

SAMUEL, BOOKS OF. The OT books dealing with Samuel and with the first two kings of Israel, Saul and David. While normally classified as historical books, they are also notable for their theological evaluation of kingship in general and of dynastic kingship and David in particular.

I. Place in the Canon

II. Contents

III. Text

IV. Sources

V. Redactional History

VI. Purpose and Theology

I. Place in the Canon.-In the Hebrew Bible the books of Samuel belong to the part of the canon called the Prophets, which consists of the Former Prophets (Joshua, Judges, I and 2 Samuel, I and 2 Kings) and the Latter Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets). Apparently because of the great length of Samuel, the LXX divided it into two books, called *Basileion A* and *B* (1 and 2 Kingdoms or I and 2 Reigns); this division was introduced into the Hebrew Bible with the First Rabbinic Bible of 1517.

The division of the books after I S. 31 makes some sense, since this chapter reports the death of Saul. Yet this division also splits in two the story of David's rise to power, which begins in I S. 16 and reaches its climax in 2 S. 5. While I Samuel begins with the birth of Samuel, who plays a prominent role in the book up to ch. 25 (cf. ch. 28), Samuel himself resembles in a number of ways the judges of the book of Judges; thus in some ways the division between Judges and 1 Samuel might better have been placed between the end of

the era of the judges (after 1 S. 7) and before the rise of the monarchy (1 S. 8-15).

The name Samuel is not altogether appropriate for the books of Samuel, since the prophet dies in 1 S. 25 and is not mentioned at all after 1 S. 28:20. Samuel's prominent role in the early chapters of 1 Samuel may have led to the association of his name with the books. At least as early as the Talmud, however, Samuel was also considered the author of those chapters preceding his death. Subsequent chapters were attributed to the prophets Nathan and Gad. This theory of authorship seems to be based on the mention in I Ch. 29:29 of "the Chronicles of Samuel the seer, and the Chronicles of Nathan the prophet, and the Chronicles of Gad the seer."

II. Contents.-The contents of Samuel may be outlined as follows (note that the divisions listed here do not necessarily correspond to divisions in the underlying sources):

I. Samuel at Shiloh (1 S. 1:1-3:21)

A. Samuel's Birth (ch. 1)

B. Song of Hannah (2:1-10)

C. Corruption of Eli's Sons (2:11-36) D. Call of Samuel (ch. 3)

II. The Ark Narrative (I S. 4:1-7:1)

A. Ark's Exile among the Philistines (ch. 4)

B. Victorious Hand of Yahweh (ch. 5)

C. Ark's Return to Israel (6:1-7:1)

III. Emergence and Early Days of Kingship (7:2-15:35)

A. Samuel's Defeat of the Philistines and Judging
of Israel (7:2-17)

B. Samuel's Warning: Rights of the King (ch. 8)

C. Samuel's Anointing of Saul (9:1-10:16)

D. Saul's Choice by Lot (10:17-27a)

E. People's Proclamation of Saul's Kingship
(10:27b-11:15)

F. Samuel's Farewell Discourse (ch. 12)

G. Saul's War Against the Philistines (chs. 13-14)

H. Saul's Rejection as King (ch. 15)

IV. History of David's Rise (1 S. 16:1-2 S. 5:25)

A. Samuel's Anointing of David (1 S. 16:1-13)

B. David's Introduction to Saul and Defeat of Goliath (16:14-18:5)

C. Several Escapes of David from Saul (18:6-9:24)

D. David and Jonathan's Mutual Loyalty (ch. 20)

E. Ahimelech's Generosity to David (21:1-9 [MT
2-10])

F. David as Madman (21:10-15 [MT 11-16])

G. Saul's Slaying of Ahimelech, and Abiathar's Escape (ch. 22)

H. David's Escape from Saul at Keilah (ch. 23)

I. David's Refusal to Kill Saul, Yahweh's Anointed (ch. 24)

J. David and Abigail (ch. 25)

K. Reprise: David's Refusal to Kill Saul, Yahweh's Anointed (ch. 26)

L. David as Double Agent (27:1-28:2)

M. The Witch of Endor (28:3-25)

N. David's Dismissal by Achish (ch. 29)

- O. David's Campaigns in the South (ch. 30)
 - P.. Death and Burial of Saul (ch. 31)
 - Q. David's Grief over Saul and Jonathan (2 S. 1)
 - R. David's Anointing as King of Judah (2:1-11)
 - S. Wars with Abner and Ishbaal (2:12-4:12)
 - T. David's Anointing as King of Israel (5:1-5)
 - U. Capture of Jerusalem and Defeat of the Philistines (5:6-25)
- V. Movement of the Ark to Jerusalem (ch. 6)
- VI. Nathan's Oracle (ch. 7)
- VII. David's Wars and Officials (ch. 8)
- VIII. Succession to David's Throne (2 S. 9:1-20:26; cf. I K. 1:1-2:26)
 - A. David's Loyalty to Mephibosheth (2 S. 9)
 - B. War with the Arameans (ch. 10)
 - C. Affair with Bathsheba and its Consequences
(11:1-12:25)
 - D. Defeat of Rabbah of the Ammonites (12:26-31)
 - E. Amnon's Rape of Tamar and Execution by Absalom (13:1-37)
 - F. Absalom's Revolt and Its Suppression (13:38
20:3)
 - G. Revolt of Sheba (20:4-26)
- IX. Miscellanies from David's Reign of (21:1-24:25)
 - A. Gibeonites' Revenge; Reburial of Saul and Jonathan (21:1-14)
 - B. Exploits of David's Men (21:15-22)

C. A Psalm of David (ch. 22)

D. David's Last Words (23:1-7)

E. David's Warriors (23:8-39)

F. David's Census and the Ensuing Plague (ch. 24)

III. Text.-The MT of 1 and 2 Samuel has suffered from extensive textual corruption, particularly in the omission of words or phrases due to homoioteleuton. A superior text can often be reconstructed with data drawn from the DSS or LXX.

