

**THE TROUBLES OF DAVID AND HIS HOUSE:  
TEXTUAL AND LITERARY STUDIES OF  
THE SYNOPTIC STORIES OF SAUL AND DAVID  
IN SAMUEL-KINGS AND CHRONICLES**

**CRAIG YUET-SHUN HO**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH**

**1994**



## ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to evaluate an almost two-century old view of current Old Testament scholarship on the interrelationship between the books of Samuel-Kings and the books of Chronicles (Chr), which claims that the author of Chronicles (the Chr) based his work on the former corpus in more or less the existing form. The evaluation is preceded by a preliminary investigation into the grounds upon which that view has been accepted to show that it is based mainly on the relative dating of the history of religion as depicted in the two historiographical works and the supposed relative historical values of the two works, neither of which guarantees Chr's dependence on Samuel-Kings. It is astonishing to find that the received view is not based on detailed textual and literary comparison of the two works in general, the parallel texts in particular. Thus, instead of attacking the historical conclusions which are derived from the text, an investigation is offered of whether or not the prevailing view is also supported by detailed textual and literary study of some three chapters of parallel texts (1 Chr 10-12 and their counterparts in the books of Samuel).

In the first chapter the textual and literary connections of the two versions of Saul's final battle (1 Sam 31 and 1 Chr 10) with their narrative contexts are explored to show that whereas the Samuel pluses and variants are mainly connected with accounts in which David's innocence in the demise of Saul and his house is defended, the Chr variants are mainly connected with stories before David's estrangement from Saul. In the second chapter the two versions of David's capture of Jerusalem (2 Sam 5.1-10 and 1 Chr 11.1-9) are submitted to similar scrutiny to show that the enigmatic extra references to "the blind and the lame" in the Samuel version are connected with a tendentious account of the story of the house of Eli ("the blind") and with the narrative of David's showing royal hospitality to Mephibosheth ("the lame"). Then the two versions of the list of David's mighty men (2 Sam 23.8-37 and 1 Chr 11.10-12.40) are studied in the third chapter to show that there are connections between the Succession Narrative and Samuel's list and that the account of David's seeking refuge under Achish in 1 Samuel has been split into two and also that Samuel's account of David's stay with Achish is more apologetic than Chr's account. Since the Samuel pluses and variants have links with stories in which blood guilt of David or his throne is involved, a thematic study of these materials—i.e. most of the History of David's Rise plus the Succession Narrative—is offered in the fourth and the fifth chapters to show that they form a thematically rather unified narrative and that they were probably from the same author. Since it is practically impossible for the Chr to remove very large text blocks from Samuel-Kings together with their subtle cross-references at the same time, the fact that none of these cross-references remains in Chr forces us to draw the inevitable conclusion that all those materials alluded to by these cross-references were originally absent from the Chr's *Vorlage*.

---

To Carmen  
and  
Rebecca

## PREFACE

This research began with my interest in the story of David and the suggestion of Dr A. Graeme Auld, my thesis supervisor, to test the standard view on the inter-relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles with a synoptic study of part of that story. It is difficult to thank Dr Auld enough for his encouragement and support “in many and various ways” during the long process of this research. His involvement in a joint-project (Auld and Ho, 1992) and his endorsement of the main result of this work in his latest monograph (1994: 36) have helped me to believe that the conjectures contained in this work may be worth suggesting. Although both of us have been working on different aspects of the same problem, I have enjoyed complete freedom to develop my own views, even when they do not always agree with his. I am equally indebted to Dr Iain Provan, also my thesis supervisor, for his careful reading and criticism of the whole thesis at its different phases. The high standard of his own doctoral thesis (now BZAW 172) has always been a model to guide my presentation and style. He has taught me the importance of writing clearly. Reading even a very interesting novel more than twice could be boring enough, I cannot imagine doing that for a foreign student’s thesis! Drs Auld and Provan therefore deserve my deepest gratitude for reading several drafts of the present work. I have learnt a lot of things from them through discussions and by means of their comments and suggestions for improving the thesis. To borrow Hardy’s words: “I have incorporated the substance of nearly all of their suggestions in my text, and have so removed a good many crudities and obscurities.” (Hardy 1940: Preface)

I wish also to thank Professor J. C. L. Gibson, who supervised my first year study (1988-89) in Edinburgh, and who has always kept an eye on the progress of my research even when I was no longer part of his supervising responsibility. He has always been very

kind, encouraging, and supportive to me and my family. It was sheer joy to have been his student.

Although I have never been a student of Professor G. W. Anderson, I was told he regarded me as one when he was once asked to count his Chinese students. Special thanks are due to him for his very helpful reading of a version of the first chapter of the thesis (forthcoming in *VT*) and for the loan of several books. I feel have treated by him and Mrs Anderson as more than just a student but a friend as well. They are both very kind to me and my family. I now understand why some of the best Chinese Old Testament scholars and teachers I know have been Professor Anderson's students.

The first three years (1988-91) of the research were funded by an Overseas Research Studentship and a New College Studentship. I wish to thank the pertinent committees of these two funding bodies for their financial support. My own college, Chung Chi College of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, also provided financial support for my first year. My remaining years in Edinburgh (1991-94) were financed by my Computing Officer job in the faculties of Divinity and Law. I am in the debt of Dr Peter Hayman, head of the department of Hebrew and Old Testament Studies, Dr David Mealand of the department of the neighbouring Testament, and Miss Lilian Edwards of the faculty of Law, who were my computing chiefs at different times and locations and who had entrusted to my care the computing networks of their faculties and allowed me to work according to my own hours. I am grateful for their trust without which it would have been impossible to administer two computer networks and to engage in an entirely different activity at the same time.

I want to record my debts to the staff of New College library. Their readiness to help with requests regarding books and photocopying made me believe that this research was worth doing.

To facilitate my study in Edinburgh my wife has sacrificed five years of her career. My three year old Rebecca has had to bear with a father who tried unreasonably telling

her the nonsense that our computer is not a toy but just a research tool and the rubbish that books she cannot understand are untouchable. I dedicate this thesis to them.

I alone am responsible for any errors this thesis may contain.

---

I now declare that the thesis has been composed by myself and is the result of my own research.

Craig Yuet-Shun Ho.

---

$P1 \rightarrow TT \rightarrow EE \rightarrow P2 \dots^1$

— Karl Popper

Sometimes I make a conjecture and then try to prove it. Many times, in trying to prove it, I find a counter-example, then I have to change my conjecture.

— Stephen Hawking (White and Gribbin 1992: 103)

---

<sup>1</sup> This is Popper's (1979: 168) schema of conjectures and refutation which, he believes, is capable of explaining the growth of our knowledge: P1=Problem 1, TT=Tentative Theory, EE=Error Elimination, P2=Problem 2.

## CONTENTS

METHOD OF CITATION, ABBREVIATIONS AND COMPUTER TEXTS.....	13
INTRODUCTION .....	16
CHAPTER ONE: IS 1 SAM 30.1-13 REALLY THE SOURCE OF 1 CHR 10.1-12 ?.....	29
1.0 Introductory .....	29
1.1 The Synoptic Texts .....	29
1.2 Textual and Literary Links.....	32
1.2.1 1 Sam 31.6    1 Chr 10.6.....	32
1.2.2 1 Sam 31.7    1 Chr 10.7.....	35
1.2.3 1 Sam 31.8    1 Chr 10.8.....	36
1.2.4 1 Sam 31.9    1 Chr 10.9.....	37
1.2.5 1 Sam 31.10    1 Chr 10.10.....	37
1.2.6 1 Sam 31.11    1 Chr 10.11.....	40
1.2.7 1 Sam 31.12    1 Chr 10.12a.....	41
1.2.8 1 Sam 31.13    1 Chr 10.12b.....	43
1.3 The Internal Coherence of the Variants in 1 Sam 31.7ff.....	44
1.4 Literary Connection with the Story of Saul and David .....	45
1.5 Literary Links between Chr's Variants and 1 Samuel.....	46
1.6 Textual Decision.....	48
1.7 Excursus: 1 Chr 10.13-14 .....	53
CHAPTER TWO: DAVID'S ACCESS TO KINGSHIP AND THE CAPTURE OF JERUSALEM: 2 SAM 5.1-10 AND 1 CHR 11.1-9, MORE TEXTUAL AND LITERARY LINKS .....	55
2.0 The Texts .....	55
2.1 Preliminary Observations .....	56
2.2 Samuel Plus: 2 Sam 5.4-5.....	56



2.2.1 2 Sam 5.1    1 Chr 11.1— <b>כל-ישראל/כל-שבטי ישראל</b> —and the Plus 2 Sam 5.4-5 .....	56
2.2.2 2 Sam 5.4-5 (plus) David's Seven and a half Year Saulide Rule of Judah.....	58
<hr/>	
2.3 Why Does the Samuel Version Stress David's Seven Year and Six Months Rule of Judah?.....	62
2.4 References to Nathan's Oracle .....	64
2.4.1 2 Sam 5.2    1 Chr 11.2 and References to Nathan's Oracle.....	64
2.4.2 First Samuel Reference (1 Sam 25.30).....	65
2.4.3 Second Samuel Reference (2 Sam 3.18).....	65
2.4.4 Third Samuel Reference (2 Sam 5.2).....	66
2.4.5 Fourth Samuel Reference (2 Sam 6.21) .....	67
2.5 Pattern of References to Nathan's Oracle in Samuel-Kings and Chr.....	68
2.5.1 Comments.....	68
2.5.2 Why did the Elders of Israel want David to be their King?.....	71
2.6 2 Sam 5.3    1 Chr 11.3—and the Chr Plus <b>כדבר יהוה ביד-שמואל</b> .....	72
2.7 2 Sam 5.6    1 Chr 11.4: <b>דויד וכל-ישראל    המלך ואנשיו</b> .....	74
2.7.1 2 Sam 5.6bβγ, 8βγ—the Problem of the Samuel Plus “the Blind and the Lame”.....	75
2.7.2 Excursus: Who is Eli's father in 1 Sam 2.28, 30, 31? .....	77
2.7.3 A New Solution—“The Blind and the Lame” as a Device of Ideological Polemics....	82
2.7.4 “The Lame and the Blind”—Conclusion.....	88
2.8 Jerusalem and Jebus .....	89
2.8.1 The Problem-situation for the Editorial References to “the Blind and the Lame”—a Conjecture.....	92
2.9 2 Sam 5.7    1 Chr 11.5b.....	92
2.10 2 Sam 5.8— <b>ביום ההוא</b> —a Test.....	93
2.11 2 Sam 5.10    1 Chr 11.10— <b>יהוה צבאות    יהוה אלהי צבאות</b> .....	95
2.12 Conclusion—Textual Decision.....	96
2.13 Excursus .....	98

<b>CHAPTER THREE: THE ROLL OF DAVID'S MIGHTY MEN: TEXTUAL AND</b>	
<b>LITERARY STUDIES OF 2 SAM 23 AND 1 CHR 11-12</b> .....	104
3.0 Introductory .....	104
3.1 The Three Anonymous Loyal Heroes (2 Sam 23.13-17    1 Chr 11.15-19) .....	104
3.2 2 SAM 23.14    1 CHR 11.16— <b>נציב    מצב פלשתים</b> .....	107
3.3 2 Sam 23.11—Shammah and the Greek Evidence in Par .....	108
3.4 The Literary Character of 1 Chr 11-12 .....	110
3.5 Literary Plan of 1 Chr 11-12 .....	111
3.6 <b>מצודה    מצדה</b> .....	114
3.7 Is the Three Mighty men at Bethlehem a Chr Addition? .....	115
3.8 Links between 1 Chr 12 and 1 Samuel .....	116
3.9 Links with 1 Sam 29-30 .....	118
3.10 Textual Priority .....	119
3.11 Other Links .....	120
3.12 David in Ziklag—Literary Continuity .....	123
3.13 Literary Development of the Book of Samuel .....	126
3.14 The Purpose of 1 Sam 30 .....	128
3.15 Could 1 Chr 12 be Part of Chr's Source? .....	129
 <b>CHAPTER FOUR: THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE HISTORY OF SAUL</b>	
<b>AND DAVID (SHSD)</b> .....	131
4.0 Introductory .....	131
4.0.1 HDR—State of the Problem .....	131
4.0.2 The Impasse and the Exit .....	132
4.0.3 A Thematic and Stylistic Approach .....	133
4.1 The Original History of Saul and David (HSD) .....	136
4.2 David's Innocence—Supplement to the History of Saul and David .....	141
4.2.1 Narrative Structure .....	141

4.2.2 Dialogical Structure of the SHSD .....	143
4.3 The Core Chapters of The SHSD: 1 Sam 24-26.....	149
4.4 A Possible Problem-situation for the Origination of the SHSD .....	152
4.4.1 David's Guilt and National Well-Being .....	152
4.4.2 Administration of Blood Guilt and National Well-Being.....	154
4.5 HDR and SN Connections.....	156
4.5.1 P. K. McCarter, Jr. (1980) .....	156
4.5.2 J. C. VanderKam (1980).....	159
4.5.3 K. W. Whitelam (1984).....	161
4.5.4 F. H. Cryer (1985) .....	163
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: THE COMMON AUTHORSHIP OF THE SUPPLEMENT</b>	
<b>TO THE HISTORY OF SAUL AND DAVID (SHSD) AND THE SUCCESSION</b>	
<b>NARRATIVE (SN) .....</b>	
5.0 Introductory .....	165
5.1 The Thematic Link between the SHSD and the SN.....	166
5.1.1 The Innocence of David and His Throne.....	166
5.1.2 Blood for Blood in the SHSD and the SN.....	167
5.1.3 The Problem of the Succession Theme.....	169
5.2 The Affinity of the SHSD and SN: Stylistic, Linguistic, and Wisdom Connections—	
Evidence of Common Authorship .....	170
5.2.1 Narrative Patterns .....	170
5.2.2 Stylistic Affinity .....	173
5.2.3 Antithetic Word-Pair: טוב רעה .....	174
5.2.4 Language of Swearing: כה יעשה-ל ... אלהים וכה יוסיף.....	175
5.2.4.1 Excursus.....	177
5.2.5 The Use of <i>hišpaal</i> of חוה.....	179
5.2.6 The Use of דם נקי / נקי.....	180

5.2.7 The Use of מלאך יהוה / מלאך אלהים.....	181
5.2.8 היה לבן-חיל .....	181
5.2.9 מנחלת אלהים / יהוה ("the heritage of God/Yahweh") .....	182
5.2.10 לא ידע כל דבר.....	182
5.2.11 למאות ולא לפים ("hundreds and thousands").....	182
5.2.12 בן מות .....	182
5.2.13 רעה ... תמצא .....	183
5.2.14 Wisdom Origin of the SHSD and the SN.....	183
5.3 Conclusion .....	187
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	189
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	192

## METHOD OF CITATION, ABBREVIATIONS AND COMPUTER TEXTS

In both the text and the notes, references to books and articles are in the form: (authorsurname year: pages), e.g. (Noth 1943: 1-2). The bibliography is formatted to facilitate looking up works cited or referred to. The Hebrew Bible used is the text of BHS: K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart, 1967-1977). The Greek Old Testament (LXX) used is the text of *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart, 1935; repr. 1979) edited by A. Rahlfs. Also used are the electronic texts of BHS<sup>2</sup> and CATSS LXX,<sup>3</sup> and the parallel aligned text of BHS and LXX<sup>4</sup> published by the Center for Computer Analysis of Texts (CCAT).<sup>5</sup> Search results of Hebrew (Greek) words and phrases were obtained using Bible Windows<sup>6</sup> (vers. 2.2.1 and 2.5 for the IBM PC/AT

---

<sup>2</sup> The following information and acknowledgement are provided by CCAT:

The computer text produced initially under the direction of H. Van Dyke Parunak (then at Univ. Michigan) and Richard E. Whitaker (representing the Claremont Grad. Schools), with funding from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. Subsequent revisions and verification have been coordinated by Whitaker with input from a variety of sources and special support from the CATSS (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies) Project and its teams at the Hebrew University (Jerusalem; under E. Tov) and at the Westminster Theological Seminary (Elkins Park, PA; under A. Groves) as well as at the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia). An early form of the Michigan-Claremont text provided the basis for the MIKRAH version, which in turn was further improved through cooperation with the Bar Ilan (Israel) computer center and the Maredsous (Belgium) based Centre: Informatique et Bible (CIB) directed by R. F. Poswick. The Michigan-Claremont text also has been collated against the CIB text. (From the 1989 file ccat.txt which goes with the BHS electronic text.)

<sup>3</sup> For the LXX, the following information and acknowledgement are provided by CCAT:

CATSS LXX = The computer form prepared by the TLG (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae) Project directed by T. Brunner at the University of California, Irvine, with further verification and adaptation (in process) by CATSS towards conformity with the individual Goettingen editions that have appeared since 1935. (From the 1989 file ccat.txt which goes with the BHS electronic text.)

<sup>4</sup> The Parallel Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek texts of Jewish Scripture is based on the Michigan-Claremont BHS consonantal text and the TLG LXX, created by the CATSS project under the direction of E. Tov (Jerusalem team).

<sup>5</sup> CCAT (R. Kraft), Box 36 College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6303, (tel. 215/898-5827 or -1597). BITNET: CCAT @ PENNDRLS

<sup>6</sup> Silver Mountain Software 1029 Tanglewood Dr. Cedar Hill, TX 7514.

and compatibles) and sometimes using Online Bible.<sup>7</sup> The abbreviations listed in “Instructions for Contributors”, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976) 331-346 are adopted with the addition of :

“Chr” for “the books of Chronicles

“the Chr” for “the Chronicler”

“Dtr” for “Deuteronomistic” or “the Deuteronomistic editor”

“DH” for “Deuteronomistic History”

“HDR” for “History of David’s Rise”

“HSD” for “History of Saul and David”

“Par” for “Paralipomenon”

“Reg” for “Regnorum”

“SHSD” for “Supplement to the History of Saul and David”

“SN” for “Succession Narrative”

The following supplements the *Abbreviations of Commonly Used Periodicals, References Works, and Serials* (JBL 95: 339-346).

*Ant.* Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*

ATSAT Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament

BKAT Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament

BLS Bible and Literature Series

CBC Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible

EF Erlanger Forschungen. Reihe A: Geisteswissenschaften

*EI* *Eretz Israel*

*FB* *Forschung zur Bible*

FThS Freiburger theologische Studien

*JETS* *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*

*JSOT* *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*

---

<sup>7</sup> THE ONLINE BIBLE FOUNDATION, THE ORIGINAL WORD, INC., P.O. Box 799, Roswell, GA 30077.

JSOTS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
<i>MBA</i>	<i>The Macmillian Bible Atlas</i>
<hr/>	
NCB	New Century Bible
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OTG	Old Testament Guide
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTW	Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap
<i>PCB</i>	<i>Peake's Commentary on the Bible</i>
<i>RBI</i>	<i>Rivista biblica italiana</i>
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
<i>TB</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
TBC	Torch Bible Commentaries
<i>TCV</i>	<i>The Bible: Today's Chinese Version</i>
<i>TEV</i>	<i>The Holy Bible: Today's English Version</i>
ThS	Theologische Studien
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary

## INTRODUCTION

The publication of the first volume of de Wette's *Beiträge* in 1806 marked the beginning of a new epoch in the history of the study of the books of Chronicles (Chr). This work on Chr was an attack of the then standard critical view that Samuel-Kings and Chr shared a common-source. The conclusion he reached there regarding Chr's *Vorlage* has become the foundation of Chr study for almost two centuries. A survey of scholarship on the general acceptance of this view of de Wette's is now of no more than antiquarian interest.<sup>8</sup> It is perhaps for this reason that such a history<sup>9</sup> is of no particular interest to authors of recent Introductions to the Old Testament<sup>10</sup> or commentaries on Chr.<sup>11</sup> Although such a survey does not affect the main conjectures and arguments proposed in this thesis, it may be useful to sketch briefly the main phases of the research on the problem of the literary relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chr from de Wette (1806) to up to the present time.

De Wette (1806: 5) claimed to be the first to have recognised the contradiction in the historical accounts of Samuel-Kings. The first thing to be said in his attack on the credibility of Chr and the common-source theory is that de Wette was not motivated in the first instance to settle a literary problem as such,<sup>12</sup> but to resolve the problem of two

---

<sup>8</sup> We do have several helpful general histories of research on Chr in: T. Willi (1972: 12-47) surveys the early stages up to Wellhausen. Williamson's (1985: 11-26) Introduction to Noth's *ÜS II* assesses Noth's view on Chr within the history of research on Chr from the nineteenth century onward. Japhet's (1985) article surveyed the history of the problem of the historical reliability of Chr and put a question mark on "the feeling of many scholars that a certain consensus has been reached [regarding the historical reliability of Chr]" (99). She appeals that more work should be done on the use of Chr as a historical source. However, she has taken de Wette's theory of Chr's use of Samuel-Kings as unproblematic. This is confirmed by her 1993 commentary.

<sup>9</sup> De Wette's original argument to support his theory of the Chr's use of Samuel-Kings as a source is given a concise and useful summary by Rogerson (1992: 55-57).

<sup>10</sup> Take for example, some standard textbooks: Anderson (1959); Childs (1979); Schmidt (1984); Rendtorff (1985); and Soggin (1989).

<sup>11</sup> E.g. in some of the most significant modern commentaries on Chr: Rudolph (1955), Williamson (1982), and Japhet (1993).

<sup>12</sup> This is in fact a more general peculiar phenomenon from de Wette's time onward as Japhet (1985) rightly points out:



contradictory histories by deciding which is the true and which is the false account. Yet, even this is not his real concern. Behind his pursuit of the historiographically reliable is the deeper interest in recovering the historical truth (or falsehood) beneath the surface of Chr's history. By highlighting the religious peculiarities of Chr and contrasting them with its source de Wette hoped to anchor firmly the Mosaic religious institution, as assumed in Chr, to its proper position in the time-line of Israel's religious development.<sup>13</sup> It is true that de Wette's ultimate preoccupation in his use of the two histories as external references of some sort is to prove the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Instead of seeing them as complementary, as was usual in his time, he found them contradictory. And to arrive at his proof, he did two things: first, to associate Chr's Davidic theocracy with that religion decreed in the Pentateuch, and second, to destroy the credibility of *the Chronicler* as a historian.

A history can be unevenly reliable (or unreliable) depending on the quality of the sources being used. But an *unreliable historian* produces unreliable history.<sup>14</sup> There is a clear distinction between attacking *Chronicles* as books and attacking *the Chronicler* as the person responsible for their production. It is the latter we find in de Wette's work. It is important to note that *the Chronicler* was not accused of using unreliable sources but of corrupting his source which might or might not be reliable. In de Wette's view (and Wellhausen's too) the unreliability of Chr as history had been inseparately linked with

---

“ ... the focus of interest in Chronicles, from the beginning of research into it and for a long time afterwards, centred upon questions of historical reliability and not upon matters of literary and theological concern, which were at the heart of the attention of biblical scholarship at the time.” (83)

<sup>13</sup> For the results of his investigation, see pp. 254-57 of *Beiträge I*. Cf. also Rogerson's summary of these in his (1992: 59-60).

<sup>14</sup> It is interesting to note how Albright (1921) attempted to rehabilitate the Chr as a reliable historian but at the same time upheld the unreliability of Chr:

... since practically the whole of the old Jewish literature perished in 586, we can understand how a writer of the early fourth century might be worthless for pre-exilic conditions, and yet reliable for the century preceding his own time. (105-6)

The basis of this position is Albright's acceptance of the traditional view that Chr and Ezra-Neh. are of common authorship (Ezra).

the untrustworthiness of its author.<sup>15</sup> Chr was studied by de Wette in such a way as to guarantee the defamation of *the Chr* as a trustworthy historian. This is the reason for a total rejection of Chr as a reliable historical source. Japhet (1985: 85) hits right at the inherent weakness of de Wette's methodology:

de Wette's goal, therefore, was to undermine the accepted view and base the history of Israel on one source alone: the Former Prophets. In order to attain this goal it was not sufficient to express a few doubts or hesitations regarding the reliability of Chronicles; rather it was necessary to reject completely any use of the book as a historical source, and to prove that it was absolutely unreliable. This was the purpose of the first part of de Wette's study [i.e. his *Beiträge I*].

His demonstration of the unreliability of Chronicles confirms and is confirmed by his view that the non-centralised religion depicted in Samuel-Kings is a realistic account and therefore historical while the account of the theocratic kingdom of David in Chr is a projection of the post-exilic ideal. Reaction to this new theory in an attempt to save the credibility of Chr, mainly from conservative scholars, came steadily. De Wette reiterated his views<sup>16</sup> in his attack on the objections from Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Keil, and Hävernick

---

<sup>15</sup> One cannot therefore rehabilitate the credibility of the Chr without exonerating him of the accusation of corrupting his source. Thus it would be very difficult for Japhet to be sympathetic to the Chr as a historian but at the same time to accept his changing of Samuel-Kings which she does not deny. One way out of this dilemma is to show that where Chr differs from its source (in the synoptic texts), the Chr is to be understood as expressing his special points of view (or his theology) without doing anything drastic to his source. This tendency can in fact be found in her (1993) commentary. E.g. when she summarises her comments on 1 Chr 10.1-12, she says:

“All in all, the Chronistic working of the story smoothes the rough edges and moderates the extremes: ... while interference with the original is kept to a minimum” (228-229).

Or when she compares the synoptic stories of David's capture of Jerusalem, she writes:

A careful comparison of the parallel texts will show how the method followed in the omission of the various elements from the text demonstrates one form of editing characteristic of the Chronicler: *a strict adherence to the literal sequence of the source, the transference of certain parts verbatim or with only minor changes* [my emphasis], and the complete omission of other elements along the way. (239)

<sup>16</sup> According to De Wette, as between the common contents of Samuel-Kings and Chr, Chr differs:

1) in später Rechtschreibung, 2) in häufigen Umänderungen der Sprache nach der Grammatik und dem Sprachgebrauche einer späteren Zeit, zum Behufe der Deutlichkeit und des Anstandes, aber auch aus Unkunde und Nachlässigkeit. Wie schon manche der sprachlichen Abweichungen in solche übergehen, welche die Sache

etc. in a different dress in his *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung* (1869). Again the credibility of Chr is at stake. The significance of de Wette's historical scrutiny of Chr in *Beiträge I*<sup>17</sup> is rightly put by Rogerson (1992: 60):

By showing that Chronicles was an entirely tendentious account of Israelite religion that falsely presented David as the founder of the postexilic Levitical-Mosaic ceremonial religion, de Wette unlocked the door that allowed access to a critical scholarly reconstruction of the history of Israelite religion.

Seventy-two years later, in 1878, Wellhausen entered that unlocked door and organized all the bits and pieces of Pentateuch in their proper chronological order (JE, D, P) helped by the connection of P with Chr—both were found to have emerged from the same religious milieu of post-exilic Israel. Wellhausen (1878: 172) totally inherited de Wette's negative assessment of Chr and he re-affirmed that "it is only the tradition of the older source [i.e. Samuel-Kings] that possesses historical value." (1957: 182) Thus whereas de Wette's (1805) associating of D with the Josiah reform provides a chronological anchorage for D, his rejection of Chr's credibility had helped Wellhausen to associate P with Chr's "clericalisation" of its source, resulting in a further devaluation of the

---

selbst betreffen, so finden sich häufig theils Auslassungen, theils Abkürzungen, theils Einschaltungen und Umänderungen, durch welche die Geschichtserzählung wenn auch nur in Nebensachen, und nicht selten zum Nachtheil verändert worden ist. (370)

De Wette discussed Chr's omissions, abridgments, insertions and alterations by juxtaposing some of Chr's texts side by side with their source to make his points (1869: 370-375, cf. 1850: 267-294). [De Wette's original editions (1817, 1844) of his *Lehrbuch* are unavailable to me. However, judging from Parker's 1843 translation, the quoted text above from Schrader's edition should be de Wette's own words.]

<sup>17</sup> Rogerson (1992: 49-51) gives an interesting account of how de Wette had to publish first *Beiträge I* which contains his work on Chr instead of his earlier work on the authenticity of the books of Moses. The first plan was shattered by the publication of J. S. Vater's commentary on the Pentateuch which anticipated some of de Wette's ideas such as the fragmentary hypothesis just when Griesbach, de Wette's teacher, was finding a publisher for his Pentateuchal study. It was on Griesbach's advice that de Wette reworked his material, expanding the section on Chr which contains his original contribution to the debate "using this as a basis for a new theory of the history of Israelite religion" (Rogerson 1992: 51). This explains the full subtitle of *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament. I. namely Kritische Versuch über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Bücher der Chronik mit Hinsicht auf die Geschichte der Mosaischen Bücher und Gesetzgebung: Ein Nachtrag zu den Vaterschen Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch.*

historical worth of Chr. The question of Chr's source was never a real problem for Wellhausen, he depended totally on de Wette.

Then, the seemingly dead common-source theory was (at least partly) revived and an older form of the complete book of Samuel was suggested as one of Chr's sources.<sup>18</sup> Noth (1943/87) quenched this last effort in his discussion of the Chr's sources and pushed de Wette's theory a step forward by arguing that the Chr used the Deuteronomistic History with Samuel-Kings "already...split up into individual 'books' and...expanded with all kinds of supplements into the form in which we find it today" (52). Noth had established once and for all what de Wette suggested. Thus Anderson (1959: 218) was able to say that "Noth has shown that the Chronicler's account of the reigns of David and Solomon is derived from Samuel and Kings, and that the differences are to be attributed, not to other sources, but to the Chronicler himself."<sup>19</sup>

To run the risk of over-simplification, one may say that in the discussion of Chr's source in this period three considerations have been regarded as crucial for deciding this relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chr. They are first the relative historical value of the two historical works, second the relative dating of the history of religion as depicted in the two works and third the supposed apologetic purpose of the Chr. These historical, chronological, and apologetic "data" when considered together point to, so it has seemed, Chr's using (and corrupting) its source. The contribution of these three giants to Chr study might be summarized in a metaphor: it was de Wette who, with his attack on Chr's credibility (*Beiträge I*), tolled the death knell of the old common-source theory. And the job of killing it off was accomplished by Wellhausen in his associating of P with Chr (*Prolegomena*). But the credit for burying it goes to Noth (*ÚS II*) for his view of the Chr's use of DH as his source and for attacking for the last time the remaining effort in its support.

---

<sup>18</sup> Rothstein-Hänel, 1927: 240f; also Noth 1943/87: 54, n. 20.

<sup>19</sup> This is a recognition of Noth's contribution to the general abandonment of the common-source theory.

In retrospect one cannot but agree with T. Willi's (1972: 33) remark that "die Stellungnahme des gerade 26 jährigen Jenaer Privatdozenten [i.e. de Wette] zur Chronik ist zwar ein Nebenprodukt der Beschäftigung mit der pentateuchische Frage—genau wie später das Chronik-Kapitel in J. Wellhausens Prolegomena". One may as justifiably say that Noth's opinion of Chr is also a *Nebenprodukt* of his preoccupation with his quest of a Dtr. This is why he was able to improve de Wette's theory and suggest that the Chr used Dtr in book form. In their works, Chr's relationship with Samuel-Kings is but the *consequence* of Pentateuchal or dtr theories and not really their *confirmation*.

De Wette had not only helped Wellhausen and Noth in the production of the JEDP schema and a legendary Dtr historian but also provided a firm foundation for Chr exegesis in later generations. Rudolph's (1955) commentary on Chr has been regarded rightly as evidence of a new interest in Chr study. There he re-affirms de Wette's view and believes "daß kein Zweifel sein kann" (p. x). Twenty seven years later Williamson (1982) echoed the scholarly consensus of our time: "it is universally agreed nowadays that his [i.e. the Chr's] major source was the books of Samuel and Kings (albeit in a sometimes slightly different form from MT ...)" (19). Several important studies on Chr between the publication of these two significant commentaries, such as those by Willi (1972), Welten (1973), Mosis (1973) and Ackroyd (1977a), all<sup>20</sup> assume Chr's dependence on Samuel-Kings.<sup>21</sup> In the most exhaustive current commentary on 1 and 2 Chr (Japhet 1993), de Wette's theory is no longer argued for or even re-affirmed but taken for granted as an established result of scholarship. De Wette's theory is only slightly modified in recent years by those [e.g. McKenzie, 1985] who argued that the Chr used an earlier edition of Samuel-Kings.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Mention should also be made of T. Sugimoto's (1992) article "Chr as Independent Literature". Yet this Chr still depends on Samuel-Kings as its *Vorlage*.

<sup>21</sup> For a survey of post-Nothian Chr study, see Williamson 1987: 11-26.

<sup>22</sup> McKenzie (1985) was not interested in the relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chr in its own right. He "was seeking to use Chronicles to clarify the distinction made by Cross (1973) and elaborated by Nelson (1981) between a first (Josianic) edition of the history (Dtr 1) and a second (exilic) one (Dtr 2)." (Auld, 1994: 7)

It is to be celebrated that in the last forty years or so scholarly discussion has returned to an interest in Chr for its own sake rather than as a means to an end. One common feature of these (post-*ÜS*) works on Chr is that the books of Samuel-Kings are to a lesser or greater extent used as a reference-frame to understand Chr's redactional, exegetical and theological effort. But this is only to be expected with the general acceptance of de Wette's theory.

Auld (1994: 4) is probably the first scholar since Noth "to suggest anew that the independent supplementation of a common inherited text may be a better model for understanding the interrelationships of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles than the dominant view". He wants to revive a buried (but still kicking?!) theory, though not for the purpose of rescuing the Chr's credibility. A sketch of this proposal was first made in his article in honour of G. W. Anderson (1983a). The present research is a response to his plea "for a radical rescrutiny of many biblical texts free from any recourse to inherited historical reconstructions whether ancient or modern" (1983b: 43).

Auld (1994) attacks not only the prevailing view of Chr's dependence on Samuel-Kings but also Noth's idea of a Deuteronomistic author. His study of Solomon's dream at Gibeon, which is also the main concern of his tributes to Smend (1992) and Malamat (1993a), is a typical piece of his evidence for a common-source solution. He has cogently argued that the two versions of that story in Kings and Chr can be understood as derived from a shorter common source. Although the main tenets of the present thesis are consistent with a common-source theory, my main aim is, however, a negative one, viz. to show that of the synoptic passages we shall soon study, we can no longer confidently say that Chr's texts were derived from the books of Samuel-Kings.

It seems to me that if the dominant view on our problem is not correct, a common-source solution has to be the next succeeding hypothesis, since the other option—Samuel-Kings dependence on (a version of) Chr—is not a genuine option. Being influenced by Popper's (1965) proposal of the piece-meal engineering approach in social reconstruction (instead of a wholesale, utopian approach as in a revolution), I have

methodological reservations about another holistic approach to the problem of Chr's relation with Samuel-Kings. I am attracted, however, by the simplicity of the hypothesis of a common source. (Simplicity is an important quality of a good hypothesis.) However, it must be said that the validity of an hypothesis is not affected by the approach being used. It is just that the holistic approach *is* bound to be difficult and risky.

Auld's main objective is to show how the special Kings and special Chr material can be derived or expanded from his Common Text.<sup>23</sup> Thus, he is not concerned with the question "How much special Kings and special Chr material might have been in the common-source?". It seems to me that if he is right, then the Chronicler's *relative* credibility as a historian might be rehabilitated by being put on the same par with the editor of Samuel-Kings who used the same source for his history.<sup>24</sup> A discussion of this aspect of Chr does not, however, fall within the scope of the present work.

Lemke (1965: 353ff) rightly laments the method of reconstructing the Chronicler's intention (or the method of reading his mind) as commonly found in older Chr commentaries as *the explanation* to account for the Chr's change of the text of Samuel-Kings since it leads to arbitrary and conflicting views. This complaint is made after his own examination of a dozen of synoptic texts of Samuel-Kings and Chr and comparing them with 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, Par or Josephus where appropriate. His results do not support popular views about Chr's change of the text of Samuel-Kings. The thought-worlds of the biblical authors are nevertheless legitimate objects of biblical research, but they should be the aim rather than the ground of our enquiry.

The first three chapters of this thesis are devoted to a synoptic study of 1 Chr 10-12 and its Samuel-Kings counterparts. Since Popper (1963, 1979) has shown that we do not reason inductively from (unbiased) observation, data collection and theory formulation,

---

<sup>23</sup> He is obviously aware of the problem of the loaded phrase "common source" and so uses the less theory-laden phrase "Common Text" or "Shared Text". But he also stresses its source quality, e.g. its "clear signs of structure and coherence" (148).

<sup>24</sup> This does not of course affect the historical value of the books of Chronicles.

our task, therefore, is not to substantiate (“prove” should be reserved for mathematical exercises) our conjectures from scratch, free from any prejudices,<sup>25</sup> but to demonstrate how they can explain existing and new textual and literary relations as well as, if not better than, existing theories. It is hoped that by recovering new textual and literary links with the synoptic texts we can be in a better position to make a decision pertaining to the relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chr.

Chapters Four and Five are not built upon the results of the first three chapters but are “inspired” by them. These last two chapters are aimed at an evaluation of the consensus that the HDR and the SN are separate documents/sources/traditions. We are indebted to L. Rost for his classic hypothesis of an author/redactor who not only had composed such a superb piece of Hebrew narrative as the Succession Narrative but was also responsible for incorporating several “subsidiary sources” (*Unterquellen*) into it, adding them to Samuel-Kings together with the SN.<sup>26</sup> Rost’s main concern in his classic work was to refute the result of source analysis of the books of Samuel and he wanted to show that instead of seeing a J source in the SN, one should see it as a separate source composed by an author/redactor who *also* incorporated the Ark Narrative, the Prophecy of Nathan and the Account of the Ammonite War. Rost wanted to see an author/redactor with a distinctive style at work instead of an editor mechanically pasting together different sources. The SN *author*, therefore, is the *only* counter evidence he

---

<sup>25</sup> With Carroll (1994: 40) “I will abandon the popular conceit of pretending to be a first-time reader of the text and admit that I have read this particular narrative many times before reading it again (i.e. *re-reading* it)”.

<sup>26</sup> Instead of tracing parallel strands of sources running from the Pentateuch through the historical books, as was usual in his time, Rost, *contra* Budde etc., sees blocks of sources joined together end to end by the author of the SN. This is why he begins with a brief Introduction which is mainly concerned with methodological issues and concludes with the rejection of Budde’s suggestion that we see Samuel-Kings as comprising J and E as its main sources. Rost laments that in the old school of source analysis “nobody has examined style” ( 3). He believes that whereas the linguistic aspect of a work may reflect the author’s background, his style is unique to him. This was a methodological breakthrough which, it seems to me, enabled Noth to postulate a Dtr who, just like the author of the SN, had joined even larger blocks of sources together to form a DH. Common to the methods of both Rost and Noth is the analysis of style. It is no wonder that Noth is able to see only *one* Dtr at work in his DH.



needed to answer Budde's source analysis.<sup>27</sup> Then those who have worked on the HDR have tried to imitate Rost's effort and delimit a similar document using the very vague theme of David's rise. Their concentration on *David himself* when trying to recover the HDR document from the David story is good, but uncritical, common-sense because in such an approach other *important* sub-themes in the HDR which might *overload* the scope of a proper HDR could easily be overlooked. The fact that they never agree over where the HDR should begin or end is also a demonstration of the problem of delimiting a clear-cut source using as vague a theme as David's rise.

Recent thematic analyses of the HDR have shown very clearly that David's rise is but the historical background of a more well-defined apologetic theme in the HDR which is the defence of David's innocence over the demise of Saul and his house. But we have yet to see the proposals regarding the various schemes of the HDR being checked against this unambiguous theme.

Although Rost (1926/82: 8) mentioned the earlier history of David's rise in passing, he was not at all interested in it with his study of the SN because his main concern there was to suggest a new redactional solution to the problem of sources in Samuel-Kings and he saw in a redactional combination of existing separate sources by the author of the SN a way out of the stalemate reached by scholars of the source analytical school.<sup>28</sup> The success of an SN author/redactor, unfortunately, has also determined how the HDR has been related to it in studies after Rost.

The separation of the HDR from the SN in the history of Samuel-Kings scholarship may thus be said to have begun with an historical accident: Rost's influential hypothesis of an SN author who had nothing to do with 1 Samuel and the beginning chapters of 2 Samuel. Had Rost done a similar stylistic analysis of the HDR at the same time, we

---

<sup>27</sup> It is important to emphasise that Rost's interest is not just to delimit an SN source but to provide redactional evidence by which one sees how the three subsidiary sources are incorporated into the SN.

<sup>28</sup> For a useful introduction to Rost's *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*, see the Introduction essay by E. Ball in the E. tr. of Rost's book.

might have a different story to tell about the composition of the books of Samuel-Kings. The success of the hypothesis of the SN as an independent source has meant that any theory of the HDR must come to terms with this starting point: the HDR must be another separate source. This is in fact what we see in later works like those of H.-U. Nübel (1959), A. Weiser (1966) and J. H. Grønbaek (1971).

Despite criticism received at its early stage, offered notably by O. Eissfeldt,<sup>29</sup> Rost's thesis has gained general acceptance, in spite of several recent approaches<sup>30</sup> which differ radically from that of Rost. Notable is Carlson's *David, the Chosen King* (1964) with its delineation of the double theme "under the Blessing" (2 Sam 2-7) and "under the Curse" (9-24) which has attracted some sympathy (e.g. Childs, 1979: 276; Ackroyd, 1981: 385 and Gordon, 1984: 82) but has not gained wide acceptance. The fact that Carlson excludes all of 1 Samuel from his David story only reflects how strongly Rost's classical delimitation of the SN is in our mind. The SN as an independent literary unit has, therefore, enjoyed a much more stable existence than the HDR. Though not as influential as Rost's original study, Carlson's study has been regarded as an interesting one (Soggin, 1989: 222), and also constitutes a challenge to the belief that the SN is answering the question of the succession to David's throne.

Disturbing connections between the HDR and the SN have recently been detected but these are subsumed under a redactional layer as either post-Dtr (Würthwein 1974: 47), or Dtr (Veijola 1975: 95), or pre-Dtr (Cryer 1985: 393). Cryer's speculation is the weakest here because he does not seem to have considered an intrinsic physical difficulty of his proposal: how could the HDR and SN be linked by additional materials before

---

<sup>29</sup> O. Eissfeldt, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 31 (1928) cols. 801-12.

<sup>30</sup> E.g. Carlson (1964), Conroy (1978), and Campbell (1986). Carlson's traditio-historical analysis by definition does not say much about the whether his *Chosen King* was once an independent document. Conroy is critical of Rost's view and suggests that the Absalom story has an "internal unity" (6). Campbell goes his own in postulating a late ninth-century document (1 Sam 1-2 Kgs 10). His view does not rule out Rost's hypothesis of an SN author/redactor but is incompatible with Noth's proposal of an exilic Dtr incorporation of the HDR and the SN into his DH. Campbell's hypothetical document has yet to be taken seriously as a contender for the status of another pre-Dtr source.

they were incorporated into a corpus?—unless, of course, they were redactionally related to a base text by the same person or written by him. The only other option not entertained is the possibility of common of authorship. This is what we shall try to demonstrate in Chapters Four and Five.

It is Noth's proposal of a Dtr using existing HDR and SN as his sources that has been most influential in scholarly opinions about their pre-Dtr status and their possible inter-relationship. Noth's view has become another reference point for any theory about the inter-connections between the HDR and the SN. General common-sense belief among scholars about their being contemporaneous with the events reported is another significant factor which has been influencing our views of their status as sources. Since the SN is "Court History", it must be earlier than the exilic/post-exilic Dtr. The same may be said of the HDR, because a defence of David would not be necessary if not close to his time. But common-sense needs to be filtered critically before it can be used as the basis of scholarly hypotheses.

The last twenty or so years have seen a proliferation of studies on the David story. Fokkelman's (1981, 1986, 1990) colossal volumes on the books of Samuel are the most noticeable example. His approach and analysis, though interesting in their own right, are not congenial to those who want to see a historical picture of the composition of the books. The increase in readings of the David story as story, while compensating for a neglect in the past, also means a relative decrease in the effort put into the critical problem of the history of the David story. This is probably due to a rather stable acceptance of the SN and the HDR hypotheses, especially the former.

Conroy (1978) points out that "the current state of research no longer justifies an automatic and uncritical acceptance of 2 Sam 9-20; 1 Kgs 1-2 as a fully rounded literary unity with a clearly defined theme" (3). Added to this critical assessment of the SN are Ackroyd's (1981) damaging questions about Rost's hypothesis of the SN as an independent document. He points out some basic difficulties with Rost's delimitation of the SN and warns us of the hindrance of any "restrictions imposed by artificial and

hypothetical categorizing of the text” (396). While he is quite right to question the thematic unity of the SN (p. 390), it does not seem he has done enough justice to Rost’s stylistic analysis which is the basis of the SN and which does demonstrate to us that the SN is rather distinct from its surroundings. He is in favour of a “less rigid reading” of the text. Such a reading (e.g. Gunn 1978), however fruitful, interesting and necessary, cannot replace the equally necessary critical inquiry into the problem of the formation of the books of Samuel.

Ackroyd’s sympathy (1981: 385) with Carlson’s (1964) approach is also shared by Gordon (1984) who points out “thematic and verbal interplay between narratives within and without the supposed ‘source’” (82) and mentions the example of the Mephibosheth story in the SN (2 Sam 9) in particular which has an “obvious dependence upon 1 Samuel 20; 23:17f.; 24:8-22” (*loc. cit.*). Such “thematic and verbal interplay” has also diminished Gordon’s confidence in the independent status of the SN.

Most would agree that Rost brought us rather effectively out of the stalemate of source analysis of the books of Samuel. Some, however, are beginning to realise that we were probably brought not to a problem free area, but to new problems of a different kind. It must be said, however, that Rost did make a very important methodological breakthrough and enhanced our appreciation of the text of Samuel. New problems are but opportunities for new, and hopefully better, hypotheses. It is hoped that the last two chapters of this thesis on the common authorship of the SHSD (a supplement to the history of Saul and David) and the SN may contribute something to this continuing debate.

## CHAPTER ONE

### IS 1 SAM 30.1-13 REALLY THE SOURCE OF 1 CHR 10.1-12 ?<sup>31</sup>

#### 1.0 Introductory

As a matter of fact all post-Nothian commentaries on Chr take de Wette's theory and therefore the dependence of 1 Chr 10.1-12 on 1 Sam 31 for granted when the two texts are compared. The main purpose of this chapter is to show, by displaying textual and literary links, that the Chr did not seem to know any form of 1 Sam 31 that we have. Relevant implications will also be discussed.

#### 1.1 The Synoptic Texts

1 Sam 31	1 Chr 10
6. וימת שאול ושלשת בניו [ונשא כליו] (גם כל-אנשיו) [ביום ההוא] יחדו:	6. וימת שאול ושלשת בניו (וכל-ביתו) יחדו [מתו]:
7. ויראו (אנשי) ישראל אשר- [בעבר] העמק [ואשר בעבר הירדן] כי-נסו [אנשי ישראל] וכי-מתו שאול ובניו ויעזבו [את] הערים וינסו ויבאו פלשתים וישבו (בהן):	7. ויראו [כל]-(איש) ישראל אשר-בעמק כי נסו וכי-מתו שאול ובניו ויעזבו עריהם וינסו ויבאו פלשתים וישבו (בהם):
8. ויהי ממחרת ויבאו פלשתים לפשט את-החללים וימצאו את-שאול ואת-[שלשת] בניו נפלים בהר [ה]גלבוע:	8. ויהי ממחרת ויבאו פלשתים לפשט את-החללים וימצאו את-שאול ואת-בניו נפלים בהר גלבוע:
9. [ויכרתו את-ראשו] (ויפשיטו) את-כליו וישלחו בארץ-פלשתים סביב לבשר [בית] עצביהם ואת-העם:	9. (ויפשיטהו) וישאו [את-ראשו] ואת-כליו וישלחו בארץ-פלשתים סביב לבשר [את]-עצביהם ואת-העם:
10. וישמו את-כליו בית (עשתרות) ואת-(גויתו) תקעו [בחומת] (בית שן):	10. וישמו את-כליו בית (אלהיהם) ואת-(גלגלתו) תקעו (בית דגון):

<sup>31</sup> A version of this chapter was read at a seminar of the Faculty of Divinity, University of Edinburgh in Nov. 1993. I had benefited from comments and responses to the paper.

11. וישמעו [כל] יביש גלעד את אשר-עשו פלשתים לשאול:	11. וישמעו [כל] יביש גלעד את [כל]- אשר-עשו פלשתים לשאול:
12. ויקומו כל-איש חיל וילכו [כל-הלילה] [ויקחו] את- [גויית] שאול ואת [גויית] בניו [מחומת בית שן] ויבאו יבשה [וישרפו אתם שם]:	12. ויקומו כל-איש חיל (וישאו) את- (גופת) שאול ואת (גופת) בניו ויביאום יבישה
13. [ויקחו] את-עצמותיהם ויקברו תחת- (האשל) ביבשה ויצמו שבעת ימים:	ויקברו את-עצמותיהם תחת (האלה) ביבש ויצמו שבעת ימים:

The Hebrew texts of our two synoptic passages are displayed in such a way that the differences<sup>32</sup> between 1 Sam 31.6-13 and 1 Chr 10.6-12 stand out easily. Variants are in normal brackets while (relative) pluses are in square brackets.<sup>33</sup>

The two parallel chapters have different grammatical and syntactical conventions. It is usually thought that Chr's linguistic characteristics represent late practice. In view of Barr's (1989) very successful attribution of much of the variation in the use of the *plene* spellings in Samuel-Kings and Chr to later copyists rather than to the authors of these books, the confidence of attributing all late grammatical practice to the authors in the Hebrew Bible might perhaps be analogically reduced. The lateness of Chr could be safely assumed, but it is doubtful whether the preservation of earlier grammatical practice in Samuel-Kings can guarantee an early date of its composition / compilation.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>32</sup> The affinity of the Greek books of Samuel-Kings with the MT Chr—e.g. τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν in 1 Reg 31.7, τοῖς εἰδωλοῖς αὐτῶν in v. 9, καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτοῦς in v. 12—seems to suggest that some of the 1 Chr 10 variants are closer to the original source than those of 1 Sam 31.

<sup>33</sup> The MT of 1 Sam. xxxi 1-12 (201 words) is 23 words (13%, relative to Chr) longer than its Chr counterpart (178 words). R. A. Kraft-E. Tov's MT-LXX parallel text gives the retroversion of 1 Reg 197 words and 1 Par 182 words. The LXX texts of the two synoptic versions appear to be very faithful renderings of their *Vorlage* as can be shown from R. A. Kraft and E. Tov's MT-LXX parallel (electronic) text from which one can see that almost all the Greek words correspond to the MT word by word. McKenzie (1985: 58) discloses that 1 Sam 31.6-12 is not extant in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. Ulrich (1978: 80, 160) discusses 1 Sam 31.3-4 of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. The minor textual differences between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and other witnesses—mainly on the use of אל/על and ל/אל—has no bearing our arguments. His study of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> suggests to him that it was “much closer than the Massoretic tradition to the Hebrew basis of the pristine Egyptian (Old Greek) translation produced in the late third or early second century” (257). He also finds (p. 160) many of the pluses, minuses and variants of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> are reflected in 1 Reg and Chr.

<sup>34</sup> Fishbane (1985) has also found that some of the theological changes in the Hebrew Bible are “non-systematic” and show inconsistency which suggests to him that “many of these changes were the product of isolated scribes or scribal schools” (71).

It can be shown, in fact, not only is the use short and *plene* spellings variable in the Hebrew Bible, the use of early and late noun forms is also variable. Here I offer only two examples of the latter which falls outside the scope of Barr's treatment. Sáenz-Badillos (1993) suggests that in Chr "מַמְלָכָה (*mamlākā*) 'kingdom' is systematically replaced by מַלְכוּת (*malḵūt*)" (117). The distribution of these two noun forms in Chr shows that it is less systematic than is suggested. In total, מַמְלָכָה appears 22 times in Chr:

(1.1) מַמְלָכָה in special Chr material, 16x: 1 Chr 29.11, 30, 9.19, 2 Chr 12.8, 13.5, 8, 14.4, 17.5, 10, 20.6, 29, 21.3, 4, 22.9, 32.15, 36.23.

(1.2) מַמְלָכָה in shared material, 6x: 1 Chr 16.20 || Ps 105.13, 2 Chr 11.1 || 1 Kgs 12.21, 2 Chr 22.10 || 2 Kgs 11.1, 2 Chr 23.20 || 2 Kgs 2.19, 2 Chr 25.3 (2x) || 2 Kgs 14.5.

מַלְכוּת appears 28 times in Chr:

(2.1) מַלְכוּת in special Chr material, 22x: 1 Chr 11.10, 12.24, 22.10, 26.31, 28.5, 28.7, 29.25, 30, 2 Chr 1.18, 2.11, 3.2, 11.17, 12.1, 15.10, 19, 16.1, 12, 20.30, 29.19, 33.13, 36.20, 22.

(2.2) מַלְכוּת in shared material, 6x: 1 Chr 14.2 || 2 Sam 5.12, 1 Chr 17.11 || 2 Sam 7.12, 2 Chr 17.14 || 2 Sam 7.16, 2 Chr 1.1 || 1Kgs 2.46b, 2 Chr 7.18 || 1 Kgs 9.5, 2 Chr 35.19 || 2 Kgs 23.23.

