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The Deuteronomistic Historian (Dtr) patterned many narratives in the Former Prophets after Tetrateuchal narratives primarily in order to complement the concern of the narratives in which the parallels in the Former Prophets occur. Various features in the Deuteronomistic History such as the recurring cycle of sin-punishment-cry-deliverance-peace in Judges, as well as the paradigmatic sin of Jeroboam, suggest that for Dtr history unfolded along various paradigms. Although all the narratives that Dtr based on given Tetrateuchal narratives are the product of such a paradigmatic historiography, a distinction is to be made between those parallels that Dtr drew for effect and those few that are only the product of a familiarity with the given Tetrateuchal accounts. That Dtr rather than the compiler(s) of the Tetrateuch was responsible for the given parallel narratives is evident from various criteria, including cross-references from the Former Prophets to the Tetrateuch, the fact that single narratives in the Former Prophets share parallels with each layer of redactionally composite Tetrateuchal accounts, and the fact that the given parallels complement the concerns of the narratives in which they occur. That Dtr rather than Dtr's sources was responsible for such parallel narratives is evident from the following. The use of Tetrateuchal narratives within the Former Prophets is strikingly similar from narrative to narrative. Similarly, the use of Tetrateuchal narratives in Deuteronomy 1—3 (chapters that are attributed to Dtr) is strikingly similar to the use of Tetrateuchal narratives in the Former Prophets. Two conclusions that may be derived from Dtr's use of Tetrateuchal narratives include the following. First, contrary to the traditional view Dtr reworked his sources. Second, by Dtr's time some form of a Tetrateuch (including the P layer) existed.
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The Old Testament includes a chorus of literary voices whose originality consists in part on the adaptation or reformulation of earlier biblical traditions. Among the deuterocanonical works Sirach and Baruch make extensive use of the Pentateuch. The Writings cite or allude to the Pentateuch. The Prophets cite one another and refer to traditions from the Pentateuch. Similarly, Deuteronomy freely adapts Tetrateuchal material. The works that make up the Old Testament thus include a host of cross-references, allusions, adaptations, reformulations and inversions of pre-existing biblical material. Curiously,
however, relatively few studies have been devoted to outlining and defining the mechanics and hermeneutics involved in the Old Testament’s use of the Old Testament. This is particularly true of the use of Tetratuchal traditions by the Former Prophets.

Limiting myself to narrative material, the principal contention of this thesis is that the Deuteronomistic Historian patterned many narratives in the Former Prophets after narratives in the Tetratuch, thereby creating parallel narratives. By “parallel narratives” I mean those accounts that share common story-lines and/or particular lexical data which, in their respective contexts in the Tetratuch and the Former Prophets, refer


to different events. In the following sections I will review the research on parallel narratives shared by the Tetrateuch and the Former Prophets, discuss the need for a new proposal, and conclude with an overview of the thesis.

1. REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Although the use of Pentateuchal traditions by Exilic and post-Exilic writers has received considerable attention, the focus has been on the ways that such writers alluded to or cited particular Pentateuchal laws or portions of a Pentateuchal narrative. With few exceptions have parallel narratives been noted or discussed. This observation is equally true of the parallel narratives shared by the Tetrateuch and the Former Prophets. Reviewing the research in this area is therefore a straightforward task.

A form-critical explanation for the parallel narratives comes with Culley's *Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Narrative.* Culley's work consists of three parts, the first of which is a review of four field studies concerning the transmission of oral prose. Culley drew the following conclusion:

Broadly speaking, all the field studies described the oral composition or prose in similar terms. Traditional stories were passed on in an unfixed form in which a loyalty to tradition, and therefore a certain stability, was combined with a creative retelling, and therefore a certain flexibility. In the second part of his work Culley applied the above observation to nine "parallel accounts in the Hebrew narrative tradition." He concluded that such accounts "reflect

---

10 Culley, *Studies,* 16.
11 Culley, *Studies,* 33.
the stability and flexibility to be expected” of oral prose insofar as “the material appears to be adapted to different contexts and changed according to the interests of different narrators.” In the final part of his work Culley applied his observations concerning “stability and flexibility” to fourteen accounts from Genesis to Kings that share common structures which he labeled “miracle stories.”

Culley made no real attempt to distinguish between the characteristics of oral and written prose. All that he could state is that a feature of oral prose is the narrators’ tendency to be both faithful and creative in the retelling of the forms; but he failed to show how this feature is peculiar to oral prose. Indeed, he conceded that one cannot rule out the suggestion that the given accounts were literarily rather than orally composed. Similarly, he concluded that the “mode of building narratives in scribal tradition may be an elaborate extension of the mode already developed and established in oral.”

In contrast to Culley, Garsiel argued that various parallel narratives in 1 Samuel itself, between 1 Samuel and the other Former Prophets, and between 1 Samuel and the Tetrateuch are all due to literary dependence. According to Garsiel, a single hand drew

---

12 Culley, Studies, 65.
13 Culley, Studies, 65.
14 Culley, Studies, 66. Robert Alter has similarly criticized Culley’s for failing to consider the possibility that the parallel narratives are due to literary rather than oral dependence:

As I stared at Culley’s schematic tables, it gradually dawned on me that he had made a discovery without realizing it. For what his tables of parallel and variants actually reveal are the lineaments of a purposefully deployed literary convention. The variations in the parallel episodes are not at all random, as a scrambling by oral transmission would imply [emphasis his] (The Art of Biblical Narrative [New York: Basic Books, 1981] 50).

such parallel narratives in order to contrast individuals, generations, and events.

However, Garsiel failed to address the question of the direction of dependence.

Although the discussion may be implicit in his contention that the parallels serve to complement the given narratives in 1 Samuel—for it is difficult to attribute the literary function of the parallels to chance—Garsiel never explicitly made this point.

Another work that merits discussion is Damrosch's *The Narrative Covenant*. In this work Damrosch brilliantly wed historical-critical conclusions regarding the evolution of Hebrew narrative to literary-critical observations regarding the artistic nature of Hebrew narrative. Damrosch argued that an agreement exists between ancient authors and readers whereby the interpretation of narratives is contingent on an understanding of the authors' use and adaptation of various genres and related narratives.16 Important for our purposes are chapters four and five where Damrosch treated many parallel narratives between the books of Samuel, and the Yahwist’s version of Genesis 2—36 and the Exodus story. In these chapters he also argued that the given narratives in the books of Samuel were based on the corresponding accounts in the Yahwist’s work.

Unlike Garsiel, Damrosch cannot be criticized for failing to address the question of the direction of dependence between various parallels. DAMrosch rightly argued that because there is no agreement regarding the date or even the existence of the Yahwist the dating of the Yahwist’s work and that of Dtr has limited value in determining the direction of dependence between the parallels. Similarly, there is no agreement
regarding both the age of the sources that Dtr incorporated as well as the degree to which he reworked such sources.\textsuperscript{17} The one argument that Damrosch used in support of his proposed direction of dependence is that of narrative function. By means of the parallels the authors provided a wealth of contrasts and ironies that complemented the concerns of the narratives in which the parallels occur. According to Damrosch, the "history of the monarchy [was] assessed and understood in conjunction with the Yahwistic stories of the foundations of society as a whole and of Hebrew history in particular in the time of the patriarchs."\textsuperscript{18}

The most exhaustive list of parallel narratives between the Tetrateuch and the Former Prophets comes with Greenstein's provocative article of 1990.\textsuperscript{19} After briefly surveying and evaluating the various higher-critical explanations for the present form of Genesis—Kings, Greenstein rightly argued that all such explanations have failed to account for the parallel narratives between the Tetrateuch and the Former Prophets:

The most outstanding feature of biblical narrative, from Genesis through Kings, is that between the Torah on the one side and the so-called Deuteronomistic History (or Former Prophets) on the other there is a very


\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Narrative Covenant}, 144-81. Damrosch nevertheless argued that the relative dating of the Yahwist's work and that of Dtr is of some value: "To deal seriously with the historical problems does not preclude reaching some tentative assessment of the situation, however, and such an assessment can be of great value in grounding and guiding literary analysis" (147).

Consistent with the fact that the majority of scribes in the ancient Near-Eastern world were men I will use the masculine pronoun with reference to Dtr (see Athalya Brenner, \textit{The Israelite Woman. Social Role and Literary Type in Biblical Narrative} [Sheffield: JSOT, 1985] 46-56).

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Narrative Covenant}, 155.

high incidence of repetition—of stories, motifs, characters, names of persons and places, phrases, as well as ideology and themes. . . . Any theory of the formation of the biblical narrative corpus must account for this fact: The narrator is all too often telling different versions of the same story [emphasis his].

According to Greenstein, in the early monarchy various stories pertaining to the early kings were produced, elements of which were subsequently recombined and/or transformed to produce other stories, and such stories were finally brought together in the Josianic era to comprise the narrative corpus of Genesis—Kings.

Greenstein's article has not received the attention that it deserves, not only because it includes the most extensive list of parallel narratives shared by the Tetrateuch and the Former Prophets to date but also because it is the first work to raise the question of the relationship between the parallel narratives and the growth of Genesis—Kings. The shortcoming of Greenstein's article is his failure to address adequately the question of the direction of dependence between such parallels. The conclusion that Greenstein did draw in this regard is that the Tetrateuchal narratives are derivative. Greenstein based this conclusion on the contention that the narratives in the Former Prophets stem from the early monarchy whereas the Tetrateuchal traditions cannot be traced to earlier than the eighth century. But this argument is only as good as the conjectured early dating of the narratives in the Former Prophets and the late dating of the Tetrateuchal narratives.

20 "Formation," 165.
21 "Formation," 177.
2. **THE NEED FOR A NEW PROPOSAL**

The preceding review of research shows that a more thorough study of the parallel narratives is needed, for, with the exception of Greenstein, the few studies that exist have dealt with only samplings of the parallels, and they have failed to address adequately the three most basic questions regarding the parallels: Are the parallels due to a shared convention—be it oral or literary—or are they due to literary dependence? If the parallels are due to literary dependence, What is the direction of dependence? Finally, What was the cause for the existence of the parallels? In the following sections these questions will be dealt with in turn.

2.1 **The Genesis of the Parallels**

With regard to the first question—whether the parallel narratives are due to shared conventions—Culley rightly noted that one feature that is common to many parallel narratives is the similar wording that they share. To be sure, the presence of verbal parallels has always provided the form critic with fodder for analysis. But a common feature of parallels due to a shared form is that the verbal parallels between them have the same or a similar function in the narratives in which they occur. This stands in contrast to many of the narratives to be discussed, the verbal parallels of which often have very different functions. Such a difference points not to shared forms but literary dependence. Again, the fact that many of the accounts in the Former Prophets are accompanied by explicit cross-references to the corresponding Tetratarchal accounts

---

also suggests that the parallels are due to literary dependence. For instance, Josh 1:17 reads “We will obey you just as we obeyed Moses; let but the LORD your God be with you just as he was with Moses!” (Josh 1:17). Following these statements the narrative shares several striking parallels not just between both Moses and Joshua but also between the generations under their leadership. Similarly, in this instance and several others the order of the parallel features between the accounts vastly differs from each other, which is not what one would expect with parallel narratives due to shared convention. Finally, if one can demonstrate that the narratives in the Former Prophets were based on the corresponding Tetrateuchal narratives then the need to discuss whether the parallel narratives are due to convention is effectively bracketed, which brings us to the second question.

2.2 The Direction of Dependence Between the Parallels

In seeking to determine the direction of dependence between the given parallel narratives one must not rely on any general theory regarding the relationship between the composition of the Tetrateuch and the DtrH, that is, for example, whether Dtr used sources which pre-date the Yahwist, or whether some form of the Tetrateuch was composed prior or subsequently to the composition of the DtrH. Using such models only begs the question for there is presently no consensus regarding the answers to such questions. The direction of dependence can only be ascertained by analyzing the parallel narratives themselves. Throughout this thesis I will use the following criteria to show that in every instance the accounts in the Former Prophets were based on the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts.
(1) **The Criterion of Cross-Reference:** When a narrative in the Former Prophets explicitly refers back to the corresponding Tetrateuchal account it is best to conclude that the narrative in the Former Prophets was based on the given Tetrateuchal account.

(2) **The Criterion of Assumed Knowledge:** When a narrative in the Former Prophets presupposes knowledge of the corresponding Tetrateuchal account, it is best to conclude that the narrative in the Former Prophets was based on the given Tetrateuchal account.

(3) **The Source-Critical Criterion:** When an account in the Former Prophets shares parallels with two or more redactional layers of the corresponding Tetrateuchal account it is best to conclude that the narrative in the Former Prophets was based on the given Tetrateuchal account.

(4) **The Criterion of Multiple Occurrence:** When two or more narratives in the Former Prophets share parallels with a single Tetrateuchal narrative, and it can be shown that such a narrative in the Former Prophets is derivative, it is best to conclude that all such narratives in the Former Prophets are derivative.²³

(5) **The Criterion of Literary Effect:** When the concern of a narrative or narrative complex in the Former Prophets is complemented by means of the parallel with the corresponding Tetrateuchal account it is best to conclude that the narrative in the Former Prophets was based on the given Tetrateuchal account.

(6) **The Criterion of Deuteronomistic Tendency:** When the parallel within the Former Prophets includes features that are Deuteronomistic—insofar as such parallels also exist in other parallel narratives in the Former Prophets that were demonstrably based on the corresponding Tetrateuchal narratives—it is best to conclude that the narrative in the Former Prophets was based on the given Tetrateuchal account.

(7) **The Criterion of Incongruities:** When a narrative in the Former Prophets contains a verbal feature that is grammatically and/or contextually incongruous in its context but grammatically and contextually sound in the corresponding Tetrateuchal account it is best to conclude that the narrative in the Former Prophets was based on the given Tetrateuchal account. Two types of incongruities exist. The first type consists of the author's attempt to call the

²³ Although this criterion presupposes that the same hand was responsible for the given narratives in the Former Prophets, in every instance that I use this criterion I will argue that because the parallels exhibit the same features the same hand was responsible for them.
reader's attention to the antecedent Tetrateuchal account by means of the incongruity. The second type is the product of the author's melding his source with a given Tetrateuchal account where the source and the Tetrateuchal account shared the same or similar verbal features.  

(8) The Criterion of Context: When an individual narrative in the Former Prophets occurs in a complex of narratives that are demonstrably dependent on Tetrateuchal accounts it is best to conclude that the account in the Former Prophets is derivative.

The greater degree to which one or more of these criteria are met the more certain one can be that the given narratives in the Former Prophets were based on the corresponding Tetrateuchal narratives.  

2.3 Dtr's Purpose in Drawing the Parallels

The final question to be asked is, What was the cause for the existence of the parallels? In the following paragraphs I will outline the reasons why Dtr rather than his putative sources was responsible for the parallel narratives. I will then suggest that one must distinguish between those parallel narratives which Dtr drew for effect and those which arose from his familiarity with the given Tetrateuchal accounts. Finally, I will

---

24 It is no coincidence that such incongruous features in the Former Prophets regularly include a text-critical issue. Although text critics attempt to emend the incongruities (as did the LXX in most instances), because such incongruities are always accompanied by other parallels with the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts I will contend that they best represent Dtr's work.

25 See also the criteria that Richard Hayes has posited for the identification of intertextuality in the Pauline corpus (Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989] 29-32). The differences between the criteria that Hayes has posited and my own are primarily due to the nature of the literature. Hayes' concern was with particular allusions and citations whereas my concern is with parallel narratives which may or may not include particular allusions and citations. Moreover, Hayes' concern was not with the direction of dependence for there is no question that Pauline literature postdates the Old Testament. In contrast with this are the
contend that various parallel narratives within the DtrH were the product of Dtr’s paradigmatic historiography.

2.3.1 Dtr and the Parallel Narratives

The conclusions of the works reviewed above are largely the product of the given scholars’ understanding of the relationship between the Biblical author and his sources. Implicit to Culley’s argument is the view that the Biblical authors left the traditions that they received and incorporated untouched, for he made no effort to compare the narratives in the Former Prophets that he discussed. What is only implicit in Culley’s argumentation is explicit in that of Damrosch. Following Rost and others, Damrosch argued that the authors of the Ark Narrative (1 Sam 4:1b—7:1; 2 Samuel 6), the History of David’s Rise (1 Sam 16:14—2 Sam 5:10), and the Succession Narrative (2 Samuel 9—20; 1 Kings 1—2) were responsible for the given narratives in the Former Prophets. Similarly, Greenstein argued that the given narratives in the Former Prophets are the product of centuries of transformations and modifications. In marked contrast to these scholars Garsiel argued that the shared artistry of the parallels in 1 Samuel points to a single hand:

But the author of Samuel, so it seems to me, reworked his material with such genuine creative artistry that he cannot be regarded as an ‘editor’ in the restricted technical sense of collecting and arranging together material and providing editorial links and glosses; rather, he seems to have been a skilled creative artist—an author in the full meaning of the word.26

---

26 Garsiel, Samuel, 15.
Consistent with Garsiel's conclusion, throughout this thesis I will argue that the marked consistency that exists both between the use of Tetrateuchal accounts in Deuteronomy 1—3 and the Former Prophets, as well as between accounts in the Former Prophets themselves, confirms the contention that Dtr was responsible for drawing the parallels.  

2.3.2 Two Types of Parallel Narratives

Although Garsiel and Damrosch rightly argued that parallels were drawn in order to complement the narratives in which they occur in the Former Prophets, at various points their interpretations of the parallels are forced or vague. For instance, in his discussion of the parallels between Cain's murder of Abel and Absalom's murder of Amnon Damrosch concluded that the latter account "would lose much of its force if the author of the Succession Narrative (and his audience) had not had the Yahwistic legend as a frame of reference." Yet Damrosch made no mention of just what the force of the parallel is, and it is anything but self-evident. The absence of interpretation at this point is all the more striking given that Damrosch skillfully defined the narrative force of various other parallels. Similarly, although Garsiel acknowledged that "the phenomenon of resemblance in all its different manifestations in the Bible" cannot "always be explained in terms of deliberate literary analogy," he failed to provide any other explanation for the parallels—even in those instances where his interpretations are

---

27 Following Noth the majority of scholars have rightly attributed most or all of Deuteronomy 1—3 to Dtr. See the history of research of these chapters by H.D. Preuss, Deuteronomium (ErFor 164; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982) 75-84.

28 Damrosch, Narrative Covenant, 154.
forced. These observations raise the question as to whether the cause of the parallels can be restricted to narrative concerns. One must in fact distinguish between those parallels that Dtr drew for effect and those that are only the product of his familiarity with the given Tetratauchal accounts. As I will show, some form of the Tetratauch had become authoritative for Dtr. As such, it afforded a repository of paradigms through which Dtr interpreted and retold his nation’s traditions. Consistent with the status that Dtr attributed to this Tetratauch he was profoundly influenced by the stories that it contained; and while most of the parallels that he drew are the product of his concern to produce an effect, a few are simply the product of his familiarity with this Tetratauch.

The criterion that I will use in distinguishing between such parallels is that of context. Fundamental to the interpretation of literature is the contextualization of data. Terms are understood only in light of neighbouring terms; figures of speech and motifs are interpreted in light of the immediate context in which they appear; and pericopes cannot be divorced from their greater narrative context if they are to be understood. Similarly, Dtr’s reason for creating parallel narratives can only be ascertained through contextualization. If the parallel complements the concern of the context in which it appears then one can conclude that Dtr drew it for effect. Conversely, if the narrative function of the parallel bears no relation to the concern of the narrative in which it occurs then it is best to conclude that it is only the product of Dtr’s familiarity with the given Tetratauchal account.

29 Garsiel, Samuel, 28.
2.3.3 **Parallel Narratives and Dtr’s Paradigmatic Historiography**

The parallel narratives must also be understood as central to Dtr’s paradigmatic historiography, that is, his conviction that history unfolded along various paradigms. An example of this feature comes in the book of Judges with its recurring five-fold sequence of events: the Israelites did evil before the LORD (2:11; 3:7, 12; 4:1; 6:1; 13:1); such evil led to the anger of the LORD and the consequent deliverance into the hands of foreign oppressors (2:14; 3:8; 4:2; 10:9); the Israelites then cried out to the LORD (3:9, 15; 6:6-7; 10:10); the LORD heard their cries and raised up a deliverer (2:16; 3:9, 15; 10:1, 12); and a period of peace ensued (3:11, 30; 5:31; 8:28).\(^\text{10}\) A similar paradigm comes with the sin of Jeroboam son of Nebat in the books of Kings. The criterion by which Dtr judged the kings of Israel consisted of their infidelity to the doctrine of centralized worship.

Jeroboam’s offense afforded a paradigm for this *theologoumenon*, for all of the kings of Israel were judged not on the basis of their particular actions but whether or not they “walked in the way of Jeroboam son of Nebat.”\(^\text{11}\)

*Consistent with Dtr’s use of paradigms in his historiography is his tendency to pattern various accounts within the DtrH after each other.* As Jeroboam’s infamous deed was the prototype of monarchic sins, so Moses’ reform policies afforded a paradigm for monarchic fidelity. This latter point is no more apparent than in the

---


Deuteronomistic depiction of Josiah, whose life and reform policies share a host of parallels with those of the Deuteronomic Moses. The two characters share the following parallels.32 (1) Dtr’s verdicts of the two figures are parallel. The phrase “Never again did there arise in Israel a prophet like Moses” (Deut 34:10) is parallel to “nor did any (king) like him arise after him” (2 Kgs 23:25). Apart from these two instances the phrase “there did not arise like PN” occurs only in 1 Kgs 3:12 (cf. 2 Kgs 18:5).33 Similarly, Dtr’s verdict that “There was no king like him before who turned back to the LORD with all his heart and soul and might” (בכח-לובך ובכלה-נפשך ובכלה נפתח) (2 Kgs 23:25) is parallel to the shema: “You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might” (בכח-לובך ובכלה-נפשך ובכלה נפתח נא) (Deut 6:5). Significantly, this three-fold form occurs only in these two texts.34 (2) As Moses “burned” (שלח) Aaron’s golden calf and smashed it as “fine as dust” (לעמר; Deut 9:21), so in 2 Kgs 23:15 Josiah “burned” (שלח) the shrine made by Jeroboam and he “beat it to dust” (לעמר). Again, Josiah “burned” (שלח) the statue of Asherah that Manasseh had set up in the temple “and he beat it to dust” (לעמר; 2 Kgs 23:6). (3) Deuteronomy 17:8-13 commands that difficult cases were to be brought before the priests at the place that the LORD was to choose. The only king to

32 Most of the following parallels were first noted by R.E. Friedman, The Exile and Biblical Narrative. The Formation of the Deuteronomic and Priestly Works (HSM 22; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981) 7-9.
34 Friedman, Exile, 7-8.
have ever done so was Josiah (2 Kgs 22:13, 18).  

(4) The law of the king states that the king was not to deviate from the instruction “to the right or to the left” (Deut 17:20). This command was fulfilled by Josiah “who did not deviate to the right or to the left” (2 Kgs 22:2). With reference to the “book,” the motif of not deviating to the right or the left occurs elsewhere only in Josh 1:7; 23:6.  

(5) Finally, in Deut 31:11 Moses commanded that “Every seventh year . . . you shall read this Torah aloud in the ears of all Israel (תֵּזָה אֶת הַתּוֹרָה אֱוָנָא נֶגֶר עָלָיוֹת בָּאוֹתֵים),” and Josiah “read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant” (מְלֹא צֶדֶק מבָּרוֹךְ סְאוּר). The idiom “to read in the ears” occurs with reference to the Torah only in these two instances in the DtrH.  

Dtr’s purpose for drawing these parallels may be adduced from the context in which they appear. In Dtr’s mind Josiah was an ideal king because his reformation activities were parallel to those of Moses. Dtr made this point explicit in his verdict of Josiah: there was no king before or after Josiah “who turned” to the LORD in full accord with the instruction of Moses (2 Kgs 23:25). Dtr’s high view of Josiah is also evident from the place given to the “book” of Moses in the Josiah narrative. For Dtr it was imperative for kings to have a copy of Moses’ teachings, which he was to read all his life in order that he might be faithful (Deut 17:18-20), and out of a total of fourteen

---

35 Friedman, Exile, 8.
36 Friedman, Exile, 8.
37 Friedman, Exile, 8.
38 That Deut 17:18-19 is a Deuteronomistic interpolation is evident from the following. First, v. 17 is naturally followed by v. 20. Second, vv. 16-17 and 20 are positive while vv. 18 and 19 are negative. Finally, the phrase נַעֲשֵׂה חָרָם (“this torah”) not only
references to the "book" (בְּרֵאשִׁית) of Moses in the Former Prophets it is referred to ten
times in relation to Josiah's reform. Significantly, some of the parallels that Dtr drew
between Josiah and Moses also pertain to the reform; and one may conclude that the
parallels were drawn by Dtr because he wished to pattern Josiah the reformer after
Moses the reformer.

Another set of parallels within the DtrH concerns the Levite's dismemberment of
his concubine's corpse and the call to arms in Judges 19—21, which anticipates Saul's
dismemberment of the oxen and the call to arms in 1 Samuel 11. (1) After his concubine
had been murdered, the Levite "cut (her) up" (נָהַם) into twelve parts (19:29; 20:6) and
sent them "throughout the territory of Israel" (בְּכֵלָל חַבֵּל שָׁם; 19:29 [cf. 20:6]).
Similarly, when Saul heard of the threat of Nahash the Ammonite he "cut up" (נָהַם) his
yoke of oxen into twelve parts and sent them "throughout the territory of Israel" (בְּכֵלָל חַבֵּל
; 1 Sam 11:7). (2) As the Levite thereupon said, "Now you are all Israelites;
produce a plan of action here and now!" (Judg 20:7) and the people gathered "as one

---

This interpretation is consistent with the conclusion that Josiah is the model king of
the DtrH (Richard D. Nelson, The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History
[JSOTSS 18; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981] 125; idem., "Josiah in the Book of Joshua," JBL
100 [1981] 531-40; Marvin A. Sweeney, "The Critique of Solomon in the Josianic

---

39 2 Kgs 22:8, 10-11, 13 [2x], 16; 23:2-3, 21 and 24. The term occurs four times
elsewhere in the Former Prophets (Josh 1:8; 8:31, 34; and 2 Kgs 14:6) and nine times in
Deuteronomy (17:18; 28:58, 61; 29:19-20[20-21]; 29:26[27]; 30:10; 31:24, 26).
40 This interpretation is consistent with the conclusion that Josiah is the model king of
the DtrH (Richard D. Nelson, The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History
[JSOTSS 18; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981] 125; idem., "Josiah in the Book of Joshua," JBL
100 [1981] 531-40; Marvin A. Sweeney, "The Critique of Solomon in the Josianic
man" (םעבג; Judg 20:8 [cf. v. 1]), so Saul declared, “Thus shall be done to the cattle of anyone who does not follow Saul and Samuel into battle” and the people gathered “as one man” (בכאת; 1 Sam 11:7). (3) In both accounts the people were mustered and their number is given (Judg 20:2, 8-13; 1 Sam 11:8). (4) As the Benjaminites would not surrender the perpetrators of the rape to the Israelites so the Benjamite Saul would not agree to have those who did not support him put to death:

**Judg 20:13**

“Give us the men (רומארד), the scoundrels who are in Gibeah and we will put them to death (רומארד) and stamp out the evil from Israel.”

But the Benjaminites would not yield to the demand of their fellow Israelites

**1 Sam 11:12-13**

“Give us the men (רומארד) and we will put them to death (רומארד).”

But Saul said, “No man shall be put to death this day.”

(5) Finally, in both narratives Gibeah of Benjamin or Saul had a similar relationship to the people of Jabesh-gilead. According to Judges 21 the only people who failed to show up at Mizpah to fight the Benjaminites (cf. 20:3) were the Jabesh-gileadites—presumably because they were sympathetic with the Benjamite cause (21:8). As a consequence they were killed (21:9-14). Similarly, in 1 Samuel 11 Saul sided with the cause of the Jabesh-gileadites; but unlike the account in Judges in this instance the Jabesh-gileadites were saved. Again, it was the Jabesh-gileadites who stole the body of Saul and his sons from the Philistines (1 Sam 31:11-13; cf. 2 Sam 2:4-5; 21:12).41

---

41 The only other instance that Jabesh-gilead is mentioned is 1 Chron 10:11, where it also concerns the rescue of Saul’s corpse.
Dtr’s purpose for drawing these parallels was to anticipate the reign of Saul negatively. In support of this interpretation, the first point to be made is that there exists in Judges 19 a concentration of place names that are associated with David and Saul. The lavish hospitality that the Levite received from his father-in-law in 19:1-9—who was from Bethlehem of Judah—is contrasted with the wicked reception that he received from the townsmen, the Gibeathites of Benjamin. The Levite’s father-in-law, who lived in “Bethlehem of Judah” (19:2), gave the Levite a warm reception (19:3); pressed the Levite to stay for an initial three days (19:4); and daily insisted that the Levite stay yet longer (19:5-9). This stands in contrast to the reception of the Levite and his concubine in Gibeah of Benjamin, the home of Saul. To be sure, none of the Gibeathites offered hospitality to the Levite (19:18)—a point that Dtr underlined by parenthetically stating that the old man who took the Levite in was not a Benjaminite but an Ephraimite: “This man hailed from the hill country of Ephraim and resided at Gibeah, where the townspeople were Benjaminites” (19:16). But the inhospitality of the Gibeathites is loudest in 19:15-30 where they ordered the old man to send the Levite out so that they could have sex with him, but then contented themselves with raping and murdering the Levite’s concubine. This interplay between Davidic and Saulide centres is also evident from 19:10-14 which outlines the Levite’s travels from Bethlehem to Gibeah. After having finally left his father-in-law the Levite journeyed as far as the non-Israelite town of Jebus, “that is, Jerusalem,” where the Levite’s servant suggested that

42 M. Güdemann was among the first to note that Judges 19 is a polemic against Saul (“Tendenz und Abfassungszeit der Letzten Capitel des Buches der Richter,” MGWJ 18
they spend the night (19:10-11). The Levite, however, opted to travel as far as the Israelite town of Gibeah—a decision that was made on the basis of the nationalities of the respective populations (19:12-14). The irony that Dtr here established is that the Levite and his concubine would have certainly received better treatment from the non-Israelite Jebusites than the Israelite Gibeathites.

To this point I have noted that both Judges and Kings unfold along paradigms, and that both the reform of Josiah and the actions of Saul in 1 Samuel 11 are based on earlier accounts in the DtrH. Significantly, all such parallels occur within the DtrH. Throughout the body of this thesis I will contend that, like the given examples, the parallels that Dtr drew between Tetratauchal accounts and the corresponding accounts in the Former Prophets are also typical of his paradigmatic historiography. But we can be even more precise. Although all parallel narratives may be attributed to Dtr's paradigmatic historiography—whether they are within the Former Prophets or between the Tetratauch and the Former Prophets—those narratives which Dtr based on Tetratauchal accounts are more particularly the product of his high esteem for the Tetratauch. I will argue both in the chapter on Dtr's use of Tetratauchal narratives in

[1869] 357-68; see also George Foot Moore, Judges [ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906] 408).

43 Though the clarifying "that is, Jerusalem" of 19:10 may simply be an attempt to identify Jebus for later readers, it may also represent a further attempt to honor the home of David at the expense of Saul's Gibeah.


45 See also Fishbane, who defined a "typologies of a historical nature" as being those in which "one historical event serves as the prototype for the descriptive shaping of another" (Interpretation, 358). See also Trompf's discussion of "historical recurrence" in the DtrH ("Historical Recurrence," 213-29).
Deuteronomy 1—3 as well as in the conclusion that in Dtr’s time the Tetrateuch—and not simply various Tetrateuchal accounts—was nearing its final form and as such it provided a repository of paradigms for Dtr.46

3. **Overview of the Thesis**

An accurate understanding of the relationship between the parallel narratives in the Tetrateuch and the Former Prophets can only be ascertained by first considering the relationship between the synoptic narratives shared by the Tetrateuch and Deuteronomy. If Dtr patterned the given accounts in the Former Prophets after Tetrateuchal accounts then one would expect that his use of Tetrateuchal narratives in Deuteronomy would exhibit the same or similar features. Conversely, if Dtr was not responsible for the given parallels, or if the given Tetrateuchal narratives were based on the corresponding narratives in the Former Prophets, then one would expect that the relationship between the synoptic Tetrateuchal and Deuteronomic narratives would be different than that between the parallel narratives in the Tetrateuch and the Former Prophets. Accordingly,

---

46 Dtr may well have inherited this use of the Tetrateuch from the Deuteronomic lawcode. For example, the story of Sodom served as a motivation for obedience to the covenant (Deut 29:22). Particularly significant is the emphasis that deliverance from Egypt receives as a motivation for obedience (5:15; 13:6, 11; 15:14-15; 16:3, 12; 17:16; 23:8; 24:17-18; 24:22; cf. the so-called little credos of 6:20-25 and 26:5-10). The wilderness experience of Israel also provided motivation for obedience: Israel was not to try the LORD as they had done at Massah (6:16); the LORD had subjected Israel to hunger in the wilderness and then provided them with manna “in order to teach [them] that man does not live on bread alone, but on anything that the LORD decrees” (8:3-4); Ammonites and Moabites were not to be admitted into the congregation because of their treatment of Israel in the wilderness (23:4-5); similarly, Israel was to destroy the Amalekites because of what they had done to Israel after they had left Egypt (25:17-19); again, the readers were to remember what the LORD had done to Miriam in the case of skin diseases (24:8-
in chapter one I will analyze Deuteronomy 1—3 and I will conclude that Dtr here relied on the synoptic Tetrataechal accounts. In chapters two through four I will outline and analyze the parallel narratives that Joshua and Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings share with the Tetrataech. (Because Dtr’s purposes for drawing the parallels coincides with the concerns of each section of the Former Prophets I will follow the canonical order of books.) The format of these chapters is roughly the same. After outlining an individual parallel I will argue that the account in the Former Prophets was based on the corresponding account in the Tetrataech. I will then discuss the purpose or cause of the parallel. At the end of each chapter I will argue that Dtr was responsible for the parallels because there exists a marked similarity between Dtr’s use of Tetrataechal narratives in Deuteronomy 1—3 and the use of such narratives in the Former Prophets, and because there also exists a marked similarity in the use of Tetrataechal narratives between the given narratives in the Former Prophets themselves. In the conclusion I will discuss the implications that my thesis has for redaction criticism of the DtrH, for Tetrataechal studies, and for historiographic studies.

CHAPTER ONE

DTR'S USE OF TETRATEUCHAL NARRATIVES IN DEUTERONOMY

The principal purpose of this chapter is to define Dtr’s use of Tetrateuchal accounts and thereby provide an Archimedean point by which the parallel narratives shared by the Tetrateuch and the Former Prophets can be better understood. I will first analyze those sections in Deuteronomy 1—3 that closely correspond to narratives in the Tetrateuch. Following this I will analyze those sections of Deuteronomy 1—3 that are at a further remove from the corresponding accounts in the Tetrateuch.

1. ANALYSIS OF THE CLOSELY CORRESPONDING ACCOUNTS

Narratives in Deuteronomy 1—3 that closely correspond to their counterparts in the Tetrateuch include the following:

The spies and their failure Numbers 13—14 = Deut 1:6-8, 19-46
The appointment of officials Exod 18:13-27; Num 11:10-30 = Deut 1:9-18
The commissioning of Joshua and the death of Moses Num 27:12-23 = Deut 3:21-28

1.1 Numbers 13—14 and Deut 1:6-8, 19-46

Deuteronomy 1:6-8, 19-46, which concerns the mission of the spies and the subsequent murmuring, includes seventeen verbal parallels with the corresponding accounts in Numbers, many of which are verbatim and extensive.
Num 14:25
turn and set out

Deut 1:7
turn and set out

Num 13:30
Let us by all means go up and take possession of it.

Deut 1:21
Go up, take possession.

Num 13:17
And go up into the hill country.

Deut 1:24
And they went up into the hill country.

Num 13:23
And they came to the Valley of Eshcol.

Deut 1:24
And they came to the Valley of Eshcol.

Num 13:20
And take some of the fruit of the land.

Deut 1:25
And they took in their hands some of the fruit of the land.

Num 13:26
And they brought back word to them.

Deut 1:25
And they brought back word to us.

Num 13:28
And the cities are fortified and very large; moreover, we saw the sons of the
Anakim there.

Deut 1:28
fortified cities to the heavens; moreover, we saw the sons of the Anakim there

Num 14:9
And do not fear the people of the land.

Deut 1:29
And do not fear them.
Num 14:23-24

None of the men shall see the land that I promised on oath to their fathers; none of those who spurn me shall see it. But my servant Caleb, because he was imbued with a different spirit and remained loyal to me—him will I bring into the land that he entered, and his offspring shall hold it as a possession.

Deut 1:35-36

Not one of these men, this evil generation, shall see the good land that I swore to give to your fathers—none except Caleb son of Jephunneh; he shall see it, and to him and his descendants will I give the land on which he set foot, because he remained loyal to the LORD.

Num 14:31

And your little ones whom you said would become a prey

Deut 1:39

And your little ones whom you said would become a prey

Num 14:25

Turn tomorrow and set out to the wilderness by the way of the Sea of Reeds.

Deut 1:40

Turn about and set out to the wilderness by the way of the Sea of Reeds.

Num 14:40

We will go up... for we have sinned.

Deut 1:41

We have sinned... we will go up.

Num 14:42

Do not go up for the LORD is not in your midst—lest you be struck down by your enemies.

Deut 1:42

Do not go up... for I am not in your midst—lest you be struck down by your enemies.
Num 14:41
למה זה אמר רב מראות יוהו
Why are you transgressing against the command of the LORD?
Deut 1:43
והמים אדם כי מה
And you rebelled against the command of the LORD.
Num 14:44
ונעלו אלו ארץ הזה
And they were defiant to go up to the crest of the hill country.
Deut 1:43
ותורו על הלוד
And you acted presumptuously and you went up to the hill country.
Num 14:45
ורד הערלק והכהני בשבע בהרה הזה ומברד כסה והבום עד ירוחמה
And the Amalekites and the Canaanites who dwelt in that hill country came down and struck them and beat them down as far as Hormah.
Deut 1:44
ורצה לאניך ושב לעבド הזה לחקא חס ורדרפ א xoשך...
And the Amorites who dwelt in that hill country came out to meet you and they pursued you... and they beat you down in Seir as far as Hormah.
Num 20:1
ורקה הנב בקדש
And the people remained at Kadesh.
Deut 1:46
ותשכ באקדש
And you remained at Kadesh.

In defense of the proposed direction of dependence, in the following paragraphs I will argue that because the account in Deuteronomy shares verbal parallels with each redactional layer of the synoptic account in Numbers, the account in Deuteronomy is dependent on that of Numbers. I will also support the proposed direction of dependence by outlining how the account in Deuteronomy assumes knowledge of the corresponding account in Numbers, the oath to the fathers in Genesis, and the Exodus story.¹

¹ Martin Rose has argued that Deuteronomy 1—3 was the Vorlage of the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts. He concluded that one can determine the direction of dependence between such accounts by analyzing the verbal and thematic links that they share (Berührungspunkten). For instance, he argued that in Deut 1:19-46 the spies initially have a dominant role, only to be overshadowed by the military role of the LORD. This movement is furthered in Numbers 13—14 where the spies lose their military role.
The account in Deuteronomy includes verbal parallels with each redactional layer of its counterpart in Numbers. Most source critics have argued for the presence of J(E) and P in Numbers 13—14. Noth's analysis is typical. He attributed 13:1-17a, 21, 25-26, 32-33; 14:1-3, 5-10, and 26-38 to P. Following this analysis there are thirteen verbal parallels between the non-P layer of Numbers 13—14 and Deut 19-46 and three verbal parallels between the P layer of Numbers 13—14 and Deut 1:19-46. It follows that because the account in Deuteronomy includes verbal parallels with more than one redactional layer of the account in Numbers one can reasonably conclude that Deuteronomy is here dependent on Numbers.

altogether. According to Rose, the account in Numbers was therefore based on that of Deuteronomy (Martin Rose, Deuteronomist und Jahwist. Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke [ATANT 67; Zürich: Theologischer, 1981] 271-74). Limiting oneself to this methodology, as Rose has done, has limited value. The analysis of points of contact only has value for determining the direction of dependence when such points are studied in light of the greater contexts in which they appear—something that Rose consistently failed to do (see also the criticism of Suzanne Boorer, The Promise of the Land as Oath. A Key to the Formation of the Pentateuch [BZAW 205; Walter de Gruyter: Berlin and New York, 1992] 397).


Note also that Deut 1:46 also shares a parallel with Num 20:1, which has traditionally been assigned to P. I say "non-P layer" because there is some discussion over the identification of this layer as consisting of J(E) and D, especially in Num 14:11-25 (see the discussion in Budd, Numbers, 152-53).

Boorer similarly argued that because Deut 1:35-36, 39*-40 shares parallels with the redactionally composite Num 14:22-25*, the account in Deuteronomy must be dependent on that of Numbers (Boorer, Promise, 393). The conclusion that Deut 1:19-46 is based on the redactionally composite Numbers 13—14 holds even with John Van Seters' conclusions regarding the layers of Numbers 13—14. Van Seters attributed Num 14:9 (= Deut 1:29) and Num 14:31 (= Deut 1:39) to P (The Life of Moses. The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers [Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994] 366).
That Dtr assumed knowledge of the account in Numbers is evident, first, from a comparison of the report of the spies in Numbers and Deuteronomy. In Deut 1:25 the spies exclaimed “it is a good land that the LORD our God is giving to us.” In 1:26-27 Dtr then outlined Israel’s refusal to enter the land, but in 1:28 the people stated “[The spies] have taken the heart out of us, saying, ‘We saw there a people stronger and taller than we, large cities with walls sky-high, and even Anakites.’” Left to itself, therefore, the positive report of 1:25 contradicts the negative report of 1:28. However, if Dtr assumed knowledge of the corresponding account in Numbers then the tension is resolved, for unlike 1:25 and 28, in Num 13:27-28 the spies’ positive verdict that the land “does indeed flow with milk and honey” is immediately modified by their description of the strength of the land’s inhabitants and their cities. In this regard Mayes rightly stated that “[t]his verse cannot be understood from the context of Dt. 1. Only against a background conclusion also undermines the view of J.G. Plöger that the theory of a shared oral tradition between these accounts explains their relationship just as well as the theory of literary dependence (Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium [Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1967] 49).

Van Seters’ contention that Deut 1:30b-33, 36-39a (to נֵבֶט) come from a post-Deuteronomistic hand must also be considered, for if these verses are redactional then the present argument would be undermined as they share verbal parallels with the account in Numbers. With regard to 1:29-30a, Van Seters argued that because these verses concern the motif of the LORD’s fighting for Israel, whereas 1:31 refers to the LORD’s care of the Israelites in the wilderness, they must be secondary (Moses, 371-72). Against this view is the fact that 1:30b, like 1:30a, is concerned with the motif of the LORD’s fighting for Israel (cf. 4:34; 6:22; 11:7; 29:1; 34:12; Josh 24:17). The transition therefore exists in the putative redaction itself. Moreover, the fact that both 1:30a and 1:33 include verbal parallels with Exod 13:21 (“who goes before you”) suggests that these verses come from the same hand. As for 1:36-39a (to נֵבֶט), Van Seters argued that 1:36 is secondary because Caleb is abruptly introduced. However, this is just as easily explained by the contention that Dtr here assumed knowledge of the account in Numbers. Moreover, the fact that 1:35 (which Van Seters attributes to Dtr) as well as
knowledge of what the source in Num. 13f. contains concerning the report of the spies is
it possible to reconcile what is said here with v. 25."\(^5\)

The second instance in which Dtr assumed knowledge of the account in Numbers
pertains to Joshua and Caleb. In the Numbers account both Caleb and Joshua are first
introduced with the other spies (13:6, 8). Following this list we read that “Moses
changed the name of Hoshea son of Nun to Joshua” (13:16). After the spies expressed
their fear of the inhabitants of Canaan Caleb encouraged the people to take the land
(13:30). The people were nevertheless swayed by the other spies and they longed for
Egypt (14:1-4). Joshua and Caleb thereupon rent their clothes and exhorted the people to
follow the LORD, but the people threatened to stone them (14:6-10). It is only after this
point that the account in Deuteronomy shares parallels with that of Numbers. Like Num
14:22-24 and 30, Deut 1:35-36 and 38 refers to the L ORD’s decision to keep the Exodus
generation—with the exception of Caleb and Joshua—from seeing the land.\(^6\)

Significantly, unlike the account in Numbers nothing is said of Caleb or Joshua prior to
this in Deuteronomy. It follows that if Dtr did not here assume knowledge of the story in
Numbers, the references to Caleb and Joshua in 1:35-36, 38 would be strikingly laconic.
Moreover, even the introductions to Caleb and Joshua would be obscure. The only
reason given for the L ORD’s promise to let Caleb see the land was that “he remained
loyal to the L ORD” (1:36), but without Numbers we would not know of what such loyalty
consisted. The case is yet more extreme for Joshua. Dtr simply introduced Joshua by

---

1:36 are verbally parallel to Num 14:23-24 also suggests that these verses come from the
same hand.