Thenius was the first modern scholar to make extensive use of the LXX for textual criticism, but pride of place in textual studies of the books of Samuel belongs to J. Wellhausen and S. R. Driver. Modern editions of the Hebrew Bible take note of the textual difficulties and list many of the divergences between the MT and LXX. (For the p. 313

books of Samuel the apparatus in *BH* is sometimes more complete and more accurate than that of *BHS*.)

The alternate and often superior text-type lying behind the LXX has been identified also in the DSS. 4QSama (50-25 B.c.), 4QSamb (mid-3rd cent. B.C.), and 4QSamc (early 1st cent. B.c.) frequently support the LXX; some of the Qumran readings correspond even more closely to the Lucianic family of LXX MSS and to readings in Josephus than to the original LXX.

F. M. Cross (*Qumran*, pp. 177-195) classified the original Greek translation, made in Egypt in the 2nd cent. B.C., as the Old Greek. About a century later, he theorized, this translation was revised to agree with the Hebrew text that was currently predominant in Palestine (witnesses to this Palestinian text tradition include citations in the books of

Chronicles and in Josephus, in addition to the DSS). This Greek revision is now imperfectly preserved as part of the Lucianic recension of the LXX, completed *ca.* A.D. 300. Lucian seems to have used for this recension a copy of the Palestinian revision of the Old Greek made in the 1st cent. B.c.; for this reason the Palestinian revision of the Old Greek text-type is called proto-Lucian.

The MT forms a third text-type. Cross theorized that this text had a Babylonian provenance. While this identification of the MT's geographical origin is far from certain, it is surely possible in many cases to reconstruct three distinct text-types for the books of Samuel.

Although the Qumran MSS have not yet been fully published, the works of Ulrich and McCarter (who had access through Cross to the unpublished MSS of Samuel and included their variant readings in their comms.) have enabled students to make substantial use of this evidence. Extensive evaluations of the Qumran and LXX evidence on individual readings are found in the comms. of McCarter and Klein.

In 2 Samuel the character of the Greek text of LXX B changes beginning with 2 S. 10:1. Before this point Vaticanus contains the Old Greek; after this point Vaticanus includes a different Greek recension, the *kaige*, a version of the LXX produced about the turn of the era in an attempt to make it agree with a proto-MT. The value of the LXX is somewhat diminished in 2 S. 10:1-24:25, therefore, although Lucianic readings offer indirect but extremely valuable access to the Old Greek.

Of the other ancient versions, the Old Latin is the most valuable. McCarter has provided a comprehensive survey of the ancient versions (*I Samuel*, pp. 9-11).

IV. Sources.-It is widely agreed that the editor responsible for the present shape of the

books of Samuel drew on a number of earlier sources. In the nature of the case, it is often impossible to determine exactly where such documents began and ended, and there is no unanimity among scholars on this matter or on the date and circumstances of their original composition. The following are the major pericopes that are thought to have served the author of the books of Samuel as sources (see the comms. of Klein and McCarter for discussion of shorter items perhaps drawn from sources).

Much of the material dealing with Samuel's birth, his connections with Shiloh, and his auditory dream theophany in 1 S. 1-3 can be attributed to sources available to the author of 1 Samuel. Chapters 1-2 in particular may stem from a time when the sanctuary at Shiloh was still powerful (the prophet Ahijah is the last Shilonite mentioned in the Bible, 1 K. 15:29f.). The Song of Hannah (1 S. 2:1-10) seems to many to have been composed originally for another context, since it refers positively to the king of Israel (v. 10) even though Hannah's son Samuel opposed kingship as contrary to the will of Yahweh.

The ark narrative (1 S. 4:1b-7:1; 2 S. 6) does not mention Samuel and seems to have a different literary history from that of 1 S. 1-3 and 7. The original beginning and ending of this narrative are in dispute. L. Rost and A. F. Campbell have argued that the account of the ark's transference to Jerusalem (2 S. 6) was part of this original narrative, which they have dated to the 10th cent. B.C. According to Campbell the precanonical source document also reported the rejection of Shiloh and the house of Eli in favor of the sanctuary at Jerusalem. Miller and Roberts, on the other hand, have denied that 2 S. 6 was part of the precanonical narrative and have hypothesized that the original narrative began with the anti-Elide portions of ch. 2 (vv. 12-17, 22-25, 27-36) as an explanation of why the ark was lost in battle. According to this theory the narrative reaffirms Yahweh's

power at a time of apparent defeat and is to be dated to a time before David's defeat of the Philistines.

Whatever its original beginning or end, the ark narrative maintains that God cannot be subjugated even when His people are overwhelmed and His sacred ark falls into enemy hands (Gordon, p. 36). Gordon proposed that the ark narrative would have had special meaning at the time of Israel's exile (cf. 1 S. 4:21f.). Exiles may have concluded that Yahweh could return from the Babylonian exile (cf. Ezk. 43:1-5; 44:4) just as He had once returned from exile among the Philistines.

The positive accounts of Saul's rise to kingship are also thought to be old sources available to the editor of Samuel. In 1 S. 9:1-10:16 we find a folkloristic story of how Saul, a handsome young man from an outstanding family, searched for his father's lost asses. During this search he encountered a man of God (Samuel), who indicated to him his future greatness. This story may have been combined with a separate account, influenced by the "call form" associated with Moses, Gideon, and several prophets, which reported that Samuel anointed Saul to be prince.