Thus, special Chr has 16x of the early form and 22x of the late form. No doubt the tendency is towards the late form. But in the shared material, Chr has 6x for both the early and the late forms. There is thus no "systematic replacement" by the Chr as suggested by Sáenz-Badillos. Should this variation be attributed to the Chr? Or the scribe(s)? Samuel and Kings tend to use the early form—12x and 17x respectively. Yet a late form is found in 1 Sam 20.31 and 1 Kgs 2.12. And simple statistics show that Samuel-Kings are not really as consistent as they appear in their use of noun forms: The early form "I" (אֲנֹכִי) is found 59 times in Samuel-Kings and the late form (אֲנִי) 96 times. Both forms are usually found within the same chapters (e.g. אֲנֹכִי in 2 Sam 7.2, 18; אֲנִי

in 2 Sam 7.8, 14)). Their irregular distribution suggests that it is very difficult to attribute the phenomenon to the compositional stage.

## 1.2 Textual and Literary Links

### 1.2.1 1 Sam 31.6 || 1 Chr 10.6

Since the majority of the substantial differences between the two texts are to be found mainly in vv. 6ff, I shall start with the first significant variants in 1 Sam 31.6 || 1 Chr 10.6 in my discussion.<sup>35</sup>

1 Sam 31.6 reads:

וימת שאול ושלשת בניו ונשא כליו גם כל-אנשיו ביום ההוא יחדו:<sup>36</sup>

Chr reads:

וימת שאול ושלשת בניו וכל-ביתו יחדו מתו:

There are mainly two types of largely compatible explanations for the differences of these two parallel verses:

(1) Literary reasons: “a generalising abridgement of the text of Samuel” (Driver: 229); “careless statement” by the Chr (Curtis and Madsen 1910: 181); “1 Chr 10 has been excerpted from 1 Sam 31 with small variations” (McKane 1963: 172). Willi (1972: 60) ascribes the differences to Chr’s tendency to generalize.

(2) Theological interpretation of Samuel: Rudolph (1955: 95) thinks that the Chr ignored the stories of Saul’s other sons because of his theological interpretation of the battle on Mount Gilboa as “das furchtbare Strafgericht” at which Yawheh has spoken his “No” to the Saulide dynasty. Williamson (1982: 93), Zalewski (1989: 462) and most recently Japhet (1993: 224) are of similar opinion.

Only a handful of scholars directly or indirectly support Chr’s reading. R. W. Klein (1983) suggests that “and all his men” in Samuel might be a gloss based on Chr’s “and all

---

<sup>35</sup> Except the variants of the last two words in v. 3 of the two texts, nearly all other variants are formal in nature. Their differences therefore do not affect the central argument of this chapter.

<sup>36</sup> כל-אנשיו is not consistently attested in LXX. LXX<sup>B</sup> has it but not LXX<sup>L</sup>.



his house” (286, n.6a). McKenzie (1985: 59) notes that Chr’s reading is “the least expansionistic” and doubts “the reference to all Saul’s house dying in Chr can be considered tendentious, as some have argued”. P. K. McCarter (1980) suggests a primitive form of the original reading to be “So Saul and his three sons died together”, getting rid of both “and all his house” in Chr and “all his men also” in Samuel (440-41).

What has not been proposed is the possible support lent to Chr’s reading by Samuel itself. The first piece of information about Saul’s household is found in 1 Sam 14.49-51:

Now the sons of Saul were Jonathan, Ishvi, and Malchishua; and the names of his two daughters were these: the name of the first-born was Merab, and the name of the younger Michal; and the name of Saul’s wife was Ahino-am the daughter of Ahima-az. And the name of the commander of his army was Abner the son of Ner, Saul’s uncle; Kish was the father of Saul, and Ner the father of Abner was the son of Abiel.

The name Ishvi has been debated. But no one seems to have raised questions about the fact that here is a record of a three son family of Saul.<sup>37</sup> Of course there are exegetical difficulties if we take 1 Sam 14.49-51 as the household background of 1 Sam 31.2 because of the obvious difference in one of the names. 1 Sam 14.49-51 knows no more sons of Saul than his three sons who might have all died on Mount Gilboa and therefore provides some external support for the phrase **שָׂאוֹל וּשְׁלֹשֶׁת בָּנָיו** to mean **כָּל בֵּיתוֹ**.<sup>38</sup> **שָׂאוֹל וּשְׁלֹשֶׁת בָּנָיו** in itself can mean either “Saul and three of his sons” or “Saul and all his three sons”. If **כָּל בֵּיתוֹ** was the original reading, it would exclude the first meaning of **שָׂאוֹל וּשְׁלֹשֶׁת בָּנָיו**. Removing **כָּל בֵּיתוֹ** would make the second phrase ambiguous and allow more narrational space for the addition (creation?) of the stories of Saul’s other

<sup>37</sup> I.XX<sup>OP</sup>, I.XX<sup>L</sup> and Syriac have four names with Ishbaal as the additional fourth. These look more like attempts to harmonise with 1 Sam 31.2 (1 Chr 10.2) than independent witnesses as the three name readings would have occasioned a need for resolving the inconsistency. Moreover, Ishvi and Ishbaal are generally accepted by commentators to be referring to the same person.

<sup>38</sup> Chr’s reading is a neat A:B || B’:A’ chiasmic parallelism:

שָׂאוֹל וּשְׁלֹשֶׁת בָּנָיו	וַיָּמָת
יַחַדּוּמָתוֹ	וְכָל-בֵּיתוֹ

sons. Moreover, the second meaning of שאול ושלשת בניו would render כל ביתו a bit superfluous. There is therefore a stronger reason for a Samuel editor to remove כל ביתו then for the Chr to add it to his *Vorlage*.

Abner, Saul's uncle and army commander, is mentioned with Saul's family and considered as a Saulide. 1 Sam 31 does not mention whether this commander was dead or alive after the battle on Mount Gilboa and his story in 2 Samuel is told in such a way as if this battle had never happened! Abner, one of the Saulides, should have been dead according to both readings since he is both a member of כל ביתו (Chr) and כל-אנשיו (Samuel). It is therefore possible that Saul's household list was part of Chr's source.

In general scholars<sup>39</sup> believe that the purpose of Chr's כל ביתו is to emphasize the total destruction of the house of Saul. Zalewski (1989: 460) takes the story of the death of Saul as a partial fulfilment of Samuel's prophecy in 1 Sam 28. No one, however, seems to have considered 1 Chr 10.6 particularly as also fulfilment of Samuel's prophecy. It is in fact there and not, *contra* Rudolph, on Mount Gilboa where Yahweh had declared his "No" to Saul through Samuel:

... Yahweh has torn the kingdom out of your hand, and given it to your neighbour, David. ... and tomorrow *you and your sons* shall be with me; (1 Sam 28.17-19)

Mount Gilboa is therefore not "das furchtbare Strafgericht" (Rudolph) but the execution chamber of a death penalty already decided on a fateful night. Although 1 Sam 28.19 mentions the impending death of Saul and his sons, Japhet (1993: 225) takes it only as a prophecy which 1 Chr 10.7 fulfils and fails to notice that a complete fulfilment of this prophecy is not possible without כל ביתו in v. 6.

It is also important to note that 1 Sam 31.6 does not in any way cause inconsistency in the development of the Chronicler's story whereas 1 Chr 10.6 causes severe contradiction to the development of Samuel-Kings.

---

<sup>39</sup> Rudolph 1955: 95; Willi 1972: 160; Mosis 1973: 22; Ackroyd 1991: 315; Williamson 1982: 95; Zalewski 1989: 462 and Japhet 1993: 224.

### 1.2.2 1 Sam 31.7 || 1 Chr 10.7

Samuel mentions that those who were **בעבר העמק** (“on the other side of the valley”) of the valley and **ואשר בעבר הירדן** (“those beyond the Jordan”) fled their cities after seeing the outcome of the battle on Mount Gilboa. However, in Chr, only those who were “in the valley” fled their cities. H. J. Stoebe and S. Zalewski rightly suggest that 1 Sam 31 should follow directly from 1 Sam 28.<sup>40</sup> In this light, it can be shown that 1 Sam 31.7 with its several pluses does not fit 1 Sam 28.4 as well as the shorter 1 Chr 10.7. 1 Sam 28.4 relates that the Philistines encamped at Shunem and the Israelites at Gilboa, with the valley of Jezreel—where some Israelites lived in their cities—in between. Stoebe also thinks that both **בעבר העמק** and **ואשר בעבר הירדן** are original to Samuel but finds the meaning of the second phrase historically difficult. On the meaning of **בעבר העמק**, Stoebe, following Schulz, suggests that it is “auf die Bucht von Beth-Schean”. McCarter (1980: 441) also thinks **בעבר העמק** to be original but believes that **ואשר בעבר הירדן** “is unquestionably expansive”. He has the support of McKenzie (1985: 59) who thinks Chr here “attests a more primitive text”. Stoebe’s interpretation of **ואשר בעבר הירדן**<sup>41</sup> is not necessary and McCarter’s textual conjecture, though correct in my view, is not sufficient. A better explanation which can fully explain the purpose of this geographical change is necessary.

There is no immediately obvious reason why the Chr wished to see the consequence of Israel’s defeat in smaller scale and so changed Samuel’s text. Stoebe’s suggestion that Bethshan is within the area covered by the phrase **בעבר העמק** offers an important clue

---

<sup>40</sup> Stoebe 1973: 523; Zalewski, 455.

<sup>41</sup> For he thinks “daß sie [die Philister] auch über den Jordan hinübergriffen, ist dagegen unwahrscheinlich, denn weder lag dort ihr eigentliches Interessengebiet, noch waren sie dort verletzlich” (529). He proposes to overcome this difficulty by taking the phrase **בעבר הירדן** to mean “das (vornemlich westliche) Gebiet und die Jordanfurten”, implying that the Philistines had not actually occupied the eastern area of Jordan. Mount Gilboa and Shunem are about 5 km apart; it is possible in the valley of Jezreel to see what happened on Gilboa. However, according to *MBA*, map 95, the river Jordan is over 15 km—about 10 miles—from Gilboa. It is doubtful that the visibility beyond such a distance can inform **ואשר בעבר הירדן** of the death of Saul and his sons on Mount Gilboa. So **ואשר בעבר הירדן** is not only historically inappropriate but geographically difficult as well.

to the purpose of having a much wider Philistine occupation in Samuel's version. Had he not tried to interpret **בעבר הירדן** historically, he might have realised that this area was in fact very close to Jabesh-gilead. This at once explains why we are told in Samuel that the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead had to steal into Bethshan at night (1 Sam 31.12) to take the bodies of Saul and his sons.<sup>42</sup> In this light the two pluses—**בעבר** and **הירדן בעבר**—and the Samuel variant **בחומת בית שן** (“to the wall of Bethshan”) are found to be thematically connected. The theme is the stealing of the bodies of Saul and Jonathan by the men of Jabesh-gilead. This act is hinted at in 1 Sam 31.12 and is given unambiguous condemnation in 2 Sam 21.12 by the narrator. We shall say more on this when we reach other related pluses and variants in Samuel.

### 1.2.3 1 Sam 31.8 || 1 Chr 10.8

Verse 7 of both versions agree that **מתו שאול ובניו** and no quantitative clarification was thought to be necessary. This agreement not only corresponds well with Samuel's prophecy to Saul that **ומחר אתה ובניך עמי** but also with the beginning clause of 1 Sam 14.49: **ויהיו בני שאול: שלשת** in 1 Sam 31.8 sounds rather like an after-thought. McCarter (1980: 440) suggests that we here are dealing with an omission by the Chronicler. However, this extra **שלשת** is connected with the question of how many sons of Saul had been killed. In the light of contextual agreement of Chr's reading with other parts of 1 Samuel one could argue that **שלשת** might as well be a Samuel addition with the effect of limiting the scope of **בניו** as there are still death stories of other sons of Saul to be told in Samuel.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Zalewski (462) overstates the superficial brevity of 1 Chr 10.7 and suggests that “the purpose of shortening the passage is to focus on the fate of Saul and his sons. The flight of the sheep is a direct result of the demise of the shepherds”.

<sup>43</sup> Again there is an overlapping of semantic scopes, but this time between **ואת-שלשת בניו** and **ואת-בניו**.

#### 1.2.4 1 Sam 31.9 || 1 Chr 10.9

The synoptic texts differ significantly in the first half of this verse. Samuel reads ויפשיטהו וישאו את-ראשו ואת-כליו, but Chr has ויכרתו את-ראשו ויפשיטו את-כליו.<sup>44</sup> Rudolph (1955: 92) firmly believes that 1 Sam 31.9a must have been known by Chr and Japhet (1993: 226) assumes this. However, McCarter (1980: 441) suggests Saul's beheading in Samuel is secondary because "its variety of form and location show it to be secondary (under the influence of 17.51)".<sup>45</sup> Williamson takes Ackroyd's advice (1977: 5) in not overpressing the differences between Samuel and Chr at this point. Williamson (1982) nevertheless points out that while 1 Sam 31 "deals mainly with the Philistines' treatment of Saul's body, the Chronicler is more interested in the fate of his head". This is an important observation. As we shall show shortly the fate of Saul's body will shed important light on the question of the coherence of the two parallel stories.

#### 1.2.5 1 Sam 31.10 || 1 Chr 10.10<sup>46</sup>

Rudolph (1955: 92) rightly thinks that 1 Chr 10.10b "muß ursprünglich auch vor 1 Sm 31 10b gestanden haben". McKane (1963: 172) is of similar opinion and thinks that Chr "preserves a better text" in this verse. Williamson apparently raises no objection to Rudolph's view. McKenzie (1985: 59) also supports Chr's reading and thinks that "it is difficult to believe that Chr omitted the reference to Ashtaroth for tendentious reasons but included the mention of Dagon in the same verse".<sup>47</sup> עשתרות as the name of a goddess appears only in the historian's comments in Judg 2.13, 10.6; in Samuel's so-

---

<sup>44</sup> In Sam, the cutting off of Saul's head is put in an emphatic position in the sentence. But it is not clear whether or not the head had been taken away with the armour as it had been in Chr, leaving the beheaded body on Mount Gilboa to be collected by the men of Jabesh-gilead.

<sup>45</sup> Furthermore LXX<sup>L</sup> (which uses ἀποκεφαλίζουσιν, LXX<sup>B</sup> uses ἀποστρέφουσιν) of Samuel is an important witness to its originality in Samuel but not necessarily to its source.

<sup>46</sup> וישמו in Sam and וישימו in Chr are not significant variants and can be securely attributed to scribal conventions.

<sup>47</sup> However, his proposal that the difference in the second half of this verse is "due to textual corruption" can at best be taken as unsupported conjecture.

called “Deuteronomistic anti-monarchical speeches”<sup>48</sup> (1 Sam 7.3, 4, 12.10) and here in 1 Sam 31.10.<sup>49</sup>

A scrutiny of the internal coherence of the two texts sheds important light on the purposes of the variants. While Chr’s reading is consistent with its own version of the story, Samuel’s text puzzles the reader. First, 1 Chr 10.9 clearly mentions that Saul’s head and armour were carried away; it is not mentioned what had been carried away in 1 Sam 31.9. Then one also wonders whether or not Saul’s body in 1 Sam 31.10 was also displayed with his head. The impression one has is that the emphasis on cutting off Saul’s head and the unexpected mention of Saul’s body implies that it was only the headless body of Saul that was on display on the wall of Bethshan. Japhet (1993) also points out that in “1 Sam 31.10 the final fate of the head is not recorded” (227). The puzzlement goes further: 1 Sam 31.10 mentions only Saul’s body but we are told in v. 12 that the valiant men of Jabesh-gilead took the bodies of his sons as well from the wall of Bethshan. However, nowhere in either story were the bodies removed by the Philistines to their territories.

Japhet is probably alone in arguing against the superiority of 1 Chr 10.10 and suggests that “the version of Chronicles is a sophisticated reworking of his source”. Her explanation, however, is not convincing. The literal closeness she suggests between the two verses is no doubt there, but the evidence is too weak to support Chr’s change of 1 Sam 31.10.<sup>50</sup> She seems also to have overlooked the strict consistency of Chr’s story in

---

<sup>48</sup> These speeches have long been regarded as late. The absence of a similar prophetic speech (Judg 6.7-10) from an unpublished Qumran text, reported by R. G. Boling (1975: 40), further strengthens their secondary nature and thus the interpolatory character of the word עשתרות in 1 Sam 31.10, which is also mentioned in 1 Sam 7.4.

<sup>49</sup> As an element in the name of a place, it appears in Deut 1.4; Josh 9.10, 12.4, 13.12, 31 and 1 Chr 6.71.

<sup>50</sup> Her textual solution breaks a rather neat A:B:C || B’:A’:C’ pattern of 1 Chr 10.10:

וישימו את-כליו בית אלהיהם  
ואת-גלגלתו תקעו בית דגון:

The chiasmic parallel pattern of verb : object || object’ : verb’ is also attested in 1 Chr 10.6.

v.9ff. In contrast to the unnaturalness of the flow of 1 Sam 31.9ff, Chr's version is straightforward and coherent. In 1 Chr 10.9 only Saul's head and his armour were carried away and the head is fastened in **בית דגון** (v. 10).<sup>51</sup> The headless body of Saul and the bodies of his sons were still on Mount Gilboa waiting for the men of Jabesh-gilead to collect. They did not have to steal into the occupied territory to do so, because Mount Gilboa was not within Philistine occupied territory, whereas Bethshan was (according to 1 Sam 31.7). The problem of Japhet's solution is that it only deals with v. 10 as a more or less local problem. It should rather be put in a much wider perspective than she has attempted.

David's bringing of Goliath's head to Jerusalem the temple city (1 Sam 17.54a) corresponds nicely with Saul's head being brought to Dagon's temple and fastened there (1 Chr 10.10). The resemblance of the death of Saul and Goliath has been noticed (e.g. Ackroyd 1977a: 6; McCarter 1980: 441). Chr's version makes a better comparison than Samuel's in that both heroes' head and armour were taken away and put in the victor's temple.

Samuel's **גויתו** and Chr's **גלגלתו** are important variants. It is interesting to note that Samuel uses **גויתו** three times in places where Chr uses **גלגלתו** in v. 10 or **גופה** (2x) in v. 12. Since Chr's **גופה** appears nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible, McCarter (1980: 442) rightly thinks that it is likely to be original. **גויה** is a more popular word<sup>52</sup> and denotes a human corpse in only a few places (1 Sam 31.10, 12, Nahum 3.3 and in Ps 110.6). Its use in a royal psalm Ps 110.6 is most intriguing:

Yahweh is at your right hand; he will shatter kings on the day of his wrath. (v. 5)

He will execute judgement among the nations, filling them with **גויות**.

<sup>51</sup> The way Saul dies resembles the death of Dagon in 1 Sam 5.4 in that both have their head cut off. The Philistines must have seen in Saul's defeat a victory of Dagon over Yahweh. See Wiggin's (1993) discussion on the private battle between Yahweh and Dagon in 1 Sam 5.

<sup>52</sup> The word **גויה** ("body") is used 13 times in the Hebrew Bible referring to a body live or dead (Gen 47.18; Judg 14.8, 9; 1 Sam 31.10, 12, 2x in v. 12; Ezek i 11, 23; Nah 3.3, 2x; Ps 110.6; Dan 10.6, Neh 9.37. While **גלגלת** ("skull") is used 12 times referring to the skull or used in counting (Ex 16.16, 38.26; Num 1.2, 18, 20, 22, 47; Judg 9.53; 2 Kgs 9. 35; 1 Chr 10.10, 23.3, 24).

Yahweh will protect his messiah by shattering the kings of the nations. Samuel's use of גיורת therefore suggests that Saul died as the enemy of the true messiah David in the sense of Ps 110.<sup>53</sup> The uniformity of the use of גייה in Samuel is probably the result of redaction and its thematic association further strengthens this possibility.

Samuel's use of גייתו and the hanging of Saul's body also link with the manner of death of his remaining sons and grandsons, who were hanged and offered as sacrifice by the Gibeonites in 2 Sam 21.1-14.<sup>54</sup> So on the one hand, 1 Chr 10.9 is a better allusion than 1 Sam 31.9 to the story of David and Goliath before the conflict between Saul and David. On the other hand, Samuel's variants can be thematically associated with David's handling of the Saulide remnants. There are a few more such cases in the remaining verses.

#### 1.2.6 1 Sam 31.11 || 1 Chr 10.11

The כל in 1 Chr 10.11 looks trivial at first sight and it is usually neglected by commentators. But the two texts convey very different pictures of how the city of Jabesh-gilead responded to the news of Saul's death. Samuel's ישבי יביש גלעד ("the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead") does not sound as impressive as Chr's כל-יביש גלעד ("all Jabesh-gilead"). For Chr, the whole city of Jabesh-gilead was involved in learning the sad news about how Saul was treated by the Philistines. But "the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead" lacks both the emphasis and the scale of "all Jabesh-gilead". On the one hand, Chr's

---

<sup>53</sup> A long plus in 2 Sam 7.1 (|| 1 Chr 17.1) betrays a similar interest on the part of the redactor of the books of Samuel:

Now when the king dwelt in his house, *and the Lord had given him rest from all his enemies round about ...*

1 Samuel repeatedly states that Saul was David's enemy (xviii 29b, an MT plus; xix 17; xxiv 4, 19; xxvi 8). Ishbosheth is also David's enemy (2 Sam iv 8). All these fall within the narrative complex of the so-called History of David's Rise. Elsewhere we are told that Yahweh had become Saul's enemy because of his disobedience (1 Sam xxviii 16).

<sup>54</sup> 2 Sam 21.12b:

:אשר תלום שם הפלשתים ביום הכות פלשתים את-שאול בגלבע ...



phrase corresponds well with the story of Saul delivering כל-אנשי יביש in 1 Sam 11.1. In this light, one expects that the whole city would be upset by the shattering news of Saul's death because כל-אנשי יביש owed him their right eyes. It also matches well the use of כל-איש חיל in the shared text of the following verse. On the other hand, Samuel's reading links nicely with the narrator's accusation of בעלי יביש גלעד ("the men of Jabesh-gilead") stealing the bones of Saul and his sons from the public square of Bethshan (2 Sam 21.12). The whole city's collective courageous act has been reduced to a theft by some of its inhabitants.

### 1.2.7 1 Sam 31.12 || 1 Chr 10.12a

Reasons based on the law concerning criminals (Lev 20.1-4, Josh 7.25) have been suggested to explain Chr's omission of the reference to the burning of the bodies of Saul and his sons.<sup>55</sup> McKenzie (1985: 60) rightly points out that here "it is not execution but disposal of the corpses that it described".

Although 1 Sam 31.12 assumes that the bodies of Saul and his sons had been carried away from Mount Gilboa, neither v. 9 nor v. 10 of either version says anything about the bodies Saul's sons. The mention of the removal of their bodies from the wall of Bethshan is therefore very unexpected in the flow of the story in Samuel. The story in 1 Chr 10.9 is a more consistent one: we are told that only the head and armour had been carried away. The beheaded bodies of Saul and the bodies of his three sons were left on Mount Gilboa.

In the Samuel version, the fixing of Saul's body on the wall of Bethshan in 1 Sam 31.10 creates an opportunity for its theft by the men of Jabesh-gilead here. That it was a theft is clear from Samuel's plus כל-הלילה, because thieves steal at night!<sup>56</sup> It has to be

---

<sup>55</sup> So Curtis and Madsen 1910: 182; G. J. Botterweck 1956: 407-8 and J. M. Myers 1965: 81.

<sup>56</sup> Willi (1972) thinks that כל-הלילה is an omission by the Chr but for unknown reason (101). The reason is rather obvious when read as a Samuel addition in connection with other pluses in 1 Sam 31.7. McKenzie's suggestion that כל-הלילה and וילכו כל-הלילה and מחומת בית שן being absent

a theft, as we mentioned in our study of 1 Sam 31.7, because the bodies were in the area occupied by the Philistines. This is the whole point of why in v. 7 the Samuel editor has to enlarge the area occupied by the Philistines to include Bethshan. Japhet has noticed all the elaboration of the heroic acts of the people of Jabesh-gilead in Samuel and she believes that the story “is greatly underrated” in Chr (Japhet 1993: 228). However, she seems to have misjudged the precise purpose of the geographical change in 1 Sam 31.7. A grander picture of Israel’s defeat and a more elaborate act of the people of Jabesh-gilead do not guarantee the textual priority of 1 Sam 31.7, 12. A good example to illustrate this point is the MT version of the duel between David and Goliath. That is a lot more interesting to read than the paler picture portrayed by the LXX, but the latter has been shown by Auld and Ho (1992) to be derived from a much shorter original.

The intention of the men of Jabesh-gilead in 1 Chr 10.12 is clearly a positive one in that their purpose in collecting the remains of Saul and his sons is to honour them (cf. McKenzie 1985: 60) and give them a decent burial. Mindful of Saul’s rescue of their city, they paid their final tribute to Saul and his family. It therefore substantiates the probability of the Chronicler’s knowledge of 1 Sam 11.1-11 which should be part of Chr’s source.<sup>57</sup> Unfortunately, the good intention of the men of Jabesh-gilead in 1 Chr 10.12 has clearly been distorted in 1 Sam 31.12 where **וַיִּשְׂרְפוּ אֹתָם שָׁם** is conveniently added to the end of the verse. The burning of the dead bodies of Saul and his sons here is probably not cremation as assumed by R. P. Gordon (1986: 203). The burning of the dead is not only rare, it is in fact sacrilegious to the dead as well as defiling the place where the corpse is burnt. This idea seems to lie behind the prophecy of the man of God in 1 Kgs 13.2 who predicts that **וְעֲצָמוֹת אָדָם יִשְׂרְפוּ עָלֶיךָ** (“men’s bones shall be burned upon you”, i.e. Bethel’s altar built by Jeroboam). Many have noticed the influence of

---

from Chr “are best attributed to Chr’s having used a different, and perhaps less expansionistic, text of S[amuel]” (60) is more likely to be correct.

<sup>57</sup> If this is right then Auld’s reconstructed common-source of Samuel-Kings and Chr—which he suggests begins at 1 Sam 31 (1994, 42)—should include some of 1 Samuel as well. It seems to me that if there were a common-source, it should include a story of the Rise and Fall of Saul.

Deut 21.22-23 on Samuel's version, but the burning of the corpse is not required by the law. It is only the hanging of the bodies overnight that should be avoided.

The idea that it is unfortunate to die in a foreign land is probably behind the story of David's re-burying of the bones of the Saulides in Benjamin, the land of their origin, and the story of the taking of Joseph's bones to the promised land (Gen 50.25; Ex 13.19). It might be the case that this motif was borrowed from the Pentateuch by the Samuel redactor who composed 2 Sam 21 to praise David's kindness towards the house of Saul. This would suggest the redactional (and thus secondary) nature of both this story and the depreciating of the heroic acts of all the men of Jabesh-gilead in 1 Sam 31.11-12.

### 1.2.8 1 Sam 31.13 || 1 Chr 10.12b

אשל is a plus in Samuel which highlights the taking of the bones to Jabesh. אשל ("tamarisk tree") appears only three times in the whole Hebrew Bible (Gen 21.33, 1 Sam 22.6 and 1 Sam 31.13) but is never associated with burial. 1 Sam 22.6 relates that when Saul was pursuing David for his life, he "was sitting at Gibeah, תחת-האשל on the height, with his spear in his hand". The mention of Saul sitting תחת-האשל in 1 Sam 22.6, which does not seem to have any narrative significance in the episode, can be understood as a literary device to foreshadow his final state of being תחת-האשל in 1 Sam 31.13.

Chr's tree, an oak, on the other hand, has connection with another episode before the rise of David. Just after Saul was anointed by Samuel, he was instructed to meet three men at the oak (אלון) of Tabor (1 Sam 10.3) to accept their tributes. And after he had died, his bones were collected and, according to the Chr. variant here, were buried under האלה ביבש. Saul was in fact the second character in the Hebrew Bible to be buried under an oak. Rebekah's nurse, Deborah, was the first one to be buried תחת האלון (Gen 25.8). The oak is a famous tree in the Hebrew Bible and appears many times as אלון

(Gen 35.8, Isaiah 44.14) or אלה.<sup>58</sup> It is a tree with important historical associations, e.g. with Yahweh's appearance and promise to Abram at the Oak of Moreh, with the sanctuary of Yahweh in Josh 24.26, with the coronation of Abimelech "by the oak of the pillar at Shechem" in Judg 9.6, and of course with Saul's own ascent to kingship in 1 Sam 10.3. The oak is therefore both a holy and royal tree which is fitting for the burial of a king. This confirms independently that (according to Chr) the men of Jabesh-gilead were meant to give not only a decent burial but a royal one too to Saul and his sons as their final tribute to their king who once saved them from disgrace.

### 1.3 The Internal Coherence of the Variants in 1 Sam 31.7ff

We have now reached a stage at which we can prepare a synthesis. We have shown in the above that most of the Samuel variants are not adventitious or independent but systematic and also thematically related. In what follows we offer a holistic understanding of the variants of 1 Sam 31 and 1 Chr 10 with respect to their narrative contexts. From the textual-literary connections of the Samuel variants discussed above, it is not difficult to see that the following variants in Samuel are related to each other:

- v. 7     (העמק)<sup>59</sup> בעבר—"on the other side" of the valley;
- v. 7     ואשר בעבר הירדן—"and those beyond the Jordan";
- v. 10    (ואת)־גויתו תקעו בחומת בית שן  
Bethshan";
- v. 12    וילכו כל הלילה—"and they went all night";
- v. 12    ויקחו (את)־גוית (שאול ואת) גוית (בניו) מחומת בית שן  
of Saul and the bodies of his sons from the wall of Bethshan".

All the above Samuel variants aim at portraying only one scene, namely the stealing of the bodies by the strong men of Jabesh-gilead. That this is the case can be seen from the

---

<sup>58</sup> Gen 12.6, 35.4; Deut 11.30; Josh 19.33, 24.26; Judg 4.11, 6.11, 19, 9.6; 1 Sam 10.3; Is 1.30 and 1 Chr 10.12.

<sup>59</sup> Texts in brackets belong to the shared material of 1 Sam 31 and 1 Chr 10.

fact that they did not have to infiltrate at night into Bethshan if the north-western area around Jabesh-gilead, including Bethshan, was not also occupied by the Philistines.

#### 1.4 Literary Connection with the Story of Saul and David

Some of the Samuel variants are further connected with 2 Sam 21.12:

וילך דוד ויקח את-עצמות שאול ואת-עצמות יהונתן בנו מאת בעלי יביש גלעד אשר  
גנבו אתם מרחב בית-שן אשר תלום שם הפלשתים ביום הכות פלשתים את-שאול בגלבע:

The following words appear as Samuel variants in 1 Sam 31:

- וישאו                    in v. 12—"all the valiant men ... ויקחו ... וילכו" Chr uses וישאו.
- ויקחו                    in v. 13—"ויקחו" their bones and ...". This verb is a Samuel plus  
highlighting for the second time the taking of the bones to Jabesh.<sup>60</sup>
- תלום                     in v. 10—"and they fastened his body"
- מרחב בית-שן        in v. 10—"to the wall of בית-שן"  
                              in v. 12—"from the wall of בית-שן"
- ביום                     in v. 6—"Thus died ... on the same יום together".<sup>61</sup>

The following idea appears as Samuel variant in 1 Sam 31:

- גנבו                     in v.12—וילכו כל-הלילה—thieves steal at night!

It is very interesting to note that so many variants and pluses in 1 Sam 31 are thematically linked with the story of David's grace bestowed upon the undeserving Saulides in 2 Sam 21.1-14.<sup>62</sup> The simplest explanation for this is that they belong together and are very probably from the same hand.

If the above internal (4.1) and external or cross-referential (4.2) textual-literary links can be established, one can further investigate other connections of these with the

---

<sup>60</sup> Willi (1972) suggests that Chr removed the two ויקחו as unnecessary for stylistic reasons (95). The implication of our study is that 1 Sam 31 rather than 1 Chr 10.1-12 should be understood as *Auslegung*. As a matter of fact, it is closer to 'eisegesis' than *exegetis*.

<sup>61</sup> This is only a possible case as 1 Par 10.6 also reflects ביום ההוא. However, ביום ההוא is a plus in the some of the synoptic texts: 2 Sam 5.8; 23.10; 24.18 and 1 Kgs 8. 64.

<sup>62</sup> The theme of 2 Sam 21.12 is the accusation against the men of Jabesh-Gilead of stealing the bones of Saul and his sons. This happens to be the same theme of what the major variants in 1 Sam 31.7-12 meant to convey.

Samuel variants of the first half chapter of 1 Samuel. The first and most important of the variants in vv. 1-6 is Chr's **וכל ביתו** and variants. 2 Sam 21.1-14 cannot be consistent with this reading, but Samuel's variants in 1 Sam 31.6 leave room for further development of David's dealing with the Saulide remnants:

ונשא כליו - a plus

גם כל-אנשיו - a variant of Chr's **וכל-ביתו**

The plus **שלשת** in 1 Sam 31.8 can also be understood in this light, as limiting the scope of **ביתו** with the effect of suggesting that not all the sons of Saul, but three, were killed in the battle. The rest of the Samuel variants in 1 Sam 31.1-5 do not have this thematic connection with 2 Sam 21.1-4; and it is no wonder that Samuel and Chr are in better general agreement there.

1 Sam 31.12 **וישרפו אתם שם** ("and they burnt them there") is connected with the prophecy of the man of God (v. 2: **עצמות אדם ישרפו עליך**) in 1 Kgs 13.1-34 which is not found in Chr.

We have already noticed some connection of the Chr variants with episodes in Samuel *outside* the story of the conflict of Saul and David. Accordingly we have to do a similar synthesis for Chr's variants.

### 1.5 Literary Links between Chr's Variants and 1 Samuel

The literary continuity from 1 Sam 28 to 1 Sam 31 is helpful in establishing another connection of 1 Chr 10.6 with a point in this chapter. There Saul heard the last prophecy of Samuel predicting a total demise of his family:

... and tomorrow *you and your sons* shall be with me. (1 Sam 28.19b)

This prophecy of doom has a ring of finality and totality. If this interpretation is correct, then we will have 1 Sam 14.49, 28.19b being consistent with 1 Chr 10.6 but not with 2 Sam 21.1-14 or with the story of David's showing his kindness to the Saulide remnants in general.

The battles in 1 Sam 28.4-5 and 1 Sam 17.1-2 are interesting contrasts and in both cases the battle field is the valley between two mountains. 1 Sam 17.2 tells us that the battle was fought “in the valley of Elah”. V.51b recounts the defeated Philistine army fleeing for life:

... When the Philistines saw that their champion was dead, they fled.

The reader would have no difficulties in seeing that they fled from the valley. This picture resembles the account in 1 Chr 10.7:

And when all the men of Israel *who were in the valley* saw that the army had fled and that Saul and his sons were dead, they forsook their cities and fled; and the Philistines came and dwelt in them.

When the Philistines encamped at Shunem and Israel at Gilboa, the battle field was meant to be the valley of Jezreel in between (as is correctly interpreted in 2 Sam 4.4). The accounts of these two battles present the same scene of defeated fleeing soldiers when the champions were killed. Thus on the one hand the geographical variants in 1 Sam 31.7ff are connected with an act of stealing by the men of Jabesh-gilead condemned in 2 Sam 21.12, and on the other the shorter text of 1 Chr 10.7 is reminiscent of a victorious battle of David in 1 Sam 17.

In the battle between David and Goliath, the Philistine’s head and armour were David’s prizes. Here in Chr, Saul’s head and armour had become the prizes of the Philistines. In both the bodies of the champions were of no interest. The anachronistic reference to Jerusalem and the bringing of the Philistine’s head there in 1 Sam 17.54 corresponds neatly with the Chr variant in 1 Chr 10.10 where we are told the Philistines fastened “his head in the house of Dagon”. This act of the Philistines’ bringing the booty to “the house of Dagon” has a precedent in 1 Sam 5 where they captured the ark of God “and brought it into the house of Dagon” (1 Sam 5.2). Nowhere in Samuel are we told that the Philistines worshipped Ashtaroth. And where Ashtaroth is mentioned in Samuel (1 Sam 7.3-4; 12.10) it is found in the so-called anti-monarchical speeches of Samuel

which are probably secondary and Dtr.<sup>63</sup> It is therefore very puzzling that the Philistines put Saul's armour "in the house of Ashtaroth" (1 Sam 31.10). Again we see the links between Chr's variants and 1 Samuel before the conflict between Saul and David.

Both Gunn (1980: 111) and Japhet (1993: 228) note the heroic acts of the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead, but they are accused of theft rather than praised in 2 Sam 21.12. It seems that 1 Sam 31 portrays a cursed Saul and sons by having them hanged. The act of loyalty of the men of Jabesh-gilead is negated by their burning of the bones. Chr's version of the story is more consistent with 1 Sam 11.1-11 and it depicts an even more positive act of the men of Jabesh-gilead without their burning of the bones of the Saulides as in 1 Sam 31.12. Again there are links between 1 Chr 10 and 1 Samuel before Saul tried to kill David.

## 1.6 Textual Decision

This study confirms Treballe's observation:

The most important and difficult problems in the textual criticism of the books of the Former Prophets are not those connected with accidents in the textual transmission. Rather they are those which originated at an earlier stage, that of the literary composition or editorial arrangement of the book. ... In such cases a joint application of textual and literary criticism is needed (p. 322).

I fully agree with his proposal of a joint application of textual and literary criticism to the textual problems of the Former Prophets. The first three chapters of this thesis are also offered as such an attempt in which the text of Chr is taken just as seriously as that of Samuel in describing the textual situations of one of their synoptic texts. The question of the relationship between the two synoptic texts must now be addressed. We can start this exercise by concluding our linking the synoptic variants with their respective literary contexts. On the one hand, Samuel's variants fit very well there concerning David's

---

<sup>63</sup> See Wellhausen 1899: 239ff; Noth 1943/81: 77; Stoebe 1973: 173; McCarter 1980: 143; Campell 1986: 68, n. 7, 101. Our observation on the distribution of Ashtaroth adds force to this classic position of Wellhausens's.



innocence in the struggle between the house of Saul and the house of David, which begins with 1 Sam 19 and continues right through to Solomon's execution of Shimei, "a man of the family of Saul" (2 Sam 16.5) in 1 Kgs 2.46.<sup>64</sup> We also find that there is a very coherent connection among most of the variants and pluses in 1 Sam 31.6ff as well as a thematic link between these and 2 Sam 21.1-14. On the other hand, the variants of Chr fit just as well the life of Saul before David became his commander-in-chief after his victory over Goliath (1 Sam 18). On the whole both sets of variants are not fortuitous but consistent with themselves and with their narrative contexts. It must be said, however, that Samuel's variants are not as natural (e.g. v. 7 on the geographical locations) and coherent (e.g. v. 10 on the body of Saul and those of his sons). So the level of consistency of the two sets of variants with the shared text does differ noticeably. There is thus a certain degree of justification in preferring Chr's readings as more original on these grounds.

If the shared text itself is a good guide in deciding a preference for the variants, then the 13% shorter Chr, which has proportionately more common elements of the shared text, is to be preferred. Not only are most of the Samuel variants longer, Samuel has many pluses as well. It cannot be overemphasised that basically Chr has very few pluses. So on text-critical criteria, Chr's text is to be preferred. The general trend of textual expansionism in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible is an added factor in favour of Chr's shorter text as reflecting the original better than Samuel's text.

Moreover, the proposal that Chr had curtailed a longer episode to suit his own theological purpose cannot stand because we have shown that almost all of Chr's variants are supported by links with the story of Saul before 1 Sam 19. It seems to me that the

---

<sup>64</sup> David's testament to Solomon has a very fine poetic structure (see Koopmans 1991) and is appropriate to end the era of David. With David's instruction on how to deal with Joab and Shimei and Solomon's execution of his father's will, the defence for the integrity of David and his throne ends properly.

fairest and most natural way of treating these two sets of variants is to put them where they belong:<sup>65</sup>

- (1) 1 Chr 10 belongs to a story of Saul told in Samuel prior to 1 Sam 19 but including 1 Sam 28;
- (2) 1 Sam 31 belongs to the stories of the conflict between Saul and David and David's dealing with the Saulide remnants.

The above two statements sound rather trivial and almost tautological once their respective literary links are accepted. Now, we come to a contradiction: 1 and 2 Sam contain both the story of the Rise of Saul and the story of David's dealings with the Saulides, but 1 Sam 31 and 1 Chr 10 are not fully consistent with each other. Do we then have to tear the stories of the conflict of Saul and David and David's dealing with the Saulide remnants away from the Chr's *Vorlage*? In the light of the two sets of literary links, we have to take this option seriously.

Had the Chr wanted to produce an abridged version of the story of the conflict between Saul and David, he would have taken away the large text blocks such as 1 Sam 19-26 and the stories of the fate of Saulide remnants (including Abner who fought the Gilboa battle) in 2 Samuel and smoothed out any contextual contradiction thus created. He did not even have to touch 1 Sam 31 since it is consistent with the rest of Chr. He might have had to change 1 Sam 31.6, but if he did not mind a *real* contradiction—that the readers already knew that the stories of the ends of the Saulide remnants could be found in a better history, i.e. Samuel-Kings—why would he mind a *literary* contradiction? After all, the fuller genealogy of Saul in 1 Chr 8.33ff already contradicts 1 Chr 10.6. The rest of the 1 Sam 31 variants are completely consistent with Chr, but none of them has been retained. Would the Chr have noticed their literary connections with the stories he had omitted, so that he also had to change these Samuel variants? This is practically very unlikely and leaves the only other option practically certain which

---

<sup>65</sup> The methodological advantages of this hypothesis are its simplicity and explanatory power as well as its independence from any view on the issue of the originality of these variants.

is that Chr would have kept 1 Sam 31 almost intact had he really truncated so much text from Samuel.

Favouring the text of Samuel as the original, Japhet (1993) concludes her comments on 1 Chr 10.1-12:

All in all, the Chronistic reworking of the story smooths the rough edges and moderates the extremes: the scope of the defeat, the disgrace of Saul and his sons, the geographical expansion of the Philistines and the heroic acts of the people of Jabesh-gilead are mitigated by carefully chosen changes, while interference with the original is kept to a minimum. (228-29)

This offers one of the best observations of the most important differences of the two parallel texts. The explanation, however, does not seem to be correct. One still has to ask: Why did the Chr have to present a lesser scope of Israel's defeat? Why did the Chr want to see a smaller geographical occupation by the Philistines and less heroic acts of the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead? It is the universal acceptance of de Wette's theory, I am afraid, that has driven many of us to explain how 1 Chr 10.1-12 can be understood as a modified version of 1 Sam 31. These questions should instead be asked the other way round, about 1 Sam 31. We now know that its major textual pluses and variants are all related to Samuel's (re-)portrayal of the fate of the bones of Saul and his sons and David's showing of his royal favour to the dead king in 2 Sam 21.12-14, where David is described as being kinder to the house of Saul than the people of Jabesh-gilead, in that he collected the bones of the Saulides and had them buried in their place of origin. The portrayal of David's favourable treatment of his enemies is the purpose of a redactor's production of 1 Sam 31. The ultimate aim is, no doubt, to declare "the cleanness of my [i.e. David's] hands" (2 Sam 22.21b) in the demise of the house of Saul.

So if Chr did not change 1 Sam 31 to produce 1 Chr 10.1-12, the only other explanation is that the original behind the synoptic texts—which is now better represented by 1 Chr. 10 and which is coherent and consistent with some of the episodes in 1 Sam 1-18 and 28—was changed by a Samuel redactor who also added the story of the struggle between Saul and David (1 Sam 19.1-27.4) and all the stories about



the final fate of the Saulide remnants<sup>66</sup> in order to exonerate David of implication in the demise of Saul and his house.<sup>67</sup> 1 Chr 10.1-12 is the way it is, I propose, because the source used by the Chr did not contain these stories. This negative result will be further (independently) corroborated by our study of other synoptic stories in Chapters Two and Three.

---

<sup>66</sup> These go as far as the death of Shimei in 1 Kgs 2.46.

<sup>67</sup> This theme of the Books of Samuel has been the subject of many recent studies by R. P. Gordon (1980), C. Mabee (1980), P. K. McCarter (1980a), J. C. VanderKam (1980), K. W. Whitelam (1984), and W. Brueggemann (1989).

### 1.7 Excursus: 1 Chr 10.13-14

1 Chr 10.13-14 is a comment from the editor or his theological explanation for (or interpretation of) the story of Saul's military failure on Mount Giboa and is itself not part of the story. It is therefore not included in the discussion above and is considered separately now. The question of whether they are from the hand of the Chr or not does not affect the arguments of this chapter.

13. וימת שאול במעלו אשר מעל ביהוה על-דבר יהוה אשר לא-שמר וגם-לשאול  
באוב לדרוש:

14. ולא-דרש ביהוה וימיתהו ויסב את-המלוכה לדויד בן-ישי:

Probably none would disagree that these two verses are the Chr's concluding remarks on Saul comparable to his positive albeit a bit disinterested remark on David (1 Chr 29.26-28). However, it does not take an observant reader to wonder how many of Saul's sins are being laid at his door by the Chr and whether he knows Saul's sins better than Samuel who in his last speech (1 Sam 28.15-19) does not count as Saul's sins his "failing to keep the terms of the meeting precisely as stipulated" (McCarter, 1980: 230), his slaughtering of Yahweh's priests at Nob (22.18-19) and his relentless attempt to murder David (1 Sam 19-26). The crux of the problem is whether the Chr is here enumerating Saul's sins or making a general reference to Saul's reign as a whole. Williamson (1982: 95), following Mosis, suggests the latter. Japhet (1993), however, thinks that the view expressed in these remarks "is actually no different from that of I Sam 28, which they come to replace" (229). 1 Sam 28 mentions only Saul's sin of not carrying out Yahweh's wrath against Amalek. The Chr states that Saul did not keep *דבר יהוה*, a locution used only in 1 Sam 3 (3x), 8 (1x as *כל-דברי יהוה*) and 14 (4x plus once as *קול דברי יהוה* in v. 1) in all 1 Samuel. 1 Sam 28.18 uses *קול יהוה*. It is therefore likely that *דבר יהוה* in 1 Chr 10.13b alludes specifically to the event in 1 Sam 15. Moreover, it should also be noted that *מצות יהוה*, instead of *דבר יהוה*, is used in the account of Saul's first sin in v. 13 of 1 Sam 13 which has been regarded as of "dtr. Herkunft" (Grønbaek 1971: 49); that may well be true, but in the light of our discussion of the two synoptic texts the

simpler explanation is that probably neither Samuel nor the Chr knows those three other sins of Saul. There is, however, one thing which we are sure they both agree which is that the transfer of Saul's kingdom to David is a rather straightforward one.

A more disturbing question is whether these two verses would have been known to the Samuel-Kings editor. Had they been in his source he would almost definitely have to drop them because he still has a lot to say about the end of the Saulide remnants before he wants to see Saul's kingdom handed over into David's hand. Against this possibility, it may be mentioned, is the proposal that the verb **מעל** (v. 13) is used only in special Chr material with no parallel in Samuel-Kings. The two verses are, therefore, "undoubtedly the Chronicler's own composition" (Williamson 1982: 94). This may well be the case. On the other hand, **מעל** is not a rare word in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>68</sup> If Lev. and Num. each have three occurrences of this word and Deut. has one, is it possible that the Chr's source might have at least two here? Behind this question looms a more fundamental one: How much of special Chr material would have been in the Chr's source? If most of the "special" Chr variants in 1 Chr 10.1-12 were (as I have argued) in the Chr's source, is it possible that these two verses of "special" Chr material might have been there as well? It seems to me that this problem may be only the tip of the iceberg. But neither a positive or a negative answer to this question would affect the main arguments in this thesis..

---

<sup>68</sup> It is used in Lev 5.15, 21, 26.40; Num 5.6, 12, 27; Deut 32.51; Josh 7.1, 22.16, 20, 31; Ezek 14.13, 15.8, 17.20, 18.24, 20.27, 39.23, 26; Prov 16.10; Ezra 10.2, 10; Neh 1.8, 13.27; 1 Chr 2.7, 5.25, 10.13; 2 Chr 12.2, 26.16, 18, 28.19, 22, 29.6, 30.7, 36.14.

## CHAPTER TWO

### DAVID'S ACCESS TO KINGSHIP AND THE CAPTURE OF JERUSALEM: 2 SAM 5.1-10 AND 1 CHR 11.1-9, MORE TEXTUAL AND LITERARY LINKS<sup>69</sup>

#### 2.0 The Texts

##### 2 Sam 5.1-10

1. ויבאו כל-שבטין ישראל אל-דוד  
חברונה [ויאמרו] לאמר הננו עצמך  
ובשרך אנחנו:

2. גם-אתמול גם-שלשום בהיות שאול מלך  
[עלינו] אתה \*הייתה \*היית \*מוציא  
(\*\*ה\*מוציא) \*ו\*ה\*מבי (\*\*ה\*\*מביא)  
את-ישראל ויאמר יהוה לך אתה תרעה  
את-עמי את-ישראל ואתה תהיה  
לנניד על-ישראל:

3. ויבאו כל-זקני ישראל אל-המלך חברונה  
ויכרת להם [המלך] דוד ברית בחברון לפני  
יהוה וימשחו את-דוד למלך על-ישראל:

4. בן-שלשים שנה דוד במלכו ארבעים שנה  
מלך:

5. בחברון מלך על-יהודה שבע שנים וששה  
חדשים ובירושלם מלך שלשים ושלש שנה  
על כל-ישראל ויהודה:

6. וילך המלך ואנשיו ירושלם אל-היבסי  
יושב הארץ ויאמר לדוד לאמר לא-תבוא  
הנה [כי אם-הסירך העורים והפסחים  
לאמר לא-יבוא דוד הנה]:

##### 1 Chr 11.1-9

1. ויקבצו [καὶ ἠλθεv] כל-ישראל אל-דוד  
חברונה לאמר הנה עצמך  
ובשרך אנחנו:

2. גם-תמול גם-שלשום [גם] בהיות שאול  
מלך אתה  
(המוציא) (והמביא)  
את-ישראל ויאמר יהוה [אלהיך] לך אתה  
תרעה את-עמי את-ישראל ואתה תהיה  
נניד על [עמי] ישראל:

3. ויבאו כל-זקני ישראל אל-המלך חברונה  
ויכרת להם דוד ברית בחברון לפני  
יהוה וימשחו את-דוד למלך על-ישראל  
[כדבר יהוה ביד-שמואל]:

4. וילך דוד וכל-ישראל ירושלם היא יבוס  
ושם היבوسی ישבי הארץ:  
5. ויאמרו [ישבי יבוס] לדוד לא תבוא הנה

<sup>69</sup> Our interest here is still mainly textual and literary issues. For an up-to-date discussion of the historical aspect of the story, see Schäfer-Lichtenberger (1993) who thinks that David's conquest of Jebusite Jerusalem has no firm historical and archaeological basis and is likely to be a biblical myth. She proposes that the city came into David's possession peacefully.

7. וילכד דויד את-מצדת ציון היא עיר דויד: וילכד דויד את-מצדת ציון היא עיר דויד:
8. ויאמר דויד כל-מכה יבסי ויגע בצנור ואת-הפסחים ואת-העורים \*שנאו \*שנאי נפש דוד על-כן יאמרו עור ופסח לא יבוא אל-הבית: ויאמר דויד כל-מכה יבסי יהיה לראש ולשר ויעל בראשונה יואב בן-צרויה ויהי לראש:
9. וישב דויד במצד [על-כן] קראו-לן עיר דויד: וישב דויד במצד [ה] [ו]יקרא-לה עיר דוד: ויבן [העיר] [מ]סביב מן-המלוא [ועד-הסביב ויואב יהיה את-שאר העיר]:
9. וילך דויד הלוך וגדול ויהוה צבאות עמו: וילך דוד הלוך וגדול ויהוה צבאות עמו:

## 2.1 Preliminary Observations

Again, Tov's MT-LXX parallel aligned text shows that the Greek texts of both versions are very faithful renderings. Just as 1 Chr 10.1-12 is shorter than 1 Sam 31.1-13, so here 1 Chr 11.1-9 is shorter—even shorter!—than its synoptic counterpart 2 Sam 5.1-10.

Text	1 Sam 31.1-13	Retroversion <sup>70</sup>	1 Chr 10.1-12	Retroversion
Number of Words	201	197	178 (23 words, 13% shorter)	182

Text	2 Sam 5.1-10	Retroversion	1 Chr 11.1-9	Retroversion
Number of Words	156	156	127 (29 words, 23% shorter)	121

## 2.2 Samuel Plus: 2 Sam 5.4-5

### 2.2.1 2 Sam 5.1 || 1 Chr 11.1—כל-ישראל/כל-שבטי ישראל—and the Plus

#### 2 Sam 5.4-5

The phrase כל-שבטי ישראל in the Samuel version occurs mainly in the so-called DH<sup>71</sup>. Three of its four appearances in Chr are paralleled by Kings (2 Chr 6.5 || 1 Kgs

<sup>70</sup> Word counted from Tov's MT-LXX parallel aligned electronic text.