\(^5\) Mayes, Deuteronomy, 129-30.
having the LORD state, "Joshua son of Nun, who attends you, he shall enter [the land]"
(1:38). Given that Dtr emphasized the point that not an individual of the Exodus generation was to see the land (1:35; 2:14-16), it would be most odd for him to say nothing about why Joshua was an exception. The best explanation for such data is that Dtr assumed knowledge of the account in Numbers.

This brings the discussion to the two instances in which Dtr assumed knowledge of other Tetratuchal accounts. The first such instance comes in Deut 1:30, 32-33 in which shares parallels with the Exodus story. Exodus 13:21, which refers to the guidance of the LORD just prior to the crossing of the Sea, reads "And the LORD was going before them" (יְהוָה הָעָם לֹא פְגִים). Parallel to this is Deut 1:30: "the LORD your God who goes before you" (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הָעָם לֹא פְגִים). Similarly, Exod 13:21 and 1:32-33 are parallel:

Exod 13:21

And the LORD was going before them in a pillar of cloud by day
to guide them along the way,
and in a pillar of fire by night,
to give them light
to go day and night.

Deut 1:32-33

Yet for all that you have no faith in the LORD your God who goes before you on the way to scout the place you are to camp,
in fire by night
to give you light on the way that you are going and in cloud by day.

Note the extensive verbal parallels between Num 14:23-24 and Deut 1:35-36.
Significantly, these parallels occur in a context in which Dtr explicitly referred to the Exodus story: in Deut 1:27 Moses quoted the people who had said, "It is because the LORD hates us that he brought us out of the land of Egypt"; similarly, in 1:29-30 Moses exhorted the people to have no fear of the Amorites because the LORD would fight for them "just as [he had done for them] while they were "in Egypt." Because these parallels are accompanied by explicit references to the Exodus story the best explanation is that Dtr was responsible for drawing them.\(^7\)

This conclusion is supported by the fact that although the Exodus story is arguably the most central event in salvation history for Dtr, knowledge of the story itself is only assumed. To begin with, there are more than seventy references to the Exodus from Egypt in the DtrH.\(^8\) More specifically, the motivation given for obeying many of the Deuteronomic exhortations and laws was based on the LORD's grace in delivering his people from Egypt.\(^9\) Similarly, the LORD's power at the Exodus is recalled for confidence in future warfare.\(^10\) Even the nations feared the power of the LORD as it was exemplified in the Exodus.\(^11\) Again, the central component of the so-called little credos

---

\(^7\) On page 62 I will also argue that Deut 1:37 assumes knowledge of Moses' transgression at the waters of Meribath-kadesh (Num 20:22-29).


\(^9\) See page 22 footnote 46.


\(^11\) Josh 2:10; 1 Sam 4:8; cf. Deut 29:25; 1 Kgs 9:9.
is that of the Exodus from Egypt. Finally, the most common time referent in the DtrH is that of the Exodus. There are many texts, for example, in which Dtr implicitly taught that the birth of Israel as a nation came only with the Exodus: “From the day that I brought Israel out of Egypt to this day ...” (2 Sam 7:6; cf. Judg 19:30; 1 Sam 8:8; 1 Kgs 8:16; 2 Kgs 21:15; etc.). This accords with the fact that the DtrH commences with the Exodus. The “fortieth year” of Deut 1:3 in which Moses addressed all Israel in Moab is an allusion to the Exodus, which is confirmed by Deut 4:45-46: “these are the decrees, laws, and rules that Moses addressed to the people of Egypt after they had left Egypt, beyond the Jordan” (cf. Josh 5:6). This point is also clear from Solomon’s commencement of the construction of the temple in “the four hundred and eightyeth year after the Israelites left the land of Egypt” (1 Kgs 6:1).

The second instance in which Dtr assumed knowledge of a Tetrateuchal account comes with the LORD’s declaration in Deut 1:35: “Not one of these men, this evil generation, shall see the good land that I swore to give to your fathers.” That “fathers” in this instance is Dtr’s title for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is evident from 1:8: “Go, enter the land that the LORD swore to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to assign to them and to their offspring after them.” Such statements as these show that Dtr assumed knowledge of that tradition in Genesis regarding the oath that the LORD had made to the Patriarchs (Gen 12:7; 13:15, 17; 15:18; 26:3-4; 28:13). Against this interpretation are the contentions of Van Seters and Thomas Römer that the names of the

---

Patriarchs in Deuteronomy represent a post-Deuteronomistic redaction and that “fathers” in Deuteronomy refers only to post-Patriarchal generations. Significantly, however, this view does not do justice to the verbal parallel between Num 14:22-24 and 1:35-36:

Num 14:22-24

(22) All the men . . . (23) will not see the land which I swore to their fathers, none who spurn me shall see it. (24) But my servant Caleb, because he had a different spirit and followed after me, will I bring to the land which he entered and his offspring will possess it.

Deut 1:35-36

(35) Not one of these men, this evil generation, shall see the good land which I swore to give to your fathers except Caleb son of Jephunneh—he will see it. And to him I will give the land on which he has set foot and to his sons because he followed after the LORD.

No one disputes that Num 14:22-23 refers to the Patriarchal promises regarding land in Genesis. Moreover, I have already shown that Dtr based Deut 1:19-46 on Numbers 13—14. It is therefore best to conclude that because Deut 1:35-36 was based on Num 14:22-24, Deut 1:35-36 must also refer to the Patriarchal promises in Genesis.

---

1.2 Exod 18:13-27; Num 11:10-30; and Deut 1:9-18

Embedded within the account concerning the spies is Moses’ appointment of officials to judge the nation in Deut 1:9-18, which is parallel in many respects both to Exod 18:13-27, where Moses followed Jethro’s advice to appoint chiefs over the nation, and Num 11:16-17, 24-25, where, at the instance of the LORD, Moses appointed seventy of Israel’s elders to accompany him in the Tent. In just ten verses the account in Deuteronomy shares five verbal parallels with the corresponding accounts in Exodus 18 and Numbers 11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text (Hebrew)</th>
<th>Text (Translation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod 18:18</td>
<td>לארחנן נשים להבך</td>
<td>you are not able to do it alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1:9</td>
<td>לארכחל לברך משה השנך</td>
<td>I am not able to bear you alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 11:14</td>
<td>לארכחל אנכי לברך משה השנך הווד</td>
<td>I am not able to bear all this people alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1:9</td>
<td>לארכחל לברך משה השנך</td>
<td>I am not able to bear you alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 11:17</td>
<td>והשק אהוך נשים להארחנן השנך אהבך</td>
<td>And they will bear the burden of the people with you so that you do not bear it alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1:12</td>
<td>אחרכ אני לאברך משה השנך ורכך</td>
<td>After I have spoken with the people which are with you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Some have argued that Deut 1:9-18 is an interpolation as it interrupts the divine command to leave Horeb in 1:6-8 and the departure from Horeb in 1:19 (e.g., N. Lohfink, “Darstellungskunst und Theologie in Dtn. 1,6—3,29,” Bib 41 [1960] 107 n.1; J.G. Plöger, Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium [Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1966] 31; Weinfeld, Deuteronomistic School, 45). However, the formula בשת הדר אימא בעית be “at that time,” which introduces 1:9-18, occurs nine other times in the prologue, and, like its occurrence in 1:9, in each of these instances it introduces a parenthesis (1:16, 18; 2:34; 3:4, 8, 12, 18, 21, 23; cf. the parenthetical passages which pertain to the histories of Moab and Ammon in 2:10-12, 20-23). It is therefore better to regard 1:9-18 as having come from Dtr (cf. S.E. Loewenstamm, “The Formula בשת הדר אימא in the Introductory Speeches in Deuteronomy” in From Babylon to Canaan. Studies in the Bible and its Oriental Background [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1992] 42-50).
How can I bear alone your trouble and your burden and your bickering?

Exod 18:21, 25

chief of thousands, chief of hundreds, chief of fifties, and chief of tens

Deut 1:15

chief of thousands, and chief of hundreds, and chief of fifties, and chief of tens

Exod 18:26 (cf. v. 22)

The difficult matter they would bring to Moses.

Deut 1:17

The matter that is too difficult for you, you shall bring to me.

In the following paragraphs I will argue that the account in Deuteronomy consists of a collation and reformulation of these two Tetrateuchal accounts.

In contrast to the majority view that this account in Deuteronomy was patterned after the given accounts in Numbers and Exodus, Van Seters has argued that both the Exodus and Numbers accounts were patterned after the account in Deuteronomy.\(^{15}\) Van Seters has contended that it is a “serious methodological contradiction” to argue that the Tetrateuchal and Deuteronomic narratives have markedly different histories:

We are asked to believe that the Yahwist, faced with different oral traditions, had no choice but to produce a combination of these traditions whose awkwardness is clearly apparent to any reader. Yet the Dtr, when faced with the written traditions of J (or E), exercised complete freedom to combine the accounts, eliminate most of the details that did not suit him, and produce a homogenous narrative with scarcely any trace of such editorial activity. That is too hard for me to swallow!\(^{16}\)


\(^{16}\) *Moses*, 214.
Van Seters concluded that it is more tenable to argue that the awkward accounts in the Tetrateuch were patterned after the polished account in Deuteronomy. Entirely on the basis of this presupposition Van Seters argued that various differences between the accounts in the Tetrateuch and Deuteronomy can be explained on the basis of the priority of Deuteronomy. There is, however, nothing at all “contradictory” about different authors or redactors treating their sources differently. Moreover, all that Van Seters has done is posited reasons why—on the supposition that J’s work is later than that of Dtr—J’s accounts differ from those of Dtr. But it is not enough simply to argue how the differences might be explained; rather, one must show how the differences are consistent with either J or Dtr’s particular concerns.

The fact is that a number of the differences between the accounts are demonstrably Deuteronomistic. To begin with, one must account for the fact that Moses is portrayed more positively in Deuteronomy than the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts. The positive depiction of Moses is first evident from Deut 1:9, which is verbally parallel to Num 11:14. Whereas Deut 1:9 refers to Moses’ inability to bear the people by himself, in Num 11:14 Moses’ statement is fraught with perturbation: he accused the LORD of dealing unfairly with him (v. 11); he complained that he had not found favor in the LORD’s sight (v. 11); he was not responsible for the birth of the people (v. 12); and he was not able to provide enough food for them (v. 13; cf. vv. 21-22). This stands in contrast to Deut 1:9 where the statement of Moses is thoroughly positive: Moses was not able to judge the people by himself because the LORD had multiplied

---

17 See also the criticism of Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*
them. This interpretation finds further support in 1:12 where Moses’ question “how can I bear by myself your trouble and your burden?” parallels the LORD’s statement in Num 11:17: “and they shall bear the burden of the people with you so that you do not bear it yourself.” Once again, the statement in Numbers comes as a result of Moses’ perturbation, but there is nothing negative in Moses’ statement in Deuteronomy: whereas in Numbers Moses expressed consternation over “all this people” (11:11-13), the “six hundred thousand” whom he had to feed (11:21-22), in Deuteronomy Moses rejoiced that Israel had become as populous as the stars of the heavens and he expressed his desire for Israel to become a thousand times more numerous than they were (1:10-11).18

This brings us to the second half of the pericope, which is also pro-Mosaic. In the Exodus account Moses takes second place to his father-in-law Jethro. According to Jethro, Moses was sitting alone while the people were waiting for their cases to be judged (18:14); what Moses was doing was not good (18:17); and we read that Jethro’s command was equivalent to that of the LORD (18:23; cf. v. 19).19 None of these points exist in Deuteronomy’s account, which presents Moses more positively. Finally, the idea to appoint “chiefs of thousands, chiefs of hundreds, chiefs of fifties, and chiefs of tens” (Exod 18:21) was Jethro’s idea, whereas Deut 1:15—which is verbally parallel to

---

18 McKenzie refers to this as a “theological correction” on the part of Dtr (“Prologue,” 96).
19 This positive presentation of Jethro is also notable in Exod 18:8-12 where Jethro rejoiced in the LORD, blessed the LORD, sacrificed to him, and where Aaron and all the elders of Israel are with “Moses’ father-in-law.”
Exod 18:21—credits Moses with the idea.\textsuperscript{20} Compared to the portrayal of Moses in the accounts in Numbers 11 and Exodus 18, then, the presentation of Moses in Deut 1:9-18 is more positive.

The \textit{prima facie} explanation for the above differences is that Dtr was responsible for them, for in order for the alternative explanation to be valid (i.e., that the author[s] of the Tetrateuchal accounts were concerned to present Moses less positively) one would have to explain why this positive portrayal of Moses was dropped—a most tenuous hypothesis given the high, even hagiographic view of Moses in exilic and post-exilic literature.\textsuperscript{21} Moreover, the positive portrayal of Moses in Deut 1:9-18 is consistent with the positive place given both to Moses and his instruction in the DtrH. The culmination of Moses’ teaching comes in the series of blessings for obedience and curses for disobedience in Deuteronomy 28: if the people obeyed the instruction of Moses they would enjoy life in the land (vv. 1-14); but if they disobeyed they would be driven from the land (vv. 15-68). Moses’ teaching thus sets the stage for the remainder of the history which is concerned in part with explaining why Israel was exiled from the land.

\textsuperscript{20} Similarly, whereas in Numbers it was the LORD who told Moses to choose the men (11:15-16), in Deuteronomy Moses chose the men without having received the idea from the LORD (1:13).  
Similarly, Dtr's principal criterion for judging the kings of Israel and Judah was the degree to which they were faithful to Moses’ command concerning centralized worship. Significantly, the differences between the depiction of Moses in Exod 18:13-27; Num 11:10-30 and Deut 1:9-18 are consistent with the prominent place that Dtr gave to Moses in his history. It follows that the best explanation for the given differences between the depictions of Moses in these passages is that Dtr adapted the Tetrateuchal accounts in accordance with this particular concern.

Another example in which a difference between the texts is demonstrably Deuteronomistic pertains to the emphasis on wisdom. Whereas Exod 18:21 reads “You shall also seek out from among all the people capable men (אשראות) who fear God (ררח אלוהים), trustworthy men (אשרא אלהים) who spurn ill-gotten gain,” Deut 1:13 reads, “Pick from each of your tribes wise (חכם), discerning (בdeen), and knowledgeable (ידע) men.” Similarly, Deut 1:15 reads, “So I took your tribal leaders, wise (חכם) and knowledgeable (ידע) men.” Weinfeld has rightly argued that, consistent with Dtr’s emphasis on wisdom, the account in Exodus was reformulated because “leaders and judges must possess intellectual qualities, wisdom, understanding, and knowledge.

23 Weinfeld in particular has discussed the emphasis on wisdom in Deuteronomy (Deuteronomistic School, 244-81; idem., Deuteronomy I-II). See also Tikva Frymer-Kensky, “The Sage in the Pentateuch: Soundings,” in The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East (eds. John Gammie and Leo G. Perdue; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990)
traits that characterize the leader and judge in wisdom literature (Prov 8:15-16).24 This interpretation finds further support from Solomon's request for wisdom. Similar to Moses before him, Solomon was overwhelmed by the population of the Israelites and so he asked for understanding to judge the people (1 Kgs 3:8-9). The LORD was pleased with Solomon's request and he gave him "a heart of wisdom and understanding" (1 לֵב יִהְיֶה וָנָבָא) (1 Kgs 3:10-12).25 This is also consistent with Deut 16:18-20, the other passage in Deuteronomy that concerns the appointment of judges. Whereas Exod 23:8 reads, "You shall not take bribes, for bribes blind the clear-sighted (יָוָה מַפְקִים)," Deut 16:19 reads, "You shall not take bribes, for bribes blind the eyes of the wise (יָוָה חָבָרָה)."26 Once again, the fact that a difference between the accounts is Deuteronomistic shows that the Tetrateuchal account is primary; and in order for the alternative explanation to stand one would have to explain why this element was omitted.27

The differences between the given accounts therefore suggest that Deut 1:9-18 consists of a Deuteronomistic conflation of Exod 18:13-27 and Num 11:10-30. Equally significant for our purposes is the fact that, as with Deut 1:35, in addition to relying on the texts in Exodus and Numbers Dtr also alluded to the promise to the Patriarchs. The

24 Deuteronomy 1-11, 64.
25 Weinfeld, Deuteronomy 1-11, 64-65.
26 Weinfeld, Deuteronomic School, 245 (cf. Fishbane, Interpretation, 244-45; Levinson, Innovation, 425-30). For an analysis of the relationship between Deut 1:15-17 and 16:18-20 see Brettler, Creation of History, 67-68.
divine promise of blessing and progeny to Abraham in Gen 22:17 shares parallels with Moses’ statement concerning the population of the Israelites in Deut 1:10-11:

Gen 22:17

כברך אברך והрожבה אברהם钮 אתחדעך כלבעך השמים
For I will surely bless you and multiply your seed like the stars of the heavens.

Deut 1:10-11

הרבה אהבת והנה יהוה עולם השמים... יברך

(A)חפט הנכם במיל כלות... לברך

(The LORD) has multiplied you until you are today as numerous as the stars in the sky ... and may he bless you just as he promised you.

Moses’ statement thus explicitly refers back to the given account in Genesis. Following D.Z. Hoffmann, Jacob Milgrom has rightly argued that whenever Deuteronomy refers to its own statements it uses the participial construction “which I am commanding” (אנא נאמר).28 Milgrom extended Hoffman’s observation by noting that whenever Deuteronomy refers to an antecedent tradition it uses the perfect “just as I have/he has commanded/swore/p Promised” (כאמר יצא... נאמר/ברך) — even as we find with Deut

37 In his critique of Van Seters’ view Levinson rightly asked, “[w]ere Exodus 18 indeed dependent upon Deuteronomy 1, why would the wisdom motif be deleted?” (Innovation, 426 n. 92).

1:10-11. It follows that the best explanation for Deut 1:10-11 is that it is a cross-reference to Gen 22:17.

1.3 Num 21:21-35 and Deut 2:24—3:3

This brings us to a discussion of Num 21:21-35 and Deut 2:24—3:3, passages that outline Israel's dealings with Sihon and Og and that share eleven verbal parallels:

Num 21:21

וישלח ישראל מלך אタイトル עלא-סית מלך האמורי לאמור

And Israel sent messengers to Sihon king of the Amorites saying

Deut 2:26

ואשלח מלך א-T∼B, מלך חבון וȒML שפלות לאמור

And I sent messengers . . . to Sihon king of Heshbon with words of peace saying

Num 21:22

 apkמ pourquoi ... ברך המלך על

Let me pass through your land . . . we will go by the way of the king.

Deut 2:27

 apkמ pourquoi ... ברך המלך על

Let me pass through your land; I will go by the way of the king.


30 The fact that the divine promise was made to Abraham whereas Deut 1:11 reads “just as he promised you” is not problematic for it is consistent with Deuteronomy’s tendency to blur the generations. For example, not only did the children of the Exodus generation witness the events accompanying the theophany at Horeb (5:20-21), but the Deuteronomist could even state that “it was not with our fathers that the LORD made this covenant, but with us, the living, every one of us who is here today” (5:3). Similarly, in 29:13-14 we read that Moses made a covenant “not with you alone, but both with those who are standing here this day before the LORD our God and with those who are not with us here this day” (Weinfeld, Deuteronomy 1-11, 238).

31 Following Num 21:22 I have emended MT’s בְּדֶרֶךְ המלך בָּרָךְ by ֹ to בְּדֶרֶךְ המלך בָּרָךְ.
De's Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives in Deuteronomy

Num 20:17
We will not turn aside to the right or the left.

Deut 2:27
I will not turn to the right or the left.

Num 20:19
It is nothing, let me pass through on foot.

Deut 2:28
Only let me pass through on foot.

Num 21:23
Sihon gathered all his people and went out to meet Israel in the wilderness.

Deut 2:32
And Sihon went out to meet us, he and all his people, for battle at Jahaz.

Num 21:33
And Og the king of Bashan went out to meet them, he and all his people, for battle at Edrei.

Deut 2:32
And Sihon went out to meet us. he and all his people, for battle at Jahaz.

Num 21:35
And they struck him and his sons and all his people.

Deut 2:33
And we struck him and his sons and all his people.

Num 21:25
And Israel took all these cities.

Deut 2:34
And we captured all his cities.
And they turned and went up the road to Bashan and Og. And Og, the king of Bashan, went out to meet them, he and all his people, for battle at Edrei. And the LORD said to Moses, "Do not fear him for I have given him and all his people and his land into your hand; and you will do to just as you did to Sihon the king of the Amorites who dwelt in Heshbon."

And they struck him... until there was no remnant left to him.

In support of his contention that Num 21:21-25 is a collation of Deut 2:26-36 and Judg 11:19-26 Van Seters has argued that where Numbers differs from Deuteronomy in three respects Judges differs from Deuteronomy in the same way. The three texts read as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(21) Israel now sent messengers to Sihon king of the Amorites, saying,</td>
<td>(26) Then I sent messengers from the wilderness of Kedemoth to King Sihon of Heshbon with an offer of peace, as follows,</td>
<td>(19) Then Israel sent messengers to Sihon king of the Amorites, the king of Heshbon. Israel said to him,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) &quot;Let me pass through your country. We will not turn off into fields or vineyards, and we will not drink water from your wells. We will follow the king’s highway until we have crossed your territory.&quot;</td>
<td>(27) &quot;Let me pass through Your country. I will keep strictly to the highway, turning neither to the right nor to the left. (28) What food I eat you will supply for money, and what water I drink you will furnish for money; just let me pass through—</td>
<td>&quot;Allow us to cross through your country to our place.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) But Sihon would not let Israel go through his territory</td>
<td>(29) as the descendants of Esau who dwell in Seir did for me, and the Moabites who dwell in Ar—that I may cross the Jordan into the land that the LORD your God is giving us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sihon gathered all his people and went out against Israel in the wilderness. He came to Jahaz and engaged Israel in battle.</td>
<td>(30) But King Heshbon refused to let us go through, because the LORD had stiffened his will and hardened his heart in order to deliver him into your power—as is now the case.</td>
<td>(20) But Sihon would not trust Israel to go through his territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) But Israel put them to the sword, and took possession of their land,</td>
<td>(31) And the LORD said to me: “See, I begin by placing Sihon and his land at your disposal. Begin the occupation; take possession of his land.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(32) Sihon with all his men took the field against us at Jahaz,</td>
<td>Sihon mustered all his troops, and they camped at Jahaz; he engaged Israel in battle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33) and the LORD our God delivered him to us and we defeated him and his sons and all his men.</td>
<td>(21) But the LORD, the God of Israel, delivered Sihon and all his troops into Israel’s hands, and they defeated them;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, Van Seters has noted that whereas Deuteronomy attributes to Moses the sending of the messengers (2:26), in Judges and Numbers this action is attributed to Israel (Num 21:21; Judg 11:19). According to Van Seters, this attribution fits the context of Judges but in Numbers it represents a "striking inconsistency" as in Num 20:14 Moses sent messengers to Edom and in Num 21:32 he sent spies to Jazer.\footnote{Moses, 395.} "[S]triking inconsistency," however, is surely an overstatement when all that can be shown is that
one account differs from two others. Moreover, the sending of messengers that is attributed to Moses rather than to Israel in Deut 2:26 is in accords with Dtr’s positive portrayal of Moses in 1:9-18.

Second, Van Seters has noted that whereas Deut 2:34-36 refers to the capture of cities, Judg 11:21-22 refers to the capture of territory. He concluded that Num 21:24-25 conflates these accounts because references to both the capture of territory as well as cities are problematic in Num 21:24-25. With regard to the capture of territory, Van Seters has contended that the seizing of land “from the Arnon to the Jabbok, as far as the Ammonites” (Num 21:24; cf. Judg 11:22) is problematic because the Ammonites are not mentioned in the narrative prior to this. However, this is hardly problematic for the narrator simply sought to delimit the area of conquest. With regard to the capture of cities, Van Seters has argued that “these cities” in Num 21:25, where cities had not been previously mentioned, is a reference to the cities in Deut 2:34-36. However, Deut 2:34 refers to “his cities,” and “every city,” but it never reads “these cities.” This is also true of 2:36 which only reads “the city.”

Third, Van Seters has noted that whereas Deuteronomy avoids any discussion of settlement (2:34), both Judg 11:26 and Num 21:25 refer to it, though Num 21:25 is inconsistent with its context. According to Van Seters, the mention of Israel settling in the region in Num 21:25 is “quite surprising” for shortly thereafter the narrative refers to the conquest of Jazer (v. 32) and Bashan (vv. 33-35). But if J had the Deuteronomy account before him he could have easily overcome this problem by incorporating Deut

34 Moses, 396-97.
2:31 which anticipates the settlement: "See I have begun (תֹּ֥בֵל) by placing Sihon and his land at your disposal." Moreover, Van Seters' contention that Num 21:25 contradicts 21:33-35 is based on his view that J was responsible for 21:33-35; but most scholars rightly argue that these verses represent a Deuteronomic interpolation. The fact is that the most notable difference between Num 21:21-35 and Deut 2:26-37 supports the view that Dtr based his account on that of Numbers. Between Sihon's refusal to let Israel pass through his territory and the subsequent preparation for the battle, unlike the account in Numbers the account in Deuteronomy includes the reason for Sihon's obstinacy as well as the divine charge to conquer Sihon:

**Num 21:23**
(23a) But Sihon would not let Israel pass through his territory.
(23b) Sihon gathered all his people and went out against Israel in the wilderness. He came to Jahaz and engaged Israel in battle.

**Deut 2:30-32**
(30) But king Sihon of Heshbon refused to let us pass through, because the LORD had stiffened his will and hardened his heart in order to deliver him into your hand—as is now the case. (31) And the LORD said to me, "See I begin by placing Sihon and his land at your disposal. Begin the occupation; take possession of his land." (32) Sihon with all his men took the field against us at Jahaz.

As with Deut 1:32-33 which I discussed above, the reference to the hardening of Sihon finds a parallel in the Exodus story: just as the LORD had "hardened" (יָדַע) Pharaoh so the LORD "hardened" (יָדַע) Sihon. Significantly, the phrase "for he hardened"

---

35 Moses, 397-98.
36 Bartlett, "Re-examination," 349.
37 I will defend this view below.
resemblance between “and I will harden Pharaoh’s heart” (Exod 7:3) and “because the LORD your God had stiffened his will and hardened his heart” (Deut 2:30). Similarly, just as the LORD had hardened Pharaoh in order to deliver Israel (Exod 3:19-20; 4:21; 11:9), so the LORD hardened Sihon in order to deliver him over to Israel (Deut 2:30). It is difficult to know why J would have omitted the Exodus motif. If, ex hypothesi, J had this account in Deuteronomy before him which shares parallels with the Exodus story, and if J was responsible for the Exodus story itself, then his omission of the Exodus motif in Num 21:3 is odd. A better explanation for the parallel is that Dtr was responsible for it.

This conclusion finds support from a verbal difference between Num 21:23 and Deut 2:30. To be sure, in both instances we read that Sihon would not let Israel pass through his territory. However, whereas in the Numbers account Sihon’s refusal is worded as “Sihon did not let [Israel] pass” (לֹא אֱלֹהָי נֶחְדָּשָׁה לֵבָר) Deut 2:30a reads “And Sihon . . . refused to let us pass through” (ולא אֵלֹהָי נֶחְדָּשָׁה דִּבְרֵנוֺ וַלָּא).

Significantly, Dtr’s account again finds a parallel to the Exodus story: “and (Pharaoh) refused to send them” (Exod 10:27). Again, if J had this account in Deuteronomy before him, and if J was responsible for Exod 10:27, then one would expect J’s account rather than that of Dtr to be consistent with the Exodus story. It follows that the best explanation for the given difference is that the account in Deuteronomy was based on that of Numbers.

That Dtr was drawing on the Exodus story is also evident from Deut 2:24-25:
Up! Set out across the wadi Arnon! See, I give into your power Sihon the Amorite, king of Heshbon, and his land. Begin the occupation: engage him in battle. (25) This day I begin to put the dread and fear of you upon the peoples everywhere under heaven whenever they hear you mentioned so that they shall tremble and quake before you.

To begin with, there is a parallel between Exod 15:14 and Deut 2:25:

**Exod 15:14**
The peoples hear (םהלות ענביו); they tremble (רנזור); writhing (אלוה) grips the dwellers in Philistia.

**Deut 2:25**
The peoples (ישראל)... hear (שניהם)... so that they tremble (רנזור) and writhe (חזר) before you.

Not only is the same terminology used in the same sequence in both passages (these are the only two instances of this grouping), but in both instances the concern is that of describing the affect of Israel upon the peoples. Furthermore, the command to cross the Arnon in Deut 2:24 is reminiscent of the command to cross the Sea of Reeds in Exod 14:15-16.

In terms of the relationship between the Exodus story and Deut 2:24-25 and 30, the Exodus parallels in Deut 1:30-33 suggest that the account in Exodus was original. I argued above that Dtr based Deut 1:30-33 on Exod 13:21 because the verbal parallels are

---

39 Because v. 25 uses the second person singular some commentators have argued that it is secondary (e.g., Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 134, 140; Perlitt, “Deuteronomium 1-3 im Streit der exegetischen Methoden,” in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* [Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 68; ed. N. Lohfink; Leuven, Leuven University Press, 1985] 160; cf. Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 53-54 n. 4). However, the fact that both vv. 24 and 25 refer to the Exodus story suggests that they come from the same hand. Moreover, in other instances in the prologue in which Dtr referred to Tetrateuchal accounts he used the second person singular (1:21; 2:30). Cf. Christopher Begg, who has argued that certain changes of number in 4:1-40 can be explained by a system of “quotation” (“The Literary Criticism of Deut 4, 1-40.”)
accompanied by two verses that explicitly refer back to the Exodus story. Because Deut 2:24-25 and 2:30 also share parallels with the Exodus story it is best to conclude that they too were based on the account in Exodus.

To this point I have argued that Dtr relied on the corresponding account in Numbers as well as the Exodus story in his recounting of Israel's encounter with Sihon. What remains to be discussed is the account concerning Og and the summary of Israel's Transjordan adventure in Deut 3:1-3. Arguing that Dtr based his narratives on Tetrateuchal accounts does not preclude the possibility that Dtr himself may have edited various Tetrateuchal accounts. This appears to be the case with the account of the battle with Og in Num 21:33-35 and the corresponding account in Deut 3:1-3. That Dtr was responsible for Num 21:33-35 is evident, first, from its terminology. Apart from Num 21:33 and Deut 3:1 the verbs הָעָלָה “to turn” and הָעָלָה “to go up” only occur together in Deut 1:24. Moreover, whereas Dtr often used the verb הָעָלָה with reference to the travels of Israel (Deut 1:7, 24, 40; 2:1, 3, 8), Numbers regularly uses the verb בָּא “to set out” (11:35; 20:22; 21:4, 10-13; 22:1); and apart from Num 21:33 הָעָלָה is only used once for Israel's travels in Numbers (17:7). Similarly, apart from personal and place names Deut 3:1b, which apart from person and number is identical to Num 21:33, is parallel to Deut 2:32: And Sihon/Og king of Bashan went out to meet us, he and all his people, for war at Jahaz/Edrei. Again, the phrase אָמַרְתֶּם כִּי “do not fear” is a favorite of Dtr (Deut 1:21 [cf. Contributions to a Continuing Discussion,” in *Ephemerides Theological Lovanienses* 56 [1980] 10-55, esp. 28-55).
1:29]; 3:22; Josh 8:1), as is the pair ידֹ וּ֥ סְיָ֔ נָה "he gave into the hand" with the LORD as the subject (e.g., Deut 1:27; 2:24, 30; 7:24; 20:13; Josh 2:24). The terminology of Num 21:33-35 is thus Deuteronomistic. This conclusion does not detract from the premise that Dtr patterned Deuteronomy 1—3 after the Tetrateuch, for Dtr himself was likely responsible for the interpolation.

Dtr's purpose for this interpolation was possibly to conform the Tetrateuchal account to his own. For Dtr the conquest commenced not with the crossing of the Jordan but with the crossing of the Arnon. This is implicit in Dtr's concern to have the entire Exodus generation die prior to the conquest: in Deut 1:35-38 the LORD swore that with the exception of Joshua and Caleb the entire Exodus generation would die prior to seeing the land; and it was only with the fulfillment of this vow in 2:14-16 that the conquest could therefore begin. What is only implicit in 1:35-38 and 2:14-16 is explicit in 2:24-25 as well as 2:31 where, with the crossing of the Arnon, the conquest began: "Up! Set out across the wadi Arnon! . . . This day I begin to put the dread and fear of you upon the peoples everywhere under heaven" (2:24-25); "See, I begin by placing Sihon and his land at your disposal. Begin the occupation; take possession of his land" (2:31). Dtr was evidently compelled to present the conquest as having begun already with the crossing of the Arnon because he needed to provide theological justification for how Israel came to occupy the Transjordan as well as Canaan. Significantly, without Num

40 Apart from some of the pronouns, the only difference between these accounts comes with Num 21:35 and Deut 3:3.
41 This conclusion is also supported from the fact that according to Deut 34:1-4 the land which the LORD had promised to the Patriarchs included Gilead (cf. Noth, Deuteronomistic History, 54; Weinfeld, Deuteronomy 1-11, 175-78).
21:33-35 there would be no mention of the conquest of the land north of the Jabbok in the Tetrateuch: Numbers 21 refers only to the conquest of Sihon's kingdom, which for Dtr extended from the Amon to the Jabbok (Judg 11:13, 22 [cf. Num 21:24]). By interpolating the account of the conquest of Og's kingdom, which for Dtr extended from the Jabbok to Mount Hermon (as may be adduced from Deut 3:8), Dtr filled in this lacuna and thereby brought some measure of conformity between the Tetrateuchal account and his own.42

1.4 Num 27:12-23 and Deut 3:21-28

To this point I have limited the analysis to a discussion of the prologue to Deuteronomy. With the account concerning the succession of Joshua and the death of Moses in Deut 3:21-28, however, it is essential to discuss the relationship between Num 27:12-23 and various texts in the epilogue to Deuteronomy—texts that are also concerned with the succession of Joshua and the death of Moses. Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 read as follows:

**Num 27:12-14**

12 And the LORD said to Moses:“Ascend these heights of Abarim

13 And the LORD said to Moses:

14 And the LORD said to Moses:

**Deut 32:48-52**

48 That very day the LORD spoke to Moses:

49 "Ascend these heights of Abarim to Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab facing Jericho,
and view the land
which I have given to the
children of Israel.

13 And when you have seen it
then you too shall be gathered
to your kin,
just as your brother Aaron was,

14 for you disobeyed my
command—
in the wilderness of Zin,

when the community was
contentious—
to uphold my sanctity in their
sight
at the water.”
Those are the waters of
Meribath-kadesh,
in the wilderness of Zin.

50 And die on the mountain that you ascend,
and be gathered to your kin,
as Aaron your brother died on Mount Hor
and was gathered to his kin;
51 for you both broke faith with me among
the Israelites,
at the waters of Meribath-kadesh in the
wilderness of Zin,

by failing to uphold my sanctity among
the Israelites.

52 You may view the land from a distance,
but you shall not enter it—the land that I
am giving to the Israelites.”

The traditional argument has been that Deut 32:48-52 was interpolated by P in order to
make a connection between Num 27:12-14 and Deut 34:1*, 7-9, texts which have almost
universally assigned to P or a P redactor.43 Contrary to this argument, I will contend that
Dtr was responsible for Deut 32:48-52 for the following reasons: (1) because the

43 Von Rad argued that Deut 32:48-52 is a variant of Num 27:12-14 (Deuteronomy
[OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966] 201). However, the differences can easily be
explained as the redactor’s attempt to adapt 32:48-52 to its context: “on that same day”
(32:48) was added with 1:3 in mind; “Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab facing
Jericho” (32:49) finds parallels with 1:5; 28:69; 34:1, 5-6; “Die on the mountain which
you are ascending” (32:50) is fulfilled in 34:1, 5; and “you shall view the land from a
distance, but you shall not enter it—the land that I am giving to the Israelites” (32:52)
picks up from 3:27 and anticipates 34:1-4.
presence of "P language" in Deut 32:48-52 is consistent with Dtr's use of such language elsewhere; (2) because Deut 32:48-52 includes "D language"; and (3), because Deut 32:48-52 is integral to Dtr's narrative. I will then conclude that Dtr based Deut 3:21-28 in part on Num 27:15-23.

In support of the view that P interpolated Deut 32:48-52 commentators have argued that in some instances where this passage differs from Num 27:12-14 one finds language that is characteristic of P. This is true, for instance, of "as a possession" (לְּמַאָס) in 32:49 as well as "Mount Hor" (הר הָוָא) of 32:50. However, it does not necessarily follow that P interpolated this passage, for as I noted above Dtr cited P texts in Deuteronomy 1—3. Although there is no question that the language of passages that have traditionally been attributed to P is markedly homogenous, it has often been the case that one's presuppositions concerning the compositional history of the Tetrateuch govern the way that the criterion of P language is used. This is no more apparent than in Deuteronomy. The reigning presupposition is as follows: "P is later than D; it therefore follows that where P language exists in D there exists a redaction by P." A majority of scholars have quickly employed this presupposition by asserting that various texts in Deuteronomy which include P language represent P's attempt to round off the Pentateuch. A glaring inconsistency in this regard is the failure to draw the same conclusions with regard to P language in, for instance, the story of the spies in Deut

---

This pericope includes three striking verbal parallels with the P layer of the corresponding Tetrateuchal account (Deut 1:25 and Num 13:26; Deut 1:29 and Num 14:29; Deut 1:39 and Num 14:31), and one with Num 20:1 (= Deut 1:46)—which is also attributed to P. Yet one searches the commentaries in vain for any discussion regarding the possibility that P interpolated such passages. The fact is that like the dozens of other instances in which Deuteronomy 1—3 shares verbal parallels with the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts, there is no evidence that such passages were interpolated. Rather, in each instance it is best to regard them as citations of the corresponding Tetrateuchal account by Dtr. Consistent with this contention, the existence of P language at the close of Deuteronomy should not be seen as a redaction by P but Dtr’s use of P language. This view is supported by the fact that the phrase “in the land of Moab” (בֵּית מַעֲרָת) of 32:49 (which does not occur in Num 27:12-14) occurs only in Deuteronomistic passages (it occurs only here and in Deut 1:5; 28:69 and 34:5-6).

---

45 See the review of scholarship in Lothar Perlitt, “Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?,” *ZAW* 100 (1988) 65-68.
46 See page 25.
47 רָאָם occurs only in Judg 11:15, 18 and Jer 48:24; רָאָם מַעֲרָת occurs only in Jer 48:33. Many commentators have also argued that בֵּית מַעֲרָת (on that same day) of 32:48 should be attributed to P, first, because the phrase occurs elsewhere in P texts (Gen 7:13; 17:23, 26; Exod 12:17, 41, 51; Lev 23:21, 28-30); and second, because P is concerned with chronology. But the force of this argument is undermined both by the fact that the phrase also occurs in Josh 5:11 and that Dtr was also concerned with chronology (cf. Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 34-44). Moreover, though 32:48 refers to 1:3 (which gives the date of Moses’ speech) there is no reason to attribute 1:3 to P. Indeed, consistent with 1:3 Dtr dated the commencement of the construction of the Temple from the Exodus in 1 Kgs 6:1 (cf. Perlitt who has cogently argued against the view that 1:3 and 32:48 come from P or a P redactor [“Priesterschrift,” 69-70, 73-74]).
The view that Dtr was responsible for Deut 32:48-52 is also supported by the fact that this passage is integral to Dtr’s narrative, as is evident from the progression between Deut 31:14 and 32:50, and between 32:49-50 and 34:1, 5:

**The LORD to Moses (31:14)**
“The days have drawn near for you to die”

**The LORD to Moses (32:50)**
“And die on the mountain which you ascend”

**The LORD to Moses (32:49-50)**
(49) “Ascend (לעלו) . . .
Mount Nebo (הר הנבון) . . .
-facing Jericho (שער יריחו) . . .
-see the land (ראתה הארץ) . . .

(50) And die (רמות).”

**Moses’ action (34:1, 5)**
(1) “And Moses went up (ריהל מנשה) . . .
Mount Nebo (הר הנבון) . . .
-facing Jericho (שער יריחו) . . .
-and the LORD showed him all the land (визראתו הארץ את כל הארץ) . . .

(5) and he died (רמות) . . . at the command of the LORD.”

Deut 31:14 is the first explicit reference to the imminent death of Moses (it is only anticipated in 1:37 and 3:27). But it is only with 32:50 that we learn that Moses would die on the mountain, which happened, in turn, in 34:5. More striking is the relationship between 32:49-50 and 34:1, 5. In addition to the verbal correspondence between these distant pericopes, the three divine commands in 32:49-50 are fulfilled in the same sequence in 34:1, 5. Moreover, the fact that Moses’ death came “at the command of the LORD” (34:5) also shows that the narrator had 32:50 in mind as this is the only place where the LORD uttered such a command. Such features show that 34:1, 5 was based on 32:49-50. All that remains to be shown is that Dtr rather than P was responsible for the given elements of 34:1, 5. The traditional view is that P interpolated “Mount Nebo” of
34:1.48 However, because this name only occurs in 32:49 and 34:1 it cannot be used to support the view that it is from P.49 As for 34:5, many commentators have attributed “according to the command of the LORD” (וְלֹא יָדַע ה' to P.50 But there is little to support this conclusion. This phrase appears elsewhere in the DtrH,51 as does “command of the LORD” (בְּקֵדֶם יָדָ֥ע ה').52 These facts undermine any dogmatic attribution to P.53 That 34:5 is Deuteronomistic is evident, first, from “and Moses the servant of the LORD died there” (וְהָיָה בְּקֵדֶם לֹא יָדַע ה'). Apart from 2 Chron 1:3 and 24:6 the title נבֶרִיאָוה הָנָּה לֹא יָדַע ה' occurs elsewhere only in Deuteronomistic literature.54 Moreover, 34:5 is parallel to Judg 2:8: “and Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the LORD, died”

48 Commentators have also argued that “from the Plains of Moab” of 34:1 was also interpolated by P because “Plains of Moab” occurs elsewhere only in P texts (Num 22:1; 26:3, 63; 31:12; 33:4-50; 35:1; 36:13; Josh 13:32) (see the review of scholarship in Perlitt, “Priesterschrift,” 65-68). However, this only begs the question, for if Dtr was reliant on P texts elsewhere it follows that he may have here used P’s language.
49 There is no contradiction between Deut 3:27, where the LORD instructed Moses to go up Pisgah where he would view the land, and 34:1, which includes a reference to Mount Nebo: 34:1 consists of Moses’ itinerary: he traveled West from the steppes of Moab to Mount Nebo, and Northwest from Mount Nebo to the summit of Pisgah (cf. E.D. Grohman, “Nebo, Mount,” IDB, 529).
50 E.g., Driver, Deuteronomy, 423. The phrase occurs in the following P texts: Exod 17:1; Lev 24:12; Num 3:16, 39, 51; 4:37, 41, 45, 49; 9:18, 20, 23; 10:13; 13:3; 33:2, 38; 36:5.
51 Josh 19:50; 22:9; 2 Kgs 24:3; cf. Josh 21:3 which reads אֲלֵפֶת יְדַע ה'.
53 Stoellger has rightly stated that it appears “unzulässig in [the phrase] Pg und Rp zu suchen und zu finden” [emphasis his] (“Priesterschrift,” 32).
There are therefore good reasons to attribute the given elements in 34:1, 5 to Dtr and to conclude that 32:48-52 is integral to Dtr’s narrative. Contrary to the view that P interpolated 32:48-52 in order to bring cohesion to the Pentateuch, then, the best explanation for the data is that Dtr was responsible for 32:48-52—perhaps in his effort to unite the Tetratuch to the DtrH.

