

# *Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament*

*JESOT* is published bi-annually online at [www.jesot.org](http://www.jesot.org) and in print  
by Wipf and Stock Publishers.  
199 West 8th Avenue, Suite 3, Eugene, OR 97401, USA

ISSN 2169-0685  
ISBN 978-1-5326-3724-7

© 2017 by Wipf and Stock Publishers

*JESOT* is an international, peer-reviewed journal devoted to the academic and evangelical study of the Old Testament. The journal seeks to publish current academic research in the areas of ancient Near Eastern backgrounds, Dead Sea Scrolls, Rabbinics, Linguistics, Septuagint, Research Methodology, Literary Analysis, Exegesis, Text Criticism, and Theology as they pertain only to the Old Testament. The journal seeks to provide a venue for high-level scholarship on the Old Testament from an evangelical standpoint. The journal is not affiliated with any particular academic institution, and with an international editorial board, online format, and multi-language submissions, *JESOT* seeks to cultivate Old Testament scholarship in the evangelical global community.

*JESOT* is indexed in *Old Testament Abstracts*, *Christian Periodical Index*, The Ancient World Online (AWOL), and EBSCO databases

# *Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament*

## *Executive Editor*

STEPHEN J. ANDREWS  
(Midwestern Baptist Theological  
Seminary, USA)

## *Editor*

WILLIAM R. OSBORNE  
(College of the Ozarks, USA)

## *Associate Editor*

RUSSELL L. MEEK  
(Louisiana College, USA)

Journal correspondence and manuscript submissions should be directed to [osborne@jesot.org](mailto:osborne@jesot.org). Instructions for authors can be found at [www.jesot.org](http://www.jesot.org).

Books for review and review correspondence should be directed to Russell Meek at [rmeek@jesot.org](mailto:rmeek@jesot.org).

All ordering and subscription inquiries should be sent to [Orders@wipfandstock.com](mailto:Orders@wipfandstock.com).

## *Editorial Board*

T. DESMOND ALEXANDER (Union  
Theological College, Queens  
University, Ireland)

GEORGE ATHAS (Moore College,  
Australia)

ELLIS R. BROTZMAN (Emeritus, Tyndale  
Theological Seminary, The  
Netherlands)

HÉLÈNE DALLAIRE (Denver Seminary,  
USA)

JOHN F. EVANS (Nairobi Evangelical  
Graduate School of Theology, Kenya)

KYLE GREENWOOD (Colorado Christian  
University, USA)

JOHN HOBBS (University of  
Wisconsin – Oshkosh, USA)

JENS BRUUN KOFOED (Fjellhaug  
International University College,  
Denmark)

KENNETH A. MATHEWS (Beeson  
Divinity School, Samford University,  
USA)

SUNG JIN PARK (Midwestern Baptist  
Theological Seminary, USA)

CRISTIAN RATA (Torch Trinity  
Graduate University, South Korea)

MAX ROGLAND (Erskine Theological  
Seminary, USA)

RODRIGO FRANKLIN DE SOUSA (Faculté  
Jean Calvin, France)

LENA-SOFIA TIEMEYER (University of  
Aberdeen, Scotland)

DANIEL TIMMER (Faculté de théologie  
évangélique, Canada)

## ***A Note on the Refrain in Genesis 1: Evening, Morning, and Day as Chronological Summary***

ANDREW E. STEINMANN

Concordia University Chicago  
*andrew.steinmann@cuchicago.edu*

*The meaning of the refrain in Gen 1 “There was an evening and there was a morning, X day” (Gen 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31) has long been in dispute. This paper argues that the refrain is a chronological summary of the preceding text by demonstrating what the syntax and usage of such summaries are in the OT. The phrase then means “In summary there was an evening and then a morning, X day,” thereby encompassing an entire day beginning at sundown and ending at the next sundown. Moreover, the phrase “evening and morning” is further defined in the refrain as a single day.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Chronological summary, refrain, sequential, non-sequential, Genesis*

One of the most vexing issues in the interpretation of Gen 1 is determining the correct understanding of the refrain:

[number] וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם

So there was an evening, and there was a morning, day [number]  
(Gen 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31).

This is often translated as “There was an evening, and there was a morning, [number] day.” There are two possibilities for this phrase—either as a continuing sequence completing the narrative of the creation day in question or as an explanation of the passage of time in the previous narration of God’s creative activity.

## THE REFRAIN AS SEQUENTIAL TO THE NARRATION

Should both preterite aspect verbs (וַיְהִי, “and there was”) be understood as sequential, thereby having each day’s narrative relating God’s work during the daylight hours followed by the night in the refrain? If so, night is in view by framing it with evening and morning.<sup>1</sup> Thus, following the narration of God’s work on a given day in Gen 1, the refrain ought to be understood as “Next there was an evening, and then there was a morning, [number] day.” In this understanding evening and morning are the beginning and ending points of the nighttime that follows the daytime of the narration.

One problem with this interpretation is that the normal way of speaking of night by framing it with evening and morning is not through the use of sequential preterite verbs, but by using the construction עַד . . . בֹּקֶר (“evening until morning,” Exod 27:21; Lev 23:32; Num 9:15, 21) which is parallel to the construction for framing a day with morning and evening (בֹּקֶר . . . עַד . . . עֶרֶב; “morning until evening,” Exod 18:13, 14). However, the preposition עַד (“until”) is nowhere to be found in Gen 1:1–2:3. Clearly, the phrasing of the refrain is not the expected or normal language for referring to nighttime.

Another impediment to this is that elsewhere in the Scriptures Israel’s days—especially sacred days—are reckoned from evening to evening, not from morning to morning (Exod 12:6, 18–19; Lev 23:32; Deut 16:6; Neh 13:19–22; Luke 23:53). This reckoning of days is further reinforced by Israel’s purity laws that deem certain activities to render one unclean until evening, implying that a new day begins at that time (Lev 11:24–25, 27–28, 31–32, 39–40; 14:46; 15:5–8, 10–11, 16–19, 21–23, 27; 17:15; 22:6; Num 19:7–8, 10, 19, 21–22; Luke 23:50–54; John 19:31–42). Considering that the days of the creation week form the basis for Israel’s week culminating in the Sabbath (Exod 20:8–11; 31:12–17), it appears as if Scripture elsewhere interprets the days in Gen 1 as beginning in the evening, not in the morning as required by the sequential reading.

This option for understanding the refrain leaves open the question of whether these days are literal days or can be explained as

1. E.g., Derek Kidner, *Genesis* (TOTC; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1967), 51; Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1–17* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 121; C. John Collins, “Reading Genesis 1–2 with the Grain: Analogical Days,” in *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation* (ed. J. Daryl Charles; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013), 84, n. 35.

something other than actual twenty-four hour days. For this reason, many contemporary evangelical scholars who opt for this interpretation also advocate for a non-literal seven-day week for Gen 1:1–2:4. It allows, therefore for an accommodation to modern neo-Darwinian views of the origin of life and for a very old universe. However, not all advocates of this view seek to accommodate contemporary scientific assessments of the universe’s origins.

#### THE REFRAIN AS AN EXPLANATION OF THE PASSAGE OF TIME IN THE PREVIOUS NARRATION

Should the first preterite verb in the refrain be understood as non-sequential to the narrative with the second being sequential to the first event (evening)?<sup>2</sup> This would then view the refrain as summarizing the narrative’s time sequence. Thus, following the narration of God’s work on a given day in Gen 1, the refrain ought to be understood as “In summary, there was an evening and then there was a morning: [number] day.” In this understanding the *evening* introduces the first part of the day (nighttime) while *morning* introduces the second part (daytime) to form a merism that indicates one complete day.<sup>3</sup>

This understanding of the refrain has the advantage of support from the rest of Scripture in reckoning Israel’s days from evening—especially the Sabbath day and other days in Israel’s sacred calendar. However, there needs to be an explanation of why the first verb ought to be read non-sequentially when the large majority of preterite verbs are used in a sequential manner (most frequently temporally sequential but also at times logically sequential). Moreover, can Hebrew use a non-sequential preterite to introduce an internal sequence using preterite verbs? I will demonstrate that such constructions are found elsewhere in biblical Hebrew, making this summarizing reading of the refrain more probable than the sequential reading.

This option for understanding the refrain makes an accommodation to modern scientific assessments of the origin of life and of the universe much more difficult. If the refrain is a *chronological* summary—if it states the time duration of the first day as encompassed by actual evening and the following nighttime and morning with its

2. E.g., Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1; Waco, TX: Word, 1994), 19.

3. Andrew E. Steinmann, “Night and Day, Evening and Morning,” *BT* 62 (2011): 145–50.

subsequent daytime—then a regular twenty-four hour day is in view. Indeed, this interpretation rules out any type of metaphorical approach to the six creation days.

#### USE OF PRETERITE VERBS TO INDICATE SUMMARY

One use of preterite verbs with prefixed  $\text{ׁ}$  is explained in the standard grammars as summarizing.<sup>4</sup> Joüon and Muraoka present this summarizing use very briefly as:

The wayyiqtol is also used for a **conclusion** or a **summary**: Gn 23.20 “Thus it is that the field passed into Abraham’s possession (ׁׁׁ)”; 2.1; Josh 10.40; 1Sm 17.50; 30.3; 31.6; 2Sm 24.8; Ru 1.22. In these examples one can hardly speak of succession.<sup>5</sup>

While these grammars recognize that not all preterite verbs indicate temporal or logical succession, they offer little in the way of identifying non-successive uses.

Despite this lack of guidance, there is one particular type of summary that can be fairly easily recognized. I will call it the *chronological summary*. It is appended to the end of a narrative or historical account and provides a summary of it by explaining the chronology of the events in the previous text. A number of examples demonstrate that chronological summaries often use preterite aspect verbs at the head of the summary.

#### *Genesis 5:1–32; Genesis 9:29*

In the genealogy stretching from Adam to Lamech (Gen 5:1–32) and ultimately to Noah (Gen 9:29), the synopsis of each person’s life and descendants is concluded with a preterite verb at the head of a chronological summary (Gen 5:5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31; 9:29). The summary for Enoch is somewhat different because he did not die (Gen 5:21–24).

4. *IBHS*, 551 (§33.2.1d); Joüon, 363–64 (§§118i, 118ia).

5. Joüon, 363–64 (§118i).

The summary is formulaic. For example:

ויהיו כל־ימי אדם אשר־חי תשע מאות שנה ושלושים שנה וימת

So all the days of Adam which he lived were 930 years, and then he died. (Gen 5:5)

The formula in general is: שנה וימת [number] שנים [number] [name] כל־ימי [name] ויהיו (“So all the days of [name] were [number] years, then he died”). Adam’s summary is unique in adding the relative phrase אשר־חי (“which he lived”) probably to denote that Adam, unlike the others in the genealogy, did not live from infancy to adulthood, since he was created, not born.

These examples of the chronological summary are probably the most important for understanding the Gen 1 refrain and share the following characteristics with it:

- 1) Both the refrain and the formula are introduced by a preterite form of the verb היה (Gen 1: ויהי [“and there was”]; Gen 5: ויהיו [“and they (i.e, the days) were”]).
- 2) Both the refrain and the formula contain an internal sequence using a preterite verb (Gen 1: ויהי [“and there was”]; Gen 5: וימת [“and he died”]).
- 3) Both the refrain and the formula can be understood as having a beginning stage with a summarizing preterite verb (Gen 1: ויהי־ערב [“In summary, there was an evening”]; Gen 5: ויהיו ... כל־ימי [“So, all the days were”]) and an ending stage with a sequential preterite verb (Gen 1: ויהי־בקר [“then there was a morning”]; Gen 5: וימת [“then he died”]).
- 4) The formula occurs frequently in a relatively small amount of text (Gen 1: six times in 31 verses; Gen 5: eight times in 32 verses).

For Enoch the summary formula is different, since he did not die:

ויהי כל־ימי חנוך חמש וששים שנה ושלוש מאות שנה ויתהלך חנוך את־האלהים ואיננו כִּי־לקח אתו אלהים

So all the days of Enoch were 365 years, and then Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him (Gen 5:23–24).<sup>6</sup>

There are obvious differences for Enoch's unique situation: the substitution of *ויהי ענוך הולך את־האלהים ואינו* ("and then Enoch walked with God, and he was not") for *וימת* ("and then he died") and the additional explanatory clause *כי־לקח אתו* ("for God took him"). However, despite these expansions, the underlying structure of this chronological summary is the same with one important addition: The phrase *ויהי ענוך הולך* ("then Enoch walked with God") is followed by *ואינו* ("and he was not"). Enoch's walk resulted in "he was not." The additional information indicates result. This can be compared to the refrain in Gen 1. Thus Gen 1:5 states:

*ויהי־ערב ויהי־בקר יום אחד*

In summary, there was an evening; then there was a morning: one day.

The first *ויהי* ("In summary, there was") is a summary use of the preterite. The second is a sequential use that is internal to the summary. The phrase *יום אחד* ("one day") is the result.<sup>7</sup> The same holds for the other instances of the refrain in Gen 1.

Of the chronological summaries that will be examined in this paper, these in Gen 5 are the most important since they not only share features with the Gen 1 refrain, but they are also found in the same OT book, and both are in the opening section, the primeval history (Gen 1–11).

