kings have an impressive pedigree, deriving as they do from all the way back to A. KUENEN<sup>22</sup>.

The point to be made here is that NOTH's thesis of a Deuteronomist who collected and reworked a variety of sources once seemed attractive because it rendered superfluous the attempts to demonstrate the presence of the Pentateuchal sources in the historical books outside of the Pentateuch. Now, however, approximately as much complexity has crept back into the discussion as NOTH's theory was intended to obviate. Clearly, in the light of the discussions of ROSE, VAN SETERS, and SCHMID another possibility presents itself, although none of them seems at present to be willing to draw this consequence of his own researches: namely, that there was a single DtrH which was secondarily edited by the author(s) of the Yahwistic History. VAN SETERS has understood this point to the extent that he acknowledges that J was composed as a sort of prologue to DtrH<sup>23</sup>. Nevertheless, he draws back from the conclusion that what were once held to be indications of the presence of continuous Pentateuchal "sources" in the historical books may instead be more profitably interpreted as indications of editorial revision by one or more of the authors of the Pentateuchal sources. There is no reason to believe that they stopped when they had finished with the introductory Landnahme chapters of Joshua. Indeed, there

---

19 Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1973, pp.274-289.

20 The Exile and Biblical Narrative, Chico, 1981, pp.1-43.

21 The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History, Sheffield, 1981.

22 Double Redaction, pp.14-15; see also pp.15-22.

23 See e.g. In Search of History, p.361.

is every reason to believe that DtrH now possesses a shape and contents quite unlike those it possessed when it was composed.

Indications that this is the case have been staring us in the face for some time, but our fascination with NOTH's claim that the Deuteronomist was the major figure responsible for the extensive revision of the materials present in his history has prevented us from seeing this clearly. An obvious point of departure is 1 Sam 7,13, which assures us that Israel had no more troubles with the Philistines as long as Samuel lived (note the similar claim in v 15 concerning Samuel's tenure as Judge). 1 Sam 7 is unquestionably Deuteronomistic, and no one has ever seriously doubted this since the 19th century<sup>24</sup>. The problem, however, is why the Deuteronomist said something so nonsensical, when we consider that according to NOTH's theory he must have had the whole of the Saul-David stories before him. Nevertheless, scholars have resorted to a number of strategies, not to explain this feature, but to explain it away<sup>25</sup>.

- 24 This was clearly recognized already by WELLHAUSEN; see e.g. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 5. Ausg., Berlin, 1899, p.249. K. BUDDÉ, *Die Bücher Samuel, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament*, Abt. VIII, Tübingen and Leipzig, 1902, pp.47-49, regarded it as a Deuteronomistically-reworked piece of earlier tradition (BUDDÉ's E-source). M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. I. Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*. Halle, 1943, p. (Jahresbande) 22, observes the role of 1 Sam 7,2 in the Dtr. chronology; he also sees the function of 1 Sam 7 and 12 as setting Dtr. parentheses around ch.9-11 (p.60). J.H. STOEBE, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, Gütersloh, 1973, p.171, notes that "das Werk des Deuteronomisten (ist) nicht in allen Kapiteln gleichmässig zu beurteilen; denn hier ist er, im Unterschied zu Kap.8ff, nicht der Bearbeiter einer älteren Tradition, sondern ein selbständiger Erzähler...". Cf. also VEIJOLA, *Königtum*, pp.30-34.
- 25 WELLHAUSEN (*Prolegomena*, pp.250-251) attempted this by describing 1 Sam 7,13 as mere rhetorical emphasis on Samuel's success, i.e., as essential to the portrait of "ein heiliger ersten Ranges" (p.250). T. VEIJOLA provides a fine contemporary example of the same tendency in claiming that Samuel's extraordinary success refers not to any "restlose Unterwerfung des Philister, sondern lediglich eine zeitweilige Erschlaffung ihrer Angriffsfähigkeit" (*Das Königtum*, p.78). Of course, this approach clearly clashes with the sense of the verse. On the Dtr nature of the language in 1 Sam 7,13, see already BUDDÉ, *Die Bücher Samuel*, p.51.