<sup>71</sup> Deut 29.20 (LXX<sup>B</sup> has  $\text{ut\omega\nu}$  for שבטי), Josh 24.1; Judg 20.2, 10 (phrase not in LXX<sup>B</sup>), 21.5; 1 Sam 2.28, 10.20; 2 Sam 5.1, 15.10, 19.10, 20.14, 24.2; 1 Kgs 8.16, 11.32, 14.21; 2 Kgs 21.7.



8.16; 2 Chr 12.13 || 1 Kgs 14.21; 2 Chr 33.7 || 2 Kgs 21.7).<sup>72</sup> Except in 2 Chr 11.16, this phrase is never used in special Chr material. However, this unique instance in special Chr material is not fully supported by 2 Par 11.16 which reads *απο φυλων Ισραηλ* lacking the expected *παντων*. The first use of *כל-שבטי ישראל* in the shared text is in Solomon's prayer (1 Kgs 8.16) which refers to Nathan's oracle and the other two are also direct references to it. We have already demonstrated the textual-literary links between 1 Chr 10 and chapters before 1 Sam 19. The only two uses before 1 Sam 19 are in an anti-northern-priesthood (or pro-Zadok) story (1 Sam 2.28) and in a late anti-northern-monarchical speech of Samuel (1 Sam 10.20).<sup>73</sup>

The proliferation of this phrase in DH suggests either its being secondary in 2 Sam 5.1 or Chr's change, depending on whether we take the shared-text or Samuel-Kings as the constraining factor. Although in order to be fair to both variants one should prefer the shared-text as the controlling reference, there are, however, other reasons for preferring Chr's reading which do not seem to have been suggested. Chr's *כל-ישראל* has generally been understood in terms of his pan-Israel interest<sup>74</sup> but simple statistics show that this is may well be a tendency of MT rather than Chr itself.<sup>75</sup> Japhet (1993: 237) thinks that here the Chr is "stressing that the historical point for the kingdom of David is 'all Israel'." However, an alternative understanding is possible and may even be preferable in view of another episode in the life of David. This pan-Israel preference of

---

The only other two places outside Deut-Kings and Chr where this phrase is found are Ezek 48.19 and Zech 9.1 of Deutero-Zechariah which is late and depends upon Ezekiel (Soggin 1989: 407).

<sup>72</sup> All of these parallels are supported by LXX<sup>B</sup>.

<sup>73</sup> Wellhausen's theory of pro- and anti-monarchical sources, despite being questioned in recent years (e.g. O'Brien 1989: 101), appears to me to be still valid. It seems to me that the author of the anti-monarchical speeches of Samuel was not against Israel being ruled by an earthly king in general but kingship in northern Israel in particular. This understanding is in line with the general condemnation of all Israelite (i.e. northern) kings in Samuel-Kings. This (southern) author/redactor approved only the Davidic house as the sole legitimate dynasty of all Israel.

<sup>74</sup> Wellhausen 1878: 172ff; Rudolph 1955: 97; Willi 1972: 161; McKenzie 1985: 42; Japhet, 1993: 236. Although Japhet equates "all the tribes of Israel" with "the northern tribes", if it is "all", it should also include Judah.

<sup>75</sup> See Excursus 2.13 at the end of this chapter.

David to Saul is already lurking in the early stage of David's rise to power. After his defeating Goliath and becoming a commander of a thousand we are told that "*all Israel and Judah* loved David; for he went out and came in before them." (1 Sam 18.16). And after his marrying Michal LXX notes that "*all Israel* [MT: Michael, Saul's daughter] loved him [David]." This love of the whole people of Israel finally found its realisation in their coronation of David in 1 Chr 11.3 here. It thus seems that the "all Israel" in 1 Chr 11.1 is a natural extension of a theme already in 1 Samuel before David became a forced fugitive. This consideration together with the fact that the phrase "all the tribes of Israel" occurs only three times<sup>76</sup> within the shared text of Samuel-Kings weakens the priority of Samuel's reading as generally believed.

McCarter (1984: 130) and McKenzie (1985: 42) adopted Chr's לאמר in the second half of the verse for Sam on the basis of the witness of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, OL and LXX<sup>MN</sup> to Samuel. I tend to side with their preference, especially in view of the fact that ויאמרו לאמר and the similar use of אמר with waw-consecutive imperfect plus an infinitive is found only in non-synoptic material of Samuel-Kings. The SN has the only other occurrence in 2 Sam 20.18 (ותאמר ... לאמר).<sup>77</sup> The story of Elisha has one instance (ויאמר לאמר) in 2 Kings 8.14.

### 2.2.2 2 Sam 5.4-5 (plus) David's Seven and a half Year Saulide Rule of Judah

The following two verses are Samuel pluses:

בן-שלשים שנה דוד במלכו ארבעים שנה מלך:  
 בחברון מלך על-יהודה שבע שנים וששה חדשים  
 ובירושלם מלך שלשים ושלוש שנה על כל-ישראל ויהודה:

When commenting on 1 Chr 11.1-3 Japhet (1993: 236) suggests that 2 Sam 5.4-5 with its note about David's reign over Judah (alone) for seven years and six months was in

<sup>76</sup> 2 Chr 11.6 is excluded because in this verse the phrase is not fully supported by LXX.

<sup>77</sup> Outside Samuel-Kings this use is found only Ex 15.1, Num 20.3 and Zech 2.4.

Chr's *Vorlage* but was "omitted in Chronicles" (238). She thinks that it was Chr's idea of a direct and complete transfer of kingship from Saul to David that occasioned his change of "all the tribes of Israel" to "all Israel". It is difficult to see any substantial difference in the "semantic scope" of the two phrases. Moreover, the secondary nature of these two verses can in fact be supported internally. In a different form, 2 Sam 5.4-5 is also found in 1 Kgs 2.11 (|| 1 Chr 29.27) which concludes the narrative on David but which does not conform to the standard formula of regnal notices in the rest of Kings or Chronicles. 2 Sam 5.4-5, however, follows strictly such a formula not only in its form but also in its position as all the regnal notices in Kings relate to accession to kingship whereas 1 Kings 2.11 (1 Chr 29.27) concludes the David story. The less formulaic 1 Kgs 2.11 (|| 1 Chr 29.27) only adds suspicion along this line.

The *textual fact* is that according to 2 Sam 5.1 it was כל-שבטי ישראל not just the tribe of Judah which came to see David and it was כל-זקני ישראל (v.3) and not just the elders of Judah who anointed David king at Hebron. This is fully congruent with the regnal notice of David in 1 Kgs 2.11 (|| 1 Chr 29.27) which indicates that David was king of all the tribes of Israel at Hebron at the beginning of his reign. The reader would take from 1 Kgs 2.11 (|| 1 Chr 29.27) that David had always been the king of all Israel from the first day of his reign:

And the time that David reigned *over Israel* was forty years; he reigned seven years in Hebron, and thirty-three years in Jerusalem.

Here "Israel" can only mean "all Israel". This might be the source, if not from the same hand, of another similar regnal notice:

... Hebron, where he reigned for seven years and six months. And he reigned thirty-three years in Jerusalem. (1 Chr 3.4)

*Neither notice says that David ruled only the tribe of Judah in Hebron.* This is stated, however, in the regnal notice plus here which has small but momentous differences:

At Hebron he reigned *over Judah* seven years and six months; and at Jerusalem he reigned over *all Israel and Judah* thirty-three years. (2 Sam 5.5)

When compared to 1 Kgs 2.11 (|| 1 Chr 29.27) the breaking down of David's reigning years here in terms of the scope of his rule reads rather like clarification with the effect of allowing seven and a half years for the (northern) Saulide kingdom to expire outside David's rule and intervention. This clarification corresponds to the regnal notice of Ishbosheth three chapters earlier:

Ishbosheth, Saul's son, was forty years old when he began to reign over Israel, and he reigned two years. But the house of Judah followed David. *And the time that David was king in Hebron over the house of Judah was seven years and six months.* (2 Sam 2.10-11)

David's elevation to the throne of Judah is reported several verses earlier in 2 Sam 2.4. The three verses immediately preceding this report a rather artificial episode in that its whole purpose is to arrange for David to settle in Hebron under divine guidance. Thus David was first king of Judah (only) in Hebron for seven years and six months. During this period, Ishbosheth reigned the northern tribes for two years. And then both Abner and Ishbosheth himself were murdered *without* David's involvement. The following considerations suggest the secondary nature of 2 Sam 5.4-5:

1. The consistency between 1 Samuel 18.16 which prepares pan-Israel rule by David, Samuel's last prophecy in 1 Sam 28.17-19 which foretells a transfer of Saul's kingdom directly (i.e. from his hand—**מִיָּדְךָ**) to David and the demise of his house [i.e. he and his sons—**אֶתְּהָ וּבְנָיִךְ**], and the non-formulaic regnal notice about David in the shared tradition (1 Kgs 2.11 || 1 Chr 29.27) which has David as king over Israel for forty years.
2. The link between the Samuel plus and special Samuel material and between Chr and material of the shared-text elsewhere.

Important ancient witnesses—4QSam<sup>a</sup>, OL, *Ant* VII. 53-55—are without these two verses though they are included in MT, LXX, Targum and Peshitta. McKenzie (1985: 43) is not as confident as Ulrich concerning the originality of Chr's text (1978: 62, 193-221) but the former still thinks that Chr follows his *Vorlage* which does not have these

two verses. Japhet (1993), despite the witness of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, thinks that “the omission of II Sam 5.4-5 from the present context of I Chron. 11 is the work of the Chronicler and not the precise reproduction of a *Vorlage*.” (238) Her evidence is 1 Chr 3.4 which mentions the peculiar “seven years and six months”.

Indeed the extra “six months” is peculiar to 1 Chr 3.4 and 2 Sam 5.5 as observed by Japhet, but even if the unity of authorship of 1 Chr 1-9 with the rest of Chr could be taken for granted, which Braun (1979: 53) disputes, the question remains: how could we be so sure that 1 Chr 3.4 is based on 2 Sam 5.5? Some puzzling textual phenomena encourage our doubt: if the author of 1 Chr 1-9 knew the current form of Samuel, why is the family of Eli not mentioned in any of the priestly genealogies? Eli and his sons are not much worse than the rebellious Korah but the latter is given a place in 1 Chr 6.22.<sup>78</sup> Also why would the Chr bother to mention David’s sister Abigail (1 Chr 2.16) who is not mentioned at all in Samuel-Kings? Even if the following question sounds quite impossible, in view of our study of 1 Sam 31 and 1 Chr 10, we plead for the legitimacy of a more basic question: which of 1 Chr 3.4 and 2 Sam 5.5 is the source of which? No doubt 1 Chr 1-9 is late; but could 2 Sam 5.5 be even later, so explaining the variability of its attestations?

2 Sam 5.5 is not quite consistent with 2 Sam 5.1 where it is not just the elders of Judah but the elders of all the tribes of Israel who crowned David at Hebron. It seems to me therefore that 2 Sam 5.5 is original to the text of Samuel but not to the source behind it. Its purpose is to correct an impression of the source that David began his pan-Israel rule at Hebron for seven years and six months. That is why he has to arrange for a prior Hebron anointment by only the tribe of Judah in 2 Sam 2.1-7 and why exactly the same regnal notice has to be stated in 2 Sam 2.11 after that of Ishbosheth’s rule. The regnal notice in 2 Sam 5.5 is not superfluous and is to be read with the first one together

---

<sup>78</sup> Schley’s (1989: 143) proposal that “the excision of the Elides from the Aaronite genealogies in Chronicles probably was the result of the tradition in 1 Sam 2.12-17, 22-25 which depicts the sons of Eli as abusing their priestly preogatives ...” cannot square with Chr’s inclusion of Korah and his descendants.

with the episodes of David's reign over Judah and the death of Abner and Ishbosheth. The effect of such an arrangement is clear enough: David was king of Judah (only) before becoming king of the north<sup>79</sup> and these two Saulide remnants died outside his sovereignty.

### 2.3 Why does the Samuel Version Stress David's Seven Year and Six Months Rule of Judah?

The bracketing of the story of David's access to kingship in 2 Samuel by 2 Sam 2.11 and 2 Sam 5.4-5 has an interesting literary effect—the Saulide kingdom lingered on until it expired of its own accord without David's intervention. That the murder of the two most likely successors to Saul's throne lies within the brackets also suggests interpretation along this line. The dislocation of 2 Sam 2.11 shows how anxious was the author of the story of the final years of the Saulide kingdom to clarify that what finally happened to the house of Saul had nothing to do with David. This interpretation anchors firmly to the author's own remark after the death of Abner in 2 Sam 3.37:

And all the people of all Israel knew that day that it had not been the king's will to slay Abner the son of Ner.<sup>80</sup>

Very shortly after Abner's death Ishbosheth is murdered, in fact a chapter later, in 2 Sam 4.5-7, without David's involvement and almost immediately before his ascent to the throne in 2 Sam 5 (|| 1 Chr 11). 2 Sam 2.11 and 5.5 are attempts to say that before these two Saulides died David had not been conspiring to secure Saul's kingdom. 2 Sam 4.12,

---

<sup>79</sup> Like 2 Sam 2.4, 10, the Succession Narrative also emphasises Judah's loyalty to the house of David: "So all the men of Israel withdrew from David, and followed Sheba the son of Bichri; but the men of Judah followed their king steadfastly from the Jordan to Jerusalem." (2 Sam 20.2) 2 Sam 2 is within what we called the Supplement to the History of Saul and David (see Chapter Four, section 4.2). We shall show in Chapter Five that the SHSD and the SN were probably written by the same writer. The divided loyalty to David might be the real situation at the beginning of David's rule, but the ideal picture of undivided loyalty could be earlier; see Auld (1994: 175) for a discussion of the "real" and the "ideal" in Kings and Chr.

<sup>80</sup> VanderKam (1980) thinks that at the redactional level of the story David is actually blamed for engineering the death of Abner and Ishbosheth (539). Historically, this might have been the case. It seems clear, however, that as it stands the story defends David against such accusation.

where David avenged Ishbosheth's death upon the murderers, is positive "proof" of David's non-implication. It was usual in ancient times for a king to obliterate his political enemies when power was gained, but David was different; so the text suggests!

Samuel's clarification of the scope of David's rule in Hebron would have given a redactor more literary space to clarify how the house of Saul come to an end without David's active involvement. The message of this "historical tuning" is the tacit assertion that David *did not* obtain the kingdom directly from Saul—against the prophecy of Samuel and the will of Yawheh (1 Sam 28.17-19)!—nor from his son Ishbosheth because he reigned over (Northern) Israel for two years (2 Sam 2.10) and it was a Saulide, Abner, who handed his kingdom over to David in a non-military coup. The shared text happens to be more faithful to the prophetic word. Thus, instead of having to interpret 1 Chr 10.13 as Chr's attempt to curtail a long story, one has internal evidence to believe that Chr might as well have had a *Vorlage* in which 1 Sam 28 just precedes 1 Sam 31, since both depict the death of Saul as the direct fulfilment of Samuel's prophecy, and this contradicts the extra information offered by the regnal notice in 2 Sam 5.4-5. The continuity of these two chapters has been cogently argued by Stoebe and others on literary grounds.

The flow of the history as presented in 1 Chr 10.14—11.3 is in perfect harmony with Samuel's last prophecy in 1 Sam 28. Evidence like 1 Samuel's preparation of a complete Davidic rule, Samuel's prophecy in 1 Sam 28, the secondary nature of 2 Sam 5.4-5 and thus the seven and a half year non-Davidic rule after Saul's death all support a literary continuity between 1 Sam 31(1 Chr 10) and 2 Sam 5 (1 Chr 11). This continuity suggests that 2 Sam 1-4 are unlikely to have been in the source of Chr.

## 2.4 References to Nathan's Oracle

### 2.4.1 2 Sam 5.2 || 1 Chr 11.2 and References to Nathan's Oracle<sup>81</sup>

Japhet (1993) thinks that the words “even when Saul was king it was you that led out and brought in Israel’, take their meaning in Chronicles not from the stories of the book of Samuel, but from those episodes which the Chronicler introduces into the story. In this new context all the heroic deeds of David’s mighty men took place in the time of Saul, as did the events described in ch. 12.” (237) Indeed, this phrase refers us not to any events in and after 1 Sam 19 but specifically to 1 Sam 18.16:

But *all Israel and Judah* loved David; for *he went out and came in* before them.

The shared-text of 2 Sam 5.2 and 1 Chr 11.2 have the people of Israel speaking in such a way as if Ishbosheth never existed, or never existed as a king over all Israel and as if Saul was supplanted directly by David, thus fulfilling Samuel’s prophecy in 1 Sam 28.17. They did not seem to know that it was Abner who transferred the kingdom from “the house of Saul” (2 Sam 3.9), from the hand of Ishbosheth to David.

An important textual difference between 2 Sam 5.2 and 1 Chr 11.2 is Chr’s plus עמי. Other textual differences between the two verses are mostly stylistic more than material.<sup>82</sup> It should be noted, though, that the *qere* of two words [marked by \*] in the Sam version is the *ktiv* in the corresponding words in Chr. The extra ם in Chr is probably a dittograph (cf. McKenzie 1985: 42). More important aspects of these synoptic verses are their intra-contextual references which we want to explore now.

The words of the people of Israel here consist of two allusions. The first is unambiguously to 1 Sam 18.13b-16. The second is to a Davidic oracle. We have several

---

<sup>81</sup> Jones (1990: 147) thinks rightly that there was a separate source of Nathan’s prophecy which was correctly identified by the Chr and used by the Dtr. He is not clear, however, on the issue of whether the Chr used this source independently or not. For a literary approach to the oracle, see Eslinger (1993).

<sup>82</sup> Samuel’s אֲתָמֹל is used in 1 Sam 4.7, 10.11, 14.21, 19.7 and 2 Sam 5.2 here. The only other use is in Ps 90.4. Chr’ תָּמֹל is a rather popular form and is used 23 times, mainly in the Pentateuch (12x), Josh (3x), 1 Sam 20.27, 21.6, 2 Sam 3.17, 15.20; 1Kgs 13.5; Job 8.9; Ruth 2.11 and only once in Chr in 1 Chr 11.2.



allusions in the Books of Samuel to a specific oracle delivered to David in which Yahweh promises him he will be the shepherd of the people of Israel. In all the Hebrew Bible, there is only one such oracle in which David is promised to be a נגיד, viz. Nathan's oracle (2 Sam 7.1-17 || 1 Chr 17.1-15), which is alluded to in other parts of Samuel and Chr, and elsewhere only in Ps 78.70-71.

There are minor but interesting textual differences in one of the phrases of this oracle in the parallel versions. The last phrase (2 Sam 7.8) on the election of David as prince over the people of Israel reads:

... להיות נגיד על-עמי על-ישראל:

εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραηλ

Note the extra על which is absent from the counterpart of 1 Chr 17.7 and which separates the appositive ישראל from עמי. The appositional relationship between עמי and ישראל in 1 Chr's version of Nathan's oracle looks a more natural reading:

... להיות נגיד על עמי ישראל:

εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν μου Ἰσραηλ

#### 2.4.2 First Samuel Reference (1 Sam 25.30)

2 Sam 5.2 is not the first allusion to Nathan's oracle in Samuel; the first allusion is a long way back in 1 Sam 25.30 from the mouth of Abigail:

והיה כִּי־יעשה יהוה לאדני ככל אשר־דבר  
את־הטובה עליך וצוך לנגיד על־ישראל:

Note the absence of עמי before ישראל. In all likelihood the author of the so-called History of David's Rise used a source in which the Nathan oracle plays an essential part.

#### 2.4.3 Second Samuel Reference (2 Sam 3.18)

The second allusion to Nathan's oracle is from the mouth of Abner when he conspired with the elders of Israel to transfer power from Ishbosheth to David:

... for *Yahweh has promised David*, saying, 'By the hand of my servant David I will save my people Israel from the hand of the Philistines, and from the hand of all their enemies.' (2 Sam 3.18)

This is an allusion to Nathan's oracle because apart from it (especially 2 Sam 7.9-11 || 1 Chr 17.8-10: "... and have cut off all your enemies from before you."), nowhere can one find a similar oracle to David in which national security is promised. However, deliverance from the hand of the Philistines is not mentioned in Nathan's oracle; it is part of Samuel's oracle concerning Saul:

... Yahweh had revealed to Samuel: "Tomorrow about this time I will send to you a man from the land of Benjamin, and you shall anoint him *to be prince over my people Israel* [לנגיד על-עמי ישראל]. *He shall save my people from the hand of the Philistines*; for I have seen the affliction of my people, because their cry has come to me." (1 Sam 9.15-16)

In the Saul oracle [NB before 1 Sam 19] we have the נגיד phrase exactly identical to that which is used in Nathan's oracle in 1 Chr 17.7. I have already shown in chapter one that 1 Chr 10 has close affinity with 1 Sam 28 and stories in 1 Samuel before 1 Sam 19. This affinity may suggest that the plus עמי in 2 Chr 11.2 could have been original.

It seems that in 2 Sam 3.18 Abner has produced an amalgamated form of Yahweh's promise to David by blending part of Samuel's oracle concerning Saul and part of Nathan's oracle concerning David. This also shows that the so-called History of Saul's Rise (HSR), if we may call it so, was present with Nathan's oracle in Samuel's *Vorlage*.

#### 2.4.4 Third Samuel Reference (2 Sam 5.2)

2 Sam 5.2, the verse we are comparing with 1 Chr 11.2, is the third reference in the Books of Samuel to Nathan's oracle:

ואתה תהיה לנגיד על-ישראל:

Note again the absence of עמי before ישראל in Samuel's reading. Chr's reading has an "extra" עמי which is closer to the Nathan oracle than Samuel's reading as this word also appears in the shared text of that oracle.

#### 2.4.5 Fourth Samuel Reference (2 Sam 6.21)

The fourth Samuel reference to Nathan's oracle is in 2 Sam 6.21. It is made by David himself as he reminds Michal the daughter of Saul about Yahweh's oracle which he had received:

ויאמר דוד אל-מיכל לפני יהוה [ארקד ברוך יהוה] אשר בחר-בי  
מאביך ומכל-ביתו לצות אתי נגיד על-עם  
יהוה על-ישראל ושחקתי לפני יהוה:

נגיד על-עמי על-ישראל is the corresponding phrase to נגיד על-עם יהוה על-ישראל in Samuel's version of Nathan's oracle. Note again the absence of עמי before ישראל. This is part of a few verses (2 Sam 6.20b-23) which are not found in Chr. While the second half refers the reader to Nathan's oracle, the first half verse alludes to Samuel's oracle in 1 Sam 16.1. Not only does the phrase ... אשר בחר-בי מאביך ומכל-ביתו remind us of Yahweh's rejection in his oracle to Samuel, כל-ביתו assumes that the sons of Saul are rejected as well along with Saul and thus indicates the author's knowledge of what is going on between the house of David and the house of Saul from 2 Sam 1 on to what befalls Ishbosheth, Saul's son, who reigned over "all Israel" except Judah (2 Sam 2.8-11).

In the last chapter when comparing 1 Sam 31.6 and 1 Chr 10.6 we noted that כל-ביתו is missing from the casualty report of the house of Saul in Samuel's version. Here, in a verse not paralleled in Chr, we have David mentioning Yahweh's election of himself above Saul and above כל-ביתו. It may well be just coincidence that the missing phrase from 1 Sam 31.6 is found in 2 Sam 6.21 because the development of the story of the fate of the house of Saul is exactly to show how David is chosen over against Saul and his house. But there is a weak possibility not only that Samuel's source has כל-ביתו in 1

---

<sup>83</sup> Reconstructed from ὀρχήσομαι εὐλογητὸς κύριος in LXX<sup>B</sup>. MT has suffered haplography when a scribe skipped ברוך ארקד from the first יהוה to the second. See McCarter (1984: 185).

Sam 31.6, but also that the author who wrote the tragic stories of its members had used it for his own purpose in the row between David and Michal.

## 2.5 Pattern of References to Nathan's Oracle in Samuel-Kings and Chr

We can now list this specific reference to Israel in all the allusions to Nathan's oracle in Samuel-King and Chr:<sup>84</sup>

In Samuel-Kings:

- |    |  |                             |
|----|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. | Oracle concerning Saul (1 Sam 9.16)        | <u>לנגיד על-עמי ישראל</u>   |
| 2. | Nathan's oracle (2 Sam 7.8    1 Chr 17.7): | להיות נגיד על-עמי על-ישראל: |
|    | Cf. also 2 Sam 7.10 (   1 Chr 17.9):       | לעמי לישראל:                |
| 3. | 1 Sam 25.30:                               | לנגיד על-ישראל:             |
| 4. | 2 Sam 5.2 (   1 Chr 11.2):                 | ואתה תהיה לנגיד על-ישראל:   |
| 5. | 2 Sam 6.21:                                | נגיד על-עם יהוה על-ישראל    |
| 6. | Solomon's prayer (1 Kgs 8.16    2 Chr 6.6) | להיות על-עמי ישראל:         |

In Chr:

- |    |                                      |                                 |
|----|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. | Nathan's oracle (1 Chr 17.7):        | <u>להיות נגיד על עמי ישראל:</u> |
|    | Cf. also 2 Sam 7.10 (   1 Chr 17.9): | <u>על עמי ישראל:</u>            |
| 2. | 1 Chr 11.2:                          | ואתה תהיה נגיד על עמי ישראל:    |
| 3. | Solomon's prayer (2 Chr 6.6)         | להיות על-עמי ישראל:             |

### 2.5.1 Comments

- In Chr's version of Nathan's oracle ישראל stands in apposition to עמי suggesting that the two terms "Israel" and "my people" have identical reference. 2 Sam 7.8 has a different construction (על-עמי על-ישראל) which is also found in 2 Sam 6.21

---

<sup>84</sup> For a detailed computer assisted analysis and comparison of the two versions of Nathan's oracle see Talstra and Verheij (1988).

על-עמי (על-עם יהוה על-ישראל).<sup>85</sup> Though grammatically the construction על-עמי על-ישראל may indicate an appositional relationship between the two nouns,<sup>86</sup> the Hebrew Bible usually does not repeat the preposition for the phrase “my, your people Israel” (Gibson, 1994: 40). In fact the repeated use of על can also be non-appositional.<sup>87</sup> And the two nouns could therefore have different referents. The decisive question is whether the author/editor of 2 Sam 7.8 intends to include “Israel”, the northern tribes, in “my people” or not.<sup>88</sup> 2 Sam 1.12, however, suggests that “the people of Yahweh” is distinct from “the house of Israel”.<sup>89</sup> It seems to me, the best we can say is that, in view of some evidence of the non-identical reference of “the people of Yahweh” and “Israel” in Samuel and in view of the possibility of non-appositional use of ... על- ... על-, the construction על-ישראל על-עמי renders the appositional relationship between עמי and ישראל ambiguous if not questionable.

2. In the books of Samuel (also DH), Judah is the favoured tribe of Yahweh and stands apart from the northern tribes. It may be the case that the separation of עמי and

<sup>85</sup> Other examples of appositional use of repeated על with על-עם in the the DH: Judg 18.27, 1 Sam 15.1, and 2 Sam 6.21. Thus, including 2 Sam 7.8, DH has four instances of such construction which is a rather unique phenomenon as this construction is not used elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>86</sup> E.g. Gen. 21.10: לבני ליצחק.

<sup>87</sup> E.g. in Jer 25.1: ... הדבר אשר-היה על-ירמיהו על-כל-עם יהודה ... Here obviously, “Jeremiah” and “all the people of Judah” cannot stand in apposition.

<sup>88</sup> In Samuel-Kings, “Israel” usually does not include “Judah”. This can be seen from the mentioning of Israel and Judah together, e.g. in 1 Sam 17.52, 18.16, 2 Sam 3.10, 5.5, 11.11, 12.8, 21.2, 24.1; 1 Kgs 1.35, 2 Kgs 3.9, 17.13. It is interesting to note that all these are special Samuel-Kings material not shared by Chr. Special Chr material mentions “(all) Israel and Judah” only in the Hezekiah narrative, in 2 Chr 30.1, 6, 31.6, 34.9, 21. For a comprehensive study of the Chr’s concept of Israel see Williamson (1977: 87-131) and for the transition of the idea of Israel from a national and political to a cultural and religious concept, see Williamson (1989).

<sup>89</sup> 2 Sam 1.12 reads:

And they mourned and wept and fasted until evening for Saul and for Jonathan his son and for the people of Yahweh and for the house of Israel, for they had fallen by the sword.

ויספדו ויבכו ויצמו עד-הערב  
על-שאול ועל-יהונתן בנו  
ועל-עם יהוה ועל-בית  
ישראל כי נפלו בחרב:

This betrays the author’s belief that “the people of Yahweh” is not the same as “the house of Israel” or the northern tribes.

ישראל by על in Samuel's reading clarifies David's separate rule of Judah, Yahweh's people *first* and then Israel *as well* and so in agreement with the regnal notice in 2 Sam 2.11 and 2 Sam 5.4-5.

3. The three allusions to Nathan's oracle in Samuel, 1 Sam 25.30, 2 Sam 5.2, 6.21, go a step further by dropping עמי altogether. The redactor probably did not want to call the northern tribes the people of Yahweh before David began his pan-Israel rule and before Nathan's oracle which legitimises David as the shepherd of Israel *as well*. Nathan's oracle is probably part and parcel of the same ideology of the southern messianist in Ps 78<sup>90</sup> who preached that David was chosen as his servant "to be the *shepherd of Jacob his people, of Israel his inheritance.*" (v. 71)<sup>91</sup> Judah had always been following David and Judeans were his subjects by default. David's rule over them needed no legitimation.

---

<sup>90</sup> Campbell's (1979) suggestion that Ps 78 is a 10th century work does not seem to be right. The psalm depicts a total and complete rejection of the northern tribes (vv. 59-67) which fits better the event of 722 BC. V. 69 betrays a kind of blind faith in the security of Mount Zion and its sanctuary which was probably the product of optimism during Hezekiah's reign after the unsuccessful campaign of the Assyrians in 701 BC.

<sup>91</sup> Ps 78 shares the same Davidic ideology of Nathan's oracle. This psalm is a Judean royalist's claim of Yahweh's rejection of the northern exodus traditions—a rejection confirmed in 722BC. *Contra* Carroll (1971) who suggests that "Ps. lxxviii may be regarded as the charter myth explaining how Judah was the rightful heir of the exodus movement" (150). Rather one should understand Ps 78 as preaching a "shift of paradigm" and the ideology of Yahweh's promise to David and his election of Zion (Jerusalem) to justify his claim of a Davidic leadership for the fallen north. The psalmist recites the exodus as a rebellious history of Ephraim and in retrospect sees in it the doomed end of the northern monarchy. This explains why the passover—the commemorative meal of the exodus—was never celebrated in Judah *except* during the unification campaign of Hezekiah and Josiah (2 Chr 30-35; cf 2 Kgs 23.21-23). These two kings might have attempted an amalgamation of the two election ideologies of the north and the south—exodus and Yahweh's promise to David—as the ideological basis for their pan-Israel campaign. And the author of Chr's account of Hezekiah was probably a supporter of this campaign and the Chr himself a sympathiser as is shown by his inclusive concept of Israel (see Williamson 1977), whereas the Dtr was likely an opponent of a south-north unification in the post-exilic time who saw the northern monarchy as the fruit of apostasy and Samaria as the centre of Israel's religious syncretism (with a foreign woman in control!) and her kings as the persecutors of Yahweh's prophets. DH "represents the earliest criticism of Samaritan practice" (Cogan 1988: 290). The Dtr might even be responsible for the beginning of the Samaritanisation of the history of the northern tribes in general and their remnants in particular (2 Kgs 17) and DH may be regarded as a document which samaritanises the north to justify a separatist approach to the identity crisis in the post-exilic community. Ideological conflicts may be one of main reasons for the production of two different histories of Israel in Samuel-Kings and Chr. See Noth (1966: 132-144) for the relation of Jerusalem and older Israelite traditions.

4. Only in Kings' version of Solomon's prayer is עמי used when Nathan's oracle is referred to. In this case either the constraining force of the shared-text is at work or the redactor now feels that since under Solomon there is only one people of God, one Israel, the use of "Israel" in the pan-Israel sense is now appropriate.
5. Chr's version of Nathan's oracle or the references to it consistently have ישראל standing in apposition to עמי. It is difficult to attribute this consistency to the Chr since 1 Sam 9.16 has the same form. It is interesting to note that only in what we call the Supplement to the History of Saul and David (see Chapter Four) do we have a *consistent* repeated use of על.
6. Interestingly, despite his interest in David, Chr never alludes to the prince phrase of the Nathan oracle apart from here in the synoptic 1 Chr 11.2 through it refers to the building of the temple in 1 Chr 22. The received view about the relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chr would put it that this is because Chr has removed the HDR from his source. This explanation cannot square with the fact of the absence from Chr of Samuel's fourth allusion in 2 Sam 6.21 (David's words to Michal). 2 Sam 6.20-23 has no corresponding parallel in Chr but the first 20 verses ahead of it are shared by Chr in a slightly different form. The theory that the Chr removed the HDR does not seem to be able to account for the absence of a parallel of 2 Sam 6.20-23 in his historical work, as these few verses in no way contradict the subject matter of Chr. We may have here a case of secondary stories built around the Nathan Oracle unknown to the Chr.

#### 2.5.2 Why did the Elders of Israel want David to be their King?

From 2 Sam 5.2 (|| 1 Chr 11.2) alone, one could never tell that there had been a *coup d'état* against a Saulide king behind the action of the elders of Israel. Also from 1 Sam 18.15-16 and 28b, where we are told all Israel loved David, the reader expects that one day all Israel will push David to the throne for the leadership which he demonstrated at this early stage of his career. The elders "quote" 1 Sam 18.16 to justify their action.

Abner, however, tells the reader something new, which is that “for some time past you [the elders] have been seeking David as king over you” (2 Sam 3.17). This may well be true in the minds of the elders but nowhere in Samuel prior to Abner’s disclosure of the elders’ preference of David to a Saulide has the reader been told they “have been seeking David as king”. Abner’s use of the not-yet-delivered Nathan oracle is meant as much to remind the readers of this oracle they might have read elsewhere as to be his persuasive tactics.

In contrast to Abner’s *coup*, the elders, when seeing David, used a different rationale (2 Sam 5.2 || 1 Chr 11.2) for their action—(1) their bond with David, (2) their recognition of David’s leadership (1 Sam 18.16) even when Saul was king, and (3) Yahweh’s promise to David as “prince over Israel” in Nathan’s oracle. Whereas Abner (2 Sam 3.18) picks up the part of the promise of national security in Nathan’s oracle, the elders of Israel are more interested in David as the divinely designated successor to Saul’s throne. The elders of Israel and Abner do not seem to be singing the same tune. One wonders whether they had met Abner and listened to him! The elders of Israel seem to know why they wanted David to be king better than Abner himself. Joab’s conspiracy thus looks very artificial, and is unnecessary as far as 2 Sam 5.2 is concerned. It would also be narratorially not necessary with the death of Saul and his sons (“you [i.e. Saul] and your sons” in 1 Sam 28.19b).

#### 2.6 2 Sam 5.3 || 1 Chr 11.3—and the Chr plus כדבר יהוה ביד-שמואל

McKenzie (1985) thinks that “it is impossible to determine whether it [Chr’s last phrase] was introduced by Chr or was already found in his *Vorlage*.”(42) The careful reader might think that שמואל should really be read as נתן because it was Nathan rather than Samuel who mediated Yahweh’s oracle to David. One could therefore reasonably conjecture that the Chr probably felt uneasy about an allusion to an oracle which appears half a dozen chapters later in his work and so had to tell the reader that Samuel too had a



similar oracle for David! There is, however, a better explanation. This Chr plus, in fact, refers the readers to 1 Sam 28.17 in which Samuel said to Saul:

Yahweh has done to you as he spoke by me; for Yahweh has torn the kingdom *out of your hand*, and given it to your neighbour, David.

This important verse suggests that there was a story in which Saul's dynasty was to transfer directly to David.

Thus the first three verses of the parallel text allude to Nathan's not-yet-revealed oracle and use it to understand Samuel's prediction. Samuel did not say from Saul's house but from his hand, i.e. directly. Again we have hint of a probable source in which not very much narratorial material comes in between this posthumous oracle of Samuel (1 Sam 28) and 2 Sam 5.2. Reading this prophecy of Samuel's side by side with the story of Abner's conspiracy, Samuel sounds as if he did not know it was not as directly from the hand of Saul as he thought, but rather indirectly from the hand of Ishbosheth helped by Abner's conspiracy!

Japhet contends that the Chr plus "according to the word of Yahweh by Samuel" in v.3 is a Chr addition. This is possible; but equally possible is its originality to his source because Samuel foretold a direct transfer of kingship from Saul to David in 2 Sam 28.17-19. The effectiveness of Samuel's word is already affirmed in 1 Sam 3.19.<sup>92</sup> Here again, like 1 Chr 10, we have Chr's text corresponding to 1 Sam 28 and stories before 1 Sam 19.

Japhet (1993: 237) also suggests that 1 Chr 11.1-3 "are fully accounted for only in their original context [i.e. Samuel], ... ." First she believes that the words "we are your flesh and bone" are an overstatement. As a matter of fact both versions overstate, because to be "the flesh and bone" of a tribe is to be a kinsman of its members (2 Sam 19.12). And only the tribe of Judah should say so, but it is all the tribes in both versions. It

---

<sup>92</sup> This verse, in my opinion, should join 2.21. The clause "And Samuel grew" appears in 2.21, 26 and 3.19 and is probably resumptive in 3.19, showing the secondary character of the oracle against the house of Eli and probably the whole narrative about Eli and his house as well.

seems that this overstatement should be understood more as a persuasive device than matter of fact. In this light it is fully justifiable especially when read along side the love of “all Israel and Judah” for David in 1 Sam 18.16. Japhet also believes that the title “king” in v. 3 is premature. But “king” has also been applied prematurely to David in 2 Sam 3.24 etc.<sup>93</sup> The simpler explanation is that David is always “the king” to both the author and the first readers. David is anointed as king as early as 1 Sam 16. The ascription of “the king” to David, rather, requires a rather swift transfer of power to him as predicted by Samuel in 2 Sam 28.17-19.

#### 2.7 2 Sam 5.6 || 1 Chr 11.4: דויד וכל-ישראל || המלך ואנשיו

Japhet takes it, rightly, that “David and his men” is almost a technical term. In the form of דויד ואנשיו, it appears in 1 Sam 22.6 [דויד ואנשים אשר אתו], 23.5 8, 13, 24, 26 (2x); 24.3, 4, 23; 25.20; 27.8; 29.2; 30.1, 3. In the form of אנשי דויד it appears in 1 Sam 23.3, 24.5, 2 Sam 19.42, 21.17. The interesting phenomenon is that this phrase or its equivalents appear only from 1 Sam 22.6, and mainly in the HDR, but *never* in the shared-texts or texts (1 Sam 28 and before 1 Sam 19) with which 1 Chr 10 has links nor elsewhere in Chr. When this phrase is mentioned in 2 Sam 5.21, the corresponding 1 Chr 14.12 has “David” only.<sup>94</sup> These data are suggestive to Japhet (240) of “David’s strength as chieftain of a military group.” But 1 Sam 22.2 already explains their origin: these are in fact his family and some four hundred social outcasts rather than a military group. It seems to me that the author of HDR purposefully dissociates David from any military groups, especially from those of Saul’s army, to avoid the suspicion of a conspiracy.

<sup>93</sup> E.g. 2 Sam 3.32, 33, 36,37,38 and 2 Sam 4.8.

<sup>94</sup> “David and his men” is attested in 2 Mss, LXX<sup>L</sup>; and Syriac has “King David and his men”.

### 2.7.1 2 Sam 5.6bβγ, 8βγ—the Problem of the Samuel Plus “the Blind and the Lame”

Scholars so far cannot reach a consensus concerning the purpose of these two Samuel text pluses.<sup>95</sup> It seems to me that the major obstacle, as will be shown below, is due to the acceptance of the textual priority of Samuel-Kings over Chr and an insufficient understanding of a major theme in Samuel-Kings. Floß's (1987) detailed redactional study of 2 Sam 5.6-9 begins with Noth's view of the Chr's use of Samuel-Kings (16) and rules out the possibility of a different source at the start:

Der Chr benutzte also für diese Textteile 2 Sam 5,6-9. Sofern er das nicht getan, sondern auf eine andere, jetzt verloren gegangene Quelle zurückgegriffen hätte, so müßte diese Quelle jedoch in diese Punkten mit 2 Sam 5,6-9 vollends übereingestimmt haben. Die weitere Auswertung des synoptischen Vergleichs wird jedoch zeigen, daß die letzterwogene Möglichkeit auszuschließen ist, wie bereits die Abweichungen in 1 Chr 11 gegenüber 2 Sam 5 zeigen können. (16-7)

Chr commentators before him (e.g. Rudolph 1955, Myer 1965, Williamson 1982) and after him (Japhet 1993) adopt basically the same view. The results of Floß's study suggest to him that David and the Samuel redactor have different aims: David wants a “greater peace” for the ark but the redactor wants a greater peace for David. The story of David's search for a place to accommodate the ark was transformed by the Dtr into a “conquest report” (Eroberungsbericht) (17). Thus a religious act was transformed into a military report.<sup>96</sup> Floß's study treats the redactional issue as more or less a local problem and thus misses the most important textual and literary links of the peculiar references to “the blind and the lame” in Samuel's text with its wider context. This is a common problem with some of the works done on this text of Samuel with attention sometimes focused on details like the meaning or etymology of the Hebrew word *šinnôr*.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> The problem received attention in Bressan (1944), Stoebe (1957), Glück (1966), Brunet (1979a, b), McCarter (1984), Floß's (1987), and Japhet (1993), Schäfer-Lichtenberger (1993) and Holm-Nielsen (1993).

<sup>96</sup> From this perspective, Chr's version is closer to the original intention. However, Floß has no interest in what he thinks to be a even later version of the story.

<sup>97</sup> For the latest discussion, see Kleven (1994).

Again an important observation about Chr's version is available from Williamson (1982) who notes with caution that "the narrative itself as presented in Chronicles is straightforward by comparison with Samuel" (98). The absence of the Samuel pluses from Chr is usually understood as an omission by the Chr and has been explained as due to the fact that the Chr did not understand their meaning "wie es uns ja auch geht" (Rudolph, 1955: 99). This explanation is followed uncritically by McKenzie (1985: 44) and Braun (1986: 154-55) but questioned by Williamson (1982) who, not satisfied with the usual blaming of the Chr for his lack of understanding of his text, recommends reserving judgment:

Again, it is usually suggested that the references to 'the blind and the lame' and to the *šinnôr* ('water-shaft?') were omitted by the Chronicler because he no longer understood them; while this is possible, we cannot be sure that it represents anything more than presumption on our part, or that the text of Samuel lay before him in its present form. It seems best, therefore, to reserve judgment on these matters for the time being (98).

His allowance for the possibility that a different text<sup>98</sup> of Samuel lay before the Chr is something we shall soon take up when we attempt a new explanation.

Japhet's commentary is probably the best effort at a solution. Nevertheless she, like those before her, cannot escape the spell of de Wette and starts almost straightaway to understand more about how Chr changed his source than about the meaning or the purpose of these obscure references. The expected conclusion, popular among Chr scholars before her since Noth, is that "the changes, and especially the omissions, are the work of the Chronicler" (239). Her solution, however, is not a postulate of a careless Chr or a less intelligent Chr (Rudolph), but the Chr's "editing characteristic method". Since the change in Chr conforms to this method exhibited elsewhere, therefore it must be the Chr's change. This can properly be said to be an alternative way of expressing the

---

<sup>98</sup> McCarter (1984: 135) thinks that these two pluses were shorter in their original, but his reconstruction retains all the basic elements..

consensus and cannot be called a new solution. She does, however, wisely suspend judgement on the Chr's motive:

... it is uncertain whether the Chronicler's motive was only a wish to clarify a difficult story, or a more polemical stand *vis-à-vis* his source.

For some scholars the purpose of the use of "the blind and the lame" diverge on details but converge on the defensive function of these handicapped people.<sup>99</sup> We have suggestions like using the blind and the lame to scorn David (Abright 1922), protection by magic and sorcery (Heller 1965), ritual defence (Brunet 1979), as a taunt expressing confidence on the part of the Jebusites and their contempt for David and his men (Stoebe 1957). McCarter (1984: 138) discusses all these views but he himself seems to be unable to adopt any one of them. Most recently Schäfer-Lichtenberger (1993: 199ff) suggests that the references to these infirms reflects an agreement of David with the city to guarantee possession of her subjects, whatever their physical condition.

Thus neither Samuel nor Chr scholarship has provided a consensus concerning the textual situation of these two enigmatic references to "the blind and the lame" or its meaning.

### 2.7.2 Excursus: Who is Eli's father in 1 Sam 2.28, 30, 31?

The episode of the prophecy from a "man of God" against the house of Eli and the house of his father (1 Sam 2.27-3.15) is secondary<sup>100</sup> and like the prophecy of another anonymous "man of God" (1 Kgs 13.1-3) a *vaticinium post eventum* (McCarter 1980: 93, Dequeker 1986: 96). The difficult part of this prophecy is the referent of the phrase "the house of your [i.e. Eli's] father" (1 Sam 2.27, 28, 30, 31). Cross (1973: 195-98) following Wellhausen (1878: 142-43) suggests that the prophecy represents the

---

<sup>99</sup> This is the view espoused by Josephus (*Ant.* 7.61), Kimchi, Hertzberg (1929), Caird (1953), Ravenna (1956), McKane (1963), Ackroyd (1977).

<sup>100</sup> It has been "reworked over" (Mauchline 1971: 54) and is more likely a "nachträglicher Einschub" (Stoebe 1973: 117).

(Aaronite) Zadokites' claim of priesthood over against the Mosaic (or Mushite) priestly family. Schley (1989: 143-44) disagrees with Cross's identification of the Zadokites with Aaron on the ground that their rivals serving in Bethel were "certainly Aaronites". Following Baudissin's (1889) suggestion of the Aaronite origin of Shiloh's Elide priesthood Schley rightly suggests that the link between Eli and Aaron is "through the occurrence of the name Phineas for the illustrious sons of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, as well as for Phineas, the corrupt son of Eli". (144).

The text seems to me to support an Aaronite origin of Eli. First, nowhere in the Pentateuch do we have Yahweh's instructions stipulating that Moses and his descendants should (1) go up to Yahweh's altar, (2) burn incense, (3) wear an ephod, and (4) be given Yahweh's holocausts from the people of Israel, as mentioned in 1 Sam 2.28.<sup>101</sup> Whereas we can easily find pertinent statutes concerning Aaron and his sons: (1) "priesthood shall be theirs by perpetual statute" (Ex 29.9), (2) Aaron was to burn "a perpetual incense before Yahweh throughout your [Aaron's] generations" (Ex 30.8, cf Num 16.40), (3) the ephod belonged to Aaron and his sons (Ex 29.5-9), and finally (4) the breast and the thigh of an offered animal were given "to Aaron the priest and to his sons, as a perpetual due from the people of Israel" (Lev 7.34).

But can we be more precise? Has the author of the prophecy taken a view of his time concerning the *immediate* father of Eli for granted? Aaron had four sons. Two of them—Nadab and Abihu—"died before Yahweh when they offered unholy fire before Yahweh in the wilderness of Sinai; and they had no children. So Eleazar and Ithamar served as priests in the lifetime of Aaron their father." (Num 4.4, cf. 1 Chr 24.2) And only Eleazar was given a genealogy in 1 Chr 5.30-41 which traces Jehozadak back to Zadok, to Eleazar and then to Aaron. In Josephus (*Ant.* v 361) and in the Midrash (Yalk. Shof. 68)

---

<sup>101</sup> Except perhaps Moses's blessing of the tribe of Levi ( Deut 33.8-11) which sees Moses as the hero of the Levites and which, in agreement with Deut (see Emerton 1962), contends that all Levites are priests. It spells out the priestly rights of the Levites but does not uphold Moses as the founder of a priesthood. This is Cross's "proof-text" for the Mushite origin of Elide priesthood. (Cross 1973: 197).

Eli is classified as an Ithamarite.<sup>102</sup> Dequeker (1986: 96) takes this as authentic and uses Num 25.12-13 to clarify the prophecy of the man of God in 1 Sam 2.27-36 making it a polemic against the Ithamar line of priesthood. This association, however, contradicts other traditions. According to 4 Ezra 1.2-3, Eli belongs to the family of Eleazar and the books of Joshua and Judges also suggest a connection of the Shilohite priesthood with Eleazar, son of Aaron, serving as priest at Shiloh (Josh 19.51, 21.1-2). In the books of Joshua and Judges the house of God is at Shiloh<sup>103</sup> and Eleazar and his son the administering priests.<sup>104</sup> Phinehas the son of Eleazar, whose name reminds us of the name of a son of Eli in the prophecy against the house of Eli and Eli's father (1 Sam 2.34), was in charge of the ark of the covenant of God (Judg 20.27-28). Thus, we have to conclude that the biblical evidence which links Eli and Shiloh directly to Eleazar son of Aaron is overwhelming. (NB. We are talking about traditions written down and not history.)

In the Hebrew Bible, only Chr offers an indirect link between Eli and Ithamar in 1 Chr 24.2 by suggesting that Ithamar was the forefather of Ahimelech whose father was Abiathar (1 Chr 18.16 || 2 Sam 8.17 || 2 Sam 20.25, note however no forefathers are mentioned in the last text). Yet this link was rejected by the author of 2 Sam 20.25 in which we have "Zadok and Abiathar" instead of "Zadok the son of Ahitub and Ahimelech the son of Abiathar" as in 2 Sam 8.17. 2 Sam 20.23-26 should have replaced 2 Sam 8.15-18 from which the former is derived, but (fortunately!) we have both.

As a matter of fact the prophecy of the man of God in 1 Sam 2.27-36 legitimises Zadok by his faithfulness<sup>105</sup> and not by virtue of his genealogical link with any ancient priestly family. Gunneweg suggests that in 2 Sam 8.17 we have an attempt to legitimize

---

<sup>102</sup> Dequeker 1986: 99.

<sup>103</sup> Josh 18.1, 8, 9, 10; 19.51; 21.2; 22.9, 12, Judg 18.31; 21.12, 19, 21.

<sup>104</sup> Josh 14.1; 17.4; 19.51; 21.1; 22.13; 31, 32; 24.33; Judg 20.28.

<sup>105</sup> The Zadokites were given the priesthood (Ezek 40.46, 43.19) for their faithfulness (44.15, 48.11).

Zadok as a descendent of Eli via Ahitub! This is easily refuted by Dequeker (1986) who contends, rightly, that “any reference to the house of Eli would have been a dishonour, as in the case of Abiathar at the time of his defeat by Solomon.” (97)

However, Dequeker’s own explanation that 2 Sam 8.17 is “a gloss, referring to the Zadokite genealogy of 1 Chron v” (97) is not convincing because 2 Sam 8.17 is simply not a cross-reference and the same text is found in 1 Chr 18.16. 2 Sam 8.17 is original to the books of Samuel and it provides a link between Zadok and Aaron via Ahitub.<sup>106</sup> However, this connection between Zadok and Ahitub is missing from 2 Sam 20.25b which also parallels 2 Sam 8.17 (|| 1 Chr 18.16) which is in the shared text. It therefore looks very likely that 2 Sam 20.23-26 is a reworked version of 8.15-18 with the purpose of dissociating Zadok’s connection with Aaron as suggested in 2 Sam 8.17. This break with the Aaronite tradition is complete with the introduction of Melchizedek (Gen 14.18-20)—the Jerusalem based *pre-Aaronite* priesthood—which is more ancient and superior to the Aaronite priesthood by being associated with Abraham who gave Melchizedek a tenth of “all”, not just of the produce of the land as stipulated in the law.<sup>107</sup>

The pro-Zadok documents (e.g. Samuel-Kings and Ezekiel) never link Zadok to Aaron and they never mention “sons of Aaron”.<sup>108</sup> This could be explained sociologically (and synchronically) in terms of struggle for power or ideological conflicts instead of (diachronically) in terms of the institutional evolution of the ancient Israelite priesthood. Chr’s genealogy for Zadok (1 Chr 5.30-41) and that of Ezra (7.1-5) were probably

---

<sup>106</sup> Gunneweg (1965: 104f.) is therefore not right to understand 2 Sam 8.17 as an attempt to legitimize Zadok as a descendant of Eli. And although Dequeker’s objection is valid, he fails to notice the parallel between 2 Sam 8.17 and 1 Chr 18.16.

<sup>107</sup> For the link between Zadok and Melchizedek see Rowley (1950).