This leads me to a discussion of the relationship between Tetratuchal accounts and Deut 3:21-28, which also concerns the succession of Joshua and the death of Moses. The first point to be made is that Dtr based 3:24-25 on various texts from Exodus 14—15. To begin with, Deut 3:24 is parallel to Exod 14:31:

**Exod 14:31**
And Israel saw (נָתַר) the great hand (וֹצֵא) which the LORD did (וְצִאתָ) among the Egyptians.

**Deut 3:24**
You have begun to show (רָאָה יִהוּד) your servant your greatness (נָרָא) and your strong hand (וֹצֵאתָ) ... who can do (יְשֵׁב) works like your own?

Deut 3:24b is also reminiscent of Exod 15:11:

**Exod 15:11**
And Israel saw (נָתַר) the land (אָרָה) from a distance (רָאָה), but you shall not enter there (רָשָׁב), into the land which I am giving (נָתַנְתָה) the sons of Israel.

**Deut 3:24b**
I have let you see (רָאְתָם) with your eyes, but you shall not cross there (רָשָׁב)."

That v.4 is Deuteronomistic is evident from the reference to the oath to the Patriarchs in the first half of the verse (cf. Deut 1:35; 10:11; 31:20, 23; Josh 1:6; Judg 2:1) and from the similarity between the second half of the verse and Deut 3:27.

Similar to this is the Deuteronomistic interpolation in Num 21:33-35 (see the discussion on page 52).

See also Moran, “Anti-Exodus,” 341.
Who is like you, O LORD, among the gods... doing wonders?

What god is there who can do such works... as yours?

But most pronounced is the parallel between Exod 15:16-17 and Deut 3:24a, 25:

Exod 15:16-17
Terror and dread descended upon them; through the majesty (בַּעַד ל) of your arm they are still as stone; till your people cross over (יָשָׁבְרָהו), O LORD, till your people cross over (יָשָׁבְרָהו) whom you have ransomed. You will bring them and plant them in your own mountain (מֵרָה).

Deut 3:24a, 25
You have begun to show your servant the works of your majesty (נָבָר ל) and your mighty hand... Let me, I pray, cross over (לֵךְ), and see the good land on the other side of the Jordan, this good mountain (יָרְדָן), and the Lebanon.

Given the fact that Dtr based Deut 2:30b-31 on the Exodus story, and that he used the language of the Exodus story in Deut 1:30 with reference to the conquest, it is best to conclude that he also based Deut 3:24-25 on Exod 14:31; 15:11, 16-17.

That Dtr based Deut 3:21-28 on Tetrateuchal accounts is also evident from 3:25-27 where we read that Moses would not enter the land because the LORD was angry with him on account of the Israelites. With regard to the cause of the LORD’s anger, some have argued that although Moses did not follow the counsel of the unbelieving spies, as leader of the people the LORD nevertheless implicated him in their sin. More likely is the view that 3:26 is a reference to the LORD’s anger with Moses for his transgression at the waters of Meribath-kadesh (Num 20:22-29). In support of this view is the fact that 32:48-52 (for which Dtr was responsible) teaches that Moses would not enter the land because of his sin at the waters of Meribath-kadesh. Moreover, 1:37, which gives the same explanation as 3:25-27 concerning the LORD’s anger at Moses, is followed in 1:38

---

58 E.g., Driver, Deuteronomy, 26-27; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 147.
by the LORD's statement that Joshua would enter the land. Significantly, these are the two subjects that are outlined in Num 27:12-23; and since Dtr used Num 27:12-14 for Deut 32:48-52 it follows that the best explanation for both 1:37-38 and 3:25-27 (cf. 4:21) is that they were similarly based on Num 27:12-23.59

2. Analysis of the Remaining Accounts

To this point I have limited the analysis to a discussion of the relationship between those narratives in Deuteronomy that closely correspond to narratives in the Tetrateuch. What remains to be discussed are the remaining portions of Deuteronomy 1—3, namely, 2:1-23 and 3:12-20.60 Since Dtr was reliant on the Tetrateuch for the dozens of verbal parallels that 1:6-8, 19-46; 2:24-3:3; and 3:21-28 share with the Tetrateuch, the prima

59 That Dtr was aware of Num 27:12-23 is also evident from Deut 34:9. There is universal agreement that Deut 34:9 refers to Num 27:18, the only other text which refers to Moses' commissioning of Joshua by laying his hand(s) on him (e.g., Driver, Deuteronomy, 424; Mayes, Deuteronomy, 413; von Rad, Deuteronomy, 210). Contrary to most commentators, however, the evidence suggests that Dtr rather than P was responsible for this verse. This is evident from the differences between Num 27:18 and Deut 34:9. To begin with, whereas Num 27:18 states that Joshua was a man "in whom was the spirit" (נְּבֵין אֶלֶּה), Deut 34:9 states that Joshua "was filled with the spirit of wisdom" (מַלְאָךְ רְאוּץ חֲבֶּם). As I noted above, Dtr reformulated Exod 18:21 in Deut 1:15 in order to emphasize the role of wisdom among Israel's leaders (see page 40). Moreover, whereas in Num 27:18 the LORD commanded Moses "and lay your hand on him" (יִנַּשְׁךָ אֵלֶּיהָ עֲלָיו), Deut 34:9 states that Joshua had the spirit of wisdom "because Moses laid his hands on him" (כִּי נַשְׁכָּךָ אֵלֶּיהָ עֲלָיו), which is consistent with Dtr's concern to present Moses positively in the prologue. The fact, then, that the differences between Num 27:18 and Deut 34:9 are consistent with Dtr's reformulation of the Tetrateuch in the prologue shows that Dtr rather than P was responsible for Deut 34:9 (cf. Perllt who, after reviewing a century of literature, could state that it was especially annoying that commentators avoided the problems of attributing 34:9 to P ["Priestschrift," 80]; Weinfeld, Deuteronomist School, 181 n.3).

60 Because the function of Deut 1:1-5 is only that of setting the time and place of Moses' oration I will not discuss it.
facie explanation for 2:1-23 and 3:4-20 is that Dtr was reliant at least in part on the given Tetrateuchal accounts, for these portions also share verbal parallels with Tetrateuchal accounts. Deut 2:1-23 shares two verbal parallels with accounts in Numbers, and 3:4-20 shares three verbal parallels with Numbers 32:

Num 21:4  

Deut 2:1  

Num 32:13  

Deut 2:14  

Num 32:41  

Jair son of Manasseh went and captured their villages and he named them Havvoth-jair.  

Deut 3:14  

Jair son of Manasseh took the whole district of Argob ... and he named them after his name, Havvoth-jair.  

Num 32:21  

Deut 3:18  

Num 32:26  

Our children, our wives, our flocks, and all our livestock will be there in the cities of Gilead.  

Deut 3:19  

Only your wives and your children and your flocks ... will remain in your cities.

Another argument in support of the proposed direction of dependence between the given texts is the fact that the differences between them can be explained on the basis of Dtr’s concern with the land. Von Rad argued that Deuteronomy 1—3 was based not
on the given Tetrateuchal accounts but on "an account not preserved for us, which gave a considerably shorter description of the events between Horeb and the arrival in the country east of Jordan."\(^{61}\) But the fact that Deuteronomy 1—3 is much shorter than its counterpart in Numbers only points to Dtr's selectivity. McKenzie rightly argued that "[o]ne theme, and one theme only, runs through all these passages: the theme that Yahweh is giving Israel the land which he promised to the fathers."\(^{62}\) This theme introduces the events in the prologue: "See, I place the land at your disposal. Go, enter the land that the LORD swore to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to assign to them and to their offspring after them" (1:8).\(^{63}\) The appointment of officials in 1:9-18, which was a response to the population surge, is also consistent with the land theme. The command of 1:8 is repeated at the beginning of the story of the spies in 1:19-46, which is itself concerned with the conquest of the land. Again, the people were not permitted to take the lands of Edom, Moab, or Ammon because they had been allocated to them by the LORD (2:5, 9, 19-22), even as the land of the Amorites was given to Israel (2:24; 3:2). Finally, Moses himself would not enter the good land (3:23-28).\(^{64}\) On the supposition that Dtr only had the non-P texts of Numbers 11—32 before him (a view which I do not hold), Dtr omitted the following accounts that do not concern the land: the rebellion of Miriam and Aaron in 12:1-16; the rebellions of Korah, Dathan and Abiram in 16; the bronze serpent in 21:4-9; Balak and Balaam in 22—24; and apostasy

\(^{61}\) Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 39.


\(^{63}\) See page 33 where I argued (against the views of Van Seters and Römer) that Dtr was responsible for Deut 1:8.

\(^{64}\) McKenzie, "Prologue," 96.
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in Moab in 25:1-5. Two further accounts that are not paralleled in Deuteronomy 1-3 must also be explained. Dtr did not include the defeat of Arad the Canaanite king in 21:1-3 because that account is inconsistent with the commencement of the conquest after the death of the Exodus generation (Deut 1:34-36; 2:14-16). Similarly, Dtr did not include the itinerary of the wilderness wanderings in 21:10-20 because for him the only wilderness wanderings traditions that were of import took place at Kadesh (Deut 1:19-46)—for it was from Kadesh that the people refused to take the land.

This brings us to Deut 2:1-23 and 3:4-20. Similar to my arguments above, the differences between these accounts and the corresponding Tetratauchal accounts may be explained by Dtr's concern with the land. With regard to Deut 2:1-23, whereas Num 20:14-21 has Israel requesting permission from the Edomites to enter their land (20:14-17), in Deuteronomy the LORD instructed Israel to pass through Edom (2:3-4). Again, whereas in Numbers Edom came out against Israel and Israel turned away (20:20-21), in Deuteronomy the Edomites were afraid of Israel (2:4). Similarly, whereas in Num 21:13-20 Israel's Transjordan itinerary is outlined, in Deut 2:9-23 Israel's encounter with Moab and Ammon is similar to that of the previously discussed encounter with Edom. All of these differences can be explained as the result of Dtr's understanding of the conquest. For Dtr nations possessed their lands only because such lands had been allotted to them by the L ORD. This was true of Edom (2:5), Moab (2:9), and Ammon

65 That Dtr was nevertheless familiar with such accounts is evident from the fact that, with the exception of the apostasy in Moab, they are referred to elsewhere in the DtrH: Miriam and Deut 24:9; Dathan and Abiram, and Deut 11:6; the bronze serpent and 2 Kgs 18:4; Balaam and Deut 23:4-6; Josh 13:22; 24:9-10.
66 The wilderness wanderings are only referred to in 1:19a and 2:1.
This was equally true for Israel: just as the Edomites dispossessed the Horites because the LORD willed them to do so (2:9, 12), so Israel later dispossessed the Canaanites in accordance with the will of the LORD (2:12). Because these lands had been allotted to Edom, Moab, and Ammon it followed for Dtr that Israel was prohibited from engaging these peoples in battle (2:5, 9, 12).

The differences between Deut 3:4-20 and Num 32:1-42—passages that concern the apportioning of the Transjordan to the two and a half tribes—can also be explained on the basis of Dtr’s view of the conquest. Whereas in Numbers Moses chastised these tribes for requesting to stay in the Transjordan, the account in Deuteronomy does not mention this conflict and it explicitly states that the LORD had given them the land. As I argued above, for Dtr the conquest commenced not with the crossing of the Jordan, but with the crossing of the Arnon.\(^\text{67}\) Because the Transjordan was a part of the promised land Dtr had no place for a tradition that had Moses chastising the two and a half tribes for wishing to occupy the Transjordan.

### 3. Identifying the Work of Dtr

A perennial difficulty in Deuteronomistic studies is that of distinguishing between Dtr and his sources. Noth argued that although Dtr at times edited his sources, for the most part he was wont to leave them as he found them.\(^\text{68}\) According to Noth, Dtr “spoke in his

---

\(^{67}\) See page 53.

\(^{68}\) *Deuteronomistic History*, 128-33. Most of subsequent scholarship has followed Noth in this regard. Exceptions include Timo Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (AASF B; Helsinki, 1977); Hans-Detlef Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen. Untersuchungen zu*
own person only at certain exceptional points, letting the old traditions speak for
themselves instead. He did so even when these old traditions told of events that did not
fit in with his central ideas. In his analysis of Deuteronomy 1—3, however, Noth
concluded that although Dtr based much of these chapters on the given JE accounts he
freely adapted his sources. With regard to the prologue as a whole, for instance, Noth
concluded that Dtr “at all times related the incidents which he select[ed] from his own
point of view and thus somewhat independently of his source or sources.” More
specifically, although Noth argued that Deut 1:9-18 was taken from Exod 18:13-27 and
Num 11:10-30 he could conclude that Dtr “expresse[d] them in his own way” and
rearranged them. With regard to the account of the spies in Deut 1:19-46 Noth argued
that Dtr “put this whole section in his own words and is responsible for the nuances of
the story.” As for the Transjordan expedition in Deut 2:1-25 Noth concluded that Dtr’s
marked departure from the account concerning Edom in Num 20:14-21 was the result of
his revisionist historiography: “[i]t is obviously better to connect this [the divine
prohibition concerning warfare against Edom] with Dtr’s tendency towards a systematic
theological interpretation of history such as we can clearly see in Deuteronomy 2 and 3”
and that it was Dtr’s contention that Edom was not part of the promised land “that lies
behind Dtr.’s deviation from Num. 20.14-21.” Noth’s conclusions regarding Dtr’s use

---

*Deuteronomistic History,* 128.

*Deuteronomistic History,* 46.

*Deuteronomistic History,* 49.

*Deuteronomistic History,* 50.

*Deuteronomistic History,* 53.
of the JE traditions in the prologue thus stand in marked contrast to his conclusions regarding Dtr’s general procedure through the rest of the DtrH.

The fact is that in one of the only instances where Dtr’s sources are extant we see that he totally reworked them. I argued above, for instance, that as a result of his high view of Moses as well as his concern with wisdom Dtr reformulated the accounts that are given in Exod 18:13-27 and Num 11:10-35 in his rendition of the appointment of officials in Deut 1:9-18. I also argued that Dtr omitted all those texts in Numbers that do not pertain to the land, and that the only wilderness stories that concerned Dtr were those concerning Kadesh because these stories alone pertain to the people’s initial failure to take the land. It follows that the operating assumption in any analysis of the DtrH must not be that Dtr was wont to leave his sources untouched.

Directly related to the manner in which Dtr used his sources is the criterion of Deuteronomistic language, a criterion that scholars have appealed to for determining where Dtr’s sources leave off and where his own work begins. With regard to this criterion Noth stated:

The linguistic evidence remains the most reliable basis ["sicherste Grundlage"] for attributing parts of the various traditions to Dtr. . . . The limited variety of expression has led to frequent repetition of the same simple phrases and sentence constructions, in which the ‘Deuteronomistic’ style is easily recognized. The characteristics of this style, its vocabulary, diction and sentence structure, are, therefore, undisputed; we need not consider them in detail.

---

74 If, as seems likely, Dtr’s source for the account of Deborah’s defeat of Sisera in Judges 4 was the poem of Judges 5, then we have another instance in which Dtr’s source is extant (see Halpern, First Historians, 76-103).
75 In this regard Brettler has rightly stated that “Noth’s understanding is fundamentally flawed” (Creation of History, 77).
76 Deuteronomistic History, 18.
The fact that Noth rarely used this criterion makes this introductory statement rather curious. In his thorough analysis of Noth's argument from Deuteronomistic language Talstra pointed out that in every instance that Noth appealed to this argument in Deuteronomy he was referring to putative interpolations in Dtr's work;77 and that this argument is rarely used elsewhere in Noth's work.78 Talstra rightly concluded that “[t]he characterization ‘sicherste Grundlage’ seems a somewhat bold assertion” and that this argument “does not have the decisive importance which Noth awards to it at the beginning of his study.”79

If Noth can be criticized for failing to use the ostensibly compelling criterion of Deuteronomistic language, much of subsequent scholarship can be criticized for failing to address the limitations of this criterion adequately. Such limitations are evident from the lack of agreement among scholars concerning Deuteronom(ist)ic language in the Tetrateuch. Though there is some measure of agreement over the identification of texts in the Tetrateuch which include Deuteronom(ist)ic language, to date there is no consensus concerning the nature and extent of such language. A distinction cannot be made between proto-Deuteronom(ist)ic and Deuteronom(ist)ic language, or between Deuteronom(ist)ic and post-Deuteronom(ist)ic language. Similarly, there is nothing approaching a consensus over the extent of Deuteronom(ist)ic language in the Tetrateuch

79 Solomon's Prayer, 25, 32.
or even in the DtrH itself. Can a distinction be made between the language used by Dtr, DtrD, DtrG, DtrP, DtrN, or other putative redactions? Is it possible to distinguish between the language of such redactions and the sources that were redacted? Again, judging from the diversity of opinion in the latter part of the twentieth century, at present the answer to such questions is No; and the criterion therefore has limited value. This contention is readily supported by the above analysis of the prologue to Deuteronomy. If the Tetrarchal accounts were not extant it would be impossible to identify Dtr's source material, for in the dozens of instances in which Dtr cited the Tetrarch he did so without creating any disjunctions.

Another limitation of the criterion of Deuteronom(ist)ic language is that context determines the selection of words. Weinfeld listed more than two hundred terms, word

---


81 See the survey of scholarship by Talstra, Solomon's Prayer, 68-78. See also the remarks of Steven L. McKenzie in this regard as well as the scholarship to which he refers ("The Books of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History," in The History of Israel's Traditions. The Heritage of Martin Noth [eds. Steven L. McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham; JSOTSS 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994] 299, 301-302).


83 Cf. Halpern, First Historians, 194-96.
pairs, and phrases that recur in the DtrH. Yet he could state that "[o]nly those recurrent phrases that express the essence of the theology of Deuteronomy can be considered ‘deuteronomic.’" The force of the criterion of Deuteronom(ist)ic language for the identification of any text is thus contingent on the degree to which such a text expresses the theology of Deuteronomy. Moreover, it is reductionistic to suppose that every Deuteronomistic text must express “the theology” of Dtr. Contending that those narratives that do not use Deuteronomistic language cannot be Deuteronomistic thus amounts only to a non sequitur, for they simply pertain to matters that are not expressly theological. The contention that context determines the selection of words is no more evident than in the prologue to Deuteronomy, for although the prologue is rightly attributed to Dtr it contains a paucity of so-called Deuteronomistic language. Only thirteen examples from Weinfeld’s list are present in the prologue, and four of these thirteen examples cannot be regarded as uniquely Deuteronomistic: one of the thirteen examples includes the phrase “he followed the LORD fully” (בַּלָּא אָדָרְיָהוּ) in Deut 1:36, which also occurs in Num 32:12 and is one of Dtr’s many citations of the Tetrateuch in the prologue; three of the thirteen examples occur outside the DtrH; and only the remaining nine examples consist of lexical data that are unique to the DtrH.

84 Weinfeld, Deuteronomic School, 3.
85 The thirteen examples come in the following sections of Weinfeld’s list: III 16; V 19; VI 4, 8, 10-13, 15-16, 16a; VII 2a, 9; VIII 4.
86 VI 11, 13; VIII 4.
87 III 16; VI 8, 10, 12, 15, 16, 16a; VII 2a, 9.
Other uniquely Deuteronomistic terms were not used by Dtr in the prologue simply because it was not amenable to the context.\textsuperscript{88}

The fact, then, that there is no consensus concerning the nature and extent of Deuteronom(ist)ic language and that context determines word selection lessens the force of the criterion of Deuteronomistic language. This is not to say that the criterion is without value, only that it rarely furnishes the definitive conclusions that some are wont to credit it with. Consequently, in my analysis of the parallel narratives in the following chapters I will not use the criterion of Deuteronomistic language. Rather, in keeping with the nature of this thesis the criterion that I will use in the identification of Deuteronomistic texts is the use of Tetratheuchal accounts. That is to say, because there is a marked consistency between the use of the Tetratheuch in the prologue and the Former Prophets, as well as among the Former Prophets themselves, it is best to conclude that Dtr was responsible for the given parallels.

At this point it is important to define my understanding of the extent of Dtr's work within the DtrH. In spite of the many challenges to Noth's thesis of a DtrH, in my

\textsuperscript{88} Lyle Eslinger makes a similar argument with regard to Solomon's prayer of 1 Kings 8, a passage which the majority of scholars have regarded as Deuteronomistic (see the review of scholarship by Gary N. Knoppers, "Prayer and Propaganda: Solomon's Dedication of the Temple and the Deuteronomist's Program," \textit{CBQ} 57 [1995] 229-30 nn. 4 and 5): M. Weinfeld's comprehensive catalogue of deuteronomic phraseology lists 59 entries falling within the verses that constitute Solomon's prayer in 1 Kgs 8. Oddly, if one were to accept the notion that it is the narrator (redactor) who shares the deuteronomic (more properly Mosaic) ideology in vv. 1-11 and vv. 62-66, the narratorial exposition that brackets the prayer, Weinfeld's indices record only one instance of deuteronomic phraseology in v. 5, which is itself an anomalous usage (Weinfeld 1972: 326). Solomon waxes more deuteronomic than the deuteronomist himself.
mind his contention that a single hand from the exile was responsible for compiling and redacting Deuteronomy—2 Kings remains the most plausible explanation.\(^9\)

Nevertheless, according to Noth Dtr’s principal task in the creation of his history was that of selecting and compiling disparate sources, and Noth’s attribution of authorial status to Dtr is therefore inconsistent with his conclusions. Consistent with my conclusions regarding Dtr’s use of Tetrateuchal accounts in the prologue to Deuteronomy, my working assumption throughout this thesis is that Dtr reworked his sources—an assumption that is readily supported by the marked continuity between the ways in which both the prologue to Deuteronomy and the given narratives in the Former Prophets make use of Tetrateuchal accounts.\(^9\)

4. CONCLUSION

The conclusions that I arrived at in this chapter set the stage for the subsequent chapters. First, I concluded that in every instance where the prologue corresponds to an account in the Tetrateuch the Tetrateuchal account is primary.\(^9\) This conclusion will support my contention that Dtr was responsible for drawing the parallels shared by narratives in the Tetrateuch and the DtrH.


\(^9\) For an analysis of the sources that Dtr may have used see Halpern, First Historians, 207-18.

\(^9\) Num 21:33-35 and Deut 3:1-3 are not exceptions to this as I argued that Dtr was responsible for both of them.
Second, I argued that Dtr freely adapted and reformulated the given Tetrarchal accounts in accordance with his concerns, as is evident from Dtr's high view of Moses, his emphasis on wisdom, his use of the Exodus story, and his concern with the conquest and the land. The fact that these concerns are also present in those narratives in the Former Prophets which were based on Tetrarchal accounts supports my contention that Dtr (rather than his putative sources) was responsible for such parallels. As I stated earlier, Dtr's use of the Tetrarch in the prologue to Deuteronomy is thus the Archimedean point by which the nature of the parallels in the Former Prophets can be determined. Because there is a marked consistency between Dtr's use of the Tetrarch in the prologue and the use of Tetrarchal narratives in the Former Prophets, Dtr rather than his sources must be regarded as the creator of the parallel features between narratives in the Former Prophets and narratives in the Tetrarch.

Third, in section three of this chapter I argued on the basis of my analysis of the prologue that it is impossible to distinguish between Dtr and his sources with any degree of certainty because Dtr extensively reworked his sources, because there is no consensus among scholars regarding the nature and extent of Deuteronom(ist)ic language, and because context determines the selection of words. Consistent with these conclusions, in the chapters to follow I will not concern myself with distinguishing Dtr's sources from his own work. Rather, when the given narratives exemplify features that are common to the prologue I will conclude that such features are the work of Dtr.

Finally, the above analysis of the prologue suggests that the Tetrarchal accounts on which Dtr depended in Deuteronomy 1—3 may have already been brought
together by Dtr’s time. This is evident from the fact that Dtr based his accounts not only on the synoptic Tetrateuchal accounts in Exodus 18 and Numbers 11—32, but also on various other Tetrateuchal accounts as well. As for the Patriarchal narratives, Dtr cited Gen 22:17 in Deut 1:10-11. With regard to the Exodus story Dtr cited Exod 10:27 and 13:15 in 2:30; Exod 13:21 in 1:30, 32-33; Exod 15:11, 16-17 in 3:24-25; and Exod 15:14 in 2:25. The fact that Dtr relied on various P texts also supports this conclusion (I noted that Dtr cited Num 13:26 in 1:25; Num 14:29 in 1:29; Num 14:31 in 1:39; and Num 20:1 in 1:46).92 There has been a growing trend among scholars to argue that although P may consist in part of an independent source or sources, it presupposes knowledge of and interacts with non-P accounts.93 That Dtr cited various P texts therefore suggests that by his time some form of the Tetrateuch was already in existence. Similarly, the contention that Dtr made use of a Tetrateuch is supported by the way in which Dtr assumed knowledge of the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts. This is particularly evident from Deut 1:34-38 which presupposes knowledge of the stories concerning Caleb and Joshua. Finally, as a perusal of all the verbal parallels shows, the fact that Dtr freely cited the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts without being concerned about the order in which they occur in the Tetrateuch suggests that this Tetrateuch was stamped indelibly on his

mind. These conclusions will provide the working framework for the subsequent chapters for I will contend that Dtr recounted his nation’s past through the lens of his Tetrateuch.

93 See the review of scholarship in Philip J. Budd, *Leviticus* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 5-12.
CHAPTER TWO

DTR'S USE OF TETRATEUCHAL NARRATIVES IN JOSHUA AND JUDGES

Similar to Dtr’s use of Tetrateuchal accounts in Deuteronomy 1—3, in the Former Prophets Dtr freely adapted the paradigms afforded by Tetrateuchal accounts. In this chapter I will analyze Joshua and Judges together because they provide a contrast between the different ways in which Dtr made use of Tetrateuchal accounts: whereas Dtr used Tetrateuchal accounts in Joshua in order to complement his positive depiction of Joshua and the generation that he led, he used Tetrateuchal accounts in Judges in order to underline his negative depiction of the period of the judges. After outlining and discussing such parallels I will turn to the remaining parallel narratives, that is, those that are only the product of Dtr’s familiarity with the given Tetrateuchal accounts.

1. PARALLEL NARRATIVES IN JOSHUA

As with every analysis of extensive parallels, I will first outline the parallels shared between Tetrateuchal accounts and Joshua. I will then defend the proposed direction of dependence; and I will conclude with a discussion of Dtr’s purpose in drawing the parallels.

1.1 Moses, Joshua, and Their Generations

1.1.1 The Parallels

There are four parallel accounts between the Tetrateuchal Moses and the depiction of Joshua in Joshua 1—5. First, both Numbers 13 and Joshua 2 concern the
sending of men to scout the promised land. (1) As Moses “sent” (יָדַע) the spies who were to “see” (וַתָּרַא) “the land” (הָעָרָמִים) and “the cities” (דְּרוֹמָה) in Num 13:17-19, so Joshua “sent” (נָסַל) the spies to “see the land and Jericho” (רַבָּתָם אָמְרָהוֹת) in Josh 2:1. (2) Accordingly, in both accounts the men journeyed to a city: Hebron in Num 13:22 and Jericho in Josh 2:1. (3) Following this the spies “reported to” (וַיְסָפְרוּ לָהוֹן) their findings (Num 13:27-29; Josh 2:22). (4) Finally, whereas the men in Numbers 13 negatively reported that the people could not succeed in taking the land (Num 13:31-33), the spies of Joshua 2 positively reported that the L ORD had delivered all the land into their power (Josh 2:24).

Second, there is the parallel between the crossing of the Sea (Exodus 14—15) and the crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 3—4), a connection that Joshua explicitly drew: “For the L ORD your God dried up the waters of the Jordan before you until you crossed, just as (כָּבָּד) the L ORD your God did to the Sea of Reeds, which he dried up for us until we crossed” (4:23). More specifically, the two accounts share the following parallels. (1) According to Exod 15:8 the waters of the Sea of Reeds stood up like a “heap” (רֵין); similarly, according to Josh 3:13, 16 the waters of the Jordan became a single “heap” (רֵין). Apart from these three instances this term occurs elsewhere only in Ps 78:13, where it also concerns the piling up of the Sea of Reeds.1 (2) In both instances the body of water became “dry ground” (זָרֵחּ) (Exod 14:21 [cf. 14:22, 29]; Josh 3:17). (3) In

---

each case the waters then returned to their normal course (Exod 14:27; Josh 4:18). (4) Like the deliverance from Egypt, the crossing of the Jordan took place on the tenth day of the first month (Josh 4:19; Exod 12:1-3, 41, 51). (5) Each account represents the point at which the people placed their confidence in their leader: after the crossing of the Sea “the people believed in the LORD and in Moses his servant” (Exod 14:31); and in Josh 3:7 the LORD stated, “this day I will begin to exalt you before all Israel that they might know that just as (יָשָׁהּ) I was with Moses so I will be with you” (cf. 4:14). 

(6) Finally, in each instance the reaction of the nations is similar. As the peoples of Edom, Moab and Canaan were gripped with fear by the crossing of the Sea, so the kings on both sides of the Jordan “lost heart and no spirit was left in them” because of the crossing of the Jordan (Exod 15:15-16; Josh 5:1).²

Third, in Exod 12:43-50 Moses commanded that people be circumcised prior to participating in the Passover, which finds a close parallel in Josh 5:2-12 where Joshua also had the Israelites circumcised before participating in the Passover. The reference in Josh 5:2 to the circumcision at Gilgal as the “second” circumcision makes this parallel explicit. For Dtr the first circumcision took place just prior to the Exodus (Exod 12:48-50), as is evident from Josh 5:5 where he contrasted the two circumcisions: “Now whereas all the people who came out of Egypt had been circumcised, none of the people born after the Exodus, during the desert wanderings, had been circumcised.”³ Moreover,

² For further parallels between the latter half of the Song of the Sea and Deuteronomistic literature see page 50.
³ Consistent with this is the fact that the Exodus from Egypt marked the birth of the nation for Dtr (see page 33). That Dtr did not regard the first circumcision as that of Abraham and his family in Genesis 17 is evident from “the second circumcision of the
consistent with the first Passover celebration "the Israelites offered the Passover sacrifice on the fourteenth day of the month, toward evening" (Josh 5:10; cf. Exod 12:6, 18).

Fourth, Joshua's meeting of the captain of the LORD's host in Josh 5:13-15 is reminiscent of Moses' encounter with the angel of the LORD in Exod 3:1-5. In each case the protagonist confronted an angelic being who said, "Remove your sandal(s) from your foot (feet) for the place where you stand is holy (ground)." Moreover, the accounts have similar functions: the Exodus account prefaces the promise of deliverance from Egypt and the Joshua account prefaces the promise of conquest of Jericho; and each account functions as a divine guarantee of deliverance/conquest insofar as through the respective angelic encounters the protagonists were assured that the LORD would be the principal agent of their success.  

sons of Israel" (v. 2). Of the roughly 900 times that the term "Israel" occurs in the DtrH it never refers to the people prior to the conquest. Rather, the DtrH always refers to the pre-conquest generations as the "fathers" (roughly eighty times).

The differences between the MT and the LXX in Josh 5:2-6 merit discussion. The LXX of Josh 5:2-6, which, unlike the MT, does not refer to a "second" circumcision (v. 2), and which states that not all of the Exodus generation was circumcised (v. 5), is likely a better representation of the original account than the MT's version for there is no reason why the LXX's Vorlage would have omitted such material (cf. A.G. Auld, "Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts," in Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament [VTSup XXX; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979] 8-10). However, because the MT's version contains a number of Deuteronomistic features it is tenable to conclude that the LXX's account is pre-Deuteronomistic, perhaps even the tradition which was Dtr's source. The reference to a second circumcision is consistent with Dtr's concern to pattern the conquest story after the Exodus story (v. 2). Only the MT states that "all the men of war died" (v. 4), which is consistent with Deut 2:14-16 where we read the same thing. Finally, whereas the LXX states that the wilderness travels lasted for forty-two years, consistent with Deut 1:3 and 2:14 the MT states that such travels lasted for forty years (v. 6).

4 The Exodus account is represented by the bracketed reading.
5 Joshua's encounter with the angelic being also shares a striking verbal parallel with Balaam's encounter with the angel of the LORD. As Balaam's ass saw the angel of the
Other parallels between Moses and Joshua include the following. (1) As Moses set up twelve pillars “for the twelve tribes of Israel” (Exod 24:4), so Joshua had twelve stones removed from the Jordan “corresponding to the number of the tribes of Israel,” which he set up in the middle of the Jordan (Josh 4:7-9). (2) Joshua’s intercession on behalf of Israel after its defeat at Ai is reminiscent of Moses’ intercession on behalf of Israel after the spies swayed the people with their unfavorable report: “When the Canaanites and all the inhabitants of the land hear of this, they will turn upon us and wipe out our very name from the earth. And what will you do about your great name?” (Josh 7:9); “When the Egyptians, from whose midst you brought up this people in your might, hear the news, they will tell it to the inhabitants of that land. . . . If then you slay this people to a man, the nations who have heard your fame will say, ‘It must be because the LORD was powerless to bring that people into the land’” (Num 14:13-16). (3) As Moses held out the rod of God until the Amalekites were defeated, so Joshua held out his sword until the forces of Ai were exterminated (Exod 17:8-13; Josh 8:18-19, 26). (4) As the LORD hardened Pharaoh’s heart that Moses might defeat the Egyptians, so he hardened the hearts of the Northern kings that Joshua might defeat them (Exod 4:21; 9:12; 10:20, 27; 11:10; 14:4, 8; Josh 11:20). Significantly, these are the only instances in which the LORD is the agent of the verb הגדיל with לְבָּרוּ as the object.⁶

1.1.2 The Direction of Dependence

Three arguments may be adduced in support of the proposed direction of dependence. The first argument concerns the criterion of cross reference. As with other accounts in the DtrH, in Joshua 1—5 Dtr invited comparisons with the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts by means of cross-references. This is true of the explicit comparisons between Moses and Joshua. In 1:17 the Transjordan tribes stated that they would obey Joshua "just as" יְהוָה their God be with you just as יְהוָה Moses and they declared "only may the LORD your God be with you just as יְהוָה he was with Moses." Similar to this is 3:7 where the LORD stated to Joshua that he would exalt him before all Israel "so that they shall know that I will be with you just as יְהוָה I was with Moses." A notice of the fulfillment of this promise comes in 4:14: "On that day the LORD exalted Joshua in the sight of all Israel, so that they revered him all his days just as יְהוָה they had revered Moses" (cf. 11:15). Another cross-reference pertains to the parallel between the crossings of the Sea and the Jordan: "For the LORD your God dried up the waters of the Jordan before you until you crossed, just as יְהוָה the LORD your God did to the Sea of Reeds, which he dried up before us until we crossed" (4:23). Such cross-references suggest that Dtr was reliant on the given Tetrateuchal accounts. Finally, there is a cross-reference to the Exodus story. In her speech to the spies Rahab stated, "for we have heard how the LORD dried up the waters of the Sea of Reeds" (2:10). As elsewhere, Dtr

evidently had Rahab make this declaration because he wanted to aid the reader in
drawing the connection between the Exodus and conquest stories.

The second argument in support of the proposed direction of dependence
concerns the criterion of assumed knowledge. Dtr's reference to the circumcision at
Gilgal as the “second circumcision” (5:2) assumes knowledge of what was in his mind
the first circumcision, Exod 12:43-50. Similarly, the statement of the captain of the
LORD's host in 5:14, “Now (יָדַע) I have come”—which precedes the battle against
Jericho—is the fulfillment of Exod 33:2 where the LORD promised to send an angel
before Israel to drive out the inhabitants of Canaan. Finally, in Josh 5:11-12 Dtr
emphasized the point that on the day following the celebration of the Passover, which
took place four days after having crossed the Jordan (cf. Josh 4:19 and 5:10), the divine
provision of manna ceased. This assumes knowledge of Exod 16:35, “And the Israelites
ate manna forty years, until they came to a settled land; they ate the manna until they
came to the border of the land of Canaan.”

The third argument comes with the criterion of multiple occurrence. In the
previous chapter I showed that in Deut 1:34-36, 39 and 2:14-16 Dtr assumed knowledge
of the account of the spies in Numbers 13—14. It is therefore reasonable to conclude
that because Joshua 2 also shares parallels with Numbers 13—14 it too was based on this

---

7 The criterion of source criticism therefore also supports the proposed direction of
dependence as Exod 12:43-50 is usually assigned to P (for a review of scholarship see
Durham, Exodus, 170-71).
8 Cf. 2 Kgs 19:25 where this adverb is also used with reference to the fulfillment of an
earlier divine decree: “Have you not heard? Of old I planned that very thing. I designed
it long ago. Now (יָדַע) I have fulfilled it.”
account. Similarly, because the reference to the death of those who heeded the counsel of the spies in Josh 5:4-6 assumes knowledge of Deut 1:34-36, 39 and 2:14-16 (passages which assume knowledge of Numbers 13—14) it is tenable to conclude that Dtr was also dependent on Numbers 13—14 for Josh 5:4-6.

Further arguments concern the criterion of Deuteronomistic tendency. Because the parallels between Moses and Joshua are consistent with Dtr's concern elsewhere, it is best to conclude that Dtr was responsible for such parallels. I argued in chapter one that Dtr was concerned to present Moses more positively than the depiction of him provided by the Tetrateuch. Consistent with this is the presentation of Joshua as a new Moses. A similar argument from the criterion of Deuteronomistic tendency concerns the parallels that Dtr drew between the Deuteronomic Moses and Josiah, which I outlined in the introduction. Because Dtr's patterning of Josiah after the Deuteronomic Moses is consistent with the parallels between Moses and Joshua, it is again reasonable to conclude that Dtr was also responsible for the parallels that exist between Moses and Joshua.

1.1.3 The Purpose of the Parallels

Although all the parallels discussed above concern events in the lives of Moses and Joshua, some of them also pertain to the respective generations that were under their leadership. This is true of the parallels pertaining to the spies, the crossing of the Jordan, and the circumcision and Passover. In the following paragraphs I will first argue that Dtr's purpose in drawing the parallels was to present Joshua as a new Moses. I will then
contend that Dtr also sought to present the generation that was under Joshua as a new, obedient Israel.

As elsewhere, Dtr's purpose in drawing the parallels between Moses and Joshua may be determined from an analysis of the context in which they appear. A central teaching of Deuteronomy is that the prosperity of the nation was contingent on its fidelity to the Mosaic teaching. This is particularly evident from the blessings and curses of Deuteronomy 28 as well as from Moses' concluding remarks concerning his teachings: "This [teaching] is not a trifling thing for you: it is your very life; through it you shall long endure on the land that you are to possess upon crossing the Jordan" (32:47). Deuteronomy thus sets the stage for the subsequent history insofar as each generation or era in the DtrH was judged on the basis of the degree to which it was faithful to the Mosaic teaching. Significant for our purposes, as the leader of the post-Mosaic generation Joshua was wholly faithful to the teaching of Moses. This is already anticipated in the LORD's first speech to Joshua in 1:7-8:

But you must be very strong and resolute to observe faithfully all the Teaching that my servant Moses enjoined upon you. Do not deviate from it to the right or to the left, that you may be successful wherever you go. Let not this teaching depart from your lips, but recite it day and night, that you may observe faithfully all that is written in it. Only then will you prosper and only then will you be successful.9

9 Some have argued that the seemingly redundant 1:7-9 was interpolated (e.g., Norbert Lohfink, "Die deuteronomistische Darstellung des Übergangs der Führung Israels von Moses auf Josua," Scholastik 37 [1962] 36-38; Noth, Deuteronomistic History, 62 n.1; cf. Alexander Rofé, "The Piety of the Torah Disciples at the Winding-Up of the Hebrew Bible: Josh 1:8; Ps. 1:2; Isa 59:21," in Bibel in Jüdischer und Christlicher Tradition [Frankfurt am Main: Hain, 1993] 78-85). However, the terminology used in 1:7-8 suggests that these verses are Deuteronomistic: these verses bear a close resemblance to Dtr's interpolation in Deut 17:18-19 (see page 17, footnote 38), and the motif of not
In accordance with this are the many instances in which Joshua carried out earlier commands of Moses. In Numbers 32 and Deut 3:18-20 Moses commanded the Transjordan tribes to aid the Cisjordan tribes in the conquest before settling in the Transjordan, a command that Joshua reiterated in Josh 1:12-15. That Joshua was carrying out the command of Moses is made explicit by Joshua’s introductory statement, “Remember what Moses the servant of the LORD enjoined upon you” (1:13). Dtr also made this explicit by the people’s response, “We will obey you just as (בְּמֶלֶךְ) we obeyed Moses” (1:17). Again, in Deuteronomy 27—28 Moses commanded the people to construct an altar on Mount Ebal and recite a series of blessings and curses from Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal respectively, a command that Joshua fulfilled in Josh 8:30-35. As with the previous example, in this instance Dtr made the connection explicit: “There was not a word of all that Moses had commanded that Joshua failed to read in the presence of the entire assembly of Israel” (8:35). In Deut 20:16-18 the LORD commanded Moses “everything that breathes shall not live” (לֹא חֲזֹרָה כלֶלֶכֶת השם). In fulfillment of this Joshua killed the inhabitants of Hazor: “nothing that breathed remained” (לֹא נָהַר חֲזֹרָה הטָּמֵת; 11:11 [cf. v. 14]). Again, Dtr made the connection explicit: “Just as (בְּמֶלֶךְ) the LORD had commanded his servant Moses, so Moses had charged Joshua, and so Joshua did; he left nothing undone of all that the LORD had

turning to the right or the left with reference to the Torah occurs elsewhere only in the DtrH (see page 17). It is therefore best to conclude that 1:7-8 was composed by Dtr.  

10 Cf. Deut 31:11. 

11 Significantly, the phrase כלֶלֶכֶת השם occurs elsewhere only in 1 Kgs 15:29.
commanded Moses” (11:15). In Deut 9:1-3 the LORD promised Israel that they would dispossess the Anakites, and in Josh 11:21-22 Israel wiped out the Anakites from the land. As elsewhere, Dtr recalled the Deuteronomic promise: “Thus Joshua conquered the whole country just as (וד חכמה) the LORD had promised Moses” (11:23). In fulfillment of Num 34:13, in Josh 14:1-2 Dtr introduced the section regarding the allotment to the nine and a half tribes with the standard “just as (וד חכמה) the LORD had commanded through Moses.” In Deut 19:1-10 (cf. Num 35:9-15) Moses commanded the people to set aside cities of refuge, and in Joshua 20 Joshua set them aside “as (וד חכמה) [the LORD] had spoken through Moses” (20:2). Finally, in Num 35:1-8 the LORD had commanded Moses to have cities set aside for the Levites, and in Josh 21:1-40 this was fulfilled by Joshua. As in all of the other instances Dtr made the connection explicit: “so the Israelites, in accordance with the LORD’s command (אלים ידיע), assigned to the Levites” the land (Josh 21:3; cf v. 2). In light of these many instances of Joshua’s obedience to Moses it is evident that Dtr’s purpose in drawing the above parallels was to underline Joshua’s faithfulness in following the Mosaic teachings.