The next equally perplexing text is 1 Sam 12. Once again, as far back as WELLHAUSEN it was acknowledged that this chapter is Deuteronomistic<sup>26</sup>, and no one has seriously questioned this determination. Thus a question that simply begs to be answered is how the Dtr could make such a hash of his summary of the *magnalia dei* in v 9-12. The struggle against Sisera (Jdg 4-5) is cited as the first of the results of Israel's apostasy and repentance (1 Sam 12,9). Also, in v 9 Sisera is characterized as the "commander of the army of Hazor", which makes only poor sense at best when compared with the present text. Israel's next enemy is then said to have been the Philistines, which may or may not refer to the Samson stories, although in reality there is no compelling reason to believe that 1 Sam 12 knows of Samson at all<sup>27</sup>. The Philistines are followed by Moab, which, again, may or may not refer to Jdg 3 (Ehud and Eglon). The most striking problem is that the list of saviours of Israel advanced in v 11 contains the name "Jerubba'al", rather than Gideon (!), followed by *Bedan*, whose name is not only the *lectio difficilior*, but also one which is well attested in the Versions<sup>28</sup>. V 11 then mentions Jephthah, whose story is related in Jdg 11-12, followed by Samuel. Yet another oddity is the fact that although Moses and, even odder (considering that 1 Kgs 12,28 and Exod 32,7-24 have long been held to be either by Dtr or else influenced by him), Aaron, are mentioned together without reservation in v 6, no mention whatsoever is made of Joshua.

Now, owing to the confusion as to the correspondences between "Sisera" and Jdg 4-5, the "Philistines" and Jdg 13-16, and "Moab" and Jdg 3, nothing may be made of v 9. The "saviours" list in v 11 implies at best a

26 See, again, WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena*, p.248. BUDDÉ (Die Bücher Samuel, p.77) assigns it to his E-source, but admits that Dtr has extensively edited it. Likewise, C.H. CORNILL (Einleitung in die Kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, 7.neug.Aufl., Tübingen, 1913, p.108) regards both ch. 7 and 12 as stemming from his E<sup>2</sup>-source, but adds that "doch lässt sich bei der Stil- und Geistesverwandschaft von E<sup>2</sup> und Deuteronomium die Scheidung nicht mit völliger Sicherheit geben". See further VEIJOLA, *Königtum*, pp.83-99, and esp.p.92.

27 See STOEBE, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, p.233, note b) to v 11.

28 Same as note 27.

sequence beginning with Jerubba'al/Gideon, followed by two presumably lesser figures "Bedan" and Jephthah, and concluding with Samuel, who is only characterized as a *Judge-cum-dux-bellorum* in 1 Sam 7! The correspondence between Jdg 6-8, containing, as it does, the narrative of the Judge who refused the offer of kingship, and 1 Sam 7, which contains the battle narrative of the last Judge, is the sort of serial or "ring composition" beloved of the Deuteronomists<sup>29</sup>. Thus I think that the "saviours" list plausibly reflects the Deuteronomistic intention to illustrate that Israel was well served when there was no king, but only divinely appointed "Judges".

However, the omissions from both lists are so striking that something is surely amiss. No mention is made of Joshua, who is otherwise the leading figure in the book which NOTH claims was virtually composed *in toto* by the Deuteronomists. Samson is not clearly mentioned, in spite of the fact that in Judges he was the major Israelite hero - outside of the reference to Shamgar in Jdg 3,31 - to take up the battle against the Philistines, and in view of Samuel's continuation of that struggle in 1 Sam 7 - a continuation which, as we have seen, the Deuteronomists labelled completely successful - it would have been imperative for the Deuteronomists to mention him. Then there is the odd appearance of "Jerubba'al" and the even more mysterious "Bedan". But above all, no mention is made of Deborah, nor is there any reference whatsoever to the internecine struggles among the Israelites themselves (e.g. Jdg 12,1-6; 19-21), and the reign of Abimelech in Shechem (Jdg 9) is passed over in silence. Of course, most of these are *e silentio* problems, but they are so extensive that, taken together, they suggest that the Book of Judges, and perhaps Joshua as well, were not present for the Deuteronomists in the form we now have them.