<sup>108</sup> בני אהרן are mentioned only in Lev, Num, Chr and Neh: Lev 1.7, 3.13, 6.14, 7.10, 7.33, 9.9, 10.1, 10.16, 16.1, 21.1; Num 3.2, 3.3, 10.8; 1Chr 6.3, 6.50, 6.54, 6.57, 15.4, 23.28, 23.32, 24.1, 24.1, 24.31; 2Chr 13.9, 13.10, 26.18, 29.21, 31.19, 35.14, 35.14; Neh 12.47.



aimed at its acceptance by both “Judah and Benjamin”<sup>109</sup> with some northern remnants from the tribe Benjamin.<sup>110</sup> The pro-Zadok author, however, probably rejected any such agenda for the inclusion of the northern cultic personnel based on Aaron on the ground that they were not genuine Levites (!) (1 Kgs 12.31)<sup>111</sup> or that they were Levites but supporters of Jeroboam’s revolt (Ezek 48.11).<sup>112</sup>

The main purpose of the prophecy against Eli in 1 Sam 2.27-36 is to justify the termination of the Aaronite priesthood and the beginning of a new line of Jerusalemite priesthood based on the house of Zadok.<sup>113</sup> It was the result of (some of) the Zadokites’s alienation from mainstream ancient election ideology based on the exodus and its Aaronite priesthood and their attempt to establish a new election ideology based on David, Zadok and Jerusalem—one king, one priest and one temple. As Dequeker (1986) rightly says:

---

<sup>109</sup> Except in 1Kgs 12.23 (|| 2 Chr 11.3), the term is mentioned only in Chr, Neh and Esdr: 2Chr 11.1, 11.3, 11.12, 11.23, 15.2, 15.8, 15.9, 25.5, 31.1, 34.9, Ezra 1.5, 4.1, 10.9, 1Esdr 2.8, 5.66, 9.5.

<sup>110</sup> Note the hostility to Benjamin in Judg 19-20 and its attack on Saul, a Benjaminite, in 1 Samuel.

<sup>111</sup> Such a claim is non-historical and is predictably absent from Chr because of its exclusivist nature. According to White (1990) “Jeroboam did not appoint non-Levites as priests; he restored the Levitical priesthood” (159). However, his distinction of an Elohist strand of diatribe against Zadokites (Ex 32.1-4a) and a Dtr strand of polemics against Bethel (4b-6) is too delicate and seems to have overloaded the evidence a little. He thinks that “the Elohist had introduced Aaron and made him responsible for the image, in order to condemn the Zadokites for apostasy” (155). It seems rather that the denigrating of both Aaron (as a type of Jeroboam) and Jeroboam were Dtr and by doing so, the whole tradition of northern priesthood was rejected: the Aaronite priests were leading the people astray and were responsible for Jeroboam’s revolt. This can hardly be clearer. See Cross’s (1973: 199) view that Bethel was administered by Aaronite priests after the division of the kingdom. Cf. also Judg 20.26-28 for Dtr’s suggestion of Aaronite priesthood in Bethel.

<sup>112</sup> For a reconstruction of its history and of the clerical polemics involved see Halpern (1976) which seems to lean too heavily on Cross’s (1973) hypothesis of a Mushite priestly tradition.

<sup>113</sup> The historical question of Chr’s claim of Zadok’s Aaronite origin does not concern us here, see Cody 1969: 89ff.

The whole house of Eli stands for the old Israelite sanctuaries before a new temple originated in Jerusalem. Zadok, on the other hand, stands for Jerusalem, David's new creation. He represents the symbiosis of El-Eljon and Jahwe.<sup>114</sup> (96)

### 2.7.3 A New Solution—"The Blind and the Lame" as Device of Ideological Polemics

The solution offered here is that David's hatred of "the blind and the lame" (in the Samuel version) points us to an ideologically polemical story of the rejection of the Aaronite priesthood of the northern tribes represented by the condemnation of the *blind* and the enigmatic Eli and his line of priesthood in favour of Zadok after the order of the equally enigmatic Melchizedek (Gen 14.18, Ps 110.4b)<sup>115</sup> and to another story of the rejection of the northern dynasty represented by the *lame* Mephibosheth, Jonathan's son, the last heir to Saul's throne. What follows is the argument.

---

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Gunneweg 1965: 98-104. Wyatt (1985: 41) has an interesting conjecture that Zadok was the son of the king of Canaanite Jerusalem. He has also suggested a reconstruction of possible political arrangements between David and some of the significant Jebusites in Jerusalem, including Araunah and Bathsheba.

<sup>115</sup> On the connection of Gen 14.18 and Ps 110, see Rowley (1950: 466, 470) who suggests rightly that the Melchizedek episode in Gen 14 functions to justify Zadok's priesthood: in Ps 110 David recognises Zadok's priesthood just as Abraham does Melchizedek in Gen 14. Ps 110 was probably used in the coronation of a Zadokite as high priest (cf. Zech 6.11). Samuel-Kings does not have Zadok crowned but Zech 6.11 decrees the crowning of the Zadokite Joshua, son of Jehozedek. It is possible that Gen 14.18-20, Ps 110, the Zadok story in Samuel-Kings together with the story of the rejection of the Aaronite Eli were attempts to justify Zadokites as high priests in the persian period, when Aaronites were an option. 2 Sam 8.15-18 (|| 2Sam 20.23-26 || 1 Chr 18.14-17, also 1 Chr 7.53) represent a very different approach in legitimising Zadok in that he was linked genealogically to Aaron. It seems to me that the latter is an earlier legitimisation which fits the monarchical period when Judah had to justify her employment of a non-Aaronite priest after separating herself from mainstream religious tradition. The hostility between between the northern remnants and the returned Judahites from exile favour a separatist approach, at least for some. Linkage to Aaron was no longer needed but legitimisation is still required. Thus the superiority of Zadok's priesthood was asserted by chronologically putting his predecessor half a millennium earlier than Aaron and by making him royal. For a recent reiteration of the view that the person addressed in Ps 110 is a king in pre-exilic Jerusalem, see Booiij (1991) who unfortunately treats Ps 110 in isolation. Emerton (1971, 1971a) dates the Melchizedek pericope to the reign of David. However, the pericope was likely added to a corpus containing at least Genesis and the Priestly document with its instruction on tithes. Van Seters' (1975: 278) dating of the promise to the fathers to the post-exilic period is an added support for the late date of Gen 14. Stoebe has a unique view on Ps 110 as the background of 1 Sam 21.

If one starts with Williamson's observation about the straightforwardness of Chr's description of the conquest and his allowances for the possibility of a different form of Samuel's version, a solution to our problem is not too far away but this solution is in 2 Samuel and not in Chr. And instead of tackling a question like "Why or How does the Chr change his source?" as Japhet seems to have done in her commentary, we ask a more neutral and more fundamental question "What is the *purpose* of the references to the blind and the lame in the wider context of the books of Samuel?" To this question so far no satisfactory answers have been offered. The answer to it, as we shall soon see, will enable us to see the interrelationship between several much larger narratives in Samuel-Kings.

As enigmatic as the two narratorial references to "the blind and the lame" is the editorial remark of v. 8b:

על-כן יאמרו עור ופסח לא יבוא אל-הבית:

Therefore it is said, "The blind and the lame shall not come into the house."

This key verse is the clue to a correct understanding of the literary interdependencies of two pertinent stories about a particular blind man and a particular crippled man. And yet the crux of this verse lies not so much in the reference to the blind and the lame as to *הבית* in *Jerusalem*—the temple or palace—the house for a priest or one for the king.

In all Samuel, only one man is said to be *blind* and he is the Shilohite priest Eli. The episode which confirms Yahweh's rejection of Eli in an oracle to the child Samuel begins almost immediately with Eli's blindness in 1 Sam 3.2. Before he fell dead after hearing the dire news of the death of his two sons the reader is reminded once again that "his eyes were set, so that he could not see." (4.15) These two reminders bracket Samuel's oracle against Eli and the story of the death of his two sons. Samuel's oracle is preceded by a short episode of a man of God who revealed to Eli Yahweh's rejection of the line of priesthood to which Eli belongs (i.e. Aaronite priesthood) and Yahweh's election of "a faithful priest". The oracles of the man of God and Samuel will be fulfilled in 1 Kgs 2.27 when Solomon expelled Abiathar from being priest to Yahweh. *Thus the door of one*

*special house in Jerusalem is closed for ever to the progeny of this particular blind man.* The other special house in Jerusalem has to be the palace.

If our understanding of 2 Sam 5.8b and its link with the prediction and fulfilment of the rejection of Eli is correct, then we expect to read about another story of how this time the door of another special house in Jerusalem will be closed forever to a crippled royal figure. In all Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, only one man is mentioned as lame and he is Mephibosheth, Jonathan's son, Saul's grandson, who is first introduced to the reader in 2 Sam 4.4 as a crippled man. And almost immediately after introducing this royal remnant of the Saulide house, we have these mystifying references to the blind and the lame in 2 Sam 5.8 here. After this the reader is reminded again and again of Mephibosheth's lameness in 2 Sam 9.13 and 19.27.

Repetition has been known to be used in Hebrew narratives to "serve the purposes of commentary, analysis, foreshadowing, *thematic assertion* [my emphasis], with a wonderful combination of subtle understatement and dramatic force" (Alter 1981: 101). I suspect that the question of why the narrator is so interested in stressing Mephibosheth's physical condition could lead us to understand the purpose of these references to the blind and the lame and indirectly to solve the text-critical problem. It will also help us to understand a polemical theme in Samuel-Kings. Part of the answer to this question lies in the text itself which in part is a psychological remark concerning David's extreme hatred of these two types of handicapped people.

Based on 4QSam<sup>a</sup>'s reading [הסיתו], McCarter (1984: 137) explains in his commentary that David hates these people because it was they who had *incited* the Jebusites against him. [הסיתו] was probably the earliest attempt to crack the difficult text by the Qumran community as suggested by McCarter.<sup>116</sup> It should, however, be noted that there is no active role at all for "the blind and the lame" in the episode.

---

<sup>116</sup> The word means "had incited them" in v. 6b, according to McCarter (1984: 137).

Our understanding of the psychological remark about David's hatred of the blind and the lame is helped by another psychological remark made by Joab in David's face after Absalom's death (and the death of the main Saulides):

“... because you love those *hate you* (שנאיך) and *hate* (ולשנא) those who love you.  
...” (2 Sam 19.7)

The references to the blind and lame in 2 Sam 5.6-8 tell us what David hates: וְאֶת־הַפְּסָחִים וְאֶת־הַעֲוִרִים שְׁנֵאֵן נִפְשׁ דָּוִד.<sup>117</sup> The references to Mephibosheth's physical condition tacitly tell us whom David would have hated had there not been a covenant between Jonathan and David (1 Sam 20.14-17)!

I propose that we understand these references to “the blind and the lame” and David's hostility to them as the narrator's rhetorical device to prepare us to read the story of how David loves a particular lame man—Mephibosheth—whom he would have hated deeply due to his natural disposition.<sup>118</sup> In this light we can understand the story teller's repetitive reminding the reader of Mephibosheth's physical condition. Just a chapter before the above remark of David's attitude towards “the blind and the lame”, the reader is first reminded twice of Mephibosheth's physical condition in 2 Sam 4.4. As if this is not enough, the readers are reminded another three times in 2 Sam 9.3c, 13b, 19.26c; and in the same chapter in which Joab makes his remark (2 Sam 19), Mephibosheth also reminds David (and the reader of course) that he is lame. If the first readers were as observant as Joab of David's likes and dislikes, they should not have expected David's extension of friendship to the grandson of his enemy *who was lame*. We are again reminded several times of David's extension of royal hospitality to this particular lame man by inviting him to eat at his table (in 2 Sam 9.7, 10; 19.28). The

---

<sup>117</sup> NB. The same Hebrew verb is used in Joab's remark.

<sup>118</sup> Alter (1992) writes that

A listener who could in this way detect close recurrence and difference within the frame of a single episode might reasonably have been expected to pick up a good many verbal echoes and situational correspondences between far-flung episodes (113).

references to the lame are therefore an integral part of this theme of David's showing royal hospitality to a remnant of his enemy.

It seems that Joab's psychological comment can sufficiently explain why he can be kind to a lame Mephibosheth against his natural disposition. It is David's nature, he can love someone he hates! And it is exactly by emphasising how David might have or would have hated Mephibosheth had he been another crippled man and had he not made a vow to Jonathan promising him not to cut off his loyalty from his house (1Sam 20.14-16). I think this explains the *literary purpose* behind the enigmatic mention of "the lame" and David's hatred of them in 2 Sam 5.6-8.

If the above literary links stand, we may be right to infer the literary interdependence of all the following narratives:

- (1) The references to "the blind and the lame" in 2 Sam 5.1-10
- (2) The anti-Aaronite narrative in Samuel-Kings: the material about the blind Eli and his two sons and the expelled Abiathar. These include 1 Sam 3b-28b, 2.11b-17, 20, 22-3.19, 4.4b, 11-22.<sup>119</sup>
- (3) The stories in which Abiathar has a part—these include part of the HDR and the SN in which Abiathar plays a weighty role but was eventually expelled. Abiathar is first mentioned in 1 Sam 22 and last in 1 Kgs 4.4 but of all the text in between only 2 Sam 8.15-17 (|| 2 Sam 20.23-26)—in which Abiathar is also mentioned—is paralleled by 1 Chr.18.14-17. Whereas this unfortunate priest is mentioned 27 times in Samuel Kings,<sup>120</sup> Chr has only 4 mentions.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> The interpolatory nature of the Eli narrative can be seen from the use of the thrice resumptive mention of Samuel's growth in 2.21b, 26 and 3.19.

<sup>120</sup> 1 Sam 22.20, 21, 22, 23.6, 9, 30.7 (2x), 2 Sam 8.17, 2 Sam 15.24, 27 (2x), 29, 35 (2x), 36 17.15, 19.11, 20.25; 1 Kgs 1.7, 19, 25, 42, 2.22, 26, 27, 35, 4.4.

<sup>121</sup> 1 Chr 15.11, 18.16, 24.6, 27.34.

- (4) The so-called History of David's Rise (from 1 Sam 19 onward, see Chapter Four) in which David promised Johnathan, Saul's son, not to cut off his loyalty from his house (1 Sam 20.14-16);
- (5) The story of David's showing royal kindness to Mephibosheth, in which the latter's physical condition is repeatedly emphasised;
- (6) The so-called Succession Narrative in which both Mephibosheth plays his last part and Abiathar (and Zadok) is always with David.

The overlapping roles of Mephibosheth and Abiathar in both HDR and SN suggest that the common distinction of these two narrative cycles as two unified and independent compositions may not be necessary. Though thematically they read differently, ideologically they share a deeper common ground, viz. their anti-Israel (the north) stance. On the one hand we have as negative parts the rejection of the religious and dynastic traditions of the north tendentiously enacted in its anti-Aaronite and anti-Saul dramas and on the other we have as a positive element an apology for David's innocence in the demise of the house of Saul replying to an accusation raised by a northerner. (2 Sam 16.8)

The above links not only confirm the standard critical view that the current shape of Samuel is far from a unity, but also demonstrate the interdependence of much of the later material, notably, the HDR and the SN. Thus at a very early stage of the formation of the books of Samuel-Kings, the above material was supplied to a much shorter base text than was previously supposed. It should be emphasised that we are not supporting the unity of the HDR and SN with just the obscure references to the blind and the lame in 2 Sam 5.1-10. These two narratives have ideological as well as narratorial—Mephibosheth and Abiathar—unifying factors. If the fates of these two men in the HDR are not complete without the SN, then one is close to the truth in saying that neither of them is complete without the other. And together with the anti-Aaronite and anti-Saulide material in 1 Samuel they form a larger unity belonging to one of the latest

literary strata of Samuel-Kings. In Chapters Four and Five, we shall consolidate this conjecture with independent linguistic and literary evidence.

#### 2.7.4 “The Lame and the Blind”—Conclusion

We conclude therefore that the obscure and hinted references to Eli (“the blind”) and Mephibosheth (“the lame”) are *pointers* to the two intertwined parallel narratives about their fate. It is interesting to note that Jacob or Israel is both lame (Gen 32.31b) and virtually blind (Gen 48.10). The secondary nature of the HDR and the SN to the original book of Samuel is also helped by the narrative continuity of 1 Sam 28, 1 Sam 31 (|| 1 Chr 10) and 2 Sam 5 as demonstrated earlier. The following table of texts displays the links of three intertwined motifs: (1) David’s hatred of the lame, (2) Mephibosheth’s lameness and (3) his kindness to him:

Pluses in 2 Sam 6-8 about the blind and the lame	Narrative absent from Chr
<p>2 Sam 5.6 “but the blind and <i>the lame</i> will ward you off”—thinking, “David cannot come in here.””</p> <p>2 Sam 5.8 ... let him get up the water shaft to attack <i>the lame</i> and the blind, who are hated by David’s soul.</p>	<p>2 Sam 4.4 ... Jonathan, ..., had a son who was <i>crippled</i> in his feet. ... he fell, and became <i>lame</i>. And his name was Mephibosheth.”</p> <p>2 Sam 9.3c ... There is still a son of Jonathan; he is <i>crippled in his feet</i>. ... And David said to him [i.e. Mephibosheth], “ Do not fear; ... and <i>you shall eat at my table always</i>.”</p> <p>2 Sam 19.6 ... because <i>you love those who hate you and hate those who love you</i></p> <p>2 Sam 9.13b So Mephibosheth dwelt in Jerusalem; <i>for he ate always at the king’s table</i>. Now <i>he was lame</i> in both his feet.</p> <p>2 Sam 19.26-28 ... For <i>your servant is lame</i>. ... but you set your servant among those who <i>eat at your table</i>.</p>

Existing scholarship tries to resolve the textual divergences between the two synoptic stories by suggesting that the Chr has omitted from his text references to “the blind and the lame”. In view of the above literary connections, this standard view creates more problems than it solves. For it is easier for the Chr to omit the story of Mephiboseth



than to omit these references in 2 Sam 5. If they were originally absent from his *Vorlage*, than we would have to hypothesise that a Samuel redactor added them into a straightforward text in order to integrate the story of the blind priest Eli and the story of David's hospitality towards the lame Mephiboseth as a potential successor to Saul's throne.

It seems that we can even trace the ideological origin of David's kindness towards the lame Mephiboseth, the remnant of Saul's house, i.e. the "one left of the house of Saul" (2 Sam 9.1a). In Micah we read of a similarly mystifying reference to the lame immediately after the prophet's message of universal peace:<sup>122</sup>

In that day, says Yahweh,  
I will assemble the lame  
and gather those who have been driven away,  
and those whom I have afflicted;  
and the lame I will make the remnant;  
and those who were cast off, a strong nation;  
and Yahweh will reign over them in Mount Zion  
from this time forth and for evermore. (Mic 4.6-7a)

This is what David did to Mephiboseth after Saul's kingdom had been transferred to his hand, i.e. after Israel finally had her peace in Davidic rule. Instead of eradicating the remnants of the house of Saul, as an usurper would usually do in ancient time, the reader is told that David tried to preserve them in his dealing with Mephiboseth and the other seven royal remnants of the house of Saul (2 Sam 21.21-14).

## 2.8 Jerusalem and Jebus

Whereas 1 Chr 11.4 clarifies the identity of Jerusalem and Jebus, 2 Sam 5.6 is ambiguous about this identity. In fact one cannot confidently tell from Samuel's text

---

<sup>122</sup> On the concern of lowly people in the Utopia, see see Weinfeld (1983).

whether the Jebusites are in fact the inhabitants of Jerusalem or not. One can only tell they are *the inhabitants of the land*:

And the king and his men went to Jerusalem against the Jebusites (אֶל־הַיְבוּסִי), the inhabitants of the land, who said to David, ... (2 Sam 5.6)

From this text, we can only say that when David went to Jerusalem, the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land, were there refusing admission to David. One can legitimately think whether here it is not assumed that Jerusalem was already part of Judah. This doubt is in line with Judg 1.8 which assumes that Jerusalem had already been taken by Judah and is therefore not quite consistent with 2 Sam 5.6-7 (|| 1 Chr 11.4-5).

Chr's text is unmistakable. The Jebusites were the inhabitants of the land but at the same time they were also the inhabitants of Jerusalem:

And David and all Israel went to Jerusalem, that is Jebus (הִיא יְבוּס), where the Jebusites were, the inhabitants of the land. The inhabitants of Jebus (יֹשְׁבֵי יְבוּס) said to David, ... (1 Chr 11.4-5)

Chr's text is unclear as to the question of whether the Jebusites were the only inhabitants of Jerusalem or not. But by calling Jerusalem Jebus and the inhabitants of Jerusalem Jebusites, the text conveys an impression that Jerusalem was home to the Jebusites. The fact that the capturing of it involves "all Israel" also seems to assume that Jerusalem is not quite an Israelite city yet. This impression, interestingly, is in line with another text of the DH:

But the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the people of Judah *could not* drive out [לֹא־יִוָּכְלוּ בְנֵי־יְהוּדָה לְהוֹרִישָׁם]; so the Jebusites dwell *with the people of Judah* [אֶת־בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה] at Jerusalem to this day. (Josh 15.63)

Without the אֶת־בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה the Greek of Josh presents an slightly different story:<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> Attention should be drawn to an important study of the textual problem of Judg 1 in Auld (1975) whose understanding of 1 Josh 15.63 (274) is followed by Weinfeld (1993: 396). But neither of them has noticed the connection of this particular verse with 1 Chr 11.4. The agreement between some interesting historiographical statements in Josh and Chr adds a very interesting dimension to the DH debate which largely ignores Chr.

καὶ ὁ Ἰεβουσαῖος κατῴκει ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθησαν οἱ υἱοὶ  
Ἰουδα ἀπολέσαι αὐτούς καὶ κατῴκησαν οἱ Ἰεβουσαῖοι ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἕως  
τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ... (And the Jebusites dwelt in Jerusalem and the Judahites  
could not drive them out; and so the Jebusites dwelt in Jerusalem to this day.)

What the Judahites began in Josh but could not accomplish, “David and all Israel” succeeded in doing in 1 Chr 11.4. But this history of Jerusalem was “reworked, altered and falsified”<sup>124</sup> by the scribe/editor who added אֶת־בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה. Prior to David’s campaign, Judg 1.8, 21 whitewashes the Judahites’ military failure and shifts the blame on to the Benjaminites and so contradicts flatly the above statement of Greek Josh:

And the men of Judah fought against Jerusalem, and *took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and set the city on fire.* ... 1.21 But the people of Benjamin did not drive out (לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ) the Jebusites who dwelt in Jerusalem; so *the Jebusites have dwelt with the people of Benjamin in Jerusalem to this day.* (Judg 1.8)

לְהוֹרִישָׁם ... לֹא־יֹכֵלוּ in Josh has a very different emphasis from לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ in Judg 1.21b. While it was a regrettable thing that Judah was unable to drive out the Jebusites in Josh, in Judg the Benjaminites are blamed for not doing that. Judg 1.8 states that not only had the city been fought against and taken by Judah, she had also plundered it utterly (note the threefold *took, smote and set on fire*). The reason for the existence of Jebusites in Jerusalem is therefore not a question of ability of the Benjaminites any more. They were just not willing to drive them out.

1 Chr 11.4 thus reads like a sequel to an unaccomplished task reported in Josh 15.63: what Judah failed to do is now accomplished by the collective effort of “David and all Israel”. But according to 2 Sam 5.8, the northern tribes are denied this military glory and it claims that only “the king [i.e. David] and his men”<sup>125</sup>—that is the Judahites who have all along been with him during his campaign—accomplished the task which, according to Judg 1.8, the Benjaminites refused to do. It is probably not coincidental that Saul happens to be a Benjaminite.

---

<sup>124</sup> What de Wette said of the Chr is more appropriately said of the MT editor/scribe at this point.

<sup>125</sup> See discussion on this term in section 2.7 above.

2 Sam 5.8 sidetracks to “the blind and the blame” and an “irrelevant” aetiology to convey a hidden message understandable only in the hinted narratives. 1 Chr’s very different v.6 is more concerned with the battle itself and praises the feat of Joab as the first one to smite the Jebusites during the battle. The variants in 2 Sam 5ff are less interested in the event as a battle. Only David and his (four/six hundred?) men were involved. Also the chief commander was not mentioned.

### 2.8.1 The Problem-situation for the Editorial References to “the Blind and the Lame”—a conjecture

With our understanding of the purpose of “the blind and the lame”, the meaning and reference of this aetiology become very clear: the descendants Eli (i.e. the Aaronites) and those of Saul (i.e. Benjamin as in “Judah and Benjamin”?) “shall not come into the house”, i.e. Jerusalem where sit the house of Yahweh and the house of the (Davidic) king. This is a separatist or exclusivist policy against the northern tribes (probably their remnants). They are to be excluded from the Judahite community in both religious (or cultic) and political terms. It thus fits very well the social condition of the period of Zerubbabel:

It was a heady time of prophecy and messianic hope. At an early stage the return of the monarchy under Zerubbabel was enthusiastically expected, but he disappeared early from the record. External politics divided parties between those in favour of reunification with the remains of the Northern Kingdom, and the separatists who hated Samaria. (Douglas 1993: 36)<sup>126</sup>

### 2.9 2 Sam 5.7 || 1 Chr 11.5b

2 Sam 5.7 is identical to 1 Chr 11.5b and contradicts 1 Judg 1.8, but is consistent with Josh 15.63. Judg 1.8, 21 are fairly certainly later than Josh 15.63 because the

---

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Stern (1976).

tradition in the latter is not only re-interpreted and negated by Judg but also utilised for political purposes. Our hypothesis on the *thematic purpose* of the references to “the blind and the lame” is *independent* support that Chr’s version is closer to the original, which can legitimately be read as the sequel to Josh 15.63 because from its incompleteness one anticipates a *necessary* story of the capture of Jerusalem and it has to be by David because the city was named after him.

## 2.10 2 Sam 5.8—ביום ההוא—a Test

**ביום ההוא** is a very common phrase in the Hebrew Bible and appears around 200 times in total.<sup>127</sup> Its use in 2 Sam 5.8 is not shared by the Chr parallel (1 Chr 11.6). It is also a favourite phrase in the special Samuel material, which has 37 occurrences, but in Kings it appears only 6 times. 8 of these are in synoptic texts but only 3 of them are also found in Chr texts (1 Chr 13.12 || 2 Sam 6.9; 2 Chr 18.24 || 1 Kgs 22.25; 2 Chr 18.34 || 1 Kgs 22.35). Of the sporadic 7 occurrences in Chr, there are therefore 4 instances in special Chr material. The 5 instances in which the phrase appears in Samuel-Kings but not in Chr are as follows:

Samuel-Kings	Chr
1 Sam 31.6 וימת שאול ושלשת בניו ונשא כליו גם כל-אנשיו ביום ההוא יחדו:	1 Chr 10.6 וימת שאול ושלשת בניו וכל-ביתו יחדו מתו:
2 Sam 5.8 ויאמר דוד ביום ההוא כל-מכה יבסי ויגע בצנור ואת-הפסחים ואת-העורים *שנאו *שנאי נפש דוד על-כן יאמרו עור ופסח לא יבוא אל-הבית:	1 Chr 11.6 ויאמר דויד כל-מכה יבוסי יהיה לראש ולשר ויעל בראשונה בראשונה יואב בן-צרויה ויהי לראש:

<sup>127</sup> Gen (5x), Ex (5x), Lev (2x), Num (4x), Deut (6x),

Josh (11x), Judg (9x), 1 Sam (25x), 2 Sam (12x), 1 Kgs (5x) 2 Kgs (1x)

1 Chr (3x), 2 Chr (4x), Neh (3x), Esth (3x), Pss (1x)

Is 1-39 (44x), Is 40-66 (1x), Jer (9x), Ezk (11x), Hosea (3x), Joel (1x), Amos (5x), Obad (1x), Micah (3x), Zep (4x), Hag (1x), Zech (21x).

2 Sam 23.10 הוא קם ויך בפלשתים עד  
 כִּי־יִגְעַה יָדוֹ וַתִּדְבֶּק יָדוֹ אֶל־הַחֶרֶב  
 וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה תְּשׁוּעָה גְדוּלָה בְּיוֹם הַהוּא  
 וְהָעָם יָשְׁבוּ אַחֲרָיו אַךְ־לִפְשׁוֹט:

1 Chr 11.14 וַיִּתְּצוּ בַתּוֹךְ־הַחֲלָקָה  
 וַיִּצִּילוּהָ וַיְכּוּ אֶת־פְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיּוֹשַׁע יְהוָה  
 תְּשׁוּעָה גְדוּלָה:

2 Sam 24.18 וַיָּבֵא־גֹד אֶל־דָּוִד בְּיוֹם הַהוּא  
 וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ עֲלֵה הַקָּם לַיהוָה  
 מִזְבַּח בַּגֶּרֶן \*אֲרֹנִיָּה \*\*אֲרֹנֹה הַיְבֵסִי:

1 Chr 21.6 וְלוֹי וּבְנֵימָן לֹא פָקְדוּ בְּתוֹכְכֶם  
 כִּי־נִתְעַב דְּבַר־הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־יְוָאב:

1 Kgs 8.64 בְּיוֹם הַהוּא קִדַּשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־תּוֹךְ  
 הַחֲצֵר אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי בֵּית־יְהוָה כִּי־עָשָׂה שָׁם  
 אֶת־הָעֵלָה וְאֶת־הַמִּנְחָה וְאֶת חֲלָבֵי  
 הַשְּׁלָמִים כִּי־מִזְבַּח הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי  
 יְהוָה קָטַן מֵהַכִּיל אֶת־הָעֵלָה  
 וְאֶת־הַמִּנְחָה וְאֶת חֲלָבֵי הַשְּׁלָמִים:

1 Chr 7.7 וַיִּקְדַּשׁ שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת־תּוֹךְ הַחֲצֵר  
 אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי בֵּית־יְהוָה כִּי־עָשָׂה שָׁם  
 הָעֲלוֹת וְאֶת חֲלָבֵי הַשְּׁלָמִים כִּי־מִזְבַּח  
 הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה שְׁלֹמֹה לֹא  
 יָכוֹל לְהַכִּיל אֶת־הָעֵלָה  
 וְאֶת־הַמִּנְחָה וְאֶת־הַחֲלָבִים:

Since the Chr himself also used this phrase, there is therefore no reason why the Chr would drop them from his source. The five examples above might be connected with the fact that this phrase is a Samuel-Kings favourite. They might have crept into the Samuel-Kings parallel material when a lot of them went into the books by way of large amount of additional texts. Let us then study in more detail the 37 instances of the phrase in the book of Samuel:

- (1). 1 Sam 3.2, 12, 4.12—3x in the story of Yahweh's rejection of the "blind" priest Eli and his sons. As argued above, this story belongs to the late anti-northern material.
- (2). 6.15, 16—2x in the Ark narrative, *original*<sup>128</sup>
- (3). 1 Sam 7.6, 10, 8.18 (2x), 12.18—5x in Samuel's Dtr anti-monarchical speeches
- (4). 1 Sam 9.24, 10.9—Saul's access to kingship, *original*
- (5). 1 Sam 14.18, 23, 24, 31, 37—5x in the story of Saul and Jonathan, the counterpart story of David and Absalom, late anti-Saul material

<sup>128</sup> The ark narrative in 1 Samuel must be read alongside 2 Sam 6.1-11 (|| 1 Chr 13.1-14) for a full understanding of David's political intention. The ark was "the old sacred symbol of the leading Northern tribes, [i.e.] Ephraim-Manasseh-Benjamin" (Carlson 1993: 23). The history of the ark in 1 Samuel is a negative one: it demonstrates the departure of Yahweh's presence from the Northern shrine Shiloh. Its arrival at its new home in Jerusalem represents the emergence a new election ideology based on David and his city. Thus the complete history of the ark must be part of the Chr's *Vorlage*. For a form-critical and traditio-historical study of 1 Sam 4-6 and 2 Sam 6, see Campbell (1975).

- (6). 1 Sam 18.2—MT plus, not original to the source
- (7). 1 Sam 20.26, 21.8, 11, 22.18, 22, 27.6, 2 Sam 2.17, 3.37—8x in the story of Saul's pursuit for David's life, an apology for David's innocence, part of the HDR, later interpolation
- (8). 1 Sam 31.6 (|| 1 Chr 10.6), 2 Sam 5.8 (|| 1 Chr 11.6), 2 Sam 6.9 (|| 1 Chr 13.12), 2 Sam 24.18 (1 Chr 21.6) — 4x in synoptic material, 3x are pluses in Samuel.
- (9). 2 Sam 11.12—1x David and Bathsheba<sup>129</sup>
- (10). 2 Sam 18.7, 8, 19.3 (2x), 4—5x David and Absalom, or the so-called Succession Narrative
- (11). 2 Sam 23.10 (|| 1 Chr 11.14), 24.18 (|| 1 Chr 21.6)—2x both are pluses

The only occurrences which seem to me to be original belong to episodes about the ark (2x), Saul (2x) and the synoptic 2 Sam 6.9, i.e. 5x in total. It is important to note that most of the occurrences (32x) belong to tendentious material like the anti-northern-priesthood Eli story and the anti-Saul story or the apologetic story for David's innocence. The distribution pattern of **בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא** is therefore consistent with our conjecture that the five pluses of this phrase in the Samuel-Kings parallel material probably went into the parallel (or synoptic) text at the same time with the 32 instances found in the tendentious narratives.

#### 2.11 2 Sam 5.10 || 1 Chr 11.10—**יהוה צבאות** || **יהוה אלהי צבאות**

2 Sam 5.10 has the long form "Yahweh, the God of hosts" but 1 Chr 11.9 has the short form "Yahweh of hosts". Samuel's locution **יהוה אלהי צבאות**<sup>130</sup> appears only 22x in the Hebrew Bible but never in Chr. However, Chr's **יהוה צבאות** has over ten times more: 266 instances in the Hebrew Bible. Samuel-Kings mainly use the short form

<sup>129</sup> Fischer's (1989) literary analysis of the story makes him doubt the historical reliability of the story and the dating of it back to the tenth century B.C. It seems to me that the Bathsheba story is part of the redactional layer to which the SHSD and the SN belongs. On the common authorship of the last two narratives see Chapter Five of this thesis.

<sup>130</sup> See Ross (1967) for a discussion of the phrase in Samuel and Psalms.

(12x)<sup>131</sup> and only 3x the long form: here in 2 Sam 5.10 and 2x in the Elijah story (1 Kgs 19.10, 14). Only the short form is found in Chr here in 1 Chr 11.9 and in the Nathan oracle (1 Chr 17.1 || 2 Sam 7.8, 1 Chr 17.24 || 2 Sam 7.26). Thus of the three instances in Chr only here do Samuel and Chr diverge. Again, it would be interesting to study the distribution of the 12 instances of the short form in Samuel-Kings.

- (1). 1 Sam 1.3, 11, 4.4—3x in the Hannah-Samuel story. 1.3b “where the two sons of Eli ...” is a plus. The story itself is complete without Eli and his sons.
- (2). 1 Sam 15.2— in the story of Saul’s sin of not killing Agag.
- (3). 1 Sam 17.45—in the duel between David and Goliath.
- (4). 2 Sam 6.2 || 1 Chr 11.5, 2 Sam 6.18—2x in the story of David’s bringing of the ark to Jerusalem. The first is a plus.
- (5). 2 Sam 7.8, 26, 27—3x in Nathan’s oracle.
- (6). 1 Kgs 18.15—in the Elijah story.
- (7). 2 Kgs 3.14—in the Elijah story.

Except the two instances in the Elijah story which is not found in Chr, the other ten instances are found in material which probably is part of Chr’s source. All the three occurrences of the long form in Samuel-Kings do not seem to be original. The instances in 2 Sam 5.10 might have crept into the text together with the Elijah-Elisha narrative cycle. Again just like the situation of the distribution of **ביום ההוא**, the addition of foreign material tends to disturb the synoptic texts in Samuel-Kings.

## 2.12 Conclusion—Textual Decision

Our investigation of **כל-שבטי ישראל** and **כל-ישראל** in 2 Sam 5.1 and 1 Chr 11.1 respectively persuades us that Chr’s reading, with its link to 1 Sam 18.6, is closer to the source than Samuel’s reading. The regnal notice in 2 Samuel 5.4-5 was original in Samuel but not in its source. Together with 2 Sam 2.1-11 its purpose is to make David

---

<sup>131</sup> 1 Sam 1.3, 11, 4.4, 15.2, 17.45, 2 Sam 6.2, 18, 7.8, 26, 27, 1 Kgs 18.15, 2 Kgs 3.14.



as king of Judah *prior* to his being king of Israel (the north). Chr's allusion to Nathan's oracle is closer to the original than Samuel's. There are also hints of excluding Israel as part of Yahweh's people in Samuel's allusions to Nathan's Oracle; and this is in line with the general anti-Israel outlook of Samuel-Kings. In the course of our investigation, we found that Abner's *coup* is not very consistent with the motives of the elders of (all) Israel in their anointing David as king and it looks probable that the episode of Abner's conspiracy is secondary. Its purpose is to show that David was not yet king of the north thus justifying the regnal notice in 2 Sam 2.11 and 5.5. It also shows that David did not seize Saul's kingdom by force and exonerated David from implication in the death of Abner and Ishbosheth since they died outside his reign. All these suggest that Chr's text is much closer to the source than Samuel's text. Our evaluations of the other synoptic variants and pluses also favour Chr's text.

It was probably the author of the stories of Eli and Mephibosheth who added the references to "the blind and the lame" in 2 Sam 5 as "redactional hinges" with both literary and polemic functions. The fact that these references point to both the HDR and the SN invites conjectures about their common origin. The rejection of the blind and the lame from the palace/temple in Jerusalem is the *aim* of the reminders. The narratives to which these references point would therefore not have been from separate editors. These two polemic undercurrents in the HDR and the SN are the sub-plots of these two narratives which govern the development of the story of the Saulide remnants (e.g. Mephibosheth) and Elide remnants (e.g. Abiathar). In both cases, Saul was made responsible for the end of most of them: his killing of the priests of Nob (1 Sam 22.18-19) and the killing in retribution of his seven sons by the Gibeonites (2 Sam 21.1-14). These two sub-plots end with the death of Shimei "a man of the family of the house of Saul" (1 Kgs 2.36-46) and the expulsion of Abiathar by Solomon (1 Kgs 2.27). From then on, the palace in Jerusalem is to be occupied by Davidides and the temple there is in the charge of Zadokites. It seems probable that the Chr's *Vorlage* did not contain stories of these two sub-plots, i.e. most of the HDR and the SN.

## 2.13 Excursus : Pan-Israel Concern in MT and LXX of Samuel-Kings and Chr

It has been generally accepted that the Chr had a pan-Israel interest, especially in his view of the beginning of the Davidic kingdom.<sup>132</sup> Thus when a commentator finds “all Israel” in Chr but only “Israel” or a different phrase in Samuel-Kings, there is a tendency to attribute the word “all” to the Chr. It would be interesting to evaluate this tendency in the light of statistical information. The following table shows the richness of the locutions “Israel” and “all Israel” in MT and LXX.

### 2.12.1 ישראל in Samuel-Kings and Chr:

**1 Sam (151x)** 1.17, 2.14, 2.22, 2.28, 2.28, 2.29, 2.30, 2.32, 3.11, 3.20, 4.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.10, 4.10, 4.17, 4.18, 4.21, 4.22, 5.7, 5.8, 5.8, 5.8, 5.10, 5.11, 6.3, 6.5, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.7, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, 7.10, 7.10, 7.11, 7.13, 7.14, 7.14, 7.14, 7.14, 7.15, 7.16, 7.17, 8.1, 8.4, 8.22, 9.2, 9.9, 9.16, 9.20, 9.21, 10.18, 10.18, 10.18, 10.20, 11.2, 11.3, 11.7, 11.8, 11.13, 11.15, 12.1, 13.1, 13.2, 13.4, 13.4, 13.5, 13.6, 13.13, 13.19, 13.20, 14.12, 14.18, 14.21, 14.22, 14.23, 14.24, 14.37, 14.39, 14.40, 14.41, 14.45, 14.47, 14.48, 15.1, 15.2, 15.6, 15.17, 15.17, 15.26, 15.28, 15.29, 15.30, 15.35, 16.1, 17.2, 17.3, 17.8, 17.10, 17.11, 17.19, 17.21, 17.24, 17.25, 17.25, 17.25, 17.26, 17.45, 17.46, 17.52, 17.53, 18.6, 18.16, 18.18, 19.5, 20.12, 23.10, 23.11, 23.17, 24.3, 24.15, 24.21, 25.1, 25.30, 25.32, 25.34, 26.2, 26.15, 26.20, 27.1, 27.12, 28.1, 28.3, 28.4, 28.19, 28.19, 29.1, 29.3, 30.25, 31.1, 31.1, 31.7, 31.7

**2 Sam (117x)** 1.3, 1.12, 1.19, 1.24, 2.9, 2.10, 2.17, 2.28, 3.10, 3.12, 3.17, 3.18, 3.19, 3.21, 3.37, 3.38, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2, 5.2, 5.2, 5.3, 5.3, 5.5, 5.12, 5.12, 5.17, 6.1, 6.5, 6.15, 6.19, 6.20, 6.21, 7.6, 7.7, 7.7, 7.7, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11, 7.23, 7.24, 7.26, 7.27, 8.15, 10.9, 10.9, 10.15, 10.17, 10.18, 10.19, 10.19, 11.1, 11.11, 12.7, 12.7, 12.8, 12.12, 13.12, 13.13, 14.25, 15.2, 15.6, 15.6, 15.10, 15.13, 16.3, 16.15, 16.18, 16.21, 16.22, 17.4, 17.10, 17.11, 17.13, 17.14, 17.15, 17.24, 17.26, 18.6, 18.7, 18.16, 18.17, 19.9, 19.10, 19.12, 19.23, 19.23, 19.41, 19.42, 19.43, 19.44, 19.44, 20.1, 20.2, 20.14, 20.19, 20.19, 20.23, 21.2, 21.2, 21.2, 21.4, 21.5, 21.15, 21.17, 21.21, 23.1, 23.3, 23.3, 23.9, 24.1, 24.1, 24.2, 24.4, 24.9, 24.15

**1 Kgs (203x)** 1.3, 1.20, 1.30, 1.34, 1.35, 1.48, 2.4, 2.5, 2.11, 2.15, 2.32, 3.28, 4.1, 4.7, 4.20, 5.5, 5.27, 6.1, 6.1, 6.13, 6.13, 8.1, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.5, 8.9, 8.14, 8.14, 8.15, 8.16, 8.16, 8.16, 8.17, 8.20, 8.20, 8.22, 8.23, 8.25, 8.25, 8.26, 8.30, 8.33, 8.34, 8.36, 8.38, 8.41, 8.43, 8.52, 8.55, 8.56, 8.59, 8.62, 8.63, 8.65, 8.66, 9.5, 9.5, 9.7, 9.7, 9.20, 9.21, 9.22, 10.9, 10.9, 11.2, 11.9, 11.16, 11.25, 11.25, 11.31, 11.32, 11.37, 11.38, 11.42, 12.1, 12.3, 12.16, 12.16, 12.16, 12.17, 12.18, 12.19, 12.20, 12.20, 12.21, 12.24, 12.28, 12.33, 14.7, 14.7, 14.10, 14.13, 14.13, 14.14, 14.15, 14.15, 14.16, 14.16, 14.18, 14.19, 14.21, 14.24, 15.9, 15.16, 15.17, 15.19, 15.20, 15.25, 15.25, 15.26, 15.27, 15.30, 15.30, 15.31, 15.32, 15.33, 15.34, 16.2, 16.2, 16.5, 16.8, 16.13, 16.13, 16.14, 16.16, 16.16, 16.17, 16.19, 16.20, 16.21, 16.23, 16.26, 16.26, 16.27, 16.29, 16.29, 16.33, 16.33, 17.1, 17.14, 18.17, 18.18, 18.19, 18.20, 18.31, 18.36, 18.36, 19.10, 19.14, 19.16, 19.18, 20.2, 20.4, 20.7, 20.11, 20.13, 20.15, 20.20, 20.21, 20.22, 20.26, 20.27, 20.27, 20.28, 20.29, 20.31, 20.31, 20.32, 20.40, 20.41, 20.43, 21.7, 21.18, 21.21, 21.22, 21.26, 22.1, 22.2, 22.3, 22.4, 22.5, 22.6, 22.8, 22.9, 22.10, 22.17, 22.18, 22.26, 22.29, 22.30, 22.30, 22.31, 22.32, 22.33, 22.34, 22.39, 22.41, 22.45, 22.52, 22.52, 22.53, 22.54

<sup>132</sup> As Japhet (1993) puts it: “The great emphasis put on the fact that the kingdom of David was from its very first day onwards a kingdom over all Israel has been rightly recognized by all those who have studied the books of Chronicles, although their interpretations vary” (236). Scholars quoted include: Wellhausen (1885: 172ff), von Rad (1930: 35), Rudolf (1955: 97), Willi (1991: 161), Williamson (1977: 95), Japhet (1989: 267ff).

**2 Kgs (164x)** 1.1, 1.3, 1.6, 1.16, 1.18, 2.12, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, 3.13, 3.24, 3.24, 3.27, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.8, 5.12, 5.15, 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 6.12, 6.21, 6.23, 6.26, 7.6, 7.13, 7.13, 8.12, 8.16, 8.18, 8.25, 8.26, 9.3, 9.6, 9.6, 9.8, 9.12, 9.14, 9.21, 10.21, 10.28, 10.29, 10.30, 10.31, 10.31, 10.32, 10.32, 10.34, 10.36, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3, 13.4, 13.5, 13.5, 13.6, 13.8, 13.10, 13.11, 13.12, 13.13, 13.14, 13.14, 13.16, 13.18, 13.22, 13.25, 14.1, 14.8, 14.9, 14.11, 14.12, 14.13, 14.15, 14.16, 14.17, 14.23, 14.24, 14.25, 14.25, 14.26, 14.26, 14.27, 14.28, 14.28, 14.29, 15.1, 15.8, 15.9, 15.11, 15.12, 15.15, 15.17, 15.18, 15.20, 15.21, 15.23, 15.24, 15.26, 15.27, 15.28, 15.29, 15.31, 15.32, 16.3, 16.3, 16.5, 16.7, 17.1, 17.2, 17.6, 17.7, 17.8, 17.8, 17.9, 17.13, 17.18, 17.19, 17.20, 17.21, 17.21, 17.22, 17.23, 17.23, 17.24, 17.34, 18.1, 18.4, 18.5, 18.9, 18.10, 18.11, 19.15, 19.20, 19.22, 21.2, 21.3, 21.7, 21.8, 21.9, 21.12, 22.15, 22.18, 23.13, 23.15, 23.19, 23.22, 23.22, 23.27, 24.13

**1 Chr (114x)** 1.34, 1.43, 2.1, 2.7, 4.10, 5.1, 5.1, 5.3, 5.17, 5.26, 6.23, 6.34, 6.49, 7.29, 9.1, 9.1, 9.2, 10.1, 10.1, 10.7, 11.1, 11.2, 11.2, 11.2, 11.3, 11.3, 11.4, 11.10, 11.10, 12.33, 12.39, 12.39, 12.41, 13.2, 13.2, 13.5, 13.6, 13.8, 14.2, 14.2, 14.8, 15.3, 15.12, 15.14, 15.25, 15.28, 16.3, 16.4, 16.13, 16.17, 16.36, 16.40, 17.5, 17.6, 17.6, 17.7, 17.9, 17.10, 17.21, 17.22, 17.24, 17.24, 18.14, 19.10, 19.16, 19.17, 19.18, 19.19, 20.7, 21.1, 21.1, 21.2, 21.3, 21.4, 21.5, 21.7, 21.12, 21.14, 21.14, 22.1, 22.2, 22.6, 22.9, 22.10, 22.12, 22.13, 22.17, 23.1, 23.2, 23.25, 24.19, 26.29, 26.30, 27.1, 27.16, 27.22, 27.23, 27.24, 28.1, 28.4, 28.4, 28.4, 28.5, 28.8, 29.6, 29.10, 29.18, 29.21, 29.23, 29.25, 29.25, 29.26, 29.27, 29.30

**2 Chr (187x)** 1.2, 1.2, 1.13, 2.3, 2.11, 2.16, 5.2, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.6, 5.10, 6.3, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.10, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 6.13, 6.14, 6.16, 6.16, 6.17, 6.21, 6.24, 6.25, 6.27, 6.29, 6.32, 6.33, 7.3, 7.6, 7.8, 7.10, 7.18, 8.2, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9, 8.11, 9.8, 9.30, 10.1, 10.3, 10.16, 10.16, 10.16, 10.17, 10.18, 10.19, 11.1, 11.3, 11.13, 11.16, 11.16, 12.1, 12.6, 12.13, 13.4, 13.5, 13.5, 13.12, 13.15, 13.16, 13.17, 13.18, 15.3, 15.4, 15.9, 15.13, 15.17, 16.1, 16.3, 16.4, 16.11, 17.1, 17.4, 18.3, 18.4, 18.5, 18.7, 18.8, 18.9, 18.16, 18.17, 18.19, 18.25, 18.28, 18.29, 18.29, 18.30, 18.31, 18.32, 18.33, 18.34, 19.8, 20.7, 20.10, 20.19, 20.29, 20.34, 20.35, 21.2, 21.4, 21.6, 21.13, 22.5, 23.2, 24.5, 24.6, 24.9, 24.16, 25.6, 25.7, 25.7, 25.9, 25.17, 25.18, 25.21, 25.22, 25.23, 25.25, 25.26, 27.7, 28.2, 28.3, 28.5, 28.8, 28.13, 28.19, 28.23, 28.26, 28.27, 29.7, 29.10, 29.24, 29.24, 29.27, 30.1, 30.1, 30.5, 30.5, 30.6, 30.6, 30.6, 30.21, 30.25, 30.25, 30.26, 31.1, 31.1, 31.5, 31.6, 31.8, 32.17, 32.32, 33.2, 33.7, 33.8, 33.9, 33.16, 33.18, 33.18, 34.7, 34.9, 34.21, 34.23, 34.26, 34.33, 34.33, 35.3, 35.3, 35.3, 35.4, 35.17, 35.18, 35.18, 35.18, 35.25, 35.27, 36.8, 36.13

### 2.12.2 כל-ישראל in Samuel-Kings and Chr:

**1 Sam (18x)** 2.14, 2.22, 3.20, 4.1, 4.5, 7.5, 11.2, 12.1, 13.4, 13.20, 14.40, 17.11, 18.16, 19.5, 24.3, 25.1, 28.3, 28.4

**2 Sam (19x)** 3.12, 3.21, 3.37, 3.37, 4.1, 5.5, 8.15, 10.17, 11.1, 12.12, 14.25, 15.6, 16.21, 16.22, 17.10, 17.11, 17.13, 18.17, 19.12

**1 Kgs (23x)** 1.20, 2.15, 3.28, 4.1, 4.7, 5.27, 8.62, 8.65, 11.16, 11.42, 12.1, 12.16, 12.18, 12.20, 12.20, 14.13, 14.18, 15.27, 15.33, 16.16, 16.17, 18.19, 22.17

**2 Kgs (3x)** 3.6, 9.14, 10.21

**1 Chr (23x)** 9.1, 11.1, 11.4,<sup>133</sup> 11.10, 12.39, 12.39,<sup>134</sup> 13.5, 13.6, 13.8, 14.8, 15.3, 15.28, 17.6, 18.14, 19.17, 21.4,<sup>135</sup> 21.5, 28.4, 28.8,<sup>136</sup> 29.21, 29.23, 29.25, 29.26<sup>137</sup>

<sup>133</sup> 1 Par has ἀνδρες Ισραηλ.

<sup>134</sup> 1 Par has Ισραηλ.

<sup>135</sup> 1 Par has παντι ὀριω Ισραηλ.

<sup>136</sup> 1 Par has πάσης ἐκκλησίας κυρίου.

<sup>137</sup> 1 Pars has only Ισραηλ.