6. For the understanding of the verb *ויהלך* ("then he walked") as sequential, see Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 120. Twice it is said *ויהלך ענוך את־האלהים* ("then Enoch walked with God"; Gen 5:22, 24). The first is clearly sequential, happening after Enoch was 65 years old. The second should also be seen as sequential, not only because of the parallel to the earlier phrase but also because of the sequential verb that is in the same position in the other chronological summaries, *וימת* ("then he died").

7. For a defense of the translation "one day" instead of "the first day" see Andrew. E. Steinmann, "אחד as an Ordinal Number and the Meaning of Genesis 1:5," *JETS* 45 (2002): 577–84.

*Ruth 1:4b–5*

Another chronological summary introduced by a summarizing preterite verb is found in Ruth:

וישבו שם כעשר שנים וימותו גם־שניהם מחלון וכליון ותשאר האשה משני  
ילדיה ומאשה

In summary, they lived there about ten years. Then both of them—Mahlon and Chilion—died, and the woman was left without her children and her husband. (Ruth 1:4b–5)

It could be argued that the initial verb, וישבו (“they lived”), is simply sequential.<sup>8</sup> However, it is often argued that this is a summary of the entire time the family was in Moab.<sup>9</sup> Wilch persuasively argues that this must be the case, since understanding the verb as sequential would lead to an improbable situation:

“About ten years” (Ruth 1:4) likely refers to the total time of Naomi’s sojourn in Moab, not just to the length of time of the sons’ marriages before the sons died, for that would be an exceptionally long time for two different marriages each to remain barren. Probably most of the ten years transpired before the death of Elimelech, the sons married their Moabite wives soon after his death, then the sons died not too long after their marriages, since they remained childless.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, Wilch describes the chronological summary in these terms: “The Qal imperfect of *שב* introduces a parenthesis with circumstantial information in the form of a sequence.”<sup>11</sup> Thus, the preterite verb וישבו (“In

8. Robert L. Hubbard, Jr. *The Book of Ruth* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 91, n. 2. However, Hubbard admits that this could be reasonably understood to be a chronological summary.

9. Paul Joüon, *Ruth: Commentaire philologique et exégésique* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1953), 34; Ernst Würthwein, *Die Fünf Megilloth* (HAT 18; 2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1969), 9–10; John R. Wilch, *Ruth* (ConC; St. Louis: Concordia, 2006).

10. Wilch, *Ruth*, 127.

11. *Ibid.*, 117. Wilch references *IBHS*, 651–2 (§ 39.2.3c), which states “A disjunctive-*waw* clause may also shift the scene or refer to new participants; the disjunction may come at the beginning or end of a larger episode or it may ‘interrupt’ one. The ‘interruptive’ use, better called explanatory or parenthetical, ‘break[s] into the main

summary, they lived”) introduces the summary, and the preterite verb *וימותו* (“then [they] died”) relates a sequence internal to the summary. Moreover, it is followed by another non-sequential preterite that indicates the result of the sequence: *והשאָר* (“and [she] was left”).

While this chronological summary is somewhat different from the previous ones, it demonstrates once again that the first preterite verb is used in a non-sequential fashion to introduce a summary. It is followed by a preterite used to indicate a sequence internal to the summary. Like the refrain in Gen 1 and the summary of Enoch’s life at Gen 5:23–24, it also contains a result, this time in the form of a clause beginning with a preterite verb.

### *Judges 10:2; 12:7, 9b–10, 11b–12, 14b–15*

Five cases of a chronological summary headed by a preterite verb are found in Judges.<sup>12</sup> In each case they follow a narrative or brief description of the judge’s tenure and serve to summarize his activity in chronological terms. Like the examples in Gen 5, they are formulaic. A typical example is Judg 12:9b–10:

וישפט את־ישראל שבע שנים וימת אבצן ויקבר בבית להם

So he judged Israel seven years. Then Ibzan died and was buried in Bethlehem.

---

narrative to supply information relevant to or necessary for the narrative’ (# 10). The disjunction may also indicate ‘either the completion of one episode or the beginning of another.’” In the case of Ruth 1:4b–5 the parenthetical material is at the completion of the episode and summarizes it chronologically.

12. There are two other chronological summaries about Israel’s Judges: The first is for Samson, Judg 16:31b (והוא שפט את־ישראל עשרים שנה), “he had judged Israel twenty years”). The second is for Eli, 1 Sam 4:18b (והוא שפט את־ישראל ארבעים שנה), “he had judged Israel forty years”). Both begin with *והוא שפט* (“so he judged”) instead of the preterite *וישפט* (“so he judged”). In the case of Samson, his death and burial are recorded immediately before the summary (Judg 16:30–31a). Eli’s death is recorded immediately before the summary (1 Sam 4:18a), though his burial is never mentioned. In both cases the chronological summary has no need for an internal sequence, since the death has already been related. Therefore, the beginning of the summary is pronoun followed by perfect aspect verb instead of a preterite verb. It appears as if the preterite is needed at the head of a chronological summary that contains other verbal expressions indicating an internal temporal sequence or explaining circumstances during the period covered by the summary (see the discussion of 2 Kgs 11:3 below).

The basic structure of the summary formula in Judges is: [place] ב ויקבר [name] [number] שנים [number] וישפט (“So he judged [number] years, then [name] died and was buried in [place]”).<sup>13</sup>

In the chronological summary in Judges the head preterite verb is non-sequential, whereas the following two preterite verbs are both sequential and complete an internal sequence of events encapsulated in the summary.

### 2 Kings 11:3

A final chronological summary to be examined here summarizes the young Joash’s time living in the temple precincts. The narration before the chronological summary notes:

ותקה יהושבע בת־המלך־יורם אחות אחזיהו את־יואש בן־אחזיהו ותגנב אתו  
מתוך בני־המלך המומטים אתו ואת־מינקתו בחדר המטות ויסתרו אתו מפני  
עתליהו ולא הומת

Jehosheba, King Jehoram’s daughter and Ahaziah’s sister, took Joash son of Ahaziah and spirited him away from among the king’s sons who were being killed [and put] him and the one who nursed him in a bedroom. So they hid him from Athaliah and he was not killed. (2 Kgs 11:2)

This is followed by a chronological summary of the final statement in 2 Kgs 11:2:

ויהי אתה בית יהוה מתחבא שש שנים ועתליה מלכת על־הארץ

So he was with her [in] the house of Yahweh, hiding for six years. Meanwhile, Athaliah ruled the land. (2 Kgs 11:3)

Interestingly, the final sentence in 2 Kgs 11:2 begins with a non-sequential preterite (ויסתרו, “so they hid”) that heads an explanation

13. There are minor variations: Tola’s name is omitted at 10:2. At 12:7 the explicit subject יפתח (“Jephthah”) is inserted after וישפט (“So he judged”). Some names include a patronymic and/or gentilic modifier (e.g., עבדון בן־הלל הפרעתוני, “Abdon, son of Hillel, the Pirathonite,” Judg 10:14). Places vary from a simple place name (e.g., Shamir, 10:2) to a place name with descriptor (“Pirathon in the land of Ephraim, in the hill country of the Amalekites”; 12:15).

illuminating Joash's whereabouts. Following this there is a summarizing preterite verb (יִהְיֶה, "So he was") that stands at the head of the chronological summary of Joash's hiding in the Temple (2 Kgs 11:3). Within this summary there is no internal sequence. Instead, this summary has two verbs that explain the circumstances attending to Joash being in the Temple. They are participles, as would be expected in communicating attendant circumstances (מִתְחַבֵּא, "hiding" and מְלִיכָה, "ruling").<sup>14</sup> One feature of this chronological summary is important to note. It begins with a preterite verb from the root הִיָּה ("be, become"). In fact, it is the same verb that is at the head of the refrain in Gen 1: וַיְהִי ("In summary, there was").

#### THE IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERSTANDING THE REFRAIN IN GENESIS 1

##### *The Refrain Follows the Form of a Chronological Summary*

To this point I have demonstrated the possibility that the refrain in Gen 1 is to be understood as a chronological summary and that it, therefore, would not be in temporal sequence with the preceding narrative about God's activity on the day being summarized. It ought to be noted that other chronological summaries demonstrate that:

1. A chronological summary with an internal sequence is normally introduced with a preterite verb used in a non-sequential fashion (i.e., the summary usage of preterites).
2. A chronological summary with an internal sequence uses temporally successive preterite verbs within the chronological summary.
3. A chronological summary can begin with a preterite from the root הִיָּה ("be, become"; Gen 5:5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23–24, 27, 31; 9:29; 2 Kgs 11:3).
4. A chronological summary may contain a reference to a result (Gen 5:23–24; Ruth 1:4b–5).

14. *IBHS*, 624–25 (§ 37.6d).

5. Chronological summaries are frequently formulaic (Gen 5:5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23–24, 27, 31; 9:29 and Judges 10:2; 12:7, 9b–10; 11b–12; 14b–15).

All of these features are relevant to the refrain in Gen 1: It can be viewed 1) as having a non-sequential preterite at its head (the first ויהי [“In summary, there was”), 2) as employing a preterite from the root היה (“be, become”) at its head, 3) as having an internal sequence employing a sequential preterite (the second ויהי), 4) as containing a result (day X) and 5) as formulaic, occurring in the same basic pattern in all six appearances in Gen 1.

An objection might be raised against this interpretation: The same verb (ויהי, “and there was”) is used in two different ways in the refrain. However, that objection might be turned around: What other Hebrew verb might be used to express the onset of evening or morning in the past? In English we prefer to use the verb *came* as in “evening came, then morning came.” We normally do not use “there was an evening” to mean the onset of evening.<sup>15</sup> In Biblical Hebrew, there are no other examples of a verb other than ויהי (“and there was”) that is used with either ערב (“evening”) or בקר (“morning”) to indicate the onset of evening. An objection to two different uses of ויהי (“and there was”) in the refrain must first demonstrate that the author of Gen 1 had another option available to him. Then it ought to be demonstrated that the author chose not to use it, implying that by deliberately using the same verb twice the author may have been signaling that the refrain was not a chronological summary. Such cannot be demonstrated, so any objection to two different uses of the same verb in one sentence is moot at best.

### *Other Biblical Passages Indicate that the Refrain is a Chronological Summary*

We have, therefore, two options for understanding the Gen 1 refrain. The first is that the refrain presents a chronology of the entire day, consisting of two parts: morning and evening and then stating a result—namely, that the two parts make up a particular single day: one day (Gen 1:5), a second day (Gen 1:8), a third day (Gen 1:13), a fourth day (Gen 1:19), a

15. We might use that phrase to identify a particular evening as in “There was an evening two weeks ago when I ate a later dinner.”

fifth day (Gen 1:23), a day, the sixth one (Gen 1:31).<sup>16</sup>

The alternative is that the refrain is in temporal sequence with the preceding narrative. In this case the temporal sequence would be: creative activity (presumably during daytime)—an evening—a morning. The refrain then lists a day, implying that these three components comprise the day.

How should we decide between these two options? As mentioned in the introduction, the treatment of sacred days in Israel's calendar tips the scale in favor of the refrain being a chronological summary. Clearly the Sabbath regulations in Exodus are based on the days of creation in Gen 1 (Exod 20:8–11; 31:12–17). Both Exod 20 and Exod 31 require that the Israelite week—six days followed by a seventh Sabbath day—are in sequence, and it bases this practice of the week culminating in the Sabbath on the days in Gen 1:1–2:4, implying they, too, were a seven-day sequence. Indeed, by mandating the weekly Sabbath, Exod 20 is teaching Israel that God did his work in six contiguous days just as Israel would do and that God rested on the next day, the Sabbath just as Israel would do. Moreover, as noted above, Israel's reckoning of days relating to their sacred festivals and the laws of purity deems days to begin in the evening. The most obvious way that this can be explained is that the later Scripture passages *do not* understand the refrain in Gen 1 to be in temporal sequence with the preceding narrative. Instead, the reckoning of sacred days from sundown indicates that the Gen 1 refrain was understood to be a chronological summary of the preceding narrative.

### THE SEVENTH DAY (GEN 2:1–3)

One other feature of the narration of the creation week must be noted: the refrain is not appended to the presentation of the seventh day in Gen 2:1–3. However, this serves as a literary device that reinforces the point that this day is set apart as special (Gen 2:3). This is noted by Arnold:

16. For the reason for translating “one day” at Gen 1:5 see Steinmann, “Night and Day” and Steinmann, “Ordinal Number.” Although the versions generally render the subsequent days with a definite article, no article is present for days two through five. On the sixth day the text does not say הַיּוֹם הַשְּׁשִׁי (“the sixth day”). It says יוֹם הַשְּׁשִׁי (“a day, the sixth one”). Therefore, the refrain deliberately and purposefully identifies each evening and morning as a particular single day.

*Narration of the seventh day is completely different from the previous six, obvious by the suspension of the creation formula used for the first six days.* Beyond this literary observation, it should be clear that the seven-day pattern of Gen 1:1–2:3 transforms something as simple as the weekly calendar, with its regular twenty-four hour periods, into a constant reminder of God’s creative sovereignty. . . . the creation narrative’s doxology—the institution of the Sabbath—goes beyond a hymn of praise because it asserts that time itself is God’s domain.<sup>17</sup>

Since the setting of the seventh day is the climax to the other six, it is doubtful that by omitting the refrain the author meant his readers to understand this day as in any way chronologically different than the previous six. It has been stated elsewhere that the author of Gen 2:1–3 “. . . did not consider his readers so dim-witted that they would not have understood there was no reason to repeat the refrain” (i.e., he had no compelling reason that forced him to affirm that the seventh day was a day chronologically like the previous six).<sup>18</sup> In fact, there was a good reason *not* to repeat the refrain—to signal the unique sanctified nature of the seventh day.