As I stated above, Dtr also sought to present the generation under Joshua as a new, obedient Israel. The first point that I will establish is that Dtr made a clear distinction between the righteous generation under Joshua’s leadership and the preceding and following generations. With regard to the generation under Joshua, as Dtr praised Joshua for his obedience to Moses so he praised Israel for its obedience to Joshua: “the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh went across armed before the Israelites, as Moses had charged them” (Josh 4:12); “they revered [Joshua] just as they
had revered Moses” (Josh 4:14); “the people served the LORD during the lifetime of Joshua and the lifetime of the older people who lived on after Joshua and who had witnessed all the marvelous deeds that the LORD had wrought for Israel” (Judg 2:7). This emphasis on the obedience of the generation under Joshua is highlighted by Dtr’s careful distinction between the generation under Joshua and the following generations: whereas Joshua’s generation “served the LORD” (Judg 2:7), the succeeding generations “did what was offensive to the LORD” (Judg 2:11). Dtr also sought to distinguish the generation under Joshua from the generation under Moses because, like the period of the judges, the generation under Moses was corrupt—as is clear from the account of the spies and the aftermath (Deut 1:19-46). This concern to distinguish these generations is already present in Deut 1:37-39 where Dtr made the point that only the generation under Joshua would see the land (cf. Deut 2:14-16). In light of this concern to distinguish the generation under Joshua from the preceding and following generations, Dtr evidently drew the above parallels in order to present the generation under Joshua as a new Israel: in marked contrast to Num 13:25-33, in Joshua 2 the spies stated the LORD had given all the land into their hands and that the inhabitants of the land were quaking before them (2:24); the crossing of the Jordan marked the birth of a new Israel (3:1-5:1); with the passing of the disobedient generation there came the second circumcision and the celebration of the Passover (5:2-12); and with the appearance of the promised angel the business of conquering Canaan could at last proceed (5:13-15).
1.2 Lot (Genesis 19) and Rahab (Joshua 2, 6)

Embedded within the group of parallels concerning Joshua and Moses there exist striking parallels between the narrative of the two Israelite spies and Rahab in Joshua 2, and the narrative of the visit of the two angels to Lot in Genesis 19.12 (1) As two “angels” (מלאךים; Gen 19:1, 15) arrived in Sodom in the evening, so two spies, who are later referred to as “messengers” (מלאךים; Josh 6:17, 25), arrived in Jericho at night (Gen 19:1; Josh 2:1-2). (2) As the angels entered the house of Lot ( сочета אלוהים), so the spies entered the house of Rahab ( сочета אלוהים) (Gen 19:3; Josh 2:1). (3) As Lot provided lodging for the two angels who were going to spend the night in the “town square” (רומים), so the two spies were hosted by one “Rahab” (רתם) (Gen 19:2-3; Josh 2:1). (4) As the angels “had not yet lain down” (仆ך שคะ), when the men of Sodom came to Rahab’s home, so the spies “had not yet lain down” (仆ך שคะ) when Rahab came up to them on the roof (Gen 19:4; Josh 2:8). Significantly, this phrase only occurs in these two instances. (5) As the men of Sodom said to Lot, “Where are the men who came to you (协作ו אלוהים) tonight? Bring them out to us (תן אלוהים)" (Gen 19:5), so Rahab was commanded, “Bring out the men who came to you” (协作ו אלוהים) (Josh 2:3). (6) Following this, in both instances the demand was denied: the men of Sodom were struck with blindness and Rahab sent the king’s men off in the wrong direction (Gen 19:11; Josh 2:4-5). (7) Both Sodom and Jericho were
subsequently destroyed (Gen 19:23-25; Josh 6:24). (8) Finally, the hosts together with their families were nevertheless spared (Gen 19:15-22; Josh 6:17, 25). More specifically, as the angels seized Lot and his family and “brought him out and left him outside the city” (יִנְצָא וְיִנָּהֳזָתָה בָּהֲדֵה לְצֵרָה), so the spies “brought out [Rahab’s] whole family and left them outside the camp of Israel” (לָלֹּמָהוּ הִרְאוּ) (Gen 19:16; Josh 6:23).

Evidence in support of the proposed direction of dependence is available from Rahab’s confession to the spies:

(9) I know that the LORD has given the country to you, because dread of you has fallen upon us, and all the inhabitants of the land are quaking before you.
(10) For we have heard how the LORD dried up the waters of the Sea of Reeds for you when you left Egypt, and what you did to Sihon and Og, the two Amorite kings across the Jordan, whom you doomed. (11) When we heard about it, we lost heart, and no man had any more spirit left because of you; for the LORD your God is the only God in heaven above and on earth below.

To begin with, there is the criterion of cross-reference: Rahab’s reference to the Exodus in v. 10 is followed in Joshua 3—4 by the crossing of the Jordan, which Dtr patterned after the Exodus story. The criterion of multiple occurrence also supports the proposed direction of dependence at this point. In the previous chapter I argued that Dtr based Deut 2:25 on Exod 15:14. Similar to this is Rahab’s speech in Josh 2:9-10 which shares striking parallels with Exod 15:14-16:

---

12 Some of the following parallels were noted by L. Daniel Hawk, Every Promise Fulfilled: Contesting Plots in Joshua (Louisville, KT: Westminster/John Knox, 1991) 64-65.
13 See page 51.
The fact that Dtr based Deut 2:25 on Exod 15:14 suggests that Dtr was also responsible for the parallels between Josh 2:9-10 and Exod 15:14-16. This contention finds further support from the criterion of Deuteronomistic tendency, for the use of Exod 15:14-16 in Josh 2:9-10 is very similar to the use of Exod 15:14 in Deut 2:25. Like Deut 2:25, Josh 2:9-10 refers to the dread of Israel's enemies upon hearing of Israel (cf. Josh 2:11, 24). Again, similar to Deut 2:24-25 this text in Joshua is used with reference to the imminent conquest of Canaan.  

The proposed direction of dependence is also supported by the criterion of context insofar as this parallel is embedded within several parallels shared between Moses and his generation and Joshua and those whom he led. Because the Joshua accounts were demonstrably based on the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts it is therefore most reasonable to draw the same conclusion in this instance. Finally, the criterion of incongruities also supports the contention that Dtr was responsible for the

---

14 One feature that is present in the speech of Rahab but is not shared by Deut 2:24-25 and 2:30 is that the passages in Deuteronomy do not explicitly refer back to the Exodus story. However, these verses must be understood in light of Deut 1:30, 32-33, which include both verbal parallels with, as well as a cross-reference to, the Exodus story.

Note also the verbal parallel between Deut 4:39 (“for the LORD alone is God in heaven above and on earth below”) and Josh 2:11 (“for the LORD your God alone is God in heaven above and on earth below”) (Hawk, *Every Promise*, 66). This verbal link
parallel. The redundant nature of Josh 2:3 is suggestive of its dependence on Gen 19:5.

The two texts read as follows:

Gen 19:5
Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us.

Josh 2:3
Bring out the men who came to you, who came to your house.

That Josh 2:3 is dependent on Gen 19:5 is probable from its redundancy concerning the arrival of the men to Rahab/Rahab’s house. I would suggest that the redundancy is the result of Dtr’s attempt to pattern his source (which also read that “the men came”) after Genesis 19.

1.3 The Defeat of Coalitions by Abram (Genesis 14) and Joshua (Joshua 10)

The final parallel in Joshua concerns that between Joshua’s defeat of Canaanite kings in Joshua 10 and Abram’s battle against the Mesopotamian kings in Genesis 14.

(1) In both accounts a coalition of kings united against a rebellion (Gen 14:1-9; Josh 10:3-4). (2) Following this there was a capture or impending threat: the Mesopotamian kings captured Lot and the Canaanite kings were poised to defeat the Gibeonites (Gen 14:10-12; Josh 10:5). (3) The hero of the story (Abram, Joshua) then heard of the crisis supports the contention that Dtr was responsible for the given parallels between Exod 15:14-16 and Rahab’s speech.

15 Cf. Trent C. Butler who has argued that the MT at this point represents a conflation of traditions (Joshua [Word Biblical Commentary 7; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983] 26).

16 As in other instances the parallels shared by Genesis 19 and Joshua 2 are only the product of Dtr’s familiarity with the given Tetratauchal account, there being nothing tendentious about them.

17 This analysis is adapted from Greenstein, “Formation,” 168.
and pursued and defeated the coalition (Gen 14:13-16; Josh 10:6-39). (4) The warfare is described similarly in Gen 14:15 and Josh 10:9-10:

Gen 14:15 וַיִּרְדָּהוּ אֵלֶּה לָילה . . . רָכַב . . . וַיִּרְדָּהוּ וַיַּעֲשֵׂהּ לָילה . . . רָכַב . . . וַיִּרְדָּהוּ
and he deployed against them at night . . . and he smote them . . . and he pursued them

Josh 10:9-10 וַיַּרְדָּהוּ אֵלֶּה כָּל לָילה . . . רָכַב . . . וַיִּרְדָּהוּ וַיַּעֲשֵׂהּ כָּל לָילה . . . רָכַב . . . וַיִּרְדָּהוּ
and he came upon them . . . all night . . . and he smote them . . . and he pursued them

Significantly, these are the only instances where יִרְדָּהוּ רָכַב and יִרְדָּהוּ רָכַב appear in a word string. (5) Finally, there is the striking parallel between the phrases “Melchizedek מְלֵךְ זְכָרָא בַּשָּׁם” of Salem” and “Adonizedek אֲדוֹנִ֫י זְכָרָא) of Jerusalem” (Gen 14:18; Josh 10:1, 3). As elsewhere, the source-critical criterion suggests that the account in Joshua was based on the account in Genesis. Though commentators differ over the text’s provenience and the number of literary layers within it, for our purposes it is noteworthy that the majority have argued that the account of Melchizedek in Gen 14:18-20 is an interpolation.18 Significantly, the phrase “Melchizedek of Salem” (Gen 14:18) is a part of the interpolation, while the remaining parallels occur outside the Melchizedek

18 See the discussion in John Van Seters, Abraham in History and Tradition (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975) 299. For a review of scholarship see Westermann, Genesis 12-36, 189-90. Even Wenham, who is generally skeptical of source-critical analyses, could say “[i]t is admittedly strange that with the king of Sodom having been introduced to Abram in v 17, Melchizedek should suddenly appear, bless Abram, receive a tithe, and the king of Sodom say nothing until v 21. On first reading it does look like an insertion” (Genesis 1-15, Word Biblical Commentary 1 [Dallas, TX: Word, 1987] 306).
Because Joshua 10 shares structural and verbal features with more than one layer of Genesis 14 it follows that Joshua 10 is dependent on Genesis 14.

Determining Dtr's purpose for drawing the parallel is not as straightforward as with the previously discussed parallels. Although the parallel may only be the product of Dtr's familiarity with the given Tetrarchial account, it seems more likely that Dtr drew it in order to extol Joshua: not only was Joshua a new Moses but he also shared parallels with Abram.

2. Parallel Narratives in Judges

In marked contrast to the exemplary generation under Joshua is the epoch of the judges in which covenant infidelity reigned supreme. All of the parallels that Dtr drew between Tetrarchial accounts and the book of Judges serve to highlight this negative depiction. The first parallel narrative comes with Moses and Gideon; the second concerns the episode of the spies in Numbers 13 and the migration of the Danites in Judges 18; the third comes with the account concerning Gibeah in Judges 19 and the corresponding account concerning Sodom in Genesis 19; and the fourth concerns the near-sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis 22, which shares parallels both with Jephthah's sacrifice of his daughter in Judges 11 as well as the account concerning Gibeah in Judges 19. In each case Dtr either inverted the parallel afforded by the Tetrarchial accounts, omitted one of its features, or sought to contrast the respective stories—all in order to emphasize the depravity of pre-monarchic Israel, that is, Israel of the period of the judges.
2.1 Moses (Exodus 2—4) and Gideon (Judges 6, 8)

The first parallel is that between Moses and Gideon. As the Egyptians oppressed Israel in the time of Moses and the Israelites "cried out to the LORD," so in the time of Gideon the Midianites oppressed Israel whose "cry" rose up to God (Exod 2:23; Judg 6:6). The connection with the deliverance from Egypt is furthered in Judg 6:8-9 by an unnamed prophet: "I brought you up out of Egypt and freed you from the house of bondage. I rescued you from the Egyptians." (2) The connection between Moses and Gideon is suggested by Gideon's references to the deliverance from Egypt in Judg 6:13, "Where are all his wondrous deeds about which our fathers told us, saying, 'Truly the LORD brought us up from Egypt'?" More specifically, Gideon's reference to "all [the LORD's] wonders" is parallel to the LORD's statement to Moses that he was to smite Egypt "with all [his] wonders" (Exod 3:20). (3) The calls of Moses and Gideon share parallel features. As God said to Moses, "I will send you," so he said to Gideon, "have I not sent you?" (Exod 3:10; Judg 6:14). Again, both Moses and Gideon thought that they were unequal to the task of delivering Israel (Exod 3:12; Judg 6:15) but the LORD nevertheless assured them of his presence. Significantly, the phrase "for I will be with you" of Exod 3:12 and Judg 6:16 only occurs in these two instances. (4) Both Moses and Gideon received signs from the LORD as confirmations that he would grant them success: the LORD gave signs to Moses (Exod

---

19 Many of the following parallels were adapted from Zakovitch, Concept of the Exodus, 67-69; Lillian R. Klein, The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges (JSOTSS 68; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988) 49-69; and Allison, Moses, 28-30. See also A. Graeme Auld, "Gideon: Hacking at the Heart of the Old Testament," VT 39 (1989) 257-67.
4:1-9) and Gideon requested signs from the LORD (Judg 6:36-40). (5) In both instances “the angel of the LORD appeared to him [Moses/Gideon]” (Exod 3:2; Judg 6:12), a phrase that only appears in these two instances (cf. Judg 13:3). (6) Both figures were afraid to look at a theophany: this is true of Moses before the burning bush and Gideon before the angel of the LORD (Exod 3:6; Judg 6:22). (7) Both the father-in-law of Moses and the son of Gideon share the name “Jether” (גֶּרֶת) (Exod 4:18; Judg 8:20).29 (8) Finally, as Moses killed an Egyptian for beating a Hebrew, “his brother” (בְּנוֹ), so Gideon killed Zebah and Zalmunna for killing “my brothers” (אְבֹתּוֹ) (Exod 2:11-14; Judg 8:18-21).

The criterion of literary function supports the proposed direction of dependence. Because the function of the parallel corresponds with the depiction of Gideon in Judges 6—8 it is reasonable to conclude that Dtr was responsible for the parallel. Judges presents Gideon both positively and negatively. Positively, we read that the LORD was with Gideon (6:12, 16); that Gideon was the LORD’s messenger (6:14); that Gideon had found favor in the LORD’s sight (6:17-18); that the spirit of the LORD enveloped Gideon (6:34); that the LORD delivered the camp of Midian into Gideon’s hand (7:9); and that Gideon rejected the invitation to rule, for he only wanted the LORD to rule over Israel (8:22). Negatively, we read that Gideon was afraid to replace the altar of Baal with an altar to the LORD during the day (6:25-27); that he was afraid to attack the Midianite

---

29 Elsewhere Moses’ father-in-law has the name Jethro (גֵּרֶת) (Exod 3:1; 18:1-2, 5-6, 12). Cf. 2 Sam 17:25 where Amasa is the son of Ithra (גָּרֶת) and 1 Chron 2:17 where he is referred to as the son of Jether (גֶּרֶת).
camp (7:10-11); and, most significantly, that he set up an ephod which led Israel astray (8:23-27).²¹

The parallels also present Gideon both positively and negatively. Not unlike the presentation of Joshua as a new Moses, the parallels between Gideon and Moses are suggestive of a positive portrayal of Gideon. However, the positive parallels begin to break down with Gideon’s complaint of Judg 6:13:

*Please, my Lord, if the LORD is with us, then why has all this befallen us? Now where are all his wondrous deeds about which our fathers told us, saying, ’Truly, the LORD brought us up from Egypt’? Now the LORD has abandoned us and delivered us into the hands of Midian!*

I noted above that the LORD’s statement “for I will be with you” (כִּי אֶחְדָּבֵלךָ) occurs only in the divine assurance given to Moses and Gideon (Exod 3:12; Judg 6:16). Whereas this parallel serves to align Gideon with Moses, Gideon’s complaint concerning the absence of the LORD’s presence in Judg 6:13—“if the LORD is with us” (וַיְהִי אֶרֶץ צְדָקָה לָנוּ) should be taken as an inversion on the aforementioned assurance to Moses of Exod 3:12. But the inversion goes much further than what is found in Gideon’s complaint insofar as Dtr patterned Gideon after Moses and then his apostate brother Aaron. I noted above that the presentation of Gideon in Judges 6—8 is both positive and negative. This is no more clear than at the close of the Gideon narrative where the positive 8:22-23 is in marked contrast to the negative 8:24-27: In response to Israel’s request that Gideon rule over them, Gideon stated, “I will not rule over you myself, nor shall my son rule over you; the LORD alone shall rule over you” (8:23). Immediately

²¹ See Klein for the ironic presentation of Gideon (Triumph, 67).
following this pious rejection Gideon requested the earrings of the Israelites, from which he made an ephod which led both Gideon and Israel astray (8:24-27). Consistent with this bizarre transition, the parallels with Moses cease in 8:20-21 and in 8:24-27 Gideon becomes a new, apostate Aaron. (1) As Aaron told the Israelites to take off their rings of gold (נמשל מטבעות; Exod 32:2), so at Gideon's request the Israelites gave him their rings of gold (נמשל אמות; Judg 8:24). (2) As Aaron thereupon made a molten calf from the rings so Gideon made an ephod from the rings (Exod 32:4; Judg 8:27). (3) Finally, in both instances the people then worshiped the molten calf/ephod (Exod 32:8; Judg 8:27). The fact, then, that the transition from parallels with Moses to parallels with Aaron is consistent with the interplay of positive and negative portrayals of Gideon suggests that Dtr was responsible for the parallels.

2.2 The Rebellion of the Spies (Numbers 13—14) and the Migration of the Danites (Judges 18)

As with Joshua 2, the migration of the Danites in Judges 18 share various parallels with the rebellion of the spies in Numbers 13.22 (1) Both the wilderness generation and the Danites were without land (Num 13:2; Judg 18:1). (2) As Moses sent twelve men representing the twelve tribes to scout the land that Israel was to possess, so the Danites sent five men representing their clan to spy out the land prior to seizing it (Num 13:2, 17; Judg 18:2). (3) As the northernmost point of the spies' travels was Rehob (רֶהוֹב), so the northernmost point of the Danites' travels was Beth-rehob (בֵּית-רֶהוֹב).
Drr's Use of Tetratauchal Narratives in Joshua and Judges

Although both the twelve spies and the five Danites gave reports of the land and its inhabitants, whereas the report of ten of the twelve spies was negative, that of the Danites was positive (Num 13:28-29, 31-33; Judg 18:9-10). (5) A final parallel is that whereas the wilderness generation included six hundred thousand men of military age (Num 1:45-46; 2:32; 11:21), the migrating Danites consisted of six hundred men "girt with weapons of war" (Judg 18:11, 16-17).

In terms of the direction of dependence between these accounts, the criterion of multiple occurrence suggests that Dtr was responsible for the parallel. I argued above that Dtr reworked the story of the spies in Numbers 13—14 in Deut 1:6-8, 19-46 in accordance with his concerns. Similarly, I argued that Numbers 13 was Dtr’s basis for the mission of the spies in Joshua 2. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that Dtr was also responsible for the parallels between Numbers 13 and Judges 18.

The criterion of literary function also supports the contention that Dtr based Judges 18 on Numbers 13. The Danites’ failure to take the inheritance that Moses had allotted to them (Judg 1:34; cf. Josh 19:40-48) led them to look for a different land. The Danites’ search in fact led them beyond the boundaries of the promised land, as is evident from the introduction to the narrative: “the tribe of Dan was seeking a territory in which to settle, for to that day no territory had fallen to them in the midst of the tribes of Israel.”

---


23 This play between רָדֹב (のように) is consistent with the parallel which Dtr drew between the messengers’ arrival at the “town square” (דָּרָה) in Gen 19:2-3 and the spies’ arrival to the house of “Rahab” (רַחֲבָּה) in Josh 2:1 (see page 90).
Israel" (18:1). The Danites thus went outside their allotted territory as well as outside Israel in search of a home, and their conquest of Laish consequently underlines their failure to take the territory that was initially allotted to them.

Consistent with this, by patterning Judges 18 after Numbers 13 Dtr effectively presented the migration of the Danites as an inverted conquest. The promised land for the Danites was no longer the land that had been allotted to them but Laish. This is particularly evident from the report of the Danite spies, which is replete with language that is applied elsewhere to the conquest of the promised land:

Let us go at once and attack them! For we have seen the land and it is very good (דָּרָותָה מַעָּלֶה), and you are sitting idle! Don’t delay to go, to enter, and to possess the land (תָּלְשֵׁה אֵת עִצְבָּן). When you come, you will come to an unsuspecting people, for God has given it into your hand (כִּי נַתַּן אלֵיהֶם בִּלְדֵי יְדֹוָה) and the land is spacious (מַעֲשֵׂה יְרָהָה יִרְדָּה) and nothing on earth is lacking there (18:9-10).

The description of Laish as being a very good land is consistent not only with the report of Joshua and Caleb (Num 14:7) but it frequently occurs in Deuteronomy with reference to the promised land (e.g., 1:25, 35; 3:25; 6:18; 8:7, 10; 9:6; 11:17). Similarly, the

---

24 Note that the emphasis is on נַחַל ("territory"), which appears only at the end of the sentence (Robert G. Boling and G. Ernest Wright, Judges [AB 6A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975] 258).

25 Dtr also underscored the illegitimacy of the Danites’ conquest of Laish by emphasizing the innocence of the Laishites over against the militaristic Danites: whereas the Laishites were “dwellings carefree” (בֵּית אָרֶץ לֵבֶן; 18:7) and “tranquil and unsuspecting” (בֵּית סִכָּה בֵּית שְׁכָנָה; 18:7, 27; cf. v. 10), in three instances we read that the Danites were “girt with weapons of war” (Judg 18:11, 16-17; cf. v. 2). Moreover, the Danites broke the Deuteronomic law of warfare: Laish lay outside the promised land (18:1), and according to Deut 20:10-14 the Israelites were to offer such towns terms of peace and if the people of such towns rejected the offer only the men were to be killed—the women, children, and spoil was to be kept. Significantly, there is no mention of such an offer, the people of Laish were put to the sword, and the city was burned (18:27).
Danite spies' statement concerning the breadth of the land is verbally parallel to the LORD's description of the promised land in Exod 3:8, and the hyperbolic "nothing on earth is lacking [in Laish]" is reminiscent of descriptions of the promised land (e.g., Exod 3:8; Num 13:23, 27; Deut 8:7-10). Again, the spies exhorted the Danites "to possess the land," a phrase that occurs elsewhere with reference to the conquest of the promised land (Deut 9:4; 11:31; Josh 1:11; 18:3; Judg 2:6). Finally, the expression that God had "given" the land occurs with reference to the promise of land to the Patriarchs (e.g., Gen 12:7; 15:7, 18; 24:7; 28:13); it occurs in the report of Joshua and Caleb (Num 14:8); and it occurs in Deuteronomy and Joshua with reference to the conquest (Deut 1:25; 3:18, 20; 34:4; Josh 1:11, 13; 21:43). By patterning Judges 18 after Numbers 13, and by having the Danite spies refer to Laish with language which usually applies to the promised land, Dtr thus made the point that the Danite migration to Laish amounted to an inverted conquest.26

---


27 Abraham Malamat concluded that the parallels between Numbers 13 and Judges 18 are due not to literary dependence but to a shared form ("The Danite Migration and the Pan-Israelite Exodus-Conquest: A Biblical Narrative Pattern," *Bib* 51 [1970] 1-16). However, as I will argue below, the fact that the literary function of the parallel exhibits the same features as other parallels between Genesis and Judges supports the contention that Judges 18 was based on Numbers 13.

Also worthy of note are the parallels that Dtr drew between the departure of the Danites from Micah's house and Genesis 31—33. (1) As Jacob placed his herds and flocks ahead of his family in preparation to meet Esau, so the Danites placed "the children, the cattle, and their household goods in front" when they set out from Micah's house (Gen 32:4-22; 33:1-11; Judg 18:21). (2) As Laban pursued Jacob because Jacob had taken Laban's daughters and because Laban's gods were missing, so Micah and his
2.3 The Account of Sodom (Genesis 18—19), and the Outrage at Gibeah and its Aftermath (Judges 19—21)

2.3.1 The Parallels

One of the most extensive parallels between the Tetrateuch and the DtrH comes with the accounts concerning the divine punishment of Sodom in Genesis 18—19 and that of the outrage at Gibeah of Benjamin in Judges 19—21. The two accounts share the following parallels. (1) As Abraham requested the angels to receive his hospitality so the Bethlehemitc urged the Levite to receive his hospitality (Gen 18:1-5; Judg 19:1-9). More specifically, as Abraham “saw” (ראה) the angels and ran “to meet them” (לראות), so the Bethlehemitc “saw [the Levite]” (רואה) and was glad “to meet him” (לראות) (Gen 18:2; Judg 19:3). (2) Shortly thereafter, Lot, who was a resident alien in Sodom (Gen 19:9), urged the angels to “spend the night” (לינה) at his home and wash their feet (_IMAGES_ נלך), even though they expressed the desire to stay “in the town square” (בגרות; Gen 19:1-3). Similarly, the resident alien of Gibeah successfully urged the Levite not to “stay the night in the town square” (אלוהים בגרות) and the Levite and his companions thereupon “washed their feet” (אלוהים נלך) (Judg 19:15-21).

neighbours pursued the Danites because they had taken Micah’s priest and his gods (Gen 31:25-30; Judg 18:22-24). (3) Although Laban/Micah caught up with and confronted Jacob/the Danites, Jacob/the Danites nevertheless kept what they had taken and the parties went their separate ways (Gen 31:25-32:2; Judg 18:23-27). As in other instances, such parallels simply arose from Dtr’s familiarity with the given Tetrateuchal accounts. As I will argue below, Genesis 18 must be included as it too shares parallels with Judges 19, a point that has not been noted in scholarship.
(3) Both Lot and the resident alien provided a feast for the visitor(s) (Gen 19:3; Judg 19:21). More specifically, as Abraham said to the angels “let me fetch a morsel of bread (אזרתנбережן) . . . afterward you may go on (ראזרת Newfoundland),” so the Bethlehemite said to the Levite, “Eat a morsel of bread (אזרתנбережן) and afterward you may go (רואזרת Newfoundland)” (Gen 18:5; Judg 18:5). (4) The arrival of the townsman is described in the same way: “the men of the city” (הוב baraיה) “gathered about/to the house” (Gen 19:4; Judg 19:22). Significantly, this form of קבב occurs only in these two instances. Moreover, קבב occurs as an (in)direct object of קבב only in these two verses, Judg 20:5 (which refers back to Judges 19) and 2 Sam 14:24. (5) The townsman then demanded that the host “bring out” (hiphil of יבוא) the men/man “who came to” (acak רום לאצלאך) the host in order that they might have sex with them/him (עשת in a purpose clause) (Gen 19:5; Judg 19:22). 29 (6) The host then “went out to them” (רוצאת אצלאך) to dissuade them, after which he stated, “Please, my friends, do not commit such a wrong” (Gen 19:6-7; Judg 19:23). (7) The host’s proposed solution to the dilemma is the same in each account: he introduced his proposal with the particle תנה and thereupon offered two female relations (Lot’s daughters/the host’s daughter and the Levite’s concubine) in place of the visitor(s). The host said that he would “bring out” (לא잣ראים) the women/woman and the townsman could do whatever they wished to them (המלש). 29

29 Dtr also used the phrase לאRecyclerView in his patterning the story of Rahab (Josh 2:3) after Genesis 19 (see page 90).
The townsmen, however, were not to harm the visitor(s) (Gen 19:8; Judg 19:24). (8) The townsmen thereupon refused the host’s offer (Gen 19:9; Judg 19:25). (9) The visitor(s) then acted to bring resolution to the conflict: the angels struck the townsmen with blindness and the Levite pushed his concubine out to the rapacious crowd (Gen 19:10-11; Judg 19:25). (10) On the following morning the visitor(s) left the city (Gen 19:15-22; Judg 19:26-28). (11) As the LORD destroyed Sodom for its sin so Israel destroyed Gibeah for the rape of the concubine (Gen 19:12-29; Judges 20).

(12) Finally, Lasine rightly noted that in both cases there are “bizarre attempts at ‘repopulation’” of the given people. In Gen 19:30-38 the two daughters of Lot were concerned about their progeny so they deceptively made their father drunk and had intercourse with him. Similarly, in Judges 21 the Israelites were concerned that a tribe of Israel was close to extinction so they deceptively had the surviving Benjaminites seize the girls of Shiloh for themselves.

---

30 The departure of the angels is implicit in 19:22.
31 “Guest,” 40.
32 Two verbal links which, unlike all the above parallels do not occur in the same place in the narratives, include “Pray, turn aside” of Gen 19:2 and “Come pray, let us turn aside” of Judg 19:11; and “He implored them/him” of Gen 19:3 and Judg 19:7 (Greenstein, “Formation,” 169-70).

2.3.2 The Direction of Dependence

Some scholars have argued for the primacy of Judges 19 over Genesis 19. Westermann, for instance, contended that "if one can speak of priority here, and this is questionable, then it falls to Judg 19." His primary reason for this conclusion is that Judg 19:15-25 is an integral part of Judges 19—20. Similarly, Niditch has argued that Judg 19:10-30 requires the preceding episode to explain how the Levite had found himself in Gibeah and that the rape at Gibeah was the motivation for the civil war that followed in chapter 20.

Two points in response are in order. First, the close relationship between Judg 19:15-25 and its context is only typical of Dtr's tendency to integrate the paradigms afforded by Tetratuchal accounts into his history, a point that is wholly consistent with my conclusions regarding Dtr's use of Tetratuchal accounts in Deuteronomy 1—3. Second, both Westermann and Niditch have wrongly presupposed that Gen 19:1-11 is not as closely related to its context as the episode in Judges 19 is to its context.

Wenham, for instance, has rightly argued that Gen 18:16-19:29 is a palistrophe:

---

33 Westermann, *Genesis* 12-36, 300.
34 Niditch, "The 'Sodomite' Theme," 376.
Abraham's visitors look toward Sodom (18:16)

Divine reflections on Abraham and Sodom (18:17-21)

Abraham pleads for Sodom (18:22-33)

Angels arrive in Sodom (19:1-3)

The Sodomites reject Lot's appeal and malign him (19:4-11)

Destruction of Sodom announced (19:12-13)

Lot's sons-in-law reject his appeal and malign him (19:14)

Departure from Sodom (19:15-16)

Lot pleads for himself (19:17-22)

Sodom and Gomorrah destroyed (19:23-26)

Abraham looks toward Sodom (19:27-28)

Significantly, there are also verbal links between the pieces. A and A' use the hiphil of רָאָשׁ (18:16: "the men . . . looked down toward Sodom"; 19:28: "he looked down toward Sodom"). C and C' use וַחֲנוֹן (18:26: "I will forgive the whole place"; 19:21: "I will grant you this favor"), as well as וַתֵּשַׁךְ to describe the destruction of Sodom (18:25, 29, 30; 19:22). D and D' are the only scenes that refer to the visitors as angels (יהוהכָּבֶד) (19:1; 19:15). Finally, E and E' alone state that "Lot went out" (לֹא צָאתוּ).36

Consistent with Wenham's analysis is that of Van Seters, who has also outlined many of the verbal and thematic links between the two chapters.37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis 18</th>
<th>vv</th>
<th>Genesis 19</th>
<th>vv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and he was sitting at the entrance to the tent as the day grew hot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>and Lot was sitting in the gate of Sodom in the evening</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 Wenham argued that the pieces of the narrative also correspond in terms of narrative/monologue/dialogue and geographical position (i.e., from Mamre, to Sodom's gates, to outside Lot's house, to inside Lot's house, and then back outside Lot's house, through the city gate, and back to Mamre). However, he forces his argument at this point (Genesis 16-50, 42-43).

37 Van Seters, Abraham, 215-16; see also Wenham, Genesis 16-50, 48-49.
and he looked and he ran to meet them
and he bowed to the ground
and he said, 'my lords'
if I have found favor in your eyes
please do not go on past your servant
and wash your feet
and recline
then you may go on
since you have come your servant's way
and he took curds and milk and the calf
that he prepared
and he gave it to them and they ate
the outcry of Sodom and Gomorrah is so
and I will see its outcry which has come
to me
will you indeed sweep away the
righteous with the wicked
will you indeed sweep away
I will not destroy

The palistrophic structure as well as the thematic and verbal similarities between these
two chapters, then, is suggestive not of a composite text but of the work of a single
hand. It follows that one cannot argue that because the episode in Judges 19 is integral
to its context it must have primacy, for Gen 19:1-11 is equally integral to its context.

In support of the proposed direction of dependence is the criterion of multiple
occurrence. Because Dtr based Joshua 2 in part on Genesis 19 it is reasonable to

38 See also Robert Ignatius Letellier who, in addition to outlining the structural unity of
these chapters, contends that "time, place and action . . . link the different characters and
conclude that he was also responsible for the parallels between Genesis 18—19 and Judges 19. In further support of this contention is the fact that both Joshua 2 and Judges 19 share parallels with particular terms and phrases in Genesis 19. This is true of Josh 2:3 and Judg 19:22, which both cite Gen 19:5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen 19:5</th>
<th>Josh 2:3</th>
<th>Judg 19:22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EREI HANESHIM&lt;br&gt;ESRABAY ALCH FAMILY&lt;br&gt;HUYAHUM ALCH&lt;br&gt;EYEHU ALCH_FINALS&lt;br&gt;Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us, so that we might know them.</td>
<td>EREI HANESHIM&lt;br&gt;ESRABAY ALCH FAMILY&lt;br&gt;HUYAHUM ALCH&lt;br&gt;Bring out the men who came to you, who came to your house.</td>
<td>EREI HANESHIM&lt;br&gt;ESRABAY ALCH FAMILY&lt;br&gt;HUYAHUM ALCH&lt;br&gt;Bring out the man who came to your house, so that we might know him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The similarity between Gen 19:16, Josh 6:23, and Judg 19:25 also merits attention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHOK HANESHIM_BIRD&lt;br&gt;BEIRASHTO BEIR_YOUTH&lt;br&gt;BAMALOT YOHEUL&lt;br&gt;RISTAH ROHITU LUTFI&lt;br&gt;So the men seized his hand, and the hands of his wife and his two daughters—in the LORD’s mercy on him—and brought him out and left him outside the city.</td>
<td>RICHOK HANESHIM_BIRD&lt;br&gt;BEIRASHTO BEIR_YOUTH&lt;br&gt;BAMALOT YOHEUL&lt;br&gt;So the young spies went in and brought out Rahab, her father and her mother, and all that belonged to her—they brought out her whole family and left them outside the camp of Israel.</td>
<td>RICHOK HANESHIM_BIRD&lt;br&gt;BEIRASHTO BEIR_YOUTH&lt;br&gt;BAMALOT YOHEUL&lt;br&gt;So the man seized his concubine and brought her out to them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also noteworthy are the parallels that both Judges 19 and Joshua 2 share with Genesis 19 in their use of the root דוב: in Gen 19:2-3 the messengers arrived in the “town square” events into a single sequence” (Day in Mamre Night in Sodom. Abraham and Lot in
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(דְּרוֹזֶב); in Judg 19:15 the Levite was urged not to stay the night "in the town square"
(בַּרְדוֹז). The fact that in Genesis 19, Judges 19, and Joshua 2 the use of the root בַּרְدوֹז is accompanied
by several other parallels makes this parallel striking.39

2.3.3 The Direction of Dependence and the Purpose of the Parallels

2.3.3.1 Gibeah as a Superlative Sodom

Another argument in support of the proposed direction of dependence comes with
the criterion of literary effect. The parallels between Judges 19—21 and Genesis 18—19
serve to emphasize the corrupt state of pre-monarchic Israel: out of the ashes of wicked
Sodom pre-monarchic Israel was eventually born. The question that arises is whether
such an aesthetically pleasing function of the parallel is only the result of redaction-
critical happenstance or whether the parallel was drawn by Dtr with the given function in
mind. Three differences between these accounts support the contention that Judges 19—
21 is derivative.

The first and most striking difference between the accounts pertains to divine
intervention. Whereas in the Genesis account the angels intervened to rescue Lot and his
family, in the Judges account divine intervention is noticeably absent and the concubine
was raped and murdered. Significantly, this lack of divine intervention is consistent with

---

39 Note also the use of the root בַּרְדוֹז among the parallels between the Num 13:21 and
Judg 18:28 discussed above: as the northernmost point of the spies' travels was Rehob
(בַּרְדוֹז) so the northernmost point of the Danites' travels was Beth-rehob (בְּהֵרְוָב).
other Deuteronomistic accounts in which the LORD did not intervene or was slow to deliver Israel because of sin. For instance, the LORD did not intervene to bring Israel victory over Ai until the sin of Achan was exposed and dealt with (Joshua 7—8).

Similarly, the relation between the presence of sin and the lack of divine intervention is explicitly drawn in Judg 10:10-14:

Then the Israelites cried out to the LORD, "We stand guilty before you, for we have forsaken our God and served the Baalim." But the LORD said to the Israelites... "You have forsaken me and have served other gods. No, I will not deliver you again. Go cry to the gods you have chosen; let them deliver you in your time of distress."

The fact that Judges 19 is consistent with the motif of the absence of divine intervention where sin is present supports the view that Dtr was responsible for the parallel. Dtr's purpose, then, in omitting this motif in Judges was to make the point that Sodom-like Israel did not merit divine intervention.

A second difference between the accounts concerns the depiction of the hosts. Lasine rightly noted that whereas Lot, in his overblown hospitality, had offered his two virgin daughters, the Levite's host turned Lot's hospitality into inhospitality by offering, in addition to his own virgin daughter, the Levite's concubine. Similarly, unlike the Genesis account, in the Judges account the host explicitly told the townsmen to "violate" (חָגוֹר) the women, a term that is used elsewhere for sexual crimes. In both of these instances the host is thus portrayed more negatively in Judges than in Genesis. The suggestion that the writer of Genesis 19 softened the portrayal of Lot fails, for Lot is

---

41 Gen 34:2; Deut 21:14; 22:24, 29; Judg 20:5; 2 Sam 13:12, 14, 22, 32; Lam 5:11.
portrayed elsewhere as a spineless individual: he chose the plain of the Jordan for himself (13:8-12); he offered his daughters to the men of Sodom (19:8); his sons-in-law regarded him as "one who jests" (19:14); like his sons-in-law he hesitated to leave Sodom (19:16); he pleaded to stay in Zoar rather than in the hill country (19:18-22), but nevertheless eventually left Zoar to live in the hill country (19:30); and he had an incestuous relationship with his daughters (19:30-38)—the same daughters whom he offered to the Sodomites! It follows that the best explanation for the differences between the hosts is that Dtr was responsible for them. This view finds further support from the fact that this portrayal of Lot is consistent with Dtr's negative depiction of pre-monarchic Israel.

A third difference between the accounts comes with the portrayal of the visitor(s). Though the function of the visitors is parallel insofar as in each account they brought resolution to the conflict, the means by which they did so are opposite to each other. In the Genesis account the people rejected Lot’s proposal and sought to make him the object of their depravity, but the angels rescued him by striking the people with blindness (Gen 19:9-11). This stands in contrast to the account in Judges where the host’s proposal was also rejected, but the Levite satisfied the people’s depravity by

---

giving them his concubine (Judg 19:25). 43 More specifically, even the particular actions of the visitors in each account stand opposite to each other. The visitors in Genesis brought deliverance and the visitors in Judges brought death: in rescuing Lot and his family the angels “seized” (רתל) their hands and “sent him” (יירא) out of the city, whereas the Levite “seized” (ךסח) his concubine and “sent” (=User) her to her rape and ultimate death (Gen 19:16; Judg 19:25)! The differences between the visitors is also clear from their final actions. Whereas in their effort to rescue Lot and his family from the coming destruction the angels said “rise (חפ), take (ךפ) your wife” (Gen 19:15), the Levite only commanded his concubine to “rise” (ךפ) after she had died, at which point “he took her” (ךסח; Judg 19:28)! Because these differences are consistent with Dtr’s concern to present pre-monarchic Israel negatively, they too suggest that Dtr was responsible for them.

I have argued that it is tenable to conclude that Dtr was responsible for the given parallels because they complement Dtr’s concern to present Israel negatively. But Dtr did not simply equate Lot’s Sodom with pre-monarchic Israel. Rather, the above differences show that he portrayed pre-monarchic Israel as even more corrupt than Sodom of Lot’s day: Israel was unworthy of divine intervention; the Levite’s host was even more degenerate than his counterpart Lot; and whereas the Levite satisfied the

43 That שָׁם of v. 25 is the Levite is evident from the fact that this is his title throughout the narrative (19:1, 6-7, 9-10, 17, 22-23, 28; 20:4). Whenever שָׁם refers to the host it is qualified either by יִרְאָה (19:17, 20, 22), or בְּנוּל דְּרְבִּי (19:22-23), or אדנֵהָ (19:26).
rapacious crowd, the visiting angels intervened to deliver Lot. In marked contrast to his use of Tetratauchal accounts in Joshua, then, Dtr used Genesis 18—19 in order to underline the wickedness of pre-monarchic Israel.

2.3.3.2 A Caustic Foreshadowing of Saul

Judges 19—21 is multivalent insofar as at the same time that it undermines pre-monarchic Israel it is also a caustic foreshadowing of Saul. In the introduction I argued that Dtr had Saul in mind in Judges 19—21. The concentration of place names that are associated with David and Saul points in this direction: the lavish hospitality that the Levite received from his father-in-law in 19:1-9—who was from Bethlehem of Judah—is contrasted with the wicked reception that he received from the townspeople—Gibeathites of Benjamin. This interplay between Davidic and Saulide centres is also evident from the irony in 19:10-14: the Levite and his concubine would have certainly received better treatment from the non-Israelite Jebusites than the Israeliite Gibeathites. The Levite’s dismemberment of his concubine’s corpse and the call to arms in Judges 19—20 also reminds the reader of Saul, who dismembered the oxen and called the people to arms in 1 Samuel 11. A final feature that is common to the account in Judges

---

44 In this regard Klein rightly argued that “[t]he situation in Genesis is used for parody; it is copied and inverted. The ironic inversions depict the inverted moral condition of Israel, the utter perversity to which the Israelites have sunk” (Triumph, 172), a point that Matthews and Lasine have also made (Victor H. Matthews [“Hospitality and Hostility in Genesis 19 and Judges 19,” BTB 22 [1992] 3-11]; Lasine, “Guest,” 40).

45 The view that the theory of literary dependence does not explain the differences between the accounts (e.g., H.W. Jüngling, Richter 19—Ein Plädoyer für das Königum: Stilistische Analyse der Tendenzerzählung Ri 19, 1-30a; 21:25 [AnBib 84; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1981] 291) fails as the differences may be explained by Dtr’s concern to present pre-monarchic Israel negatively, as I have argued.
and the life of Saul pertains to Jabesh-gilead, for in both accounts Gibeah of Benjamin or Saul had a similar relationship to the people of Jabesh-gilead. There are, then, striking parallels between the Benjaminites of Judges 19—21 and the later depiction of Saul. This brings us back to the parallel between Genesis 18—19 and Judges 19: similar to Dtr’s attempt to portray pre-monarchic Israel negatively by means of the parallel, Dtr presented Gibeah (and therefore Saul) negatively by means of the parallel with Sodom.46

2.4 The Near-Sacrifice of Isaac (Genesis 22), the Outrage at Gibeah (Judges 19), and the Sacrifice of Jephthah’s Daughter (Judges 11)

The parallels between the near-sacrifice of Isaac in Gen 22:1-19 and the outrage in Gibeah in Judges 19 include the following.47 (1) As Abraham took along with him one ass, two servants, and a familial relation (Gen 22:3), so the Levite took along with him two asses, one servant, and a familial relation (Judg 19:10-11). These are the only instances in which there is an enumeration of asses (אָבוֹת לֹא) and servants (קָנָי וַיָּשָׁל תְמָלָה) accompanying a man on a journey. (2) The phrase “the two of them together” (אֵלֶּה הַשָּׁלֵלָה מִצְוָתָם) occurs only in these two narratives. In Gen 22:6, 8 this phrase is used with reference to the journey of Abraham and Isaac and in Judg 19:6 it is used with reference to the meal that the Levite and his father-in-law shared. (3) Both Abraham and the Levite “arose in the morning and went/to go” on their way (Gen 22:3: אֵלֶּה הַשָּׁלֵלָה מִצְוָתָם).

46 For a more detailed treatment of the parallels between Judges 19—21 and 1 Samuel 11 see page 18.
47 The following analysis was adapted from Jeremiah Unterman, “The Literary Influence of ‘The Binding of Isaac’ (Genesis 22) on ‘The Outrage at Gibeah’ (Judges 19),” HAR 4 (1980) 161-66.
Both Abraham and the Levite journeyed in the region of Jerusalem—Abraham was to take Isaac to the land of Moriah (Gen 22:2), and after departing from his father-in-law the Levite journeyed to Jebus (Judg 19:10). (5) Both Abraham and the host “lifted [their] eyes and saw” (Gen 22:4; Judg 19:17): Abraham saw the mountain that the LORD had chosen (ֵלוהי אֹבֵרֵךְ הָאָדָם); and the host saw the Levite in the town square of Gibeah (יהוה עֲנוֹתֵנִי יִירְדֵּן). The final two parallels are key for determining the direction of dependence between the parallels as well as the purpose for their existence. (6) Both Abraham and the Levite raised their knives against the relation (Gen 22:10; Judg 19:29). Significantly, the phrase “and he took the knife” (וַיְקָח אֶת־הָעִזְמָה) only occurs in these two instances, as does the singular נֶעֲבָלָה. Whereas this phrase occurs just prior to divine intervention in Genesis 22, in Judges 19 it occurs just prior to the dismemberment of the concubine. Similar to the parallels between Genesis 18—19 and Judges 19—21, then, in this instance whereas Isaac was the subject of divine intervention the concubine was dismembered. Because this parallel has the same literary function as that between Genesis 18—19 and Judges 19—21 it is evident that Dtr drew it in order to emphasize again the point that pre-monarchic Israel was unworthy of divine intervention. (7) The phrase “the LORD will see it as it is said” of Gen 22:14 is parallel to the phrase “all who saw [it] said” of Judg 19:30. Again, whereas in Genesis the phrase refers to the divine provision of a ram to Abraham in Judges it is used with reference to the horror of those who saw the concubine’s dismembered corpse. Because this is consistent with Dtr’s
concern to disallow divine intervention in the period of the Judges it is again reasonable to conclude that Judges 19 is derivative.