2 Chr (25x) 1.2, 1.2,<sup>138</sup> 7.6, 7.8, 9.30, 10.1, 10.3,<sup>139</sup> 10.16, 10.16, 11.3,<sup>140</sup> 11.13, 12.1, 13.4, 13.15,<sup>141</sup> 18.16,<sup>142</sup> 24.5, 28.23, 29.24, 29.24, 30.1, 30.5, 30.6, 31.1, 31.1, 35.3

### 2.12.3 Ιαραηλ in Samuel-Kings and Chr:

1 Reg (149x) 1.17, 2.14, 2.22, 2.28, 2.28, 2.29, 2.30, 3.11, 3.20, 3.21, 4.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.10, 4.10, 4.17, 4.18, 4.22, 5.7, 5.8, 5.10, 5.11, 5.11, 6.3, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.7, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, 7.10, 7.10, 7.11, 7.13, 7.14, 7.14, 7.14, 7.14, 7.15, 7.16, 7.17, 8.1, 8.4, 8.22, 9.2, 9.9, 9.16, 9.20, 9.21, 10.1, 10.18, 10.18, 10.18, 10.20, 11.2, 11.3, 11.7, 11.7, 11.8, 11.13, 11.15, 12.1, 13.2, 13.4, 13.4, 13.5, 13.5, 13.6, 13.13, 13.19, 13.20, 14.12, 14.18, 14.21, 14.22, 14.23, 14.37, 14.38, 14.39, 14.40, 14.41, 14.41, 14.41, 14.45, 14.47, 14.48, 15.1, 15.2, 15.6, 15.12, 15.17, 15.17, 15.23, 15.26, 15.28, 15.29, 15.30, 15.35, 16.1, 17.2, 17.3, 17.8, 17.10, 17.11, 17.36, 17.45, 17.46, 17.52, 17.53, 18.6, 18.16, 18.28, 19.5, 20.12, 23.10, 23.11, 23.17, 24.3, 24.15, 24.21, 25.1, 25.30, 25.32, 25.34, 26.2, 26.15, 26.20, 27.1, 27.12, 28.1, 28.3, 28.4, 28.19, 28.19, 29.1, 29.3, 29.11, 30.25, 31.1, 31.1, 31.7, 31.7

2 Reg (120x) 1.3, 1.12, 1.19, 1.24, 2.9, 2.10, 2.17, 2.28, 3.10, 3.12, 3.17, 3.18, 3.19, 3.21, 3.37, 3.38, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2, 5.2, 5.2, 5.3, 5.3, 5.5, 5.12, 5.12, 5.17, 6.1, 6.5, 6.15, 6.19, 6.20, 6.21, 7.6, 7.7, 7.7, 7.7, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11, 7.23, 7.24, 7.25, 7.27, 8.15, 10.9, 10.15, 10.17, 10.18, 10.19, 10.19, 11.1, 11.11, 12.7, 12.7, 12.8, 12.12, 13.12, 13.13, 14.25, 15.2, 15.6, 15.6, 15.10, 15.13, 16.3, 16.15, 16.18, 16.21, 16.22, 17.4, 17.10, 17.11, 17.13, 17.14, 17.15, 17.24, 17.26, 18.6, 18.7, 18.16, 18.17, 19.9, 19.10, 19.11, 19.12, 19.23, 19.23, 19.41, 19.42, 19.43, 19.44, 19.44, 20.1, 20.2, 20.13, 20.14, 20.18, 20.19, 20.19, 20.23, 21.2, 21.2, 21.4, 21.5, 21.15, 21.17, 21.21, 23.1, 23.3, 23.3, 23.9, 24.1, 24.1, 24.2, 24.4, 24.9, 24.15, 24.25

3 Reg (192x) 1.9, 1.9, 1.23, 1.23, 1.24, 11.30, 11.9, 11.14, 11.16, 11.25, 11.31, 11.32, 11.37, 12.1, 12.12, 12.16, 12.16, 12.16, 12.18, 12.19, 12.20, 12.20, 12.21, 12.24, 12.28, 12.28, 12.33, 12.25, 12.28, 12.33, 21.34, 21.37, 22.9, 22.16, 22.17, 22.19, 22.20, 22.25, 22.25, 22.26, 22.27, 22.30, 22.30, 22.31, 22.33, 22.34, 23.2, 23.2, 23.5, 23.8, 23.13, 23.13, 23.14, 23.15, 23.16, 23.16, 23.17, 23.19, 23.20, 23.21, 23.23, 23.26, 23.26, 23.27, 23.34, 23.29, 23.33, 24.1, 25.17, 25.18, 25.19, 25.20, 25.31, 25.31, 25.36, 25.36, 26.10, 26.14, 26.16, 26.18, 27.7, 27.18, 27.21, 27.22, 27.26, 28.2, 28.4, 28.7, 28.11, 28.13, 28.20, 28.21, 28.22, 28.23, 28.26, 28.27, 28.27, 28.28, 28.28, 28.29, 28.31, 28.31, 28.32, 28.38, 28.40, 28.41, 28.43, 29.1, 29.2, 29.3, 29.4, 29.5, 29.6, 29.7, 29.8, 29.9, 29.10, 29.17, 29.18, 29.19, 29.20, 29.26, 29.29, 29.30, 29.30, 29.31, 29.32, 29.33, 29.34, 29.39, 29.41, 29.45, 29.52, 29.52, 29.53, 29.54, 1.56, 1.20, 1.30, 1.34, 1.35, 1.48, 2.4, 2.5, 2.11, 2.15, 2.32, 2.46, 2.52, 2.47, 2.27, 3.1, 3.7, 4.27, 5.1, 5.1, 7.1, 7.5, 7.9, 7.14, 7.14, 7.15, 7.16, 7.16, 7.16, 7.17, 7.20, 7.20, 7.22, 7.23, 7.25, 7.25, 7.26, 7.28, 7.30, 7.32, 7.33, 7.34, 7.36, 7.43, 7.52, 7.55, 7.56, 7.59, 7.62, 7.63, 7.65, 7.66, 8.5, 8.5, 8.7, 8.7

4 Reg (166x) 1.1, 1.3, 1.6, 1.18, 1.18, 1.20, 2.12, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, 3.13, 3.24, 3.24, 3.27, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.8, 5.8, 5.12, 5.15, 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 6.12, 6.21, 6.23, 6.26, 6.30, 7.6, 7.13, 7.14, 8.12, 8.16, 8.18, 8.25, 8.26, 9.3, 9.6, 9.6, 9.8, 9.12, 9.14, 9.16, 9.21, 9.29, 10.21, 10.28, 10.29, 10.30, 10.31, 10.31, 10.32, 10.32, 10.34, 10.36, 13.2, 13.3, 13.4, 13.5, 13.5, 13.6, 13.8, 13.10, 13.11, 13.12, 13.13, 13.14, 13.14, 13.18, 13.22, 13.25, 14.1, 14.8, 14.9, 14.11, 14.12, 14.13, 14.15, 14.16, 14.17, 14.23, 14.24, 14.25, 14.25, 14.26, 14.26, 14.27, 14.28, 14.28, 14.29, 15.1, 15.8, 15.9, 15.11, 15.12, 15.15, 15.17, 15.18, 15.20, 15.21, 15.23, 15.24, 15.26, 15.27, 15.28, 15.29, 15.31, 15.32, 16.3, 16.3, 16.5, 16.7, 17.1, 17.2, 17.6, 17.7, 17.8, 17.8, 17.9, 17.13, 17.18, 17.19, 17.20, 17.21, 17.21, 17.22, 17.23, 17.23, 17.24, 17.34, 18.1, 18.4, 18.5,

<sup>138</sup> 2 Par has only Ιαραηλ

<sup>139</sup> 2 Par has πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία Ιαραηλ.

<sup>140</sup> 2 Par has πάντα Ιουδαν καὶ Βενιαμιν which also appears in 2 Par 15.2 and reflects the MT. So it is not the translator's carelessness to have skipped כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל after the כָּל.

<sup>141</sup> 2 Par has only Ιαραηλ.

<sup>142</sup> 2 Par has only Ιαραηλ.

18.9, 18.10, 19.15, 19.20, 19.22, 21.2, 21.3, 21.7, 21.8, 21.9, 21.12, 22.15, 22.18, 23.13, 23.15, 23.19, 23.22, 23.22, 23.27, 24.13

**1 Par (108x)** 2.1, 2.7, 4.10, 5.1, 5.1, 5.3, 5.17, 5.26, 6.23, 6.34, 6.49, 7.29, 9.1, 9.1, 9.2, 10.1, 10.7, 10.7, 10.11, 11.1, 11.2, 11.2, 11.2, 11.3, 11.3, 11.4, 11.10, 11.10, 12.33, 12.39, 12.39, 12.41, 13.2, 13.2, 13.5, 13.6, 13.8, 14.2, 14.2, 14.8, 15.3, 15.12, 15.14, 15.25, 15.28, 16.3, 16.4, 16.13, 16.17, 16.36, 16.40, 17.5, 17.6, 17.6, 17.7, 17.9, 17.10, 17.21, 17.22, 17.24, 18.14, 19.10, 19.16, 19.17, 19.19, 20.7, 21.1, 21.1, 21.2, 21.3, 21.4, 21.5, 21.7, 21.12, 21.14, 21.14, 22.1, 22.2, 22.6, 22.9, 22.10, 22.12, 22.13, 22.17, 23.1, 23.2, 23.25, 24.19, 26.29, 26.30, 27.1, 27.16, 27.22, 27.23, 27.24, 28.1, 28.4, 28.4, 28.4, 28.5, 29.6, 29.10, 29.18, 29.21, 29.23, 29.25, 29.26, 29.30

**2 Par (184x)** 1.2, 1.2, 1.13, 2.3, 2.11, 2.16, 5.2, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.6, 5.10, 6.3, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.10, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 6.13, 6.14, 6.16, 6.16, 6.17, 6.21, 6.24, 6.25, 6.27, 6.29, 6.32, 6.33, 7.3, 7.6, 7.8, 7.10, 7.18, 8.2, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9, 8.11, 9.8, 9.30, 10.1, 10.3, 10.16, 10.16, 10.16, 10.17, 10.18, 10.19, 11.1, 11.13, 11.16, 11.16, 12.1, 12.6, 12.13, 13.4, 13.5, 13.5, 13.12, 13.15, 13.16, 13.17, 13.18, 15.3, 15.4, 15.9, 15.13, 15.17, 16.1, 16.3, 16.4, 16.11, 17.1, 17.4, 18.3, 18.4, 18.5, 18.7, 18.8, 18.9, 18.16, 18.17, 18.19, 18.25, 18.28, 18.29, 18.29, 18.30, 18.31, 18.32, 18.33, 18.34, 19.8, 20.7, 20.10, 20.19, 20.29, 20.34, 20.35, 21.4, 21.6, 21.13, 23.2, 24.5, 24.6, 24.9, 24.16, 25.6, 25.7, 25.7, 25.9, 25.17, 25.18, 25.21, 25.22, 25.23, 25.25, 25.26, 27.7, 28.2, 28.3, 28.5, 28.6, 28.8, 28.13, 28.23, 28.26, 28.27, 29.7, 29.10, 29.21, 29.24, 29.24, 29.27, 30.1, 30.1, 30.5, 30.5, 30.6, 30.6, 30.6, 30.21, 30.25, 30.25, 30.26, 31.1, 31.1, 31.5, 31.6, 31.8, 32.17, 32.32, 33.2, 33.7, 33.8, 33.9, 33.16, 33.18, 34.7, 34.9, 34.21, 34.23, 34.26, 34.33, 34.33, 35.3, 35.3, 35.3, 35.4, 35.17, 35.18, 35.18, 35.18, 35.19, 35.25, 35.27, 36.13

#### 2.12.4 πας Ισραηλ (all cases) in Samuel-Kings and Chr:

**1 Reg (17x)** 2.14, 3.20, 3.21, 4.5, 7.5, 11.15, 13.4, 13.20, 14.22, 14.40, 17.11, 18.16, 18.28, 19.5, 24.3, 25.1, 28.3

**2 Reg (19x)** 2.9, 3.21, 3.37, 5.5, 7.7, 10.17, 11.1, 12.12, 14.25, 15.6, 16.21, 16.22, 17.10, 17.11, 17.13, 17.26, 18.17, 19.11, 19.12

**3 Reg (19x)** 1.20, 2.15, 2.27, 3.7, 4.27, 7.5, 7.14, 7.65, 11.16, 12.1, 12.12, 12.16, 12.18, 12.20, 22.27, 23.17, 25.19, 25.20, 29.17

**4 Reg (2x)** 9.14, 10.21

**1 Par (18x)** 9.1, 11.1, 11.10, 12.39, 13.5, 13.6, 13.8, 14.8, 15.3, 15.28, 17.6, 18.14, 19.17, 21.5, 28.4, 29.21, 29.23, 29.25

**2 Par (20x)** 1.2, 7.6, 7.8, 9.30, 10.1, 10.16, 10.16, 11.13, 12.1, 13.4, 24.5, 28.23, 29.24, 29.24, 30.1, 30.5, 30.6, 31.1, 31.1, 35.3

Let us compare Samuel-Kings as “one” book with Chronicles:

	Sam-Kings	Chr	Comments
ישראל	635	301	
Ισραηλ	627	292	
MT plus %, relative to LXX	1.3 <sup>143</sup>	3.1	MT has a much stronger tendency to use “Israel” in Chr than in Samuel-Kings
כל-ישראל	63	48	
πας Ισραηλ	57	41	

<sup>143</sup> (635—627) / 627 \* 100% = 1.3%

MT plus %, relative to LXX	10.5	17.1	MT has a stronger tendency to use “all Israel” in Chr than in Samuel-Kings.
כל-ישראל relative to ישראל (%)	63/635 = 9.9	48/301 = 15.9	
πας Ισραηλ relative to Ισραηλ	57/627 = 9.1	41/292 = 14.0	

- (a) The כל-ישראל and πας Ισραηλ figures show clearly that MT has a tendency to use more frequently both “Israel” and “all Israel” than LXX. This is the case for both Samuel-Kings and Chr.
- (b) In its pluses relative to LXX (12.3% and 31.7%) MT’s tendency to use extra “all Israel” is stronger than pluses with “Israel” and this is true for both Samuel-Kings (10.5%:1.3%) and Chr (17.1%:3.1%).
- (c) It seems that scribes had a stronger tendency to add “all” to “Israel” in Chr (31%) than in Samuel-Kings (12.3%). This might have been due to different attitudes towards prophetic and non-prophetic books.

When the Samuel-Kings are analysed into their component “books”, a more complex picture emerges; but in general, we can observe the same tendency:

	1Sam	2 Sam	1Kgs	2Kgs	1Chr	2Chr	average
ישראל	151	117	203	164	114	187	156
Ισραηλ	149	120	192	166	108	184	153
MT plus %, relative to LXX	1.3	-2.5	5.7	-1.2	5.6	1.6	1.8
כל-ישראל	18	19	23	3	23	25	18.5
πας Ισραηλ	17	19	19	2	18	20	16
MT plus %, relative to LXX	5.9	0	20.1	50	27.8	25	111/95 =11.7
כל-ישראל relative to ישראל	18/151 = 11.9	19/117 = 16.2	23/203 = 12.3	3/164 = 1.9	23/114 = 20.2	25/187 = 16.6	119/936 = 12.7
πας Ισραηλ relative to Ισραηλ	17/149 = 11.4	19/120 = 15.8	19/192 = 9.9	2/166 = 1.2	18/108 = 17.7	20/184 = 10.9	95/919 = 10.3

Of particular interest to us are the following observations:

- (1) The MT of all books (except 2 Samuel ) have pluses of כל.
- (2) The MT of 1 Kgs, 1 and 2 Chr have a strong percentage of pluses relative to LXX. 2 Chr is particularly high (25%). (2 Kgs should be ignored for its small sample.)
- (3) Whether in MT or LXX, the frequency of the use of “all Israel” relative to “Israel” is in the same order of magnitude in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles.

Thus, when one detects a כל-ישראל in Chr with a כל plus but not in the same synoptic text of Samuel-Kings, it is as likely for the Chr to change its source as for the Massorete (or the scribe) to change Chr's. The same applies to Samuel-Kings. It is thus necessary to be cautious in relating Chr's pan-Israel concern to his use of כל-ישראל because MT has a much stronger tendency (17.1% plus) to use “all Israel” in Chr than in Samuel-Kings (10.5% plus).

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE ROLL OF DAVID'S MIGHTY MEN: TEXTUAL AND LITERARY STUDIES OF 2 SAM23 AND 1 CHR.11-12

#### 3.0 Introductory

This is our last chapter on detailed textual and literary studies between Chr and Samuel-Kings. In this chapter our main concern is still with the problem of textual and literary interdependence, in this case between 1 Chr 11 (|| 2 Sam 23)—12 and Samuel-Kings. Here and there we shall summarise results reached so far, but the arguments in this chapter are not dependent upon those in the two previous chapters. However, when results reached independently concur and point to the same direction or conclusion, they do corroborate one another.

The main interest in recent scholarship about 2 Sam 23 || 1 Chr 11 is with the question of the precise meaning of **שְׁלִשִׁים**<sup>144</sup> and the problem of the precise extent of the names in the list.<sup>145</sup> Neither of these two shall be our main concern here. Our main interest in 2 Sam 23 and 1 Chr 11 will be its textual development. Here the Greek text of the synoptic chapters, especially Par, is particularly helpful. 1 Chr 12, not paralleled in the Book of Samuel, will occupy much of our attention. And our concern is mainly with textual and literary connections.

#### 3.1 The Three Anonymous Loyal Heroes (2 Sam 23.13-17 || 1Chr 11.15-19)

It has been accepted, rightly, that the story of the exploit of the three mighty men at Bethlehem "is out of its original connection".<sup>146</sup> Some details in the first two verses of

---

<sup>144</sup> E.g. B. A. Mastin (1979), N. Na'aman (1988), and D. G. Schley (1990)

<sup>145</sup> E.g. B. Mazar (1963).

<sup>146</sup> To quote a few examples: Curtis and Madsen 1910: 188, McCarter 1984: 499, and Japhet 1993.



the story suggest to Japhet (1993: 245) that “v. 15a preserves the torso of an originally independent account, which was later combined with the story of the well at Bethlehem”. For 1 Chr 11.15 has David hiding “at the cave of Adullam” (v. 15) but the scene is switched immediately to “the stronghold” (v. 16). The Philistines’ encampment is first “in the valley of Rephaim” (v.15), but immediately thereafter “at Bethlehem” (v. 16). However, the text does not say that the Philistines encamped in both the valley of Rephaim *and* at Bethlehem but only that they were out for battle in the valley and that their garrison was in Bethlehem. The reason for this arrangement was probably that the Philistines were fighting against David and they expected him to return to Bethlehem via the valley. David was, however, hiding in the stronghold at Adullam. It was therefore dangerous to go back to Bethlehem because the Philistines were waiting for them in the valley. 1 Chr 11.15a is therefore a unity with the rest of the story and we have “the cave at Adullam” corresponding to “the stronghold” where David and his men were and “the valley of Rephaim” to “Bethlehem” because both were Philistine occupied areas.

The old consensus that this episode is out of its own context is fully justified but the conjecture of Budde and Curtis and Madsen (1910) that “v. 19b appears to have been the true conclusion of vv. 11-14, and vv. 15-19a probably came after the list of the thirty (in 2 S. vv. 13-17a after v. 39)” (188)<sup>147</sup> is not radical enough. It can be shown that this story is thematically foreign to the nature of the list and therefore a hypothesis of dislocation is not sufficient. Literary analysis of the story and evidence from the Greek text of 1 Chr 11.21a suggest that this small episode is likely to be an interpolation.

From a literary point of view, this small narrative pericope is well defined and self-contained. It has its own theme which differs from that of the anecdotes and the list. One can see that here in the story David’s ethico-religious piety is praised as much as, if not in fact more than, the feats of his three heroes. He looks more like the protagonist of

---

<sup>147</sup> Cf. McCarter (1984: 499) who also seems to suggest that the vignette in vv. 13-17 is just out of place and not foreign to the roster.

the short story than the three anonymous heroes; for he alone is allowed to speak<sup>148</sup> and to express his longing for water from the well of his home town, and also it is he alone who is given a chance to speak again to refuse to drink the water, in deep respect for the absolute loyalty of his men and in his fear of God. If, as the formulaic introduction of 2 Sam 23.8 says, the list is “the names of the mighty men whom David had”, it is surely strange to find three most heroic warriors unnamed. The reason for not naming the three heroes is probably because the narrator wants to focus on their loyalty and not on themselves, as R. P. Gordon (1986: 312) has rightly noted:

The heroism of the three mighty men is also a testimony to the loyalty which David inspired in his followers, ...

Contextually and thematically 1 Par 11.20, which is about Abishai, should join 11.14, but the little story breaks the continuity of its context. The first three named mighty men are men of war and they did very well in battle but Benaiah is even better because he is “a doer of great deeds” who killed a lion and a giant with a staff. He was so good that David set him over his bodyguard. Thus in the original list we have the anecdotes of four *gibborim* with descriptions of their feats one by one. The author’s praise of them reaches its climax at Benaiah. Into this comparison of feats, the redactor inserted another story comparing this time not physical feats but loyalty to David with the three unnamed men.

The interpolatory character of the three anonymous men could be further substantiated by the fact that the two pairs of the same comparative clauses applied to Abishai and Benaiah all read like external elements:

2 Sam 23.18 (|| 1Chr 11. 20): and won a name beside the three

2 Sam 23.19 (|| 1Chr 11. 21): but he did not attain to the three

2 Sam 23.22 (|| 1Chr 11. 24): and won a name beside the three mighty men

2 Sam 23.23 (|| 1Chr 11. 25): but he did not attain to the three.

---

<sup>148</sup> Dialogue has been regarded as the focus of Hebrew narrative as Alter (1981) says, “Everything in the world of biblical narrative ultimately gravitates toward dialogue” (182).

These two pairs of clauses are consequential of the interpolation and comparison. The secondary character of these half verses is rather obvious to see, e.g. :

He was renowned among the thirty, *but he did not attain to the three*. And David set him over his bodyguard. (2 Sam 23.18 || 1 Chr 11.25)

The comparative clause reads intrusively and the verse makes full sense without this afterthought. After all, what in fact did Abishai and Benaiah not attain compared with the three? Their reputation? But then why did not the author give us their names? Their bravery? In fact their sacrificial loyalty. The small episode is incongruous with the immediate context. The purpose of their story and the purpose of these two pairs of comparisons signify an anti-climatic undercurrent: military accomplishment is, after all, not as important as absolute loyalty to David.

### 3.2 2 Sam 23.14 || 1 Chr 11.16—**מצב פלשתים** / **נציב פלשתים**

2 Sam 23.14 and 1 Chr 11.16 differ in the use of the word for “garrison”. Samuel uses **מצב** whereas Chr uses **נציב**. The same difference is reflected in the Greek with τὸ ὑπόστημα in Reg and τὸ σύστημα in Par. This shows that the difference must be in the Hebrew text before the translation. The interesting phenomenon is that in the shared text, Chr’s word is used (2 Sam 8.6 || 1 Chr 18.6; 2 Sam 8.14 || 1 Chr 18.13). **מצב** is used only in a rather self-contained story in 1 Sam 14.1ff (vv. 1, 4, 6 and 11) and 13.23 which is part of that story. Elsewhere, **מצב** is used only in Josh 4.3, 9, Is 22.19, 29.3 and nowhere else. Chr’s word is used in the rest of Samuel in 1 Sam 10.5; 13.3, 4 and in the rest of Chr (2 Chr 8.10; 17.2) and elsewhere.<sup>149</sup> Hence, **נציב** is not a special Chronistic word and since the shared text elsewhere uses Chr’s “variant”, it seems possible that **נציב פלשתים** in 1 Chr 11.6 is the original reading and that **מצב פלשתים** is from a later hand. From this evidence alone, one cannot suggest that the story in 1 Sam 14 could be a later addition because it consistently use **מצב פלשתים**. But the possibility is there.

---

<sup>149</sup> E.g. in Gen 19.26, Josh 15.43 etc.

### 3.3 2 Sam 23. 11—Shammah and the Greek Evidence in Par

Shammah in Samuel’s text is the third named man of valour but he is not found in Chr. Japhet (1993) thinks that it is due to “a textual corruption [that] two of the anecdotes [of Eleazar and Shammah] become one”. [243] In suggesting that literary-historical possibility, Japhet, however, has not considered the relevance of the Greek text of 1 Par 11.21 and its interdependence with its Reg counterpart. The textual situation seems to be more complex than a mere textual corruption could explain. First, 1 Par 11.21 suggests that before Abishai there are only two named mighty men and that the anecdote of Abishai should be read immediately after that of Eleazer. 1 Par 11.21 reads:

<p>ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο ἔνδοξος<sup>150</sup> καὶ ἦν αὐτοῖς εἰς ἄρχοντα καὶ ἕως τῶν τριῶν οὐκ ἤρχετο.</p>	<p>Of the three, he was <u>more honourable than the two</u>;<sup>151</sup> and he became their captain; but he did not attain to the three.</p>
--	---

The text suggest that here we are dealing with two groups of three mighty men. Par’s reading compares Abishai with two other men who can only be the two previously named above, viz. Ishbaal (LXX) in v. 11 and Eleazar in v. 12. This comparison makes Abishai the most famous among the three named, himself included, and then he is compared with the three anonymous water-bringing heroes but found less illustrious in comparison.

It has been rightly suggested that “the compiler of 2 S. probably thought that the actors of this story were the three mighty men just mentioned” (Curtis and Madsen, 1910: 188). The plus 2 Sam 23.11 with the extra Shammah gives us precisely this impression and whereas Abishai is compared with the first two men in 1 Par 11.21, in 2 Reg 23.19 he is therefore compared first with those three named men and then the other unnamed three.

<sup>150</sup> MT has מן־השלשה הכי נכבד (|| 2 Sam 23.21: ... מן־השלשה בשנים נכבד).

<sup>151</sup> To my knowledge, only AV accepts the reading of the Greek which is a difficult reading but seems to be more original.

ἐκ τῶν τριῶν ἐκείνων ἐνδοξος  
καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς εἰς ἄρχοντα  
καὶ ἕως τῶν τριῶν οὐκ ἦλθεν. (2 Reg 23.19)

Of those three he is more honoured  
and he was their captain:  
but he did not attain to the three.

This comparison makes him better than the three (named) mighty men but less than the other three (unnamed) heroes. Reg's difference from Par is to be expected if Shammah was in fact an addition to identify the three anonymous heroes with Ishbaal, Eleazar and Shammah. Thus in place of Par's ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο, we have ἐκείνων which together with τριῶν compares Abishai with the three named. The insertion of 2 Sam 23.11 makes this change necessary. If our reconstruction of textual development is correct, we have here an editor's first attempt to be numerically precise in editing the list. The reason behind this identification of the three named heroes with the three water-bringing men is that the Samuel editor is obviously concerned with the fact that what lay before him is "the *names* of the mighty men whom David had" (2 Sam 23.8). The Chr is concerned, however, not so much with names and exactness of numbers but with those "who gave him [David] *strong support* in his kingdom" (1 Chr 11.10).

Thus we may conclude that the original list consisted of (1) anecdotes of Ishbaal, Eleazar, Abishai and Benaiah with the first three constituting the three mighty men; and (2) a list of names. The little episode of three anonymous water-bringing heroes was then added to shift the focus to them from the named mighty men. The feats of the four named men of valour are compared and found not as worthy of honour as the three loyal soldiers who risked their lives just to satisfy their king's longing for home and its water.

The history of textual development is probably this:

- (1) the original list had the anecdotes of Ishbaal, Eleazar, Abishai and Benaiah plus a few dozen names. The first three formed the original group known as "the three".
- (2) the exploit of three mighty men at Bethlehem was then inserted separating the comparison of Abishai from the first two. Consequential of this insertion is the comparison of Abishai and Benaiah with the three anonymous men.
- (3) the Samuel editor, with his concern for names and accuracy, added Shammah, probably borrowed from elsewhere in the list (2 Sam 23.25 || 1 Chr 11.27), to

complete the first three names and to identify the two groups of three. This change also necessitates a change of something like 1 Par 11.21 to 2 Reg 23. 19 in their originals.

Our next question now would be: Who added the story of the exploit of the three anonymous men?

### 3.4 The Literary Character of 1 Chr 11-12

In his 1981 OTS article, Williamson argues against a view espoused by Noth (1943) and Rudolph (1955) which sees 1 Chr 12.1-23 as a later addition to Chr. The arguments behind this view are first, 1 Chr 12.1-23 interrupts the connection between 11.10-47 and 12.24ff, both of which deal with those who came to David in Hebron. Second, 1 Chr 12.1-23 are chronologically out of order and refer back to David's rise.

Against Noth and Rudolph's view, Williamson suggests three arguments all of which seem to me to be valid: first, the language and style of the passage is characteristic of the Chr and second, 1 Chr 12.1-23 fits the general outlook of Chr. Third, he agrees with Noth and Rudolph that Chr 1 Chr 12.1-23 is not in correct chronological order but argues that a correct understanding of the Chr's method authenticates the passage as Chronistic. Williamson has also tried to show that 1 Chr 11-12 are carefully arranged in a neat chiasmic pattern, which is intended as a specific literary device to convey part of his message.

The more interesting and perhaps more conjectural idea in his paper is the proposal that like the song of the women in 1 Sam 18.7 (also in 1 Sam 21.12 and 29.5) and the proverbial question concerning Saul's prophetic status in 1 Sam 10.11-12 (also in 1 Sam 19.24), the poetic saying concerning David in 1 Chr 12.18 (comparable to 2 Chr 10.16, 2 Sam 20.1, 1 Sam 25.10) originated as "a saying in his favour, almost like a slogan" (174) coined by his followers in the early days of David's rise and circulated widely in oral form. This, it seems to Williamson, explains why it surfaced every now and then in different contexts. He therefore suggests that:

“the Chronicler, knowing of this old poetic saying, was attracted to it because it provided an early indication of God’s choice of David as king. He therefore emphasized its importance by presenting it as a prophetic saying, and he then added to it in order to reapply it dynastically by way of contrast with the account of the division of the kingdom.” (175)

In order to draw attention to it, the Chr arranged 1 Chr 11-12 in such a way that the poetic saying sits at the centre of a literary pattern. All these confirm to him, once again, “the interplay between inherited text and interpretative activity which has been at the centre of so much recent work on the books of Chronicles as a whole.” (176)

### 3.5 Literary Plan of 1 Chr 11-12

Zeron (1974) has suggested points of contact between 1 Chr 12 and the account of the period of and after Absalom’s rebellion, but all have been successfully rejected by Williamson who suggests instead that 1 Chr 11-12 forms a pattern which

... has at its centre the earliest period at which David began to attract support (e.g. 1 Sam xxii 1-5; xxiii 14; xxiv 1) and then moves through the Ziklag period (1 Sam xxvii 6 and xxix-xxx) and the assembling of the military personnel at Hebron finally to encompass the full extent of Israel at David’s coronation. (170)

It is possible that 1 Sam 22.1-4 could be the background for 1 Chr 11.15-19 but it is doubtful that the references to מצד in 1 Chr 12.9, 17 are to David’s fugitive period as described in 1 Sam 23 and 24. The only account about people dissenting to David is 1 Sam 22.1-2. In view of David’s friendly connection with the king of Moab who received his parents when they fled to join him, Japhet’s suggestion (1993: 257) that “the bond between David and the tribe of Gad, in fact with the whole of Transjordan, seems to have been established early in his career and lasted to its end” sounds plausible, and therefore explains an early dissent of the Transjordan tribe to David. The Benjaminites would have dissented to David about the same time.

The Greek text of Chr does not have the word מצד in 1 Chr 12.9, 17. It may well be the case that these two מצד were later added to the MT to aid a closer link to 1 Sam

22.5 where the prophet Gad advised David not to remain *במצודה*. Only *מדבר* in 12.9 is attested in both Hebrew and Greek. There were naturally plenty of opportunities for David to be in the Wilderness of Judah during his self-consolidating campaigns described in 1 Sam 27.8, where we are told that David “went up” (*ויעל*) against the Geshurites in the far north, across the Jordan west of the Sea of Chinnereth (Sea of Galilee) and he also went south-east beyond the border of Judah against the Amalekites and went down south-west as far as Shur in Egypt. David would have needed a lot of warriors for all those campaigns and it is possible that the Gadites were those who joined him for his campaign against the Geshurites (1 Sam 27.8). And it was geographically convenient, too, for the Manassehites to join him when he went with the Philistines to the valley of Jezreel against Saul.

Even if we prefer the Hebrew text, there is only one account of people deserting to David very close to his first attempt to seek refuge in Philistia, in 1 Sam 22. Another evidence against associating links between 1 Chr 12 and 1 Samuel other than 1 Sam 22.1-4 is that 1 Chr 12.1 provides a general introduction to the warriors “who helped him in war” when David was at Ziklag. Those are David’s self-consolidating wars and the best historical situation of 1 Chr 12.1 would therefore be 1 Sam 27.8-9 when David was getting more breathing space in Ziklag under Philistine protection. It should also be noted that the interpolatory little story of the three loyal anonymous men (1 Chr 11.15-19), though belonging to a different period, has nevertheless a battle as its context. *We shall shortly show that if we combine David’s two attempts to seek refuge from Achish, king of Gath, those who deserted to him would be those who would have helped him in his self-consolidating campaigns.*

With a change of perspective, one could as well say that 1 Chr 12 is presenting the support to David from all directions: Gad in Transjordan, Benjamin in central Palestine, Judah in the south and Manasseh in the north just before and when David was in Ziklag and then all the other tribes as well in Hebron. At the beginning there were about two dozen Benjaminite archers, and then about a dozen Gadite “mighty and experienced



warriors". There followed some Benjaminites and Judahites, probably too many to name one by one. Then seven "chiefs of thousands in Manasseh" probably with their subordinates in their thousands. Finally over 330,000 in Hebron! This way of seeing the literary plan is also suggested by the remark: "For from day to day men kept coming to David to help him, until there was a great army, like an army of God." (12.23)

1 Chr 12 may be regarded as describing the building up of David's military might during his sixteen month stay in Ziklag. It is at the same time an account of the change of allegiance from Saul to David before the transfer of his kingdom to the latter. In his "second" attempt to seek refuge from Achish, David went with his (four hundred) men, who are obviously those who had deserted to him as recounted in 1 Sam 22.1-4. It seems that 1 Chr 12.20a (without the correcting remark in v. 20b) betrays what David's real purpose was in seeking refuge from Achish and in requesting "one of the country towns"—to recruit an army to fight back against Saul with the support of the Philistines. There is no doubt that David was consolidating himself as a second power centre at Ziklag.

It was not unreasonable, too, to conjecture that an agreement could have been reached between him and Achish to eradicate Saul in a joint campaign. This agreement might underlie the cryptic dialogue between Achish and David in 1 Sam 28.1-2 which tells of David's consent to go with Achish against Saul. That explains why "all the Philistines" went up in search of him when they heard that David had been anointed king. Achish would have felt cheated by a David whom he once trusted so much (1 Sam 27.12)! Thus 1 Chr 12 is in the main a rather chronologically arranged structure from Ziklag to Hebron. In this chapter, Saul has been mentioned four times plus once as one of David's "adversaries" when he checked the loyalty of the Benjaminites, Saul's kinsfolk, who had also deserted to him. One of the main concerns of the editorial notes is the (direct) transfer of Saul's kingdom to David, as prophesied by Samuel in 1 Sam 28.17 (hence 1 Chr 12.24 "according to the word of Yahweh"); and how it was achieved with the support of the tribes. It thus become rather clear that 1 Chr 12 is an account of how

the tribes from the Transjordan (Gad), from central Palestine (Benjamin) and from the south (Judah) and north (Manasseh), i.e. people from all directions, deserted to David from Saul to transfer the latter's kingdom to him. Thus, besides Williamson's chiasmic pattern, we have a geographical pattern as well and both suggest that loyalty to David is the central theme of the chapter which is poetically expressed in the slogan in v.19. Japhet (1993: 259) notices that the tribes in 12.24ff are listed geographically in a south-north direction followed on each side. This fits a perspective of looking at the land of Israel from the position at Ziklag.

### 3.6 מצודה || מצדה

מצד ("stronghold") only in 1 Chr 11.7, 12.9, and 12.17.<sup>152</sup> However, the LXX does not reflect this word in 1 Par 12.8 (=12.9 MT) and 12.16 (=12.17 MT). It is not certain whether מצד in these two verses was from the hand of the Chr or a scribe. Other synoptic texts (of Samuel-Kings and Chr) use מצודה/מצדה. The spelling phenomenon of this word in the Hebrew Bible is an interesting one and deserve some discussion.

מצודה/מצדה appears only 20 times in Sam, Ezk, Ps, Job and Chr. What interests us is the fact that only in the synoptic texts of Samuel and Chr can we find the short spelling: 2 Sam 5.7 || 1 Chr 11.5; 2 Sam 5.9 || 1 Chr 11.7 (מצד), 2 Sam 22.2 (Ps 18.3 uses the *plene* spelling). Among the parallel texts only in the story of the three water-bringing heroes do we have a parallel in the *plene* spelling. This strengthens our suspicion that the story might be an interpolation. Elsewhere all its uses in Samuel not paralleled by Chr are in the *plene* form: 1 Sam 22.4, 5; 24.23 and 2 Sam 5.17. Chr's use of מצד in 1 Chr 11.7 is a rather unique one. It might have been derived from מצדה by the scribe who also added two more מצד in 1 Chr 12.9, 17. מצודה is used basically with the same

---

<sup>152</sup> The plural מצודות is found in Judg 6.2, 1 Sam 23.14, 19, 24.1; Is 33.16; Jer 48.41, 51.30; Ezek 19.9, 33.27.

meaning “fort, citadel”, as is the same word in modern Hebrew, but **מִצְדָּה** in modern Hebrew, from **מצד**, is a slightly different word of roughly the same meaning.

Although Barr (1989) has very successfully demonstrated that short and *plene* spellings may reflect more the practice of scribes than that of the authors, I would urge seeing our case here differently because the patterns we have detected are very regular ones. The use of the *plene* spelling in the story of David’s estrangement from Saul adds cumulative evidence for our argument that this part of the Davidic story might be a late interpolation. An interesting case for us is the variants in 2 Sam 5.17 || 1 Chr 14.8:

2 Sam 5.17 וישמעו פלשתים כי־משחו את־דוד למלך  
על־ישראל ויעלו כל־פלשתים לבקש את־דוד  
וישמע דוד וירד אל־המצודה:

1 Chr 14.8 וישמעו פלשתים כי־נמשה דויד למלך  
על־כל־ישראל ויעלו כל־פלשתים לבקש  
את־דויד וישמע דויד ויצא לפניהם:

If **מצודה** is the original reading now changed by the Chr, it would have more likely been originally a short spelling word since the shared-texts all use the short one. It is possible that a scribe/editor did not want to see David going out to battle before enquiring of Yahweh (2 Sam 5.19) and so he arranged for David to hide in the stronghold first.

### 3.7 Is the Three Mighty Men at Bethlehem a Chr Addition?

We have demonstrated above that the small story of the three anonymous men was probably later interpolation. Literary and linguistic considerations point in this direction. Thematically this story is very similar to the historical introductions of different segments of the name list. If “the verses which introduce each paragraph [of 1 Chr 12] and which conclude the whole should be attributed in their present form to the Chronicler” (Williamson, 1982: 106), should we also attribute the story of the three men to the Chr as well, because of their thematic and literary affinity with the other historical introductions?

If loyalty is the central theme of 1 Chr 11.10-12.1ff, then it is possible that the interpolatory 1 Chr 11.15-19 may be from the hand of the Chr, since the author of the

small story is as much concerned with loyalty to David as the poetic saying in 1 Chr 12.18 suggests. Stylistically, it also reads like other historical introductions in 1 Chr 12.

### 3.8 Links between 1 Chr 12 and 1 Samuel

In this part, we shall discuss literary interdependency between the half a dozen historical introductions to different segments of the name list and the Book of Samuel:

<i>Historical introductions</i>	<i>References in Chr</i>	<i>References in Samuel</i>
1. The loyal three at Adullam	1 Chr 11.15-19	2 Sam 5.17-25 (1 Sam 22.1)
2. The Benjaminites at Ziklag	12.1-2	1 Sam 22.1-2 or 27.8-9
3. The Gadites in the wilderness	v.9	1 Sam 22.3-5 or 27.8-9
4. The Benjaminites and Judahites	v. 18	1 Sam 22.1-2 or 27.8-9
5. The Manassehites at Ziklag	vv. 20-22	1 Sam 28.1
6. All the tribes at Hebron	v. 23	2 Sam 5.1-3 (1 Chr 11.11.1-3)

Of the six historical introductions above (5) is the most interesting one. Let us start with a translation of 1 Chr 12.20-22:

And Manasseh deserted to David when he came with the Philistines	12.20	וממנשה נפלו על-דוייד בבאו עם-פלשתים
for the battle against Saul. [He did not help them, for the rulers of the Philistines took counsel and sent him back saying, "With our heads he will desert to his master Saul."]		על-שאול למלחמה וילא עזרם כי בעצה שלחו סרני פלשתים לאמר בראשינו יפול אל-אדניו שאול:]
When he went to Ziklag these men deserted to him: Adnah, Jozabad, Jediahel, Michael, Jozabad, Elihu, and Zilethai, chiefs of thousands of Manasseh.	12.21	בלכתו אל-ציקלג נפלו עליו ממנשה עדנח ויזובד וידיעאל ומיכאל ויזובד ואליהוא וצלתי ראשי האלפים אשר למנשה:
They helped David over the troops because they were all mighty men of valour; and they became the commanders in the army.	12.22	והמה עזרו עם-דוייד על-הגדוד כי-גבורי חיל כלם ויהיו שרים בצבא:

Of these three verses, v. 22 is most ambiguous on the reference of **הגדוד**. The problem does not lie with the verse itself but with the influence of v. 20b which clearly alludes to the event in 1 Sam 29. The RSV puts this half verse in parentheses attributing something like an editorial remark to it. It also helpfully suggests in a footnote an alternative rendering of **על-הגדוד**: "as officers of his troops".<sup>153</sup>

<sup>153</sup> As far as I know only TEV and TCV, which probably follows TEV, adopt this rendering.

Although 1 Sam 30 uses הגדוד to refer to the Amalekite raiders (30.8, 15, 15, 23), the current context suggests rather that the word גדוד refers to David's troop in 1 Chr 12.19:

David received them, and make them chiefs of *the army*.

ויקבלם דויד ויתנם בראשי הגדוד:

Elsewhere except in 2 Chr 22.1, the Chr himself uses this word *only* as “troops” or “army” (e.g. 2 Chr 25.9, 10, 13; 26.11). Its use as “the army of Israel” (גדוד ישראל) in 2 Chr 25.9ff is particularly relevant to our present discussion. The preposition על can, of course, be used in a hostile sense to mean “upon, against” with or without a verb (*BDB*: 757) though it is used mainly in the non-hostile sense in the Hebrew Bible. Its use as “above” or “over” an army (על-הצבא) is well attested.<sup>154</sup> In the present immediate context על-הגדוד should therefore be taken as equivalent to על-הצבא.

The phrase עזרו עם is a unique one here and is not attested anywhere else in the Hebrew Bible. However, the analogous use of עבד עם (“serve with”, e.g. Gen 29.25, 27, 30; Lev 25.40) enables us to translate עזרו עם as “they helped ... with”. The sentence והמה עזרו עם-דויד על-הגדוד should therefore be rendered as “they helped David with overseeing the army” or less literally as “they helped David as army officers”. The use of על as part of an official title is attested in the use of אשר על-הבית (2 Kgs 10.5; Is 22.15: “the Governor of the Palace” (*BDB*: 755), “steward” (RSV)), אשר על-המס (1 Kgs 12.18: “overseer of the forced labour”) and אשר על-העיר (2 Kgs 10.5: “Governor of the City”). The structure of v.22 also supports our translation:

They helped David over the troop  
because they were all mighty men of valour;  
and they became the commanders in the army.

והמה עזרו עם-דויד על-הגדוד  
כי-גבורי חיל כלם  
ויהיו שרים בצבא:

This is a simple a-b-a' structure with על-הגדוד in parallel with שרים בצבא. The explanation in between tells us why the men of Manasseh were able to help David with his troop and why they were made commanders.

<sup>154</sup> 2 Sam 8.16; 17.25; 1 Kgs 2.35; 4.4; 1 Chr 18.15.

Thus we have to conclude that all considerations of points of context, grammar and style concur with the alternative translation suggested by the RSV. The RSV's alternative rendering "officers of the troops" is therefore fully justified and should be used in the text as in *Today's English Version* or *Today's Chinese Version*. The standard translation which is almost universally accepted by modern versions and commentators of Chr is an easier one but not necessarily the right one.

### 3.9 Links with 1 Sam 29-30

If we take seriously the proposal suggested by Stoebe *et al* that 1 Sam 31 should continue from the end of 1 Sam 28, then the last three chapters of 1 Samuel (without ch. 29-30) tell us a horrible story (supplemented by 1 Chr 12.20-22):

1. Achish demanded that David and his men should join him and David agreed (1 Sam 28.1-2)
2. On his way to Shunem, David and the Philistine army had to pass Manasseh and from there some of people deserted to him to help him in the battle (1 Chr 12.20a).
3. David was with Achish at Shunem (not Aphek as in 1 Sam 29) facing Mount Gilboa where Saul and the Israelite army encamped (1 Sam 28.4).
4. Saul sought guidance from a medium at Endor at night on the eve of the battle (1 Sam 28.8ff)
5. Next morning the battle was fought and Saul and his sons were killed. (1 Sam 31)
6. After the battle (and knowing the demise of Saul and his sons), the army officers of Manasseh, i.e. the chiefs of thousands, decided to follow David and returned to Ziklag (1 Chr 12.21)
7. Since they were all mighty men of valour, they helped David over the troops (על הגדוד) and were appointed commanders of the army (1 Chr 12.22)

Without v.20b, 1 Chr 12.20-22 fits the account of 1 Sam 28 perfectly. A practical consideration supports this literary connection: it is absolutely amazing that with deserters from Gad, Benjamin and Judah so much nearer to Ziklag than Manasseh David

would need supporters from a tribe in the far north to help to fight the Amalekite raiders in the far south. How could “far water” help with “near fire”? goes a Chinese saying. Shunem, on the other hand, is close to Manasseh and the Philistine army would have to pass through it to the battle field, probably with David’s help! Thus 1 Chr 12.20-22 is more likely a reference to 1 Sam 28.1-4 than to 1 Sam 29-30 which do not mention any further deserters.

We are therefore forced to conclude that 1 Chr 12.20b is a cross-reference to 1 Sam 29 put there by a scribe rather than the Chr. It is therefore proper to be put in parentheses as in the RSV.

### 3.10 Textual Priority

The apologetic nature of 1 Sam 29-30 is easy to see. Ch. 29 denies that David went to the battle with the Philistines and Ch. 30 provides an alibi for David when the battle was being fought and Saul and his sons were killed. We could even conjecture that 1 Chr 12.20-22 probably lies behind 1 Sam 29.1-2 because:

- (1) whereas 1 Sam 28.1-4 implies that David went with the Philistines and “encamped at Shunem”, 1 Chr 12.20a states explicitly that David “came with the Philistines for the battle against Saul”. It is this coming with the Philistines that 1 Sam 29 was designed to deny. 1 Sam 29.1-2 does not deny that David did go with the Philistines but it denies that he completed that journey and asserts that David had to return to Ziklag from Aphek more than 40 miles<sup>155</sup> south of Shunem!
- (2) 1 Sam 29.1 even denies that the Philistine army went by way of Manasseh and states that they went by the west coast and that David went only as far as Aphek which is west of and outside the border of even Ephraim not to mention Manasseh.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>155</sup> According to Y. Aharoni et al, *MBA*, map 95.

<sup>156</sup> *MBA*, map 68.

(3) Then the returning from a victorious battle to Ziklag was re-interpreted as returning from Aphek to see David's own place plundered by the Amalekites who, according to 1 Sam 27.8-11, should have all been killed.<sup>157</sup> It may well be the case that 1 Sam 30 is generated from twisting the meaning of the **על-הגדוד** in 1 Chr 12.22 which is contextually unambiguous.

All these changes have already been predicted in and necessitated by the words of a wise woman:

Now then, my lord, as Yahweh lives, and as your soul lives, seeing *Yahweh has restrained you from bloodguilt, and from taking vengeance with your own hand*, now then let your enemies and those who seek to do evil to my lord be as Nabal. (1 Sam 25.26)

We shall say a bit more about this important verse in the next chapter. Suffice it to say only that 1 Sam 29-30 is part of the narrative complex which defends David's innocence in the demise of Saul and his sons.

### 3.11 Other Links

The other links are less controversial and can easily be established. The story of the loyal three at "the cave of Adullam" fits the account in 1 Sam 22.1. Their story is put in front of the rest probably because they are loyal models. The other five are in strict historical order from the account of people deserting to David, David at Ziklag and then at Hebron. In the main the picture before us is that military power began to accumulate around David when he escaped from Saul to Ziklag. This continued until after the death of Saul, when all the tribes came to elevate him to the throne.

It may be worth going back to 1 Samuel to evaluate the literary situation there so as to provide a more accurate literary background for 1 Chr 11-12. In Chapter One we have shown a few points of contact between 1 Sam 31's variants and the HDR, notably "all his [i.e. Saul's] men" and "the tamarisk tree" and suggested these may be

---

<sup>157</sup> They are not mentioned again in Samuel-Kings or Chr.



consequential of the interpolation of the melodrama between Saul and David into 1 Samuel. An independent literary phenomenon in that book further corroborates this hypothesis because the insertion also created a doublet on David's escape from Saul to Achish in 1 Sam 21.10-15 and 1 Sam 27.1-4. The account of David's first encounter with Achish ends abruptly with the latter's question "Shall this fellow come into my house?" Then in 1 Sam 27.1 David behaved as though he were for the first time seeking refuge in the land of the Philistines. It thus looks like the original account has been cut short in the middle and the remaining part is used to start a second account in ch. 27. There are literary reasons to believe that the doublet was originally only one account:

First, Achish's despising rhetorical question "*Shall this fellow come into my house?*" is appropriately answered by David's plea for favour and request for another place, together with a corresponding rhetorical question "*for why should your servant dwell in the royal city with you?*" "*this fellow*" and "*my house*" correspond in parallel neatly with "*your servant*" and "*the royal city*" respectively. Such neat correspondence in form and subject matter is a strong indication that 1 Sam 27.5 should join 21.15 and that together they form one account of David's "escaping" to the land of the Philistines.

Second, immediately after David's "first" aborted attempt to seek refuge in Philistia, we are told that four hundred men deserted to him (1 Sam 22.1-2). As soon as David settled in Ziklag, David "and his men" began his self-consolidating campaigns around Palestine. If we put 1 Sam 22.1-4 in front of 1 Sam 21.10, we can immediately see that David went to see Achish during his "first attempt" with a small army. It is, however, inconceivable that with only four hundred men, David could make such extended raids upon the Geshurites, the Girzites, the Amalekites and as far down as Shur in Egypt as described in 1 Sam 27.8. Here, 1 Chr 12 fills the story which tells who were those who deserted to David in 1 Sam 22.1-4, as well as completing the picture of a growing army in Ziklag.

Third, the current form of 1 Samuel tells a long story of Saul's pursuing David for his life, dividing the account of David's escape to Philistia into two, the two accounts

presenting two different Davids. The ambitious David in 1 Sam 27.8-12 is totally different from the passionate David who showed no interest in Saul's kingdom. The David who asked the men of Benjamin and Judah

“If you have come to me in friendship *to help me*, my heart will be knit to you; but if to betray me to my adversaries, although there is no wrong in my hands, then may the God of our fathers see and rebuke you.”

is obviously an ambitious one. David's question does not say *to help him* with what, but the help he expected is rather clear in the context of 1 Chr 12, viz. to help “to turn the kingdom of Saul over to him, according to the word of Yahweh.” (v.23) The unnecessary long peril of escaping from the pursuit of Saul in 1 Samuel has its own purpose *which 1 Chr 12 does not assume*. The fact that David sought refuge from Achish together with the account of the ambitious David in 1 Sam 27.8-12, suggest that David wanted more than a passive protection.

It therefore seems likely that the original account of David's escaping from Saul should be a rather short one. David is not a sentimental person but a rather resolute one, as can be seen from the story of his early success as commander of a thousand winning the love of all Israel and Judah (1 Sam 18.16). As soon as he knew Saul was determined to kill him, he would have joined to the deserters and planned a fight-back with Achish's support. That was, we believe, the original story David's rise. The pace of the story is a rather swift one if we join 1 Sam 27.5 to 1 Sam 21.15 and read it back from 1 Sam 27.5-29.1ff with the help of 1 Chr 12.

The account of Jonathan's pact with David and David's promise not to cut off his name from the house of David belongs to the literary stratum of 2 Sam 21 and the account of David's dealing with Mephibosheth, both of which we have shown in Chapters One and Two respectively to be thematically unified and later additions. The material between the doublets of David's fleeing to the Philistines can likewise be narratively and thematically linked and unified. We shall give a thematic analysis of these related stories in the next chapter. Suffice it here just to state our working

hypothesis that the narrative which defends David's innocence had been written or joined to an originally much shorter story of David's rise.

### 3.12 David in Ziklag—Literary Continuity

A resolute and sensible David as depicted in 1 Sam 17-18 would have completely escaped out of Saul's sight when he knew the latter's determination to kill him (1 Sam 19.9-10).<sup>158</sup> It seems appropriate too that an evil spirit would have come upon Saul while he was in fear of David (1 Sam 18.29a).

It is important to note that v. 29b ("So Saul was David's enemy continually.") is not found in the Greek, which summarises Saul's long pursuit of David for his life as displayed in 1 Sam 19-26 succinctly in one sentence, and therefore constitutes a small piece of indirect evidence that at one stage of the development of the Book of Samuel(-Kings) the story of this continuous animosity between Saul and David might not have been there. It was only after the insertion of this narrative that v. 29b was incorporated into the Book of Samuel. A scribe put a remark after 1 Sam 18.29a to prepare the reader to enjoy a long story of hide-and-seek between the first two kings of Israel in their melodrama.

Hence 1 Sam 18.19a should join 19.9-10:

But when Saul saw and knew that Yahweh was with David, and that all Israel loved him, 18.29a Saul was still more afraid of David. 19.9 Then an evil spirit from Yahweh came upon Saul, as he sat in his house with his spear in his hand; and David was playing the lyre. 19.10 And Saul sought to pin David to the wall with the spear; but he eluded Saul, so that he struck the spear into the wall. And David fled, and escaped [וימלט].

This should then join 1 Sam 22.1-4, note the use of the same verb:

22.1 [David departed from there] and escaped [וימלט] to the cave of Adullam; and when his brothers and all his father's house heard it, they went down there to him.