Saul's choice by lot (1 S. 10:17-27a) seems to be another old and independent tradition about the origin of his kingship. Those who argue for its independence note that the lot-casting carried out by Samuel would be an unnecessary procedure if Samuel had already anointed Saul. Some have argued that still another tradition is preserved in vv. 21b-24, in which Saul is identified as the one chosen by Yahweh because of his great height.

Saul's accession to the kingship in 1 S. 10:27b-11:15, another old account, is attributed to his leadership in a war against the Ammonites. Here Saul seems to be a private citizen living in Gibeah, not the person who had been designated and acclaimed king in 10:17-

27a. The public proclamation of his kingship at the Gilgal sanctuary (11:15) seems redundant after the similar ceremony in Mizpah (10:17, 24).

All of the positive stories about Saul's rise to kingship give Samuel a prominent role. While it is not possible, at this stage of our knowledge, to harmonize the various ceremonies and locales in these accounts, the stories do represent a very strong and ancient tradition that saw Saul's rise as part of the will of Yahweh.

Among the traditions critical of the monarchy, Samuel's unflattering portrait of kingship in 1 S. 8:11-18 is identified as an early source by several scholars. Mendelsohn proposed that Samuel was drawing on his knowledge of Canaanite kingship when he identified the ways in which the king would tax his subjects and turn them into slaves. Crusemann drew an analogy between this critique of kingship and the grievances that fed the revolts of Absalom and Sheba.

While 1 S. 12 has been identified by many scholars as basically a Deuteronomistic composition (for the theological importance of this speech, see below), it is often said to contain archaic material, largely because the historical details it reports differ from data reported elsewhere in the Bible. In v. 9, e.g., the sequence of enemies - Sisera, the Philistines, and Moab - is contrary to the chronological order of enemies in the book of Judges. The second deliverer cited in v. 11 is either Barak or Bedan (the text is uncertain); if the correct reading is Barak he comes in the wrong chronological sequence, and if it is Bedan the text refers to a deliverer completely unknown elsewhere in the Bible. While ch. 11 reports that the Ammonite crisis was the occasion for Yahweh to raise up Saul as a charismatic deliverer, 12:12 reports that the same crisis resulted in the sinful demand for a king. However this conflict is resolved, chs. 11 and 12 were probably

not written by the same person.

The history of David's rise (HDR) seems to be another old document that was incorporated into the books of Samuel. Again, scholars have not achieved unanimity on where this document began or ended. Grønbaek and Mettinger proposed that it began at 1 S. 15:1, the report of Saul's rejection as king. Weiser argued that 16:1-13, the anointing of David by Samuel, would be an appropriate beginning. Since HDR makes no further mention of this anointing ceremony, others would see 16:14 as the beginning of the precanonical document. Most have identified 2 S. 5:10 as the final verse of HDR, in which case it would conclude with David's anointing by both Judah (2 S. 2:4) and Israel (5:3).

The time of composition and the purpose of the HDR source are equally in doubt. Ward suggested that it was prepared by a member of Solomon's court who was trying to justify the king to the Saulides (cf. Crusemann). Mettinger believed that it should be dated after Solomon, arguing that it supports the Jerusalem king's right to rule over all Israel, as David had done, and not just over the southern kingdom. While Grønbaek and Conrad placed it in the 9th cent., McCarter dated it within the reign of David, comparing it to apologetic literature and especially to the Apology of Hattusilis III, a thirteenth-century Hittite king (cf. Whitelam). According to this view the HDR source was originally meant to counteract those who were suspicious of the new king. The document exonerates David from any complicity in the deaths of Saul (2 S. 1:14-16), Abner (3:27, 31-39), and Ishbaal (Ishbosheth, 4:2-12), and it underscores David's generosity to Merib baal (Mephibosheth), Jonathan's surviving son (ch. 9; 19:24-30). It shows that David did not take advantage of easy opportunities to assassinate his

predecessor (1 S. 24, 26), nor, despite his alliance with the Philistines, did he participate in their fatal battle against Saul on Mt. Gilboa (1 S. 31). David's association with the Philistines, a source of potential embarrassment to the king and his supporters, is shown to have been forced upon him by Saul's harassment (27:1).

According to HDR, David also enjoyed the support - or at least the implicit recognition - of Jonathan, Saul's heir apparent and the first of the royal house to acknowledge David (1 S. 18:1-5; 19:1; 20:5-8; 23:6-18), of king Saul's daughter Michal (18:20-29; 19:11-17), of Samuel (19:18-24; 28:17), and of Saul himself (24:20). Abigail, the wife of a wealthy Calebite, joined the chorus of those prophesying David's kingship (25:30). All Israel and Judah are said to have loved him (18:16), and the women sang, "Saul has struck down his thousands, but David his ten thousands" (18:7). It is also repeatedly affirmed that

315

Yahweh was with David (16:18; 17:37; 18:14, 28; 2 S. 5:10). Even Abner, the general of Saul and later of Saul's son Ishbaal, made efforts to swing the remnant of Saul's kingdom behind David, although Joab assassinated Abner to satisfy a private grievance before the latter's plans were fully carried out (2 S. 3:6-27). Saul is portrayed throughout HDR as beset with paranoid fear and as abandoned by the spirit of Yahweh. Although Saul had failed to carry out the ban on Amalek (1 S. 15), he ruthlessly destroyed all the priests of Yahweh suspected of Davidic sympathies (22:16-19).