Yet some Christian commentators (but by no means all or even a majority) have used the lack of the refrain for the seventh day to argue that the seventh day is presented literarily as if it had no end, since the refrain is missing.<sup>19</sup> Originally this is a thought from Augustine who asserted, “But the seventh day is without any evening, nor hath it any setting, because Thou hast sanctified it to an everlasting continuance. . . .”<sup>20</sup> However, this makes sense only if the day is seen as drawing to an end at evening (i.e., that only daytime, not nighttime is in view). However, the seventh day is clearly a prototype for the Sabbath (Exod 20:8–11; 31:12–17), and Sabbaths *begin* at evening and include the next morning—both nighttime and daytime make up a single day. The Gen 1 refrain affirms this. Thus, Augustine’s little *theologicum* is without basis in the actual seventh day in Gen 2:1–3 and is simply a quaint, if

17. Bill T. Arnold, *Genesis* (New Cambridge Bible Commentary; (Cambridge: Cambridge, 2009), 50, emphasis added.

18. Steinmann, “Night and Day,” 149.

19. E.g., Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26* (NAC 1A; Nashville: B & H, 1996), 181; Collins, “Reading Genesis,” 87.

20. Augustine of Hippo, *The Confessions of St. Augustine* 13.36.51 (NPNFI, 1:207).

misleading, meditation on the eternal rest God has prepared for his people (Heb 4:1–11).<sup>21</sup>

The seventh day in Israel's week—the Sabbath—becomes the paradigm for the rest of the days of the week. That is, it is a day that begins at evening and ends at the following evening. It is difficult, if not impossible, to reckon the rest of the days of the week as having some other starting point such as sunrise (as in some ancient Egyptian reckonings) or at midnight (as is modern western tradition inherited from the ancient Romans). The command to do all one's work during the first six days of the week and then rest on the seventh *requires* that the first

21. Collins views Augustine's observation as "the simplest explanation" for the missing refrain on the seventh day (Collins, "Reading Genesis," 87). However, it is not the simplest, nor is it correct. Arnold's observation mentioned above is far simpler. Moreover, Collins appears to believe that Augustine's remark carries the weight of both Christian and Jewish tradition (Collins, "Reading Genesis," 87 n. 41). I am unaware, however, of any Jewish commentator who follows Augustine's observation. Moreover, there are quite a few Christian commentators on Gen 2:1–3 who do not mention Augustine or apply his observation to the seventh day. Collins also follows Donald Guthrie, *Hebrews* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 116 and F. F. Bruce, *Hebrews* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 106 in asserting "Hebrews 4:3–11 says that believers have entered God's Sabbath rest—a rest that began in Gen 2:1–3. This makes sense only if God is still enjoying that same Sabbath." However, a close look at Heb 4:10 reveals that it actually says "For the person who has entered His rest has rested (κατέπαυσεν) from his own works, just as God did from His" (HCSB). The verb is an aorist, implying simple action, and the verse predicates this of both the person who has entered God's rest and of God himself. The verb does not in itself denote continuing action as if God is still in his rest that was initiated on the seventh day. Moreover, it is surprising that had the author of Hebrews wanted to denote continuing action, he did not use a present or imperfect tense verb. See Ernst DeWitt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1898), §35; see also Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 554–62 which states: "The constant characteristic of the Aorist tense in all of its moods, including the participle, is that it represents the action denoted by it indefinitely; *i.e.* simply as an event, neither on the one hand picturing it in progress, nor on the other affirming the existence of its result." Also, see Wallace, "The aorist tense 'presents an occurrence in summary, viewed as a whole from the outside, without regard for the internal make-up of the occurrence.' This contrasts with the present and imperfect, which portray the action as an ongoing process....if a speaker wants to speak of the unchanging nature of a *state* (such as "I have" or "I live"), the aorist is not normally appropriate. . . . The constative aorist covers a multitude of actions. The event might be iterative in nature, or durative, or momentary, *but the aorist says none of this* [emphasis added]. . . . The aorist indicative is occasionally used to present a timeless, general fact. When it does so, it does not refer to a particular event that *did* happen, but to a generic event that *does* happen." (Clearly, this last situation is not the case at Heb 4:10 where God's action is portrayed as what happened in the past on the seventh day.)

six days be reckoned as beginning and ending in the same manner as the seventh day. One cannot have the sixth day ending at a time different than when the seventh day is beginning, nor can one have the next week's first day beginning at a time other than when the previous seventh day is ending. This, then, dictates that all seven days in the seven-day Sabbath cycle be reckoned from the same starting point of the twenty-four-hour daily cycle. A practice of switching the reckoning of the beginning of a number of days in sequence somewhere during the sequence is unknown and unwieldy.<sup>22</sup>

### CONCLUSION

The most compelling way to read the refrain at Gen 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31 is as a chronological summary of the events that transpired on that day. It presents each day as beginning in darkness (cf. Gen 1:2) and each day as progressing to a period of light, a cycle of evening followed by morning. Moreover, it also relates the result of having the cycle of evening and morning as forming a single day, with each day numbered. This understanding of the days in Gen 1 is affirmed in Israel's sacred days, which always begin in the evening and end with the onset of the following evening. This paper has marshalled evidence to demonstrate that the chronological summary exists in biblical Hebrew and is present in Gen 1. That chronological summary defines each day as "evening and morning." Though this paper has presented new evidence, this conclusion about the meaning of the refrain is nothing new, but is at least as old as Basil of Caesarea (ca. AD 330–379):

*And the evening and the morning were one day.* Why does Scripture say "one day" not "the first day"? Before speaking to us of the second, the third, and the fourth days, would it not have been more natural to call that one the first which began the series? If it therefore says "one day," it is from a wish to determine the measure of day and night, and to combine the time

22. This is not to assert that at times people did not reckon days differently from the officially sanctioned way of reckoning them in a society. For instance, we officially count days as beginning at midnight. Yet at times people will get up in the morning and call it "the start of a new day." It is not inconceivable that at times the Israelites had similar informal ways of referring to the beginning of days, most notably from morning. Thus, one might argue that some texts in the Scriptures use this informal reckoning. One might understand Exod 19:16; Judg 19:5, 8; Isa 28:19 in this way. However, even these passages can be reconciled with a day that began at the preceding evening.

that they contain. Now twenty-four hours fill up the space of one day—we mean of a day and of a night....It is as though it said: twenty-four hours measure the space of a day, or that, in reality a day is the time that the heavens starting from one point take to return there. Thus, every time that, in the revolution of the sun, evening and morning occupy the world, their periodical succession never exceeds the space of one day.<sup>23</sup>

23. Basil of Caesarea. *The Hexaemeron* 2.8 (NPNF2 8:64).

## ***On the Commonalities of Deuteronomy 13 with Ancient Near Eastern Treaties***

DREW S. HOLLAND

Asbury Theological Seminary  
*drew.holland@asburyseminary.edu*

*This article evaluates the numerous potential influences upon Deut 13 from ancient Near Eastern treaties. After assessing both the features Deut 13 shares with Hittite, Aramean, and neo-Assyrian treaties and the ways in which Deut 13 is distinct from them, it will become apparent that this biblical text shares some significant literary traits with these ANE treaties, but the degree to which it differs from them does not enable us to confirm literary dependence, a claim many scholars have asserted. Rather, Deut 13 expresses a uniquely Israelite treaty style within a general ancient Near Eastern treaty tradition.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Deuteronomy 13, ancient Near Eastern treaties, comparative analysis, date of composition*

### INTRODUCTION

Scholars have long recognized that Deut 13 shares common features with ancient Near Eastern treaties, particularly those from the neo-Assyrian and Hittite kingdoms. What has been vigorously debated, however, is the nature of this relationship. In other words, the primary question is whether or not Deut 13 is *directly* influenced by either of these treaty traditions. To aver a direct relationship with neo-Assyrian treaties is to situate this text in the eighth-to-seventh centuries B.C.E, and thus potentially affirm the enduring argument of a Josianic redaction of Deut 12–26, the legal core of the text.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, to argue for a direct

1. Scholars and works representative of this view include the following: Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992); Paul E. Dion, “Deuteronomy 13: The Suppression of Alien Religious Propaganda in Israel during the Late Monarchical Period,” in *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel*, ed. Baruch Halpern and Deborah W. Hopson, JSOTSup (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic,

relationship with Hittite treaties is to see this text in the temporal context of its narrative, the Late Bronze Age.<sup>2</sup> Other scholars, however, posit no direct relationship between Deut 13 and these treaties and envision the text as an exilic or post-exilic composition.<sup>3</sup>

Like the last of these, this paper claims that there is no direct influence upon Deut 13 from either the neo-Assyrian or Hittite treaties. Contrary to scholars of this persuasion, however, I argue that what we find in this chapter is a uniquely Israelite treaty composed in the preexilic period. It is a treaty that has resonance with its ancient Near Eastern counterparts simply because it was composed in the ancient Near Eastern cultural milieu. The similarities with other treaties are neither numerous nor close enough, and they constitute only the cultural husk which we may peel away to determine that Israel has composed here a treaty in its own style as an expression of loyalty to its god, YHWH.

The methodology I will employ is comparative; however, some interaction with the historical-critical method will be necessary in order to address the prevalent issue of the dating of this passage. I will look to Deut 13's resonance with neo-Assyrian, Hittite, and Aramaic treaties by

1991), 147–216; Bernard M. Levinson, *The Right Chorale: Studies in Biblical Law and Interpretation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Bernard M. Levinson, "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty as the Source for the Canon Formula in Deuteronomy 13:1," *JAOS* 130 (2011): 337–47; Jeffrey Stackert and Bernard M. Levinson, "The Limitations of 'Resonance' A Response to Joshua Berman on Historical and Comparative Method," *JJS* 130 (2014): 1–140; Bernard M. Levinson and Jeffrey Stackert, "Between the Covenant Code and Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty. Deuteronomy 13 and the Composition of Deuteronomy," *JAJ* 3 (2012): 123–40; Jeffrey Stackert, "The Syntax of Deuteronomy 13:2-3 and the Conventions of Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy," *JANER* 10 (2010): 2–3; Eckart Otto, "Political Theology in Judah and Assyria: The Beginning of the Hebrew Bible as Literature," *SEA* (2000): 167–84.

2. For this perspective, see the following: Meredith G. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy: Studies and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963); Joshua Berman, "CTH 133 and the Hittite Provenance of Deuteronomy 13," *JBL* 130 (2011): 25–44.

3. For this perspective, see the following: Timo Veijola, "Warheit Und Intoleranz Nach Deuteronomium 13," *ZTK* 92 (1995): 287–314; Juha Pakkala, *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999); Juha Pakkala, "The Date of the Oldest Edition of Deuteronomy," *ZAW* 121 (2009): 56–65; Christoph Koch, *Vertrag, Treueid Und Bund*, BZAW 383 (Berlin: DeGruyter, 2008); Martti Nissinen, "Prophecy against the King in Neo-Assyrian Sources," in *"Lasset Uns Brücken Bauen": Collected Communications to the XVth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Cambridge 1995*, ed. K.-D. Schunck and M. Augustin, BEATAJ 42 (Frankfurt am Main, 1998), 157–70.

paralleling the relevant aspects of these treaties to the Israelite source. I will examine the commonalities between them in terms of thematic, phraseological, and lexical coherence. In each of these I will also address the historical plausibility of Deut 13's composition in light of these treaties. Ultimately, I shall show that the other Near Eastern treaties share common features with Deut 13, but that there is no evidence for direct influence from any of them.

#### COMMONALITIES WITH NEO-ASSYRIAN TREATIES

Since Rintje Frankena's 1965 article presenting the parallels between Deuteronomy 13 and the Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty (henceforth known as "EST"),<sup>4</sup> the majority of commentators on Deuteronomy have posited a direct relationship between EST and Deut 13.<sup>5</sup> These have built upon Frankena's work by suggesting that the relationship between them is one of subversion in which the author of Deut 13 is responding to EST by claiming Israelite allegiance to YHWH, particularly against loyalty to the neo-Assyrian king.

Indeed, the parallels between EST and Deut 13 are striking. For one, the introduction to chapter 13, found in verse 1, displays a reversal of §4, lines 57–61, of EST. This is seen in the table below:

Figure 1

<u>EST §4, line 57-61<sup>6</sup></u>	<u>Deuteronomy 13:1<sup>7</sup></u>
tu-še-šab-a-ni šum-ma a-bu-t'u šá <sup>m</sup> aš-šur-PAB-AŠ MAN KUR- aššur.KI te-na-a-ni- tu-šá-an-na-a-	את כל־הדבר אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם אתו תשמרו לעשות לא־תספ עליו ולא תגרע ממנו

4. Rintje Frankena, "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy," *OWN* 25 (1965): 122–54. Recently, many scholars have preferred this term against the traditional designation, "Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon," or "VTE" for short. This is because this treaty specifically concerns Esarhaddon's desire to secure his succession more than the more general idea expressed in the traditional term that Esarhaddon is establishing a relationship with his vassals. See footnote 1 in Joshua Berman, "CTH 133 and the Hittite Provenance of Deuteronomy 13," *JBL* 130 1 (2011): 25.

5. See note 1 above.

6. All EST references are transcribed from Simo Parpola and Kazuko Watanabe, "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty," *State Archives of Assyria Online*, 1988, <http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/saao/corpus>.