Another account in the book of Judges that shares parallels with the near-sacrifice of Isaac comes with the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter in Judg 11:29-40.

(1) These are the only narratives that concern a Hebrew's (near-) sacrifice of his child to the LORD. (2) More specifically, in Gen 22:2 the LORD commanded Abraham to "offer him [Isaac]" (ֶלְעֵלָּל לֹא) and in Judg 11:31 Jephthah stated "whatever comes out of my home . . . I shall offer (יִדְעָה לֹא) as a burnt offering (לְעֵלָּל)." (3) In Gen 22:2 Isaac is referred to as Abraham's "only son" (יִדְעָה לֹא), while in Judg 11:34 Jephthah's daughter is referred to as his "only child" (יִדְעָה לֹא). (4) Finally, in both accounts the child/youth addressed Abraham/Jephthah as "My father" (יָבִנָּה) (Gen 22:7; Judg 11:36). The first notable difference concerns the function of each narrative in its context. With regard to the Genesis account, the divinely sanctioned near-sacrifice of Isaac is arguably the climax of the Abraham cycle: unlike the previous threats to the divine promise of progeny in the Abraham cycle at this point the threat comes from the LORD himself. The subsequent divine intervention together with the reiteration of the promise of progeny is therefore climactic. This is in contrast to the literary function of
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48 Edmund Leach has argued that the two accounts share four common structural features that are mirror images of each other, but his structural analysis of the Judges account is forced (Genesis as Myth and Other Essays [London: Jonathan Cape, 1969] 37-38; cf. the discussion in Bertel Nathhorst, Formal or Structural Studies of Traditional Tales. The Usefulness of Some Methodological Proposals Advanced by Vladimir Propp, Alan Dundes, Claude Lévi-Strauss and Edmund Leach [Stockholm Studies in Comparative Religion 9; Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1969] 68-69).
Jephthah's sacrifice of his daughter: though by means of the spirit of the LORD Jephthah had soundly defeated the Ammonites, the needless sacrifice of his daughter which follows, be it real or figurative, was tragic.\(^49\) The second notable difference between the parallels is that whereas in the Genesis account the LORD gave the command to sacrifice Isaac and then intervened to deliver him, in the Judges account Jephthah himself made the rash vow and the LORD did not intervene.\(^50\) Significantly, these two differences are similar to those between Genesis 18—19 and Judges 19—21 as well as those between Genesis 22 and Judges 19: the outcome in Judges 11 is tragic whereas the outcome in Genesis 22 is climactic; and unlike Genesis 22 there was no divine intervention in Judges 11. The consistency between the Judges 11 parallel and the parallels in Judges 19 suggests that the Judges 11 parallel was also drawn by Dtr in order to yet again make the point that pre-monarchic Israel was unworthy of divine intervention.

3. **The Remaining Parallel Narratives in Judges (Genesis 18; and Judg 6:11-24; 13:2-24; 2 Kgs 4:8-17)**

To this point I have argued that in his use of Tetrateuchal accounts in Joshua and Judges Dtr extolled or deprecated generations and/or individuals. What remains to be discussed are other narratives in Judges that also arose from Dtr's historiography but are only the

---

\(^{49}\) Whether or not Jephthah literally sacrificed his daughter is of little consequence for our purposes. On the different interpretations see David Marcus, *Jephthah and His Vow* (Lubbock: Texas Tech, 1986); and Klein, *Triumph*, 221 n. 13.

\(^{50}\) That Jephthah's vow was entirely unnecessary is evident from the phrase "the spirit of the LORD" had come upon him (Judg 11:29), a motif that always ensures success in the book of Judges (see Barry G. Webb, *The Book of Judges. An Integrated Reading* [JSOTSS 46; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987] 60-65; O'Connell, *Rhetoric*, 183). For further discussion of the differences between the two accounts see Phyllis Trible, "A Meditation
product of his familiarity with the given Tetrateuchal accounts, there being nothing tendentious about them. The instances that I will discuss include Gideon’s encounter with an angel of the LORD in Judg 6:11-24, and the divine promise of a son to Manoah and his wife in Judg 13:2-24—both of which share parallels with Genesis 18. Because Elisha’s promise of a son to the barren Shunemite woman in 2 Kgs 4:8-17 is similar to these accounts in Judges and is also dependent on Genesis 18, I will discuss it here rather than in the chapter on 1 and 2 Kings. I will argue that Dtr based each of these narratives on the story of the divine promise of a son to Abraham and Sarah in Genesis 18. I will begin the discussion with an analysis of Robert Alter’s contention that Judg 13:2-24 and 2 Kgs 4:8-17 are type-scenes.

In his *The Art of Biblical Narrative* Robert Alter offered a case for what he referred to as “type-scenes,” which he defined as “fixed constellation[s] of predetermined motifs” which a narrator could adapt in accordance with the concerns of the narrative in which it occurs.\(^{51}\) An example includes the so-called “betrothal” type-scene, which include the following: a bridegroom meets a girl at a well; either the man or girl draws water from the well; the girl rushes home with news of the man’s arrival; and a betrothal follows (Gen 24:10-61; 29:1-20; Exod 2:15b-21; Ruth).\(^{52}\) In a later work Alter applied the same argument to the “annunciation” type-scene, which consists of three elements: the plight of barrenness; the annunciation from a visiting man of God or angel concerning the promise of a son; and the conception or birth of the promised son in *Mourning: The Sacrifice of the Daughter of Jephthah*,” *USQR* 36 (1981) 63-64; Marcus, *Jephthah*, 38-39.

(Gen 18:9-15; 25:19-25; 30:1-2; Judg 13:2-24; 1 Sam 1:4-20; 2 Kgs 4:8-17). Similar to the betrothal type-scene, according to Alter in each instance narrators adapted this type-scene in order to complement the concerns of the narrative in which it occurs.

Alter concluded that the examples of the annunciation type-scenes cannot be the product of the transmission of a single story, whether oral or written, because “variations in the handling of the repeated motifs are never at random.” According to Alter, the differences between the ways in which the annunciation type-scenes are employed are hermeneutically significant. Nor, according to Alter, can the type-scenes only be explained on the basis of allusion, for they lack the textual signals that allude to the antecedent story. The best explanation for the existence of the annunciation type-scenes is that they are due to convention: the type-scene was “an accepted common framework of narrative situation which the writer could . . . modify for the fictional purposes at hand.”

The one exception for Alter comes with the annunciation type-scene involving Elisha and the Shunemite woman of 2 Kgs 4:8-17, which, although it is a type-scene, also “possibly” alludes to the annunciation type-scene involving the promise of a son to Abraham and Sarah in Gen 18:9-15. Against Alter, in the following paragraphs I will contend that the best explanation for both Judg 13:2-24 (the promise of a son to Manoah and his barren wife) and 2 Kgs 4:8-17 (the promise of a son
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52 *Biblical Narrative*, 52.
54 “Type-Scene,” 128.
55 “Type-Scene,” 128.
56 “Type-Scene,” 128-29.
57 “Type-Scene,” 128.
to the barren Shunemite woman) is that they are not the product of an accepted literary convention but of Dtr’s reliance on Gen 18:9-15.

It first bears mentioning that Alter failed to note other passages in Judges that share many parallels with Genesis 18 and which have nothing to do with an “annunciation.” This is true, as I argued above, of Judges 19. It is also true of Gideon’s encounter with an angel of the LORD in Judg 6:11-24, which shares parallels with Gen 18:1-8. (1) Abraham’s encounter with “three men” who turned out to be the LORD and two angels is similar to Judg 6:11-24 (Gideon’s encounter with the angel of the LORD) insofar as in both instances the identity of the supernatural being is ambiguous. In Genesis the supernatural being is identified as a man as well as the LORD himself (compare Gen 18:1-2, 13, 22; and 19:1), and in Judges the angel of the LORD is later identified as the LORD himself (Judg 6:11-12, 14, 20). 58 (2) In both cases the supernatural being “appeared” (אלהים) to Abraham and Gideon (Gen 18:1; Judg 6:12) at (an) “oak(s)” (עץ) (Gen 18:1; Judg 6:11). (3) In each case Abraham and Gideon began their conversations with “My Lord(s)” (יְהוָה) followed by “if I have found favor in your eyes” (בריכך; Gen 18:3; Judg 6:13, 15, 17). (4) The supernatural beings then accepted the invitations of Abraham and Gideon to stay for meals which they ate “under” (על) the tree (Gen 18:4-8; Judg 6:19). (5) A further parallel exists between Abraham’s final intercession for Sodom and Gideon’s second request concerning the fleece: “Let not my Lord be angry, but let me speak only once”

Consistent with the parallels that Dtr drew between Genesis 18 and Judges 19, the parallels between Gen 18:1-8 and Judg 6:11-24 (which has nothing to do with an ‘annunciation’) are best explained as the product of Dtr’s reliance on a favorite text rather than an annunciation type-scene. The counter-argument (that Dtr was familiar with the annunciation type-scene and that he also alluded to Genesis 18) lacks force because two of the three annunciation type-scenes which Alter discussed were also based on Genesis 18, as I will now argue.

The parallels that Genesis 11—18 shares with Judg 13:2-24 include the following. (1) As “Sarai was barren; she had no child” (עקרת אשת لها ילד) so Manoah’s wife “was barren and she had no child” (עקרת ראש ולא ילדה) (Gen 11:30; Judg 13:2). (2) As the LORD appeared (וירא) before confirming that he would increase Abraham’s numbers, so the angel of the LORD appeared (וירא) to Manoah’s wife (Gen 17:1; Judg 13:3). (3) As “God ascended” (דוגו אלוהים) from Abraham after promising him progeny, so “the angel of the LORD ascended” (דוגו אלוהים) after promising
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59 See also the analysis by Greentein, “Formation,” 168.

60 To be sure, Alter delimited the type-scene in Gensis 18 to vv. 9-15, and the parallels that Judg 6:11-24 only go from vv. 1-8. However, he should have included vv. 1-8 as well because these verses include features that are common both to Judg 13:2-24 as well as 2 Kgs 4:8-17 (passages which Alter also defined as annunciation type-scenes). As the LORD “appeared” (וירא) to Abraham (Gen 18:1) so an angel of the LORD “appeared” to Manoah (Judg 13:3). Similarly, as Abraham prepared a meal for the angels (Gen 18:6-
Manoah and his wife a son (Gen 17:22; Judg 13:20). (4) In both instances the divine promise of a son was made to a woman: Sarai (Gen 18:9-15) and Manoah’s wife (Judg 13:3-7). (5) Finally, as Abraham pleaded with the angels to eat a meal, so Manaoh pleaded with the angel of the LORD to eat a kid (Gen 18:5; Judg 13:15). That Dtr was responsible for these parallels is evident from the criterion of source criticism. Judges 13:2-24 shares three parallels with passages that have traditionally been assigned to J (Gen 11:30 = Judg 13:2; Gen 18:9-15 = Judg 13:3-7; Gen 18:5 = Judg 13:15) and two that have traditionally been assigned to P (Gen 17:1 = Judg 13:3; Gen 17:22 = Judg 13:20). It therefore follows that the best explanation for the given parallels is that Dtr based Judges 13 on the given account in Genesis.

As with the parallels that Dtr drew between Genesis 18 and Judg 6:11-24, it is again best to conclude that Dtr’s concern was not with a type-scene but with Genesis 18 itself. This conclusion is supported by the fact that, like so many other examples, Dtr here conflated unrelated Tetrateuchal accounts. Dtr based the conclusion to Judg 13:2-24 on the conclusion to Jacob’s tussle with a “man” after crossing the Jabbok in Gen 32:23[22]-33[32]. In response to Jacob’s request to know the man’s name, the man replied, “Why do you ask my name?” (לָאַד ולָאַד לָאַד לָאַד) (Gen 32:30[29]), and in response to Manoah’s request to know the man’s name the man replied with a verbatim response (Judg 13:18). Moreover, as Jacob thereupon said, “I have seen God face to face and my life has been preserved” (Gen 32:31[30]), so Manoah then said, “We shall surely
die for we have seen God” (Judg 13:22). Dtr’s conflation of sources again suggests that his concern was not with type-scenes but with the given Tetratauchal account itself.

Similarly, and even as Alter acknowledged, Elisha’s promise of a son to the Shunemite woman in 2 Kgs 4:8-17 was dependent on the divine promise of a son to Abraham and Sarah in Gen 18:6-15. (1) Both accounts involve a barren woman with an old husband. (2) In both instances the woman prepared a meal for the visitor(s) (Gen 18:6; 2 Kgs 4:8). (3) Following this the visitor(s) promised that the woman would have a son in the “spring time” (נהר ולא בנה), a phrase that only occurs in these two passages (Gen 18:10, 14; 2 Kgs 4:16-17). (4) The woman heard this promise while she was in the “doorway” (שער) (Gen 18:10; 2 Kgs 4:15). (5) Finally, the woman regarded the promise as unbelievable (Gen 18:12; 2 Kgs 4:16). That Dtr was responsible for this parallel is evident from the criterion of multiple occurrence. I argued above that Dtr was responsible both for the parallels between Genesis 18—19 and Judges 19 as well as between Genesis 11—18 and Judg 6:11-24. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that Dtr was also responsible for this parallel.

I have asserted, then, that in Judg 6:11-24 Dtr’s concern was not with a type-scene but with the paradigms afforded by the story in Genesis 18. Similarly, I argued that two of the three accounts which Alter discussed in the Former Prophets (Judg 13:2-24; 2 Kgs 4:8-17) were based not on an annunciation type-scene but on Genesis 18. All that remains to be discussed is why Dtr patterned the given accounts after Genesis 18. The preceding analysis shows that Dtr used Genesis 18 in diverse ways: it is part of the
contrast that Dtr drew between Sodom and pre-monarchic Israel (Judges 19); Dtr patterned Gideon’s encounter with the angel of the LORD after it (Judg 6:11-24); and it served as Dtr’s basis for two accounts in the Former Prophets which concern the promise of a son to a barren woman (Judg 13:2-24; 2 Kgs 4:8-17). Such diversity shows that Genesis 18 provided a number of paradigms that Dtr could use in the recounting of his nation’s past, and with the exception of his use of Genesis 18 in Judges 19 it is best to conclude that the given parallels are only the product of Dtr’s paradigmatic historiography.

4. CONCLUSION

In this chapter I first argued that Dtr presented Joshua as a new Moses and the generation under Joshua as a new Israel, both in order to underline the fidelity of this generation to Moses’ teachings. In marked contrast to the use of Tetratuchal accounts in Joshua, I then argued that in Judges Dtr inverted and adapted various paradigms afforded by Tetratuchal narratives in order to underline his negative depiction of pre-monarchic Israel. In Judges 6 and 8 Gideon was well on his way to becoming a new Moses only to become a new, apostate Aaron. In Judges 18 Dtr inverted the paradigm afforded by the story of the spies in Numbers 13 in order to support the point that the migrating Danites, who had failed to take the land that had been allotted to them and looked outside of Canaan to Laish for the promised land. Dtr used the Sodom narrative of Genesis 18—19 for Judges 19 in order to present pre-monarchic Israel in a worse light than Sodom of Lot’s day. I also argued that Dtr patterned various accounts in Judges after accounts in
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61 “Type-Scene,” 128.
Genesis in order to make the point that pre-monarchic Israel did not merit divine intervention: unlike the Sodom narrative (Genesis 18—19) and the account of the near-sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22:1-19), in the Gibeah account (Judges 19) and the account concerning Jephthah's sacrifice of his daughter (Judg 11:29-40) there was no divine intervention. Dtr's use of Tetrarchal accounts in Judges is therefore markedly different than that in Joshua: whereas in Joshua Dtr sought to underline his positive portrayal of Joshua and the generation under him, in Judges he denigrated pre-monarchic Israel by means of the parallels. Finally, I argued that two parallels in Judges and one in 2 Kings are only the product of Dtr's paradigmatic view of Tetrarchal accounts.

The continuity that exists between the use of various Tetrarchal accounts from one narrative to another in Joshua—Judges as well as the consequent implications for redaction-critical studies of these books must not be overlooked. The tremendous continuity between the various ways that the Tetrarchal accounts were used points to a single hand. The same may be argued with regard to the multiple use of the same Tetrarchal account: both Judges 11 and 19 make use of Genesis 22; and both Joshua 2 and Judges 19 are dependent on Genesis 19. Indeed, even the same verse from a Tetrarchal account was used in different accounts in Joshua—Judges: both Josh 2:3 and Judg 19:22 were based on Gen 19:5; and both Josh 6:23 and Judg 19:25 were based on Gen 19:16. Such consistency points not to unrelated sources or redactions but to Dtr's proclivity to use the same Tetrarchal account in different Deuteronomistic texts. This conclusion finds further support from the fact that the use of the Tetrarch in Joshua—Judges has much in common with Dtr's use of Tetrarchal accounts in the
prologue to Deuteronomy: Deut 2:24-25 is very similar to Rahab's speech to the spies in Josh 2:9-10; and both the prologue and Joshua 2—4 pattern the conquest after the Exodus story, a story to which they both explicitly refer. That Dtr was responsible for the parallels is also evident from the fact that the parallels between Joshua, Gideon, and Moses are akin to those between Josiah and the Deuteronomic Moses. This conclusion challenges the view that Dtr had little or nothing to do with the given accounts in Joshua—Judges. Dtr rather than pre-Deuteronomistic compilers was responsible for the present shape of Joshua 2—5 and 10. Similarly, Dtr was responsible for the present shape of the stories of Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson. Again, the so-called epilogue in Judges 19—21 should neither be deemed a pre-Deuteronomistic compilation nor a post-Deuteronomistic accretion. Given the marked consistency between the ways in which the given accounts make use of the Tetratauch such views cannot be sustained.

---


63 For a review of scholarship on the redactional history of the book of Judges see Webb, Judges, 19-28; and Mark A. O’Brien, “Judges and the Deuteronomistic History,” in The History of Israel’s Traditions. The Heritage of Martin Noth (Eds. Steven L. McKenzie
CHAPTER THREE

DTR’S USE OF TETRAEUCHAL NARRATIVES IN I AND II SAMUEL

1. MOSES, SAMUEL, AND THEIR GENERATIONS

1.1 The Parallels

There are many parallels between the life of Samuel in 1 Samuel 1—8, and Moses in Exodus 1—14 and Numbers 11.1 First, their early years are similar. After having been suckled by their mothers (Exod 2:1-9; 1 Sam 1:20-23) both of these figures were brought up in official establishments: Moses with Pharaoh’s daughter in the court of Pharaoh and Samuel under Eli in Shiloh (Exod 2:10; 1 Sam 1:24-3:19).

Second, there are parallels between the calls of Moses and Samuel. Just as the LORD called to Moses (יְהֹוָה יִקְרָא; Exod 3:4), so he called to Samuel (יְהֹוָה יִקְרָא; 1 Sam 3:4; cf. 3:6, 8, 10). When the LORD called Moses he called his name twice, which is also the case for the call of Samuel (Exod 3:4; 1 Sam 3:10).2 The only other instance in which God addressed an individual with a double vocative is Gen 46:2 (with reference to Jacob). Again, whereas God thereupon outlined his judgment against
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2 By referring to this pericope as the “call” of Samuel I am referring to its function rather than its form. N. Habel has argued that the genre “call narrative” consists of divine confrontation, introductory word, commission, objection, reassurance, and sign (“The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives,” ZAW 77 [1965] 297-323). On this basis a number of scholars have rightly argued that 1 Samuel 3 is not a call narrative (cf.
the king of Egypt to Moses, so he outlined his judgment against the House of Eli to Samuel (Exod 3:19-20; 1 Sam 3:11-14). Also noteworthy is the fact that, like Moses, Samuel was a prophet (Num 12:6-8; Deut 34:10; 1 Sam 3:20). Indeed, Samuel was “a prophet like Moses” after the order of Deut 18:18. This is evident from Elkanah’s statement to Hannah, “only may the LORD fulfill his word” (1 Sam 1:23), which came as a response to Hannah’s statement that she would bring Samuel to Shiloh after he had been weaned and which is a fulfillment of the LORD’s promise in Deut 18:18 (cf. v. 15): “I will raise up a prophet from among their own people like yourself.”

A third parallel between the lives of Moses and Samuel comes with the early chapters of Exodus, particularly the plagues narrative in chapters 5—12, and the early chapters of 1 Samuel, particularly the so-called “Ark Narrative” in chapters 4—6. Both


1 Stanley D. Walters, “Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1,” *JBL* 107 (1988) 411-12. With regard to 1 Sam 1:23, most commentators follow the LXX’s ἀλλὰ στήριξι κύριος τὸ ἐξελθὼν τοῦ στόματός σου and 4QSam”s יָדֵי יִהוָה מְנַהֲגָה (“only may the LORD/Lord fulfill what has come from your mouth”) because the MT of 1 Samuel 1 has no antecedent for 1:23 (e.g., P. Kyle McCarter, *1 Samuel* [Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1980] 56; Ralph W. Klein, *1 Samuel* [Word Biblical Commentary 10; Waco, Texas: Word, 1983] 3). However, given the fact that Dtr was concerned to draw parallels between Samuel and Moses, the MT should be followed.

4 Referring to 1 Samuel 4—6 as “the Ark Narrative” is a misnomer as the principal concern of these chapters is not the ark but the supremacy of the LORD, over the Philistines, their God, and Israel. The criticism of Miller and Roberts concerning the designation “Ark Narrative” is on the mark:

[T]o define these chapters as the Ark Narrative(s), qua Rost, Schicklberger, Campbell, and most scholars is to detheologize them and to miss their point at a most elemental level. The subject of the narrative is Yahweh, and not the ark. The issue is not what happens to the ark, but what Yahweh is doing among his people. Not the ark, but Yahweh’s power and purpose is what the story is about.
accounts are concerned with something belonging to God (Israel/ark) which an enemy
(Egypt/Philistia) held, and the series of plagues that came upon the enemy as a
consequence so that the given possession would return to Canaan. Similar to other
accounts in the Former Prophets Dtr sought to draw the readers' attention to the plagues
narrative by having various characters explicitly refer to it. Upon seeing the ark enter the
Israelite camp the Philistines cried out “Woe to us! Who will save us from the power of
these mighty gods? These are the gods who struck the Egyptians with every kind of
plague in the wilderness!” (1 Sam 4:8). Similarly, the Philistine priests and diviners
counselled the Philistines, “Don’t harden your hearts as the Egyptians and Pharaoh
hardened their hearts. As you know, when he made a mockery of them, they sent
[Israel], and they departed” (1 Sam 6:6).

(Miller, Hand of the Lord, 60; as cited in J.P. Fokkelman, Narrative Art and Poetry in
the Books of Samuel. A Full Interpretation Based on Stylistic and Structural Analyses
[Vol. 4, Vow and Desire [1 Sam. 1-12]; Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1993]
266 n. 16). Nevertheless, the title has become conventional and will therefore be retained.

5 Many commentators have sought to emend the text at this point because of the singular
and plural references to God in vv. 7 and 8 and because the Egyptians were not struck
with plagues in the wilderness but in Egypt (e.g., McCarter, 1 Samuel, 104). But such
emendations are unnecessary as the incongruous statements of the Philistines have the
function of underlining their confusion and they should therefore be regarded as original,
as Damrosch has rightly contended: “[t]he confusion of the Philistines is comically
shown by their conflicting cries [“God” vs. “gods”] and their garbled version of the
Exodus story [“wilderness” rather than “Egypt”]” (Narrative Covenant, 189). More
specifically, Dtr had the Philistines garble Num 11:33 where the same terminology is
used: “the LORD struck the people [Israel] with a very great plague” (יְהוָה בְּנֵהוֹ יָדָּהוּ מִיְּאָרָ֖י מִלְּאָרָ֖י), an action which took place “in the wilderness.”
The parallels between the two accounts include the following. The Philistine priests and diviners not only referred to the plagues narrative in 1 Sam 6:6 but they explicitly cited it five times, four of which occur between 1 Sam 6:6-8. Whereas God said to Moses in Exod 10:2 that he would favorably depose the Egyptians toward Israel, "so that when you go, you will not go empty-handed (לֹא תְּלָהָר יִרְפָּה)," the Philistine priests and diviners counseled the Philistines, "If you are going to send the Ark of the God of Israel away, do not send it away without anything (אלִיתָעֲלוֹת אֲוַדְיוֹרִים)" (Exod 3:21; 1 Sam 6:3). Similarly, whereas the LORD stated "you may recount in the hearing of your sons . . . how I made a mockery of the Egyptians (רַעְתָעֲלוֹת בְּמַמְרָים)" in Exod 10:2, the Philistine priests and diviners stated "he made a mockery of them" (רַעְתָעֲלוֹת בְּמַמְרָים) in 1 Sam 6:6. Again, whereas the LORD stated in Exod 3:20-21 that Pharaoh would "send" (שָלָה) Israel and they would "depart" (וְלָהָר), in 1 Sam 6:6 the Philistine priests and diviners stated that the Egyptians "sent them (וְלָהָר) and they departed (וְלָהָר)," and in 1 Sam 6:8 they stated "and you will send it and it shall depart" (וְלָהָר אֱוַדְיוֹר וּשָלָה). The Ekronites also cited the plagues narrative when the ark
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entered their town. Parallel to Pharaoh’s request of Moses and Aaron, “Plead with the LORD to remove the frogs from me and my people” (Exod 8:4), is the Ekronites’ exclamation that “they have moved the ark of the God of Israel to me to kill me and my people” (1 Sam 5:10; cf. v. 11). Significantly, the phrase “me and my people” only occurs in these three instances.² (2) The refusal of Pharaoh/the sons of Eli to heed the voice of the LORD/Eli stemmed from the LORD’s desire to punish them. The LORD hardened the heart of Pharaoh so that he would not let the people go (Exod 4:21), so that he might display his signs (7:3; 10:1), and so that he might gain glory (14:4). Similarly, Hophni and Phinehas ignored Eli’s plea to reform “for the LORD was resolved that they should die” (1 Sam 2:25). (3) The Egyptians and the Philistines, who were both struck by the plagues, came to a knowledge of the LORD (Exod 7:5, 17; 8:6[10], 18[22]; 9:14, 29; 10:2; 1 Sam 6:3, 9).⁹ Similar to this is the parallel between Exod 5:2, “I [Pharaoh] fulfillment of Exod 15:14—a verse that Dtr quoted in Deut 2:25 (see page 50)—where we read that the inhabitants of Philistia writhed because of the Israelites’ crossing of the Sea.

² Exod 8:4; 1 Sam 5:11; והם יראים את המותים: 1 Sam 5:10; זכרו וראה מי. ⁹ Some have argued that MT’s והם יראים את המותים (“and he will make himself known to you”) of 1 Sam 6:3 should be emended to והם יראים את המותים (“when you have been ransomed”), following the LXX and 4QSam⁹, primarily because of the interrogative לְמָז which immediately follows (e.g., McCarter, I Samuel, 129). Against this emendation is the fact that לְמָז never occurs in the Niphal stem. A better explanation is that which is afforded by JPS: “He will make himself known to you; otherwise his hand will not turn away from you.” The JPS translator took והם יראים reflexively, “he will make himself known to you” (cf. Exod 6:3 and Isa 19:21 where the Niphal of יראים is used reflexively with לְמָז as the subject), and והם לְמָז as introducing an undesirable alternative, “otherwise his hand will not turn away from you” (cf. 1 Sam 19:17; Qoh 5:5; Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990] 18.3c). Cf. David Winton Thomas who follows the MT but argues
do not know (לָא יְדַעֲךָ) the LORD,” and 1 Sam 2:12, “[Hophni and Phinehas] did not know (לָא יְדַעֲךָ) the LORD.” Apart from these instances this expression only occurs in Judg 2:10. (4) As Pharaoh’s courtiers exhorted Pharaoh, “Let the men go to worship the LORD their God!” so the priests and diviners counselled the Philistines, “Send [the ark] off, and let it go on its own way” (Exod 10:7; 1 Sam 6:8; cf. 5:8, 11). (5) Similarly, there is a parallel between the summoning of the leaders: “And Pharaoh . . . summoned (אֲנִי רָאִיתִי) the wise men and the sorcerers” (Exod 7:11); “The Philistines summoned (אֲנִי רָאִיתִי) the priests and the diviners” (1 Sam 6:2). (6) What escaped one plague was struck by another: the locusts consumed what was left after the plague of hail (Exod 10:5, 12, 15); and the Ekronites who escaped death were stricken with tumors (1 Sam 5:12). (7) In the same way that Moses told Pharaoh to provide animals for the burnt offerings, so the Philistines provided the cows for the burnt offering when the ark returned to Israel (Exod 10:25; 1 Sam 6:14). (8) Just as the Egyptians were persuaded to release Israel after a series of plagues, so the Philistines were persuaded to release the ark after a series of plagues. More specifically, in both instances “the hand of the LORD” (הֲדֹעַר) was instrumental in bringing the plagues (Exod 9:3; 1 Sam 5:6). (9) Upon release of Israel/the ark, Israel received gifts referred to as “objects of gold” (Exod 3:22; 11:2; 12:35; 1 Sam 6:8: כִּלּוֹת זוֹדוֹר). (10) The outcry of those struck by the plagues is mentioned (Exod 11:6; 12:30; 1 Sam 5:10-12). Worthy of note is the parallel that may be translated as “then shall rest be granted to you” (“A Note on לְכַּפָּר וּרְוֹדֵה in 1 Samuel VI 3,” JTS 11 [1960] 52).
between Exod 2:23, where the outcry of the Hebrews went up to God, and 1 Sam 5:12, where the outcry of the Ekronites went up to the skies. In only these two instances does the phrase (העבישותָ) occur. (11) Each episode consists of a confrontation between the God of Israel and the enemy’s god(s). As the L ORD punished “all the gods of Egypt" by means of the plague on the firstborn (Exod 12:12), so his defeat of Dagon was accompanied by plagues (1 Sam 5:2-7; 6:5). (12) Finally, neither Israel nor the ark reached a final resting place: Israel stayed in the desert for forty years and the ark remained at Kiriath-jearim for twenty years (Numbers 14; 1 Sam 7:2).

The fourth parallel between Moses and Samuel comes with Israel’s victory over the Egyptians in Exodus 14 and their defeat of the Philistines in 1 Samuel 7. Both narratives are concerned with divine deliverance from an oppressor—Israel from Egypt and the Philistines respectively (Exod 14:5; 1 Sam 7:3). There is a marked emphasis in each on the L ORD’s function as warrior (e.g., Exod 14:13-18, 30; 1 Sam 7:3, 8-10). More specifically, the following order of events is shared by both narratives. (1) Both Pharaoh and the Philistines were told of Israel’s whereabouts and then went out to them. Upon hearing that Israel had fled Pharaoh gathered his men and pursued them (Exod 14:5-9). Similarly, “when the Philistines heard that the Israelites had assembled at Mizpah the lords of the Philistines marched out against Israel” (1 Sam 7:7). (2) In both accounts the Israelites consequently became terrified and appealed to the L ORD/Samuel for assistance:

Exod 14:10

1 Sam 7:7-8

they were greatly frightened and they cried out to the LORD they were frightened of the Philistines and they implored Samuel, “Do not neglect us and do not refrain from crying out to the LORD”

(3) Through the ministration of Moses/Samuel the LORD nevertheless brought victory to Israel: Moses held out his rod over the sea and the waters divided (Exod 14:16, 21, 26-27); and upon sacrificing and crying out the LORD responded to Samuel (1 Sam 7:9-10).

(4) Finally, the LORD “confused” ( Heb הָסָר) the enemy (Exod 14:24; 1 Sam 7:10) and defeated them “on that day” ( Heb בָּאתָ הָדוֹר) (Exod 14:30; 1 Sam 7:10).  

The fifth parallel between Moses and Samuel concerns the rebellion against the LORD in Numbers 11 and 1 Samuel 8. (1) Similar to Num 11:4-6 where the people complained about the manna and wanted meat, in 1 Sam 8:1-5 the people noted the failings of Samuel’s sons and demanded a king. (2) In both stories it is stated that the complaint/request of the people was “evil in the eyes of Moses/Samuel” (Num 11:10: רָעַ֣ה היָדֵ֖ר בְּעֵינַ֥יָּהוּ: 1 Sam 8:6: רָעַ֣ה בְּעֵינֵי מָשָּׁאֵ֣י רָעַ֣ה). The phrases “in the eyes of Moses” and “in the eyes of Samuel” only occur in these instances. (3) In both stories the prophet then prayed to the LORD: Moses expressed his frustration to the LORD over Israel’s complaint (Num 11:10-15, 21-23) and Samuel prayed regarding the people’s

11 Apart from these two instances the verb מָסָר is used with the LORD as the subject and Israel’s enemies as the object in only three other instances (Exod 23:27; Josh 10:10; Judg 4:15; cf. 2 Chron 15:6).
request for a king (1 Sam 8:6). (4) Although the LORD fulfilled the pleas in both instances the consequences were disastrous. After being deluged with quail the people were struck by a plague (Num 11:31-34); and after the LORD told Samuel to heed the demand of the people Samuel warned the people of oppression under a monarchy (1 Sam 8:7, 11-18). (5) In both stories it is stated that in their complaint/request the people had “rejected” the LORD: “for you have rejected the LORD” (ךכ נספתא א汰ויויהו; Num 11:20); “for they have rejected me” (ךכ אתי נספתא; 1 Sam 8:7). Significantly, the verb נספתא (“to reject”) with people as the subject and the LORD as the object occurs only in these two instances.12 (6) Finally, the phrase “in the ears of the LORD” (באמויר לייווה) only occurs in these two chapters: the people wailed for lack of food “in the ears of the LORD (Num 11:1, 18); and Samuel reiterated the request of the people “in the ears of the LORD (1 Sam 8:21).

1.2 The Direction of Dependence

The best explanation for the numerous parallels between the given Tetratuchal accounts and 1 Samuel 1—8 is that Dtr was responsible for them. This is evident from the criteria of cross-references, incongruities, source criticism, multiple occurrence and Deuteronomistic tendency. Though my discussion concerning such criteria will centre on 1 Samuel 1—8 I will also discuss related texts.

As in other accounts in the Former Prophets, in 1 Samuel 1—8 some of the characters explicitly refer to the corresponding Tetratuchal accounts. As I noted above,

12 Stanley D. Walters, personal communication.
this is true of the Philistines (4:8) as well as the Philistine priests and diviners (6:6), who both refer to the Exodus story. Another cross-reference comes in 1 Samuel 8. As I argued above, Numbers 11, which pertains to the people’s rebellion against the LORD, shares striking parallels with 1 Samuel 8, which also pertains to the people’s rebellion against the LORD. This connection was made explicit by a cross-reference in 1 Sam 8:8: “Like everything else they have done ever since I brought them out of Egypt to this day—forsaking me and worshiping other gods—just as they are doing to you.” The best explanation for such cross-references is that the given Deuteronomistic accounts were based on the corresponding Tetratauchal accounts.

Similar to the function of the cross-references are the grammatical incongruities. In fear of the ark the Philistines cried, “they have moved the ark of the God of Israel to me to kill me and my people” (1 Sam 5:10, 11). The use of the first person singular rather than the expected first person plural represents Dtr’s attempt to call the reader’s attention to the plagues narrative. For example, the plagues narrative has Pharaoh say to Moses and Aaron, “Plead with the LORD to remove the frogs from me and my people” (Exod 8:4).13 Similarly, in response to the Philistines’ concern over the troublesome ark their priests and diviners counselled them to send “five golden mice . . . for the same plague which struck all of them and your lords” (1 Sam 6:4). This too represents Dtr’s attempt to call the reader’s attention to the plagues narrative insofar as “them” is a cross-reference to the Egyptians of the plagues narrative. Because of this incongruity—the reader expects the second rather than third person—most commentators have followed
the LXX at this point which reads “you.”\textsuperscript{14} However, in light of the foregoing analysis such an emendation is unwarranted. The fact, then, that two texts are grammatically incongruous in Samuel but fitting in the parallel Tetrateuchal traditions supports the posited direction of dependence.\textsuperscript{15}

The criterion of multiple occurrence also supports the proposed direction of dependence. I argued above that Dtr based the appointment of officials in Deut 1:9-18 in part on Num 11:10-30. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that Dtr was also responsible for the parallels between Numbers 11 and 1 Samuel 8. This contention finds further support from other passages in 1 Samuel 6—10 which also share striking parallels with Numbers 11. This is true, for instance, of 1 Sam 6:19 and Num 11:33: while the meat was still in the mouths of rebellious Israel “the LORD struck the people with a very great plague” (דָּבָּה יְהוָה בֵּןָם המָרָּה מְאָרָּה). This word string occurs elsewhere only in 1 Sam 6:19 (דָּבָּה יְהוָה בֵּןָם המָרָּה מְאָרָּה).\textsuperscript{16} There are also parallels

\textsuperscript{13} As I stated above, the phrase “me and my people” only occurs in these three instances (cf. Exod 8:4[8], 5[9], 7[11], 17[21], 25[29], 27[31]; 9:14, 27).


\textsuperscript{15} Van Seters has argued that the Yahwist “drew upon Dtn 28, Lev 26 and the common Near Eastern curse tradition to create a series of seven plagues,” thereby dating the plagues narrative after Dtr (“The Plagues of Egypt: Ancient Tradition or Literary Invention?” \textit{ZAW} 98 [1986] 31-39). Van Seters failed, however, to note the fact that the Ark Narrative—which as I have shown, shares a wealth of parallels with the plagues narrative—explicitly refers back to the plagues narrative and should therefore be dated after it.

\textsuperscript{16} Most commentators have here followed the LXX because of the MT’s redundancy: “and he struck the men of Beth-shemesh . . . and he struck the people . . . for the LORD struck the people” (e.g., S.R. Driver, \textit{Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel} [2nd. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1966] 59). A better explanation is that the MT’s redundancy is the result of the incorporation of Num 11:33.
between Numbers 11 and 1 Samuel 10. To begin with, there is the parallel between Num 11:20 and 1 Sam 10:18-19. Both of these texts refer to the people’s dissatisfaction in spite of the fact that they had come out of Egypt. In each case, moreover, the people had thereby “rejected” (ךֹּדֶס) the LORD/God. Significantly, this verb only occurs with the LORD or God as the object in these verses and the previously discussed 1 Sam 8:7.17

Another parallel between Numbers 11 and 1 Samuel 10 concerns the subject of prophecy in Num 11:25-30 and 1 Sam 10:5-6, 10-13. (1) In the Numbers account the 70 elders prophesied (11:25), as did Eldad and Medad, who were not among the 70 and upon whom “the LORD put his spirit” (11:26, 29). Similarly, in the Samuel account a band of prophets prophesied (10:5, 10), as did Saul, who, although he was not one of the prophets, was gripped by “the spirit of the LORD” (10:6, 10). (2) Because Eldad and Medad were “prophesying” (מִנָּחָם) (Num 11:27), Joshua was constrained to object of this to Moses (11:28). Consistent with this is the reference to the bystanders in the Samuel account who were perplexed by Saul’s prophesying (10:11). Apart from Num 11:27 and 1 Sam 10:5 the term “prophesying” (מִנָּחָם) occurs elsewhere only in 1 Kgs 22:10; 2 Chron 18:9; and Jer 14:14. (3) As Moses then countered Joshua’s objection by stating that he wished that all the LORD’s people were prophets (Num 11:29), so, contrary to the astonishment of the bystanders, an individual suggested that Saul himself was not only among the prophets but that he was their “father” (1 Sam 10:11-12).18

17 Dr. referred to “your God” rather than “the LORD” in 1 Sam 10:19 because the LORD himself was speaking.
18 For a review of the research on 1 Sam 10:11-12 see Klein, 1 Samuel, 92-93.
(4) As Moses then reentered the camp (Num 11:30) so Saul thereupon entered the shrine (1 Sam 10:13).

The criterion of source criticism also supports the proposed direction of dependence. The Ark Narrative shares verbal parallels with both the non-P and P layers of Exodus 1—14. With regard to the non-P layer, “vessels of gold” in Exod 3:22 and 12:35 is cited in 1 Sam 6:8; “me and my people” in Exod 8:4 is cited in 1 Sam 5:10-11; and “I do not know the LORD” in Exod 5:2 is cited in 1 Sam 2:12. As for the P layer, “and the outcry went up” of Exod 2:23 is cited in 1 Sam 5:12; and “Pharaoh summoned [two groups of officials]” of Exod 7:11 is cited in 1 Sam 6:2.19 The Ark Narrative thus shares four verbal parallels with the non-P layer and two verbal parallels with the P layer of Exodus 1—14. It therefore follows that the Ark Narrative was based on the plagues narrative.20 The criterion of multiple occurrence may also be used with regard to the parallels between the Exodus story and the Ark Narrative: Dtr cited Exod 14:31 in Deut 3:24 and he patterned much of Joshua 3—4 and 1 Samuel 7 after Exodus 14.

More generally, the criterion of source criticism also applies to the parallels between Numbers 11 and Deuteronomistic literature. The majority of source critics have argued that Num 11:4-35 is made up of of two layers. The first layer, consisting of vv. 4-15, 18-24a, 31-35, pertains to the people’s complaint regarding a lack of meat and the subsequent plague. The second layer, consisting of vv. 16-17, 24b-30, concerns

19 With regard to the given source-critical identifications see discussions in Childs (Exodus) and Durham (Exodus).
20 As I have argued elsewhere, the fact that Dtr cites P shows that P pre-dates Dtr.
prophecy and the selection of seventy elders. To be sure, the account in 1 Samuel 8 only shares verbal parallels with the first layer (Num 11:10 = 1 Sam 8:6; Num 11:18 = 1 Sam 8:21; Num 11:20 = 1 Sam 8:7). However, other Deuteronomistic accounts share parallels with both layers of Numbers 11. Deut 1:9-18 shares one verbal parallel with the first layer of Numbers 11 (Num 11:14 = Deut 1:9) and one with the second layer (Num 11:17 = Deut 1:12). 1 Samuel 6—10 also shares verbal parallels with each layer of Numbers 11: this is true of 1 Sam 6:19 and Num 11:33; 1 Sam 10:18-19 and Num 11:20; and 1 Sam 10:5 and Num 11:27, as I argued above. Various accounts in the DtrH, then, share verbal parallels with each layer of Num 11:4-35: the Deuteronomistic accounts share five verbal parallels with the first layer (Num 11:10 = 1 Sam 8:6; Num 11:14 = Deut 1:9; Num 11:18 = 1 Sam 8:21; Num 11:20 = 1 Sam 8:7; Num 11:20 = 1 Sam 10:19; Num 11:33 = 1 Sam 6:19) and two verbal parallels with the second layer (Num 11:17 = Deut 1:12; Num 11:27 = 1 Sam 10:5). The best explanation for these data is that Dtr relied on Num 11:10-35 for the given Deuteronomistic accounts, including 1 Samuel 8.

21 Examples of earlier commentators who held this view include those of J. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, The Hexateuch According to the Revised Version (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900) 201-203; and S. R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New York: The Meridian Co., 1957) 62. Though the analyses of more recent commentators have tended to be less rigorous in the distinction between the layers, their conclusions are very close to those of the older commentators (cf. Budd, Numbers, 124-27).

22 This analysis also holds for different source-critical analyses of Numbers 11. This is true of Martin Noth (Numbers [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968] 83), who argued that vv 14-17, 24b-30 are the only insertions into an otherwise unified text; H. Seebass ("Num XI, XII und die Hypothese des Jahwisten" VT 28 [1978] 214-23), who argued for no less than four sources; and Van Seters (Moses, 227-29), who has argued that J interwove the two traditions.
The criterion of Deuteronomistic tendency also supports the proposed direction of dependence. I argued above that Dtr patterned Joshua, Josiah, and Gideon after Moses. It is therefore again most tenable to conclude that Dtr was responsible for the parallels between Samuel and Moses. Finally, the criterion of literary function also supports the proposed direction of dependence, which brings us to a discussion of Dtr’s purposes for drawing the given parallels.