The final perplexing feature of 1 Sam 12 is the fact that Samuel claims that the Israelites had demanded a king on the occasion of the attack of the Ammonites under Nahash (v 12), an event which takes place

29 See R.A. CARLSON, David, The Chosen King. A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel, Uppsala, 1962, pp.32-33 et passim.



in 1 Sam 11. However, according to the present form of the First Book of Samuel, the Israelite demand actually took place earlier, and with a completely different motivation (1 Sam 8,1-9). Of course, this discrepancy, too, has been countered in numerous ways by OT scholars<sup>30</sup>, but no one has as yet offered a convincing explanation of the problem itself.

The next passage to be considered is 1 Sam 14,47-52. Once again, there is little doubt that this little notice is Deuteronomistic, as most commentators acknowledge, since the phrases "he fought against his enemies on every side" (v 47) and "he did valiantly and smote X, and delivered Israel out of the hands of those who plundered them" are clearly Deuteronomistic, as was noticed already by BUDDÉ<sup>31</sup>, and seemingly also by GRESSMANN<sup>32</sup>. NOTH, however, finds the picture of Saul contained in these verses so contrary to the "Dtr" understanding of Saul - even though he admits Dtr influence in v 47-51 - that he is forced to deny their Dtr provenance<sup>33</sup>. NOTH is surely right as far as the understanding of Saul contained in v 48 is concerned<sup>34</sup>; he is victorious over all of Israel's "enemies round about" in the fashion of a Judge. Indeed, v 48 characterizes Saul as

30 BUDDÉ (Die Bücher Samuel, p.80) describes v 12 as "eine so grosse Gedankenlosigkeit" that an "Überarbeiter" must have been responsible for it. But why on earth would any later figure with even a minimal knowledge of the story-line in 1 Sam 7-12 say anything so silly? STOEBE (Das erste Buch Samuelis, pp.237-238) recognizes that there is a problem, but assumes that the Deuteronomists are here citing a variant tradition, which raises doubts about the sanity of the Deuteronomists in question. P.K. McCARTER (I Samuel. A New Translation with Introduction, Notes & Commentary, Garden City, 1980, p.215, n. to v 12) admits that the verse is clearly Deuteronomistic as well as problematical, and yet claims that its author simply "made a free interpretation of the inauguration of kingship". Of course, this is even worse than BUDDÉ's suggestion, since instead of making a fool of BUDDÉ's convenient "Überarbeiter", it makes a fool of the very author of the whole section!

31 Die Bücher Samuel, pp.105-106.

32 Die Schriften des Alten Testaments. Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels, 2. Ausg., Göttingen, 1921, p.52.

33 Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p.105.

34 Cf. HERTZBERG, ATD 10, p.95: "Von Haus aus ist der Bericht dem Saul freundlich gesinnt gewesen..."

one of the many "deliverers" of Israel. It should also be noted that in v 47 Saul is said to have "taken" the kingship, using the Qal of the verb *lākad*. Elsewhere in the Books of Samuel this verb figures only in the Niphal (in 1 Sam 10,20.21 and 1 Sam 14,41.42) in connexion with oracular decisions. The Qal, however, is the standard Deuteronomistic usage for conquering a city or a hostile army (cf. Jos 6,20; 8,19.21; 10,1.28.32.35.37.39.42, etc.). The implication is that Saul literally *seized* the kingship. Given the Deuteronomistic editing or authorship of the passage, it is quite astonishing that both this implication and the generally admiring tone stand in such stark contrast to the Saul narratives - that is, if it was the Deuteronomist(s) who edited these.