7. All OT citations appear from the Masoretic Text and translations are my own.

ni šum-ma <sup>m</sup> aš-šur-DU- A DUMU- MAN GAL-u ša Ē-UŠ-ti ša <sup>m</sup> aš-šur-PAB-AŠ MAN KUR-aš-šur.KI.EN-ku-un [ū]-kal-lim-ka-un-ni ḥa-an-un-um- ma la to-da-gal-a-ni	
<b>A.</b> You shall neither change nor alter the word of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, <b>B.</b> but serve this very Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate whom Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, your lord, has presented to you, and he shall exercise the kingship and dominion over you.	<b>B’.</b> Every word which I am commanding you, it you shall carefully keep <b>A’.</b> Do not add to it and do not take away from it

Bernard Levinson sees here a direct citation of EST, since this reversal of the order of this so-called covenant formula conforms to the requirements of a citation in Seidel’s Law, in which one text cites another by reversing the order of its elements.<sup>8</sup> Also, there is a strong correlation between the people groups presented in Deut 13 and those listed in both EST and the Zakutu Treaty. The following chart displays this and the other pertinent sections between these three treaties:<sup>9</sup>

Figure 2

<u>EST §10 Lines 108-122<sup>10</sup></u>	<u>Zakutu Lines 18-27<sup>11</sup></u>	<u>Deuteronomy 13</u>
šum-ma a-bu-tū la DŪG.GA-tū la de-iq-	ū šum-ma at-tu-nu ta- šam-ma-a-ni tu-da-a-	כִּי־יִקוּם בְּקִרְבְּךָ נְבִיא אֹר חַלֵּם חֵלוֹם וּנְתַן אֵלֶיךָ אוֹת

8. Levinson, “Esarhaddon’s Succession Treaty.”

9. This is seen most forcefully in Levinson., *Right Chorale*, 138–44, 184–93.

10. It should be noted that §12 of EST also retains similarities to Deut 13. However, §12 mostly repeats the material of §10, so for the sake of brevity I have only included §10.

11. Transliteration and translation from Simo Parpola and Kazuko Watanabe, “Zakutu Treaty,” *State Archives of Assyria Online*, 1988, <http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/saao/corpus>.

<p>tū la ba-ni-tū ina UGU<sup>m</sup> aš-šur-DU-A DUMU-MAN GAL ša E-UŠ-ti DUMU<sup>m</sup> aš-šur-PAB-AŠ MAN KUR-aš-šur EN-ku-nu la tar ša-at-u-ni la ʔa-bat-u-ni lu-u ina pi-I LU.KUR-šu lu-u ina pi-I sal-me-šu lu ina pi-I ŠEŠ-MEŠ-šū ŠEŠ-MEŠ-AD-MEŠ-šu DUMU-ŠEŠ-MEŠ-AD-MEŠ-šū qin-ni-šu NUMUN E-AD-šu lu-u ina pi-I ŠEŠ-MEŠ-ku-nu DUMU-MEŠ-ku-nu DUMU.MI-MEŠ-ku-nu- lu ina pi-I LU.ra-gi-me LU.maḥ-ḥe-e DUMU ša-‘i-li a-mat DINGIR lu-u ina pi-I nap-ḥar šal-mat-SAG.DU mal ba-šū-u ta-šam-ma-a-ni tu-pa-za-ra-a-ni la ta-lak-a-ni-ni a-na<sup>m</sup> aš-šur-DU-A DUMU-MAN GAL-u ša E-US-te DUMU<sup>m</sup> aš-šur-PAB-AŠ MAN KUR-aš-šur la ta-qab-ba-a-ni</p>	<p>ni ma –a ERIM-MEŠ mu-šam-ḥi-iš-šu-u-te mu-šad-bi-bu-u-te ina bir-tuk-ku-nu lu-u ina LU.šā-ziq-ni lu-u ina LU.Sag-MEŠ lu-u ina PAB-MEŠ-šū lu-u ina NUMUN MAN lu-u PAB-MEŠ-ku-nu-lu lu-u EN ʔa-ba-te-ku-nu [lu-u] ina UN-MEŠ KUR gab-bu ta-šam-ma-a-ni [tu-da-a-ni] la ta-šab-ba-ta-nin-ni [la ta-du-ka-ni ina] UGU MI.za-ku-te [AMA-šū ū ina UGU<sup>m</sup> aš-šur-DU]-A [MAN KUR-aš] [be-li-ku-nu la tu-bal]-a-nin-[ni]</p>	<p>או מופת  7 כי יסיתך אחיך בן־אמך ארבנך ארבכתך או אשת חיקך או רעך אשר כנפשה בסתר לאמר נלכה ונעבדה אלהים אחרים אשר לא ידעת אתה ואבתיך  13 כִּי־תִשְׁמַע בִּאֲחַת עֵרִיךָ אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה נֹתֵן לְךָ לְשֶׁבֶת שֵׁם לְאִמֶּר</p>
<p>If you hear any evil, improper, or ugly word which is not seemly nor good to Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, son of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, your lord, either <b>A.</b> from the</p>	<p>And if you hear and know that there are men instigating armed rebellion or fomenting conspiracy in your midst, <b>A.</b> be they bearded or eunuchs or his brother or of royal line <b>B.</b> of your brothers or friends <b>D.</b></p>	<p><b>C.</b> <sup>2</sup>If there arises in your midst a prophet, or dreamer of dreams, and he gives to you a sign or wonder...  <b>B’.</b> <sup>7</sup> If your brother, the son of your mother, or your son, or your daughter, or</p>

<p>mouth of his enemy or from the mouth of his ally, or from the mouth of his brothers or from the mouth of his uncles, his cousins, his family, members of his father's line, <b>B.</b> or from the mouth of your brothers, your sons, your daughters, <b>C.</b> or from the mouth of a prophet, an ecstatic, an inquirer of oracles, or from the mouth of any human being at all, you shall not conceal it but come and report it to Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, son of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria.</p>	<p>or any one in the entire nation- should you hear and [know] (this), you shall seize and [kill] them and bring them to Zakutu [his mother and to Assurbani]pal, [king of Assyria, your lord.]</p>	<p>the wife of your lap, or your friend whose soul is as yours, incites you in secret, saying, "Let us walk and let us serve other gods whom you have not known, you or your fathers..."</p> <p><b>D'.</b> <sup>13</sup>If you hear in one of your cities which the LORD, your God, is giving to you to live there, saying...</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

In these examples, **A** corresponds to those close to monarch, **B** to family and friends of the vassal, **C** to diviners, and **D** to citizens of the land. While **A** is unique to EST, **B** is shared by all three treaties, **C** is only shared between EST and Deut 13,<sup>12</sup> and **D** is common only to Zakutu and Deut 13. These are certainly close thematic parallels between the treaties. Furthermore, both Deut 13 and Zakutu share the phrase "in your midst." Finally, EST and Deut 13 share a cognate expression in the phrase "to speak defection or rebellion."<sup>13</sup>

Historically, Deuteronomy's use of neo-Assyrian treaties has been deemed plausible because neo-Assyrian records indicate that the

12. On this, see especially Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 97.

13. *Ibid.*, 98.

Judean king Manasseh paid tribute to Esarhaddon in the late-eighth to early-seventh centuries B.C.E.<sup>14</sup> The implication here is that Judah would have had on file a treaty from the neo-Assyrians similar to what we find in EST. Then Judean scribes just a few generations later, when the neo-Assyrian empire began to crumble, would respond to this document they received from their suzerain king by transforming “the obligation of loyalty to the Assyrian king to YHWH’s claim of absolute veneration . . .”<sup>15</sup> Eckhart Otto goes so far as to date the translation of a neo-Assyrian treaty into Hebrew in the year 672 B.C.E.<sup>16</sup>

To view Deut 13 in this historical context, of course, assumes the Josianic composition of Deuteronomy. Strong affinities between this chapter and the neo-Assyrian treaties point to a shared temporal context, and this case can be easily made for other reasons. First, there are several Deuteronomic phrases that link this chapter. This includes the following: v. 4b, where Israel is encouraged to “love YHWH, your God, with all your heart and with all your soul”; v. 5, which states, “You shall walk after YHWH, your God, and it is him you shall fear, and it is his commandments you shall observe, and it is his voice you shall listen to, and it is him you shall serve, and to him you shall cleave”; and v.8 , “From the gods of the peoples who are around you, the ones near you or far from you, from the ends of the earth and unto the ends of the earth.”<sup>17</sup> Moreover, the command to stone the offender from 13:11 is also found in 19:22 and 22:21, but in those places the command is for the elders. Dion correctly notes that the punishment of chapter 13 is on such a massive scale (i.e., the eradication of an entire city), that a king can be the only one to carry out such a punishment.<sup>18</sup> Thus, the time of the monarchy provides our context here. Also, while detractors to this theory have posited that EST would not have been available to sixth-century Judean scribes,<sup>19</sup> recent scholarship has become less sure of this. For one,

14. *ANET* 294

15. Otto, “Political Theology,” 63.

16. *Ibid.*, 64–65.

17. Cf. Dion, “Deuteronomy 13,” 188–92. Dion adds more examples, but the ones listed here are the ones I find most convincing.

18. *Ibid.*, 193.

19. For the most recent example, see Markus Zehnder, “Building on Stone? Deuteronomy and Esarhaddon’s Loyalty Oaths. (part 1), Some Preliminary Observations,” *BBR* 19

the discovery of a copy of EST at Tell Tayinat has confirmed that neo-Assyrians composed vassal treaties west of Mesopotamia.<sup>20</sup> Also, Shawn Z. Aster's research into the symbols and rhetoric of the neo-Assyrian empire has definitively exhibited the pervasiveness of neo-Assyria's hegemonic expressions, particularly for its vassal states.<sup>21</sup> These studies have shown that neo-Assyrian influence in sixth-century Judah was more pervasive than some scholars are willing to admit, buttressing Dion's claim that, ". . . [T]he closer to 672BC one places the composition of Deuteronomy 13, the easier to understand are its precise contacts with the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon."<sup>22</sup>

Although the literary and historical factors we have examined thus far point to a close resonance between Deut 13 and neo-Assyrian treaties, we should not posit a direct correlation between the two. While the historical reasons to assert neo-Assyrian influence are valid, and at the very least difficult to prove otherwise, the literary coherence between Deut 13 and the neo-Assyrian treaties falls short.

(2009): 358. See also William S. Morrow, "Cuneiform Literacy and Deuteromic Composition," *BO* 62 (2005): 204–14.

20. Jacob Lauinger, "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty at Tell Tayinat: Text and Commentary," *JCS* 64 (2012): 87–123.

21. Shawn Zelig Aster, "Transmission of Neo-Assyrian Claims of Empire to Judah in the Late Eighth Century BCE," *HUCA* 78 (2007): 1–44.

22. Dion, "Deuteronomy 13," 204–205. This is contrary to the arguments of scholars like Pakkala and Nissinen, who argue for an exilic or postexilic dating of Deuteronomy. Pakkala holds that the monarchy is not in focus in Deuteronomy, and thus the setting must be in the Babylonian or Persian periods. In this light, he believes that Deut 13 was composed on the basis of Babylonian and/or Persian treaties. See Juha Pakkala, *Intolerant Monolatry*, 41–50; Juha Pakkala, "Oldest Edition," 56–65. I believe Dion's arguments concerning the monarchy mentioned above to be more methodologically sound. Further, there is the simple fact that Israel's concern in Deuteronomy was with its relationship with YHWH, not the monarch. And, as Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy*, 100) has demonstrated, Israel's political life was wrapped up in its deity's in a way their neighbors were not. Thus, we would not expect the monarch to play as great a role in these texts as he or she would in other ancient Near Eastern texts. Nissinen ("Prophecy," 162) argues that the theologizing of treaties would have taken time. Yet, this argument is unsubstantiated and the logic is circular. Thomas Römer, who argues for a Josianic date of the first edition of Deuteronomy, concurs with Dion here. He asserts "literary dependency" of the Judean scribe upon EST. In also demonstrating parallels between EST and Deuteronomy 28, Römer concludes that "a copy of this treaty was available in Jerusalem, which strongly influenced the first edition of Deuteronomy." See Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 74–78.

First, although it has been argued, neither of the three treaties we have examined is a direct citation of another.<sup>23</sup> Seidel's Law does not hold true for these treaties. The closest to Deut 13 appears to be EST on the basis of both the chiasmic citation of EST's covenant formula and the reverse ordering of **B** and **C** in figure 2 above. Nevertheless, the lack of **A** detracts from a direct citation. A difficulty for Levinson's contention of the citation of the canon formula between EST and Deut 13:1 loses its force if this verse belongs to the previous chapter, as the Septuagint has it. Moreover against Levinson's point, the superscription of Deuteronomy 13:1 is not identical to the superscription of EST, which reads rather,

The treaty of Esarhaddon, (king of the world), king of Assyria, son of Sennacherib, (likewise king of the world), king of Assyria, with Humbareš, city-ruler of Nahšimarti (etc.), his sons, his grandsons, with all the Nahšimartean (etc.), the men in his hands young and old, as many as there are from sunrise to sunset, all those over whom Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, exercises kingship and lordship, (with) you, your sons and your grandsons who will be born in days to come after this treaty.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, the focus of the superscription in EST is the identity of Esarhaddon, the suzerain, and the focus of the superscription of Deut 13 (v.1) is the integrity of the treaty. While this is certainly present in EST, it is not in an identical location. Furthermore, the superscription of EST does not have a parallel in Deut 13.