The succession narrative (roughly 2 S. 9-20; 1 K. 1-2) is another document widely believed to predate the present books of Samuel, but again there is no agreement on its beginning, end, date, or purpose. Rost, whose monograph forms the starting point for all subsequent research, saw its beginning in 2 S. 6:16, 20-23 and in fragments of the oracle

of Nathan (7:11b, 16). More recently, Gunn added much of 2 S. 2-4 to the beginning of the succession narrative. While Rost saw in the narrative "eyewitness history," others have emphasized its wisdom characteristics (Whybray) or events role as story (Gunn).

Gordon argued that "succession" is not the theme of this narrative, especially if Gunn's identification of its beginning is correct. In Gordon's view the theme must involve David himself. Delekat even proposed that the document was opposed to David and Solomon (note the king's bad behavior in the whole Bathsheba incident). Wurthwein found anti-Solomonic tendencies in 1 K. 1-2 and anti-Davidic ideas in 2 S. 10-12. Although many scholars have dated this narrative to the reign of Solomon, Gordon apparently favored a time after the division of the united monarchy (pp. 90f.). Van Seters (p. 290) even dated it to the postexilic period, after the composition of the Deuteronomistic History; but his is decidedly a minority viewpoint.

According to McCarter the succession narrative in the strict sense is limited to 1 K. 1-2, although that document's author knew and drew on materials from 2 S. 9-20. 1 K. 1-2 offers an apology for the coronation of Solomon instead of his older brother Adonijah. The writer noted that David himself had decreed from his deathbed that Solomon was the son destined to be king, and that Solomon enjoyed the support of Nathan the prophet, Zadok the priest, and David's wife Bathsheba. The violent deaths of Adonijah and his supporter Joab and the banishment of the priest Abiathar, who was also involved in Adonijah's abortive coronation, are justified by appeals to David's wishes (Joab), to a foolish and perhaps revolutionary request for David's concubine Abishag (Adonijah), and to the fulfillment of a curse announced in 1 S. 2:30-33 against the Shilonite priesthood (Abiathar). The executions of Adonijah, Joab, and Shimei (the latter had cursed David)

were carried out by Benaiah, Solomon's general, not by the new king himself.

The writer of the Solomonic succession narrative (1 K. 1-2) drew on the HDR source (Joab's execution of Abner in 2 S. 3 is presupposed by 1 K. 2:5, 31-33), on the account of Absalom's revolt in 2 S. 13-20, and on the two related stories of the Gibeonites' revenge for a sacrilege committed by Saul (21:1-14) and David's patronage of Mephibosheth (9:1-13; note that when David executed seven descendants of Saul he was not trying to secure his own position but only to stop the famine that had been precipitated by Saul's actions; note also that David provided burial for these slain Saulides as well as for Saul and Jonathan). All of these documents drawn upon by the Solomonic succession narrative are apologetic for David and appear to stem from the period of David's reign. The apparent purpose of the Solomonic writer's allusion to these documents is to explain why Solomon rather than any of his three older brothers - Amnon, Absalom, or Adonijah - succeeded to the throne of David. All three of the older brothers recapitulated their father's sin in the area of sexual behavior: Amnon raped his sister Tamar; Absalom publicly slept with the king's concubines, whom David had left behind in Jerusalem; and Adonijah greedily sought to acquire another of his father's concubines, Abishag. All three also met violent deaths: Amnon was killed by Absalom; Absalom was killed by Joab despite David's explicit prohibition against harming him; and Adonijah, who incited Solomon's understandable wrath by asking for a woman who might give him some claim to the throne, was executed by Benaiah.

Several scholars have suggested that the succession narrative was originally hostile to David and Solomon, with the present pro-Solomonic bias coming from a later redactor (Delekat, Langamet, Veijola, and Wurthwein). The tensions these scholars have detected

within the document, however, are better ascribed to its apologetic character. The original writer had to refer to serious charges made against David and/or Solomon in order to write in his/their defense. Thus the negative views about David or Solomon are not the result of an earlier edition of the succession narrative, but reflect the usual tensions inherent in an apology.

V. Redactional History.-*One's* reconstruction of the path by which the above-mentioned sources and other materials were brought together determines to a large extent what one sees as the meaning of the books of Samuel; or it makes possible the isolation of a series of meanings that the work had as it passed through several editions. Some studies have virtually ignored such endeavors and focused more on the literary qualities of the present text of Samuel (e.g., Conroy, Eslinger, Humphreys, Gunn, and Jobling). While the holistic approach of these scholars is often quite illuminating and can benefit any reading of the text, most scholars still believe there is profit in trying to reconstruct the editorial stages through which the work has passed.

Several scholars have proposed that there was a prophetic edition of many of the materials in Samuel prior to the 7th cent. B.c. This edition purportedly accepted the monarchy with a great deal of caution, as an unwelcome but inevitable reality. It affirmed that a king could be head of the government but maintained that he should be subject to the instruction of the prophet and that he could even be rejected by the prophet in the name of Yahweh. Because of its critical attitude toward kingship, this prophetic edition is usually thought to have a northern origin. At the same time, however, it is said to have acknowledged David's right to be king. McCarter, who has provided the most extensive treatment of this edition, summarized its author's intent as follows: "His background was

northern, and he drew the fundamental principles upon which he based his interpretation of history from the teachings of the prophetic circles of the north; but his orientation was to the south, to which he looked for hope and in which he knew the future of Israel to be" (*I Samuel*, p. 22). For this reason the prophetic edition is dated to the end of the 8th cent., after the fall of the northern kingdom. The existence of this edition, however, is open to some question. Some of its prophetic tendencies may be part of the Deuteronomistic redactional process. The supposed double - and almost contradictory - orientation (northern criticism of the monarchy and a proDavidic, southern bias) contributes to the skepticism concerning the isolation of this redaction.