---

<sup>158</sup> This is doubtless the original attempt and the first attempt in 1 Sam 18.11, not found in LXX<sup>B</sup>, a later addition.

22.2 And every one who was in distress, and every one who was in debt, and every one who was discontented, gathered to him; and he became captain over them. *And there were with him about four hundred men.*

22.3 And David went from there to Mizpeh of Moab; and he said to the king of Moab, "Pray let my father and my mother stay with you, till I know what God will do for me." 22.4 And he left them with the king of Moab, and they stayed with him all the time that David was in the stronghold.

The above should join 1 Sam 21.10-15:

21.10 And David rose and fled that day from Saul, and went to Achish the king of Gath. 21.11 And the servants of Achish said to him, "Is not this David the king of the land? Did they not sing to one another of him in dances,

Saul has slain his thousands,  
and David his ten thousands?"

21.12 And David took these words to heart, and was much afraid of Achish the king of Gath. 21.13 So he changed his behaviour before them, and feigned himself mad in their hands, and made marks on the doors of the gate, and let his spittle run down his beard. 21.14 Then said Achish to his servants, "Lo, you see the man is mad; why then have you brought him to me? 21.15 Do I lack madmen, that you have brought this fellow to play the madman in my presence? *Shall this fellow come into my house?"*

Achish last question corresponds tightly with David's in 27.5:<sup>159</sup>

27:5 Then David said to Achish, "*If I have found favour in your eyes, let a place be given me in one of the country towns, that I may dwell there; for why should your servant dwell in the royal city with you?"* 27:6 So that day Achish gave him Ziklag; therefore Ziklag has belonged to the kings of Judah to this day. 27:7 And the number of the days that David dwelt in the country of the Philistines was a year and four months.

---

<sup>159</sup> I tend to think that David's feigning of madness and Achish's response to his servants in 12-15a is a redactional attempt to abort David's "first" attempt to seek vassalship under Achish. V. 15b could have been modeled upon 27.5 so as to have Achish rejecting David, *even* before he asks! If Achish did not allow a mad man to stay in his country at the first time, why would he do that at the second? 1 Sam 27. 1-5 has not resolved this difficulty. It does not make sense that after rejecting David and after his victory over the Philistines in his delivery of Keilah (1 Sam 23.1-5), Achish would grant him protection in 1 Sam 27. The story of David's delivery may be modeled upon Saul's delivery of Jabesh-gilead and more importantly it tells the reader that David was not with the Philistines when he fled from Saul. He went there only as a last resort.

27:8 Now David and *his men* went up, and made raids upon the Geshurites, the Girzites, and the Amalekites; for these were the inhabitants of the land from of old, as far as Shur, to the land of Egypt. ... [to end of 1 Sam 28] ...

The above are texts with which 1 Chr 12 has clear links and they are consistent with the idea that David was setting up a second power centre at Ziklag where he went with his four hundred men, and then, as the number of deserters multiplied as described 1 Chr 12.1-23 David was able to consolidate himself by making raids to as far north as Geshur and as far south as into Egypt.

The above reconstruction of one of the earliest stages in the development of Samuel is helped by the fact that 1 Sam 19.1-27.4 (with the accounts of the fate of the Saulide remnants in 2 Samuel) is stylistically and thematically part of a larger coherent narrative complex which can rightly be said to be *the Apology for David's Innocence*. In the next chapter we shall attempt a delineation of this *Apology* in Samuel-Kings. The reconstruction of our more primitive Book of Samuel immediately resolves the problem of a couple of doublets in the current form of that book.

In 1 Sam 10.11 and 19.24 we have a double explanation of the proverb "Is Saul also among the prophets?". Our reconstruction supports Soggin's contention that "the first occurrence is probably the earlier and authentic one."<sup>160</sup> He also notes the two narratives about David's flight and the change of side in which he becomes a Philistine vassal.<sup>161</sup> This is automatically resolved when we join 1 Sam 27.5 to 21.15 to form one single account from the two. The death of Samuel is notified twice (1 Sam 25.1; 28.3). The later one is followed naturally by the story of Saul seeking guidance from the medium in 1 Sam 28. The first one is reported early to tell us that the help from Samuel David once enjoyed (19.18) is no longer available with the former's death. David is now all on his own, more helpless than before. Soggin then notes the fact that there are two different accounts of the circumstances of Saul's death: he committed suicide in 1 Sam 31,

---

<sup>160</sup> Soggin 1989: 212.

<sup>161</sup> Soggin 1989: 213.

whereas in 2 Sam 1 an Amalekite mercifully killed him when he was seriously wounded. Obviously the synoptic text 1 Sam 31 || 1 Chr 10 is the original account because the one in 2 Sam 1 is tendentious, in that its aim is to keep David at an epistemological distance from the event of the death of Saul and his sons, maintaining his non-implication in Saul's death. 2 Sam 1 therefore belongs naturally to the *Apology*.

Soggin (1989) supposes that "1 Sam 24 and 26 give duplicate versions of the episode in which the fugitive David generously spares the life of Saul". (213) However, R. P. Gordon's (1980) literary analysis of 1 Sam 24-26 demonstrates cogently that a chiasmic pattern is to be seen in these three chapters and 1 Sam 24 and 26 are therefore not duplicates.

For all the doublets and contradictions Soggin has collected and collated, he is obviously right to say that "here, too, we have the product of a union of various traditions and later re-readings" but his remark that "any attempt to distinguish sources, as in the Pentateuch, must be considered unsuccessful" is a little too pessimistic (212-13). There might not be a blending together of once existing separate sources, but there may have been several stages of rewriting and expanding of existing traditions which could be made recognisable with the help of 1 Chr 10-12.

### 3.13 Literary Development of the Book of Samuel

We shall now offer a sketch of a development history of the Book of Samuel based on the results of our study so far.

We have shown above that 1 Sam 29-30 is not the background for 1 Chr 12.20-23 which on the contrary may lie behind the tendentious 1 Sam 20-30. However, since it has been suggested by Stoebe *et al* that 1 Sam 31 should pick up where 1 Sam 28 ends, the two chapters in between would have to be a later addition. The following considerations substantiate Stoebe's view.

First, a contradiction exists between 1 Sam 30 and 1 Sam 27.8-9, with the latter telling us that the Amalekites were one of the peoples David raided and he "smote the

land, and left neither man nor woman alive ... to bring tidings to Gath" (vv.9-11).<sup>162</sup> But then after being rejected for the campaign, David returned to Ziklag only to find it being plundered by the Amalekites.

Second, according to 1 Sam 29.1 "the Israelites were encamped by the fountain which is in Jezreel" but according to 1 Sam 28.4 "they encamped at Gilboa" which matches the situation in 1 Sam 31.1. 1 Sam 29.1 tells us that the Philistines were still on their way to the battle field and encamped at Aphek over 40 miles away from Shunem, at which 1 Sam 28.4 says the Philistines had encamped. All these suggest that 1 Sam 29-30 is a later addition. *According to the flow of story in 1 Sam 28.1-5 David and his men are already with the Philistines at Shunem with the Israelite army at Mount Gilboa on the eve of the battle before Saul went to see a medium.* 1 Sam 29.1 puts him 40 miles away from the front-line. Obviously 1 Sam 28.1-5 is clear evidence that David and his men were in the battle with the Philistines against Saul.

The purpose of 1 Sam 29 is to correct the picture one sees in 1 Sam 28.1-5, where David agreed to help Achish to fight against Saul and where David is with the Philistines at Shunem. 1 Sam 29 flatly denies that David did go to the battle, whereas 1 Sam 30.1 provides evidence of David's alibi when Saul was killed in the battle in which he was suspected to have assisted. It took David three days to go back to Ziklag and when David arrived there, Saul was already two days ago dead.

It is hardly possible that a story of David usurping power by destroying Saul and his family could have been written, and even if it had, it is unlikely that it would have been handed down to us without being heavily edited or corrected. Even without the correcting chapters 1 Sam 29-30, the account in the earlier stratum in 1 Sam 27.5ff, 28 and 31 already has a modest defence for David's non-implication in the death of Saul and his sons. First, he was required by Achish to join the battle against Saul—it was not his own initiative. Then, in the account of the battle, it was the Philistines who killed

---

<sup>162</sup> One has the impression that the Amalekites had already been completely suppressed before David went with Achish for the battle against Saul.

Saul's sons, and Saul committed suicide. Obviously, these points still assume that David did go to the battle—exactly the point 1 Sam 29-30 is designed to deny. 1 Sam 29-30 could therefore be taken as a later stage in the literary development of the Book of Samuel. These two chapters deny that David fought alongside the Philistines against Saul. The melodrama between Saul and David (1 Sam 19.1-27.4 plus stories about the death of other Saulides, except 19.9-10, 21.10-15 and 22.1-4) belong to the same stage.

Thus far, we can have no unambiguous evidence in 1 Chr 10-12 which presupposes the story of Saul's pursuit of David. The following results we have so far reached point to this statement:

- (1). Links to the melodrama of Saul and David can be found in 1 Sam 31 but not in 1 Chr 10.
- (2). Internal evidence in 1 Samuel suggests that at one stage of the development of the Book of Samuel there was probably nothing standing between 1 Sam 21.15 and 1 Sam 27.4; related material in 1 Sam 19-21 can easily be delineated.
- (3). 1 Sam 21.10-22.4, with a little rearrangement, plus 1 Sam 27.5-12 fits the situation as described in 1 Chr 11.10-12.1ff almost point by point: Adullam, stronghold, Transjordan support, Ziklag, war fought while David was in Ziklag. They are supplemental accounts.

### 3.14 The Purpose of 1 Sam 30

In an interesting chronological treatment of the short period close to Saul's death, Fokkelman lists the train of events taking places synchronically at three scenes: (1) the raid on Ziklag by the Amalekites (1Sam30.1-2), (2) the rejection of David by the Philistine lords at Aphek (1Sam29.1-10) and (3) the battle between the Israelites and the Philistines (1Sam28.5).<sup>163</sup> According to the time-table he reconstructed,<sup>164</sup> by the time

---

<sup>163</sup> Fokkelman 1986: 592-95.

<sup>164</sup> Fokkelman 1986: 594.



Saul and his sons were killed, David was attacking the Amalekites (1 Sam 30.17) and he remarks that

The surprising consequence of the table is that *the defeat of Saul and Israel on the Gilboa took place on the same day as David's victory over the Amalekites.* (595, italics original)

In view of the overarching concern of the author to produce an alibi for David from the scene of Saul's death, one can say that such synchronism is actually the purpose of the narrative of 1 Sam 30. One can easily tell where David had been just before and when Saul was killed. We have a time-table of David's whereabouts during the three days in which Saul was killed. Let us take as the first day when David was with Achish at Aphek (1 Sam 29.1). The second day David with his men parted company with the Philistines. He returned to the land of the Philistines when Achish and his army marched up to Jezreel to meet Saul. Then we are explicitly told that "on the third day" (1Sam30.1) David came to Ziklag and found that it had been plundered by the Amalekites when he was away. This is the one thing that happened in the whole day while David was on his way to Philistia. But when David was half way between Aphek at the North and Ziklag at the south near Gath, the armies of Achish and Saul had already engaged and very soon Saul and his sons were killed, the first thing mentioned about that battle on Gilboa in 1 Sam 31. Thus David had a unmistakable alibi.

### 3.15 Could 1 Chr 12 be Part of Chr's Source?

We are treading much less solid ground in tackling this question. However, some of the conclusions we reached above suggest that this is a legitimate one. The following are some indications; together they may form a case:

- (1) The story of the three anonymous men in 1 Chr 11.15-19 || 2 Sam 23.13-17 is thematically the same as the historical introductions in 1 Chr 12, especially Amasai's poetic slogan.

- (2) Both Williamson and Japhet have shown that 1 Chr 11-12 forms a unity in its present form.
- (3) 1 Chr 12 fills out and explains 1 Sam 27.8-28.2.
- (4) 1 Chr 12 is consistent with a short story of David's elevation to the throne with Saul's kingdom transferred to him shortly after Saul's death but not with the story of Ishbosheth. It also satisfies Samuel's prophecy of a total collapse of the Saulide dynasty the next day after his appearance to Saul in 1 Sam 28.19.
- (5) The figure 336,222 for the total number David's military personnel as described in 1 Chr 12.24-40 matches well the 300,000 men of Israel and 30,000 men of Judah in 1 Sam 11.8.
- (6) A pan-Israel support for David's leadership is supported by both 1 Sam 17.16 ("all Israel and Judah"), 2 Sam 5.1 ("all the tribes of Israel") or its synoptic counterpart 1 Chr 11.1 ("all Israel").

One thing we are more confident of is that 1 Chr 12 does not seem to presuppose the long extended story of the struggle between Saul and David.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE HISTORY OF SAUL AND DAVID (SHSD)

Thus said Shimei as he cursed, "Out, out, man of blood, and man of wickedness. Yahweh has avenged upon you all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose place you have reigned; and Yahweh has given the kingdom into the hand of your son Absalom. See you are in your own evil; for you are a man of blood. (2 Sam 16.7-8)

16.7 וכה-אמר שמעי בקללו צא צא  
איש הדמים ואיש הבליעל:  
16.8 השיב עליך יהוה כל דמי  
בית-שאול אשר מלכת תחתו  
ויתן יהוה את-המלוכה  
ביד אבשלום בנך והגך  
ברעתך כי איש דמים אתה:

#### 4.0 Introductory

##### 4.0.1 HDR—State of the Problem

In his seminal work Rost (1926/82) did not give the HDR as stable a demarcation as he did to the SN. His HDR comprises pericopae and fragments from 1 Sam 23 to 2 Sam 5 but without 1 Sam 24-25. Scholars in general agree that the HDR is a tendentious story of David—that it has as its aim “in der göttlichen Legitimation des Königs David und seiner Dynastie über Israel” (Weiser 1966: 354); that it is a political propagandistic apology of David’s rule comparable to the Hittite apology (McCarter 1980); that it provides a judicial exoneration of David from any accusation that he is implicated in the death of Saul and his sons or that of Isbosheth (Mabee 1980); that its purpose is to acquit David of usurpation as accused by Shimei in 2 Sam 16.7-8 (Brueggeman 1989: 24). All these are largely compatible positions.

It is on the question of its delimitation that to date no consensus has been achieved among scholars. This situation of the HDR is quite unlike the SN which most scholars, whether or not they think that it once existed as a written source, agree comprises 2 Sam 9-20, 1 Kgs 1-2. Ward (1967) defines the HDR to be from 1 Sam 16.14 through to 2 Sam 5. Weiser’s delimitation (1966) is about the same but begins with 1 Sam 16.1. Grønbaek (1971: 37) moves its beginning a chapter back to the beginning of the pericope about the rejection of Saul at 15.1 because he thinks that David’s rise should begin with Saul’s fall. He has won the following of Mettinger (1976) but his position is rejected by

McCarter (1980: n.6). As to the far end, Weiser pushes it two chapters forward to 2 Sam 7 because in 7.8 he sees “der Rückblick auf Davids Geschick” (p. 325) as determined in 1 Sam 16.1-13. The chapter 2 Sam 7, which refers the reader back to the time when David was a shepherd, acts as the keystone of the narrative.

#### 4.0.2 The Impasse and the Exit

A brief description of scholarly investigation into the HDR is enough to enable us to see where are the deserts and where are the fertile lands. The clear impression is that whereas those who have worked on the problem of the scope of the HDR as an independent source cannot reach a general agreement on where it should begin and where it should end, those who have done thematic analysis of the HDR agree that it is *an apology for David vis-à-vis the demise of Saul and his house*. David's innocence is the theme of this story. This general consensus puts a question mark on the theoretical value of the comparatively vaguer theme of *David's Rise*. It appears rather clearly that the idea of “David's Rise”, because it does not signify a clear cut and specific theme, cannot reliably be used as a guide to determine the scope of the HDR. It is a pity, however, that none of those who agree on the apologetic theme of the HDR has tried to delimit the HDR using this theme which, being very precise, may have a much better chance of helping us to delimit a literary unit than the general idea of David's Rise.

The appeal of Rost's SN, besides its showing an exit from the stalemate reached by the older source analysis of the books of Samuel, lies precisely in its very concrete theme expressible in the question “Who shall sit on David's throne?” Might one have a more reliable demarcation if one is to re-delimit the HDR so that it answers the question “Was David responsible for the demise of Saul and house?”—as suggested by Shimei's accusation (2 Sam 16.7-8) to David?

To the existing schemes of the HDR, one must raise these two questions: How could we separate the story of Saul's rise from his fall? (*contra* Grønabæk) Or Solomon's building of the temple from Nathan's oracle which it anticipates? (*contra* Weiser) One

feels that the tendency to extend the HDR in both directions has simply been arbitrarily stopped. It seems to me that the idea of an HDR as an originally independent document in any of the suggested delimitations is indefensible. Firstly, they all sacrifice the integrity of a complete (not necessarily independent) story of Saul. Secondly, there are clear narrational and thematic links between the HDR and the SN, e.g. the story of Mephibosheth, the fulfilment of the prophecy against the house of Eli and the theme of David's guilt. Thirdly, in all the existing schemes of the HDR it is a very unbalanced document—sixteen (1 Sam 19-27; 29-30, 2 Sam 1-4) out of twenty-one chapters (1 Sam 16-2 Sam 5) are devoted to a verbal (or judicial) defence of David's innocence. Fourthly, our textual and literary studies in the last three chapters suggest the possibility that the Chr did not know the extended account of David's estrangement from Saul and all the accounts of the final fates of the Saulide remnants.

#### 4.0.3 A Thematic and Stylistic Approach

As mentioned above sixteen out of twenty-one chapters of the usual delimitation of the HDR (1 Sam 16-2 Sam 5) are devoted to defending David's innocence over the death of Saul and his house. All these sixteen chapters are concerned with only one thing, viz. a verbal, judicial exoneration of David. These sixteen chapters are after all not so much concerned with telling a story of David's rise to kingship or justifying his elevation to the throne as with a judicial defence of his *person*. Their focus is David *himself*, his purity, his honesty, and his righteousness. Outside these sixteen chapters his rule has already been justified by stories about Saul's disobedience (1 Sam 15), Yahweh's favour of David (16), David's piety and valour (17), David's leadership (18.14-15), the people's love of David (1 Sam 18.16), the support of the dignitaries of the tribes (2 Sam 5.1), and the circumstances of how Saul and his sons died on Mount Gilboa (1 Sam 31) without David's involvement. All these "events" are rather descriptive. What "happened" justified David. The reader is invited to see and believe, to put it bluntly.

In contrast to the justification of David as a better king than Saul in various aspects, the sixteen apologetic chapters are concerned with opinions about David's integrity, with his own verbal self-defence of innocence and loyalty to Saul. One hears the witness of Jonathan (1 Sam 19), Ahimelech (22), Saul (24, 26), Abigail (25), Achish (29), David himself (24, 26), and the narrator's own remark (3.37). Judging by the amount of dialogue in these chapters, Rost (1926/82) is right to apply the following comment to his three *Unterquellen* available to the author of the SN:

In the earlier David story we can see hardly anything of this [the SN's] dominating and creative power of direct speech. (110)

But it is surely not applicable to the judicial defence of David's innocence in the HDR, where direct speech is of paramount importance. As a matter of fact, everything Rost has said about the significance of speech in the SN can be applied to the narrative which defends David's innocence. There, events are secondary and subordinated to verbal pronouncements. E.g. "So all the people and all Israel understood that day that it had not been the king's will to slay Abner the son of Ner" (2 Sam 3.37). Events are not considered by the narrator to be sufficient. Events must be interpreted; they do not speak with unambiguous intention. In contrast the sixteen chapters that defend David are concerned with judicial acquittal of David which requires the reader to hear the evidence of various witnesses for David's character and come to an expected conclusion about him.

The narrator of the apology chapters does not, of course, just use dialogues and speeches; he presents evidence and favourable circumstances for David as well. He reports the final fate of all those in whose death David could be implicated. He also gives an alibi to David and distances him physically and emotionally from the situations of the death of Saul and his sons (2 Sam 1). To enhance the effect of his re-portraying David's person, the person of Saul is depreciated by putting blood into his hand: he is responsible for his relentless attempt to murder David, killing the priestly city of Nob (1 Sam 22.16-19) and the Gibeonites (2 Sam 21.1-14).

The purpose of this chapter is to suggest a way out of the *impasse* scholars of the HDR have reached when they try to pin down precisely where the HDR should begin and end. In view of the above discussion, our purpose must not be to select the best HDR schemes available or even to work out our own. We must take account of the redactional conclusions reached in the previous chapters. We must also take account of many recent studies on the HDR that focus on its apologetic theme.

The justification for our approach is mainly a methodological one. Firstly, none of the literary schemes for the HDR seems to me to be convincing. They all share the same internal (scope) and external (links with the SN) difficulties. Secondly, our redactional finding in the last three chapters corresponds surprisingly well with many recent thematic studies of the HDR, especially those on the apology of David's innocence which begins sharply at 1 Sam 19. These two considerations force us to suggest as a working hypothesis that we should instead see in the books of Samuel an originally much shorter but complete (though not independent) History of Saul and David (HSD), but without the extended apology for David's innocence over the demise of Saul and his house which was only later *added* to the base text. For the sake of economy, we call it "SHSD", acronym for "Supplement to the HSD". There is, however, no evidence to show that the HSD and the SHSD were once independent documentary sources.

In what follows, we shall suggest a structure of the HSD which has already been briefly mentioned above. Following this is a thematic analysis of the SHSD with highlights on its thematic structural elements, mainly dialogues, which form the framework of the SHSD. Then there finally follows a review of several thematic studies of the HDR to show that it has many connections with the SN which cannot be satisfactorily explained as secondary. This logically leads to the problem of the interrelationship between the SHSD and the SN which will be discussed in the next chapter. This and the following chapter therefore form a two-part argument for the common authorship of the SHSD and the SN. Our main proposals are (1) that, *contra* de Wette's and its modern derivatives, the Chr did not know the SHSD and the SN; and

(2) that, *contra* Rost, the SN is not an independent written source; and (3) that the SHSD and the SN were very probably written by the same author who attached them to a much shorter version of “Samuel-Kings” than has ever been suggested before Auld (1994) but probably longer than the actual version proposed by Auld.

#### 4.1 The Original History of Saul and David (HSD)

Our study of 1 Sam 29 in Chapter 3 confirms that those are right who suggest that 1 Sam 31 should continue from where 1 Sam 28 ends. As we shall soon see, 1 Sam 29 is part of a thematically coherent narrative defending David’s innocence over the death of the Saulides on Mount Gilboa. Also discussed in Chapter 3 is the internal evidence which suggests that the original account of David’s seeking protection from Achish (1 Sam 21.11-16; 27.5-7) has been split into two, with the narrative space thus created in between for an extended account of David’s estrangement from Saul. Our study of 1 Sam 31 || 1 Chr 10 in Chapter 1 suggests that the story of David’s duel with Goliath must be in the Chr’s *Vorlage* because the battle in the valley of Jezreel where Saul was defeated and fell dead is a contrast to the battle in the valley of Elah in which the victor was David. The story of Michal in the shared text (2 Sam 6.16 || 1 Chr 15.29) also necessitates that the story of her marriage to David in 1 Sam 18 should also be in the Chr’s *Vorlage*.

Our question now is: how much material between 1 Sam 19.1 and 21.9 would have been in the Chr’s *Vorlage*? If, as we have argued in Chapter One, 2 Sam 21.1-14 was not in the Chr’s *Vorlage*, then the account of the covenant between Jonathan and David in 1 Sam 20.1-42 should also go, because 2 Sam 21.7 refers specifically to David’s oath made in that chapter. The argument to support the inclusion of Ahimelech the priest’s support for David in 1 Sam 21 in the Chr’s source, except perhaps v. 7 which links ch. 21 to ch. 22, runs like this. This story makes good sense in that David obtains from Ahimelech enough food for himself and the “young men” and also weapons to embark on a long journey to Gath. Another reason for keeping 1 Sam 21 is a literary one, which is that its



account of David seeking help from Yahweh's priest forms an interesting contrast to Saul's seeking guidance from a medium in 1 Sam 28.

Against the inclusion of 21.1-10, however, one could argue that this episode may well just be a secondary addition to contrast David and Saul and it may also be the case that the account of David meeting Ahimelech is just to prepare for the latter's death, i.e. to add an item to the list of Saul's crimes and *more importantly* to bring the prophecy against Eli's house in 1 Sam 2.27-3.18 closer to fulfilment. As we have discussed in Chapter Three, Yahweh's rejection of the northern priesthood and of the northern dynasty—represented by the houses of Eli and Saul—have redactional links (“the blind and the lame”) in 2 Sam 5 that are absent from the synoptic counterpart in Chr. Moreover, another strong reason to support this conjecture is that Ahimelech does not appear at all in Chr's genealogical lists and does not exist prior to his debut here in 1 Sam 21.1. Hence, the balance of evidence tends to suggest excluding 21.1-10 from the Chr's *Vorlage*.

Saul's sin of slaying the servants of Yahweh is surely not a lesser sin than his disobedience to the words of Yahweh in sparing the life of Agag, the Amalekite; but in his last appearance Samuel mentions only the latter. 1 Chr 10.13-14 also refers only to that sin. The escape of Abiathar from death is the beginning of the end of the Shilonite priesthood that is to be reported near the conclusion of the SN in 1 Kgs 2.27. The two accounts therefore belong together with 21.1-10.

Only 1 Sam 19 now remains to be considered. What we have to find is the crucial event that would have caused David to make up his mind to flee to Philistia. The best candidate is obviously Saul's attempt to kill him using a spear in 19.9-10.<sup>165</sup> Saul's “first” attempt in 18.10-12 is not found in the LXX and its secondary character has been argued by Auld and Ho (1992). It is interesting to note that 18.10-11 repeats 19.1-10 concerning the coming of the evil spirit upon Saul. 18.12 repeats 18.29a (29b is not in

---

<sup>165</sup> Lemche (1978) is quite right to suggest that “apparently David took refuge in the Philistine camp very soon after his break with Saul” (13).

the LXX) on Saul's fear of David. The report of Saul's fear in 18.29a is a good opportunity for him to be possessed by an evil spirit (19.9). We shall shortly show that the dialogue between Saul and Jonathan in 19.1-7 on the one hand and between Achish and David in 1 Sam 29 on the other shows that they have the same judicial function and they are composed using the same literary technique. It also seems that 19.11-24 is secondary because the proverb about Saul's prophetic status is repeated there. 1 Sam 19-22 reads like the redactor's attempts to show that David enjoys support from all sides: crown prince (19.1-7), wife (vv. 11-17), Samuel and his prophetic guild including the spirit of God (vv. 18-24), priest Ahimelech (21.1-10) and even Saul's servants (22.7-8). This redactional concern in vv. 11-17 has outweighed David's good sense in that instead of making him flee and escape to a really safe place the redactor put him in one of the most dangerous and predictable locations! In all of David's many escape episodes, the only one that makes sense is 21.11-15. Seeking protection from Achish is risky, as the text itself tells, but Philistia is the safest place for David.

So we suggest that 1 Sam 18.29a should connect to 19.9 and 19.20 should lead immediately to 21.11. Thus the flow of the original story of David at the crucial juncture of his escape for life reads as follow:

... 18.28 But when Saul saw and knew that Yahweh was with David, and that all Israel loved him, 18.29a Saul was still more afraid of David. (→) 19.9 Then an evil spirit from Yahweh came upon Saul, as he sat in his house with his spear in his hand; and David was playing the lyre. 19.10 And Saul sought to pin David to the wall with the spear; but he eluded Saul, *so that he struck the spear into the wall. And David fled* (וַיִּבְרַח דָּוִד) (→) 21.10 (11)<sup>166</sup> *and ran away that day* (וַיִּבְרַח בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא) from Saul, and went to Achish the king of Gath. ... 21.14 Then said Achish to his servants, "Lo, you see the man is mad; why then have you brought him to me? 21.15 *Do I lack madmen, that you have brought this fellow to play the madman in my presence? Shall this fellow come into my house?*" (→) 27.5 *Then David said to Achish, "If I have found favor in your eyes, let a place be given me in one of the country towns, that I may dwell there; for why should your servant dwell in the royal city with you?"* ...

---

<sup>166</sup> The first two words וַיִּבְרַח דָּוִד gives a fresh beginning of another journey.

Our textual evidence (Chapters One to Three) and redactional considerations above are the main support for this reconstruction. The thematic coherence studied in the next section will add cumulative support to it as well. It is not our purpose here to delimit a History of Saul and David (HSD) as many have with the HDR. The reason is that we have no evidence to suggest that it once existed as an independent source. It is, however, useful to have an overview of the structure of this story when the SHSD was attached to it. We therefore suggest the following:

- ... Most of 1 Sam 1-8 without the Eli story and minus ch 8<sup>167</sup>
- (1). Saul anointed by Samuel (1 Sam 9-10)
  - (2). Saul's proof of his leadership—delivering Jabesh-gilead (11)<sup>168</sup>
  - (3). Saul's victory over the Philistines (13.2-4a, 5-7a; 15-22; 14.46-52)<sup>169</sup>
  - (4). Saul's disobedience to the Words of Yahweh (15)
  - (5). David anointed by Samuel (16)
  - (6). David's proof of his leadership—delivering Israel (17)
  - (7). David gaining popularity and Saul tries to kill him (18; 19.9-10)
  - (8). David as vassal of Achish (21.11; 27.5-7)<sup>170</sup>
  - (9). Samuel's prophecy of a total demise of the Saulide dynasty (28.1-25)
  - (10). Prophecy fulfilled on Mount Gilboa (31)
  - (11). David anointed by all the tribes (2 Sam 5)
  - (12) Episodes shared with Chr

---

<sup>167</sup> Our attention is on the story of Saul and David but it is part of a larger story. 1 Sam 1 no doubt gives "a sense of a beginning" (Brueggemann 1990) but this does not imply that the original document in which the HSD was a part began sharply at 1 Sam 1.

<sup>168</sup> Scholars differ in details on exact delimitations, but in general agree that material favourable to the monarchy is to be found in chs. 9-11, 13 and 14 while material critical to the monarchy is to be found in chs. 8 + 10.17-27 +12 (Anderson 1959: 74-5; Kaiser 1975: 153; Rendtorff 1985: 171; Soggin 1989: 210-11). For a holistic (literary) treatment of these chs. from the perspective of the Dtr, see Polzin 1989: 80-139.

<sup>169</sup> Saul's first sin disturbed a very positive story (note the favourable remark in 14.47-48) reporting Saul's victory over the Philistines. This is not known either to Samuel or to the Chr (1 Chr 10.13-14).

<sup>170</sup> Note the bulk of the SHDR is within 21.12 -27.4.

The story of Saul and David is, as Fokkelman (1986) has nicely put in the subtitle of vol. 2 of his fascinating analysis of the books of Samuel, a story of their “crossing fates” and the story of David has therefore to be an integral sequel to a story of Saul and vice versa. The rejection of Saul and the election of David cannot be separated. In this respect Grønbæk is certainly right in taking *die Verwerfung König Sauls und Davids Salbung zum König* as part of his HDR. But this cannot be a proper beginning of a story of crossing fates. Just as one cannot have a proper story of David with only his coronation (2 Sam 5) but without the divine election, so a *Verwerfung Sauls* cannot be a proper beginning of a story of David either without his rise to the throne: one cannot have a Fall without a Rise, or a Rejection without an Election.<sup>171</sup>

It is important to note that the structure of the suggested History of Saul and David (HSD), to use a fairly neutral term, is a rather balanced one. Its concern is to tell a story of dynastic transfer from Saul to David, and at the same time to state its theological and tribal preference (1 Sam 18.16) for David as a better king. It should be noted, however, that lifting the SHSD from this HSD does not render the latter non-apologetic. It is still a story *for* David: Saul is elected and rejected by Yahweh. David proves to be a militarily and religiously better leader and more favoured by Yahweh and loved by “all Israel and Judah”. His vassal status under his new master Achish is directly caused and forced by Saul. The account which defends David’s stay with the Philistines is short but to the point. He has no choice but to follow Achish in the battle against Saul. The story is silent about his activity in Saul’s last battle. What is clearly said, however, is that Saul and his sons are killed by the Philistines and not by David’s men; and in particular, the wounded Saul commits suicide.

---

<sup>171</sup> Berges (1989) suggests that the story runs from the end of Judges through to David’s enthronement in 2 Sam 5 and that the story conforms to Dtr’s interpretation of history and its present form was produced for the people in exile. This is in sharp contrast to a tradition-historical reconstruction which Berges doubts would succeed for a story so drastically rewritten by the Dtr. This redactional view could be complemented by a literary view espoused by Brueggemann (1990) which sees 1 Sam 1 as the beginning of a new era.

This original apology of David, the HSD, is rather factual and less verbose. In contrast, the SHSD is more concerned with constructing a rather judicial and therefore verbal defence of David. It is understandable that the defence has to be thus portrayed because Shimei does not just raise a suspicion of David's implication in Saul's death but a *public* accusation which therefore needs a solid response and an unambiguous judicial exoneration of David. As we shall soon show, the SHSD is indeed formulated very judicially in its defence of David's innocence over the demise of Saul and his house. Again, we must emphasize that there is no evidence which suggests these materials were once a documentary source.

The extended apology for his innocence in the SHSD does not add very much factual information to the HSD except geographical locations in the route of David's escape. David's regular seeking of oracular guidance from Yahweh (ישאל דוד ביהוה in 1 Sam 22.10; 23.2, 4; 30.8; 2 Sam 2.1) contrasts with Yahweh's rejection of Saul in not answering him. But there is nothing new in this because the shared text (2 Sam 5.19, 23 || 1 Chr 14.10, 14) already has David twice inquiring of Yahweh concerning battles.

## 4.2 David's Innocence—Supplement to the History of Saul and David

### 4.2.1 Narrative Structure<sup>172</sup>

In this section, we shall discuss the thematic coherence of the SHSD.<sup>173</sup> But first a list of these materials and their content:<sup>174</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup> Since 2 Sam 9 is generally accepted as the beginning of the SN and 2 Sam 5-8 has its synoptic counterpart in Chr, we shall end the SHSD at 2 Sam 4. But it must be emphasised that this is only a convenient end-point. We shall show in Chapter Five that the SN continues the theme of the SHSD till its end in 2 Kgs 2.

<sup>173</sup> Humphreys (1978, 1980, 1982) believes that he has recovered an ancient narrative stratum in 1 Samuel governed by the theme "the rise and fall of king Saul". In her literary and historical scrutiny of the DH's story of Saul, Edelman (1990) rightly suggests that in its present form, a history of Saul's rise, even if once existed as a self-contained narrative, forms only the background after the Dtr redaction. Here what we are attempting is *not* the recovery of yet another source but the demonstration of a major coherent theme of a redactional layer composed and added to a *Vorlage* by the same person and *not* just cut-and-pasted to it by an editor.

- (1). Jonathan defends David's innocence (19.1-7)
- (2). Saul's daughter helps David to escape (19. 11-17)
- (3). Prophetic spirit prevents Saul from harming David (19. 18-24)
- (4). The oath between Jonathan and David (20)
- (5). Supporters of David:
  - (5.1) Ahimelech provides David with food and weapon and thus plants the seed of his destruction (21.1-10)
  - (5.2) David does not run away with an army but just social outcasts (22. 1-2)
  - (5.3) Support from the king of Moab and the prophet Gad (22.3-5)
- (6). Saul's blood guilt in utterly slaughtering Nob, the city of the priests (22.6-23)
- (7). David is still the enemy of the Philistines after escaping from Saul (23.1-5).
- (8). From Keilah to the Wilderness of Ziph, then to the strongholds at Horesh, then to the wilderness of Maon, then to the strongholds of En-gedi (23)
- (9). Saul-Nabal-Saul: Narrative analogy defending David's innocence against accusation of treason (24-26)<sup>175</sup>
- (10). David's second attempt to seek protection from Achish (27.1-4, 8-12)
- (11). David did go with the Philistines to the battle against Saul but was returned by Achish (29)
- (12). David's alibi in the death of Saul and his sons (30)
- (13). David's revenge for Saul and his lament for Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam 1)<sup>176</sup>
- (14). Exonerating David from the accusation that he killed Abner and Ishbosheth (2 Sam 2-4)<sup>177</sup>

---

<sup>174</sup> The SHSD must be part of much larger redactional layer. For our purpose we are interested mainly in supplements which are thematically coherent.

<sup>175</sup> Gordon (1980) has argued cogently for the coherence of these three chapters.

<sup>176</sup> For an analysis of the poetic quality of David's lament, see Oesterley 1938: 59-62.

<sup>177</sup> Rendtorff (1971: 439) has already suggested that 2 Sam 3.6-4.12 were composed by the author who wrote the HDR on the ground of their similarity.

There is one thing in common in all the above materials. They all aim at defending David's innocence, with Shimei's accusation in mind (2 Sam 16.7-8).<sup>178</sup>

#### 4.2.2 Dialogical Structure of the SHSD

The narrative framework of the SHSD is supported by a series of thematic dialogues between the main characters of the narrative:

- (1). Saul and Jonathan (1 Sam 19.1-6)
- (2). David and Jonathan (20.1-23)
- (3). Saul and Jonathan (20.27b-32)
- (4). David and Saul (24.8-23[22])
- (5). Abigail and David (25.24-34)
- (6). Saul and David (26.17-25)
- (7). Achish and David (29.6-10).

All the above dialogues share very close stylistic features and all the characters, including David himself, verbally support David's integrity. In the following we shall discuss the main dialogues and their stylistic parallel points.

Jonathan's defence of David:

19.4 And Jonathan spoke well (טוב) of David to Saul his father, and said to him, "Let not the king sin against his servant (בעבדו) David; because he has not sinned against you (כי לוא חטא לך), and because his deeds (מעשיו) have been of good (טוב) to you; 19.5 for he took his life in his hand and he slew the Philistine, and Yahweh wrought a great victory for all Israel. You saw it, and rejoiced; why then will you sin against innocent blood (בדם נקי) by killing David without cause?"

---

<sup>178</sup> It is outside the scope of the current research to discuss various schemes of DH redactions, but it is surprising to find that almost all of our SHSD fall within Peckham's (1985) DTR<sup>2</sup> edition of the history of Saul and David. See Peckham 1985: Fig. 1. Although Peckham claims that "the distinction between the two editions [of the HSD] is based on the evidence for two complete and exclusive historical interpretations" (192), it does not seem to me that he has convincingly shown in sufficient detail how this distinction is made or what governs the structure of each edition.

20.32b Jonathan answered Saul his father, “Why should he be put to death (למה ליומת)? What has he done (מה עשה)?”

#### David defends himself:

26.18 And he said, “Why does my lord pursue after his servant (עבדו)? For what have I done (מה עשיתי)? What guilt is on my hands (ומה-בידי רעה)? 26.19 Now therefore let my lord the king hear the words of his servant (עבדו). If it is Yahweh who has stirred you up against me, may he accept an offering; but if it is men, may they be cursed before Yahweh, for they have driven me out this day that I should have no share in the heritage of Yahweh, saying, ‘Go, serve other gods.’ 26.20 Now therefore, let not my blood (דמי) fall to the earth away from the presence of Yahweh; for the king of Israel has come out to seek my life, like one who hunts a partridge in the mountains.” (1 Sam 26.19-20)

#### Achish’s defence of David:

And Achish said to the commanders of the Philistines, “Is not this David, ... since he deserted to me I have found nothing in him (ולא-מצאתי בו מאומה) to this day.” (1 Sam 29.3)

Then Achish called David and said to him, “As Yahweh lives, you have been honest (ישר אתה), ... for I have not found any evil in you (לא-מצאתי בכ רעה) ... “ (1 Sam 29.6)

And Achish made answer to David, “I know that you are as good (טוב) in my sight as an angel of God; ...” (1 Sam 29.9)

The close stylistic and thematic affinity between the first two passages above is one of the reasons why we start with Jonathan’s defence of David’s innocence as the beginning of the SHSD. In both, David is referred to as Saul’s עבד. David’s question מה עשיתי is also asked by Jonathan and Saul is reminded of David’s good מעשיו. Jonathan also reminds Saul that David has been טוב to him while David denies any רעה. Both try to prevent Saul from shedding דם (נקי). It is interesting to note that the accusation against David for treason is only defended but not fully raised in Samuel—in fact not until 2 Sam 16.7-8, in Shimei’s accusation. Saul does warn Jonathan of David’s threat to his kingdom (1 Sam 20.30-31) but does not accuse him of treason.



In his very skilful analysis of the subtlety of 1 Sam 29, Brueggemann (1989) is able to demonstrate that from Achish's three-fold declaration of David's innocence (1 Sam 29.3-9), "the canonical intentionality" of the narrative is "to express the trust Israel has in David, a trust not necessarily based on facts, but on the strong habit David has of making his way through crises unscathed, even by bloodguilt" (p. 30). Brueggemann makes an heuristic observation that "the accusation of Shimei [2 Sam 16.7-8] is not answered or refuted by David, or by the narrator, but is left unresolved" (p. 23).<sup>179</sup> David is depicted as being in a dilemma when he follows Achish to fight against Saul (1 Sam 28.1-2):

He must either now go against his own people and forfeit his future kingdom as a traitor, or he must expose himself as a fraud to Achish and surely be exterminated.  
(25)

The resolution of this dilemma is wrought in ch. 29 which he thinks is from "an unexpected source" (25). By sitting between the narrative of blood guilt avoided in 1 Sam 24-26 and blood guilt denied in 2 Sam 1-4 ch. 29 acquits David through the mouth of Achish, the character witness of David who declares:

I have not found anything in him (29.3).  
I have found no evil (רעה) in him (29.6).  
I know you are as good (טוב) in my eyes as an angel of God (29.9)<sup>180</sup>

Brueggeman points out three levels of David's acquittal. From Achish's standpoint, David is innocent. The "omniscient" reader knows, however, David is not innocent because he lies to Achish. However, from the perspective of Israel, David is in fact innocent in the death of Saul. But when he uses Shimei's curse to make his point

---

<sup>179</sup> It is resolved by David through quietly bearing the pain of "misunderstanding" and by hoping that in doing so Yahweh will repay him good for Shimei's cursing. The reader is left to resolve the validity of the accusation. The narrator obviously expected the reader would disagree with Shimei.

<sup>180</sup> We shall later see that the key words of רעה and טוב run through the whole of the HDR and the SN.

Brueggeman is illustrating a theme of the HDR by a passage taken from the SN when he says that

the explicit accusation of Shimei and the painstaking attention of the narrative to David's innocence together suggest a central motif in the narrative of David's Rise to Power. (24)

One may add to Brueggeman's analysis that Jonathan's defence of David in 1 Sam 19.4-5 and Achish's positive witness to David's integrity form an interesting bracket of claims of David's innocence as far as Saul's death is concerned. Both Jonathan and Achish defend David's innocence. Achish has a three-fold intensifying assertion not only about David's innocence and his lack of רעה but more positively about his goodness (טובה). טוב(ה)/רעה are keywords here and appear again and again in the SHSD and the SN. Another important word is נקי ("innocent") used of David in 1 Sam 19.5 and used again of David's throne in the SN (2 Sam 14.9).

David appeals before Jonathan:

David fled from Naioth in Ramah, and came and said before Jonathan, "What have I done (מה עשיתי)? What is my guilt (מה-עוני)? And what is my sin (ומה-חטאתי) before your father, that he seeks my life?" (1 Sam 20.1)

David appeals before Achish:

And David said to Achish, "But what have I done (מה עשיתי)? What have you found (ומה מצאת) in your servant ..., that I may not go and fight against the enemies of my lord the king?" (1 Sam 29.8)

In both scenes we have David appealing to the one who is sympathetic to him, indeed, the one who "really knows" the truth about him. David declares that no fault can be found in him that Saul should seek his life. With about the same words, David declares his loyalty to Achish his "lord the king" and maintains that he should therefore be allowed to fight the battle with him against his enemies. Two points are being made about David, in fact by David himself: First, he was loyal to Saul when he was with him and to Achish after he fled to him. Secondly, being loyal to Saul, there is no reason for

him to seek David's destruction; and by virtue of the same kind of loyalty to Achish, he should be allowed to seek the destruction of his enemies (not David's). David is always loyal to his masters—a defence against Nabal's charge that David is just one among "many servants nowadays who are breaking away from their masters". (1 Sam 25.10)

David declares the cleanness of his hands, note the almost playful use of the word יד:

24.10 And David said to Saul, "Why do you listen to the words of men who say, Behold, David seeks your hurt (רעתך)?"

24.11 Lo, this day your eyes have seen how Yahweh gave you today into my hand (בידי) in the cave; and some bade me kill you, but I spared you. I said, I will not put forth my hand (ידי) against my lord; for he is Yahweh's anointed.'

24.12 See, my father, see the skirt of your robe in my hand (בידי); for by the fact that I cut off the skirt of your robe, and did not kill you, you may know and see that there is no evil (רעה) or treason in my hands (בידי). I have not sinned against you (ולא-הטאתי לך), though you hunt my life to take it.

24.13 May Yahweh judge between me and you, may Yahweh avenge me upon you; but my hand (ידי) shall not be against you.

24.14 As the proverb of the ancients says, 'Out of the wicked comes forth wickedness'; but my hand (ידי) shall not be against you.

24.15 After whom has the king of Israel come out? After whom do you pursue? After a dead dog! After a flea!

24.16 May Yahweh therefore be judge, and give sentence between me and you, and see to it, and plead my cause, and deliver me from your hand (מידך)." (1 Sam 24.9-12)

From the repeated mention of "the hand", it is clear that the central concern and focus here is the cleanness of David's hands, i.e. the innocence of his royal power.<sup>181</sup> In all the SHSD, it is Saul's hands which are not clean. Saul's servants, when ordered to kill the priests of Nob because their hand (ידם) supports David, "would not put ידם upon the priests of Yahweh" (1 Sam 23.17). This concern with the innocence of David is the main

---

<sup>181</sup> One of the main meanings of יד is, figuratively, "strength and power" (BDB: 390). Thus the SHSD argues that David had not abused his power against the failing Saul and his family.

reason for the redactor's incorporating Ps 18 into 2 Samuel because one of its fragments depicts the Davidic king declaring the cleanness of his hands:

- 21 "Yahweh rewarded me according to my righteousness (כצדקתי);  
according to *the cleanness of my hands* (כבר ידי) he recompensed me.
- 22 For I have kept the ways of Yahweh (דרכי יהוה),  
and have not wickedly departed from my God (ולא רשעתי מאלהי).
- 23 For all his ordinances were before me,  
and from his statutes I did not turn aside.
- 24 I was blameless before him,  
and I kept myself from guilt (מעוני).
- 25 Therefore Yahweh has recompensed me  
according to my righteousness (כצדקתי),  
according to my cleanness in his sight (כברי לנגד עיניו).<sup>182</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup> The Davidic king's declaration of innocence (DI) has an interesting resemblance with the judgement scene described in *The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead*. In Spell 125 (Andrews 1985: 29-34) the dead is reported as making his "declaration of innocence" (DI) in the Hall of Justice before the Lord of justice; in this DI the dead invokes the name of forty-two gods and after each is a confession of innocence. After declaring innocence to the forty-two gods of different parts of Egypt, the dead then makes an address to the god of the Hall of Justice. The following is particularly interesting:

I am pure, pure, pure, pure!

...

you shall tell the truth about me in the presence of the Lord of All, because I have done what is right in Egypt, ...

...

Behold, I have come to you *without falsehood of mine, without crime of mine, without evil of mine*, and *there is no one who testifies against me*, for I have done nothing against him. I live on truth, I gulp down truth, I have done what men say and with which the gods are pleased.

...

*Save me, protect me*, without your making report against me in the Presence, for *I am pure of mouth and pure of hands*, ...

I have come here to bear witness to truth and to set the balance in its proper place within the Silent land.

O You who are uplifted on your standard, Lord of Atef-crown, who made your name as Lord of the Wind, save me from your messengers who shoot forth harm and create punishments and who show no indulgence, *because I have done what is right for the Lord of Right. I am pure, my brow is clean, ... there is no member in me devoid of truth.*

2 Sam 22.21-25 (|| Ps.18.20-24) reads very much like an address to the god of justice. Its use with a preceding underworld scene (vv. 16-20) is particularly interesting. The Davidic king, being entangled by "the cords of death" and "the cords of Sheol", must declare his innocence before he can be delivered "out of many waters". For a study of the *genre* of DI in the OT and Job 31 in particular, see Dick (1983) who has, regrettably, overlooked Ps 18.

This thematic affinity of 2 Sam 22 with the SHSD suggests that they belong to the same redactional stratum and that the former may be the source of inspiration of the latter.

### 4.3 The Core Chapters of the SHSD: 1 Sam 24-26

Crucial to the understanding of the thematic (*not* literary) unity of the SHSD is Abigail's speech. It is worth displaying this wise lady's words in full:

She fell at his feet and said, "Upon me alone, my lord, be the guilt; pray let your handmaid speak in your ears, and hear the words of your handmaid.

Let not my lord regard this ill-natured fellow, Nabal; for as his name is, so is he; Nabal is his name, and folly is with him; but I your handmaid did not see the young men of my lord, whom you sent.

Now then, my lord, as Yahweh lives, and as your soul lives, seeing *Yahweh has restrained you from blood guilt*, and from taking vengeance with your own hand, now then let your enemies and those who seek to do evil to my lord be as Nabal.

And now let this present which your servant has brought to my lord be given to the young men who follow my lord.

Pray forgive the trespass of your handmaid; for Yahweh will certainly make my lord a sure house,

because my lord is fighting the battles of Yahweh; and *evil shall not be found in you so long as you live*.

If men rise up to pursue you and to seek your life, the life of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of the living in the care of Yahweh your God; and the lives of your enemies he shall sling out as from the hollow of a sling.

And when Yahweh has done to my lord according to all the good that he has spoken concerning you, and has appointed you prince over Israel,

*my lord shall have no cause of grief, or pangs of conscience, for having shed blood without cause or for my lord taking vengeance himself*. And when Yahweh has dealt well with my lord, then remember your handmaid."

ותפל על-רגליו ותאמר בי-אני 25.24  
 אדני הען ותדבר-נא אמתך באזניך  
 ושמע את דברי אמתך:  
 אל-נא ישים אדני את-לבו אל-איש 25.25  
 הבליעל הזה על-גבל כי כשמו כן-הוא  
 גבל שמו וגבלה עמו ואני אמתך לא  
 ראיתי את-נערי אדני אשר שלחת:  
 ועתה אדני חי-יהוה וחי-נפשך 25.26  
 אשר מנעך יהוה מבוא בדמים  
 והושע ידך לך ועתה יהיו כגבל  
 איביך והמבקשים אל-אדני רעה:  
 ועתה הברכה הזאת אשר-הביא שפחתך 25.27  
 לאדני ונתנה לנערים המתהלכים ברגלי אדני:  
 שא נא לפשע אמתך כי עשה-יעשה 25.28  
 יהוה לאדני בית נאמן  
 כי-מלחמות יהוה אדני  
 גלחם ורעה לא-תמצא בכ מימך:  
 ויקם אדם לרדפך ולבקש 25.29  
 את-נפשך והיתה נפש אדני צרורה  
 בצרור החיים את יהוה אלהיך ואת  
 נפש איביך יקלענה בתוך כף הקלע:  
 והיה כי-יעשה יהוה לאדני 25.30  
 ככל אשר-דבר את-הטובה עליך  
 וצוך לנגיד על-ישראל:  
 ולא תהיה זאת לך לפוקה 25.31  
 ולמכשול לב לאדני ולשפך-דם  
 חנם ולהושיע אדני לו והיטב  
 יהוה לאדני וזכרת את-אמתך ס:

4.3.1 If Nabal (=Saul) is folly incarnated, then Abigail must be Lady Wisdom. Her wisdom has not only won her the future king's approval (v. 33), but even his desire for her person—"Happy is the man who finds wisdom" (Prov 3.13a). We shall compare more fully the sapiential quality of the SHSD with that of the Succession Narrative in the next chapter. Here in the core speech of the SHSD, the narrator is playing analogy within an analogy. Externally, the reader understands that Nabal is an analogy for Saul. Internally, within this "narrative analogy" (Gordon 1980), the narrator has Abigail

making another analogy using the name of her husband to ridicule him. Thus we have Saul=Nabal=fool! In contrast, David, who listens to the words of Lady Wisdom, must be the “wise son” of Proverbs which teaches that

24.3 By wisdom a house is built,  
and by understanding it is established;

The wise father will soon bring up a perhaps even wiser son in whose hand the kingdom will be established (1 Kgs 2.46b). We shall say more on the sapiential provenance of the SHSD in the next chapter.

4.3.2 In her speech, Abigail looks forward to Yahweh’s promises of a sure house for David in Nathan’s oracle (2 Sam 7), and backward to David’s military might in 1 Sam 17-18. But her main concern is to relieve David of any guilt feeling in his conscience in the matter of the death of Saul and his house. She also curses all David’s “enemies and those who seek to do evil” (v. 26) to him, that they may share the fate of Nabal (=Saul), i.e. killed in battle (26.10; 31). In this sense, the speech also looks forward to the Absalom story, where Absalom will die seeking to do evil to his father. The woman of Tekoa, another *persona* of Lady Wisdom, will speak to David again to deal with his second guilt and give advice on the matter of his guilty son Absalom (2 Sam 14.4-20). The sapiential link between the SHSD and the SN is found in their respective core chapters of which both deal with David’s conscience. This adds to our argument for the common authorship of the SHSD and the SN in the following chapter.