Second, while Deut 13 devotes whole paragraphs to the three potential inciters, EST and Zakutu mention them in list form only. The remaining content after the headings (vv. 2, 7, and 13) of the paragraphs in Deut 13 is found elsewhere in the neo-Assyrian treaties. Specifically, the command concerning one's reaction to the inciter (vv. 3 and 8) is found at the end of the neo-Assyrian treaty paragraphs. Similarly, the command to investigate and kill the offender is near the end of the final paragraph in Deut 13 (vv. 13–17) with one verse remaining, while the parallel command in EST and Zakutu are found at the extreme end of those pertinent paragraphs. Note also that this command is omitted in the

23. Although Levinson (*Chorale*, 140–41) attempts to see a chiasm here, he admits that the warnings against the royal family are not present in Deut 13.

24. Simo Parpola and Kazuko Watanabe, "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty," *State Archives of Assyria Online*, 1988, [oracc.museum.upenn.edu/saao/corpus](http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/saao/corpus).

first two paragraphs of Deut 13. The positive command of obedience to YHWH in Deut 13 found in two of its three paragraphs (vv. 4 and 18) is not found anywhere in the sections from the neo-Assyrian treaties we have examined, although it is present elsewhere.

In addition, though the groups of listed peoples are similar thematically between Deut 13 and the neo-Assyrian treaties, there is no exact correspondence lemmatically or phraseologically between them. The list of family members (**B**) is more extensive than in either of the neo-Assyrian treaties, the list of diviners (**C**) contains three such persons in EST and only two in Deut 13,<sup>25</sup> and the stress of the most general command (**D**) in Deut 13 is on “one of your cities” while it is on “the whole nation” in Zakutu.

Another literary distinction is how the reader learns of the insurrection. Deuteronomy 13 poses the problem in three different ways, noting “if there arises in your midst . . .” in v. 2, “if (your family member) incites you” in v. 7, and “if you hear . . .” in v.13. While the last of these parallels how one hears of insurrection in EST, EST notes that what you will hear is an “evil, improper, or ugly word,” and Deut 13 instead lists the speech content. Further, the emphasis in EST is on the “word” or the “mouth” of the inciter. Zakutu stresses not only hearing the word of insurrection, but “knowing” it.

Further, the length of the neo-Assyrian treaties provides a glaring contrast to Deut 13. EST is 106 sections long, including 644 lines. Deuteronomy 13, by contrast, is three paragraphs (or sections) of nineteen verses. Zakutu, however, is close in length to Deut13, as it is comprised of two sections and twenty-seven lines. Yet, as we have seen, the closest parallel to Deut 13 between the neo-Assyrian treaties is EST, and the form of Zakutu does not parallel that of Deut 13.

On a similar point regarding EST, this treaty is highly repetitive, whereas Deut 13 is more concise in its composition. The clause concerning sedition is repeated several times throughout EST in various places with modified verbiage (with §§10 and 12 providing the closest parallel to what we find in Deut 13). Deuteronomy 13, on the other hand, does not present recapitulation of this sort. Rather, it repeats the command to root out insurrection a mere three times in consecutive paragraphs with a focus on sedition arising from a different people group each time.

25. Furthermore, the terms here are not cognate, as Berman (“CTH 133,” 40) has shown.

These literary relationships I have thus far demonstrated point to no more than a common scribal tradition between the neo-Assyrian treaties and Deut 13. If we were to argue for direct literary dependence, we would expect closer lemmatic and syntactic parallels as well as more proximate thematic order.<sup>26</sup> Carly L. Crouch rightly contends that an author must utilize identifiable, specific signals to the reader in order to indicate the sort of literary dependence often argued for here.<sup>27</sup> Instead, the parallels between the neo-Assyrian treaties and Deut 13 exhibit nothing more than a loose correlation.

Finally, I note that both of the neo-Assyrian treaties are of a different literary genre than Deut 13. The neo-Assyrian treaties belong to the broad genre of political vassal treaties between a suzerain and a vassal, who are both indicated in the third and second person, respectively. Deuteronomy 13, by contrast, is first a character speech. While it has features of a treaty, it is a speech by Moses (12:1), who is an explicit third party to the contract between YHWH and Israel. This speech is couched within a larger paraenesis and the entire narrative sweep of Deuteronomy. There is no overt third party in the neo-Assyrian texts, and no other material with which it is connected. One could posit with Otto that Deut 13, along with Deut 28, existed independently as a treaty, but Römer is correct to point out that the traces of neo-Assyrian influence outside of these chapters suggest that these chapters belong to a larger, more coherent body of text composed in the sixth century.<sup>28</sup> Again, we cannot deny that Deuteronomy has treaty elements within it, but the reader must keep these elements in mind of its broader literary context and the figure who proclaims them.

These factors lead us to proceed with caution when trying to ascertain a close relationship between neo-Assyrian treaties and Deut 13. Although there are some strong thematic links between them, there is insufficient evidence to link the neo-Assyrian texts and Deut 13 at a lemmatic or phraseological level. As we have seen, the author does not signal to the reader clearly enough that a literary relationship is present. Indeed, we must concur with Crouch, who writes that the similarities

26. This is the principle behind Seidel's Law. However, this law, nor any other demonstration of close literary dependency can be proven here.

27. See C L Crouch, *Israel and The Assyrians*, Ancient Near Eastern Monographs 8 (Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 23.

28. Otto, "Political Theology," 65; Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 78. I argue here that the neo-Assyrian influence Römer asserts is part of a more general shared scribal tradition and style as opposed to direct literary borrowing.

“are not specific or distinctive enough to support the claim that Deuteronomy is using VTE material with the intention of signaling a relationship with VTE.”<sup>29</sup>

### COMMONALITIES WITH HITTITE TREATIES

Rivalling the resonance of Deut 13 with neo-Assyrian treaties, some scholars posit that this chapter finds its closest relative in Hittite vassal-suzerain treaties. Some in this camp see the closeness between Deut 13 and Hittite treaties as evidence of Deuteronomy’s composition in its literary setting, the Late Bronze Age.<sup>30</sup> Others, remaining cautious of setting this text at such an early date, still assert that the Hittite treaties provide the greatest influence upon Deut 13.<sup>31</sup>

The Hittite text upon which those of this persuasion have focused is the Ismirika Treaty (also known as CTH133), which offers close formal and thematic resonance with Deut 13. Like all of the treaties we have seen thus far, it warns of insurrection against the suzerain king. The king in this case, Arnuwandas I, establishes a treaty with the people of Ismirika to ensure their loyalty to him and to provide military relief when necessary. The passages concerning insurrection are presented in parallel with its similar passages in Deut 13 in figure 3 below.

Figure 3

<u>Ismirika Treaty</u> <sup>32</sup>	<u>Deuteronomy 13</u>
§3 nu-uš-ša-an A-NA LUGAL SAL.LUGAL [DUMU <sup>MEŠ</sup> .LUGAL]	כִּי יִסְיִךְ אַחִיךָ בֶן־אִמֶּךָ או־בִּנְךָ אוֹ אִשֶׁת חִיקֶךָ אוֹ רֵעֶךָ אֲשֶׁר כִּנְפֹשֶׁךָ בַּסֶּתֶר

29. Crouch, *Israel and The Assyrians*, 84. Regarding the use of the phrase “VTE,” see note 4 above.

30. The first to explicitly offer this voice was Kline in Kline, *Treaty*. For many years following, the parallels with neo-Assyrian treaties received more attention and a large majority of scholars became less inclined to view Deuteronomy as a LBA composition. However, this notion has gained attention again by Berman. See Berman, “CTH 133.”

31. This was shown most recently by Zehnder, “Building on Stone? (part 1)”; and idem., “Building on Stone? Deuteronomy and Esarhaddon’s Loyalty Oaths. (part 2), Some Additional Observations,” *BBR*. 19 (2009): 511–35.

32. Transliteration and translation adapted from Kenneth A. Kitchen and Paul J. N. Lawrence, “Arnuwandi I of Hatti and People of Ismirika,” in *Treaty, Law, and Covenant in the Ancient Near East: Part 1: The Texts* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012), 53.

p[a-r]a-a ḥa-an-da-a-an-ni ZI-ni [...] [i-d]a-lu-ma-aš-ša-an le-e ku-iš-ki [...] [i-da]-a-lu tāk-ki-eš-zi na-an ki-e [NI-IŠ DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>] [...] QA-DU E-ŠU A.ŠA<sup>HLA</sup>-ŠU<sup>GI</sup>[ŠSAR.GEŠTIN<sup>HLA</sup>-ŠU] [...] a-pi-e-el ŠUM-ŠU NUMIN-ŠU [...] [...] ḥar-ni-in-kân-[...-du] §4 [...] LUGAL-ma SAL.LUGAL DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>.LUGAL[...] [...] -na-aš na-aš-ma-aš-ši [...] [...] le]-e ku-iš-ki ša-an-[aḥ-zi...] [...] QA-D]U DAM-ŠU DUMU<sup>ME</sup>[Š.ŠU ḥar-ni-in-kân-du]. §10 ma-a-an-ša-ma-[aš]-kân i-da-lu-ma ut-tar ku-iš-ki pi-ra-an [te]-iz-zi na-aš-ma EN MAT-KAL-TI [. . .] na-aš-ma-aš ap-pi-iz-zi-ia-aš na-aš-ma-aš LU KUR<sup>URU</sup>Ḥa-at-[ti n]a-aš-ma-aš LU KUR<sup>URU</sup>Ki-ia-zu-wa-at-[ni...] na-aš-ma-aš an-tu-uḥ-ši A-BU-SU AMA-ŠU NIN-Š[u n]a-aš-ma DUMU-ŠU ga-e-na-aš-[...] un ku-iš ut-tar me-ma-i na-an le-e ku-iš-ki mu-u[n-na]-a-iz-zi e-ep-du-an na-an te-ek-ku-u[š-ša-un-us-du]. §11 ma-an-kân KUR-IA-ma iš-tar-na-1 URU<sup>LUM</sup> wa-aš-d[a-a-i LU]<sup>MEŠ</sup> KUR<sup>URU</sup>Išmi-ri-ka an-da a-ar-te-ni L[U? . .] IŠ-TU LU<sup>MEŠ</sup> ku-en-te-en NAM.RA-ma MA-ḤAR<sup>D</sup>U[TU<sup>Š1</sup> ũ-wa-t]e=et-ten GUD<sup>HLA</sup>-ma-za UDU<sup>HLA</sup> šu-um-me-e-eš [da-a-at-ten] ma-a-an-kân A-NA URU<sup>LIM</sup>-ma iš-tar-na 1 E<sup>TUM</sup> w[a-aš-da-a-i] a-pa-a-at E-ir LU<sup>MEŠ</sup> it a-ku SA[G.GEME.IR<sup>MEŠ</sup>] ũ-wa-te-et-ten GUD<sup>HLA</sup>-ma-zu UDU<sup>HLA</sup> šu-me-e-eš d[a-at-ten ma-a-an] 1 EN LU-ma-wa-aš-da-a-i n[a...]. §17 [...] LU<sup>MEŠ</sup> URU]Iš-mi-ri-ga a-ar-te-ni un-za DAM<sup>MEŠ</sup> KU-NU DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> KU-NU<sup>L[M]</sup> [...] [ki-e-d]a-ni li-in-ki-ia te—et-ta-nu-ut-te-en, nu ḥu-u-m[a...] §18 [...] NI-EŠ D]INGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> šar-ra-at-ta na-an ki-e NI-EŠ DINGIR<sup>ME</sup>[Š...]