1.3 The Purpose of the Parallels

1.3.1 The Ark Narrative and the Plagues Narrative

The capture of the ark from Israel in 1 Samuel 4 came as a direct consequence of the sins of the house of Eli. With 1 Samuel 5—6, however, the narrative shifts its focus to the movement of the ark from the Philistines to Israel. But the movement of the ark only provides the skeleton of the narrative, for the principal concern of these chapters is not the ark but the LORD’s supremacy over the Philistines, their god, and Israel. The LORD’s supremacy over Dagon is outlined in 5:1-5 where, after the Philistines placed the ark in the temple of Dagon, in two consecutive mornings Dagon was found in a posture of worship before the ark—and therefore the LORD.

As for the LORD’s supremacy over the Philistines and Israel, it is important to note that Dtr was concerned to equate Israel with the Philistines. Both Israel and the Philistines wrongly thought that the ark had inherent power. This is implicit in Israel’s declaration, “Why did the LORD put us to rout today before the Philistines? Let us fetch the ark of the covenant of the LORD from Shiloh; thus he will be present among us and
will deliver us from the hands of our enemies” (4:3). Similarly, the Philistines wrongly identified the ark as God/gods: “God has come to the camp . . . Woe to us! Nothing like this has ever happened before. Woe to us! Who will save us from the hand of these mighty gods?” (4:7-8). However, in both instances such anticipation was misguided for, ironically, the ark turned out to be the nemesis not only of the Philistines but of the Israelites as well: the Philistines were struck by plagues because of the ark (5:6-12), and the LORD struck the men of Beth-shemesh for looking into the ark (6:19). In addition to these shared views of the ark, there exists a parallel four-fold sequence between the Philistines and the Israelites in their dealings with the ark. (1) As the ark was taken to Philistia (4:11-5:1) so it was later taken to Beth-shemesh (6:10-12). (2) Both the Philistines and the Israelites were punished for their sin involving the ark: the LORD “struck” (יָדָע) the Ashdodites because the Philistines had taken the ark from Israel (5:6, 9; cf. v. 2); and the LORD “struck” (יָדָע) the men of Beth-shemesh who looked into the ark (6:19). (3) As “the men of Ashdod” then asked, “What shall we do with the ark of the God of Israel?” (5:7-8), so “the men of Beth-shemesh” asked, “Who can stand in attendance on the LORD, this holy God? And to whom shall he go up from us?” (6:20). (4) Finally, whereas the men of Ashdod then “sent” (עָרְשָׁב) messengers to ask what they should do with the ark (5:8), the Israelites thereupon “sent messengers” (עהש). See also Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, 52; and John T. Willis, “An Anti-Elide Narrative Tradition form a Prophetic Circle at the Ramah Sanctuary,” JBL 90 (1971) 301-02; Klaas D. Smelik, Converting the Past. Studies in Ancient Israelite and Moabite Historiography (OTS XXVIII; New York: E.J. Brill, 1992) 46.
to the inhabitants of Kiriath-jearim and told them to take the ark into their keeping (6:21).

By paralleling Israel's involvement with the ark with the Philistine's involvement with the ark Dtr thus effectively placed the Philistines and Israel on the same footing. Consistent with this, Dtr patterned the Ark Narrative after the Exodus story in order to present both the Philistines and Israel as new Egyptians. With regard to the Philistines, this is evident from those two instances in which they explicitly compared their circumstances to those of the Egyptians of old (4:8; 6:6). The movement of the ark from the Philistines to Israel, which is parallels to the movement of Israel from Egypt to the promised land, also supports the equation "Philistia = Egypt." But the same holds true for Israel. In the plagues narrative it was Israel that was oppressed by Egypt and in need of deliverance. Similar to his use of Tetratychal accounts in Judges, Dtr inverted the paradigm afforded by the plagues narrative insofar as it was the ark (and therefore the LORD) that was mistreated by Israel (rather than Israel mistreated by Egypt); and it was the ark that needed to be "delivered" from such mistreatment (rather than Israel that needed to be delivered from Egypt). By patterning the Ark Narrative after the Exodus story, then, Dtr thereby complemented his presentation of the LORD's supremacy over the Philistines and Israel.

1.3.2 The Rejection of the LORD in 1 Samuel 8 and Numbers 11

As with the Ark Narrative, in order to determine Dtr's purpose in patterning 1 Samuel 8 after Numbers 11 it is first important to outline the message of 1 Samuel 8. Samuel evidently regarded the request for a king as a slight against himself, but the
LORD assured him that “it is not you that they have rejected; it is me they have rejected as their king” (8:5). Again, the request “Let our king rule over us and go out at our head and fight our battles” (8:20) was an implicit rejection of the LORD’s leadership in war, for according to the Deuteronomic legislation the LORD was Israel’s military leader (Deut 20:1-4). The LORD had demonstrated as much in his defeat over Dagon (1 Sam 5:1-5) as well as the Philistines (1 Sam 7:2-14).

Significantly, both Numbers 11 and 1 Samuel 8 concern the people’s rejection of the LORD: whereas in Numbers 11 the people rejected the LORD by complaining, in 1 Samuel 8 the rejection consisted of the people’s request for a human king. Because the concerns of Numbers 11 and 1 Samuel 8 are similar Dtr’s purpose in patterning 1 Samuel 8 after the rejection of the LORD in Numbers 11 can be easily ascertained. Dtr sought to underline the rebellious nature of Israel by means of the parallel: the predisposition of the Exodus generation to reject the LORD was equally present in Samuel’s generation. Not only does this interpretation do justice to the content of the respective passages, but Dtr also invited such an interpretation in 1 Sam 8:8: “Like everything else they have done ever since I brought them out of Egypt to this day—forsaking me and worshiping other gods—so they are doing to you” (8:8). This interpretation also finds support from the fact that Dtr used other Tetrateuchal accounts in his outline of the period of the judges in order to present pre-monarchic Israel negatively.

24 Other texts in the DtrH which pertain to the LORD’s military leadership include Josh 10:14, 42; 23:3, 10; Judg 4:14; and 2 Sam 5:24.
1.3.3 Samuel as a Second Moses

In the previous sections dealing with the parallels between the plagues narrative and the Ark Narrative, and the rebellions of Numbers 11 and 1 Samuel 8, I argued that Dtr's primary purpose was to indict Samuel's generation. This does not, however, preclude the possibility that Dtr also had the Moses-Samuel parallel in mind with 1 Samuel 1—8. With regard to Numbers 11 and 1 Samuel 8 two points support this contention. First, Samuel's role as intercessor is the same as that of Moses in these chapters; and second, the fact that the given narratives in 1 Samuel 1—8 follow the same sequence as the corresponding accounts in Moses' life suggests that Samuel is to be understood as a second Moses in 1 Samuel 8: early life and call (Exodus 1—3; 1 Samuel 1—3); plagues narrative and Ark Narrative (Exodus 5—12; 1 Samuel 4—6); defeat of Egyptians/Philistines (Exodus 14; 1 Samuel 7); and the people's rebellion against the Lord (Numbers 11; 1 Samuel 8).25 The parallels that Dtr drew between Moses and Samuel therefore complement Dtr's positive portrayal of Samuel.

But Dtr was not simply interested in presenting Samuel positively. I noted above that, like Moses, Samuel was a prophet (Num 12:6-8; Deut 34:10; 1 Sam 3:20); indeed, he was "a prophet like Moses" after the order of Deut 18:18:—"I will raise up a prophet

---

25 Samuel's relationship to the Ark Narrative merits discussion. Commentators have argued that the Ark Narrative lacks any reference to Samuel because it was an independent source that was incorporated into Samuel (e.g., Klein, 1 Samuel, xxx; cf. the works referred to in Willis ["Anti-Elide," 298 n. 41]). But the absence of Samuel may also be explained by the literary context of the section. Dtr presented Samuel as the imminent successor of Eli and his wicked sons in chapters 1—3 and it was therefore unnecessary to include Samuel before the Elides had met their doom (cf. Smelik, Converting the Past, 44; Frank Anthony Spina, "A Prophet's 'Pregnant Pause': Samuel's Silence in the Ark Narrative [1 Sam. 4:1-7:2]," HBT 13 [1991] 59-73).
from among their own people like yourself.” Consistent with this depiction of Samuel, Dtr’s more specific purpose for the parallel that he drew between Moses and Samuel may be adduced from the relation between Mosaic teaching and the prophetic word in the DtrH. The prophetic word is inseparable from the teaching of Moses in the Former Prophets (1 Kgs 11:29-39; 13:1-3; 14:6-16; 2 Kgs 21:10-15; 22:14-20). Indeed, for Dtr the prophetic word was the channel through which the Deuteronomic blessings and curses were fulfilled: in Deuteronomy 28 Moses taught that the series of blessings for obedience and curses for disobedience would govern Israel’s history; and we find in the Former Prophets eight instances in which a prophetic word was uttered concerning the results of cultic infractions only to be recalled upon their fulfillment.36 Finally, all prophets were to follow the Mosaic pattern (Deut 18:15-22), yet for Dtr Moses was the preeminent prophet: “never again did there arise in Israel a prophet like Moses” (Deut 34:10).37 In light of this association between Moses and the prophetic office it is evident that Dtr drew the given parallels between Moses and Samuel because he wished to present Samuel as a model prophet.

36 Von Rad noted eleven prophecies and their fulfillments in the DtrH: 1 Kgs 11:29-39 and 1 Kgs 12:15; 1 Kgs 13:2 and 2 Kgs 23:16-18; 1 Kgs 14:6-16 and 1 Kgs 15:29; 1 Kgs 16:1-4 and 1 Kgs 16:12; 1 Kgs 21:21-22 and 1 Kgs 21:27-29; 2 Kgs 1:6 and 2 Kgs 1:17; 2 Kgs 21:10-15 and 2 Kgs 24:2; and 2 Kgs 22:15-20 and 2 Kgs 23:30 (“Theology of History,” 78-81). Significant for our purposes, eight of these instances pertain to cultic infractions—the three exceptions being 2 Sam 7:13 and 1 Kgs 8:20; Josh 6:26 and 1 Kgs 16:34; 1 Kgs 22:17 and 1 Kgs 22:35-36 (this is the only instance where the prophecy was not recalled) (“Theology of History,” 78; see also Nicolas Wyatt, “The Old Testament Historiography of the Exilic Period,” Studia Theologica 33 [1979] 61 n.42). 37 Joseph Blenkinsopp is correct in his contention that this statement is “probably a warning against interpreting it [the promise in Deut 18:15-18] in such a way as to put prophetic mediation on the same level as that of Moses” (The Pentateuch. An...
2. THE LINES OF AARON AND ELI

Embedded within the parallels between the lives of Moses and Samuel in 1 Samuel 1—8 are those between the priestly lines of Aaron and Eli.28 (1) Just as Nadab and Abihu the sons of Aaron were put to death at the same time for their cultic infraction (Lev 10:1-3; Num 3:4; 26:61), so Hophni and Phinehas the sons of Eli were killed on the same day because of their cultic infractions (1 Sam 2:12-17, 27-34; 4:17). (2) More specifically, there is a verbal parallel between the accounts. Parallel to “I will be honored (ז"ב; Niphal) before all the people” of Lev 10:3 is “for those who honor me I will honor (伝え; Piel)” of 1 Sam 2:30. The only other instance of ה"ב comes in Isa 60:13, where it is in the Piel stem. (3) Furthermore, whereas Nadab (ע"ב) and Abihu (ע"א) were the sons of Aaron, Abinadab (ע"אע"ב)—whose name consists of a combination of “Abihu” and “Nadab”—was the son of the priest Eleazar (1 Sam 7:1). (4) Finally, there are two Phinehases. The first Phinehas killed Zimri and Cozbi for their cultic/sexual transgression while all Israel was weeping at “the entrance of the tent of meeting” (סנפ נח; Num 25:6).29 As a result, according to Num 25:13 Phinehas’ line was to be an “enduring priesthood” (כַּהַנִּים עֶלְּיוֹן). This is in contrast to Phinehas the son of Eli whose cultic/sexual offense consisted of having sexual relations with the women “at the

---

28 Greenstein also noted some of the following parallels (“Formation,” 171).
29 That their sin was sexual is evident from Num 25:1 (the men committed “harlotry” [נִקְנָה] with the Moabite women), and 25:8 (Phinehas evidently killed the couple, who were in the tent, with one thrust of his spear); that their sin also pertained to the cult is evident from 25:2 (the people sacrificed to the Moabites’ god).
entrance of the tent of meeting” (םִשַּׁתְּךָ הַתָּלַתְּךָ מְצוּרָה; 1 Sam 2:22). As a result, according to 1 Sam 2:25 this Phinehas was to be put to death, and according to 2:30 his line would not last forever (תּוֹרֵדוּתָלָה).

Three arguments may be adduced in support of the proposed direction of dependence. The first argument concerns the criterion of context. In the preceding section I argued that 1 Samuel 1—8 was patterned after the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts. It follows from this that the parallels between the lines of Aaron and Eli are also best explained by the proposed direction of dependence as they are embedded within those between Moses and Samuel in 1 Samuel 1—8.

The second argument involves the criterion of incongruities. Whereas 1 Sam 1:9 and 3:3 refer to “the temple of the LORD” (דֶּרוֹכְלַי יְהוָה) and 3:15 refers to “the doors of the house of the LORD” (אַחַטֲדָלָהוֹת בִּרְיָיוֹהוֹה), 2:22 refers to “the entrance to the tent of meeting” (פָּתָחָה הַתָּלָתְּךָ מְצוּרָה). 1 Samuel 2:22 thus refers to the “tent” while 1:9 and 3:3, 15 refer to the “house” or “temple.” As elsewhere, this incongruity is due to Dtr’s citation of a corresponding Tetrateuchal account, as is evident from the parallel between 1 Sam 2:22 and Exod 38:8. Not only did Dtr have Phinehas the son of Eli commit the same type of offense in 1 Sam 2:22 which Phinehas the son of Aaron was rewarded for having punished in Num 25:1-8, but Dtr also cited Exod 38:8 in 1 Sam 2:22: parallel to “the women who performed tasks at the entrance to the tent of meeting” (דַּנְשֵׁשָלְכַּאֲנוֹת) of 2:22 is “the women who performed tasks at the entrance to the tent of meeting” (הָקַבַּאֲנוֹתָךְ אָשֶׁר עָבָר פָּתָחָה הַתָּלָתְּךָ מְצוּרָה) of Exod 38:8. As elsewhere, the
incongruity can therefore be explained on the basis of Dtr’s citation of the Tetratuchal account.  

The final argument in support of the proposed direction of dependence concerns the criterion of literary function. Dtr’s principal concern in 1 Samuel 2—3 was to outline the certain demise of Eli’s line: Eli’s sons were wicked priests (2:12-17, 22-24); the LORD had resolved to put them to death (2:25); and a man of God prophesied that Eli’s line would not endure because of Eli’s inability to restrain his sons (2:27-36)—a prophecy that was reiterated by the LORD in Samuel’s vision (3:10-14). The parallel between Phinehas the son of Eleazar and Phinehas the son of Eli underlines this concern as the second Phinehas is an inversion of the first Phinehas. The first Phinehas killed Zimri and Cozbi for their cultic/sexual transgression. As a result, according to Num 25:13 Phinehas’ line was blessed; it was to be an enduring priesthood. This is in contrast

---

30 Partly because of the above inconsistency, and partly because LXX and 4QSam do not include the MT’s “and how they lay with the women who performed tasks at the entrance to the tent of meeting,” many commentators have argued that the MT here represents an interpolation (e.g., Driver, Samuel, 33; McCarter, 1 Samuel, 81; Klein, 1 Samuel, 22). Against this view is the fact that this portion in the MT is consistent both with Dtr’s concern to pattern Phinehas the son of Eli after Phinehas the son of Aaron as well as Dtr’s citation of corresponding Tetratuchal accounts. Moreover, the fact that the LXX of 1 Samuel is concerned with priestly matters as well as with presenting priests positively also suggests that the MT best represents the original. I will confine the discussion to 1 Samuel 2. In 2:16 the MT has the people tell Eli’s sons to burn the fat before taking the meat whereas the LXX has the people tell them to cook the sacrifices “as it is fitting” (ὡς καθήκει). In 2:28 of the MT the LORD stated that he had given all of the offerings by fire to the house of Eli and the LXX includes the phrase “for food” (εἰς βρῶσιν), which is a reference to the obligation of the people to the Levites (Lev 22:7; Num 18:9-13; Deut 18:1-8). Whereas the MT of 2:32 has Eli ask “Why do you these things, the evil things that I hear from all these people?” out of deference for the priesthood the LXX omits “the evil things.” Finally, whereas in 2:15 of the MT we read that the priest would not accept boiled flesh but only raw, in the LXX we read that the servant of the priest would not accept boiled flesh.
to Phinehas the son of Eli whose cultic offense consisted in having sexual relations with women who performed tasks at the doorway to the tent of meeting. As a result, Eli’s line was cursed: Phinehas was to be put to death (1 Sam 2:25), and according to 1 Sam 2:30 Eli’s line would not last forever. Once again, it is evident that Dtr inverted a Tetrateuchal account in order to present pre-monarchic Israel negatively.31

3. The Absurdity of Human Kingship: Genesis 2—3, 6—8 and 1 Samuel 14—15

In the following paragraphs I will contend that Dtr patterned 1 Samuel 14, which concerns Jonathan’s eating of forbidden food, after the Eden narrative of Genesis 2—3. I will then argue that Dtr patterned 1 Samuel 15, which concerns the LORD’s regretting having made Saul king, after the flood narrative of Genesis 6—8.

1 Samuel 14 shares the following parallels with the Eden narrative of Genesis 1—3. (1) A superior prohibited people to eat on pain of death (Gen 2:17; 1 Sam 14:24, 28, 39). More specifically, “you will surely die” (תָּבֹא תַחְתוֹן) of Gen 2:17 (cf. 3:3-4) parallels “he will surely die” (תָּבֹא תַחְתוֹן) of 1 Sam 14:39, and the divine “cursing” (יִרְאוֹ אֶלֶּה) [Gen 3:14]; יִרְאוֹ אֶלֶּה [Gen 3:17]) of the serpent and the ground parallels Saul’s oath

31 Important to note is the fact that Dtr was here reliant on P texts for these parallels. With the exception of the references to Nadab and Abihu in Exod 24:1, 9, every other reference to them has been traditionally identified as P (Exod 6:23; 28:1; Num 3:2, 4; 26:61-62; Lev 10:1; see the discussions in Childs, Exodus, 111-14, 499-502; and Budd, Numbers, 29-30, 296-97). That Dtr patterned his account after the P texts rather than after Exod 24:1, 9, is evident from the fact that it is only the P texts that refer to the death of Nadab and Abihu. Again, that Dtr was reliant on P is evident from the striking structural and verbal parallels between the account of P’s Phinehas in Numbers 25 and Dtr’s Phinehas in 1 Samuel 2 (the account in Numbers has traditionally been assigned to
“Cursed be (אֲרָעִי) the man who eats any food” (1 Sam 14:24, 28). (2) The command was then transgressed: Eve and then Adam ate the fruit (Gen 3:6); and Jonathan ate the honey (1 Sam 14:27). (3) The “eyes” of the transgressor(s) were consequently opened/brightened (Gen 3:7; 1 Sam 14:27). (4) An interrogation then ensued: the LORD God questioned Eve and Adam (Gen 3:8-13); and Saul sought to determine who was at fault (1 Sam 14:36-42). More specifically, the LORD’s implicating question to Eve in Gen 3:13, “What is this you have done?” (ובואו שפתי) is parallel to Saul’s command to Jonathan in 1 Sam 14:43, “Tell me what you have done” (דנייה לָי נִחְשָׂבֵית). (5) Finally, the sentence of death was not carried out: Adam was banished from the garden (Gen 3:22-24); and the troops saved Jonathan (1 Sam 14:45).32

This brings us to 1 Samuel 15, which shares the following parallels with the flood narrative of Genesis 6—8. (1) There is a divine decree to annihilate because of sin in both accounts: humanity together with all animals in Gen 6:5-7; and the Amalekites together with all their animals in 1 Sam 15:2-3. (2) A segment of the population was nevertheless delivered: Noah and his family in Gen 6:17-18, and the Kenites in 1 Sam 15:6. (3) The LORD’s statement “I regret that (נָאָמַר יִרְצֶנֶה) I made them” of Gen 6:7 is parallel to the LORD’s statement “I regret that (נָאָמַר יִרְצֶנֶה) I made Saul king” of 1 Sam 15:11 (cf. 15:35). Significantly, this phrase only occurs in these two instances. (4) The phrase “Noah found favor (ירה in the eyes of the LORD (בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה) in Gen 6:8 is akin

P [Budd, Numbers, 275]). That Dtr was reliant on P is also evident from the citation of Exod 38:8 in 1 Sam 2:22.
to “and [Saul] did evil (רָעָּךְ) in the eyes of the LORD (בִּי נַחַל יְהוָה) in 1 Sam 15:19. (5) Finally, a verse in 1 Samuel 14 also shares a verbal parallel with the flood account: the statement “Noah built an altar to the LORD” (רָאָה נָא חוֹבֶת לְיָהוָה) of Gen 8:20 is parallel to “Saul built an altar to the LORD” (רָאָה שָׂעַל חוֹבֶת לְיָהוָה) of 1 Sam 14:35.

The direction of dependence between the two groups of parallels outlined above can be determined from the criterion of literary function: consistent with the wordplays that Dtr drew between 1 Samuel 8 and 15 he patterned Saul of all people after the depiction of the LORD in the Genesis narratives—all in order to underline the absurdity of the request for human kingship.33 No sooner had the LORD defeated the Philistines in 1 Samuel 7 then the people requested a human king who would fight their battles (1 Sam 8:19). That Dtr equated such a request with the rejection of divine kingship is evident from 1 Samuel 8 and 10: “It is not you that they have rejected; it is me they have rejected as their king” (8:7); “But today you have rejected your God who delivered you from all your troubles and calamities. For you said, ‘No, set up a king over us!’” (10:19). But Dtr did not simply equate the people’s request with the rejection of the LORD. Rather, by means of two sets of wordplays between 1 Samuel 8 and 15 Dtr patterned the LORD’s

---

32 Most of these parallels are adapted from Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Jonathan’s Sacrilege. 1 Sam 14, 1-46: A Study in Literary History,” CBQ 26 (1964) 447-48.
33 Blenkinsopp submitted that the account in 1 Samuel 14 pre-dates that of Genesis 2—3: “[t]he compositions we are considering [battle accounts]—and the story of Jonathan’s adventure in particular—stand at this transition period; they are an edition of all that was allowed to survive of the old order and, at the same time, they look forward to the great Yahwist corpus which is, in all probability, a product of the same period” (“Jonathan’s Sacrilege,” 445). However, Blenkinsopp’s conclusion was based only on the supposition that 1 Samuel 14 was written in the early monarchy and that the J source followed shortly thereafter, a point that he did not defend.
rejection of Saul's kingship (1 Samuel 15) after the people's rejection of the LORD's kingship (1 Samuel 8). To begin with, there is the play on the roots שָׁמַע ("to reject") and מלך ("king") between these chapters: the LORD "rejected" Saul as "king" (1 Sam 15:23, 26) even as the people had "rejected" the LORD "from being king" (1 Sam 8:7). Similarly, the play on the roots שָׁמַע ("to obey") and קִאי ("voice") links the two chapters. With regard to the people's request for a king in chapter eight, in two instances the LORD commanded Samuel to "obey the voice" of the people concerning their request for a king (8:7, 9); and when Samuel warned them of the ways of the king the people refused "to obey the voice of Samuel" (8:19). As for chapter fifteen, Samuel said to Saul, "Why did you not obey the voice of the LORD?" (15:19; cf. v. 22); and although Saul contested this accusation, "I did obey the voice of the LORD" (15:20), he later conceded that he feared the people and that he "obeyed their voice" (15:25). As with the play on the roots שָׁמַע and מלך, then, the play on the roots שָׁמַע and קִאי serve to contrast the human rejection of divine kingship in 1 Samuel 8 with the divine rejection of human kingship in 1 Samuel 15.

The parallels between Saul and the Genesis narratives underline this absurdity of replacing human kingship with divine kingship. In three instances in 1 Samuel 14 Saul curiously takes the place of the LORD God of Genesis 2—3: both Saul and the LORD God made the prohibition; they both interrogated the transgressor(s); and they both failed to reject Saul's kingship (1 Samuel 15) after the people's rejection of the LORD's kingship (1 Samuel 8). To begin with, there is the play on the roots שָׁמַע ("to reject") and מלך ("king") between these chapters: the LORD "rejected" Saul as "king" (1 Sam 15:23, 26) even as the people had "rejected" the LORD "from being king" (1 Sam 8:7). Similarly, the play on the roots שָׁמַע ("to obey") and קִאי ("voice") links the two chapters. With regard to the people's request for a king in chapter eight, in two instances the LORD commanded Samuel to "obey the voice" of the people concerning their request for a king (8:7, 9); and when Samuel warned them of the ways of the king the people refused "to obey the voice of Samuel" (8:19). As for chapter fifteen, Samuel said to Saul, "Why did you not obey the voice of the LORD?" (15:19; cf. v. 22); and although Saul contested this accusation, "I did obey the voice of the LORD" (15:20), he later conceded that he feared the people and that he "obeyed their voice" (15:25). As with the play on the roots שָׁמַע and מלך, then, the play on the roots שָׁמַע and קִאי serve to contrast the human rejection of divine kingship in 1 Samuel 8 with the divine rejection of human kingship in 1 Samuel 15.

The parallels between Saul and the Genesis narratives underline this absurdity of replacing human kingship with divine kingship. In three instances in 1 Samuel 14 Saul curiously takes the place of the LORD God of Genesis 2—3: both Saul and the LORD God made the prohibition; they both interrogated the transgressor(s); and they both failed to reject Saul's kingship (1 Samuel 15) after the people's rejection of the LORD's kingship (1 Samuel 8). To begin with, there is the play on the roots שָׁמַע ("to reject") and מלך ("king") between these chapters: the LORD "rejected" Saul as "king" (1 Sam 15:23, 26) even as the people had "rejected" the LORD "from being king" (1 Sam 8:7). Similarly, the play on the roots שָׁמַע ("to obey") and קִאי ("voice") links the two chapters. With regard to the people's request for a king in chapter eight, in two instances the LORD commanded Samuel to "obey the voice" of the people concerning their request for a king (8:7, 9); and when Samuel warned them of the ways of the king the people refused "to obey the voice of Samuel" (8:19). As for chapter fifteen, Samuel said to Saul, "Why did you not obey the voice of the LORD?" (15:19; cf. v. 22); and although Saul contested this accusation, "I did obey the voice of the LORD" (15:20), he later conceded that he feared the people and that he "obeyed their voice" (15:25). As with the play on the roots שָׁמַע and מלך, then, the play on the roots שָׁמַע and קִאי serve to contrast the human rejection of divine kingship in 1 Samuel 8 with the divine rejection of human kingship in 1 Samuel 15.

The parallels between Saul and the Genesis narratives underline this absurdity of replacing human kingship with divine kingship. In three instances in 1 Samuel 14 Saul curiously takes the place of the LORD God of Genesis 2—3: both Saul and the LORD God made the prohibition; they both interrogated the transgressor(s); and they both failed to

---

34 Fokkelman, Narrative Art, 59-60. Fokkelman has noted that the verb שָׁמַע "is exclusively connected with the question of monarchy" in 1 Samuel (Narrative Art, 337).
carry out the sentence of death. Saul, of all people, was patterned after the LORD God.

With regard to 1 Samuel 15, like the LORD in the flood narrative Saul was to annihilate the population with the exception of one group. However, unlike the LORD Saul failed miserably in the task set before him—such that the LORD “regretted” that he had made Saul king even as he had “regretted” making humanity in Gen 6:7. King Saul could not replace the divine king and his failure as a king is nowhere more clear than 1 Samuel 14—15 where he sat under a tree while Jonathan initiated the defeat of the Philistines (14:1-23); where his rash vow lessened the Israelite victory and caused the men to sin (14:24-32); and where he failed to carry out the LORD’s command to annihilate the Amalekites and their animals (15:1-26). By drawing the given parallels Dtr thus underlined the absurdity of replacing divine kingship with human kingship.15

4. DAVID’S RISE TO PROMINENCE AND DTR’S USE OF GENESIS

Dtr drew three sets of parallels between various characters in Genesis and David in order to complement David’s rise to prominence. The first concerns the depiction of Joseph in Genesis 37—41 and that of David in 1 Samuel 16—17. The second involves Jacob and Laban in Genesis 29—31, and David and Saul in 1 Samuel 18—19. And the third concerns the depiction of Jacob in Genesis 29—33 and that of David in 1 Samuel 25.

The term occurs in 8:7(x2); 10:19; 15:23(x2), 26(x2); and 16:1, 7 (but see 15:9 where should be emended to following LXX8 [McCarter, I Samuel, 262]).

15 Cf. Damrosch who has likened Saul to an “anti-God” (Narrative Covenant, 201, 210).
4.1 Joseph (Genesis 37—41) and David (1 Samuel 16—17)

The parallels that exist between Joseph in Genesis 37—41 and David in 1 Samuel 16—17 include the following.\(^{36}\) (1) Both Joseph and David were shepherds (Gen 37:2; 1 Sam 16:11, 19; etc.). (2) From a choice of other brothers both Joseph and David were selected by the LORD to rule Israel: Joseph dreamt that his brothers and parents would bow down to him (Gen 37:5-11; cf. 42:6; 43:26; 44:14); and Samuel anointed David rather than any of his brothers (1 Sam 16:1-13). (3) Both Joseph and David are said to be "prudent" (מעיר) (Gen 41:33, 39; 1 Sam 16:18). This term is used in narratives elsewhere only in 1 Kgs 3:12. (4) The accounts state that Joseph and David were handsome: in Gen 39:6 Joseph is described as יָנוֹשׁ יְרֵא as is David in 1 Sam 17:42 (cf. 1 Sam 16:12, 18). Significantly, these are the only occurrences of this phrase.\(^{37}\) (5) Both Joseph and David were sent by their fathers to their elder brothers to inquire after their welfare (Gen 37:13-14; 1 Sam 17:17-18, 22), at which point the brothers were hostile toward them (Gen 37:12-28; 1 Sam 17:17-20, 28). In terms of the direction of dependence, the criterion of literary effect suggests that Dtr was responsible for the parallel. By patterning the early life of David after the early life of Joseph Dtr emphasized David's eventual rise to prominence from lowly beginnings.

---

\(^{36}\) The following analysis is mostly taken from Garsiel (1 Samuel, 120-21). See also Alter, Biblical Narrative, 117.

\(^{37}\) Cf. Gen 12:11; 29:17; and 2 Sam 14:27 which use the terms in construct, יָנוֹשׁ וְיָרֵא.
4.2 Jacob and Laban (Genesis 29—31), and David and Saul (1 Samuel 18—19)

Many of the parallels that exist between the stories of Jacob and David pertain to their relationship with the daughters of Laban and Saul. (1) As Laban gave his eldest daughter Leah to Jacob (Gen 29:23-26), even though Jacob loved his younger daughter Rachel (Gen 29:18), so Saul offered his older daughter Merab to David (1 Sam 18:17), even though David was loved by Saul’s youngest daughter Michal (1 Sam 18:20).

(2) Jacob and David worked twice as long/hard as was initially required for their wives: Jacob worked for fourteen rather than seven years for Rachel, and David provided Saul with 200 rather than 100 Philistine foreskins for Michal (Gen 29:20, 27; 1 Sam 18:25-27). (3) After Jacob had worked for seven years he told Laban to give him his wife for “my days have been filled” (מָלְאַא יְבֵן; Gen 29:21), while the Samuel account states that David was pleased with becoming the king’s son-in-law, “but the days had not been filled” (נָלָא מָלְאַא מַדְמֹם; 1 Sam 18:26). In both cases the phrase refers to the time that had to elapse before the protagonist could take his wife.

The flights of Jacob and David from their fathers-in-law also have parallels. (1) Jacob as well as David “fled” (עַבְרָה) from their fathers-in-law (Gen 31:21; 1 Sam 19:12). (2) As Rachel deceived Laban when she remained sitting on his “teraphim” (תְּרָפִים) (Gen 31:31-35), so Michal deceived Saul’s men by placing “teraphim” (תְּרָפִים) in David’s bed (1 Sam 19:11-17). (3) As Laban then pursued Jacob because “he was told (רָאָב) that Jacob had fled” (Gen 31:22-24), so Saul sent messengers to seize David because “he was told (רָאָב) that David was at Nain” (1 Sam 19:19-20). (4) A final
resemblance between the two accounts concerns Jacob’s question to Laban, “Why have you deceived me? (湎ְחַה רֶמְתִּי)” (Gen 29:25), which is parallel to Saul’s question to Michal, “Why have you deceived me so? (לֹא הָלְכֵּ֣ה רֶמְתִּי)” (1 Sam 19:17). Though the questions come in different contexts the fact that מָלְחַה רֶמְתִּי occurs elsewhere only in 1 Sam 28:12 makes the parallel striking.

That the account in Samuel was based on the account in Genesis is evident from the criterion of incongruities: the parallel phrase “my days have been fulfilled/but the days had not been fulfilled” is fitting in Gen 29:21 but problematic in 1 Sam 18:26. Whereas in Genesis it clearly refers to the time that Jacob had to wait for his bride, in the Samuel account it has no expressed antecedent. Some scholars have therefore argued that it introduces 18:27 (“When the time had not yet been fulfilled . . .”). Others have simply stated that it is obscure, while still others have argued that the LXX, which does not include the phrase, best represents the original. The most tenable explanation is that, as elsewhere, the problematic phrase arose from the parallel that Dtr drew with Genesis 29—31. The proposed direction of dependence also finds support from the criterion of literary function. Consistent with the parallels between Joseph and David, Dtr drew these parallels to emphasize further David’s rise to prominence despite his circumstances: like Jacob, David had to overcome the machinations of his father-in-law if he was to rise to power.

---

38 Hertzberg, Samuel, 129; Klein, I Samuel, 185; JPS.
39 E.g., Driver, Samuel, 154.
40 E.g., McCarter, I Samuel, 316.
4.3 Jacob and Laban (Genesis 27—33), and David and Nabal (1 Samuel 23:19—26:25)

The three stories involving David and his adversaries Saul and Nabal in 1 Samuel 23:19—26:25 each share many parallels with the account concerning Jacob and his father-in-law Laban in Genesis 27—33. Because there are a host of parallels between 1 Samuel 23:19—24:23 (hereafter, 24) and 1 Samuel 26, where David spared Saul’s life on two occasions while he was fleeing from him, I will deal with the parallels between these chapters and Genesis 29—33 separately from those parallels between the David/Nabal episode in 1 Samuel 25 and the Jacob/Laban episode in Genesis 27. Accordingly, in the first section below I will outline the parallels shared by David in 1 Samuel 25 and Jacob in Genesis 29—33. I will then outline the parallels between David in 1 Samuel 24 and 1 Samuel 26, and Jacob in Genesis 27. In the second section below I will argue that Dtr was responsible for all such parallels and that he drew them in order to emphasize the certainty of David’s accession to the throne as well as his blood-guiltlessness.

4.3.1 The Parallels

4.3.1.1 Jacob (Genesis 29-33) and David (1 Samuel 25)

The parallels that David in 1 Samuel 25 shares with Jacob in Genesis 29—33 include the following.\footnote{Garsiel also includes a discussion of many of the following parallels (Samuel, 130-32).} (1) As Jacob served Laban the wealthy shepherd by tending his
flocks (Gen 30:29), so David served the wealthy shepherd Nabal by protecting his possessions (1 Sam 25:21). (2) The phrase “Laban went to shear his sheep (לֶעַר אֲבֹאָנָיו)” in Gen 31:19 finds a close parallel with “and (Nabal) was shearing his sheep (בַּעַל אֲבֹאָנָיו)” in 1 Sam 25:2. Significantly, these are the only two instances where the verb נִשְׁחַת has נַחַת as its object. (3) Similar to other instances the names of the wealthy shepherds are inversions of each other: “Laban” (לאָב) and “Nabal” (נָבָל). (4) Both Jacob and David requested remuneration for their services. Jacob requested from Laban a selection from his flocks (Gen 30:25-33), and David requested from Nabal a donation, presumably of livestock (1 Sam 25:5-8). (5) Both Jacob and David were nevertheless denied: Laban consented but acted deceptively while Nabal rejected the request (Gen 30:34-35; 1 Sam 25:9-11). ⁴² (6) 1 Samuel 25 is particularly reminiscent of Esau’s statement to Jacob in Gen 31:28-29: “It was a foolish thing for you to do. I have it in my power to do you harm; but the God of your father warned me last night.” To begin with, Laban’s charge that Jacob was “foolish” (הַסְכָּלְלָה) is similar to Abigail’s charge that “Nabal is his name and folly (נַבָּל) is with him” (1 Sam 25:25). Moreover, Laban’s statement that he could have harmed Jacob if God had not warned him is parallel to David’s contention that he would have killed Nabal and his line if Abigail had not dissuaded him (1 Sam 25:32-33). (7) Similarly, both accounts make the point that the success of Jacob and David was the result of divine intervention: although Laban kept

⁴² These denials both stemmed from the materialism of the antagonists. For the materialism of Laban see Robert Alter, The Art of Biblical Narrative (New York: Basic
the streaked and spotted goats for himself (Gen 30:35) the LORD intervened and Jacob came to own large flocks of streaked and spotted goats (Gen 30:37-43; 31:4-16); and although David was determined to kill the males in Nabal's household (1 Sam 25:22, 34) the LORD intervened by sending Abigail to dissuade David (1 Sam 25:32-33; cf. v. 29).

(8) In spite of their rejected requests for fair remuneration both Jacob and David nevertheless succeeded in attaining goods from Laban/Nabal: the speckled and spotted goats miraculously multiplied under Jacob's care (Gen 30:37-43); and Abigail brought David provisions (1 Sam 25:18, 27). (9) Finally, as Jacob wed "beautiful" (םָנָה נְפֶן) Rachel the daughter of Laban (Gen 29:17), so David wed "beautiful" (םָנָה נְפֶן) Abigail the widow of Nabal (1 Sam 25:3). Significantly, this phrase only occurs in two other instances with reference to women.\(^\text{43}\)

But the parallels between these two accounts do not simply consist of those between Jacob and David, and Laban and Nabal. There are also many parallels between Esau and David, and Jacob and Abigail.\(^\text{44}\) (1) Both Esau and David are described as "ruddy" (רַדָּא), a term that only occurs with reference to these characters—though admittedly outside of the given narratives (Gen 25:25; 1 Sam 16:12; 17:42). (2) As Esau met Jacob with "four hundred men" so David set out against Nabal with "about four

---


\(^\text{43}\) Deut 21:11; Esth 2:7; cf. Gen 41:18 where it is used with reference to cattle.

\(^\text{44}\) Many of the following points were adapted from Garsiel, Samuel, 132.
hundred men” (Gen 32:7; 33:1; 1 Sam 25:13).45 (3) As Esau did not avenge himself against his deceptive brother so David did not avenge himself against Nabal (Gen 33:1-17; 1 Sam 25:32-35). Jacob and Abigail also share parallels. (1) Both Jacob and Abigail sought to appease the anger of Esau/David by presenting them with gifts (Gen 32:14-22; 33:1-11; 1 Sam 25:18, 27), which they specifically referred to as a “blessing” (ברך) (Gen 33:11; 1 Sam 25:27). (2) On their way to meet Esau/David both Jacob and Abigail counseled their attendants to “pass on ahead” (��ה לארד) (Gen 32:17; 1 Sam 25:19), a phrase that occurs elsewhere only in Josh 4:5. (3) With regard to the encounter itself, in both cases there is an emphasis on Jacob and Abigail’s obeisance before Esau/David:

“[Jacob] bowed low to the ground (ишימים ארצה) seven times” (Gen 33:3), and

“[Abigail] threw herself face down before David, and bowed low to the ground (חרבה), and fell at his feet” (1 Sam 25:23-24).46 (4) Finally, in both narratives Jacob and Abigail repeatedly addressed Esau and David as “my lord,”47 and they referred to themselves as “servant” (שבור; אמא) and “maidservant” (שבור; אמא).48

4.3.1.2 Jacob (Genesis 27) and David (1 Samuel 23:19—24:33; 26:1-25)

Like 1 Samuel 25, both 1 Samuel 24 and 26 share parallels with the Jacob cycle, Genesis 27 in this instance. Prior to outlining such parallels it is important to note those

45 Apart from these three instances the phrase אברע נמא only occurs in 1 Sam 30:10, which likely refer to the same four hundred men as in 1 Sam 25:13; 1 Sam 30:17; 1 Kgs 22:6 = 2 Chron 18:5.
46 Apart from these two instances, the verb הרע with ירה as an indirect object occurs only in Gen 24:52; Ruth 2:10; 2 Kgs 4:37.
parallels shared by 1 Samuel 24 and 26, where David spared Saul’s life twice while he was fleeing from him.\(^49\) (1) In both accounts David was fleeing from Saul when the Ziphites reported to him “Is not David hiding (הָלַ֣א לֹא דוֹר מָשָׁהוּ) . . . [near] Jeshimon?” (23:19; 26:1). (2) Saul then selected “three thousand chosen men” (סֵלֶ֥לֶת הַעֲלִים אֲלֵיוֹן) of Israel “to search for David” (לְמָלֵךְ אֲלֵיוֹן) (24:3[2]; 26:2). (3) Following this, David had the opportunity to kill Saul, and David’s men/Abishai thereupon told David that the LORD had delivered Saul into his hands (24:5a[4a]; 26:8). (4) David nevertheless refused to harm “the LORD’s anointed,” choosing rather to take something that belonged to Saul (24:5b-7[4b-6]; 26:9-12). (5) David then confronted Saul, telling him, among other things, that he was seeking a “single flea” (חוֹזַע הָעָצָה) (24:15[14]; 26:20) and that his refusal to kill him is evidence of his innocence (24:9-16[8-15]; 26:13-21). (6) At this point Saul confessed his guilt, told David that he would prosper, and departed (24:17-23[16-22]; 26:21-25). A further parallel is the emphasis on providence at different points in both accounts: in the first account the LORD delivered Saul into

\(^48\) Gen 32:5[4], 19[18], 21[20]; 33:5, 14; 1 Sam 25:24-25, 27-28, 31, 41.