316

In any case, the vast majority of all more recent studies of Samuel has concluded that the present shape of the canonical work has resulted from its being part of the Deuteronomistic History. In 1943 M. Noth suggested that a single exilic writer, living in Palestine, wrote a history of Israel based on the theology of Deuteronomy. This history consisted of an expanded book of Deuteronomy (the original book of Deuteronomy was supplied with a new introduction that was more a prologue to the Deuteronomistic History than to Deuteronomy itself), plus the books we now call Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings (for Noth's work in English, see *Deuteronomistic History*).

Four questions about Noth's hypothesis continue to provoke much discussion. First, Noth interpreted the history as primarily a theodicy written to provide the theological rationale for the fall of the northern kingdom, Jerusalem, and Judah. Even if one grants that theodicy was a major part of the historian's intention, it is important to note that theodicy is rarely an end in itself; rather, a theodicy is written to move the reader to

accept God's role in history and to continue to worship and serve Him or to change one's relationship to Him. Recent scholars, therefore, have found a number of positive messages in the history and a more hopeful assessment of the future (see Klein, *Israel in Exile*, pp. 38-43).

A second area of controversy is Noth's hypothesis about the Palestinian provenance of the history. Although a majority of scholars still favor a provenance in Palestine, some have argued cogently for Babylonia as the place of composition (see esp. Nicholson, pp. 116-122; Soggin, p. 164).

Noth's idea of a single historian responsible for the entire work has been all but given up. Some scholars have spoken generally of a Deuteronomistic school that was active over a considerable period of time, while others have claimed to detect distinct editions or redactions (Cross, Dietrich, McCarter, Nelson, Smend, Veijola).

Perhaps the most important area of discussion, still unresolved, centers on the date of these redactions. Cross (*Canaanite Myth*, pp. 274-289; cf. McCarter; Nelson) proposed that the first edition of the Deuteronomistic History was composed after the discovery of Deuteronomy in the temple (2 K. 22:8-10) but prior to the death of Josiah. Cross considered it a propaganda document for the Josianic reform, with a date somewhere between 621 and 609 B.C. A second edition of the history was completed in mid-exile (*ca.* 550 B.C.). It brought the history up to date and attributed the fall of Jerusalem to Manasseh's wickedness, which canceled out whatever virtues Josiah had shown in his reform.

Smend, Dietrich, and Veijola (the Gottingen school) have also detected multiple editions but have dated none of them prior to the destruction of Jerusalem in 587. Their

first edition, called DtrG (G for *Geschichte* or *Geschichtswerk*), provided an explanation for the fall of Jerusalem; it criticized Israel for worshipping other gods and patronizing sanctuaries other than the temple in Jerusalem. A second edition, called DtrP (P for Prophetic), added accounts about prophetic figures and highlighted the notions of prophecy-and-fulfillment and the reliability of the word of Yahweh. (Some of the material attributed to DtrP in this hypothesis is assigned by McCarter and others to the prophetic, pre-Deuteronomistic edition discussed above). The Gottingen school's third redaction, DtrN (N for Nomistic), faults Israel for violating details of the law and for mixing with the surrounding nations.

The Gottingen school has been far more persuasive in its arguments that the Deuteronomistic History is an exclusively exilic work, without a preexilic Josianic predecessor, than in its assignment of specific verses to one of the three supposed exilic editions. At this stage of research it may be advisable to speak more generally of the Deuteronomistic interpretation of history during the Exile and to acknowledge that this interpretation may have resulted from two or more editors, without claiming to be able to identify precisely where the work of one leaves off and the work of the next begins. The effect of such a Deuteronomistic reading can be sampled in two key chapters, 1 S. 12 and 2 S. 7.

1 Samuel 12, the farewell speech of Samuel, is the final Deuteronomistic reflection on the rise of kingship in Israel as reported in chs. 7-11. In those chapters the historian had incorporated several older compositions, the majority of which treated Saul and kingship in a most positive manner. In 9:1-10:16 Saul had been anointed by the prophet Samuel and had displayed a kind of prophetic ecstasy that showed that the Spirit of Yahweh

rested on him. In 10:17-27a, on the other hand, Saul was singled out by lot and by a prophetic oracle, while in 11:1-15 the spirit of Yahweh had rushed upon him and helped him deliver the city of Jabesh-gilead from Ammonite attack. In the aftermath of this victory, the people spontaneously acclaimed him as king at Gilgal. These passages in their present form give a prominent role to Samuel and clearly consider Saul's kingship to be the will of Yahweh.

The Deuteronomistic historian also included in chs. 7-11 other texts that he had either written or redacted, which frequently contain explicitly or implicitly negative comments on kingship. Since Samuel had been a more than adequate channel for God's victory over the Philistines according to ch. 7, the author seems to imply that the Israelites had no need for a king to lead them in battle. Samuel had also warned of the social inequities and self-aggrandizement that would come with kingship, and he twice criticized kingship as a rejection of Yahweh as king and savior (8:7; 10:19). The negative opinions about kingship in these three Deuteronomistic pericopes (7:2-17; 8:1-22; 10:18b-19) are balanced by Yahweh's command to make a king in 8:7, 22 and by the fact that these pericopes are interspersed with the positive ones discussed above (9:1-10:16; 10:17-27a; 11:1-15). Crusemann (pp. 61f.) may well have been correct in isolating 8:1-3, 11-17, and 12:3-5 as pre-Deuteronomistic material that is unsympathetic to the monarchy. The criticism of kingship in these sources employed by the Deuteronomistic historian is economic and social rather than theological. Its original setting may have been among wealthy landowners about the time of Solomon (cf. Mendelsohn).