לאמר נלכה ונעבדה אלהים אחרים אשר לא ידעתי עתה ואבתוך<sup>8</sup> מאלהי העמים אשר סביבתיכם הקרבים אליך או הרחקים ממך מקצה הארץ ועדקצה הארץ<sup>9</sup> ולא-תאבה לו ולא תשמע אליו ולא-תחס עינך עליו ולא-תחמל ולא-תכסה עליו<sup>10</sup> כי הרג תהרגנו ידך תהיה-בו בראשונה להמיתו ויד כליהעם באחרונה<sup>11</sup> וסקלתו באבנים ומת כי בקש להדיחך מעל יהוה אלהיך המוציאך מארץ מצרים מבית עבדים<sup>12</sup> וכל-ישראל ישמעו ויראון ולא-יוספו לעשות כדבר הרע הזה בקרבך<sup>13</sup> כפי-תשמע באחת עריך אשר יהוה אלהיך נתן לך לשבת שם לאמר<sup>14</sup> יצאו אנשים בני-בליעל מקרבך וידיחו את-ישיבי עירם לאמר נלכה ונעבדה אלהים אחרים אשר לא-ידעתם<sup>15</sup> ודרשת וחקרת ושאלת היטב והנה אמת נכון הדבר נעשתה התועבה הזאת בקרבך<sup>16</sup> הכה תכה את-ישיבי העיר ההוא לגי-חרב החרב אתה ואת-כל-אשר-יבה ואת-בהמתה לפי-חרב<sup>17</sup> את-כל-שללה תקבץ אל-תוך רחבה ושרפת באש את-העיר ואת-כל-שללה כליל ליהוה אלהיך והיתה תל עולם לא תבנה עוד<sup>18</sup> ולא-יידבק בידך מאומה מן-החרם למען ישוב יהוה מחרון אפו ונתן-לך רחמים ורחמך והרבך כאשר נשבע לאבתך<sup>19</sup> כי תשמע בקול יהוה אלהים לשמר את-כל-מצותיו אשר אנכי מצוך היום לעשות הישר בעיני יהוה אלהים

<p>[...Q]A-DU E-ŠU A.ŠA-ŠU  <sup>GI</sup>SAR.GEŠTIN-ŠU[...]  <b>§19</b> [...]-ŠU ša-an-ḥu-wa-an-du [...]</p>	
<p><b>§3</b> Now, for the King, Queen, [and princes] [?may they be led] by divine direction(?)[...][Wick]edness let nobody [commit, but who(ever) may] commit [wicked]ness, him shall these divine oaths seize;[and him], with his house, fields, [vineyard]. [together with] his name and his offspring [...][...], they shall destroy!  <b>§4</b> But [...] the King, Queen, and the princes, [...] [...] ... or him [...] wickedness against them] [shall no]body plo[t; but who(ever) (does so), [such a one, along with] his wife and children [shall they] destroy!  <b>§10</b> If anyone says something (which is) bad in your presence, whether it be a border commander [...] or] a commoner, be he a man of Hatti, or be he a man of Kizzuwat[na...], or to a man (so speaks) his (own) father, his mother his brother, his sister, his son, (or his) in-law [...] who(ever) says such a thing, this person shall nobody conceal, (but) he shall seize him and [bring (him)] to account.  <b>§11</b> If a town in the midst of my land does wro[ng], then shall you, people of Ismirika, go in, [and this town] with (its) men shall you destroy; the ordinary deportees, to the Sun-King you shall send, but the cattle and sheep you shall [take] for yourselves. If within a town, (just) one house does wr[ong, th]is house and its men shall die, (and) the domestics be sent on [to the Sun-king], but the cattle and the sheep you take. [If] (just) on man does</p>	<p><sup>7</sup>If your brother, your mother, or your son, or your daughter, or the wife of your lap, or your friend, whose soul is as yours, instigates you in secret, saying, ‘Let us go and serve other gods who you did not know, you and your fathers.’  <sup>8</sup>From the gods of the peoples who are around you, the ones in the midst of you, or far away from you from the ends of the earth and until the end of the earth.  <sup>9</sup>You shall not desire it and, you shall not listen to him, and your eyes shall not have pity upon him, and you shall not spare him, and you shall not conceal him.  <sup>10</sup>For your hand shall slay him, it will be against him first to kill him and the hand of the people thereafter.  <sup>11</sup>And you shall stone him with stones and he shall die, for he sought to scatter you against the LORD, your God, the one who brought you out from the land of Egypt, from the house of slavery.  <sup>12</sup>And all Israel shall hear, and they shall fear, and they shall not continue to do as the word of this evil one in your midst.  <sup>13</sup>If you hear in one of your cities which the LORD, your God, is giving to you to dwell</p>

wrong, (then) so shall [the man die!]  
**§17** [Now, for the oath-taking], you people of Ismirika, come! And (likewise) your wives, children, and a[ssocaites shall come for this]. You shall put yourselves [under th]is oath, and all swear together!

**§18** [But whoever] breaks the sacr[ed oath], that (person) shall this sacred oath [seize!] [That one, wi]th his house, his field(s), and his vineyard shall it destroy!

**§19** [...] his [...] shall they roast! [...]

there, saying,

<sup>14</sup>Let men, sons of worthlessness, go out from your midst, and let them scatter the inhabitants of the cities saying, ‘Let us go and let us serve other gods who you did not know.’

<sup>15</sup>And you shall seek, and you shall search out, and you shall ask well, and right then the truth shall be firmly established, the word of a deed of this abomination in your midst.

<sup>16</sup>You shall absolutely strike the inhabitants of that city before the sword. You shall ban it, everything in it, and its cattle before the sword.

<sup>17</sup>And all its booty you shall collect to the midst of its town square, and you shall burn with fire the city and all its booty a whole offering to the LORD, your God, and it will be a ruin heap eternally and you shall not rebuild it.

<sup>18</sup>And nothing from the ban shall cling to your hand because it shall return to the LORD from his anger, and he shall give compassion to you, and he shall love you, and he shall make you great as he swore to your fathers.

<sup>19</sup>If you listen to the voice of the LORD, your God, to observe all his commandments which I am commanding you today, to do the right in the eyes of the LORD, your God.

From this table we see that the concerns of CTH133 are similar to the texts we have encountered thus far, the neo-Assyrian treaties and Deut 13. It expresses the wish of a suzerain king to root out insurrection among the vassal people by reporting it and killing the offender(s). On this general thematic level, all of our texts agree.

However, a few other factors reveal the coherence between CTH133 and Deut 13 and distinguish it from EST and Zakutu. For one, the form of CTH133 is closest to that of Deut 13. This is seen especially in §§10–11, which closely parallels the form of the second and third paragraphs of Deut 13 (vv. 7–12 and 13–19, respectively). The earlier section of each describes insurrection among family members, and the later section describes insurrection in one of the vassal towns. In both texts, each of these sections receives an introduction to the scope of the insurrection (i.e., family or towns) followed by detailed information as to how to proceed in punishing such an offender. This stands in contrast to the neo-Assyrian treaties, in which the scope of insurrection was merely listed. Moreover, as we have seen regarding part **D** from figure 2 above, the emphasis in Zakutu is on the entire land as opposed to individual cities.<sup>33</sup>

Despite the fact that the Hebrew and Hittite treaties were composed in languages of wholly different language families, there are some phraseological equivalents, if not cognates, between these texts. For one, the phrase “a town in the midst of my land” found in §10 of CTH133 and the phrase “in your midst” seen in vv. 2 and 13 of Deut 13 reveal a shared concern for sedition arising from within the vassal nation.<sup>34</sup> Likewise, §11 of CTH133 and Deut 13:17–18 include directives regarding the booty of the seditious city, also not found in the neo-Assyrian treaties.<sup>35</sup> These sections also witness a close parallel in that the seditious cities are to be burned.<sup>36</sup> Berman includes mention of another Hittite text, the Hittite Instructions for Functionaries, in which there is a call to switch allegiances similar to the “let us go and . . .” phrases of

33. See also Zehnder, “Building on Stone? (part 2),” 528.

34. Berman, “CTH 133,” 40.

35. *Ibid.*, 32.

36. *Ibid.*, 32–33.

Deut 13:2, 7, and 14.<sup>37</sup> Again, EST only notes the “word” of the potential usurper, not the content of his speech. Similarly, it is the “word” that one must not conceal in EST, not the actual rebel himself, as in Deut 13 and CTH133.<sup>38</sup> However, it must be acknowledged that the disclosure of the offender himself is present in Zakutu.

In addition, unlike the neo-Assyrian treaties, CTH133 and Deut 13 share similar parties to the treaty. Both are contracts between the suzerain king and vassal people, as opposed to the king as the treaty party of the vassal like we find in neo-Assyrian texts.<sup>39</sup> Berman also notes that the relationship of the suzerain toward the vassal in both texts is one of compassion and mutuality. The faithful vassal is rewarded with blessing.<sup>40</sup> By contrast, neo-Assyrian treaties are characterized by the suzerain’s assumption of the vassal’s subservience with no promise of blessing. Indeed, this is indicated by CTH133 in the sections presented in figure 4 below. Moreover, like §§13–14 of CTH133, we see commands expressed in a positive form in Deut 13: 5 and 19 (“After the LORD, your God, you shall follow . . .” and “If you obey the voice of the LORD, your God, by keeping . . .” respectively). Contrarily, the pertinent sections of EST show only negative commands.

Figure 4

<p>§1 UM-MA <sup>m</sup>Ar-nu-[wa-an-da LUGAL.GAL LUGAL.KUR  <sup>URU</sup>Ha-at-ti]</p> <p>§2a [ka-a-ša A-NA LU<sup>MEŠ</sup> KUR <sup>URU</sup>Iš-me-ri-ga ki-e ud-da-a-ar]  ŠA-PAL NI-IŠ DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> te-eḫ-ḫu-un A-NA LUGAL  SAL.LUGAL DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> LUGAL] U A-NA KUR <sup>URU</sup>Ha-[at-ti, aš-  šu-li pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-un-ut-te-ni]. Nu ka-a-ša LI-I[M DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> tu-li-  ia-ḫal-zi-ū-en na-at A-NA- NI-IŠ DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>] ku-ut-ru-ū-e-ni-i[š  a-ša-an-du]</p> <p>§13 un-za ka-a-ša šu-me-eš LU<sup>MEŠ</sup> KUR <sup>URU</sup>Iš-mi-ri-ka ḫu-ma-an-  te-eš IT-[TI UTU I]i-[in]-ki-ia-aš-ša-aš nu LUGAL SAL.LUGAL  DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>. [LUGAL] U KUR <sup>URU</sup>Ha-at-ti EGIR.UD<sup>KAM</sup> pa-aḫ-ḫa-  aš-te-en kat-ta-ma šu-me-i[n-za-an DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> IT]-TI  DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>.LUGAL li-in-ki-ia-aš-ša-[aš] DUMU.DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> KU-</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

37. *Ibid.*, 39.38. *Ibid.*, 35.39. *Ibid.*, 29.40. *Ibid.*, 36–37.

UN-ma-aš-ma-aš IT-TI DUMU.DUMU<sup>MES</sup> LUGAL li-in-ki-aš-pāt  
 un-u[š-ma-aš ne-pi-i]š a-ra-u-wa-an kat-ta-an-ma-aš [...] [te-e-kān  
 a-ra-u-wa-an un A-NA EGIR.UD<sup>KAM</sup> LUGAL SAL.LUGAL  
 DUMU<sup>MES</sup>.LUGAL [kat]-ta ḥ[a-aš-ša ḥa-a]n-za-aš-ša pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš-  
 ten.

§14a [šu-me]-eša LU<sup>MES</sup> KUR<sup>URU</sup> Iš-mi-ri-ka ḥu-u-ma-an-te-eš li-  
 in-ki-ia ar-du-ma-at...

§1 Thus speaks Arnu[wandas (I), Great King, King of the Hatti-  
 land]

§2a [Thus, for the people of the land of Ismirika, this matter] under  
 oath [have I laid. For the King, Queen, and princes], and for the  
 Hat[ti-land, you shall offer friendly protection!] Now see, the  
 thou[sand gods we have called into judgment session; and for (this)  
 oath [they shall be] witnesses: . . .

§13 Now see, all you people of  
 Ismirika, you are oath-bound allies t[o  
 the Sun-king. So you shall protect the  
 King, the Queen, the [prin]ces, and the  
 land of Hatti. Thereafter [shall] yo[ur  
 so]ns be oath-bound allies to the  
 King's sons, and equally your  
 grandsons be oath-bound allies to the  
 King's grandsons. Now, for [you, the  
 s]ky (above) is free, and below, for  
 you, the earth is free; - so ever after,  
 you shall protect the King, the Queen  
 and their distant descendants.

§14 All you people of Ismirika, you must stand by the oath! . . .

A final point of resonance between these treaties regards their length. The extant portions of CTH133 reveal twenty-nine lines, which is much closer to the nineteen verses of Deut 13 than the 664 lines of EST. I must note that Zakutu is also close to Deut 13 here in that it contains twenty-seven lines, but this treaty again has been seen as less comparable to Deut 13 than EST among the neo-Assyrian treaties.

In light of the evidence presented above, CTH133 presents some unique similarities to Deut 13 when compared with neo-Assyrian treaties. Nevertheless, there are several points of disparity between CTH133 and Deut 13 as well, which we now consider.

Textually, the first paragraph of Deut 13 dealing with the “prophet or dreamer” does not have a parallel in the Hittite text. As mentioned above, this is a considerable point of similarity between EST and Deut 13. Also, there are several portions of CTH133 which have no parallel in Deut 13. These include the following: §2b, which lists the deities as witnesses to the treaty; §§15–16, which lists the peoples under the purview of the treaty; §6, which includes instructions for foreign envoys; §§7 and 12, which includes military provisions; and §§8–9, which presents directives regarding fugitives. While §§2b and 6 would be understandably left out of a treaty between a single deity and his people, as opposed to a treaty between nations, the remaining sections are certainly plausible options for Deut 13 and are not included. If the author of Deut 13 were directly using this treaty, we would see parallel sections within it. Also, the list of friends in Deut 13 omits mention of the father or relative in-law as potential instigators like we find in CTH133, while CTH133 omits mention of the daughter, wife, and friend like we find in Deut 13. Once more, we would expect a closer literary relationship here if the authors of Deuteronomy were borrowing directly from a Hittite treaty.

There are also factors CTH133 shares with the neo-Assyrian treaties that are not found in Deut 13. For one, CTH133 and the neo-Assyrian treaties are independent documents while Deut 13 is embedded with a character speech. While Zehnder notes that the first-person reference to the suzerain is present in both Deuteronomy and Hittite treaties to the exclusion of neo-Assyrian treaties, this is not the case in chapter 13.<sup>41</sup> The first-person reference in Deut 13 is Moses, not YHWH, as Moses enters this text as a third party. Also, CTH133 and the neo-Assyrian treaties share an introduction, including the treaty party and the presence of the gods as witnesses. These factors, in combination with the shared features of the Hittite and neo-Assyrian treaties each exclusively share with Deut 13, suggest that there are traditional elements to treaties that are found across geographic and temporal expanses in the ancient Near East.