Two other interesting notices of clearly Dtr provenance are 1 Sam 13,1 and 2 Sam 2,10, the regnal notices of Saul and Ishba'al, respectively. NOTH himself recognized both passages as Dtr<sup>35</sup>. However, NOTH dismisses the difficult two-year reign of Saul in 1 Sam 13,1 as a corruption and so arrives at the conclusion that the text originally contained all of two lacunae, which he explains by the assumption that Dtr had no actual information as to these data, for which reason he simply left the spaces in question blank<sup>36</sup>. Thus some moronic scribe, perhaps some friend of BUDDER's "Überarbeiter" (see note 30, above), must have left the text in its present sad state. NOTH is, however, at a loss to explain how Dtr could have been so much better informed as to Ishba'al's age and dates in 2 Sam 2, 10<sup>37</sup>. Particularly the latter text has given scholars pause, since in its present form the Ishba'al narrative seems to suggest that David and Ishba'al were crowned at approximately the same time - otherwise their civil war would make little sense - and yet while Ishba'al reigns for only two years (2 Sam 2,10), David is said to have reigned for seven years and six months (2 Sam 2,11). Thus either David was actually made king while Saul yet reigned, thus providing ample reason for Saul's displeasure with him

35 *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, pp.66f., and 104f. See already WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena*, p.242.

36 *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, p.66, n.3.

37 *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, p.104, n.8.

in the First Book of Samuel, although unattested elsewhere - or else five and a half years elapsed before the elders of Israel consented to make David king. What is distressing is that even when Dtr apparently had some figures to go on, his data do not square with the narratives as we have them. There is accordingly no reason to rule out, with NOTH, the two years of Saul's reign in 1 Sam 13,1, but there is good reason to ask how they cohere with the Saul narratives.

Yet another passage for our consideration is the famous remark in 2 Sam 7,6, in which Yahweh claims that "I have not dwelled in a house since the day I led the sons of Israel up from Egypt". Once again, it goes without saying that 2 Sam 7 is a Deuteronomistic composition, as has been emphasized strongly in recent years by numerous scholars<sup>38</sup>.

For this very reason it is distressing that v 6 seems to have no knowledge whatsoever of the Samuel narratives in 1 Sam 1-3, which locate the Ark and the "word of Yahweh" (cf. 1 Sam 3,21) at Shiloh. This is all the more odd when we consider that these very narratives contain an excellent example of a "Deuteronomistic" prophecy, namely the judgement on the house of Eli in 1 Sam 2,27-36. Moreover, the suspicion that the Deuteronomists did not know Samuel's birth legend becomes a certainty when we compare the Dtr chronological notice in 1 Sam 7,2, according to which the Ark rusticated for 20 years in Kiriath-Jearim, with the fact that Samuel, whom we previously encountered as a young boy at Shiloh (1 Sam 1 and 3), is suddenly an aged man on the brink of the grave (1 Sam 8,1.5). Once again, the Dtr chronological notice leads us into a frontal collision with the narratives as we have them; thus Dtr cannot have been familiar with 1 Sam 1-3.

38 Surprisingly, WELLHAUSEN (Prolegomena, p.20: "Aber diese Betrachtungsweise der Bedeutung des Königtums für die Geschichte des Kultus ist nicht die des Verfassers der Königsbücher") was not aware of the Dtr character of 2 Sam 7. In Modern times, A. CARLSON (David, The Chosen King, pp.97-128), F.M. CROSS (Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the Religion and History of Israel, Cambridge (Mass.) and London, 1973, pp.241-261), J. VAN SETERS (Orientalia 50 (1981) 152-156), and T. VEIJOLA (Die ewige Dynastie, pp.72-79; idem Verheissung in der Krise, pp.62-65) have amply substantiated the Dtr nature of 2 Sam 7.