\(^49\) The classic form-critical explanation for the parallels between these chapters comes with the study of Klaus Koch who argued that the accounts represent different versions of a single tradition (The Growth of the Biblical Tradition. The Form Critical Method [New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1969] 132-48; cf. J.H. Grønbaek, Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids [1 Sam. 15-2 Sam. 5] [Copenhagen, 1971] 169). As I will argue, a better explanation for these parallels is that they are the result of literary dependence. This was the view of most older commentators who explained the parallels source-critically (e.g., Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel [Cleveland: World, 1961] 264-65; H.P. Smith, The Books of Samuel [ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912] 216). More recent commentators have also argued for literary dependence (e.g., Samuel Sandmel, “The Haggada within Scripture,” JBL 80 [1961] 114; McCarter, 1 Samuel, 386-87).
David’s hands (24:11[10], 19[18]) while in the second account “a deep sleep from the LORD” fell upon Saul’s men (26:12).\(^5\)

Contrary to the traditional contention that 1 Samuel 24 and 26 have little to do with David’s interaction with Nabal in 1 Samuel 25, the fact that 1 Samuel 25 itself shares many parallels with 1 Samuel 24 and 26 thus suggest that the same hand was responsible for their present shape.\(^6\) Consistent with this, these chapters include the following parallels with 1 Samuel 25. (1) In each instance David was treated unjustly by a man of prominence and David had the opportunity to kill him. (2) There is an emphasis on providence: in chapter 24 the LORD delivered Saul into David’s hands (24:11[10], 20[19]); in chapter 25 the LORD kept David from violence against Nabal (25:32, 39); and in chapter 26 “a deep sleep from the LORD” fell upon Saul’s men at the instance of the LORD (26:12). (3) Rather than avenging himself David trusted that the LORD would avenge him (25:33 [cf. vv. 26, 31]; 26:10-11). (4) David is referred to as the “son” of Saul/Nabal (24:17[16]; 25:8; 26:17). (5) As David paid homage to Saul after Saul exited the cave (24:9[8]), so Abigail paid homage to David upon intercepting him (25:23-24). (6) David received evil for good: Saul unjustly pursued David (24:13-14[12-13], 18[17]), and Nabal did not repay David for his protection (25:21). (7) In both accounts reference is made to the descendants of David’s enemy: Saul pleaded with David not to destroy his descendants (24:22[21]) and David relented from killing every


\(^6\) Koch incorrectly argued that chapter 25 “has nothing to do with” chapter 24 (*Biblical Tradition*, 137).
male of Nabal’s line (25:34). (8) Like chapters 24 and 26, chapter 25 is concerned with David’s accession to the throne. This is particularly clear from Abigail’s speech to David which is the pivotal point of the narrative. Abigail declared that the Lord would grant David an “enduring house” (25:28) and that the Lord would accomplish for him all that he had promised by appointing him “ruler over Israel” (25:30; cf. 24:21[20]; 25:28-30). (9) Finally, like chapters 24 and 26, chapter 25 is concerned with David’s blood-guiltlessness. In chapters 24 and 26 David refused to lay a hand on the Lord’s anointed (24:7[6]; 26:11), and in chapter 25 he refrained from avenging himself (25:32-34).\(^5\)

Having argued that a single hand was responsible for the present shape of 1 Samuel 24—26 I will now turn to the correspondences between 1 Samuel 24 and 26, and Genesis 27. (1) The accounts involve a “son” who supplanted another son by receiving a blessing from the father.\(^5\) Jacob the son of Isaac supplanted his brother Esau by deceitfully receiving the “blessing” of his father Isaac. Similarly, David, whom Saul referred to as “my son” (1 Sam 24:17[16]; 26:17, 21, 25), took Jonathan’s place as the successor to Saul, whom David referred to as “my father” (1 Sam 24:12[11]), and he

\(^5\) As Gordon has argued, it is likely that chapter 25 also pertains to the demise of Saul as “Nabal reads like a diminutive Saul” (“David’s Rise,” 45). The primary points that make Nabal a reflex of Saul include their parallel functions in chapters 24—26 (as above); Abigail’s wish that all David’s enemies fare like Nabal, which is a certain allusion to Saul, David’s foremost enemy (25:26); and Saul’s confession that he had “played the fool” (רהבל) (26:21), which is a play on “Nabal” (נבל) (cf. Gordon, “David’s Rise,” 42-51).

\(^5\) Most of the following parallels are taken from Damrosch, Narrative Covenant, 211-12.
received a blessing from Saul (1 Sam 26:25; cf. 24:20-21). (2) The blessing which the “sons” Jacob and David received from their “fathers” are also similar insofar as they both concern their respective reigns: “Let peoples serve you, and nations bow to you” (Gen 27:29); “May you be blessed my son David. You shall achieve and you shall prevail” (1 Sam 26:25). (3) Another parallel between the accounts comes with the identification of the voice of Isaac/Saul’s “son.” As Jacob queried over what seemed to him to be Jacob’s “voice” (קֹולָו) (Gen 27:22), so Saul asked David, “Is that your voice (קֹולֹ), my son David?” (1 Sam 24:17[16]; 26:17). (4) Finally, as “Esau lifted up his voice and wept” (וַיְנשָׁף קָולוֹ וַיַּרְעֵם) upon hearing of the deception (Gen 27:38), so “Saul lifted up his voice and wept” (וַיְנשָׁף קָוָלוֹ וַיַּרְעֵם) upon being confronted by David (1 Sam 24:17[16]).

4.3.2 The Direction of Dependence and the Purpose for the Parallels

The criterion of multiple occurrence supports the proposed direction of dependence: because Dtr based the depiction of David in 1 Samuel 18—19 after that of Jacob in Genesis 29—31, as I argued above, it is reasonable to conclude that he was also responsible for the parallels between 1 Samuel 24—26 and Genesis 27—33.

The criterion of literary function may also be advanced. Whatever their pre-history may have been, 1 Samuel 24 and 26 were subsequently arranged and/or edited in order to complement the principal concerns of 1 Samuel 16—31, the rise of David and the correlated demise of Saul. In this regard Brettler has rightly contended that “[a]

54 Significantly, these are the only instances where David is referred to as the “son” of
major vehicle for asserting the legitimacy of David is emphasizing the illegitimacy of Saul" and that "[a]lmost every chapter of the long unit [1 Sam 14:52—2 Sam 8:15] can be seen as fitting into the ideological program of legitimating David at Saul’s expense."

This theme is also central to 1 Samuel 24 and 26 insofar as both chapters portray David as a righteous hero and Saul as a desperate has-been. More specifically, these chapters are concerned with David’s certain accession to the throne and his blood-guiltlessness.

With regard to David’s accession, in 24:20 Saul declared to David “I know that you will become king and that kingship over Israel will remain in your hands,” and in 26:25 he told him “you shall achieve and you shall prevail.” As for David’s innocence, although in both chapters his men told him that the LORD had delivered Saul into his hands, David was determined to let the LORD alone avenge him (24:13[12], 16[15]; 26:10-11). As I noted above, like 1 Samuel 24 and 26, 1 Samuel 25 is also concerned with David’s accession to the throne. This is particularly clear from Abigail’s speech to David which is the pivotal point of the narrative. Abigail declared that the LORD would grant David an “enduring house” (25:28) and that the LORD would accomplish for him all that he had promised by appointing him “ruler over Israel” (25:30). Again, similar to the concern with David’s blood-guiltlessness in chapters 24 and 26 is chapter 25 where Saul and Saul is referred to as the “father” of David.

55 *Creation of History*, 102, 108. Similarly, Robert P. Gordon has rightly stated that “[t]he motif to which all else in these chapters [1 Sam 16:14–2 Sam 5] is subservient is that of David’s progress towards the throne” (“David’s Rise and Saul’s Demise: Narrative Analogy in 1 Samuel 24-26,” *TB* 31 [1980] 39).

56 Lemche has rightly argued that the primary purpose of these chapters was “(a) to legitimate David’s succession to the throne which rightly belonged to the house of Saul, and (b) to acquit David of charges brought against him for complicity in the disaster that ruined Saul’s family” (Niels Peter Lemche, “David’s Rise,” *JSOT* 10 [1978] 2).
David refrained from avenging himself (25:32-34). The concern of the three narratives in 1 Samuel 24—26 is thus to legitimize David as king.

This brings us to Dtr’s purpose in drawing the parallel between 1 Samuel 24—26 and Genesis 27—33. As Genesis 27—33 is principally concerned with the continuation of the promise to the Patriarchs in the person of Jacob, so the primary concern of 1 Samuel 24—26 is the legitimate ascendance of David to the throne of Israel; and by drawing the parallel Dtr effectively emphasized the given concern. As for the emphasis on David’s innocence, however, determining Dtr’s purpose in drawing the parallel is not so straightforward because Genesis 27—33 is not concerned with establishing the innocence of Jacob. As I noted above, however, there exists a surprising turn in the parallels between 1 Samuel 25 and Genesis 29—33: while for the most part David was patterned after Jacob he also shares parallels with Esau. In Genesis 32—33 Esau, who had been cheated by Jacob and who approached Jacob with “four hundred men,” did not avenge himself. This statement is parallel to 1 Samuel 25 where David, who had been cheated by Nabal and who had approached Nabal with “about four hundred men,” did not avenge himself. Dtr therefore freely adapted the Tetrateuchal paradigm: Esau, rather than Jacob, became David’s counterpart because Dtr wished to emphasize David’s blood-guiltlessness.

5. **Fratricide and Incontinence: Genesis 4, 34, 38; and 2 Samuel 13—14**

Like Judges 19 which shares parallels with Genesis 18—19 and 22, the rape of Tamar in 2 Samuel 13—14 and its aftermath shares parallels with three accounts in Genesis: the rape of Dinah in Genesis 34; the account of Tamar and Judah in Genesis 38; and the
fratricide of Abel in Genesis 4. Because the accounts in Samuel cannot be separated from each other I will outline the parallels that they share with Genesis together.

There are six parallels between the rapes of Dinah and Tamar. 57 (1) Both accounts pertain to the rape of the daughter of a Hebrew leader: Dinah the daughter of Jacob and Tamar the daughter of David. (2) In both accounts the rapists were princes: Hamor was the son of Shechem chief of the Hivites and Amnon was a son of David (Gen 34:2; 2 Sam 13:1). (3) The description of the rape is parallel in both cases. Whereas Gen 34:2 reads, “and he lay with her and ravished her” (רָעָת אֲחָה וְרַעֲמָה), 2 Sam 13:14 reads, “and he ravished her and lay with her” (רָעָת אֲחָה וְרַעֲמָה). (4) The responses of Jacob’s sons and David are very similar. Genesis 34:7 reads, “when they heard . . . they were very angry” (ָּתָּת לֵעָה וְתָּמָּת), while 2 Sam 13:21 reads, “he heard . . . and he was very angry” (שָׁמְעָת לֵעָה וְתָּמָּת). (5) The verdicts regarding the immorality of the rapes are also similar. Whereas Gen 34:7 reads, “he had committed an outrage in Israel . . . a thing not to be done” (רָעָת לֶא יְשַׁלֶּה בְּשׁיָּרָא), in 1 Sam 13:12 Tamar cried, “for such a thing is not done in Israel: don’t commit this outrage” (כִּי לָא יְשַׁלֶּה בְּשׁיָּרָא אֲלֵי יְשַׁלֶּה אֲחָה וְרַעֲמָה). (6) Lastly, in both accounts the brother(s) deceived the transgressor prior to murdering him: Jacob’s sons told Hamor and his clan that they must be circumcised, and Absalom invited Amnon to a feast on the pretext of hospitality (Gen 34:13-17; 2 Sam 13:23-27).

The two Tamar stories share the following parallels. 58 (1) Both accounts outline sexual misconduct toward women with the name of Tamar: Onan would not carry out his levirate duty to Tamar (Gen 38:8-10); Judah treated Tamar as a prostitute (Gen 38:12-23); and Amnon raped Tamar (2 Sam 13:11-14). (2) The transgressors' names as well as their relation to the given Tamars are very similar: Onan (חָשֵׁב) the brother-in-law of Tamar, and Amnon (הָנָן) the half-brother of Tamar (Gen 38:8; 2 Sam 13:1). (3) Finally, Judah’s wife, who is referred to only as the “daughter of Shua” (בּוֹתִית; Gen 38:12), finds a close parallel with David’s wife, “daughter of Sheba” (בּוֹתִית; 2 Sam 11:3). 59

58 The parallels between these accounts have long been noted. See, for example, Michael Heilprin, The Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews (vol. 1; New York: Appleton, 1879) 25-26; see also Gary A. Rendsburg, “David and His Circle in Genesis XXXVIII,” VT 36 (1986) 438-46.
59 Cf. 1 Chron 3:5 where David’s wife is referred to as “daughter of Shua” (בּוֹתִית). For other possible parallels see Rendsburg, “David,” 438-46. With regard to the direction of dependence between these accounts, Zakovitch has argued for two layers in Genesis 34, the second of which consists of the rape element of the account and was borrowed from 2 Samuel 13 in order to provide a motive for the deceit and cruelty of Jacob’s sons (“Assimilation,” 185-90). According to Zakovitch, some of the features that Genesis 34 shares with 2 Samuel 13 occur in this layer. From this he concluded that because the parallel features in the Genesis account are contextually or grammatically incongruous they must have been based on the Samuel account where the same features are not incongruous. The weakness with Zakovitch’s contention that the editor of Genesis 34 sought to pattern the account after 2 Samuel 13 pertains to the purported incongruous nature of the parallel features in the Genesis account. According to Zakovitch, for instance, the fact that (opposite to the Samuel account) Shechem first raped Dinah before falling in love with her is “difficult” (“Assimilation,” 186). To defend this point Zakovitch would have to explain how this sequence is difficult. Again, Zakovitch argued that because the judgment in Gen 34:7, “he had committed an outrage in Israel,” is anachronistic (Israel was not an entity at this point) whereas the parallel in 2 Sam 13:12 is not, the judgment in Gen 34:7 must be dependent on 2 Sam 13:12
The third parallel comes with the fratricides of Abel and Amnon.\(^6\) (1) The men hated their brothers: whereas Cain was filled with jealousy Absalom wanted to avenge his sister (Gen 4:3-5; 2 Sam 13:32). (2) As Cain killed Abel “in the field” (בשראד) (Gen 4:8), so the woman of Tekoa stated in her tale that one brother (= Absalom) killed another (= Amnon) “in the field” (בשראד) (2 Sam 14:6). (3) As Cain feared for his life and appealed to the LORD (Gen 4:14), so the woman of Tekoa feared for the life of her son (= Absalom) and appealed to David (2 Sam 14:11). (4) Protection was thereupon promised for the murderers by the LORD and by David: the LORD put a mark on Cain and David promised the woman of Tekoa that her (fictitious) son would not be put to death (Gen 4:15; 2 Sam 14:11). (5) As Cain was to be a wanderer “upon the face of the earth” (נפל על פני האדמה) (Gen 4:12), so the woman of Tekoa would not have a remnant “upon the face of the earth” (על פני האדמה; 2 Sam 14:7). Significantly, this phrase is used with reference to exile only in these two instances. (6) Finally, as Cain was exiled to the

\(^6\) See also the following: Blenkinsopp, “Jonathan’s Sacrilege,” 449; idem., “Theme and Motif,” 51; Walter Brueggemann, “David and His Theologian,” CBQ 30 (1968) 164-67. In this last article Brueggemann argued that besides the Cain-Abel and Absalom-Amnon parallels, Adam and Eve were patterned after David and Bathsheba, Noah and the flood after Absalom and David, and the Tower of Babel after Solomon and David. However, the proposed parallels are vague and unconvincing.
land of Nod (Gen 4:16), so Absalom was not permitted to leave his house (2 Sam 14:24, 28).

The criterion of multiple occurrence supports the direction of dependence. I argued above that Dtr was reliant on the Eden narrative for his depiction of Saul in 1 Samuel 14. Although Genesis 4 does not share any parallels with 2 Samuel 13—14, the fact that Genesis 4 cannot be separated from Genesis 2—3 suggests that Dtr was also responsible for the parallels between Genesis 4 and 2 Samuel 13—14. The criterion of literary effect also supports the proposed direction of dependence. The given offenses in the Genesis narratives functioned as paradigms for Dtr’s depiction of the events in 2 Samuel 13—14. By means of the parallels Dtr thereby underlined the sordidness of the sexual offense and fratricide that are outlined in these chapters.

---

61 With regard to the close relationship between Genesis 2—3 and 4:1-16 see A.J. Hauser, “Linguistic and Thematic Links between Gen 4:1-16 and Gen 2-3,” JETS 23 (1980) 297-305. In this regard Westermann has rightly argued that “[t]he parallels between Gen 4 and 3 are so striking and thorough as to make the intention of J unmistakable, namely to construct in ch. 4 a narrative of crime and punishment corresponding to that in ch. 3” (Genesis I-11, 285).

62 Upon noting some of the above parallels Joseph Blenkinsopp argued that they point to “a certain genetic development of literary type or Gattung” (“Theme and Motif in the Succession History [2 Sam. XI 2ff] and the Yahwist Corpus,” [VTSup 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966] 50). Similarly, Brueggemann argued that the accounts of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, Noah and the Flood, and the Tower of Babel were respectively based on the stories of David and Bathsheba, Amnon and Absalom, Absalom and David, and Solomon and David (“David,” 156-81). Though they have both noted some interesting parallels their conclusions regarding the direction of dependence were based on nothing more than the assumption, which was then in vogue, that the Succession Narrative was written in the tenth century and that the J source was written shortly thereafter. But the date and/or existence of the Succession Narrative are far from fixed. Similar to Blenkinsopp and Brueggemann, Joel Rosenberg has argued that much of Genesis is an allegory of David’s reign in 2 Samuel (King and Kin. Political Allegory in the Hebrew Bible [Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986]). However, he failed to establish criteria in support of the purported direction of dependence.
6. CONCLUSION

Like Joshua and Judges, the books of Samuel also include parallels that extol and parallels that undermine. Parallels that extol in the books of Samuel include the presentation of Samuel as a new Moses in 1 Samuel 1—8 and the patterning of the early life and reign of David in 1 Samuel 16—19, 24—26 after that of Jacob and Joseph. Parallels that undermine include the presentation of Israel as a new Egypt in the Ark Narrative; the use of Israel’s rebellion in Numbers 11 for Israel’s rebellion in 1 Samuel 8; the patterning of Eli’s line after Aaron’s line; the presentation of Saul in 1 Samuel 14—15 after the LORD in the Eden and flood narratives; and the patterning of the sordid events of 2 Samuel 13—14 after the corresponding accounts in Genesis.

In support of the contention that Dtr rather than his sources was responsible for the parallels is the continuity between the parallels in Joshua, Judges, and Samuel. Similar to his presentation of Joshua, Dtr patterned the life of Samuel after Moses. As Dtr compared pre-monarchic Israel with Sodom in Judges 19 so he equated Israel with oppressive Egypt in the Ark Narrative. Similarly, as Dtr patterned the conquest of Canaan after the Exodus story, to which Rahab referred, so the Ark Narrative, which was also based on the Exodus story, also explicitly refers back to the Exodus story. Again, in the previous chapters I outlined how the parallels in Joshua 1—5 and Judges 19—21 occur within narrative complexes. This same tendency exists in 1 Samuel 1—8, 14—15, 16—17, 18—19, and 2 Samuel 13—14. This too suggests that Dtr was responsible for the given parallels. Finally, like the parallel between “Melchi-zedek of Salem” and “Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem” that Dtr drew in Josh 10:1, so in the books of Samuel Dtr
was wont to use and modify various Tetrateuchal names: Phinehas and Phinehas; Abihu and Nadab, and Abinadab; Laban and Nabal; Tamar and Tamar; Onan and Amnon; and Bath-shua and Bath-sheba.

As I argued in the previous chapter, contending that such consistency only points to a single hand is not sufficient, for the given parallels share many features in common with Dtr’s use of Tetrateuchal accounts in Deuteronomy 1—3. As Dtr was concerned to present Moses positively in Deut 1:9-18, so 1 Samuel 1—8 presents Samuel as a new Moses. As Dtr patterned the conquest of the Transjordan after the Tetrateuchal account of the Exodus and explicitly referred back to the Exodus story, so the Ark Narrative shares many parallels with the Exodus story and in two instances the Exodus story is explicitly referred to (1 Sam 4:8; 6:6). Another similarity concerns the motif of the hardening of the heart. In Deut 2:30 Moses stated that the LORD had stiffened the will of Sihon in order to deliver him over to Israel. That Dtr here had the Exodus story in mind is evident from the fact that Deut 2:30 includes two verbal parallels with the Exodus story. Similar to this is 1 Sam 6:6 where the Philistine diviners and priests counseled the Philistines not to harden their hearts as did the Egyptians and Pharaoh. It also bears mentioning at this point that, like 1 Sam 6:6, Rahab’s speech to the spies in Josh 2:9-10 also includes parallels with the Exodus story to which it explicitly refers. Because the parallels in Joshua—Samuel share similar features, and because such parallels are also similar to Dtr’s use of Tetrateuchal accounts in the prologue, it is best to conclude that Dtr was responsible for the given parallels.
The above conclusions present a challenge to the view that Dtr had little or nothing to do with the given accounts in the books of Samuel. If the account of Samuel's birth and childhood (1 Samuel 1—4:1a) and the Ark Narrative (1 Sam 4:1b—7:1) existed prior to Dtr then they were totally reworked by him, for they are heavily reliant on Tetratauchal accounts pertaining to the life of Moses.\footnote{Even Damrosch, who argued for the existence of a pre-Deuteronomistic Ark Narrative stated the following regarding its use of the plagues narrative:} Though 1 Samuel 14 and 15 may have had independent origins, the fact that they both play off stories in the Primeval History shows that in their present form they are the product of Dtr. If the so-called History of David's Rise (1 Sam 16:14—2 Sam 5:10) was at one time an independent source, the fact that much of 1 Samuel 18—19 was based on Genesis 29—31 and that 1 Samuel 24—26 on Genesis 27—33 shows that this source also underwent a Deuteronomistic reworking. Finally, if the so-called Succession Narrative (2 Samuel 9—20; 1 Kings 1—2) ever had an independent existence, at a minimum one must conclude that Dtr reworked the story of Absalom in 2 Samuel 13—14: it includes parallels with the rape of Dinah in Genesis 34, the story of Tamar in Genesis 38, and the fratricide of Cain in Genesis 4.\footnote{For reviews of scholarship on the Succession Narrative and the books of Samuel see Randall C. Bailey, \textit{David in Love and War. The Pursuit of Power in 2 Samuel 10-12} (JSOTSS 75; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990) 7-31; and P. Kyle McCarter, "The Books of Samuel," in \textit{The History of Israel's Traditions. The Heritage of Martin Noth} (eds. Steven}
The books of Kings share three groups of parallel narratives with the Tetrateuch. In chapter two I argued that the parallels between the divine promise of a son to Abraham and Sarah in Genesis 18 and Elisha’s promise of a son to the barren Shunemite woman are only the product of Dtr’s familiarity with Genesis 18. The other two sets of parallels in the books of Kings both concern Moses and were drawn by Dtr for effect.

1. **Egypt Revisited and Aaron Revived: Exodus 1—14, 32 and 1 Kings 3—15**

The construction of the temple and its aftermath in 1 Kings 3—15 consists of nothing less than the reliving of Israel’s early history as a nation, for the history which these chapters trace are closely analogous to several of the major events recorded in Exodus. As elsewhere, however, the Deuteronomistic account consists of an inversion of its corresponding Tetrateuchal account: Solomon was patterned after Moses only to become a new Pharaoh; Rehoboam the king of Israel is a new Pharaoh; Hadad follows the Mosaic trail only to turn from it at the point of delivering oppressed Israel; and Jeroboam also follows the Mosaic trail only up to the point of delivering Israel—at which point he becomes a new, apostate Aaron. Finally, unlike Exodus 33—34 there is no Moses to intercede on behalf of idolatrous Israel and consequently no divine forgiveness.¹ Dtr’s purpose for drawing such parallels was to indict the early monarchy with having become

a second Egypt which enslaved the people of God and to underline the seriousness of Jeroboam's sin by patterning it after the gravest sin of Israel's earlier history.

1.1 The Parallels

1.1.1 Pharaoh and Solomon, and Moses and Hadad

That Dtr patterned the early monarchy after the history of Israel as it is outlined in Exodus is first evident from the place which he accorded the temple. Consistent with Dtr's view that the construction of the temple was the high point of the monarchical period, from his perspective the Tabernacle was but the Temple in utero. This is particularly evident from Solomon's dedication of the Temple in 1 Kings 8. The priests brought the Tent of Meeting together with its holy vessels to the Temple (8:4); they "brought the Ark of the LORD's covenant to its place" in the holy of holies (8:6); and Solomon could conclude, with reference to the law of centralized worship (Deut 12:1-28), that "not a single word has failed of all the gracious promises that he made through his servant Moses" (8:56). As the overseer of the construction of the Temple, Solomon thus corresponds to Moses as the overseer of the construction of the Tabernacle.

Yet Solomon was no Moses. If anything, he was the antithesis of Moses. Whereas Moses brought the people out of Egypt and led them to the edge of the

---

1 That Dtr was referring to the law of centralized worship in 8:56 is evident from its relationship with Deuteronomy 12: in Deut 12:10-11 Moses stated, "when . . . he grants you rest (יִרְבָּג) from all your enemies . . . then you must bring everything that I command you to the place where the LORD your God will choose to establish his name"; and after the construction of the Temple Solomon stated, "Praised be the LORD who has given rest (נָקָל) to his people according to all that he promised; not a single word has failed of all the gracious promises that he made through his servant Moses" (1 Kgs 8:56).
promised land, Solomon effectively transformed the promised land into a new Egypt.

The relationship between Solomon and Egypt is first evident from 1 Kgs 3:1: “Solomon allied himself by marriage with Pharaoh king of Egypt. He married Pharaoh’s daughter and brought her to the City of David.” Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter is picked up again in 7:8; 9:16, 24; and 11:1, which introduces the cause of Solomon’s demise: his marriage to foreign women. For Dtr Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter constituted the beginning of a return to Egypt. Solomon’s relationship to the law of the king in Deut 17:14-20 also links Solomon to Egypt. That Dtr had the law of the king in mind in his presentation of Solomon is evident from the following parallels.

The statement, “And he shall not take many wives, lest his heart go astray” of Deut 17:17a shares striking parallels with 1 Kgs 11:1-10, as Brettler has noted:

Its literary connection to Deut. 17.17 is clear; Deuteronomy prohibits having too many wives, using the verb רְבָּעָה, ‘to increase’, the same root used in 11.1, רְבָּעָה נְבֵרָיות, ‘many foreign wives’. Deuteronomy, in its motive clause, warns יָאָה יִרְאוּ לְבָּבָו, ‘so his heart will not stray’; paralleled by 1 Kgs 11.2, יָאָה נְצִיאוּ אֲרָיֹלֶהוֹ, ‘[the nations . . . who] will sway your heart’, v.3 רְפָּס הֵבֶל לְבָּב, ‘his wives swayed his heart’, v.9 כְּרֵפָּס הֵבֶל לְבָּב, ‘because his heart strayed’ and perhaps the mention of מֹסֶית לְבָּב, ‘heart’, twice in v. 4b.4

---


Similarly, Solomon’s amassing of gold in 1 Kgs 9:28—10:25 is reminiscent of “nor shall he amass silver and gold to excess” of Deut 17:17b. But most important for our purposes is Deut 17:16, “he shall not keep many horses or send people back to Egypt to add to his horses since the LORD has warned you, ‘You shall not go back that way again.’” 1 Kings 10:26, 28 stands in marked contrast with this command: “Solomon assembled chariots and horses, which he stationed in the chariot towns and the king in Jerusalem... Solomon’s horses were procured from Egypt and Kue.”

In light of the parallels between Deut 17:16-17 and Solomon, there can be little question that Dtr had the law of the king in mind in his references both to Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter as well as in his references to Solomon’s horses. In contrast to Moses, then, Solomon led Israel from Canaan to Egypt and thereby inverted the Exodus story.

Consistent with Solomon’s inversion of the Exodus story are the parallels that Dtr drew between the pharaoh of the Exodus story and Solomon. As magnificent as Solomon’s building enterprises may have been, according to Dtr they were accomplished on the backs of Israelites and non-Israelites alike (1 Kgs 5:27-30[17-20]; 9:15-22), a fact that is dangerously reminiscent of the Pharaohs’ treatment of Israel. Again, the fact that both Pharaoh and Solomon used slave labour to build “store cities” (תַּוְּרָא, נַחֲלַנִים) is suggestive of Dtr’s attempt to draw a parallel between these figures (Exod 1:11; 1 Kgs 9:19).6

---

5 That Solomon’s horses of 1 Kgs 5:6 [4:26] were from Egypt is evident from 1 Kgs 5:1 [4:21] which teaches that the Egyptians brought Solomon tribute.
6 Zakovitch, Concept of the Exodus, 88. For recent analyses of the critical portrayal of Solomon in 1 Kings 1—11 see Brettler, “1 Kings 1-11,” 87-97; Sweeney, “Solomon,”
What is only adumbrated with Solomon becomes full-blown with Hadad, for in just nine verses (1 Kgs 11:14-22) Dtr drew many striking parallels between Moses and Hadad. (1) Just as Pharaoh sought to kill all the Hebrew male infants in the time of Moses, so Joab killed every male in Edom in Hadad’s day (Exod 1:15-22; 1 Kgs 11:15-16). (2) Both Moses and Hadad escaped from their oppressors: after escaping the threat of male infanticide Moses later fled from Pharaoh after killing the Egyptian (Exod 2:11-15); and Hadad escaped the massacre of male Edomites (1 Kgs 11:17). (3) Whereas Moses fled from Egypt to Midian, however, Hadad fled from Midian to Egypt (Exod 2:15; 1 Kgs 11:17-18). (4) While Moses was in Midian he won the favor of Reuel the priest of Midian who then gave (יִדוּ הַנַּחַל) his daughter Zipporah to Moses, who bore him a son, Gershom (Exod 2:16-22). Similarly, while Hadad was in Egypt he won the favor of Pharaoh, who thereupon gave (יִדוּ הַנַּחַל) his sister-in-law to Hadad as a wife, who bore him a son, Genubath (1 Kgs 11:18-20). There is, moreover, a parallel between Moses and Hadad’s son Genubath insofar as both Moses and Genubath were weaned/reared by someone other than their natural mothers and were brought up in a

Failure to take יֹדֵע as a preposition at this point led to the LXX’s emendation כָּאֵיָּהֶנֶּרֶה קָנְתָּה סִמְכַּה רֹדָה אֵינוֹ זַבִּיק ("when David annihilated Edom"). But יֹדֵע should be taken not as the sign of the accusative but as the homonymous preposition and translated as “near” (cf. Exod 20:23; Judg 4:11; Waltke, Syntax, 11.2.4a). For other proposals see the discussion in Gray, Kings, 282.

Rather than following the MT’s כָּאֵיָּהֶנֶּרֶה זַבִּיקוֹ (and [Tahpanes] weaned him) in 1 Kgs 11:20, a few commentators, such as Gray (Kings, 282) have followed the LXX’s כָּאֵיָּהֶנֶּרֶה זַבִּיקוֹ (and [Tahpanes] brought him up) because Tahpanes’ ability to wean the child is suspicious (her sister was the mother). However, as elsewhere Dtr
Both Moses and Hadad discovered that their oppressors had died: as Exod 4:19 reads, “The LORD told Moses in Midian ‘Go back to Egypt, for the men who sought to kill you are dead,’” so 1 Kgs 11:21 reads, “Hadad heard in Egypt that David had been laid to rest with his fathers and that Joab the army commander was dead.”

Just as Moses requested of Jethro, “Let me go back to my kinsmen in Egypt and see how they are faring,” so Hadad requested of Pharaoh, “Give me leave to go to my own country” (Exod 4:18; 1 Kgs 11:21). Finally, shortly after the Sinai event Moses and the people stayed in the wilderness of Paran (Num 10:12), at which time they successfully urged Hobab to stay with them (Num 10:29-32). This parallels 1 Kgs 11:18 where Hadad and some Edomite men traveled through Paran and “took along with them men from Paran.”

1.1.2 Moses, Aaron, and Jeroboam; and Pharaoh and Rehoboam

The second group of parallels comes with Moses, Aaron, and Jeroboam; and Pharaoh and Rehoboam. Jeroboam shares the following parallels with Moses. (1) Both Moses and Jeroboam lived under oppressive kings—Moses under Pharaoh and Jeroboam under Solomon—who forced the people to build or rebuild cities: Pithom and Ramses in Moses’ case and Jerusalem in Jeroboam’s case (Exod 1:11; 1 Kgs 11:27-28).  

may have been attempting to draw the reader’s attention back to the Exodus narrative which refers to the weaning of Moses (Exod 2:9). In any case, both the LXX and the MT of 1 Kgs 11:20 are consistent with the parallel as the Exodus account refers both to the weaning and rearing of Moses.

See page 129 where I note that both Moses and Samuel were brought up in official establishments: Moses under Pharaoh’s daughter in the court of Pharaoh and Samuel under Eli in Shiloh (Exod 2:10; 1 Sam 1:24-3:21).
Both figures nevertheless enjoyed positions of grandeur—Moses in Pharaoh’s court and Jeroboam in the court of Solomon (Exod 2:10-11; 1 Kgs 11:28). (3) As Moses fled from Pharaoh to Midian, so Jeroboam fled for his life from Solomon to King Shishak of Egypt (Exod 2:15; 1 Kgs 11:40). (4) Like Moses, Jeroboam returned to his land after the death of his enemy (Exod 4:19-20; 1 Kgs 11:40; 12:1-3). (5) There is also a parallel between Moses and his people and Jeroboam and his people. In Exod 5:1-3 Moses and Aaron asked Pharaoh to give the people reprieve from their labours for worship, and in 1 Kgs 12:4 (cf. vv. 9-10) the people asked Rehoboam to lighten their labours.

---

10 To be sure, Num 10:29-32 itself is ambiguous as to whether or not Hobab ventured further with the nation, but in Dtr’s mind he evidently did so (cf. Judg 1:16; 4:11).
11 The parallel between Moses and Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 11:28 is furthered with the use of the root הָבָשׁ as it is reminiscent of the oppression that the Hebrews suffered while in Egypt (Exod 1:11; 2:11; 5:4-5; 6:6-7; cf. Ps 81:7). At this point there are also parallels between Joseph and Jeroboam: both figures were appointed as high officials in the kings’ court (Gen 41:33-43; 1 Kgs 11:28); and the phrase רְבִּיא עָרָבָה in 1 Kgs 11:28 also occurs in the Joseph narrative (Gen 43:18-19; 50:8).
13 A less likely parallel consists of Rudolph Smend’s contention that the absence of any reference to Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 12:1-11 is similar to the absence of Moses in Exodus 5. According to Smend, the narrator refrained from referring to Moses in Exodus 5 (vv. 1-2, 20-23 being redactional according to Smend) in order to heighten the tension: even though the LORD had promised victory through Moses in Exodus 3—4, in the peoples’ time of duress in Exodus 5 Moses had no part to play; he only came onto the scene in Exodus 6. So also, even though the LORD had promised Jeroboam a kingdom in 1 Kgs 11:29-39, in the peoples’ time of duress in 1 Kgs 12:1-11 no mention is made of Jeroboam (following the LXX); he only comes onto the scene later in 1 Kings 12 (Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation [New York: Abingdon, 1970] 125-27). However, this proposed parallel between Moses and Jeroboam is only as good as the
The parallels between Aaron and Jeroboam surface with the accounts of the
golden calves in Exodus 32 and 1 Kgs 12:25-31. (1) The literary context of the sins of
Aaron and Jeroboam are parallel: Aaron’s offence follows the cultic high point of the
Tetrateuch, the covenant and law at Sinai (Exod 19:1-24:18); and Jeroboam’s offence
follows the cultic high point of the DtrH—the construction of the temple and worship in
Jerusalem (1 Kgs 6:1-9:3). (2) Just as Aaron made the molten calf from gold in response
to the request of the people, so Jeroboam’s decision to make the two golden calves
stemmed in part from his counselors (Exod 32:1; 1 Kgs 12:28). (3) The declarations of
the Exodus generation and Jeroboam are almost identical: “These are your gods, O
Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt” (Exod 32:4, 8); “Behold your gods,
O Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt” (1 Kgs 12:28). (4) After the
construction of the calf/calves both Aaron and Jeroboam celebrated a festival, for which
Aaron built an altar and Jeroboam ascended an altar (Exod 32:5-6; 1 Kgs 12:32-33 [cf. 2
Kgs 23:15]). (5) Just as Moses had the Levites slay the transgressors (Exod 32:26-28)—
who were likely priests themselves, as is evident from Exod 32:27 where Moses
commanded the Levites to slay “brother, neighbour, and kin” (cf. v. 29)—so a man of
God prophesied that Josiah would slaughter the priests who sacrificed at the calf at
Bethel (1 Kgs 13:2). (6) A final parallel between Aaron and Jeroboam is that both of

contention that the references to Moses in Exodus 5 are redactional, which is not at all clear.
15 Gary N. Knoppers, “Aaron’s Calf and Jeroboam’s Calves,” in Fortunate the Eyes that
See. Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday
them had two sons who share a number of similarities. First, their names are parallel: Aaron’s sons were Nadab and Abihu and Jeroboam’s sons were Nadab and Abijah. Second, both pairs of sons died for cultic infractions: Aaron’s sons died because they offered “strange fire” (Lev 10:1-3), while Jeroboam’s sons died because he set up the golden calves (1 Kgs 14:1-14; 15:25-30). Finally, there was no possibility that either pair of sons could have descendants: Aaron’s sons died childless (Num 3:4) and Jeroboam’s line was annihilated (1 Kgs 14:10-11; 15:29). This brings us to the parallels between Pharaoh and Rehoboam. (1) Whereas Moses asked Pharaoh to let the people go on a three-day journey in order to worship, Rehoboam instructed the people to go away for three days, at which time he would tell them his decision (Exod 3:18; 5:3; 8:23[27]; 1 Kgs 12:5, 12). (2) In each instance the kings’ response to the people’s request for reprieve is also parallel: in Exodus 5 Pharaoh told the foremen that the people’s labours were to increase, and in 1 Kgs 12:9-14 Rehoboam told the people that their labours were to be sharply multiplied. (3) In both accounts officials urged the king to heed the cry of the people (Exod 10:7; 1 Kgs 12:7). Pharaoh, however, was slow to do so (Exod 10:8-11, 24-29) and Rehoboam was entirely negligent (1 Kgs 12:8). (4) As the LORD had hardened Pharaoh’s heart to accomplish his purpose, so Rehoboam did not heed the advice of his counselors for the LORD “had brought it about to fulfill the promise” that he had made through the prophet Ahijah

---

16 The following parallels were taken from Roland Gradwohl, “Das ‘Fremde Feuer’ von Nadab und Abihu,” ZAW 75 (1963) 288-96.
17 The names Abihu and Abijah have the same meaning. Abihu means “he [Yahweh] is my father” while Abijah means “Yahweh is my father.”
Dm's Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives in I and II Kings

(Exod 4:21; 7:3; 9:12; 10:1; etc.; 1 Kgs 12:15). (5) Finally, as Pharaoh's stubbornness led to Israel's carrying off Egypt's wealth, the sins of Rehoboam and his people led to Egypt's despoiling of Israel's wealth (Exod 12:35-36; 1 Kgs 14:25-26).¹⁹

1.2 The Direction of Dependence

The proposed direction of dependence is supported, first, by the criterion of Deuteronomistic tendency. In the previous chapters I noted that Dtr used personal names in the given Tetrateuchal accounts in very clever ways. Consistent with this is the play on the names "Nadab" and "Abijah" the sons of Aaron. In the last chapter I argued that Dtr combined these names to create the name "Abinadab" of 1 Sam 7:1. Significantly, Jeroboam's sons "Nadab" and "Abijah" are also parallel to "Nadab" and "Abihu." The fact, then, that Dtr had a penchant for using and adapting personal names and that he used the names of Aaron's sons elsewhere suggests that he was also responsible for the names "Nadab" and "Abijah." Similarly, in the preceding chapters I argued that Dtr based much of Joshua 1—5 and 1 Samuel 1—8 on events in the life of

---

¹⁸ See the chart on page 188 for all the parallels between the Tetrateuchal accounts and those in 1 Kings 5—15.

¹⁹ Though the motif of the despoiling of Judah's wealth—particularly that of the temple and the palace—by its enemies is a common motif in the DtrH (1 Kgs 15:18; 2 Kgs 12:19; 24:13; cf. 16:8; 18:16), this is the only instance in which Egypt was the despoiler. Also important to note is the use of the root עָבְרָה in the Exodus and Kings accounts. With regard to the use of "עָבְרָה", the Egyptians and Pharaoh imposed "hard labour" (עָבְרָה כַּפָּשֶׁס) on Israel (Exod 1:14; 6:9; cf. 6:6 where כַּפָּשֶׁס is used without כַּפָּשֶׁס), even as the Israelites begged Rehoboam to lighten the "hard labour" of his father (עָבְרָה אֵלֶּה כַּפָּשֶׁס) (1 Kgs 12:4 = 2 Chron 10:4). (Besides these occurrences, is modified by קָפַשְׁת only in Deut 26:6, which also refers back to the Exodus, and Isa 14:3.) As for the verb עָבְרָה, it occurs with reference to Israel's serving Egypt (Exod 1:13-14; 5:18; 6:5) and Israel's serving Rehoboam (1 Kgs 12:4, 7).
## Retelling Mosaic Traditions in 1 Kings 5—15

### Moses, Hadad, and Jeroboam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moses</th>
<th>Hadad</th>
<th>Jeroboam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandeur in the King’s Court</td>
<td>Exod 2:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived Under Oppressive King(s)</td>
<td>Exodus 2:14</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaped Genocide</td>
<td>Exod 1:15-16; 2:1-10</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fled from King to a Foreign Land</td>
<td>Exod 2:15</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was Authority’s Daughter who Bore a Son</td>
<td>Exod 2:16-22</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested to Return at Death of Enemy</td>
<td>Exod 4:18-19</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Reprieve Relief</td>
<td>Exod 5:1-3</td>
<td>1 Kgs 12:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were Denied the Request</td>
<td>Exod 5:1-5</td>
<td>1 Kgs 12:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Paran</td>
<td>Num 10:12, 29-33</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aaron and Jeroboam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aaron</th>
<th>Jeroboam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselled to Build Calf Calves</td>
<td>Exod 32:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Calf Calves</td>
<td>Exod 32:4, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Ascended Altar</td>
<td>Exod 32:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrated Festival</td>
<td>Exod 32:5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (to be) Slain</td>
<td>Exod 32:26-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Heinous Offense</td>
<td>Exod 32:21, 30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons were Nadab and Abihu Abijah</td>
<td>Exod 6:23, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons Had No Descendants</td>
<td>Num 3:4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second Pharaohs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharaoh(s)</th>
<th>Joab</th>
<th>Solomon</th>
<th>Rehoboam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oppressed Israel</td>
<td>Exod 1:8-14; 5:6-14</td>
<td>1 Kgs 5:27-30; 9:15-22</td>
<td>1 Kgs 12:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killed Males</td>
<td>Exod 1:15-22</td>
<td>1 Kgs 11:15-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected Reprieve</td>
<td>Exod 5:1-5</td>
<td>1 Kgs 12:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Burden</td>
<td>Exod 5:6-19</td>
<td>1 Kgs 12:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected Advice</td>
<td>Exod 10:7-11</td>
<td>1 Kgs 12:7-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence and Sin</td>
<td>Exod 4:21; etc.</td>
<td>1 Kgs 12:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plundered</td>
<td>Exod 12:35-36</td>
<td>1 Kgs 14:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moses. That 1 Kings 3—15 also shares many striking parallels with Moses therefore suggests that Dtr was responsible for them. Again, in the preceding chapters I argued that Dtr based much of Deuteronomy 1—3, Joshua 1—5, and 1 Samuel 4—6 on the Exodus story. It is therefore again tenable to conclude that Dtr was responsible for the many parallels that 1 Kings 3—15 shares with the Exodus story. Similarly, in my analyses of Judges 19 and the Ark Narrative I argued that Dtr presented Israel as a new Sodom and a new Egypt respectively; and the fact that Israel shares many parallels with Egypt in 1 Kings 3—12 again suggests that Dtr was responsible for the given parallels.

A final argument in support of the proposed direction of dependence concerns the criterion of literary function. In the following section I will argue that because the parallels complement Dtr’s anti-Egypt rhetoric as well as his negative portrayal of Jeroboam it is best to conclude that they were drawn by Dtr.

1.3 The Purpose of the Parallels

The above parallels consist of two streams. In the first stream Dtr patterned Solomon and Rehoboam after the pharaohs of the Exodus story, and Hadad and Jeroboam after Moses—all in order to present Israel as a new Egypt that oppressed the people of God. In the second stream Dtr patterned Jeroboam after Aaron and he thereby indicted both Jeroboam and the succeeding kings of Israel with having revived the apostasy of Aaron.
1.3.1 Egypt Revisited and the Absence of Moses

Dtr's purpose in drawing many of the above parallels may be adduced from the anti-Egypt rhetoric in the DtrH. The LORD had delivered Israel from Egypt that "iron furnace" (1 Kgs 8:51) with a "mighty hand and an outstretched arm" (Deut 6:21; 26:8). The children were to learn this (Deut 6:20-25); the people were to recall it at their festivals (Deut 26:5-10); kings were not to send the people back to Egypt (Deut 17:16); and the final Deuteronomic curse for disobedience included returning to Egypt where the people would offer themselves as slaves (Deut 28:68). Tragically, the DtrH ends where it started. As is suggested by Deut 1:3, the DtrH begins with the Exodus from Egypt; and it ends with the people's return to Egypt: "the people, young and old, and the officers of the troops set out and went to Egypt" (2 Kgs 25:26). Consistent with this emphasis, in the paragraphs to follow I will argue that in the given parallels Dtr presented Israel as a new Egypt in order to provided a subtle, yet damning critique of the early monarchy.