While the Hittite treaties, and CTH133 in particular, provide us with further similarities to the material of Deut 13, we must conclude that the evidence does not point to a direct dependence of Deut 13 upon Hittite treaties. While the theme, form, and some phraseological similarities exist, there are nonetheless too many incongruences between these texts to assert direct borrowing. There are no specific literary

41. Zehnder, “Building on Stone? (part 2),” 524.

signals to detect direct borrowing, and we must still contend with similarities to later, neo-Assyrian treaties.

#### COMMONALITIES WITH ARAMAIC TREATIES

Thus far we have witnessed treaties from Assyria and Hatti that have revealed close, though not exact, parallels to the treaty-like material in Deut 13. Another text that scholars have mentioned, albeit without extended explication, as also having affinities with Deut 13 is Sefire III, an Aramaic treaty from the eighth century BCE. The opening of this inscription, as opposed to other sections of the treaty, has the tightest correlation to the material in Deut 13. It is seen in the figure below in parallel with the pertinent material from Deut 13.

Figure 5

<p>או אל ברך או אל עקרך או אל חד מלכי ארפד וי[מל]ל [ע]לי או על ברי או על בר ברי או על עקרי כים כל גבר זי יבעה רוח אפוח וימלל מלך לתית לעלי [את ל]תקה מליא מן ידה הסכר תהדכרהם בידי וברך יהסכר לברי ועקרך יסכר לעקרי ועקר [חד מ]לכי ארפד יהסכרן לי מה טב בעיני אעבד להם</p>
<p>. . . or to your son or to your descendants or to one of the kings of Arpad and will speak against me, or against my son, or against the son of my son, or my descendants, or if any man who inquires a breath then he speaks a word against me, you must not accept the word from his hand. You must hand him over to my hand, and your son must hand over to my son, and your descendants must hand over to my descendants, and one of the kings of Arpad must hand over to me. Whatever is good in my eyes I will do to them.</p>

Here we see again the general similarities between an ancient Near Eastern treaty and Deut 13 regarding the theme of potential sedition. As with all of the treaties we have encountered, there is a warning against someone who utters a hurtful word against the king. This is expressed in a unique fashion, as it is in all of the treaties we have seen. In other words, although the theme is the same, it is articulated differently. None of the treaties we have reviewed is exactly parallel. In the case of this extant section of Sefire, the concern is that the addressee's family members must report to the corresponding family member of the king.

This treaty is significant, not because of its similarities to Deut 13 (of which there are only general thematic correlations), but because it reveals how common this type of treaty was in the ancient Near East and

how unique the conventions of the individual treaties could be. Aram, just like Hatti and neo-Assyria, utilized some of its own vassal treaty conventions and borrowed some from its neighbors. Among the treaties we have seen, Sefire finds its closest relative in EST, since the emphasis is on reporting the instigation, as opposed to the vassal taking justice upon himself or bringing the instigator before the suzerain. However, like Hittite treaties, this treaty mentions the suzerain in the first-person singular form. This commonality and its general thematic resonance with the treaties of Hatti, a nation temporally (if not as much geographically) distant from eighth-century Aram, shows, on the one hand, how stable some features of treaties could be. Yet, on the other hand, it has its own unique manner of expressing its treaty. This reveals the conclusion of Noel Weeks that in the ancient Near East, “the whole area had inherited the notion of relationships bound by oaths before God/gods. Each developed that in accord with the socio-political structure of the country.”<sup>42</sup> This is indeed what we have witnessed with the treaties we have examined thus far.

#### PROPOSING A UNIQUE ISRAELITE TREATY

The above has shown that Deut 13 shares many features of other ancient Near Eastern treaties. Regarding neo-Assyrian treaties, Deut 13 shares a covenant formula with §4 of EST, and it exhibits concern that diviners, family members, and anyone within the nation may stir up revolt against the suzerain. There is one cognate phrase with the expression “speaking a lie.” With respect to Hittite treaties, Deut 13 shares even more features in common. These include the closeness in form between them, phraseological similarities, similar parties to the treaties, and length of the treaties. Sefire shows a similar general concern to Deut 13, although there are no close literary parallels.

The issue for biblical interpreters, however, is the vast difference between Deut 13 and all of these treaties. Between these treaties, there are varying structures, expressions of how sedition is reported, and explanations of how justice is to be executed. Most striking of all is that there is only one direct, cognate lexical similarity between Deut 13 and these texts (“to speak defection or rebellion”). The most we can say about Deut 13 in light of the other ancient Near Eastern treaties we have examined is that it stands in the same general thematic tradition of warnings against sedition with them. Indeed, several scholars have noted

42. Noel K. Weeks, “The Ambiguity of Biblical ‘Background,’” *WTJ*: 72 (2010), 225.

that there are parallels across treaties from Hatti to neo-Assyria, thus pointing to a larger shared tradition in the ancient Near East.<sup>43</sup> Veijola even argues that the conventions of ancient Near Eastern treaties extend all the way to the Greco-Roman period.<sup>44</sup> The fact that no two ancient Near Eastern treaties from different nations share the exact same form points to this common practice in the ancient Near East, namely that each nation has expressed its warnings against sedition in a different manner.

Moreover, there are other features of the Israelite text that are inexplicable by means of borrowing from any of the extant ancient Near Eastern treaties. These include the command to stone the offender, the unique lists of family members as potential inciters and booty to be destroyed in a seditious city, the order in which the would-be rebels are presented, the placement of this treaty form within a character speech, and the divinity as the suzerain. The last of these is a distinct feature of this text, and of Israelite religion as a whole, that places Deut 13 in a wholly other literary category from the treaties of Israel's neighbors. Nowhere else in the literature of the ancient Near East, and particularly in the treaty literature, do we see a divinity bound to its people in this manner. In Deut 13 the deity is no mere witness but rather a treaty partner. A summary comparing the features of the texts we have examined may be found in the chart below:<sup>45</sup>

Figure 6

<u>Treaty Feature</u>	<u>Deut</u> <u>13</u>	<u>EST</u> <u>§§4,</u> <u>10,</u> <u>and 12</u>	<u>Zakutu</u>	<u>CTH</u> <u>133</u>	<u>Sefire III</u> <u>Introducti</u> <u>on</u>

43. Markus Zehnder, "Building on Stone? (part 2): 511–22; Berman, "CTH 133," 39.

44. Veijola, "Warheit," 310. Sharing a similar sentiment are the following: Pakkala, *Intolerant Monolatry*, 389; Koch, *Vertrag, Treueid Und Bund*, 289; Nissinen, "Prophecy," 162.

45. This chart displays the shared treaty conventions between the treaties we have examined in this paper. The "+" sign in a box indicates that a particular feature is present in the treaty; a "-" sign designates that the feature is absent; and N/A means that there is not enough extant text to make a sound judgment. For the sake of convenience, I have attempted to arrange the features from the most general features to the most specific. The chart is not exhaustive of all of the features of these texts, but only those illustrative of this paper's argument, namely that Deut 13 participates in the larger treaty tradition of the ancient Near East but also witnesses to its own unique features.

General Warning against Seditious	+	+	+	+	+
Command to Report Seditious	-	+	-	-	-
Treaty between Suzerain King and Vassal King	-	+	+	-	+
Treaty between Suzerain King and Vassal People	+	-	-	+	-
Author an Explicit Third Party	+	-	-	-	-
Inciters Detailed in Own Paragraph	+	-	-	+	N/A
Redundant/Lengthy	-	+	-	-	-
Inciters Appear in List Form	-	+	+	-	N/A
Command to Bring Inciter to the Suzerain	-	-	+	+	+
Command to Kill the Offender	+	+	+(?)	+	-
Positive Command Regarding the Suzerain	+	- (appears in other sections)	-	+	N/A
Mention of Family Members	+	+	+	+	+
Family Members as Potential Inciters	+	+	+	+	-
Seditious Cities	+	-	+(?)	+	-
The King's	-	+	-	-	-

Court as Potential Inciters					
Diviners as Potential Inciters	+	-	-	-	+
Command to Stone the Offender	+	-	-	-	-
Command to Burn a Seditious City	+	-	-	+	N/A
Command to Ignore Malicious Words	+	-	-	-	+
Covenant Formula	+	+	-	-	-
Specific Command to Not Conceal	-	+	-	+	-
Lexical Similarity of “Speaking a Lie” (דבר סרה)	+	+	-	-	-
Lexical Similarity of “In Your Midst”	+	-	+	+	-
Lexical Similarity in “Let Us Go And”	+	-	-	+	-
Emphasis on the “Word” of Insurrection	-	+	-	-	-
Emphasis on the Person Leading Insurrection	+	-	+	+	+

This uniqueness extends throughout ancient Israel’s literature. Many of the conventions of Deut 13 we have noted thus far appear in

treaties made within the Deuteronomic corpus. For one, the positive command to love YHWH, which only finds a parallel in the Ismirika Treaty, is present in Rahab's treaty with the Israelite spies (Josh 2:8–14, 17–21). Also, the sedition of Achan (Josh 7) reveals how Israel lived out the command to stone someone who rebels against the commands and lordship of YHWH, a marked feature of Deut 13. We must conclude then that Israel had its own approach to the treaty tradition of the ancient Near East. While this included sharing some features with its neighbors, such as the positive command we find in Josh 2, there were also some conventions that were unique to Israel, such as the punishment of stoning.

As for the historical plausibility of this text's composition in a specific period of time, the idea that this text eludes a direct relationship with any ancient Near Eastern text provides us little assistance. The fact that there are pronounced similarities to neo-Assyrian treaties and no resonances with extant neo-Babylonian or Persian documents suggests that we may place a *terminus ad quem* for the composition of Deut 13 in the late sixth century, before the exile. Despite this, no date is certain. Rather, the preceding has shown that the text was composed in a larger stream of ancient Near Eastern scribal tradition. As William F. Morrow expresses the ambiguity present here when he writes,

It is possible that a 7<sup>th</sup> century loyalty oath in Judah followed the NA model in form as well as content. But, so far as Deuteronomy resembles an ancient Near Eastern Treaty, its structure also has similarities to Second Millenium Treaties of the so-called Hittite pattern.<sup>46</sup>

Regardless, the text itself resists dating to a particular point on the basis of treaty forms alone. It witnesses instead to Israel's attempt to create its own treaty. On this point, I agree with Morrow that Deut 13 can be best described as uniquely Israelite. Nevertheless, although Morrow argues that Deut 13 is based upon an Israelite treaty after the succession in the reign of Manasseh, this argument is speculative. Juha Pakkala has noted the minor role of the king throughout Deuteronomy, and this is certainly true.<sup>47</sup> However, unlike Pakkala, I do not believe this points to a later date for Deuteronomy. Rather, it points to the repeated insistence in

46. Morrow, "Cuneiform Literacy," 213.

47. Pakkala, "Oldest Edition," 392.

Israel's literature that the king is subservient to YHWH, who is the suzerain of the "treaty" between Israel and the people.<sup>48</sup> This means that Deut 13 expresses Israel's wish to remain loyal only to YHWH alone, a distinct voice among its Near Eastern neighbors, whose texts instead exhibited popular loyalty to a human monarch. This undergirds the reason for one of Israel's divergent treaty features while also remaining faithful to the larger witness of Israel's sacred texts.

#### CONCLUSION

In sum, we cannot confirm that Deut 13 draws directly from a particular treaty. Rather, this text witnesses to a unique Israelite treaty that exhibits its own particular conventions while still participating in a larger ancient Near Eastern genre of composing treaties that warn against sedition. This investigation may not be satisfying to interpreters who wish to place Deut 13, and all of Ur-Deuteronomium for that matter, in a specific temporal context or to those who wish to read this chapter as a subversive reaction to neo-Assyrian oppression. However, the evidence points to another conclusion. That is, Israel wished here to express their devotion to YHWH using a genre typical of their contemporaries but in their own unique manner. This does not place the text in a particular historical setting but rather exalts it as a command for the faithful people of YHWH within the broader literary context of the ancient Near East.

48. Cf. 1 Sam 8; 2 Chr 6; Ps 21:9; etc. See also Bernard M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 141.

## ***King and Cultus: The Image of David in the Book of Kings***

GREG GOSWELL

Christ College, Sydney  
ggoswell@christcollege.edu.au

*The image of David in the book of Kings is of a cultically-observant king, who does not commit the sin of idolatry, and, as a result, David becomes the model of proper royal behaviour for all kings that follow. In the theology of Kings there is an essential link between kingship and the temple cultus, and the kings who were like David reformed the cult and suppressed deviant cultic expression. The author of Kings measures and assesses the performance of every king by the rule of whether he supported the primacy of the YHWH and his temple in Jerusalem (of which piety David is the exemplar). It is argued that the image of David found in Kings is not without connection to the memory of David preserved in the preceding book of Samuel. In terms of the fate of the Davidic house in exile and beyond, various features in Kings suggest that the book is at best ambivalent as to the long term future of kingship as an Israelite institution.*

KEYWORDS: *David, king, image, cult*

Antony F. Campbell sees the book of Samuel as being about David and orientated toward David (and his dynasty) from the beginning, and, despite the traditional name assigned to the canonical book, it is true that Samuel is less visible after he has anointed David, so that Campbell asserts that “Samuel’s life-work is finished by 1 Sam 16:13.”<sup>1</sup> From this point onwards the focus is the rise of David and the corresponding fall of Saul and his house, and 2 Samuel is largely occupied with the successes and failures of the reign of David. The figure of David also has a long afterlife in the book of Kings, in which the image of David is the standard by which all subsequent kings are measured and mostly found wanting. In this article I explore what that image is, from where it is

1. Anthony F. Campbell, *1 Samuel* (FOTL 7; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 25.

derived, and what it may suggest about the possibilities and shape of kingship in the post-exilic period.