4.3.3 The key to the understanding of 1 Sam 24-26, according to Gordon, is the function of the “narrative analogy” of the David-Nabal story in 1 Sam 25. Gordon suggests rightly that these chapters of the HDR address most directly the question of David’s avoidance of blood guilt on his way to the throne. 1 Sam 24 and 26 are two

similar incidents in which David has a chance to kill Saul. In between is the David-Nabal story and Abigail's speech to David persuading him to avoid bloodshed.<sup>183</sup>

Following Alter, narrative analogy is understood by Gordon to be "a device whereby the narrator can provide an internal commentary on the action which he is describing, usually by means of cross-reference to an earlier action or speech" (42). Many factors point to the narrator's attempt to prepare the readers to read Nabal as a Saul figure. Most importantly, the killing of either Saul or Nabal would cast a shadow over David's throne. Both Saul and Nabal share a similar spatial-temporal background and both of them are of comparable social status. Nabal is also depicted as "a diminutive Saul" by the narrator. They both refuse to know and acknowledge David for what he is. Abigail's attitude to Nabal reverberates with Saul's servants attitude to him. Both Saul and Nabal share a very similar temperament: impulsive, suicidal behaviour, in short "foolish" in opposing David as the destined messiah of Yahweh.

4.3.4 Rhetorically, the narrator gives hints to the readers to interpret Nabal as Saul. Gordon notes the following parallels between chapters 25 and 24:

1. David to Nabal: "... your son David" (25.8) || David to Saul: "... my son David" (24.16)
2. The use of טוב / יטב and רעה: "... and he has returned me *evil* for *good*" (25.21) || "... you have repaid me *good*, whereas I have repaid you *evil*" 24.17(18).
3. The use of ריב (cause): "Blessed be Yahweh *who has pleaded the cause of my reproach* at the hand of Nabal and has kept back his servant from evil." 25.39 || 24.15(16) " ... *may he* [i.e. Yahweh] *see and plead my cause, ...*"

---

<sup>183</sup> On the question of the unity of these chapters, Gordon disagrees with the view that ch.24 and 26 are sibling accounts of the same incident and argues that these three chapters constitute a three-part plot with incremental repetition of the motif of blood guilt and its avoidance (p.53). He therefore rightly disagrees with those who argue that chapters 24 and 26 are separate written sources (Budde 1902: 157; Smith 1912: 216) or variant accounts of the same story as a result of separate development within the oral tradition (Koch 1969: 132-48) or two originally independent traditions developed in parallel at the oral stage (Grønbaek 1971: 169).

Analogical use of this kind of parallel and repetition can also be found between ch.25 and ch. 26:

1. "... Yahweh smote Nabal; and he died." 25.38 || 26.10 " ... Yahweh will smite him [Saul]"
2. Abigail wishes the fate of David's enemies, i.e. Saul, "be as Nabal" (25.6)

The narrator plays with Nabal's name. Nabal (נבל) means a "fool" or a "churl" and Saul confessed, "... I have played the fool" (הסכלתי) (25.21) which also echoes Samuel's remark about his behaviour—"You have acted foolishly (נסכלת) (13.13). Abigail is also made to play with her husband's name—"נבל is his name and נבלה is with him" (25.25).

Gordon has thus cogently argued that narrative analogy provides an important clue to the relationship between 1 Sam 24-26 and "the point can be expressed in the simple equation: Nabal=Saul. Saul does not vanish from view in 1 Samuel 25; he is Nabal's *alter ego*" (p. 43). Because of this analogical relationship between chapters 24 and 25 on the one hand and chapters 25 and 26 on the other, Gordon has also convincingly shown that they are a unity and that the repetitive impression of chapters 24 and 26 is only superficial. There is in fact an "incremental repetition of the motif of blood-guilt and its avoidance" (54) in this three-part plot.

Abigail's speech helps the readers to anticipate the end of Saul, as well as David's eventual ascent to the throne. "Such anticipations have a strongly integrating power; they are one of the narrator's temporal means of keeping the mass of matter together and giving it a structure." (Fokkelman 1986:313, n. 24)

#### 4.4 A Possible Problem-Situation for the Origination of the SHSD

##### 4.4.1 David's Guilt and National Well-Being

There is a very interesting thematic link between the concern for David's blood guilt in the SHSD and Ps 51.16, 20:



- 16 Deliver me from blood guilt (הצילני מדמים),  
O God, thou God of my salvation,  
and my tongue will sing aloud of thy deliverance.  
...  
20 Do good (היטיבה) to Zion in thy good pleasure;  
rebuild the walls of Jerusalem

Abigail's words (1 Sam 25.26) sound as if Yahweh has already answered the prayer of the author of Ps 51 and delivered him from blood-guilt. The narrative purpose of SHSD is precisely to show how Yahweh has restrained David from blood guilt. Concerning Ps 51, Anderson usefully notes some of its elements which are of a late and non-Davidic date: "The attitude to sacrifice in 16f. [Heb. 18f.] suggests the later prophetic teaching; and the thought and language of 10-12 resembles parts of Jer. and Ezek." He is of the opinion that the last two verses were "added, perhaps, during the Exile, or just before Nehemiah's time." (*PCB*: 424).

It is most intriguing that in this individual lament, David's blood guilt is associated with the restoration of Jerusalem. This psalm may well provide a clue to the situation from which the extended defence of David's innocence might have emerged: it was probably thought that the collapse of the Davidic dynasty was due to the blood guilt of its first king. The conclusion reached in the books of Samuel is that David was indeed guilty, though not on account of the demise of Saul and his house (hence the SHSD), but on account of Uriah (hence the SN), a somewhat lesser evil. And for this guilt David has paid the price dearly. The SHSD may have been the response of a southerner to an accusation of the northern remnants who remembered the old sore between the first two kings of Israel. The purpose is both apologetic and theological: the accusation is answered and the hope of restoration assured on the basis of David's righteousness. This may have been the immediate problem-situation for the production of the SHSD; it had

surely been rooted in genuine accusation which may go back to the time of David.<sup>184</sup> 1 Sam 31 in the earlier HSD has already demonstrated David's non-involvement in the deaths of Saul and his sons though it does not deny David's support to Achish's campaign.

#### 4.4.2 Administration of Blood Guilt and National Well-Being

There is in Deuteronomy a judicial basis for the association of proper administration of blood guilt and national well-being:

If a man hates his neighbour, and lies in wait for him, and rises upon him and wounds him mortally so that he dies, and he flee into one of these cities, then the elders of his city shall send and fetch him from there, and hand him over to the avenger of blood, so that he may die. *Your eye shall not pity him, but you shall purge (the guilt) of innocent blood from Israel, so that it may be well with you.*

19.11 וכי־יהיה איש שונא לרעהו וארב לו וקם עליו והכהו נפש ומת ונס אל־אחת הערים האל:  
19.12 ושלחו זקני עירו ולקחו אתו משם ונתנו אתו ביד גאל הדם ומת:  
19.13 לֹא־תחוס עינך עליו ובערת דם־הנקי מִישראל וטוב לך:

In the light of this Deuteronomic legislation which prohibits the shedding of דם נקי in the land of Israel (v. 10), and which bases national well-being (טובה) upon proper administration of blood guilt (Deut 19.4-13), the last two verses of Ps 51 (*contra* Anderson) may well be original, because with them the psalm is a complete prayer for the well-being of the land: a messianic supplicant, probably a davidide, prays in the post-exilic period for the restoration of Jerusalem on the basis of a guilt free king. The psalm does not specify the precise nature of the sin committed but the title fills in this gap with David's murder of Uriah, probably to discourage any association with the death of Saul and his house!

The use of היטיבה in the supplicant's request to Yahweh in Ps 51.20 on the basis of purged blood guilt shows that a judicial background similar to that of Deut 19.4-13 was known. It should be noted that this Deuteronomic idea of the well-being of the land as dependent upon a guilt-free people is not found in other legislative material in the

<sup>184</sup> David and Saul may also have typological significance representing types of a Judahite and a Benjaminite. Those who responded to Hezekiah's unification program before the Judean exile were now rejected for rebuilding the post-exilic community.

Pentateuch. The concern about David's blood guilt in the SHSD and the SN therefore has a much wider ramification than a personal apology for David's own innocence or a legitimation of his reign.

The Deuteronomic idea of national well-being without blood guilt is also represented in David's response to Shimei's accusation. When he is accused as a man of blood, responsible for "the blood of the house of Saul", David's response can be properly understood only according to Deut 19.13. Instead of denying Shimei's accusation, David expresses a hopes:

Perhaps Yahweh sees my עון,  
and Yahweh will repay me with טובה  
for his cursing of me today. (2 Sam 16.12)

אולי יראה יהוה בעוני  
והשיב יהוה לי טובה  
תחת קללתי היום הזה:

David neither pleads guilty nor repudiates Shimei's "false" accusation, but bears the cursing in the hope that Yahweh will repay him with טובה. This is the טובה of his kingdom, comparable to the טובה of the land in Deut 19.13.

The concern with blood guilt and dynastic well-being runs through the whole of the SHSD and the SN, and blends them inseparably together. David is depicted as a king who follows strictly the Deuteronomic criminal legislation (which appears only in Deut). All those who have shed innocent blood in the SHSD and the SN pay the price of life for their guilt, either themselves or, in Saul's case, through his descendants: the Amalekite who claimed to have killed Saul (2 Sam 1), Abner who killed Asahel, Joab's brother (2 Sam 2), Joab who killed Abner and Amasa (2 Sam 3, 20), Baanah and Rechab who murdered Isbosheth (2 Sam 4), Absalom who killed Ammon (2 Sam 13), Saul who killed the Gibeonites (2 Sam 21)—all paid the price of blood for blood.

The Absalom story is also a test of David's judicial impartiality to see if he would treat his own guilty son similarly to the other man-killers. Joab knows exactly what is in David's mind. He faces the dilemma of choosing between executing his own son or having a guilty throne (successor). By killing Absalom, Joab has saved David of the worry of having a guilty man sit upon his throne! One should not of course forget David's own blood guilt in murdering Uriah. For this crime, three of David's sons were killed and

David almost lost his life. Even the accuser Shimei met a bloody end for his accusation of David.

#### 4.5 HDR and SN Connections

Scholars have long believed that there is thematic and verbal interplay between the HDR and the SN. In what follows we shall review four recent works on the HDR, which touch upon the links between the HDR and the SN.

##### 4.5.1 P. K. McCarter, Jr. (1980)

McCarter's article aims at defending a Davidic date for the HDR, or the apology of David, as he prefers to call it, using a thematic analysis based on the structure of the Hittite apology studied by Hoffner.

Although the problem of delimitation is not his main concern, McCarter accepts the prevalent view of the HDR as lying within 1 Sam 16—2 Sam 5 and regards Grønbaek's attempt to include 1 Sam 15 as "unsuccessful". He also rejects Grønbaek's claim that the unity of the HDR is derived from the point of view of its editor who assembled different and diverse traditional materials. McCarter suggests, instead—justifiably especially in light of his thematic analysis—that

the unity reflects the presence of an underlying, more or less unified composition by an author with a clear point of view, to which various secondary materials, some of them deuteronomistic, have accrued. ( 491)

McCarter's idea of single authorship underlying the HDR is an attractive one but most of what he thinks to be of dtr origin in the HDR is probably original, and it is due to his acceptance of the HDR as a pre-dtr work that he has problems with it. He suggests that the *additions to the story of David and Jonathan* (1 Sam 20.11-17, 23, 40-42) are from the dtr hand because "they read intrusive and anticipatory of the Meribaal (Mephibosheth) episode in 2 Sam 9" (493). 2 Sam 9 is in fact part of the apology of David's innocence over the demise of the Saul and his house. This is evidence that the apologetic narrative

cannot be confined by the limits of the HDR and it thus constitutes important evidence against the very idea of the HDR as commonly understood.

Moreover, in light of Gordon's study of the chiasmic structure of 1 Sam 24-26, McCarter's suggestion that *the first account of David's refusal to take Saul's life* (1 Sam 23.14-24.23) is secondary and of dtr origin is due to a misunderstanding of the literary function of 1 Sam 24-25.

His rejection of *Abigail's second speech* (1 Sam 25.28-31) as being secondary and of dtr origin because it "look[s] beyond the history of David's rise to the deuteronomistic presentation of the dynastic promise to David in 2 Sam 7" (p. 493) is based entirely on a pre-dtr view of the base text. Its presence could as well be taken as evidence against the generally accepted view. These few verses, together with the unity of the two accounts of David's taking refuge in Philistia, are important pointers to the secondary character of the SHSD.

McCarter is in the main correct to point out that the *additions to the account of David's reign in Hebron* (2.10a+11; 3.9-10, 18b; 5.1-2, 4-5) are secondary. The reason, however, is not that they are dtr chronological formulae but that they are part of the account of David's seven and a half year rule over Judah *only* in Hebron before becoming king of all Israel. The purpose of the account of this period of David's rule is to leave room for the expiration of the Saulide kingdom without his involvement—a proof that David had not conspired and revolted against Saul and taken his kingdom directly from his hand.

It can thus be seen that all those dtr editorial footprints on the HDR from 1 Sam 20 onward suggested by McCarter can easily be explained by positing that (1) the apology of David's innocence runs beyond all the suggested endings of the HDR and that (2) it is a late supplement to a much shorter base text. The narrator's concern for David's innocence and a guilt-free throne of David runs through the HDR and the SN from his estrangement from Saul in 1 Sam 19 right through to the death of the accuser Shimei in 1 Kgs 2.

McCarter then defends a date for the earliest formulation of the HDR in the reign of David himself because there would be no point in defending his right of accession as a non-natural successor to Saul's throne during the reign of another king. He therefore disagrees with Conrad<sup>185</sup> on a date during Jehu's reign, and with Grønæk and Mettinger on a date shortly after Solomon's death when the Davidic king's sovereignty in the north was being challenged. Based on Hoffner's study of "Propaganda and Political Justification in Hittite Historiography"<sup>186</sup> McCarter suggests that the original HDR was an apology in the same sense that Hoffner understands it (p. 499).<sup>187</sup> The basic themes of the Hittite apology consist of the following aspects of the new king for whom the apology is written: (1) military success, (2) favourite of the royal family, (3) loyal to the king, (4) blameless in his elevation to the throne and (5) elected by the Divine. In his thematic analysis of the apology of David, McCarter finds that he was faced with charges like: having a relationship with the Saul's daughter, deserting the king, becoming an outlaw, becoming a Philistine mercenary, being implicated in Abner's death and in Ishbaal's death. The apology answers these charges one by one and also includes a theological defence of David's elevation to Saul's throne. McCarter then claims that "some or all of these charges must actually have been made during David's lifetime" (p. 502) and thus the apology was of Davidic date.

To conclude our evaluation of McCarter's article, it may be pointed out that (1) all the themes suggested by Hoffner and McCarter are already covered by a shorter version of the apology (the HSD) without the extended episode of David's estrangement from Saul in 1 Sam 19-26; (2) it is probable that the original apology might have come from an earlier time, but the expanded version might have originated from a situation other than a concern of defending David's rise to Saul's throne.

---

<sup>185</sup> Conrad 1972: 321-32.

<sup>186</sup> The title of his article in Goedicke and Roberts (eds.) 1975: 49-62.

<sup>187</sup> Hoffner understands an apology as "a document composed for a king who had usurped the throne, composed in order to defend or justify his assumption of the kingship by force." (Hoffner 1975: 49)

Point (2) is particularly relevant to our purpose because if one could successfully apply McCarter's thematic analysis guided by the theme "apology of David" to parts of Samuel-Kings other than the HDR, would the demarcations so far suggested (none go further than 2 Sam 7) not have to be revised? Surely the accuser and his accusation (Shimei, 2 Sam 16.5-13) and his final end (1 Kgs 2.46) should be part of that apology; besides, the accounts of the fate of the other Saulides are not covered by the HDR.

#### 4.5.2 J. C. VanderKam (1980)

VanderKam tries in his article to extract precise historical references from Shimei's accusation of David (2 Sam 16.5-13) and supports this by redactional analysis. He first gives a rather detailed (12 pp.) "historical analysis" of the HDR up to the account of the death of Abner and Eshbaal to show that "David, who had designs on Saul's throne from an early time, ... probably arranged the murder of Abner but that no hard evidence connects him with the convenient death of Eshbaal" (524). Following this is a redactional analysis of 2 Sam 16.5-13, within the Court History (i.e. the SN), which aims at determining the referents of Shimei's accusation against David as a murderer and a usurper. He believes that the account of the Saulide Shimei in the SN was from the hand of its final editor. VanderKam's translates of 2 Sam 16.10b, 11b, 12a as follows:

10b: He is cursing in this way because Yahweh told him: 'Curse David,' And who is to say: 'Why have you done so?' 11b: Let him curse because Yahweh has told him to. 12a: Perhaps Yahweh will look upon my affliction and Yahweh will repay me good instead of curse today. (536)

He thinks that David admits the accuracy of the charge. He agrees with the views of Budde, Eissfeldt, Blenkinsopp, and Carlson that 2 Sam 21.1-14 was moved to its existing position from before 2 Sam 9 but does not think that 21.1-14 ever formed part of the SN (p. 537, n. 46; p. 539). However, if David spared Mephibosheth (21.7), why did he still ask "Is there still any one left of the house of Saul, that I may show him kindness for Jonathan's sake?" (9.1) Is it not possible that 21.1-14 should be after 2 Sam 9? When

properly rearranged, the two chapters show how David fulfils his oath to Jonathan. Firstly David reassures Mephibosheth that he would be properly treated and allows him to eat at his table and to stay in Jerusalem. Then in 21.1-14 David spares Mephibosheth when being requested by the Gibeonites to hand over seven of Saul's sons for execution. Neither is VanderKam's attempt to exclude 21.1-14 from the scope of the SN successful, because that poor lame man is mentioned again and again in the SN (2 Sam 16.1, 4; 19.24, 25, 30), and the account of the conflict of interest between Ziba and his master Mephibosheth in 2 Sam 19 is dependent upon 2 Sam 9.9-13 as its proper context.

VanderKam also suggests that, historically, Shimei's curse and David's confession refer to the deaths of the seven male members of Saul's house in 21.1-14. By relocating it, the final editor of the SN wished the reader to infer that it was Abner and Eshbaal that were meant because they are the only Saulides whose death could have involved David prior to Shimei's accusation.

Our objection to VanderKam's redactional proposal must be from the content of 21.1-14 itself. A careful reader, like that scribe who added the last phrase in 1 Kgs 15.5 ("except in the matter of Uriah the Hittite"), would definitely not put the responsibility for the death of the seven sons of Saul at David's door, when it is clearly the responsibility of Saul himself (v. 1). David tries to do something to make expiation but is refused by the Gibeonites and it is they who execute the Saulides. David is required by justice to meet the demand of the Gibeonites to hand over Saul's seven sons to them. The price of blood guilt must be paid. This is a basic theme in Samuel-Kings. What David has done to the dead Saulides, according to the text, deserves only approval if not praise. Contextually, 21.1-14 fits its present position because it concludes with the final account of how all the remaining male members of Saul's family (except Mephibosheth) meet their end. And in the following chapter, the narrator declares the cleanness of David's hands (2 Sam 22.21b) and his innocence (v. 24a) using a hymn.

Historically and literally, Shimei's accusation should not be taken as a local phenomenon in the SN alone and should be understood with both the SHSD and the



SN in perspective. The deaths of not only Abner and Eshbaal, but also of Saul and his three sons who died with him on Mount Gilboa should be part of that accusation, because the present form of the HDR clearly keeps a distance between their deaths and David. Moreover, Shimei's accusation is concerned with "all the blood of the house of Saul" (2 Sam 16.8a), i.e. the deaths of Saul and of his family members. The historical accusation, therefore, would have to be that David was responsible for the demise of Saul and all his house. This immediately explains why the narrator takes pain to report all the deaths of the Saulides in such a way as to make sure that David is not implicated in any one of them, not even that of Absalom. If this proposal is correct, then one can no longer have two separate independent documents in terms of an HDR and an SN as has been generally accepted for so long. This is not to deny that these two narratives have two distinguishable themes but to suggest that, despite their apparent thematic differences, they seem to share a more basic common theme which regulates the development of the stories of some of their common characters. This can be corroborated by consistent thematic analysis using the idea of "apology" (and related subthemes like "innocence" and "blood guilt") employed by McCarter.

Although it is one man's accusation, Shimei's curse probably represents a typical attitude of the North towards the dynastic legitimacy of the South, not even just the legitimacy of David. The question of legitimacy is inevitably intermingled with the question of origin, i.e. with the beginning of the Southern dynasty and hence the rise of David to the throne. Thus we have to recognize the typical character of Shimei's accusation. All the deaths of the Saulides are recounted in such a way that together they answer Shimei's curse.

#### 4.5.3 K. W. Whitelam (1984)

In this article Whitelam attempts to investigate 1 Sam 9-1 Kgs 2 as "an official interpretation of events in defence of David" (p. 61) produced and disseminated by the royal bureaucracy. He tries to show that in the main it fits all the characteristics of

political propaganda in its themes, its perspective and the way the narrator influences the attitude and emotion of the audience towards David. It also shares some of the characteristics of other political propaganda of the ancient Near East. The thematic analysis of “the defence of David” is preceded by a long methodological discussion and justification (10 pp.) about approaching 1 Sam 9–1 Kgs 2 as propaganda from a sociological perspective. Whitelam’s approach is not only interesting and important in itself, it even has some bearing on the problem of the literary relationship between the HDR and SN which are usually accepted as independent sources of the Deuteronomistic historian. In his analysis, it seems rather clear that, at least on the levels of *genre*, themes and purpose, the two narratives have much in common. Near the end of the article, Whitelam points out that

the summary fate which befalls of the leaders of the Saulide factions, Saul, Ishbaal, Abner, Shimei and Sheba, who threaten David’s power, or those involved in palace intrigues, such as Absalom, Adonijah and their supporters, signals a clear warning to the privileged audience who might harbour any such ambitions. (77)

If the above is indeed one of the purposes of the defence of David, then the SHSD and the SN should be read as one continuous story. The question now is whether the thematic affinities of the stories of these two groups of men were only adventitious or whether they owe their origin to a single mind. Whitelam’s main aim, however, is not literary history and he has therefore not touched on the possibility of the literary unity of the HDR and SN before their incorporation into Samuel-Kings.

#### 4.5.4 F. H. Cryer (1985)

Cryer tries to argue in this article that 1 Sam 26.14-16 is secondary in its present context, and that in effect it pronounces a sentence of death upon Abner (391); that it is a judgement of Abner and not just a taunt as is usually understood. Cryer therefore thinks that the theological reason for David not killing Saul is “purely theologico-political propaganda” (391) and that the real “Yahweh’s anointed” is David himself. He also suggests that the various texts which provide Joab with a motive for killing Abner are secondary and fictitious designed “to camouflage” David’s own intention to have Abner killed. In contrast to the secondary portrayal of Joab and Abishai as “sons of thunder”, Cryer thinks that they have a rather positive character according to the books of Samuel elsewhere. The “sons of thunder” *topos* is therefore also secondary.

He agrees with Würthwein about the existence of a pre-dtr stratum linking the HDR and SN. To the latter’s repertoire of those secondary materials (2 Sam 16.5-14, Shimei’s curse; 18.1b-4a, 10-14, Absalom’s death, 20.8-13, Amasa’s death and 2 Sam 14.2-22, the Tekoa woman) which have in common the feature of defending David’s innocence Cryer adds 1 Sam 26.14-16. He also suspects that the account providing a motive for Joab killing Abner is secondary.

Cryer’s proposal, and that of Würthwein is an attractive one because it confirms that there are connections between the HDR and SN. We shall show, in the course of Chapter Five, that Cryer’s so-called pre-Dtr links between the HDR and SN are in fact an integral part of them. Cryer’s conjecture that 26.14-16 is secondary seems probable. There is no evidence, however, to believe as Cryer suggests that 1 Sam 26.14-16 is later than its immediate context. Indeed the MT plus אֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ appended to the end of v. 14 does direct David’s speech to Saul but has no bearing on the redactional character of 26.14-16 as a whole. Contrary to Cryer’s contention that “vv. 14-16 are unrelated to vv. 17ff” (387), v. 17 (“Saul recognised David’s voice ...”) requires that Saul is woken up by a (loud) voice which can only be David’s in vv. 14-16. 2 Sam 3.28-29 express a similar wish of David when he heard of the death of Abner:

(28) ... he said, "I and my kingdom are for ever guiltless before Yahweh for the blood of Abner the son of Ner. (29) May it fall upon the head of Joab, and upon all his father's house; and may the house of Joab never be without one who has a discharge, or who is leprous, or who holds a spindle, or who is slain by the sword, or who lacks bread!"

This is only a wish or a curse; the actual execution command comes a long way later in 1 Kgs 2.5-6. Of course, the wishes of a king are not always distinguishable from his commands! Should 1 Sam 3.28-29 then be added to Würthwein's pre-Dtr redactional stratum which attempts to link the HDR and the SN? How about the story of Mephibosheth who is first mentioned in 2 Sam 4.4 but appears again and again in 16.1, 4; 19.24, 25, 30 and 21.7? The apologetic feature of the account of Mephibosheth is obvious: David keeps his oath and deals kindly with the undeserving grandson of his enemy. Cryer also notices David's wish for Saul's death: "As Yahweh lives, Yahweh will smite him; or his day shall come to die; or he shall go down into the battle and perish" (1 Sam 26.10). The question of whether or not David was actively involved in these deaths *in history* does not concern us. Cryer's suggestion of a pre-Dtr redactional stratum linking the HDR and SN can be more simply explained—there were never two separate independent documents with different themes, but one single narrative dealing with the guilt of David and his house. We shall corroborate this hypothesis with textual and literary evidence in next chapter.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE COMMON AUTHORSHIP OF THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE HISTORY OF SAUL AND DAVID (SHSD) AND THE SUCCESSION NARRATIVE (SN)

#### 5.0 Introductory

Chapter Four clears the ground for the development of a full argument for the common authorship of the SHSD and the SN. But first we have to face a minor but popular view on the basic theological difference between the HDR and the SN. The relatively few references to the involvement of God in the SN (2 Sam 11.27; 12.24, and 17.14) and its indifference to cultic matters have been suggested as distinctive features of the SN (e.g. Gordon 1984: 88). This can easily be explained in terms of Carlson's second theme of "David under the Curse" in his scheme. The absence of God's involvement is understandable when David is to suffer the aftermath of his crime. Neither is God more active in the SHSD during David's flight from Saul nor is it more interested in cultic matters. It does report that David inquired of Yahweh several times (1 Sam 23.2, 4; 30.8; 2 Sam 2.1) and that Yahweh answered him. This, however, is to be explained by narrational design instead of by different theological attitude. As a matter of fact, Saul is reported to have inquired of Yahweh a couple of times but he got no answers from Yahweh. This contrast is to demonstrate to the reader Yahweh's abandonment of Saul and his favour of David.

The spatial and narrational separation of the SHSD and the SN just cannot be helped because this author has to work against the constraint of the base text. That is why he added into the base text here and there pointers directed to his work to overcome this physical constraint and also why these pointers are absent from the corresponding synoptic texts in Chr. In what follows we shall provide *cumulative* evidence by comparisons of thematic, stylistic, linguistic, and Wisdom background of the SHSD and the SN to substantiate the inevitable conclusion implied by our synoptic studies.

## 5.1 The Thematic Link between the SHSD and the SN

The laconic style of the narrator(s) in the books of Samuel gives us enough freedom to read the SHSD (1 Sam 19.1-27.4) and the SN (2 Sam 9-10, 1 Kgs 1-2) as separate stories. Enough evidence, however, has been left for us to detect a narrational continuity without which the the two narratives are incomplete: e.g. the defence of David's loyalty to the house of Saul and his innocence over its demise answers an accusation raised only in the SN in Shimei's curse (2 Sam 16.7-8) and a more positive answer to that accusation is dramatized in 2 Sam 21.1-4, wherever its precise location.<sup>188</sup> The story of Mephibosheth is only half told in the SHSD. The final solution with regard to the "innocence" (cf. נְקִי) of David's throne is ultimately to silence the slanderous Shimei and this is shrewdly done by David's wise son in 1 Kgs 2.46 without involving David's very own hand.

### 5.1.1 The Innocence of David and His Throne

It is through his rebellious son Absalom that David suffers the pain of his family problem as prophesied by Nathan (2 Sam 12) and in his suffering he redeems his own guilt. This is how David interprets his own experience if we take the *Ketiv* of the fourth word of 2 Sam 16.12 as the original reading:

Perhaps Yahweh sees my guilt,  
and Yahweh will repay me with טובה  
for his cursing of me today. (2 Sam 16.12)

אולי יראה יהוה בעוני (בעיני)  
והשיב יהוה לי טובה  
תחת קללתו היום הזה:

Here David is denying Shimei's accusation by tacitly shifting the reader's attention to his murder of Uriah to which he pleads guilty. He believes that it is Yahweh whose hands are behind this cursing—the revolt of his own son against him—and, by suffering it, his killing Uriah could be redeemed and there would be טובה lying ahead for him. This

---

<sup>188</sup> It is usually thought to belong to 2 Sam 9. Soggin (1989) thinks that 2 Sam 21.1-14 almost certainly belongs before II Sam.9." (218)

idea of the righteous messiah of Yahweh suffering false accusation is already built into the SHSD in which David risks his life to prove his innocence to Saul face to face.

Nathan's second oracle (2 Sam 12.7b-15a) predicts David's family trouble because of his bloodguilt. Shimei's accusation suggests that it is a greater crime that has caused David's conflict with his sons. Again, as in the SHSD the burden of proving David's innocence falls upon his own shoulders, in the SN it is David who has to make sure his successor will not bring guilt to his throne. The woman of Tekoa probably betrays this inner struggle of David's conscience:

The woman of Tekoa said to the king,  
"Upon me, my lord the king, be the guilt, and upon the house  
of my father; let the king and his throne be guiltless.

14.9 ותאמר האשה התקועית אל-המלך  
עלי אדני המלך העון ועל-  
בית אבי והמלך וכסאו נקי:

The focus of concern here has shifted from David's innocence in the SHSD to the integrity of his successor in the SN. Judging from the woman's speech, Joab probably thinks David wants Absalom to be his successor and he further surmises that David is troubled by the fact that a guilty successor will bring guilt to his throne which would not then last long. The speech of the wise woman brings home the theme of guilt in the SN: a guilty man, even if he is the crown prince, would not be able to be Yahweh's anointed and sit on David's throne for too long. Absalom's final fate is almost predictable in that he must pay the price of bloodguilt.

### 5.1.2 Blood for Blood in the SHSD and the SN

The belief in retribution on bloodguilt runs through Samuel-Kings in both the SHSD and the SN. All those who have committed murder die under the sword or have the sin visited upon their descendants. The idea clearly underlies the story of the Gibeonites requesting retaliation on the Saulide remnants because "there is bloodguilt on Saul and his house, because they put the Gibeonites to death" (2 Sam 21.1b). As a result, all Saul's remaining sons were killed for Saul's bloodguilt and this brings an ultimate end to his dynasty. It seems that this is an additional reason added to account for the end of Saul's kingdom in the original History of Saul and David (HSD). Whereas Samuel sees

Saul's disobedience to Yahweh's command as the only reason for Yahweh's giving his kingdom to David (1 Sam 28.18), the SN adds his bloodguilt to be the immediate historical cause. The necessity of an additional cause is easily understandable because of the additional stories about the Saulide remnants. The MT accepts nothing as David's (blood) guilt, "except in the matter of Uriah the Hittite" (1 Kgs 15. 5 MT plus). The importance of establishing the innocence of David lies in the fact that, according to Samuel-Kings, David's righteousness is the theological basis of his dynasty. This is the reason why Yahweh continues to give a "lamp" to a bad Judahite king "for David's sake" (e.g. 1 Kgs 15.3-7, absent from Chr).

From the words of the Tekoite woman,<sup>189</sup> the reader would think David has a bad conscience for what he had done to Uriah. Shimei's curse, however, sheds an alternative light on how one should interpret the Absalom story. Shimei thinks that because of David's bloodguilt, his kingdom will be given into the hand of his usurping son Absalom. Prior to his curse, according to Joab's hunch, David has been troubled by the fact that his successor will be a guilty man. This concern of David's house to be free from blood is best illustrated by Solomon's speech before he ordered the execution of Joab (1 Kgs 2.31). The whole of the SN from David's murder of Uriah to the death of David's accuser can therefore be seen as threaded through by the theme of bloodguilt in the house of David. The SHSD asserts that David is guiltless in the matter of the demise of Saul and his house and the SN points out that David has left a guiltless throne to Solomon.

The stylistic and thematic resemblance of the Tekoa woman's words to those of another wise woman (1 Sam 25.23-31) in the SHSD surely reminds the reader that there is some problem with David's נִסְכָּא which has as much to do with Shimei's accusation as

---

<sup>189</sup> Hoftijzer (1970) has shown that here we have a very able and wise woman. Indeed, she was able to achieve a task Joab could have failed had he himself tried. In a way, the wise Abigail, Nabal's wife, had similar wit and wisdom so that she could stop a disaster from happening to her family.



that of Nathan's! The narrator wants to break the cause and effect relationship of the two and David, therefore, has good reason to worry about whether his throne is נקי

### 5.1.3 The Problem of the Succession Theme

The question "Who will sit on David's throne?" is suggested by Rost to be the narrative theme of the SN but the real struggle for succession does not emerge before the narrative remark "Now King David was old and advanced in years" (1 Kgs 1.1) which appears to mark a new beginning to what follows (Mowinckel, 1963: 11-14). It is only after this report of David's age that the real struggle for succession begins. Rost also does not seem to have taken seriously enough Nathan's second oracle (2 Sam 12.7-14), which asserts that the conflict among David's sons is (at least in part) caused by his bloodguilt which therefore defines the narrational shape of the stories about his family tragedy. But the wider theme of the story of David's family problem is not the question of who would or should succeed him as king, which really begins only at 1 Kgs 1.1—but David's guilt and not only the guilt of killing another man and stealing his wife but an earlier guilt related to the death of Saul and his house.

The traditional theme of the SN as suggested by Rost does not have as much a regulatory power as the theme of David's guilt. As a consequence, it blurs our vision and prevents us from seeing a deeper and more explanatory theme underlying both the SHSD and the SN and as a result it splits them up into two documents. The followers of Rost replicate his effort and do the same for an HDR and, I am afraid, replicate the same mistakes for exactly the same reason when they suggest the HDR to be another separate document.

Neither can we go with Carlson's double-themed tradition-history of David in terms of "David under blessing" (2 Sam 2-7) and "David under curse" (2 Sam 9-24). His first theme cannot stand recent thematic study of the HDR, in which it has been convincingly shown that 2 Sam 2-4 is part of an apology of David. Then, 2 Sam 1 is an attempt to distance David from the scene of Saul's death in order to provide an alibi for

him. Moreover, we have 2 Sam 2 preparing Abner's death by the hand of Joab in showing Abishai, his brother, killed by Abner. It is therefore part of the apologetic scheme in defence of David's non-implication in Abner's death (2 Sam 3). And finally 2 Sam 4 reports the murder of Isbosheth; and David's revenge on his two murderers thematically belongs together with the previous three chapters.

2 Sam 5-7 is about a completely different business and has a progressive theme which leads from the establishment of Jerusalem as both the city of the king and his god, to the bringing of the Ark, the symbol of Yahweh's presence, to the royal city and then to Yahweh's promise of an eternal dynasty for the house of David and his presence in a temple. 2 Sam 8 is an account of David's success in battles against the surrounding countries. Thus only 2 Sam 5-8 may properly be said to be a period of "David under blessing". 2 Sam 2-4 is but part of a much longer apology of David and may appropriately be described as a sub-theme of the SHSD: "David under trial".

## 5.2 The Affinity of the SHSD and SN: Stylistic, Linguistic, and Wisdom Connections—Evidence of Common Authorship

### 5.2.1 Narrative Patterns

The immediate cause of David's trouble is Absalom, which means "My Father is Peace": how ironic but at the same time how true! The reader is encouraged to see in Absalom David's shadow in a crucial episode of the SN in 2 Sam 14.28-33. This episode has the following points to make:

- (1). Absalom wanted to see his father David the king
- (2). Joab refused to help him when sent for in the first two instances
- (3). The third time, Absalom forced Joab to come by making his servants (עבד) set fire (אש) to his field (חלקה)
- (4). Absalom asked Joab to help him see the king

- (5). Absalom told Joab: ואם־יש־בי עון והמתני (“if there is guilt in me, let him kill me”)
- (6). When Absalom saw his father the king, וישתחו לו על־אפיו ארצה לפני המלך,
- (7). David kissed him (וישק המלך לאבשלום).

The above account is almost a mirror image<sup>190</sup> of the account below which follows immediately the report of David’s escape from Saul in the SHSD. Mostly the same motifs are used, sometimes in contrast, sometimes in parallel, this time between David himself and the son of another king, in the SHSD in 1 Sam 20.5-42:

- (1). David wanted to escape from king Saul’s face  
(whereas Absalom wanted to see his father the king)
- (2). Jonathan was very willing to help David  
(whereas Joab only avoided Absalom repeatedly)
- (3). David said to Jonathan: ואם־יש־בי עון המיתני אתה (“if there is guilt in me, kill me yourself”)  
  
(The same point made by Absalom. Although the expected reponses are the same, whilst Jonathan gave a negative one we expect Joab to give a positive one to Absalom.)
- (4). He begged Jonathan not to bring him to Saul his father  
(whereas Absalom made Joab help him to see David his father)
- (5). Jonathan used the field (שדה), a lad (נער) and shot three arrows (חצים) to give signal to David. Here we have similar narrative elements as in the Absalom episode:
  - (a) similar scenes: חלקה || שדה;
  - (b) the lad here is likely Jonathan’s servant: עבד || נער;
  - (c) both the arrow and the fire are meant to be a signal: אש || חצים.
- (6). David then met Jonathan, ויפל לאפיו ארצה וישתחו שלש פעמים

---

<sup>190</sup> See Zakovitz (1985) for a discussion of “mirror narrative” in biblical narrative.

(Absalom did the same with regard to David.)

(7). Then they kissed one another (וישקו איש את רעהו) and David departed.

(David did the same with Absalom)

It cannot be denied we have here very close affinity of linguistic elements and motifs of the two episodes.<sup>191</sup> This almost one-to-one correspondence between the above two episodes suggests that the Absalom episode may also be appropriately called the “narrative analogy” of the David episode, to apply the same rhetorical concept as Gordon does to 1 Sam 25. It can be seen that the stylistic affinity of the author of the SHSD and the SN thus goes down to exact details. These linguistic elements and motifs may as well just be literary conventions. It would be very difficult to find another two episodes with so many parallel elements from two different authors.<sup>192</sup> Through exact parallel/contrast of motifs, the narrator seems to invite us to see in Absalom’s revolt and conspiracy what David was accused of in the SHSD, and interpret both with the same thematic concern. They give strong hints of unity of authorship; and what makes this more probable is the fact that the paralleled questions about עון are also expressed in the speeches of Abigail in the SHSD and that of the Tekoa woman in the SN. Whereas Jonathan reassures David of innocence, Joab ignores Absalom’s stupid question. Joab of course knows Absalom is guilty. When he asks Joab the rhetorical question, Absalom is abusing the love of a passionate father (2 Sam 14.1). This is in sharp contrast to the genuine love between David and Jonathan (1 Sam 20.17) and suggests an additional contrast between the two episodes.

---

<sup>191</sup> I suspect that Hagan’s (1979) very interesting analysis of the SN by a “twofold construction of deception and counter-deception” could also be successfully applied to the SHSD, during the hide-and-seek between Saul and David and especially David’s deception of Achish and the counter-deception of the commanders of the Philistines (1 Sam 29)!

<sup>192</sup> Gunn’s (1974, 1974a) analysis of the uniformity of narrative patterns in three battle reports in Judges and Samuel enables him to link them with “a technique of narrative composition which can be readily associated with oral tradition” (316). The affinity of languages, styles and patterns discovered here in our case is more extensive than the simple pattern Gunn studied. Thus our case cannot simply be explained in terms of traditional techniques. Safren (1988) has also found a “mirror” relationship between Balaam and Abraham in Num 22.22-35 and Gen 22.1-19 with the former modelled upon the latter.

### 5.2.2 Stylistic Affinity

It is just possible that the above affinity of motifs was caused by one of the authors of the SHSD or SN purposely mirroring the motifs used by the other. There is thus a possibility of literary interdependence between the two. Closer examination of style, however, shows that the affinity between the two narratives is to be explained not by imitation but by common origin. The following example points to the latter possibility and strengthens the previous finding. In the above parallels and contrasts, Absalom is put in contrast to his father. The central concern is bloodguilt; whereas Absalom is guilty, David is not. Absalom is not only a “negative” of David, he is also depicted as another Nabal figure:

The king said to the Cushite, “Is it well with the young man Absalom (השלום (לנער לאבשלום)?” And the Cushite answered, “*May the enemies of my lord the king, and all who rise up against you for evil, be like that young man* (יהיו כנער איבי) (אדני המלך וכל אשר-קמו עליך לרעה: (2 Sam 18.32)

Saul and those in his family who could challenge David’s claim to the throne have long been dead; but Saul is survived by seven more potential heirs (2 Sam 21.7-14). Shimei can do nothing more than curse David, and that is harmful enough to the psychological well-being of the king even if the voice of conscience could be extinguished. His accusation would certainly damage both the public perception of the legitimacy of David’s reign as king of all the tribes and the unity of the unstable nation. When compared to the opportunist Sheba, the Saulide remnants are nothing more than “a dimly burning wick” (Is 42.3a) whom, we are told, David “will not quench”, to borrow a metaphor; but they, out of David’s own control, are to be executed by the Gibeonites. Sheba will soon make his debut in the power struggle arena, whom David thinks “will do more harm than Absalom” (2 Sam 20.6). Thus the narrator builds into Absalom’s death an anticipation of yet another death, if not a few more that are to follow. This literary technique seems to be a unique one in the Hebrew Bible. We do not lack parables in the

Hebrew Bible, but here the narrator is threading several stories together using a “narrative analogy”. Things that are said of Absalom by the Cushite have already been said of Nabal, even before his death:

Now then, my lord, as Yahweh lives, and as your soul lives, seeing Yahweh has restrained you from bloodguilt, and from taking vengeance with your own hand, *now then let your enemies and those who seek to do evil to my lord be as Nabal* (ועתה יהיו כנבל איביך והמבקשים אל-אדני רעה: (1 Sam 25.26)

The reader is here invited to see Saul’s fate as being bound up with that of Nabal’s so much so that, in reading the report of Nabal’s death, he knows the fate of Saul immediately. The same technique as used in the SN. What is most surprising is that the same sentence structure is used. Note the following exact stylistic parallels:

יהיו	כנער	איבי אדני המלך	וכל אשר-קמו	עליך לרעה:
יהיו	כנבל	איביך	והמבקשים	אל-אדני רעה:

Here we have to postulate very similar rhetorical training of the authors of the SHSD and the SN if we want to believe they were separate authors.

### 5.2.3 Antithetic Word-Pair: טוב-רעה

The words טוב and רעה are two very common words in the Hebrew Bible with the former occurring 539 times and the latter 354 times when used separately; but when used together as an antithetic word-pair they are not so common and appear in only thirty verses in all the three canonical parts of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>193</sup> The word-pair is found in twelve books of the Hebrew Bible (Gen, Num, Sam, Jer, Amos, Mic, Ps, Prov, Qoh, Lam, Neh and Chr). Its five instances attested in the books of Samuel are exactly two times the average frequency of its occurrences in the other eleven books. It is never used in the books of Kings and its five instances in the books of Samuel (1 Sam 20.7; 24.18;

<sup>193</sup> Gen 26.29; 44.4; Num 13.19; 24.13; 1 Sam 20.7; 24.18; 25.21; 29.6; 2 Sam 17.14; Jer 15.11; 18.10, 20; 21.10; 32.42; 39.16; 44.17; 44.27; Amos 9.4; Mic 3.2; Ps 35.12; 38.21; 109.5; Prov 11.27; 13.21; 17.13; 17.20; Qoh 7.14; Lam 3.38; Neh 2.10; 2 Chr 18.7.

25.21; 29.6; 2 Sam 17.14) are found *only* within the SHSD and the SN. It may be worth listing them in full, as they show important thematic affinity as well:

If he says “Good!” it will be well with your servant; but if he is angry to him, you know that evil is determined by him.

אם-כה יאמר טוב שלום לעבדך ואם-חרה יחרה לו דע כי-כלתה הרעה מעמו: (1 Sam 20.7)

He said to David, “You are more righteous than I; for you have repaid me good, but I have repaid you evil. David said, “Surely in vain have I guarded all that this fellow has in the wilderness, so that nothing was missed of all that belongs to him; and he has returned me evil for good.”

ויאמר אל-דוד צדיק אתה ממני כי אתה גמלתני הטובה ואני גמלתיך הרעה: (1 Sam 24.18)  
ודוד אמר אך לשקר שמרתי את-כל-אשר לזה במדבר ולא-נפקד מכל-אשר-לו מאומה וישב-לי רעה תחת טובה: (1 Sam 25.21)

Achish called David and said to him, “As Yahweh lives, you haven been honest, and it is good in my eyes that you should march out and in with me in the campaign; for I have found no evil in you from the day of your coming to me to this day. But in the eyes of the overlords you are not good.”

ויקרא אכיש אל-דוד ויאמר אליו חי-יהוה כי-ישר אתה וטוב בעיני צאתך ובאך אתי במחנה כי לא-מצאתי בך רעה מיום באך אלי עד-היום הוה ובעיני הסרנים לא-טוב אתה: (1 Sam 29.6)

Absalom and all the men of Israel said, “The counsel of Husahai the Archite is better than the counsel of Ahithophel.” Yahweh had ordained to defeat the good counsel of Ahithophel, so that Yahweh might bring evil upon Absalom.

ויאמר אבשלום וכל-איש ישראל טובה עצת חושי הארכי מעצת אחיתפל ויהוה צוה להפך את-עצת אחיתפל הטובה לבעבור הביא יהוה אל-אבשלום את-הרעה: (2 Sam 17.14)

#### 5.2.4 Language of Swearing: כה יעשה-ל... אלהים וכה יוסיף

The familiarity of this construction is due not so much to its frequent use as to the familiarity of the stories where it appears. In all the Hebrew Bible, it occurs only 12 times. Except once in Ruth 1.17 where “Yahweh” is used instead of “Elohim”, they all appear in special Samuel-Kings material:

- (1). Eli swears to the child Samuel to warn him not to hide Yahweh’s oracle (1 Sam 3.17);
- (2). Saul swears to Jonathan (1 Sam 14.44) after prohibiting his army from eating bread before evening (v. 24);
- (3). Jonathan swears to David promising to disclose Saul’s design (1 Sam 20.13, MT uses Yahweh while LXX reflects Elohim);
- (4). David swears to Abigail after being restrained from killing the male members of Nabal’s household (1 Sam 25.22);

- (5). Abner swears to Ishbosheth after being refused his request for Saul's concubine (2 Sam 3.9);
- (6). After the murder of Abner David swears to the people and refuses to eat before sunset (2 Sam 3.35, cf ii. above.);
- (7). David swears to Amasa promising that he will replace Joab as commander of the army (2 Sam 19.14[13]);
- (8). Solomon swears against Adonijah after refusing his request to get Abishag (1 Kgs 2.23);
- (9). Jezebel swears to Elijah after his killing of four hundred prophets of Baal (1 Kings 19.2);
- (10). Ben-hadad king of Syria swears to Ahab after the latter refused to pay tribute to him (1 Kgs 20.10);
- (11). Ben-hadad swears to a woman against Elisha during Ben-hadad's besieging of Samaria and after the woman who boiled her son shared him with another woman who refused to give up hers as food (2 Kgs 6.31);
- (12). Ruth swears to Naomi that she will follow her wherever she goes (Ruth 1.17).

This list obviously needs some comments. We have already shown in Chapter 2 that the polemics against the priesthood of the North (represented by the blind Eli) and against the Northern dynasty (represented by the lame Mephibosheth) have been redactionally built into Samuel's version of David's capture of Jerusalem (2 Sam 5). Here once again, a special locution is used in the Eli story, the SHSD and the SN. The anti-Saul 1 Sam 14 with its father/son problem between Saul and Jonathan resembles the Absalom story. Not only is it connected with the SHSD in this specific locution, even the content of the oaths of Saul and David is the same: in both, bread is not eaten before evening/sunset. The story of Elijah and Elisha is basically a dramatisation of the polemics against the Northern monarchy as one which rejects the prophets the servants of Yahweh. It is another major aspect of the anti-Northern, or more precisely perhaps anti-Samaritan propaganda, in Samuel-Kings.



The whole propagandistic scheme consists of (i) polemics against the Aaronite priesthood of the North, (ii) polemics against the establishment of the Northern kingdom, (iii) polemics against the first Northern king, (iv) defence of David's purity as the basis of Yahweh's promise of a sure house to Judah, (v) polemics against all the Northern kings. As far this piece of evidence is concerned, it shows that the story of the house of Eli, the anti-Saul story in 1 Sam 14, the SHSD, the SN and the story of Elijah and Elisha very probably belong to the same redactional layer: if they were not written by the same hand, they must have been written by people of the same mind with very similar rhetorical training!

It cannot be overemphasized that the locution כה יעשה-ל... אלהים וכה יוסיף, except for its use in Ruth 1.17, is special Samuel-Kings usage. *All occurrences appear in materials which share an anti-North attitude.* This phenomenon is so peculiar that it demands a very specific explanation. They may be the product of an anti-Samaritan campaign in the post-exilic period: the Samaritans, the Bamoth builders (2 Kgs 17.29) who, just like the foreign women—both Jeroboam and Jezebel were archetypal figures—would lead the true Israelites astray from Yahweh. So both should be excluded from the society of true Israelites, i.e. the Judahites of the returned exiles.

#### 5.2.4.1 Excursus

The most interesting and peculiar item of the above list is the single instance of the locution found in the book of Ruth which provides a genealogy for the ancestors of David. The story takes place in Bethlehem in Judah. It justifies the acceptance of a Moabite ancestress of David into the Davidic family. The genealogical link between Ruth and David may have been the reason for its inclusion in the Hebrew Bible but could hardly be the motivation for its being written. Rather it might have been written as a response from those who wanted to use a precedent to refuse to divorce their foreign wives during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (cf. Soggin 1989: 459). The piety of Ruth

is not emphasized; neither is God's universal love mentioned. The book should therefore not be compared to Jonah which has a more theological concern.

A lot of artful effort has been put in characterising Ruth as a passive "woman of worth" (3.11). The justification of Ruth is very clear and straightforward:

1.16 But Ruth said, "Entreat me not to leave you or to return from following you; for where you go I will go, and where you lodge I will lodge; your people shall be my people, and your God my God; 1.17 where you die I will die, and there will I be buried. *May Yahweh do so to me and more also* [my emphasis] if even death parts me from you." 1.18 And when Naomi saw that she was determined to go with her, she said no more.

The focus of Ruth's words here is not so much on her *choice* of faith (Soggin:459) as her *determination* to go with Naomi to live in Judah. The question to be resolved is what the society should do to those foreign women who determined to live the life of a genuine Israelite. The reader is expected to draw the conclusion that there should be exceptional cases in Ezra and Nehemiah's policy. After all, the narrator may have reasoned, there are women who are very willing to completely assimilate into the Israelite society. How "disloyal" (the meaning of "Orpah") it is to divorce them and return them to their homeland. It is because they love them that the Israelite men married these women who (at least some of them) have all along been true to the tradition of the ancestors. The legalistic rulers should take (the Israelite men's) love seriously into consideration! (Note the depiction of Boaz's clear signal of concern and love to Ruth.) If David's ancestor loved a Moabite woman and took her for a wife, why cannot we do the same?

The interest here is entirely humanitarian, even romantic, over against a rigid, legalistic and rather inhuman approach which is based on the ideology of a pure race of God. For the author of Ruth, what really matters is common humanity before God "under whose wing" these poor women "have come to take refuge" (2.12). And under divine providence love between different races is not only possible but beautiful and fruitful at the same time without sacrificing the traditions of the fathers. Ruth's next of kin, who was nearer to her than Boaz, obviously refused his responsibility because of her

nationality; for after learning her origin, he immediately took back his words (4.5). But a good foreign woman is just like the Israelite ancestresses “who together built up the house of Israel” (4.11b).

The purpose of a wife is to be a “companion” (meaning of “Ruth”), not just to generate pure posterity. Instead of causing family problems, the leaders should work “peacefully” (meaning of “Naomi”). It is the men, not the wives, who are the “strength” (meaning of “Boaz”) of the Israelite society. This symbolic and analogical use of narrative is not unlike the Nabal-Saul narrative analogy in 1 Sam 25. If our interpretation is plausible, then a story could be beautifully written, moving, entertaining but propagandistic at the same time. It appears that, *contra* Gunn (1980/89: 11),<sup>194</sup> the same applies to the SHSD and SN.