Before concluding our study, it would be worthwhile to consider the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic "law of kingship" in Deut 17,14-20. This section comes naturally to our attention since, as we have seen, 1 Sam 7 and 12 comprise the Dtr parenthesis around the present accounts of the introduction of the monarchy into Israel. It has long been noted that the reference in v 17 to the king who "multiplies wives for himself" must in some fashion refer to Solomon<sup>39</sup>. However, it is, to put it mildly, strange that in the Dtr narrative of Solomon's kingship only the problem of foreign wives is expressly singled out for criticism (1 Kgs 11,1-13), since Deut 17,16 also protests against a king who accumulates horses, while 17,17b protests against one who collects gold. This could be taken to suggest that even the Dtr account of Solomon's rule has not survived in its original form. Finally, there is another feature of the "law of kingship" which has attracted very little attention, namely the provision in v 15, which states that "one from among your brethren you shall set as king over you; you may not put a foreigner over you, who is not your brother". Given the fact that David's line sat for 400 years on the throne of Judah without interruption, one wonders what on earth the Deuteronomists are protesting about. The reference could conceivably be to Absalom, whose mother was a Geshurite, and whose maternal grandfather was additionally a foreign king (cf. 2 Sam 3,3; 13,38), and whom both Israel and Judah attempted to make king (2 Sam 15-19). Alternatively, it could be a veiled allusion to the mysterious "son of Tabe'el" whom the Israelites and Aramaeans attempted to make king in Isa 7,6<sup>40</sup>. The identity of the figure in question is not at issue. What is at issue is the fact that the Deuteronomists polemicize in their "law of kingship" against features which are not elsewhere made specific in their historical narratives. This is entirely remarkable, when we consider the extent of the Deuteronomistic prophecy-and-fulfilment scheme, which otherwise invariably leads them to emphasize the fruition of a prophecy.

39 As argued by, among others, R.E. CLEMENTS, *God's Chosen People*, London, 1968, pp.40-42.

40 Cf. O. KAISER, *Jesaja 1-12*, ATD 17, p.74, who suspects the name to be Aramaean in origin.

For a more specific comparison, one has merely to compare the many references to the "place which Yahweh your God will choose" in Deut 12 with e. g. 2 Sam 7, 1 Kgs 8, 2 Kgs 22-23, Ps 132 and Ps 89. Although this, too, is an *e silentio* indication, it also tends to suggest that the Deuteronomistic account of the kingship preserved in Samuel and Kings once had a different form and content than is now the case.

To be brief: when we examine the Dtr framework passages, that is, passages which were intended to demarcate important periods in Israel's history such as the end of the age of the Judges and the introduction of the monarchy, the dynastic promise to David, and even the résumés of the careers of Saul and Ishba'al, we discover that when the Dtr looks forward (1 Sam 7,13 and 15) he is in error. Furthermore, he is no less in error when he tries to recall the contents of the Book of the Judges (1 Sam 12, 9-11). Finally, when he attempts to cross-refer to events within the First Book of Samuel, he is once again in error (1 Sam 12,12; 1 Sam 13,1; 1 Sam 14,47-48) or is extremely mystifying when we compare his notices with the actual narratives in our possession, just as his prospect from Egypt to Jerusalem has "neglected" the temple of Yahweh at Shiloh (2 Sam 7,6). In addition to all of this are the numerous examples which point to a Deuteronomistic "knowledge" of an Israelite history which differs considerably from that with which we are now familiar. One or two such examples might be explainable by simple scribal sloppiness, but when they are present in so many passages which are *central* to such things as the Deuteronomistic presentation of the monarchy, we are forced to conclude that the Deuteronomist simply knew a Book of Judges and a complex of stories about Samuel, Saul, and David which differed remarkably from the texts as we have them today.