1 Samuel 12, then, produces a synthesis at the conclusion of all these varied accounts of the rise of kingship. The people first declare Samuel completely innocent in his public

life, and both Samuel and the people agree that Yahweh is a witness to this (vv. 1-5). Yahweh is also shown to have been without fault in His saving actions for Israel (vv. 6f.). The people had erred, however, in demanding a king during the recent crisis with Nahash instead of turning to Yahweh for help (vv. 8-12). Nevertheless, the king of their own choosing is also Yahweh's gift, and Samuel presents the conditions under which kingship might be a blessing rather than a curse (vv. 13-15). A rain during wheat harvest, which comes in answer to Samuel's prayer, persuades the people to confess their sin in requesting a king and to ask Samuel to intercede for them (vv. 16-19). Samuel promises to pray for them and urges them not to turn to other gods. Total destruction of the people and their king will result if they turn to wicked behavior (vv. 20-25).

p. 317

This Deuteronomistic summary indicates that Israel's life under a king will be blessed if the people are obedient (v. 14), but that it will be cursed if the people disobey (v. 15). The final, conditional curse in v. 25 threatens the people and their king with exile if they persist in acting wickedly. This threat had become a reality in the destruction of Jerusalem and the exiling of Israel's leadership by the time this chapter reached its final form. But these events of national catastrophe are not evidence for Yahweh's weakness, unfaithfulness, or caprice. Rather, in the light of the entire chapter, they are completely harmonizable with Yahweh's record of fidelity with His people, i.e., with His righteousness (v. 7).

2 Samuel 7 has been the object of a spirited search for older and more -original elements beneath its present Deuteronomistic surface (see the surveys in Gordon, pp. 71-80; McCarter, *II Samuel*, pp. 9-16). McCarter's own reconstruction demonstrates both the

potential value and the precariousness of such literary critical endeavors. He found the oldest document behind this chapter in vv. 1a, 2f., 11b-12, and 13b-15a, and he assigned it to the period of Solomon. David's promise to build a temple for Yahweh lends authority to Solomon's actual construction of this sanctuary, and David's promise is answered by Yahweh's promise to build a house or dynasty for David.

According to McCarter, the northern prophetic redaction, which he discovered especially in 1 S. 1-15, added 2 S. 7:4-9a and 15b to the earlier document. This addition was critical of David's presumption in offering to build Yahweh a house. The temple is contrasted in this redaction with Yahweh's former sanctuary or tent, and David is informed that a temple is unnecessary and unwanted. The dynastic promise at this stage is understood as an uninduced gift, not as a response to David's pledge to build the temple.

The Deuteronomistic additions in the strict sense are vv. 1b, 9b-11a, 13a, and 16. They pick up familiar themes: a great name for David, a permanent sacred site, and the achievement of rest (freedom from war) for Israel. The latter two ideas are already linked in Dt. 12:10-12. The Deuteronomistic historian linked the long-awaited central sanctuary to the monarchy. The divine prohibition of temple construction was only temporary because the time was not yet right. Elsewhere in the Deuteronomistic History, David's failure to build the temple is traced to the fact that his was an age of war, while rest came only with the advent of Solomon (cf. 1 K. 5:3-5; 8:17-19).

By these additions, of course, the historian incorporated all of 2 S. 7 into his massive history. The chapter as a whole integrates themes from the judges (vv. 7, 11), the rejection of Saul (v. 15), the rise of David (vv. 8f.), the accession of Solomon (v. 12), and the erection of the temple (v. 13). David's rapid rise was possible because he was divinely

destined for kingship, because he was to be the progenitor of the chosen dynasty (a secure house), and because he was a savior whose victories would make possible the promised rest for Israel (McCarthy, "II Samuel 7," pp. 131f.). Since one of David's major achievements was the initiation of "rest," his military victories are catalogued by the Deuteronomistic History in ch. 8.

Deuteronomistic elements also play a role in David's prayer in response to Nathan's oracle (7:18-29). Verse 22 stresses Yahweh's uniqueness, and vv. 23f. report His incomparable benefactions for the Israelites, especially His making them a people through the exodus from Egypt. David's reign was a time of promise and preparation, looking forward to the establishment of the dynasty and the building of the temple. David received the promises, prayed for their fulfillment (vv. 25f.), and even prepared for their fulfillment by winning rest for the people (ch. 8 in its present position).

It is widely held that 2 S. 21-24 is a supplement to the Deuteronomistic History and that typical Deuteronomistic terminology is absent from these chapters. Often dismissed as miscellany, they actually show a clear and meaningful structure. For example, Gordon (pp. 95-97) found a concentric arrangement, in which items 1 and 6, 2 and 5, and 3 and 4 are parallel: (1) 21:1-14 A famine story

(2) 21:15-22 Warrior exploits

(3) 22:2-51 A psalm (= Ps. 18)

(4) 23:1-7 A divine oracle about the Davidic covenant (cf. Pss. 89; 132; 2 S. 7)

(5) 23:8-39 Warrior exploits and a list of warriors (6) 24:1-25 A plague story.