This story might have been written when the debate was still alive. But its inclusion in the Hebrew Bible could have been later and would have been for both its literary quality and its link with David.

### 5.2.5 The Use of *hištpael* of חרה

חרה in its *hištpael* form is used (1) in the cultic sense to describe the act of bowing deeply down before a deity in worship, or (2) in the non-cultic sense to describe the act of doing obeisance before a human being, usually a king. It appears 38 times in the Hebrew Bible but is not widely used and is found only in Gen (10x),<sup>195</sup> Deut (17.3), Judg (7.15), Sam (14x), Kgs (8x),<sup>196</sup> Is (44.15, 17) and Chr (1Chr 21.21; 2 Chr 33.3). It is used in the second sense only in Gen (23.7, 12; 27.29, 33.3; 48.12) in the Abraham story and Joseph story, in Sam (12x), in 1 Kgs (1.23, 53) and in 1 Chr 21.21. The occurrences in 1 Chr 21.21 and 2 Chr 33.3 are paralleled by 2 Sam 24.20 in the story of

---

<sup>194</sup> Gunn is rather unwilling to apply the genre “political propaganda” to the David story and suggests instead to regard it as “serious entertainment” .

<sup>195</sup> Gen 18.2; 19.1; 23.7, 12; 24.26, 52; 27.29; 33.3; 47.31; 48.12.

<sup>196</sup> 1 Kgs 1.23, 47, 53; 2.19; 9.9; 16.31; 2 Kgs 21.3, 21.

David purchasing a plot of land from Araunah/Ornan for an altar to Yahweh, and by 2 Kgs 21.3 in the account of Manasseh's reign condemning him for rebuilding the *bamoth* which Hezekiah had broken down and for *worshipping* all the hosts of heaven etc. *This means that special Chr material, despite its interest in worship, never uses the word in either sense and that it is only rarely (twice) used in the synoptic text.*

Except in 1 Sam 28.14, in the story of Saul's seeking guidance from a medium, and in the synoptic story of Araunah (2 Sam 24.20), it is used in the non-cultic sense in Samuel-Kings 12 times and *only* in the SHSD (1 Sam 20.41; 24.9; 2 Sam 1.2) and the SN (2 Sam 9.6, 8; 12.20; 14.22, 33; 18.21, 28; 1 Kgs 1.23, 53). It is usually used in rather standardised formulae: וישתחו ויקד/ויפל ל... לאפיו ארצה or וישתחו ל... לאפיו ארצה. Elsewhere only נפל is used without חוה in 1 Sam 5.4 (נפל לפניו ארצה), ארצה not attested in the LXX), 5.4 (נפל לפניו ארצה, ארצה not attested in the LXX) and 17.49 (ויפל על-פניו ארצה). The above data show that in its non-cultic use in Samuel-Kings וישתחו is concentrated mainly in the SHSD and the SN.

### 5.2.6 The Use of נקי / נקי דם

The word נקי is not unique in Samuel-Kings but is a key thematic term shared by both the SHSD and SN. It occurs 35x in the Hebrew Bible<sup>197</sup> in 20 of which it is used with דם<sup>198</sup> What interests us is that נקי דם never occurs in Chr but only in special Samuel-Kings material (7x). Its only three occurrences in the books of Samuel are found in the SHSD (1 Sam 19.5; 2 Sam 3.28) or the SN (2 Sam 14.9) and all three are used in the defence of the innocence of David or his throne.

<sup>197</sup> Gen 24.41; Ex 21.28; 23.7; Deut 19.10, 13; 21.8, 9; 24.5; 27.25; 1 Sam 19.5; 2 Sam 3.28; 14.9; 1 Kgs 15.22; 2 Kgs 21.16; 24.4(2x); Is 59.7; Jer 7.6; 22.3, 17; 26.15; Joel 4.19; Jonah 1.14; Ps 10.8; 15.5; 24.4; 94.21; 106.38; Job 4.7; 17.8; 22.19; 22.30; 27.17; Prov 1.11; 6.17.

<sup>198</sup> Deut 19.10, 13; Deut 21.8, 9; 27.25; 1 Sam 19.5; 2 Kgs 21.16; 24.4 (2x); Is 59.7; Jer 7.6; 19.4; 22.3, 17; 26.15; Joel 4.19; Jonah 1.14; Ps 94.21; Ps 106.38; Prov 6.17.

## 5.2.7 The Use of מלאך יהוה / מלאך אלהים

The locution מלאך אלהים<sup>199</sup> is used only 10 times in the Hebrew Bible compared with the 58 times of מלאך יהוה.<sup>200</sup> Both locutions appear in the books of Samuel, the former usage 4 times, all in the SHSD (1 Sam 29.9) or the SN (2 Sam 14.17, 20; 19.28), and the latter usage only once, in a synoptic text (2 Sam 24.16 || 1 Chr 21.15). Chr never uses the latter locution and it mentions angels only in synoptic texts (1 Chr 21.18-30 || 2 Sam 24.18-25; 2 Chr 32 || 2 Kgs 19.35)<sup>201</sup>

## 5.2.8 היה לבן-חיל

This special phrase appears only four times in the Hebrew Bible. 1 Sam 18.17 is not found in the LXX. The second is found in the SHSD and the last two in the SN. It is worthwhile to display the evidence in full:

Then Saul said to David, "Here is my elder daughter Merab; I will give her to you for a wife; only be valiant for me and fight Yahweh's battles." For Saul thought, "Let not my hand be upon him, but let the hand of the Philistines be upon him."

ויאמר שאול אל-דוד הנה בתי הגדולה מרב אתה אתן-לך לאשה אך היה-לי לבן-חיל והלחם מלחמות יהוה ושאול אמר אל-תהי ידי בו ותהי-בו יד-פלשתים: 1 Sam 18.17

Now therefore let your hands be strong, and be valiant; for Saul your lord is dead, and the house of Judah has anointed me king over them."

ועתה תחזקנה ידיכם והיו לבני-חיל כי-מת אדניכם שאול וגם-אתי משחו בית-יהודה למלך עליהם: 2 Sam 2.7

Then Absalom commanded his servants, "Mark when Amnon's heart is merry with wine, and when I say to you, Strike Amnon, then kill him. Fear not; have I not commanded you? Be courageous and be valiant."

ויצו אבשלום את-נעריו לאמר ראו נא כטוב לב-אמנון ביין ואמרתי אליכם הכו את-אמנון והמתם אתו אל-תיראו הלוא כי אנכי צויתי אתכם חזקו והיו לבני-חיל: 2 Sam 13.28

And Solomon said, "If he prove to be a worthy man, not one of his hairs shall fall to the earth; but if wickedness is found in him, he shall die."

ויאמר שלמה אם יהיה לבן-חיל לא-יפל משערתו ארצה ואם-רעה תמצא-בו ומת: 1 Kings 1.52

<sup>199</sup> Found in Gen 21.17; 31.11; Ex 14.19; Judg 6.20; 13.6, 9; 1 Sam 29.9; 2 Sam 14.17, 20; 19.28.

<sup>200</sup> Gen 16.7, 9, 10, 11; 22.11; 22.15; Exod 3.2; Num 22.22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34, 35; Judg 2.1, 4; 5.23; 6.11, 12, 21, 22, 22; 13.3, 13, 15, 16, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 21; 2 Sam 24.16; 1 Kgs 9.7; 2 Kgs 1.3, 15; 19.35; Is 37.36; Hag 1.13; Zech 1.11, 12; 3.1, 5, 6; 12.8; Mal 2.7; Ps 34.8; 35.5, 6; 1 Chr 21.12, 15, 16, 18, 30.

<sup>201</sup> היה מלאך אלהים appears again in 1 Kgs 19.7; 2 Kgs 1.3, 15 and מלאך יהוה in 1 Kgs 13.18; 19.5 in special Kings materials.

### 5.2.9 מנחלת אלהים / יהוה (“the heritage of God/Yahweh”)

The form מנחלת יהוה appears only in the SHSD (1 Sam 26.19) and in the SN (2 Sam 14.16; 20.19; 21.3). מנחלת אלהים is found only in the SN (2 Sam 14.16).

### 5.2.10 לא ידע כל דבר

The phrase in this form is found only in 2 Sam 15.11 in the SN. In the SHSD we have לא ידע עבדך בכל־זאת דבר (“your servant has known nothing of all this”). ידע + obj. (דבר־ים) is found in 1 Sam 14.12 and in the SHSD (1 Sam 20.39; 21.3; 22.15), elsewhere only in Deut 18.21; Jos 14.6; Prov 1.23; Qoh 8.5.

### 5.2.11 למאות ולאלפים (“hundreds and thousands”)

This phrase appears only in the SHSD (1 Sam 29.2) and the SN (2 Sam 18.4) in the whole Hebrew Bible.

### 5.2.12 בן מות

The phrase appears only in the SHSD (1 Sam 20.31; 26.16) and the SN (2 Sam 12.5). A similar usage מות אנשי is found in the SN (2 Sam 19.9; 1 Kgs 2.26). In 1 Sam 26.16 and 2 Sam 12.5 both חי־יהוה and בן־מות are spoken by David with similar emotion:

For as long as the son of Jesse lives upon the earth,  
neither you nor your kingdom shall be established.  
Therefore send and fetch him to me, for he shall surely die.

This thing that you have done is not good. As Yahweh lives,  
you deserve to die, because you have not kept watch over  
your lord, Yahweh’s anointed. And now see where the  
king’s spear is, and the jar of water that was at his head.

Then David’s anger was greatly kindled against the man;  
and he said to Nathan, “As Yahweh lives, the man  
who has done this deserves to die;

כי כל־הימים אשר בן־ישי חי על־האדמה  
לא תכון אתה ומלכותך ועתה שלח וקח  
אתו אלי כי בן־מות הוא: (1Sam 20:31)

לא־טוב הדבר הזה אשר עשית חי־יהוה כי  
בני־מות אתם אשר לא־שמרתם על־אדניכם  
על־משיח יהוה ועתה ראה אי־חנית המלך  
ואת־צפחת המים אשר מראשתו: (1 Sam 26:16)

ויחר־אף דוד באיש מאד  
ויאמר אל־נתן חי־יהוה  
כי בן־מות האיש העשה זאת: (2 Sam 12:5)

### 5.2.13 רעה ... תמצא

**מצא** is a very common word in the Hebrew Bible and appears 457 times in total. But the niph'al form is comparatively very rare and is used in only 9 instances.<sup>202</sup> The use of the niph'al form together with **רעה** is unique to the SHSD (1 Sam 25.28) and the SN (1 Kgs 1.52):

Pray forgive the trespass of your handmaid; for Yahweh will certainly make my lord a sure house, because my lord is fighting the battles of Yahweh; and evil shall not be found in you so long as you live.

שָׂא נָא לַפֶּשַׁע אֲמַתְךָ כִּי עָשָׂה-  
יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה לְאֲדֹנָי בַּיִת נְאֻמָּן  
כִּי-מִלְחָמוֹת יְהוָה אֲדֹנָי נִלְחָם  
וְרָעָה לֹא-תִמְצָא בְךָ מִיְמֶיךָ: (1 Sam 25.28)

And Solomon said, "If he prove to be a worthy man, not one of his hairs shall fall to the earth; but if wickedness is found in him, he shall die."

וַיֹּאמֶר שְׁלֹמֹה אִם יִהְיֶה לְבֶן-חַיִּל  
לֹא-יִפֹּל מִשְׁעָרְתּוֹ אֶרֶצָה  
וְאִם-רָעָה תִמְצָא-בּוֹ וּמָת:

We have already shown in section 5.2.8 the rarity (4x) of the locution **יהיה לבן-חיל**. Here in 1 Kgs 1.52, two rare usages are found which are found otherwise only in the SHSD.

### 5.2.14 Wisdom Origin of the SHSD and the SN

Whybray (1968) suggested taking "the Succession Narrative as a dramatization of proverbial wisdom" (78f.). He has correlated many pertinent proverbial aspects of the SN with proverbs in the book of Proverbs and has suggested that

... there is a sufficiently close resemblance between Proverbs and the incidents and situations of the Succession Narrative to show that the author of the latter was not merely a man who shared the general outlook of the wisdom teachers, but was himself a wisdom teacher in the sense that he set out deliberately to illustrate specific proverbial teaching for the benefit of the pupils and ex-pupils of the schools. (95)

<sup>202</sup> Exod 22.3; 1Sam 13.22; 25.28; 1 Kgs 1.52; Is 35.9; Job 28.12, 13; Prov 10.13; 16.3.

In what follows we submit the SHSD to the same sapiential comparison with the book of Proverbs.<sup>203</sup> It is not our purpose here to do as thorough a comparison of the SHSD to Proverbs as Whybray has been done for the SN. Suffice it to apply to the SHSD some of the proverbs he has used on the SN:

(1). Characterization: Wise woman and foolish man in 1 Sam 25

The vexation of a fool is known at once,  
but the prudent man ignores an insult. (Prov 12.16)

Whybray applies this proverb to Absalom who, after learning the rape of his sister, “spoke to Amnon neither good nor bad” but waited for two years for an opportunity to revenge this crime (2 Sam 13.22). I find that this proverb can be even more appropriately applied to the narrative analogy in 1 Sam 25. The ill-natured Nabal, folly incarnated, responds impulsively to David’s request and accuses him of disloyalty to his master Saul. David responds humanly, but fortunately has taken the advice of a woman of discretion and “ignores an insult” and prevents bloodshed.

(2). Saul exposes himself to danger while David hides from it

The simple believes everything,  
but the prudent looks where he is going. (Prov 14.15)  
*And David said to Saul, “Why do you listen to the words of men who say, Behold, David seeks your hurt?” (1 Sam 24.10)*  
A prudent man sees danger and hides himself;  
but the simple go on, and suffer for it. (27.12)  
*Lo, this day your eyes have seen how Yahweh gave you today into my hand in the cave; and some bade me kill you, but I spared you. I said, I will not put forth my hand against my lord; for he is Yahweh’S anointed.’ (1 Sam 24.11)*

These two proverbs are applied to Adonijah by Whybray. Again they can more appropriately be applied to the SHSD. Saul is portrayed as a simple-minded king who

---

<sup>203</sup> Fontaine (1986) has successfully extended Whybray’s sapiential analysis to the Bethsheba story in 2 Sam 11-12.



believes rumour (1 Sam 24.10[9]) and so tries to kill David. Whereas Saul falls into David's hand twice (1 Sam 24; 26), the prudent David always hides himself carefully. Saul repeats his mistakes from beginning (1 Sam 19) to end (26) and behaves like "a fool who repeats his folly" (Prov 26.11b).

### (3). David as Saul's loyal servant.

Many a man proclaims his loyalty (חסד),

but a faithful man (איש אמונים) who can find? (Prov 20.6)

*If I am still alive, show me the loyal love of Yahweh (חסד יהוה), that I may not die;  
and do not cut off your loyalty (חסדך) from my house for ever. (1 Sam 20.14-15a)*

*And David said, "Is there still any one left of the house of Saul, that I may show him  
loyalty (חסד) for Jonathan's sake?" (2 Sam 9.1)*

One of the apologetic purposes of the SHSD is not only to demonstrate David's innocence but more positively his loyalty to the first king and his family. David promises to act on the requests of Jonathan (1 Sam 20.17) and Saul (1 Sam 24.22[21]); he fulfills his obligation (2 Sam 9.1; 21.7) and demonstrates his innocence to Saul even when being pursued by him. We are told he retains his faithfulness to Saul even as a Philistine vassal and is only forced to join the campaign against Saul, but fortunately is saved from treason by being rejected from going to the battlefield.

### (4). David purging the guilt of innocent blood:

A king who sits on the throne of judgment  
winnows all evil with his eyes. (Prov 20.8)

A wise king winnows the wicked,  
And drives the wheel over them. (v. 26)

Whybray's application of the above proverb to the death of Joab and Shimei should certainly be applied to a few more in the SHSD: the Amalekite who claimed to have killed Saul, and Baanah and Rechab who murdered Ishbosheth. It is not just the

ruthlessness of royal power that is at work but David's fulfillment of Deuteronomic criminal legislation which requires the ruler to purge the guilt of innocent blood from Israel (Deut 19.13).

The above examples could be multiplied but let us end with a very interesting connection between Proverbs and the SHSD, which has escaped Whybray's attention. The list of seven types of wickedness in the following proverbial saying is all found in the SHSD:

Six things which Yahweh hates,  
and seven are an abomination to him:  
haughty eyes, a lying tongue,  
and hands that shed innocent blood (דַּם־נִקִּי),  
a heart that devises wicked plans,  
feet that make haste to run to evil,  
a false witness who breathes out lies,  
and a man who sows discord among brother. (Prov 6.16-19)

שֵׁשׁ־הֵנָּה שִׂנְאָה יְהוָה 6.16  
וְשִׁבְעַת תּוֹעֲבוֹת נִפְשׁוֹ:  
6.17 עֵינַיִם רְמוּת לְשׁוֹן שִׁקְרָה  
וַיָּדַיִם שׁוֹפְכוֹת דַּם־נִקִּי:  
6.18 לֵב חָרַשׁ מַחֲשָׁבוֹת אֶוֶן  
רַגְלַיִם מִמְהָרוֹת לְרוּץ לְרָעָה:  
6.19 יִפְיֵחַ כּוֹבְבִים עַד שִׁקְרָה  
וּמְשַׁלַּח מִדְּנִיִּים בֵּין אַחֲיָיִם:

Nabal rejected David's request with his haughty aloofness. Shimei wrongly accused the long suffering David with a lying tongue. Many hands shed דַּם־נִקִּי in the SHSD. דַּם־נִקִּי appears only 20 times in the Hebrew Bible and the only occurrence in Prov is found here. Ahithophel's wicked plan against David was averted by counter-intelligence. Many a time, Saul made haste to hunt David when he was told of his whereabouts. There are many good witnesses for David's character in the SHSD but Shimei "breathes out lies". Ziba is also a liar "who cleverly takes advantage of David's confusion of mind during his flight from Jerusalem by alleging (II Sam 16.3) that Meribaal is plotting the restoration of the house of Saul" (Whybray 1968: 44). Absalom planned his revolt by first sowing discontent among the people of Israel at the gate of the city. To heal this conflict among the people, Ahithophel's advice is that by seeking the life of "one man", i.e. David, "all the people will be at peace" (2 Sam 17.4b).

Of course, it is not difficult to illustrate different characters of a narrative with relevant proverbs from Prov which comprises sayings about basically all kinds of people. But the correspondence of the example above with the characters in the SHSD and the SN is surprising. The only use of דַּם־נִקִּי in Prov is found here and it is also used in the SHSD (1 Sam 19.5; 2 Sam 3.28) and the SN (2 Sam 14.9) (see 5.2.6 above). It almost

looks as if those seven evils are dramatized into characters in the books of Samuel. This, I submit, is a better candidate for the kind of proverbial wisdom from which the SHSD and the SN could be understood as a dramatized form. It also strengthens the plausibility of the Wisdom provenance of the the SN as suggested by Whybray and draws the SHSD and the SN closer together as being from the same milieu. It is, however, doubtful whether we can say very much about the pedagogic purpose of the SN from its Wisdom connections. There is, to be sure, a sapiential perspective on human nature and politics because it was, as Whybray suggests, probably written by someone with the training of a wise man but the overarching purpose is still entirely political and ideological.

### 5.3 Conclusion

The above literary affinities and parallels between the SHSD and the SN in terms of the same motifs, style, linguistic characteristics and wisdom background show that their authors were probably the same person, because borrowing and imitation cannot explain such close and unique similarity down to very specific and peculiar details (e.g. 5.5.11-13). More unique affinity between the SHSD and the SN may be discovered, so our finding is meant to be illustrative instead of exhaustive. We may thus fairly safely conclude that the affinity detected above is to be explained by common authorship rather than by literary interdependence and certainly not by redaction because the stylistic and linguistic affinities are found both within and outwith thematic connections.

Rost's classic hypothesis is a very successful attempt to point an exit from the impasse reached in the study of the former prophets using the old method of source analysis. But it also leads to a stalemate in scholars' attempts to tackle the problem of the delimitation of the HDR. Our synoptic studies show that the SHSD and the SN, with cross-referential pointers alluding to them in Samuel's texts but not in the Chr's, were probably added to a base text of Samuel-Kings. Similar thematic and apologetic concerns for the guilt of David and his throne further corroborate our new hypothesis of common

authorship.<sup>204</sup> The result of our study also relieves us from the burden of delimiting the HDR as another documentary source distinct from the SN. The problem no longer exists when the existence of the SHSD is recognised. It must be emphasized, however, that we have no evidence to show that the SHSD and the SN form an originally larger independent narrative. In fact they may be related to other special Samuel-Kings materials in the compositional level. But to demonstrate this is beyond the scope of our thesis.

---

<sup>204</sup> This also was also responsible for composing and adding the story of Eli and 1 Sam 14 to the base text.

## CONCLUSION

The textual and literary studies in the first three chapters of the thesis suggest to us that some of the main Samuel variants and pluses are pointers to thematic materials pertaining to the defence of David in pertinent episodes in the SHSD and the SN. This shows indirectly that the Chr probably did not have these two narratives in his *Vorlage*.

In Chapter Four we discussed the structure of the HSD and the SHSD. Their relation to the HDR can be schematically represented:  $HDR=HSD+SHSD$ . A review of recent works on the HDR in the same chapter showed that connections between the HDR and the SN have not been satisfactorily explained. A list of more than a dozen pieces of evidence suggested in Chapter Five shows that the SHSD and the SN can best be explained in terms of common authorship.

This thesis would not conclude properly without a response to Auld's latest proposal (1994). I have briefly discussed his views in the Introduction. His idea of "independent supplementation of a common inherited text" is a sound one. Now we shall spend some time on his reconstructed Common Text which begins at 1 Sam 31 (|| 1 Chr 10). Our studies in Chapter One suggest, however, that 1 Chr 10 has links to 1 Sam 5, 11 and 17. Also the story of the ark cannot be complete without 1 Sam 4-6 to represent Yahweh's abandonment of the northern shrine Shiloh and his election of a new sanctuary in Jerusalem. These literary connections break his policy of reconstruction guided only by what is commonly shared in Samuel-Kings and Chr. It must be said that this policy is too simplistic and mechanical: it by definition excludes special Samuel-Kings and special Chr materials from the common-source. It is precisely where variants and pluses in synoptic texts disagree that we are able to link them to larger special materials (e.g. the SHSD). One example will illustrate the point. Both Chr and Samuel-Kings agree that David could not build a house for Yahweh's name. Kings' reason is that it was "because of the warfare with which his [i.e. David's] enemies surrounded him" (1 Kgs 5.3). That is, according to Kings, David was too busy fighting battles against his enemies to build

the house for Yahweh. The Chr, however, gives an entirely different reason: “You [David] have shed much blood and have waged great wars; you shall not build a house to my name, because you have shed so much blood before me upon the earth” (1 Chr 22.8).<sup>205</sup> The question now is: did the authors of Kings and Chr both have a *common* problem in mind independently and give *different* explanations independently?<sup>206</sup> It seems more plausible that the common-source had the problem and an explanation but one of the authors disagreed. While Chr’s reason sounds obviously offensive, Kings’ explanation looks apologetic. The next question would then be: whose explanation belongs to the common-source?

No doubt, Auld’s recent work is a new starting point for future synoptic study of Samuel-Kings and Chr. The next, probably more difficult, stage is to approach the synoptic texts again to find out how many of special materials in Samuel-Kings were due to disagreement over the shared text and how many were the product of independent composition. That is, to answer the question: “How common is the special?”

Near the end of his monograph (1994), Auld proposes a new understanding of the formation of Kings:

... it was the addition of the northern story with its prophetic critique – originally intended, Jeremiah-like, as a mirror in which the south might view itself and shudder – that signalled the fresh creation of the Books of Kings out of the Common Text (172).

To the redactional layer of this “northern” story, we should add the Eli story, the negative portrayal of Saul (1 Sam 14), the SHSD and the SN. Our study of the oath formula *כה יעשה-ל... אלהים וכה יוסיף* suggests that these stories can be linked together (see 5.2.4, cf. also 2.11). They were probably written by people with similar attitudes to the northern kingdom and with similar rhetorical training, and added to a much shorter,

---

<sup>205</sup> Note the reason given by Chr is outside the synoptic scope 2 Chr 1-9.

<sup>206</sup> Kings’ reason is given within a plus of two verses in the word Solomon sent to Hiram after a shared verse (1 Kgs 5.2 [BHS 5.16] || 2 Chr 2.3 [BHS 2.2]).

earlier form of Samuel-Kings. Some of them, e.g. the Eli story, the SHSD and the SN, are likely to have originated from the same hand. It is outside the scope of this thesis, however, to enquire about the beginning or the end of this text. It would be important in the future to investigate how many materials in other parts of Deut-Kings we could link to these special Samuel-Kings texts and also to see how far we could extend the beginning of Auld's "Common Text".

The above concludes the thesis; but as Conroy (1978) has aptly said of his study of the story of Absalom, "There is no end to literary study of a text, and the reader of the present work will surely feel that much else could, and indeed should, be said about 2 Sam 13-20" (146). I suspect a lot more should be said concerning the rather general problem of the literary relationship between Samuel-Kings and Chr.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackroyd, P. R.

- 1971 *The First Book of Samuel* (CBC), Cambridge.
- 1977 *The Second Book of Samuel* (CBC), Cambridge.
- 1977a "The Chronicler as Exegesis," *JSOT* 2: 2-32.
- 1981 "The Succession Narrative (so-called)", *Int* 35: 383-96.
- 1991 *The Chronicler in His Age*, (JSOTS 101), Sheffield.

Aharoni, Y. and Avi-Yonah, M.

- 1993 *The Macmillan Bible Atlas*, revised 3rd ed. by A. F. Rainey and Z. Safrai, New York.

Albright, W. F.

- 1922 "The Sinnor in the Story of David's Capture of Jerusalem", *JPOS* 2: 286-290.

Alter, R.

- 1981 *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, New York.
- 1992 *The World of Biblical Literature*, London.

Amit, Y.

- 1990 "Hidden Polemic in the Conquest of Dan: Judges xvii-xviii", *VT* 40: 4-20.

Andersen, F. I. and Freedman, D. N.

- 1989 "Another Look at *4QSam<sup>b</sup>*", *RevQ* 14/53: 7-29.

Anderson, G. W.

- 1959 *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, London.

Andrews, C. (ed.)

- 1985 *The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead*, E. tr. by R.O. Faulkner, (London: 1972, revised 1985).

Arnold, B. T.

- 1989 "The Amalekite's Report of Saul's Death" Political Intrigue or Incompatible Sources?", *JETS* 32: 289-98.

Auld, A. G.

- 1975 "Judges I and History: a Reconsideration", *VT* 25: 261-285.



- 1983a "Prophets Through the Looking Glass: Between Writings and Moses", *JSOT* 27: 3-23.
- 1983b "Prophets Through the Looking Glass: A Response to Robert Carroll and Hugh Williamson", *JSOT* 27: 41-44.
- 1992 "Salomo und die Deuteronomisten: Vision einer neuen Zukunft?", *ThZ* 48: 343-55.
- 1993a "Solomon at Gibeon: History Glimpsed", *AvrahamMalamat Volume*, EI 23.
- 1993, ed. *Understanding Poets and Prophets, Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson* (JSOTS 152), Sheffield.
- 1994 *Kings without Privilege*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Auld, A. G. and Ho, C. Y. S.
- 1992 "The Making of David and Goliath", *JSOT* 56:19-39.
- Barr, J.
- 1989 *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible*, The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, Oxford.
- Baudissen, W. W. G.
- 1889 *Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priesterhums*, Leipzig.
- Barthélemy, D.
- 1982 *Critique Textuelle de l'ancien Testament*, (OBO 50/1), Göttingen.
- , Gooding, D. W., Lust, J. and Tov, E.
- 1986 *The Story of David and Goliath. Textual and Literary Criticism*, Friburgo/Gotinga.
- Benzinger, J.
- 1901 *Die Bücher der Chronik*, (KHAT), Tübingen/Leipzig
- Berges, U.
- 1989 *Die Verwerfung Sauls: Eine Thematische Untersuchung* (FB 61) Echter, Würzburg.
- Bertheau, E.
- 1873 *Die Bücher der Chronik erklärt*, 2nd ed. (KEH 15), Leipzig. E. tr. by James Martin, *The Books of the Chroniclers*, 1st ed., Edinburgh: 1857.
- Black, M. and Rowley, H. H. (eds.)
- 1962 *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, London/Edinburgh.

- Blenkinsopp, J.  
 1966 "Theme and Motif in the Succession History (2 Sam. xi 2ff) and the Yahwist Corpus", (VTSup 15) *Volume du Congrès: Genève 1965*, Leiden, 44-57.
- de Boer, P. A. H.  
 1949 "Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii-xxxi", (OTS 6), Amsterdam, 1-100.
- Boling, R. G.  
 1975 *Judges, A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, (AB), Garden City.
- Booij, Th.  
 1991 'Psalm cx: "Rule in the Midst of your Foes!"', *VT* 41: 396-407.
- Botterweck, G. J.  
 1956 "Zur Eigenart der chronisticschen Davidgeschichte", *TQ* 136: 402-435.
- Braun, R. L.  
 1973 "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles", *JBL* 92: 503-16.  
 1977 "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude Toward the North", *JBL* 96: 59-62.  
 1979 "Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah: Theology and Literary History", (VTSup 30. Leiden), 52-64.  
 1986 *1 Chronicles* (WBC), Waco, Texas.
- Bressan, G.  
 1944 "L'espugnazione di Sion in 2 Sam 5,6-8 || 1 Chr 11, 4-6 e il problema del *šinnôr*", *Biblica* 25: 346-81.
- Brueggemann, W.  
 1989 "Narrative Intentionality in 1 Samuel 29", *JSOT* 43: 21-25.  
 1990 "1 Samuel 1: A Sense of a Beginning", *ZAW* 102: 33-48.
- Brunet, G.  
 1979a "Les aveugles et boiteux jébusites", *VTSup* 30: 65-72.  
 1979b "David et le *šinnôr*", *VTSup* 30: 73-86.
- Bruno, D. A.

- 1955 *Die Bücher Samuel: Eine Rhythmische Untersuchung*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Budde, K.  
1902 *Die Bücher Samuel*, (KHC 8), Tübingen/Leipzig.
- Campbell, A. F.  
1975 *The Ark Narrative*, (SBLDS 16), Missoula, Montana.  
1979 "Psalm 78: A Contribution to the Theology of Tenth Century Israel", *CBQ* 41: 51-79.  
1986 *Of Prphets and Kings, A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel -- 2 Kings 10)*, (CBQMS 17), Washington, DC.
- Caird, G. B.  
1953 *The First and Second Books of Samuel*. (IB vol. 2: 853-1176), New York and Nashville.
- Carlson, R. A.  
1964 *David, the Chosen King. A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel*, Stockholm.  
1993 "David and the Ark in 2 Samuel 6", (VTSup 50), A. Lemaire and E. Otzen, ed. *History and Traditions of Early Israel. Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen, May 8th 1993*, Leiden, 17-23..
- Carroll, R. P.  
1971 "Psalm lxxviii: Vestiges of a Tribal Polemic", *VT* 21: 133-150.  
1994 "Stange Fire: Abstract of Presence Absent in the Text. Meditations on Exodus 3", *JSOT* 61: 39-58.
- Childs, B. S.  
1979 *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, London: SCM.
- Clements, R. E.  
1989, ed. *The Word of Ancient Israel. Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives. Essays by Members of the Society of Old Testament Study*, Cambridge.
- Coats, G. W.  
1981 "Parable, Fable and Anecdote. Storytelling in the Succession Narrative", *Int* 35: 368-82.
- Cody, A.  
1969 *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*, (AnBib 35), Rome.

- Cogan, M.  
1988 "For We, Like You, Worship Your God", *VT* 38: 286-92.
- Coggins, R. J.  
1976 *The Cambridge Bible Commentary*, (CBC), Cambridge.
- Conrad, J.  
1972 "Zur geschichtlichen Hintergrund der Darstellung von Davids Aufstieg", *TLZ* 97: 321-32
- Conroy, C.  
1978 *Absalom Absalom!* (AnBib 81), Rome.
- Croft, S. J. L.  
1979 "Review of Williamson's *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*", *JSTOT* 14: 68-73.
- Cross, F. M.  
1973 *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Cryer, F. H.  
1985 "David's Rise to Power and the Death of Abner. An Analysis of 1 Samuel xxvi 14-16 as its Redaction-Critical Implication", *VT* 4: 385-94.
- Curtis, E. L. and Madsen, A. A.  
1910 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*, (ICC), Edinburgh.
- Day, J.  
1979 "The Destruction of the Shiloh Sanctuary and Jeremiah vii 12, 14", *VTSup* 30: 87-94.
- Dequeker, L.  
1986 "1 Chronicles xxiv and the Royal Priesthood of the Hasmoneans", *OTS* 24: 94-106.
- Dhorme, Le P. P.  
1910 *Les Livres de Samuel (Études Bibliques)*, Paris.
- Dick, M. B.,  
1983 "Job 31, The Oath of Innocence, and the Sage", *ZAW* 95: 31-53.
- Driver, S.R.

- 1913 *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford.
- Edelman, D.  
 1990 "The Deuteronomist's Story of King Saul: Narrative Art or Editorial Product?" (BETL 94) C. Brekelmans and J. Lust ed. *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies (1989 ISOST Papers)*, Leuven.
- Eichhorn, J. G.  
 1780-83 *Einleitung ins Alte Testament*. 1803<sup>3</sup>, 1823-24<sup>4</sup>, Leipzig.
- Emerton, J. A.  
 1962 "Priest and Levites in Deuteronomy", *VT* 12: 129-38.  
 1971 "Some False Clues in the Study of Genesis xiv", *VT* 21: 24-47.  
 1971a "The Riddle of Genesis xiv", *VT* 21: 403-39.
- Eissfeldt, O.  
 1965 *Old Testament: An Introduction*, E. tr. by P. R. Ackroyd, Oxford.
- Eslinger, L.  
 1985 *Kingship of God in Crisis. A Close Reading of 1 Samuel 1-12*, (BLS 10), Sheffield.  
 1994 *House of God and House of David*, (JSOT 164), Sheffield.
- Fishbane, M.  
 1985 *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Oxford.
- Fisher, V. A.  
 1989 "David und Batseba", *ZAW* 101: 50-59.
- Floß, J. P.  
 1987 *David und Jerusalem* (ATSAT 30), Otilien.
- Fokkeman, J. P.  
 1981 *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. A full interpretation based on stylistic and structural analysis. Vol. I: King David (II Sam. 9-20 & I Kings 1-2)*, (SSN) Assen/Maastricht / Dover.  
 1986 *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. A full interpretation based on stylistic and structural analysis. Vol. II: The Crossing Fates (I Sam. 13-31 & II Sam. 1)*, (SSN) Assen/Maastricht / Dover.  
 1990 *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. A full interpretation based on stylistic and structural analysis. Vol. III: Throne and City (II Sam. 2-8 & 21-24)*, (SSN) Assen/Maastricht / Dover.

- Fontaine, C.  
1986 "The Bearing of Wisdom on the Shape of 2 Samuel 11-12 and 1 Kings 3", *JSOT* 34: 61-77.
- Garsiel, M.  
1990 *The Book of Samuel: a literary study of comparative structure, analogies and parallels*, Ramat Gan.
- Gerleman, G.  
1948 *Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament*, (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1. Bd 44. Nr 5), Lund.
- Goedicke, H. and Roberts, J. J. M. (eds.)  
1975 *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East*, Baltimore/London.
- Gibson, J. C. L.  
1994 *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar—Syntax*, Edinburgh.
- Glück, J. J.  
1966 "The Conquest of Jerusalem in the Account of 2 Sam 5,6a-8 with Special References to 'the Blind and the Lame'" and the Phrase 'w<sup>e</sup>yigga' bassinor', *OTW* (1960): 98-105.
- Gordon, R. P.  
1980 "David's Rise and Saul's Demise: Narrative Analogy in Samuel 24-26", *TB* 31, 37-64.  
1986 *1 & 2 Samuel. A Commentary*, Exeter.  
1984, 87 *1 & 2 Samuel*, (OTG), Sheffield
- Grønбæk, J. H.  
1971 *Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids (1 Sam.15 - 2 Sam.5) Tradition and Komposition*, (ATD 10), Copenhagen.
- Gunn, D. M.  
1974 "Narrative Patterns and Oral Tradition in Judges and Samuel", *VT* 24: 286-317.  
1974a "The 'Battle Report': Oral or Scribal Convention?", *JBL* 93: 513-18.  
1978 *The Story of King David. Genre and Interpretation*. Repr. 1982, 89. (JSOTS 6), Sheffield.  
1980 *The Fate of King Saul, An Interpretation of a Biblical Story* (JSOTS 14), Sheffield.

- Gunneweg, A. H. J.  
 1965 *Leviten und Priester. Hauptlinien der Traditionsbildung und Geschichte des israelitisch-jüdischen Kultpersonals*, Göttingen.
- Hagan, H.  
 "1979 "Deception as Motif and Theme in 2 Sm 9-20; 1 Kgs 1-2", *Bib* 60: 301-26.
- Halpern, B.  
 1976 "Levitical Participation in the Reform Cult of Jeroboam I", *JBL* 95: 31-42.
- Hardy, G. H. H.  
 1940 *A Mathematician's Apology*, Cambridge.
- Hertzberg, H. W.  
 1964 *I and II Samuel. A Commentary.* (OTL), London. E. tr. from German (1960) by J. Bowden.
- Ho, C. Y. S.  
 (forthcoming) "Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Sam 31.1-13 really the source of 1 Chr 10.1-12", *VT*.
- Hoffman, Y.  
 1989 "A North Israelite Typological Myth and a Judean Historical Tradition: the Exodus in Hosea and Amos", *VT* 39: 169-82.
- Hoffner, H. A. Jr.  
 1970 "David and the Tekoite Woman", *VT* 20: 419-44.  
 1975 "Propaganda and Political Justification in Hittite Historiography" in H. Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts, eds. *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East*, Baltimore/London, 49-62
- Hoftijzer, J.  
 1970 "David and the Tekoite Woman", *VT* 20: 419-44.
- Holm-Nielsen, S.  
 1993 'Did Joab Climb "Warren's Shaft"?', *VTSup* 50: 38-49.
- Humphreys, W. L.  
 1978 "The Tragedy of King Saul: A Study of the Structure of 1 Samuel 9-31", *JSOT* 6: 18-27

- 1980 "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: A Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in 1 Samuel", *JSOT* 18: 74-90.
- 1982 "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel", *JSOT* 22: 95-117.
- Japhet, S.
- 1985 "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles", *JSOT* 33: 83-107.
- 1989 *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, E. tr., Frankfurt, Bern and New York.
- 1993 *I & II Chronicles. A Commentary*, (OTL), London.
- Jobling, D.
- 1976 "Saul's Fall and Jonathan's Rise: Tradition and Redaction in 1 Sam 14:1-46", *JBL* 95: 367-76.
- Johnstone, W.
- 1987 "Reactivating the Chronicles Analogy in Pentateuchal Studies, with Special Reference to the Sinai Pericope in Exodus", *ZAW* 99: 16-37.
- Jones, G. H.
- 1990 *The Nathan Oracle*, (JSOTS 80), Sheffield.
- 1993 *1 & 2 Chronicles*, (OTG), Sheffield.
- Kaiser, O.
- 1970/75 *Introduction to the Old Testament*, Oxford. E. tr. by J. Sturdy from 2nd ed. (Gütersloher: 1970), incorporating revisions by the author to 1973.
- Klein, R. W.
- 1983 *1 Samuel*, (WBC 10), Waco, Texas.
- Kleven, T.
- 1994 "The Use of *šnr* in Ugaritic and 2 Samuel v 8: Hebrew Usage and Comparative Philology", *VT* 44: 195-204.
- Koch, K.
- 1969 *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method*, E. tr., London.
- Koopman, W. T.
- 1991 "The Testament of David in 1 Kings ii 1-10", *VT* 41: 429-49.
- Kraft, R. A. & Tov, E.



*The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible*, Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies, Center for Computer Analysis of Texts (CCAT), University of Pennsylvania, Box 36 College Hall, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6303..

- Lemche, N. P.  
1978 "David's Rise", *JSOT* 10: 2-25.
- Lemke, W. E.  
1965 "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History", *HTR* 58: 349-63.
- McCarter, P.K. Jr.  
1980 *I Samuel, A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, New York.  
1980a "The Apology of David", *JBL* 99: 489-504.  
1981 "Plots, True or False. The Succession Narrative as Court Apologetic", *Int* 35: 355-67.
- Mckane, W.  
1963 *I & II Samuel Introduction and Commentary*, (Torch Bible), London.
- McKenzie, S. L.  
1985 *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, Missoula, Montana.
- Mabee, C.  
1980 "David's Judicial Exoneration", *ZAW* 92: 89-107.
- Marcos, N. F. and Saiz, J. R. B.  
1989 *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega I 1-2 Samuel*, Madrid.
- Mastin, B. A.  
1979 "Was šālīš the Third Man in the Chariot?", (VTSup 30), J. A. Emerton (ed.), *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament*, Leiden, 125-54.
- Mauchline, J.  
1971 *1 and 2 Samuel*, (NCB), Frome and London.
- Mazar, B.  
1963 "The Military Élite of King David", *VT* 13: 310-20.

- Mettinger, T. N. D.  
 1976 *King and Messiah. The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*, (ConB, Old Testament Series, 8), Lund.
- Mosis, R.  
 1973 *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (FThS 92), Freiburg.
- Mowickel, S.  
 1963 "Israelite Historiography", *ASTI*, 2: 4-26.
- Myers, J. M.  
 1965 *I Chronicles* (AB), New York.  
 1965a *II Chronicles* (AB), New York.
- Na'aman, N.  
 1988 "The List of David's Officers (*šālīšim*)", *VT* 38: 71-79.
- Nelson, R. D.  
 1981 *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, (JSOTS 18), Sheffield
- Noth, M.  
 1943/81 *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. E. tr. of Teil I: *The Deuteronomistic History*, (JSOTS 15), 1981, 291. E. tr. of  
 1843/87 *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Teil 2, E. tr. and Introduction by H.G.M. Williamson, *The Chronicler's History*, (JSOTS 50), Sheffield: 1987.  
 1966 *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*, London. E. tr. by D. R. Ap-Thomas from the author's *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, Munich, 1957, 1960.
- Nübel, H.-U.  
 1959 *David's Aufstieg in der frühe israelitischer Geschichtschreibung*, diss. Bonn.
- O'Brien, M. A.  
 1989 *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*, (OBO 92), Göttingen.
- Oesterley, W. O. E.

- 1938 *Ancient Hebrew Poems, Metrically Translated with Introduction and Notes*, London.
- Peckham, B.
- 1985 "The Deuteronomistic History of Saul and David", *ZAW* 97: 190-209.
- Perdue, L. G.
- 1984 "Is there Anyone Left of the House of Saul ... ?" Ambiguity and the Characterization of David in the Succession Narrative', *JSOT* 30: 67-84.
- Polzin, R.
- 1989 *Samuel and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History, Part Two: 1 Samuel*, San Francisco.
- Popper, K. R.
- 1963 *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, London and Henley.
- 1965 *The Open Society and its Enemies, vol.2: The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel & Marx*, London.
- <sup>2</sup>1979 *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*, Oxford.
- Provan, I.
- 1988 *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings, A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 172), Berlin.
- Purvis, J. D.
- 1968 *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*, (HSM 2), Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Von Rad, G.
- 1930 *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistische Werkes*, Stuttgart.
- 1944 "The Begining of Historical Writing in Ancient Israel" in *The Problem of the Hexatuech and other Essays*, London, 166-204.
- Rendtorff, R.
- 1971 "Beobachtungen zur altisraelitischen Geschichtsschreibung anhand der Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids", in *Probleme biblischer Theologie, FS G. von Rad*, ed. H. W. Wolff, Munich, 428-39.
- 1983/85 *Das Alte Testament: Eine Einführung*, Neukirchener Verlag. E. tr. by John Bowden, 1985, *The Old Testament, an Introduction*, Philadelphia: 1986.

- Ravenna, A.  
 1956 "Osservazioni sul testo di Samuele", *RBI* 4: 143-44.
- Rendsburgh, G. A.  
 1986 "David and his Circle in Genesis xxxviii", *VT* 36: 438-46.
- Rofé A.  
 1989 "The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and its Occurrence in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>", *RevQ* 14: 247-54.  
 1990 "4QSam<sup>a</sup> in the Light of Historical-literary Criticism: The Case of 2 Sam 24 and 1 Chr 21", in *Biblische und Judaistische Studien, FS Paolo Sacchi*, ed. Angelo Vivian, Frankfurt, 109-19.
- Rogerson, J. W.  
 1984 *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century, England and Germany*, London.  
 1992 *W. M. L. de Wette: Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism*, (JSOTS 126), Sheffield.
- Ross, J. P.  
 1967 "Jahweh seba'ôt in Samuel and Psalms", *VT* 17: 76-92.
- Rost, L.  
 1926/82 *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*, Stuttgart: W, Kohlhammer. E. tr.: *The Succession to the Throne of David*, by M. D. Rutter and D. M. Gunn, Sheffield: 1982.
- Rothstein, J. W. & Hänel, J.  
 1927 *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, (KAT), Leipzig.
- Rowley, H. H.  
 1950 "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps 110)", W. Baumgartner, O. Eissfeldt, J. Elliger, and L. Rost, eds. *Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet*, Tübingen, 461-472.  
 1951 ed. *The Old Testament and Modern Study. A Generation of Discovery and Research. Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study*, Oxford.
- Rudolph, W.  
 1954 "Problem of the Books of Chronicles", *VT* 4: 401-409.  
 1955 *Chronikbücher* (HAT), Tübingen.

- Safren, J. D.  
1988 "Balaam and Abraham", *VT* 38: 105-13.
- Sáenz-Badillos, A.  
1993 *A History of Hebrew Language*, Cambridge. E. tr. and revision of *Historia de la Lengua Hebrea*, (Sabadell: 1988), by J. Elwolde revised with collaboration from the author.
- Schäfer-Lichtenberger, C.  
1993 "David und Jerusalem—ein Kapitel biblischer Historiographie" (Malamat Festschrift), *EI* 24: 197-241.
- Schley, D. G.  
1989 *Shiloh, A Biblical City in Tradition and History*, (JSOTS 63), Sheffield.  
1990 "The *šālīšîm*: Officers or Special three-man Squads?", *VT* 40: 321-326.
- Schmidt, W. H.  
1979, <sup>2</sup>1982 *Einführung in das Alte Testament*, Berlin. E. tr. J. O'Connell, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, London: 1984
- Schulz, A.  
1919/20 *Die Bücher Samuel*, (EHAT 8/1), Münster, 1919 (I), 1920 (II).
- van Seter, J.  
1975 *Abraham in History and Tradition*, New Haven.
- Smith, H. P.  
1912 *The Books of Samuel*, (ICC), Edinburgh.
- Soggin, J. A.  
1987/89 *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed., London. E. tr. of *Introduzione all'Antico Testamento*, 4th ed. (Brescia: 1987), by John Bowden.
- Stern, M.  
1976 "The Period of the Second Temple", in Ben-Sasson (ed.), *A History of the Jewish People*, London, 1976, 185-306.
- Stoebe, H. J.  
1957 "Die Einnahme Jerusalems", *ZDPV* 73: 73-99.

- 1959 "Erwägungen zu Psalm 110 auf dem Hintergrund von 1 Sam. 21", (EF 10), *Festschrift Friedrich Baumgärtel zum 70. Geburtstag* 14. Januar 1958, Erlangen.
- 1973 *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT VIII/1), Gütersloh.
- Sugimoto, T.
- 1992 "Chronicles as Independent Literature", *JSOT* 55: 61-74.
- Talstra, E and Verheij, A. J. C.
- 1988 "Comparing Samuel/Kings and Chronicles. The Computer Assisted Production of an Analytical Synoptic Database. *Textus* 14: 41-60.
- Tov, E.
- 1979 "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>", *JSOT* 14: 37-53.
- Trebolle, J.
- 1992 "Light from 4QJudga and 4QKgs on the Text of Judges and Kings" in D. Dimant & U. Rappaport, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10), Leiden, 315-342.
- Tsevat, M.
- 1961 "Studies in the Book of Samuel. I. Interpretation of I Sam. 2.27-36. The Narrative of *kareth*", *HUCA* 32: 191-216.
- 1963 "Studies in the Book of Samuel", *HUCA* 34: 71-82.
- Ulrich, E. C. Jr
- 1978 *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19), Missoula, Montana.
- VanderKam, J. C.
- 1980 "Davidic Complicity in the Deaths of Abner and Esbaal", *JBL* 99, 521-39.
- Veijola, T.
- 1975 *Die ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*, Helsinki.
- De Vries, S. J.
- 1989 *1 and 2 Chronicles*, FOTL, Vol. XI, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Ward, R. L.

- 1967 *The Story of David's Rise: A Traditio-historical Study of I Samuel xvi 14 - II Samuel v* (diss. Vanderbilt, 1967, Ann Arbor: Univ. Microfilms).
- Weinfeld, M.
- 1983 "Zion and Jerusalem as Religious and Political Capital: Ideology and Utopia", in R. E. Friedman, ed., *The Poet and the Historian*, Chico, 99-100.
- 1993 "Judges 1.1-2.5: The Conquest under the Leadership of the House of Judah" in Auld (ed. 1993), 387-400.
- Weiser, A.
- 1966 "Die Legitimation des Königs David. Zur Eigenart und Entstehung der sog. Geschichte von Davids Aufstieg", *VT* 16: 325-54.
- Welten, P.
- 1973 *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern*, (WMANT 42), Tübingen.
- Wellhausen, J.
- 1871 *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, Göttingen.
- 1883 *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, Berlin. E. tr., *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, Edinburgh: 1885.
- Wesseliuss, J. W.
- 1990 "Joab's Death and the Central Theme of the Succession Narrative (2 Samuel ix-1 Kings ii)", *VT* 40: 336-51.
- Westermann, C.
- 1986 *Genesis 12-36, A Commentary*, London. E. tr. from German (BKAT, Neukirchen-Vluyn: 1981) by J. J. Scullion.
- De Wette, W. M. L.
- 1805 'Dissertatio critico-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi Libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur; auam...auctoritate amplissimi philosophorum ordinis pro venia legendi AD XXVIII.' (Aug. MDCCCV publice defendet auctor Guilielm Martin Leberech de Wette, philosophiae doctor; Jena, 1805 [repr. in *Opuscula theologica* (Berlin 1830)]).
- 1806/7 *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alten Testament*, 2 vols., Halle, reprinted Hildesheim 1971.
- 1817/44 *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testament*, Berlin.

- 1843 *Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*, E. tr. and enlarged by T. Parker, Boston.
- 1869 *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testament*, neu bearbeitet von E. Schrader, Berlin.
- Wharton, J. A.
- 1981 "A Plausible Tale. Story and Theology in II Samuel 9–20, I Kings 1–2", *Int* 35: 341-54.
- White, M.
- 1990 "The Elohist Depiction of Aaron: A Study in the Levite-Zadokite Controversy", (VTSup 41), J. A. Emerton, ed., *Studies in the Pentateuch*, Leiden, 150-159.
- White, M. and Gribbin, J.
- 1992 *Stephen Hawking. A Life in Science*, London.
- Whitelam, K. W.
- 1984 "The Defence of David", *JSOT* 29: 61-87.
- Whybray, R. N.
- 1968 *The Succession Narrative*, (SBT 2nd Series 9), London.
- Wiggins, S. A.
- 1993 "Old Testament Dagan in the Light of Ugarit", *VT* 43: 268-273.
- Willi, T.
- 1972 *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, (FRLANT 106), Göttingen.
- 1991 *Chronik*, (BK), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Fasc. 1.
- Williams, R. J.
- 1975 "A People Come out of Egypt", VTSup 28: 252ff
- Williamson, H. G. M.
- 1982 *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCB), London.
- 1977 *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (SOTSMS), Cambridge.
- 1981 "'We are Yours, O David' The Setting and Purpose of 1 Chronicles xii 1-23", *OTS* 21: 164-76.
- 1987 Review: S. L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, (HSM 33), *VT* 37: 107-14.
- 1989 "The concept of Israel in transition" in Clements (1989), 141-61.



- Würthein, E.  
 1974 *Die Erzählung von der Thronfolge Davids—theologische oder politische  
 Geschichtsschreibung?* (ThS 115), Zürich.
- Wyatt, N.  
 1985 “Araunah the Jebusite” and the Throne of David”, *ST* 39: 39-53.
- Zakovitz, Y.  
 1985 “Reflection Story—Another Dimension of the Evaluation of  
 Characters in Biblical Narrative”, *Tarbiz* 54/2: 165-76 (Hebrew  
 with English summary).
- Zalewski, S.  
 1989 “The Purpose of the Story of the Death of Saul in 1 Chronicles X,”  
*VT* 39: 449-467.
- Zeron, A.  
 1874 “Tag für Tag kam man zu David, um ihm zu helfen, 1 Chr. 12, 1-  
 22”, *ThZ* 30: 257-61.