To this conclusion it might be objected that the second or third Deuteronomistic redactor may not have been aware of the intentions of his predecessor, so that all of these errors and anomalies may have crept in by accretion, that is, on the assumption that the passages referred to above are to be distributed among as many as three redactors. To this the obvious response is that we then no longer have to do with a Deuteronomistic redaction in the sense envisaged by NOTH, that is, a *systematic* and de-

liberate compilation of quite heterogeneous materials into an extensive "historical work". I have chosen my examples - with the single exception of Deut 17,14-20 - from the Books of Samuel deliberately, since already NOTH felt that there was very little Deuteronomistic influence present in them. Admittedly, T. VELJOLA has attempted to demonstrate the presence of all three of his supposed Deuteronomistic redactions in Samuel<sup>41</sup>, but even he is forced to admit that there are very few signs of his DtrN (i.e., his "nomistic" redactor) in Samuel. This means that in Samuel, at least, the Deuteronomists do not speak to any significant extent about law, a conclusion which I think anyone who has ever even cursorily read these books probably suspected in advance. Thus we have at best to contend with two redactions by the Deuteronomists. Accordingly, one of these will have ordered the materials, while the other completed this process. However, given the mass of contradictions, ambiguities, and direct errors I have pointed to above, the second "Deuteronomist" who arises from this picture is one whose left hand does not know what his left hand is doing. Thus, if one should persist in claiming that the second redaction, which, as we have seen, had so profound consequences for the contents and structure of the whole, was Deuteronomistic, one would at the very least be forced to conclude that the "Deuteronomistic" redaction process had much less cohesion and continuity than we have hitherto supposed.

An alternative would be to assume that the Deuteronomistic history has suffered extensive editorial revision, a revision which preserved all of the Deuteronomistic speeches and notices, "warts and all", but which was not particularly concerned to retain the Deuteronomistic understanding of the course of events. It is not a question of BUDDE's providential "Überarbeiter" or of NOTH's imagined moronic scribe. We do not have to do with minor scribal additions or the insertion of a tendentious "Schicht" to counter some other tendency in the Deuteronomistic history. The Deuteronomist is simply wrong or misleading whenever he refers to the work that has been named after him; thus this work cannot now have the form and con-

41 Die ewige Dynastie, Das Königtum, passim.

tents it had when he assembled it, and the very extent of the differences between the Deuteronomistic collection and the present one lead me to prefer the hypothesis of a distinctively non-Deuteronomistic redaction.

The mere fact of such purposive, all-encompassing revision in itself suggests that the figures who undertook it were in some disagreement with the Deuteronomist. The issues on which they were opposed will naturally not be dealt with here, but in subsequent publications. However, as an example, I should like to point to the Succession Narrative (2 Sam 9-20 + 1 Kgs 1-2). It has been argued for some time that the Succession Narrative is in reality a tendentious work which is highly critical of David and Solomon, all of which conflicts with the Deuteronomistic picture of David as the saintly king *sans pareil*<sup>42</sup>. Up to the present, only VAN SETERS has drawn the appropriate conclusion, namely that also the present form of the Succession Narrative is post-Deuteronomistic in its entirety<sup>43</sup>. This last observation offers us some food for thought and additionally brings us back to our original point of departure, namely contemporary Pentateuchal criticism, since it has been argued for some time that the author of the Succession Narrative was in fact the Yahwist, or someone closely related to his work<sup>44</sup>. Naturally, these suggestions were not originally taken very seriously, owing, once again, to the assumption that the corpus in question was merely one of the many blocks of material the Deuteronomists had incorporated into their work. Now, however, it may be possible to arrive at a different appraisal of this situation. If so sizable a corpus as the

42 Cf. L. DELEKAT, "Tendenz und Theologie der David-Salomo Erzählung", in: (ed.) F. MAAS, Das Ferne und Nahe Wort (= Fests. L. ROST), Berlin, 1967, pp.26-36; E. WÜRTHWEIN, Die Erzählung von der Thronfolge Davids - theologische oder politische Geschichtsschreibung? Zürich, 1974, esp. pp.19-31; T. VEIJOLA, Die ewige Dynastie, p.18; J. VAN SETERS, In Search of History, pp.277-291.