David, according to the psalm, was righteous in carrying out his duties (2 S. 22:22-25) and yet dependent on Yahweh his lamp (v. 29). David also rejoiced in the covenant that

God had made with him and his house (23:3-5). It is an obedient and blessed David that appears at the center of this final section of Samuel, but he is surrounded by the David of history, who turned over the descendants of Saul to the vengeance of the Gibeonites (ch. 21) and who erred in taking a census of the people (ch. 24). David ends his life, like Moses, with a hymn of vindication (ch. 22; cf. Dt. 32:1-43) and a testimony (2 S. 23:1-7; cf. Dt. 33).

VI. Purpose and Theology.- The prophet judge Samuel, born in answer to his mother's fervent prayer, offers a contrast to the corrupt priesthood at Shiloh, whose behavior guaranteed the end of the Shiloh epoch in Israelite history (1 S. 1-2). The focus of 1 and 2 Samuel on David, God's chosen king and anointed one, is adumbrated in the Song of Hannah (1 S. 2:10; cf. Childs, pp. 272f.). Since Yahweh was with Samuel and since all Israel acknowledged him as prophet (1 S. 3:19f.), he was fully qualified for the task of inaugurating kingship in Israel (chs. 7-12) and for transferring the office of king to David (ch. 16).

The loss of the ark to the Philistines (1 S. 4) led the wife of Phinehas to cry out, "The glory has gone into exile from Israel since the ark of God has been taken" (v. 22); but it also provided an opportunity for Yahweh to manifest His superiority over Israel's enemies (ch. 5) and to demonstrate that Israel had no need for a king in order to be victorious over the Philistines. The loss of the ark and its subsequent glorious return (ch. 6) may suggest what the audience to which Samuel was addressed expected in its own day about the return of Yahweh to the land.

Samuel's victory over the Philistines at Ebenezer followed a ceremony of repentance (1 S. 7). If such repentance and putting away of foreign gods had been followed

consistently, the defeats of the northern and southern kingdoms in 721 and 587 B.c., respectively, would not have been necessary. While the request for a king was sinful because it manifested a failure to look to Yahweh for help in time of need, kingship was also a gift of Yahweh, as is asserted throughout chs. 8-11. Samuel made it clear that kingship would be a blessing if Israel's conduct was obedient, but it would be a curse if the people disobeyed and rebelled (ch. 12). Israel chose the latter course, as is demonstrated throughout the Deuteronomistic History, and this led to the sweeping away of both king and people (cf. v. 25; for discussion of chs. 7-12, see V above).

Saul lost the opportunity to establish a dynasty (1 S. 13) and to continue as king himself (ch. 15) because of his disobedience on two occasions: he erred in performing a sacrifice in the place of Samuel (13:8-14) and in not carrying out the ban in the war against Amalek (ch. 15).

p. 318

Samuel, who delivered Yahweh's verdict to Saul, also anointed David, the youngest son of Jesse, to succeed Saul as king of Israel (ch. 16). The anointing signified Yahweh's obligation to David and, by implication, His covenant with him. While the account of David's anointing relates how he became king *de jure*, the following chapters (1 S. 16:14-2 S. 5) tell how he became king *de facto*. All the deeds of politics, of guerrilla action and intrigue, of marriages of convenience, and of questionable service with the Philistines are trumped by a prior fact: already at the start Yahweh had anointed David to be Saul's successor. After Saul's death first Judah (2 S. 4) and then Israel (5:3) seconded Yahweh's choice by anointing David to be king. David himself acknowledged that Yahweh had chosen him to be king (5:12; 6:21). For the numerous references to David

as the one destined to be king, see the discussion of the history of David's rise (HDR) in IV above.

David's transfer of the ark to Jerusalem gave great prestige and honor to the Jerusalemite monarchy and, later, the Jerusalem temple (2 S. 6). It prepared the way for the divine oracle granting David a dynasty and his son the right to build a temple for Yahweh (ch. 7). Six times in ch. 7 it is stated that David's kingship, his house, or his throne will last forever. The unconditional character of this promise is modified later in the Deuteronomistic History (1 K. 2:3f.; 6:12f.; 8:25; 9:4f.), but the reliability of the promise also offered some hope as the historian turned toward the future.

Throughout the entire Deuteronomistic History, Judah's life is extended because of Yahweh's choice of David and Jerusalem (1 K. 11:34-36). Because of the promises to David and of David's perfect obedience (2 S. 22:22-25), Yahweh postponed the punishment merited by later kings, or He did not carry it out fully. The division of the kingdom, e.g., did not take place during the lifetime of Solomon because of Yahweh's commitment to David (1 K. 11:12, 32); and this promise also secured the loyalty of at least one tribe to the Davidic dynasty after the division of the kingdom (vv. 13, 32). The promise to David forestalled total destruction during the reign of wicked Jehoram (2 K. 8:19), and the choice of David and Jerusalem led to Yahweh's defense of the city during the days of Hezekiah (19:39; 20:6). The release of Jehoiachin at the end of the Deuteronomistic History (25:27-30) may mark the beginning of a new era of blessing; at least it shows that the promise to David continued to have positive effects.

The historian later portrays David as wholly true to Yahweh (1 K. 15:3) and as a man who did what was right and did not turn from anything that Yahweh had commanded

him all the days of his life (1 K. 15:5). Despite his adultery and murder in the affair with Bathsheba (2 S. 11:12), and despite his failure to act decisively with respect to Amnon's rape of Tamar and Absalom's subsequent rebellion (chs. 13-20), David is one of only three persons designated as Yahweh's servant in the Deuteronomistic History (the others are Moses and Joshua). David stands out because he captured Jerusalem (2 S. 5), brought the ark to the holy city (ch. 6), and demonstrated his loyalty and piety in his prayers (7:18-29; 1 K. 1:47f.). David administered justice and equity to all the people (2 S. 8:15), walked before Yahweh in uprightness of heart (1 K. 3:6), and kept Yahweh's statutes and commandments (3:14).