The presentation of Israel as a new Egypt is first adumbrated in the reign of Solomon. Solomon inverted the Exodus story by marrying Pharaoh's daughter, making the Israelites return to Egypt for horses, and, like the pharaohs before him, building his empire on the backs of Israelites. Similarly, like Pharaoh before him Solomon's son Rehoboam multiplied the labours of the Israelites. This brings us to the portrayals of Hadad and Jeroboam. Like Moses, Hadad escaped genocide and fled to a foreign land

---

10 On Deut 1:3 see Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 40 n. 2; see also Richard Eliot Friedman, "From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr1 to Dtr2," in *Traditions in Transformation*. 
where he was welcomed and where he married and had a son. Similarly, like Moses
Jeroboam enjoyed a position of grandeur, fled for his life, returned after the death of his
enemy, and protested with the people against the king because of the harsh labour. Dtr’s
purpose for drawing these parallels may be adduced from the flights of Hadad and
Jeroboam from their oppressors. Hadad’s flight was the reciprocal of Moses’ flight:
whereas Moses fled to Midian from Egypt, Hadad fled to Egypt from Midian. Similarly,
Jeroboam’s flight consists of an inversion of the Exodus: whereas the nation fled from
Egypt to Israel, Jeroboam fled from Israel to Egypt. This sort of inversion is also evident
from King Shishak’s despoliation of wealthy Israel in the reign of Rehoboam (1 Kgs
14:25-26), which is an inversion of Exod 12:35-36 where Israel despoiled wealthy
Egypt. For Dtr, Israel had thus become the locale of slavery and oppression and Egypt
had become the land of refuge, and like the parallels that Solomon and Rehoboam share
with the pharaohs, the fact that Hadad and Jeroboam failed to deliver Israel again points
to Dtr’s attempt to indict early-monarchic Israel with having become a new Egypt.

In addition to the many points of contact the two streams share striking
omissions, both of which are to be interpreted.21 With regard to the first stream, at the
point where the implied reader expects Hadad and then Jeroboam to deliver Israel they
fail—there is no new Moses to deliver oppressed Israel. If the pattern between Moses
and Hadad had continued Hadad would have been in the position to deliver Israel from

---

21 On the reading of “gaps” in Hebrew narrative see Meier Sternberg, *The Poetics of
Biblical Narrative. Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington:
pharaonic Solomon. However, the parallels between Moses and Hadad abruptly stop in 1 Kgs 11:22 where Hadad requested to return to Edom—even as Moses had requested to return to Egypt in Exod 4:18.22 There was no new Moses to deliver oppressed Israel.

Similarly, Jeroboam followed Moses as far as Exodus 5, but at the very inception of his kingdom, a kingdom that was to endure if he remained faithful (1 Kgs 11:38), Jeroboam ceased following Moses. Again, there was no new Moses to deliver oppressed Israel.

For the implied reader Dtr’s conclusion to Deuteronomy becomes all the more haunting:

Never again did there arise in Israel a prophet like Moses—whom the LORD singled out, face to face, for the various signs and portents that the LORD sent him to display in the land of Egypt, against Pharaoh and all his courtiers and his whole country, and for all the great might and awesome power that Moses displayed before all Israel (Deut 34:10-12).

1.3.2 The Revived Cult of Aaron and the Absence of Moses

What remains to be discussed is Dtr’s purpose for drawing the parallels between Jeroboam and Aaron. Like Gideon before him, although Jeroboam was on his way to becoming a new Moses he ended up as the antithesis, a new Aaron.23 On the surface it

22 Indeed, Hadad may have even stopped short of leaving Egypt to return to Edom. When Pharaoh asked “What do you lack with me, that you want to go to your own country?” Hadad replied, “Nevertheless, give me leave to go” (1 Kgs 11:22); but no mention is made of his departure. Whatever the case, Hadad therefore stopped short of seeking deliverance for Israel—unlike Moses in Exodus 5.

23 Out of fairness to Aaron, however, it is important to note that Dtr’s presentation of Jeroboam is worse than the presentation of Aaron. (1) Whereas at Sinai Aaron fashioned the golden calf under duress (the people gathered against Aaron [עַל אֹרְחֵי הָעָם; Exod 32:1]), Jeroboam’s measures were considered and deliberate (1 Kgs 12:26-28) (Knoppers, “Aaron’s Calf,” 97). (2) Whereas in Exodus 32 the people made the declaration “these are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt” (v. 4), in 1 Kings 12 Jeroboam himself made the declaration (v. 28). (3) Dtr depicted Jeroboam as an anti-Moses insofar as all that he did after setting up the calves and before the encounter with the man of God was against Mosaic legislation. This is already evident in his gross infraction of the doctrine of centralized worship; but it is also
appears that Dtr drew this parallel because he wanted to underline his negative portrayal of Jeroboam—and therefore the sinfulness of those kings who broke the command of centralized worship. Indeed, in Dtr's mind the most heinous sin was the worship of the golden calves, as is clear from the emphasis that it receives. For Dtr, then, the kings of Israel had not simply become new pharaohs in their oppression of Israel, but Israel itself became apostate in its participation in Aaron's revived cult. But Dtr's purpose in drawing the parallel between Jeroboam and Aaron goes beyond the equation "the sin of Jeroboam in 1 Kings 12 = the sin of Aaron in Exodus 32." In the introduction I noted that Josiah's reform measures were based on those of Moses. In contrast with this is Jeroboam's action which was the prototype of monarchic infidelity to the doctrine of centralized worship—and as such he is an anti-Moses. Another equation is therefore "Jeroboam is the reciprocal of Moses." This conclusion is readily supported by the parallels that Jeroboam shares with Moses' apostate brother. As I mentioned above, the sin of Jeroboam occurs in a parallel context to the sin of Aaron: Aaron's offence follows the cultic high point of the Tetrateuch, the covenant and law at Sinai (Exod 19:1—24:18); and Jeroboam's offence follows the cultic high point of the DtrH, the construction of the temple, sacrifice and prayer (1 Kgs 6:1—9:3). Unlike the story in
evident from those statements which underline the novelty of Jeroboam's actions. First, Jeroboam instituted a new priesthood made up of people "who were not of Levite descent" (1 Kgs 12:31). Second, in imitation of the festival in Judah he established a festival at Bethel; but the date that he set for this festival was contrary to Mosaic legislation: "on the fifteenth day of the eighth month—the month in which he contrived of his own mind to establish a festival for the Israelites" (1 Kgs 13:33; cf. Lev 23:39-41).


25 See also Knoppers, "Aaron's Calf," 92-104.
Exodus, however, in Kings there is no Moses to intercede on behalf of sinful Israel, and no divine pardoning, as in Exod 34:6-7: “The LORD, the LORD, the compassionate and gracious God, slow to anger, abounding in kindness and faithfulness, extending kindness to the thousandth generation, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin.” Rather, following Jeroboam’s apostasy Jeroboam had no regard for the prophetic word against the altar in Bethel (1 Kgs 13:1-32), and Dtr could solemnly conclude,

Even after this incident, Jeroboam did not turn back from his evil way, but kept on appointing priests for the shrines from the ranks of the people. He ordained as priests of the shrines any who so desired. Thereby the House of Jeroboam incurred guilt—to their utter annihilation from the face of the earth (1 Kgs 13:33-34).

Though Hadad and Jeroboam followed the Mosaic trail, unlike their Tetrateuchal counterpart they stopped short of delivering the people. Similarly, after the apostasy of 1 Kings 12 there was no new Moses to intercede on behalf of idolatrous Israel, and Israel’s fate was determined.

The criterion of literary function and the direction of dependence now merits further attention. In order to contend that the direction of dependence was in the other direction one would have to argue that the literary function of the parallels was only a happy coincidence. One would also have to explain why those who were responsible for the Tetrateuchal accounts chose to invert the paradigms afforded by the Kings account. Why, for instance, would the Yahwist have inverted the flight of Hadad from Midian to Egypt to Moses’ flight from Egypt to Midian? Again, Why would the Yahwist have inverted Jeroboam’s flight from Israel to the people’s flight from Egypt to Israel? As
with many other examples, an easier and more tenable view to defend is that in his brilliance Dtr drew such parallels for effect.\textsuperscript{26}

2. Moses and Elijah

A final instance in which Dtr drew an extensive parallel between the Tetrateuch and his history comes with Moses and the Elijah-Elisha cycle. As elsewhere, I will outline and analyze the parallels together.

2.1 The Parallels

The first parallels between Moses and Elijah involve various Tetrateuchal accounts and 1 Kings 17—18. (1) As the Lord was to give Moses’ generation “flesh to eat in the evening and bread in the morning” (Exod 16:8 [cf. v.12]), so at the behest of the Lord ravens provided Elijah with “bread and meat every morning and bread and meat every evening” (1 Kgs 17:6).\textsuperscript{27} (2) As Moses gathered the people to Sinai where the Lord made a covenant with them, so Elijah gathered the people to Carmel in his defense of the covenant (Exod 19:17; 1 Kgs 18:19). (3) As Moses built an altar and set up twelve pillars for the twelve tribes in his ratification of the covenant, so Elijah built

\textsuperscript{26} This conclusion has obvious ramifications for the ongoing discussion concerning the relationship between the golden-calf narrative of Exodus 32 and the golden-calves narrative of 1 Kgs 12:26-32 (for the history of scholarship see J. Hahn, Das “Goldene Kalb.” Die Yahwe-Verehrung bei Stierbildern in der Geschichte Israels [Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift 154; Frankfurt am Main, Bern: Lang, 1981]). Because such parallels are but a part of a complex of parallels which commence with Solomon and extend to Jeroboam’s sons (1 Kings 3—15) it is best to conclude that the same hand was responsible for them.

\textsuperscript{27} Cf. the emphasis on the never-ending supply of food and water in the Elijah-Elisha accounts (1 Kgs 17:8-16; 2 Kgs 3:15-20; 4:1-7; 4:42-44) (R.P. Carroll, “The Elijah-
an altar of twelve stones for the twelve tribes of Israel in his competition with the prophets of Baal (Exod 24:4; 1 Kgs 18:31). (4) Both Moses and Elijah prayed to the God of “Abraham, Isaac, and Israel,” which is a rare triad (Exod 32:13 and 1Kgs 18:36).28 (5) The people’s response to the fire from the LORD in Lev 9:24 finds a close parallel to the people’s response to the fire from the LORD in 1 Kgs 18:38-39. Lev 9:24a reads, “And fire went out from before the LORD and consumed the burnt offering and the fat parts on the altar.” Parallel to this is 1 Kgs 18:38, “And the fire of the LORD fell and consumed the burnt offering, the stones, and the earth; and it licked up the water that was in the trench.” Again, Lev 9:24b reads, “And all the people saw, and they shouted, and fell upon their faces.” Parallel to this is the nearly verbatim 1 Kgs 18:39a, “And all the people saw, and fell upon their faces.” The only difference between Lev 9:24b and 1 Kgs 18:39a comes with the additional “and they shouted” of Lev 9:24b. However, parallel to this is the people’s exclamation in 1 Kgs 18:39b, “The LORD, he is God; the LORD, he is God!”29 (6) Finally, Moses’ imperative “Whoever is for the LORD come here!”, which is followed by the slaughter of the idolaters (Exod 32:26-28), is parallel to Elijah’s imperative, “If the LORD is God, follow him; but if Baal, follow him!” which is followed by his command to slay the prophets of Baal (1 Kgs 18:21, 40).30

28 Apart from these instances this triad occurs elsewhere only in 1 Chron 29:18 and 2 Chron 30:6 (Allison, New Moses, 40).
29 Allison, New Moses, 40.
1 Kings 19 also shares many parallels with Tetrateuchal accounts involving Moses. (1) Moses' fast of forty days and nights while he was on Sinai is parallel to Elijah's fast of forty days and nights while he traveled to Horeb (Exod 34:28 [cf. 24:18]; 1 Kgs 19:8). (2) As Moses witnessed a theophany from a rocky cleft on Sinai, so the word of the LORD came to Elijah in a cave on Horeb (Exod 33:21-22; 1 Kgs 19:9). (3) As the LORD commanded Moses, "Station yourself on the rock," so he commanded Elijah, "Stand on the mount" (Exod 33:21; 1 Kgs 19:11). (4) In both instances the LORD's glory/name "passed by" (נָאַבְרָךְ)—such that the prophet was either shielded from seeing the LORD, as with Moses, or he wrapped his mantle about his face, as with Elijah (Exod 33:22; 1 Kgs 19:11, 13). (5) The natural violence that came with/before the theophany of Exodus 19 and 1 Kings 19 is similar. In Exodus the LORD appeared amidst thunder, lightning, dense cloud, fire and smoke, while in Kings the theophanic whisper came after the great and mighty wind, the earthquake, and the fire (Exod 19:16-18; 1 Kgs 19:11-12). (6) Finally, both Exodus 34 and 1 Kings 19 are concerned with the LORD's maintenance of the covenant. The Sinaitic covenant, which was broken by the worship of the golden calf in Exodus 32, was reestablished in Exodus 34. Similarly, though Elijah could say "the Israelites have forsaken your covenant, torn down your altars, and put your prophets to the sword" (1 Kgs 19:10, 14), the LORD assured him that Israel's relationship to himself would nevertheless continue (1 Kgs 19:15-18).

The last days of Elijah also share parallels with Tetrateuchal accounts concerning Moses. (1) Just as Moses crossed the Sea of Reeds by means of his rod (Exod 14:6), so

---

Elijah crossed the Jordan by means of his mantle (2 Kgs 2:8). (2) Again, as Joshua succeeded Moses (Num 27:15-23; Deut 31:1-8, 14, 23; 34:9), so Elisha succeeded Elijah (1 Kgs 19:16; 2 Kgs 2:9-15).  

2.2 The Direction of Dependence

The criteria of Deuteronomistic tendency, multiple occurrence, assumed knowledge, and source criticism provide compelling support for the posited direction of dependence. With regard to Deuteronomistic tendency, in the preceding chapters I argued that Dtr patterned the reign of Josiah after Moses; that his depiction of Moses in Deut 1:9-18 is more positive than the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts; and that he patterned Joshua, Gideon, Samuel, Hadad, and Jeroboam after Moses. The best explanation for the many parallels that Elijah shares with Moses, therefore, is that Dtr was responsible for drawing them. The most plausible explanation for this is that Dtr patterned the lives of these individuals after the Tetrateuchal portrayal of Moses. Otherwise, one would have to argue that the Tetrateuchal depiction of Moses was based on various unrelated Deuteronomistic figures.

The argument from multiple occurrence also supports the proposed direction of dependence. As I argued in chapter two, Dtr patterned the incident concerning the twelve stones of Josh 4:7-9 after Exod 24:4, where Moses "set up an altar at the foot of the mountain, with twelve pillars for the twelve tribes of Israel." The fact that 1 Kgs

---

32 See also Simon J. DeVries, *1 Kings* (Word Biblical Commentary 12; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985) 209-10. A chart of the parallels between Moses and his Deuteronomistic counterparts is on page 199.  
33 See page 82.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moses</th>
<th>Joshua</th>
<th>Samuel</th>
<th>Hadad</th>
<th>Eliphaz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exod 2:1-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaped Genocide</td>
<td>Exod 2:1-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuck by Mother</td>
<td>Exod 2:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:2:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised in Egypt &amp; Exod 2:1-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 2:1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died from Oppressive King(s)</td>
<td>Exod 2:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed Foreign Authority to a Son</td>
<td>Exod 2:16-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority’s Relation Bare a Son</td>
<td>Exod 3:1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Divine Call</td>
<td>Exod 3:1:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned to Enemy’s Death</td>
<td>Exod 4:18-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:21:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Reprieve/Relief</td>
<td>Exod 5:1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:24:13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied the Request</td>
<td>Exod 5:1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:24:13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed Plagues on Enemy</td>
<td>Exod 5:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:24:13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumcision and Passover</td>
<td>Exod 12:24-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kgs 1:24:13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossed the Water</td>
<td>Exod 14:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the River</td>
<td>Exod 14:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved the Community</td>
<td>Exod 14:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers and Sons</td>
<td>Exod 14:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned to Egypt</td>
<td>Exod 16:8, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Bread and Meal</td>
<td>Exod 16:16-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathered People to Sinai/Carmel</td>
<td>Exod 19:16-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Theophany</td>
<td>Exod 19:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Altar of 12 Pillars/Stone</td>
<td>Exod 24:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Abraham, Isaac, and Israel&quot;</td>
<td>Exod 32:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanded to Slaughter Idols</td>
<td>Exod 32:26-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw Theophany from Rock Cave</td>
<td>Exod 33:21-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of the Covenant</td>
<td>Exodus 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Response to Divine Fire</td>
<td>Lev 9:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Paran</td>
<td>Num 10:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was Rebuked Against</td>
<td>Num 11:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent Spies to Explore Land</td>
<td>Num 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moses and His Deuteronomistic Counterparts**
18:31 is also parallel to Exod 24:4 suggests that Dtr was also responsible for the parallel between 1 Kgs 18:31 and Exod 24:4. In further support of this contention is the fact that there is greater continuity between Josh 4:8 and 1 Kgs 18:31 than between either of these passages and Exod 24:4. Whereas both Josh 4:8 and 1 Kgs 18:31 refer to twelve “stones,” Exod 24:4 refers to twelve “pillars.” Again, both Josh 4:8 and 1 Kgs 18:31 define the symbolic action in almost exactly the same way—“according to the number of the tribes of the children of Israel/Jacob”—whereas Exodus 24:4 reads, “according to the twelve tribes of Israel.” This brings us to the criterion of assumed knowledge. “Israel shall be your name” (ישראל תגד) of 1 Kgs 18:31 parallels Gen 35:10 exactly. The fact that this statement is parenthetical in 1 Kgs 18:31 and is introduced by “to whom the word of the LORD had come” shows that Dtr here assumed that his readers were acquainted with the account concerning the renaming of Jacob to Israel.

Finally, the criterion of source criticism also supports the proposed direction of dependence. I noted above that 1 Kgs 17:6 (“bread and meat every morning and bread and meat every evening”) is parallel to Exod 16:8 (“flesh to eat in the evening and bread in the morning” [cf. 16:12]). This verse from Exodus has traditionally been assigned to P. Similarly, I noted above the striking verbal correspondence between the people’s response to the fire from the LORD in 1 Kgs 18:38-39 and Lev 9:24. This verse from Leviticus has also traditionally been assigned to P. Significantly, all the other parallels that Elijah shares with Moses come from non-P sections of the Tetrateuch. Because the

34 See the discussion in Childs, Exodus, 274-76.
Elijah story shares parallels with both P and non-P layers it is again best to conclude that Dtr was responsible for the parallels.

2.3 The Purpose of the Parallels

In the preceding chapter I argued that Dtr patterned Samuel after Moses because he wished to present Samuel as a Mosaic prophet. Similarly, Dtr drew parallels between Moses and Elijah in order to emphasize the positive nature of Elijah’s prophetic ministry. However, in keeping with his contention that “never again did there arise in Israel a prophet like Moses” Dtr was careful not to equate Elijah with Moses. This is particularly evident from two differences between Moses and Elijah in the respective accounts concerning the covenant. First, Moses requested to die because he wanted the LORD to pardon the people for worshiping the golden calf: “Now, if you will forgive their sin [well and good]; but if not, erase me from the record which you have written” (Exod 32:32). This stands in contrast to Elijah who, after having been frightened by Jezebel’s plan to kill him, requested to die because he lamented his failure: “‘Enough!’ he cried. ‘Now, O LORD, take my life for I am no better than my fathers’” (1 Kgs 19:4). The second difference between Moses and Elijah with respect to the accounts concerning the covenant pertains to the theophanies. After the description of awesome visual and audible violence in Exod 19:16-18 “God answered [Moses] in thunder (הבדל) (19:19). Dtr freely adapted this account in order to underline the point that Elijah was not equal to

---

35 See also Carroll, “Elijah-Elisha,” 413; and Robert R. Wilson, Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 198.
36 Zakovitch, Concept of the Exodus, 72.
Moses, for according to 1 Kgs 19:11-12 “the LORD was not in” the wind, the earthquake, or the fire but in a “still, small voice” (ָֹלַה רְמֹתָה דְּמוּדַה). 37

3. Conclusion

As with my analyses of the parallels in Joshua—Samuel, so in this chapter I argued that Dtr drew parallels in order to undermine and to extol. Parallels that undermine in Kings are confined to 1 Kings 3—15 where Dtr complemented his concern to present the early monarchy negatively by patterning it after Egypt of Moses’ day. In contrast to this are those parallels which Dtr drew to extol. In keeping with his concern to associate prophecy with Moses, Dtr patterned Elijah after Moses and thereby presented him as an ideal prophet.

Similar to Joshua—Samuel, the parallels in Kings share many features with other parallels in the Former Prophets. Hadad, Jeroboam and Elijah share a host of parallels with Moses as do Joshua, Samuel, Gideon, and Josiah. Similarly, 1 Kings 3—15 affords a masterful inversion of Tetratauchal accounts as does the Jephthah narrative, the Gibeah episode, the Ark Narrative, and narratives in 1 Samuel 14—15 concerning Saul. Again, 1 Kings 3—15 is concerned with presenting Israel as a new Egypt, which corresponds to the use of the Exodus story in the Ark Narrative. Another common feature between the parallels in Joshua—Samuel and those in the books of Kings are those complexes of narratives which share parallels with Tetratauchal accounts. In the books of Kings this is the case with 1 Kings 3—15; and 1 Kings 17—19; 2 Kings 2. In addition to these general correspondences there are a number of very specific features that the parallels in

Kings share with other parallels in the Former Prophets. Just as Gideon was patterned after Moses and then Aaron, so Jeroboam was patterned after Moses and then Aaron. Again, just as Abinadab of 1 Sam 7:1 was named after Abihu and Nadab the sons of Aaron, so Abijah and Nadab the sons of Jeroboam were named after Abihu and Nadab. Finally, following Moses in Exod 24:4 Joshua had twelve men each take a stone from the midst of the Jordan (Josh 4:5), and Elijah took twelve stones to build an altar (1 Kgs 18:31). Because Dtr was responsible for the parallels between Joshua—Samuel and the given Tetrateuchal accounts it therefore follows that he was also responsible for the given parallel narratives between the books of Kings and the Tetrateuch.

Finally, it bears mentioning that these conclusions challenge the view that Dtr’s presence in the given accounts is negligible. Dtr may have been reliant to some degree on “the annals of Solomon” (1 Kgs 11:41) and “the annals of the kings of Israel” (1 Kgs 14:19) for 1 Kings 3—15, but it is clear from his use of Exodus that he was directly responsible for much in these chapters. Again, most have argued that traces of Dtr’s work in the Elijah cycle are slight. Cross could assert that “[t]he two chapters are marked strongly by traits of oral composition, and in their present form are little shaped by the Deuteronomistic Historian.”38 Similarly, although Gray presented the more notable parallels between Moses and Elijah, even calling Elijah a “new Moses,” he assumed that these parallels were not drawn by Dtr: “[t]he tradition proclaimed its own message without undue Deuteronomistic comment.”39 Once again, the similar ways in

38 Canaanite Myth, 191-92.
39 Kings, 376-77 (cf. 372, n. e).
which Tetrateuchal accounts are used in the Former Prophets undermines such conclusions as these.\footnote{For a review of scholarship on the books of Kings see Steven L. McKenzie, "The Books of Kings," 281-307.}
Conclusion

I have argued that Dtr based many of his narratives and groups of narratives on Tetrateuchal accounts. In the first chapter I discussed Dtr's use of Tetrateuchal accounts in Deuteronomy 1—3 and I argued that he freely adapted the Tetrateuchal accounts in accordance with his concerns. This conclusion functioned as the Archimedean point for my analysis of the parallel narratives shared by the Tetrateuch and the Former Prophets, for if such narratives use Tetrateuchal accounts the same way that Deuteronomy 1—3 uses Tetrateuchal accounts then it follows that Dtr was responsible for the parallels. With the exception of three narratives that Dtr patterned after Genesis 18 (Judg 6:11-24; 13:2-24; and 2 Kgs 4:8-17) and one that he patterned after Genesis 19 (Joshua 2) I argued that in every instance Dtr sought to complement his concerns by means of the given parallels. In the following paragraphs I will discuss some of the implications that this study has for redaction criticism of the Former Prophets, Tetrateuchal studies, and historiographic studies.

In my analyses of the given narratives in the Former Prophets I argued that if Dtr was reliant on sources for the passages that I discussed then he completely reworked them—even as he reworked the corresponding Tetrateuchal accounts in Deuteronomy 1—3. This is evident from the fact that many of the narratives in the Former Prophets use the corresponding Tetrateuchal narratives in the same ways. (1) Many characters were patterned after Moses, including Joshua, Gideon, Samuel, Solomon, Hadad, Jeroboam, Elijah, and Josiah. (2) Various Tetrateuchal accounts are used more than once
in the DtrH. The most frequently used Tetrateuchal account was the Exodus story, which served as the basis of Joshua’s early ministry, the Ark Narrative, 1 Kings 3—12, and Elijah’s crossing of the Jordan. Similarly, the influence of Numbers 11 is evident in Deuteronomy 1; and 1 Samuel 6, 8, 10. Again, Genesis 18—19 afforded paradigms for Joshua 2; Judges 6, 13, 19; and 2 Kings 4. (3) More specifically, the same verse from the Tetrateuch is cited in more than one instance. This is true of Dtr’s citation of Gen 19:5 in Josh 2:3 and Judg 19:22; his citation of Gen 19:16 in Josh 6:23 and Judg 19:25; his citation of Num 11:33 in 1 Sam 4:8 and 1 Sam 6:19; and his citation of Exod 24:4 in Josh 4:8 and 1 Kgs 18:31. (4) Israel was patterned after given peoples for effect: Sodom in Judges 19; and Egypt in 1 Samuel 5—6 and 1 Kings 3—12. (5) Similarly, various narratives omit features of the corresponding accounts for effect. Unlike their parent-texts in Genesis, both the Jephthah narrative (Judges 11) and the Gibeah narrative (Judges 19) lack divine intervention; and unlike Moses in Exodus, in 1 Kings 11—12 Hadad and Jeroboam failed to deliver Israel and there was no new Moses to intercede for idolatrous Israel. (6) Several of the narratives in the Former Prophets include inversions of the Tetrateuchal accounts, as is the case with Gideon (Judges 6—8) and Jeroboam (1 Kings 11—12) who were both patterned after Moses and then Aaron. (7) Most of the parallels occur in narrative complexes. This is true of Joshua 1—5; Judges 19—21; 1 Samuel 1—8, 14—15, 16—17, 18—19; 2 Samuel 13—14; 1 Kgs 3—15; and 1 Kgs 17—19; 2 Kings 2. (7) In several instances the accounts in the Former Prophets explicitly refer back to the corresponding Tetrateuchal narratives with which they share many parallels, as with Josh 1:17; 2:10; 3:7; 4:23; 1 Sam 4:8; and 6:6.
Finally, many of the narratives include the use or adaptation of personal names from the corresponding Tetratauchal accounts. This is true of Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem (= Melchi-zedek of Salem); Phinehas the son of Eli (= Phinehas the son of Eleazar); Abinadab of Kiirath-jearim (= Abihu and Nadab the sons of Aaron); Eleazar the son of Abinadab (= Eleazar the son of Aaron); Nabal the fool from Maon (= Laban the uncle of Jacob); Tamar the daughter of David (= Tamar the daughter-in-law of Judah); Onan the son of Judah (= Amnon the son of David); Bath-shua the wife of Judah (= Bath-sheba the wife of David); and Nadab and Abihu the sons of Aaron (= Nadab and Abijah the sons of Jeroboam). These eight common features undermine the view that Dtr left his sources as he found them, a contention which is readily supported by the fact that the prologue to Deuteronomy uses Tetratauchal accounts in markedly similar ways.

In addition to undermining the view that Dtr left his sources as he found them, the marked consistency in the use of Tetratauchal narratives by the Former Prophets should be regarded as a new criterion for the identification of Dtr's work. For too long much of scholarship has been swayed by the assumption that Dtr's work can only be identified by the presence of Deuteronomistic language and concerns. The problem with this assumption is that it fails to appreciate the fact that in addition to being a theologian Dtr may also have composed narratives which are neither expressly theological nor laden with the rhetoric and style which is so common in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic speeches. Although fidelity to the Deuteronomic teaching may have been foremost in Dtr's mind, I have shown that he was also responsible for those narratives which share parallels with corresponding Tetratauchal accounts.
This brings me to a discussion of some of the implications that my findings have for Tetrateuchal studies. In the first chapter I submitted that Dtr was not simply reliant on unrelated accounts for Deuteronomy 1—3 but on a unified Tetrateuch. This submission now merits further discussion. Dtr patterned three of his accounts after stories in the so-called Primeval History: the garden story of Genesis 2—3 was Dtr's basis for the account concerning Jonathan's transgression of his father's prohibition in 1 Samuel 14; the fratricide of Abel in Genesis 4 was used by Dtr in his account of the fratricide of Amnon in 2 Samuel 13—14; and the flood narrative was Dtr's basis for the LORD's rejection of Saul in 1 Samuel 15. As for the Abraham cycle, Dtr patterned the encounter with the angel of the LORD by Samson's parents in Judges 13 after texts from Genesis 11, 17, and 18; Joshua's war against the Canaanite kings in Joshua 10 after Abram's battle with the Canaanite kings in Genesis 14; Gideon's encounter with the angel of the LORD in Judges 6, the encounter between the angel of the LORD and Samson's parents in Judges 13, as well as the account of Elisha's promise to the barren woman in 2 Kings 4 after the account in Genesis 18; the Gibeah episode of Judges 19 after the Sodom and Gomorrah account of Genesis 18—19; Rahab's hospitality toward the spies in Joshua 2 after Lot's hospitality toward the angels in Genesis 19; and the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter in Judges 11 as well as the dismemberment of the...
Levite's concubine in Judges 19 after the near-sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis 22.9 With regard to the Jacob cycle, the story of Jacob and Laban in Genesis 29—31 was Dtr's basis for David's experiences with his father-in-law Saul in 1 Samuel 18—19;10 Gen 27—33 was his basis for the stories of David's interactions with Saul and Nabal in 1 Samuel 24—26;11 and the rape of Dinah in Genesis 34 was used for the account of the rape of Tamar in 2 Samuel 13.12 As for the Joseph cycle Dtr's depiction of David in 1 Samuel 16—17 was patterned after the depiction of Joseph in Genesis 37—41;13 and Dtr patterned the rape of Tamar in 2 Samuel 14 after the sexual exploitation of Tamar in Genesis 38.14

This brings us to the book of Exodus. With regard to the introduction of Moses in Exodus 1—4, Dtr patterned the early life and call of Samuel in 1 Samuel 1—3 after the early life and call of Moses in Exodus 1—3;15 the kings of Israel as well as their interactions with the people in 1 Kings 3—12 after the pharaohs of Exodus 1—4 and their interactions with Israel;16 two of the adversaries of Solomon in 1 Kings 11—12 after the depiction of Moses in Exodus 1—4;17 and the appearance of the captain of the LORD's host to Joshua in Joshua 5 after the appearance of the angel of the LORD to

---

8 See page 90.
9 See pages 117 and 103.
10 See page 158.
11 See page 160.
12 See page 169.
13 See page 157.
14 See page 171.
15 See page 129.
16 See page 178.
17 See page 182.
Moses in Exodus 3. As for the plagues narrative of Exodus 5—12, it served as Dtr's basis for the Ark Narrative of 1 Samuel 4—6; and Dtr used the Passover and circumcision account of Exodus 12 in his outline of the Passover and circumcision of Joshua 5. Dtr cited the account of the Exodus itself seven times in Deuteronomy 1—3 and once in Rahab's speech of Josh 2:10. Similarly, he patterned Samuel's defeat of the Philistines in 1 Samuel 7 after the Exodus story, as well as the crossings of the Jordan by Joshua in Joshua 3—5 and Elijah in 2 Kings 2, after Exodus 14—15. With regard to the wilderness traditions in Exodus, Dtr patterned the divine provision of water and food in 1 Kings 17 after the parallel accounts in Exodus 15—16; and he used the account of the appointment of officials in Exodus 18 as a basis for the parallel account in Deuteronomy 1. As for the Sinai tradition of Exodus, Dtr drew upon Exodus 19, 24, and 32—34 for his presentation of Jeroboam in 1 Kings 12—15 as well as the story of Elijah in 1 Kings 17—19.

All that remains are the wilderness traditions of Leviticus and Numbers. Dtr drew upon Leviticus 9 in his recounting of the people's response to the fire from the Lord in 1 Kings 18. So also, he relied on traditions relating to Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu in Leviticus 10 and Numbers 3, 25, and 26 in his outline of Eli's sons Hophni and Phinehas in 1 Samuel, as well as in his depiction of Nadab and Abijah the sons of

18 See page 81.
19 See page 130.
20 See page 80.
21 See pages 135, 79, and 197 respectively.
22 See page 195.
23 See page 35.
24 See pages 178 and 197.
Conclusion

Ieroboam in 1 Kings 14—15. The account of the rebellion against the LORD in Numbers 11 was used by Dtr in the parallel account of Deut 1:19-46 as well as the rejection of the LORD in 1 Samuel 8. The expedition of the spies in Numbers 13—14 was used by Dtr for his parallel account in Deuteronomy 1, the account of the spies in Joshua 2, and that of the migration of the Danites in Judges 18. The Transjordan ventures of Numbers 20—21, 27, 32 were used by Dtr in Deuteronomy 2—3. Finally, the accession of Elijah in 2 Kings 2 was patterned after the appointment of Joshua in Numbers 27. All counted, Dtr patterned no less than twenty-eight of his narratives or complexes of narratives after thirty-seven of his narratives or complexes of narratives.

The fact, then, that Dtr based many of his narratives after each section in the Tetratæ euch shows that by his time some form of the Tetratæ euch was in existence. This contention is supported by the fact that Dtr made use of both P texts and non-P texts. I

---

25 See pages 129 and 137.
26 See pages 35 and 136.
27 See pages 24 and 78.
28 See pages 43, 55, and 63 respectively.
29 See pages 197.
30 After noting that various narratives in the Books of Samuel are reliant on Tetratæ euchal accounts Damrosch drew a similar conclusion: “the early materials of the David story already seem to presuppose something rather like the Yahwistic form of Genesis 2—11, of at least a version of patriarchal narratives, and of the Exodus story” (Narrative Covenant, 180).
31 At this point I will review Dtr’s use of P texts. Limiting myself to direct citations of P texts, there are the following instances. In his account of the spies in Deut 1:19-46 Dtr cited three P texts from the corresponding account in Numbers 13—14 (Num 13:26 and Deut 1:25; Num 14:9 and Deut 1:29; Num 14:31 and Deut 1:39), as well as Num 20:1 (= Deut 1:46) which has also traditionally been assigned to P In 1 Samuel 2—7 Dtr cited five P texts: 2:12 is verbally parallel to Exod 5:2 (both Eli’s sons and Pharaoh “did not know the LORD”); 2:22 is verbally parallel to Exod 38:8 (both accounts refer to “the women who performed tasks at the entrance to the tent of meeting”); 2:30 is verbally parallel to Lev 10:3 (“I will honor/be honored”); 1 Sam 5:12 is verbally parallel to Exod
have argued that when various accounts in the Former Prophets share parallels with both P and non-P sections of given Tetratalchal accounts Dtr was responsible for drawing the parallels. This conclusion may be extended to the entire Tetratalch. In recent years there has been a growing trend to argue that although P may consist in part of an independent source or sources, it presupposes knowledge of and interacts with non-P accounts. Because Dtr based several accounts in part after P accounts it therefore follows that he was not simply dealing with disparate accounts but a unified Tetratalch.

The nature of many of the parallels also suggests that this Tetratalch was well-known by Dtr’s time. This is evident from those instances in which Deuteronomistic narratives explicitly refer back to Tetratalchal accounts, for such cross-references presuppose knowledge of the parallel passages: in Deut 1:29 Moses explicitly compared the conquest of the Transjordan with the Exodus story; in Joshua 1—5 Dtr compared Joshua to Moses; and in 1 Samuel 4—6 the Philistines compared their plight with that of the Egyptians in the plagues narrative. Dtr’s masterful use of the Tetratalch also supports this contention for in most instances the full force of the narrative would be lost without an awareness of the parallel that Dtr drew. Only a step away from the conclusion that a Tetratalch existed already by Dtr’s time and that as such it afforded a

2:23 (“and the outcry went up”); and 1 Sam 6:2 is verbally parallel to Exod 7:11 (“Pharaoh summoned [two groups of officials]”; “The Philistines summoned [two groups of officials]”). In 1 Kgs 17:6 Dtr cited Exod 16:8 (daily provision of bread and meat). Finally, Dtr based 1 Kgs 18:38-39 on Lev 9:24 (fire from the LORD consumed the offerings).

32 See the review of scholarship in Philip J. Budd, Leviticus (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 5-12.
33 The view that the Tetratalch was written as an introduction to the DtrH is therefore patently false.
repository of paradigms is the contention that it enjoyed authoritative status.\textsuperscript{34} A universal phenomenon of religious traditions is their proclivity to define the world through the lens of their scriptures, and although Dtr's Tetrateuch may not have been "scripture" in the modern sense of the term, the preceding analysis shows that the Tetrateuch was the lens through which Dtr both interpreted the traditions which he received and wrote his history.\textsuperscript{35}

This brings me to a discussion of some implications that this study has for analyses of Dtr's historiography. In the introduction I argued that the Former Prophets consist in part of a collocation of paradigms through which Dtr recounted and interpreted the traditions of his nation. The foregoing analysis is a window on such a paradigmatic historiography, for as clever as Dtr may have been in his use of Tetratal narratives, above all he was a historian. That Dtr was not simply being cute is evident from the fact that in several instances there is nothing tendentious or even aesthetically pleasing about the parallels. They are the product of his familiarity with the given Tetratal accounts. But those parallels which Dtr drew for effect reveal more about his

\textsuperscript{34} The fact that Dtr edited the Tetrateuch at various points, such as in Num 21:33-35, in no way undermines this contention. There is ample evidence that texts or traditions which were deemed authoritative could be altered. In his analysis of legal material in Deuteronomy, for example, Levinson could conclude that "[i]conoclastic Deuteronomy not only prohibits cultic protocols that formerly were normative but which were, indeed, \textit{required by Sinaitic law} in the Covenant Code" (emphasis his) (\textit{Innovation}, 460). Similarly, Jeffrey H. Tigay outlined various ways in which the Samaritan Pentateuch is a reworking of its \textit{Vorlage} ("An Empirical Basis for the Documentary Hypothesis," \textit{JBL} 94 [1975] 329-42).

paradigmatic historiography. This is true of those characters which Dtr patterned after Moses. Moses was a paragon for several characters whom Dtr sought to extol: Joshua was a new Moses who led the nation into the land; Samuel and Elijah were prophets like Moses; and Josiah’s reform measures were patterned after those of Moses. But Dtr also used the Moses paradigm in his presentation of various anti-heroes: Gideon was set to be a deliverer like Moses only to become a new, apostate Aaron; like Moses Solomon constructed a place of worship but his oppression of Israel is reminiscent of the Pharaoh of Moses’ day; Hadad was about to deliver Israel but he vanished into obscurity; and Jeroboam was set to deliver oppressed Israel after the manner of Moses, but like Gideon he too became an apostate Aaron. For Dtr, then, the stature of various individuals was proportionate to the degree to which they fulfilled or frustrated the Mosaic model. More specifically, for Dtr the leaders of the nation—be they judges, prophets, saviors, or kings—were obliged to be like Moses. As such, the salvation of the nation was contingent not only on fidelity to the doctrine of centralized worship, but on the leader’s fidelity to the Mosaic model as well. This is implicit in the law of the king, who was to read the Torah (of Moses) all the days of his life—that the royal line might endure (Deut 17:19-20). What is only implicit in the law of the king is explicit for the prophet, who was to be “like” Moses—lest he speak in the name of other gods (Deut 18:15-20).

Similar to the Moses paradigm is the Exodus paradigm. Although the Exodus paradigm failed to come to fruition in Deuteronomy 1—3 it was nevertheless met in Joshua 3—5—the people entered the promised land. In contrast with these instances is 1 Samuel 4—6 and 1 Kgs 3—12 where Dtr inverted the paradigm such that Israel became
an oppressive Egypt. Like the Moses story, for Dtr the Exodus story was thus relived in various ways. But one must not confine Dtr’s paradigmatic use of the Exodus story—or any Tetratuchal account—to his history, for the close of the DtrH suggests that Dtr may well have expected another Exodus. Disenchanted with Gedaliah’s accession to power, Judahite troops executed him (2 Kgs 25:22-25). As a consequence, “all the people, young and old, and the officers of the troops set out and went to Egypt because they were afraid of the Chaldeans” (2 Kgs 25:26). This is the great tragedy of the DtrH: Israel became a nation with the Exodus from Egypt, and by Dtr’s time the nation had collapsed and the people found themselves once again in Egypt. Knowing that the Exodus story could be repeated, even as it had in the past, Dtr and his readers could only hope for a new Exodus from Egypt.

---

36 This tragedy was already anticipated by the final Deuteronomic sentence for covenant infidelity, “The LORD will send you back to Egypt in galleys, by a route which I told you you will not see again.” (Deut 28:68).
37 See also the discussions of Hans Walter Wolff and D.J. McCarthy regarding the close of the DtrH. Wolff has noted that such passages as Deut 4:25-31; 30:1-10; and 1 Kgs 8:46-53 presuppose the exile and teach that salvation is contingent on “turning” (חזרה) to the LORD. It therefore follows that return from Babylonian captivity was contingent on repentance (“The Kerygma of the Deuteronomistic Historical Work,” in The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions [eds. Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff; Atlanta: John Knox, 1978] 83-100). Similarly, McCarthy argued that the cycle of anger—penalty—repentance—salvation, which is so prevalent in the book of Judges, is to be applied to the rest of the DtrH as well. According to McCarthy, phrases referring to divine anger occur in clusters at the major divisions of the history. Moreover, the penalty for sin always follows divine anger. The fact that the cycle ends in 2 Kings with “penalty” therefore suggests that Judah was given the opportunity to repent and so be saved (“The Wrath of Yahweh and the Structural Unity of the Deuteronomistic History,” in Essays in Old Testament Ethics [eds. James L. Crenshaw and John T. Willis; Ktav: New York, 1974] 99-110). Similarly, Trompf could state that “[t]he Deuteronomist almost certainly assumed that patterns of events similar to those he recorded would happen in the future, if the same kinds of transgressions and deeds were effected. By
What remains to be discussed is the historical veracity of the parallel narratives in the Former Prophets. Some scholars have stressed the importance of detecting the history of thought rather than historical verisimilitude in the Biblical record. For instance, after outlining the problems associated with identifying historicity in the Biblical record Zakovitch could write: "The learning of actual history from biblical narrative except in the most general and vague terms is an unachievable task, even irresponsible. The ideological history of the nation of Israel is the task worthy of effort." In a similar vein Thompson could refer to the DtrH as the "mother of all fictions." Consistent with the contentions of Zakovitch and Thompson, there can be no question that in his use of Tetrateuchal traditions Dtr primarily created rather than recounted his nation's past. This is far from saying, however, that such a creation was ex nihilo. Objective and unbiased historiography is a "fiction," and like any historian Dtr assembled and reworked the sources that he received. As tendentious as Dtr's historiography was, relegating the task of the historian to tracing the history of Hebrew thought and using the unqualified word "fiction" is equally telltale of tendentious historiography.

reviewing their chequered past, then, the Israelites had much to learn for the future consolidation of their nation and faith" ("Historical Recurrence," 223-24).


A more modest approach is to look for varying degrees of plausibility rather than entertain either/or dichotomies.\textsuperscript{40} In chapter three I argued that Dtr patterned the account of David and Nabal (1 Samuel 25) after that of Jacob and Laban (Genesis 29—31). A non-historical feature of Dtr’s account is immediately present in the name Nabal. In addition to the fact that “Nabal” is an inversion of “Laban”—a feature which is consistent both with Dtr’s inversion of Tetratouchal narratives as well as his clever use of Tetratouchal names—it is most unlikely that someone would name their child “fool.” But it does not follow from this that the whole narrative is fictitious. After extracting the obvious literary features from 1 Samuel 25, for instance, Levenson persuasively argued that, in historical terms, “David’s marriage to Abigail was the pivotal move to his ascent to kingship at Hebron” and that “the man whose name has been altered to Nabal must have been a very powerful figure.”\textsuperscript{41} As with every other investigation, in this instance one can only speak in terms of degrees of plausibility. Levenson’s methodology of distinguishing between what is obviously literary and what is historical is on the mark and his conclusions regarding various historical features of 1 Samuel 25 are plausible.

\textsuperscript{40} In this regard Brettler uses the helpful analogy of the historian as a detective and jurist who looks not for certitude but a preponderance of evidence (Creation of History, 142-42). See also Halpern’s extensive discussion concerning the historical and non-historical elements in the DtrH (First Historians, esp. 207-80).
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