43 In Search of History, p.290.

44 Cf. e.g. most recently J. BLENKINSOPP, "Theme and Motif in the Succession History (2 Sam XI 2ff) and the Yahwist Corpus", SVT 15 (1965) 44-57; see also the parallels adduced by W. BRUEGGEMANN in "David and His Theologian", CBQ 30 (1968) 156-181. The further parallels mentioned by R.N. WHYBRAY, The Succession Narrative, London, 1968, pp.6-7 and 76-78, are also suggestive.

Succession Narrative, or the materials contained therein<sup>45</sup> should prove to derive from the same circles as those responsible for the Yahwistic history, then it is very likely that the author of the substantial revision of the Deuteronomistic history of which I have been speaking was simply the Yahwist. Accordingly, a programme for future investigation by OT scholars will necessarily be the extent of Yahwistic redaction of the Deuteronomistic history. In this connexion it will naturally be instructive to examine the works of the earlier literary critics who attempted to pursue the Pentateuchal sources throughout the historical books from Joshua to Kings, on the assumption that the traces of these sources which were held to be present were not indications of "continuous sources", but of occasional redaction and interpolation.

I should like to add that I do not advance this theory without some trepidation, as there are numerous obstacles to it. The first question that presents itself is, why necessarily the Yahwist? This question is all the more acute inasmuch as, for example, VAN SETERS has assigned chapters 14-19 of the Book of Joshua plus Jdg 1-2,5 to P<sup>46</sup>; hence, one might be led to suppose that our hypothetical redactor (RDtrH) was simply P. Without taking issue with VAN SETERS in detail<sup>47</sup>, it is sufficient to

- 45 Far from all scholars are convinced that there even was an integral Succession Narrative in the sense envisioned by ROST; see e.g. J.W. FLANAGAN, "Court History or Succession Document. A Study of 2 Sam 9-20 and 1 Kings 1-2". JBL 91 (1972) 172-181.
- 46 In Search of History, pp.331-336 and 337-342, respectively.
- 47 Although one could easily do so; any comparison of e.g. Jdg 2,1-5 with the Pentateuchal sources suggests J (in VAN SETERS' sense), rather than P, because of the *mālāk yhw* in v 1; futher, the placename *bokim* in v 1, as many scholars have held, is surely a variant of *bakūt*, Gen 35,8 (JE in traditional terms, J in VAN SETERS' own). Also, P generally eschews the phrase *kārat berit* (v 2) in favour of *qwm* and *nātan*. Indeed, in Gen 17,14 and elsewhere P deliberately uses the term quite differently, namely to signify the "cutting off" of a transgressor. Finally, it might be asked just why P, surely the great exponent of the Jerusalem Temple, would want to locate the "angel of YHWH" at Bethel (LXX; but surely correct exegesis of the aforementioned *bōkīm*)?. Cf. already HOLSCHER, Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung, Heidelberg, 1942, p.26, n.2: "In Wirklichkeit ist Jos 24 bis Jud 2<sub>5</sub> alter jehovistischer Zusammenhang".



point out that P is not ordinarily suspected of being a narrative source, as such, and, as the Deuteronomistic discrepancies revealed previously show, whoever was responsible for the revision of DtrH under consideration was surely a dab hand at the composition of narratives. Of course, this does not quite rule out the possibility that P, or an even later figure, such as the redactor of J and P recently proposed by my colleague, N.P. LEMCHE (<sup>R</sup>JP)<sup>48</sup>, simply edited an aggregate of ready-to-hand narratives into the DtrH. Nevertheless, this latter suggestion would imply that the least writing source, that is, P or <sup>R</sup>JP, was responsible for the most redaction. It would also raise the question as to the source of such available narratives. Thus, while the latter possibilities are not empirically out of the question, it is obviously preferable to keep our hypothetical redactional entities to a minimum until the hypothesis of a single Yahwistic redaction of the DtrH should have proven to be unable to account for the phenomena as we have them.

48 Cf. "The Chronology of the Story of the Flood", JSOT 18 (1980) 52-62.