David, according to a psalm ascribed to him and placed near the end of 2 Samuel, was righteous in carrying out his duties (22:22-25) and yet dependent on Yahweh his lamp (v. 29). David also rejoiced in the covenant God had made with him and his house (23:3-5) and foresaw a glorious future for his dynasty with God's help. 2 S. 21:1-14 shows that the reason for the destruction of Saul's descendants lay in the bloodguilt of Saul himself. David's weakness in his final battle with the Philistines (21:15-22) prepares the reader for the psalm in ch. 22, which attributes all of David's victories to Yahweh's power. Although David sinned in conducting a census, he repented of this sin, and the incident provided an opportunity for emphasizing Yahweh's mercy toward him and toward Israel (Childs, pp. 274f.).

Bibliography. -Surveys of Recent Work: R. P. Gordon, *1 & 2 Samuel* (1984); also [comms. by](#) Klein and McCarter (see below).

OT Intros.: B. S. Childs (1979); O. Eissfeldt (Eng. tr. 1965); R. K. Harrison (1969); W. H. Schmidt (Eng. tr. 1984); R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des AT* (1978); J. A. Soggin (Eng.

tr. 1980).

Comms.: P. R. Ackroyd (*CBC*, 1971); K. Budde (*Kurzer Handcommentar zum AT*, 1902); G. B. Caird (*IB*, 1953); H. W. Hertzberg (Eng. tr., *OTL*, 1964); R. Kittel (*Heilige Schrift des AT*, 4th ed. 1922); R. W. Klein (*Word Biblical Comm.*, 1983); P. K. McCarter, Jr. (*AB*, 1980, 1984); J. Mauchline (*New Century Bible*, 1971); H. P. Smith (*ICC*, 1899); H. J. Stoebe (*KAT*, 1973).

Text: F. M. Cross and S. Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (1975); S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2nd ed. 1913); R. W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the OT* (1974); S. Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel* (1984; critical of viewpoints presented in this article about the text of Samuel); J. Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht* (1871).

Studies: B. C. Birch, *Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15* (1975); A. F. Campbell, *The Ark Narrative (1 Sam. 4-6; 2 Sam. 6): A Form-critical and Traditio-historical Study* (1975); R. A. Carlson, *David, the Chosen King: A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel* (1964); J. Conrad, *TLZ*, 97 (1972), 321-332; C. C. Conroy, *Absalom! Absalom! Narrative and Language in 2 Sam 13-20* (1978); F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (1973); F. Crusemann, *Der Widerstand gegen das Konigtum: Die antikoniglichen Texte des AT and der Kampf um den fruhen israelitischen Staat* (1978); L. Delekat, "Tendenz and Theologie der David-Salomo Erzählung," in F. Maass, ed., *Das ferne and nahe Wort (Festschrift L. Rost, 1967)*, pp. 26-36; W. Dietrich, *Prophetie and Geschichte: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*

(*FRLANT*, 108, 1972); L. M. Eslinger, *Kingship of God in Crisis: A Close Reading of 1 Samuel 1-12* (1985); J. H. Grønbaek, *Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids (I. Sam. 15-2. Sam. 5): Tradition and Komposition* (1971); D. Gunn, *The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story (JSOT Supp., 14; 1980); Story of King David (JSOT Supp., 6; 1978)*; W. L. Humphreys, *JSOT*, 22 (1982), 95-117; D. Jobling, "Jonathan: A Structural Study in 1 Samuel," in *The Sense of Biblical Narrative (JSOT Supp., 7; 1978)*, pp. 4-25; R. W. Klein, *Israel in Exile* (1979); F. Langamet, *RB*, 83 (1976), 321-379, 481-528; A. D. H. Mayes, *Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (1983); P. K. McCarter, Jr., *JBL*, 99 (1980), 489-504; *Interp.*, 35 (1981), 355-367; 40 (1986), 117-129; D. J. McCarthy, *JBL*, 84 (1965), 131-38; I. Mendelsohn, *BASOR*, 143 (Oct. 1956), 17-22; T. N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (1976); P. D. Miller, Jr., and J. J. M. Roberts, *Hand of the Lord: A Reassessment of the 'Ark Narrative' of 1 Samuel* (1977); R. D. Nelson, *Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (1981); E. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah* (1970); M. Noth, *Deuteronomistic History* (Eng. tr., *JSOT Supp.*, 15; 1981); L. Rost, *The Succession to the Throne of David* (Eng. tr. 1982); R. Smend, "Das Gesetz and die Volker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in H. W. Wolff, ed., *Probleme biblischer Theologie (Festschrift G. von Rad; 1971)*, pp. 494-509; E. C. Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (1978); J. Van Seters, *In Search of History* (1983); T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie: David and die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (1975); *Das Konigtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche*

Untersuchung (1977); R. L. Ward, "Story of David's Rise: A Traditio-historical Study of I Samuel xvi 14 - II Samuel v" (Diss., Vanderbilt, 1967);

319

Arthur Weiser, *Samuel: Seine geschichtliche Aufgabe and religiöse Bedeutung*.

Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu 1. Samuel 7-12 (FRLANT, 81, 1962); K. W.

Whitelam, *JSOT*, 29 (1984), 61-87; R. N. Whybray, *The Succession Narrative: A Study of*

II Sam. 9-20 and I Kings I and 2 (SBT, 2/9; 1968); E. WOrthwein, Die Erzählung von der

Thronfolge Davids - theologische oder politische Geschichtsschreibung? (Theologische

Studien, 115, 1974).

Ralph W. Klein