#### DAVID AT DEATH'S DOOR

The opening verses of the book of Kings depict a decrepit David (1:1–4) and anticipate that the focus of the book will be the post-Davidic era, and the death of David is reported as early as 1 Kgs 2:10.<sup>2</sup> The four Hebrew book titles “Joshua,” “Judges,” “Samuel” and “Kings” give the Former Prophets (of which the book of Kings is a key component) a distinct focus on leadership that is not at all inappropriate.<sup>3</sup> In line with this, Mark O’Brien sees the books of Joshua onwards as composed “principally as a story of Israel’s leaders,” with the leaders portrayed as exercising various aspects of Mosaic authority, “albeit of course in a way that was appropriate to the particular period of Israel’s life in the land.”<sup>4</sup> The placement of the divisions between the books at the point of significant deaths (those of Moses, Joshua, Saul, and Ahab) has the same effect of drawing attention to leadership (and transitions in leadership) as a prominent feature of this literary corpus (Josh 1:1; Judg 1:1; 2 Sam 1:1; 2 Kgs 1:1; using the formula “after the death of X” in each case).<sup>5</sup> The formula is modified in the case of 1 Kgs 1:1 (“Now King David was old

2. The division of the Greek books of 1–4 Kingdoms between books 2 and 3 in the Antiochene (proto-Lucianic) text and *kaige* revision takes place at this point, with 1 Kgs 2:11 commencing 3 Kingdoms, in line with what triggers the book divisions between 1–2 Kingdoms (2 Sam 1:1: “After the death of Saul”) and between 3–4 Kingdoms (2 Kgs 1:1: “After the death of Ahab”); see Natalio Fernández Marcos, “Translating the Historical Books,” in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 59; Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 222–23, 226–27; John W. Olley, “Re-Versing Tradition: The Influence of Sense-Divisions in Reading the Bible Then and Now,” *ABR* 62 (2014): 37–38.

3. See Mark A. O’Brien, “The ‘Deuteronomistic History’ as a Story of Israel’s Leaders,” *ABR* 37 (1989): 14–34; idem, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 288.

4. O’Brien, “A Story of Israel’s Leaders,” 17, 19; cf. idem, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 288.

5. The latter two divisions are in the Greek tradition that subdivides the books of Samuel and Kings (= 1–4 Kingdoms).

and advanced in years”; cf. Josh 13:1; 23:1),<sup>6</sup> but it is plain that a change of monarch must soon take place, and the likelihood of David’s imminent death fuels the competition between Adonijah and Solomon over who will succeed him as king (1:5). The focus of 1 Kgs 1 on kingship is underlined by the repeated use of the title “King David” (9x) or “the king” (39x) in the chapter, and 2:1 is the first instance of an unadorned use of “David” in the narrative,<sup>7</sup> but this only occurs after the contested succession has been resolved in Solomon’s favour at the close of the first chapter (1:53: “And he [Adonijah] came and did obeisance to King Solomon”).

The book opens with an uncomplimentary picture of David’s physical infirmity due to advanced age (1:1–4), and Peter Leithart raises the possibility that this scene is placed in premier position to foreshadow the eventual demise of Davidic monarchy as an Israelite institution.<sup>8</sup> Despite the beauty of his female attendant, Abishag, David is sexually impotent (1:4: “but the king *knew* [root ידע] her not”), and, as pointed out by Leithart, David’s physical state is matched by (and becomes a symbol of) his political feebleness, in that David also fails to “know” (using the same Hebrew root) about the plotting going on around him (“and David our lord does not know it” [1:11]; “although you, my lord the king, do not know it” [1:18]). Nathan and Bathsheba labour to make sure that the royal ambition of Adonijah comes to David’s knowledge, and Bathsheba’s question to the king again touches on this motif (1:27: “Has this thing been brought about by the king and you have not *made it known* [*Hiphil* of root ידע] to your servants who should sit on the throne of my lord the king after him?” [RSV modified]).

In certain ways the opening paragraph of Kings is echoed by the final paragraph of the book, which depicts the scene of the release of Jehoiachin from prison by order of Evil-merodach of Babylon (2 Kgs 25:27–30). It is noted that subsequently “every day of his life . . . as long

6. In regard to the ancient books titles assigned to Kings, Origen (*apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25) transliterates the incipit that was a Hebrew title Οὐάμμελχ Δαβίδ, i.e., the first two words of 1 Kgs 1:1 “and King David . . .” (וַיְהִי כִּי מָלַךְ דָּוִד), but then translates it: “that is, the kingdom of David” (ὅπερ ἐστὶ βασιλεία Δαβίδ) (*Patrologia Graecae* [ed. Migne] 20.581). Jerome has *malachim* (*Prologus Galeatus*) (*Patrologia Latina* [ed. Migne] 28.598) and Epiphanius δμαλαχει (construct plural), which both reflect the MT title (מלכיה); see H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, Appendix Containing the Letter of Aristeas*, ed. H. St. J. Thackeray (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 198.

7. For these statistics, see Olley, “Re-Versing Tradition,” 38.

8. Peter J. Leithart, *1 & 2 Kings* (SCM Theological Commentary on the Bible; London: SCM, 2006), 30.

as he lived” (his death being presupposed),<sup>9</sup> Jehoiachin king of Judah dined at the Babylonian king’s table. At the very least, this scenic ending serves to bring this history to a close on a cheery note, especially given the contrast between this episode and the preceding string of calamities precipitated by the death of Josiah (23:29), but the question is whether it is no more than just a “happy ending.”<sup>10</sup> I agree with those who argue that the closing verses of the book of Kings are too weak a foundation on which to build high hopes for the Davidic house. The passage does not say that the rehabilitation of Jehoiachin is divinely ordered (in contrast to 2 Kgs 24:2–3). There is no verbal link to God’s promise of 2 Sam 7,<sup>11</sup> nor does it use one of the writer’s fulfilment notices (cf. 2 Kgs 23:16). Nothing is said about his release being preceded by an act of repentance or an appeal to God by Jehoiachin, such as we might expect given the paradigm set out in the prayer of Solomon in 1 Kgs 8:46–53.<sup>12</sup> It must be said, therefore, that these considerations favour Martin Noth’s minimalizing view of the manumission of Jehoiachin in the final paragraph of Kings, with Noth viewing this turn of events as simply the last historical datum available to the Historian to record.<sup>13</sup>

Kings is not entirely pessimistic about the future, as the closing section of Solomon’s prayer shows (1 Kgs 8:46–53), but it does not contemplate a return to the land (unlike is the case in Deut 30:3–5) nor

9. As explicit in the version of this passage found in Jer 52:34 (“until the day of his death as long as he lived”).

10. Recent scholarship is divided between minimalizing and maximalizing viewpoints of what is described in the final paragraph of the book, namely whether the release of Jehoiachin means little (just the last information available to the author) or much (presaging a revival of Davidic rule over Judah); see the summary provided by C. T. Begg, “The Significance of Jehoiachin’s Release: A New Proposal,” *JSOT* 36 (1986): 49–56; for the argument that the ending of Kings does not foreclose possibilities but is deliberately ambiguous as to the future of the Davidic house, see David Jansen, “An Ambiguous Ending: Dynastic Punishment in Kings and the Fate of the Davidides in 2 Kings 25:27–30,” *JSOT* 33 (2008): 39–58.

11. As commented on by Michael Avioz, *Nathan’s Oracle (2 Samuel 7) and Its Interpreters* (Bible in History; Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), 111–13.

12. For this paragraph I acknowledge my dependence on Begg, “The Significance of Jehoiachin’s Release,” 50–51.

13. Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 98. This is the English translation of part of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957).

does it speak of a postexilic restoration of Davidic kingship.<sup>14</sup> Read in the light of these verses, what happens to Jehoiachin at most reflects the hope that God would “grant them compassion in the sight of those who carried them captive” (8:50).<sup>15</sup> On this reading, the improvement in the lot of Jehoiachin does not presage a messianic hope, but it does suggest that there is a future for God’s people in the good purposes of God.<sup>16</sup> Jehoiachin prospers under Babylonian rule, and so, therefore, can God’s people generally (cf. Jer 29). The implied application for readers is that serving the king of Babylon is the way ahead in the exilic situation.<sup>17</sup>

With these last four verses we have come full circle, for they recall the beginning of Kings that opens with four poignant verses portraying an enfeebled King David (1 Kgs 1:1–4). Jehoiachin as depicted in the closing verses of Kings is “a similarly enfeebled monarch,” though his impotence is political, not sexual.<sup>18</sup> This helps to give the ending of the book a sense of closure. On this reading, the house of David meets the same fate as the house of Saul, for Jehoiachin is a Mephibosheth-like figure, namely a humbled royal personage who cannot himself exercise rule and is condemned to eat at another king’s table (2 Sam 9:11b, 13a; cf. 1 Kgs 2:7; 4:27). Kings ends in hope, but the unflattering portraits of the first and last Davidic kings with which the book opens and closes suggest that it entertains a *democratized* hope and not one that features the prospect of a return of Davidic kingship.

14. J. G. McConville, “1 Kings VIII 46–53 and the Deuteronomic Hope,” *VT* 42 (1992): 67–79; idem, “The Restoration in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic Literature,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. James M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 11–40.

15. Donald F. Murray, “Of All the Years the Hopes—or Fears? Jehoiachin in Babylon (2 Kings 25:27–30),” *JBL* 120 (2001): 263–65.

16. See also Jon D. Levenson, “The Last Four Verses in Kings,” *JBL* 103 (1984): 360; Bob Becking, *From David to Gedaliah: The Book of Kings as Story and History* (OBO 228; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 187.

17. As argued by Begg, “The Significance of Jehoiachin’s Release,” 53–54; cf. Iain W. Provan, *1 and 2 Kings* (NIBC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 280.

18. Jan Jaynes Granowski, “Jehoiachin at the King’s Table: A Reading of the Ending of the Second Book of Kings,” in *Reading between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (ed. Danna Nolan Fewell; Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 178.

In line with the opening of Kings, the type-scene of a mortally ill king who seeks prophetic advice recurs in the narrative of Kings,<sup>19</sup> and the delicate health of the monarch becomes a symptom of the precarious state of the nation over which he rules. Examples of such a scene are those involving Ahaziah (2 Kgs 1), Ben-hadad (2 Kgs 8), and Hezekiah (2 Kgs 20). A deviation from this stereotypical scene is the story of Jeroboam's inquiry (via his wife) of the prophet Ahijah on behalf of his sick son, Abijah (1 Kgs 14), but this gives the prophet the opportunity to announce the demise of the house of Jeroboam *in toto* (14:12–16).<sup>20</sup> In each case the king dies—as the prophet foretold (1 Kgs 14:18; 2 Kgs 1:17; 8:10), though, in a variation on the theme, godly Hezekiah is granted an extension of fifteen years to his life (20:6). This suggests that God's long-term plan for his people in the book of Kings may not include rule under human kings.

#### DAVID'S ADVICE TO SOLOMON

In 1 Kgs 2 both good and bad advice is offered by David to Solomon as his successor. The striking difference between the advice given in 2:2–4 (to obey God) and in 2:5–9 (to take vengeance on enemies) need not be resolved by positing different sources or redactional layers,<sup>21</sup> but shows that David is the same flawed character he was in 2 Sam 11–20, and the cast of characters in those earlier chapters reappears, namely Adonijah (as a second Absalom; cf. 1 Kgs 1:5–7),<sup>22</sup> Joab, the sons of Barzillai and Shimei. David's speech urging conformity to God's commandments in 1 Kgs 2:3 is heavily Deuteronomic, and 2:4 provides a rendering of the Dynastic Oracle of 2 Sam 7 that stresses that the continuance of the

19. As pointed out by T. R. Hobbs, *2 Kings* (WBC 13; Waco: Word, 1985), xxxvi; and this type-scene is explored by Robert L. Cohn, "Convention and Creativity in the Book of Kings: The Case of the Dying Monarch," *CBQ* 47 (1985): 603–16.

20. Cf. Cohn, "Convention and Creativity," 614: "Abijah's death was symbolic of the coming destruction of Jeroboam's house and the ultimate fall of Israel."

21. Walter Brueggemann, "Heir and Land: The Royal 'Envelope' of the Books of Kings," in *The Fate of King David: The Past and Present of a Biblical Icon* (ed. Tod Linafelt et al.; LHBOTS 500; New York: T & T Clark, 2010), 88; *pace* e.g., Antony F. Campbell and Mark A. O'Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 332–33.

22. Eric A. Seibert, *Subversive Scribes and the Solomonic Narrative: A Rereading of 1 Kings 1–11* (LHBOTS 436; New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 118.

dynasty is contingent on the obedience of the Davidides (“If your sons take heed to their way, . . .”) (the same interpretive move as Ps 132:11–12). This must be viewed as sound advice from the lips of David given that the identical sentiment is voiced in later passages in Kings (1 Kgs 6:12; 8:24–26; 9:4–5; 11:36; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19). Later, Solomon acknowledges that David’s faithfulness led to him, David’s son, gaining the throne (3:6), and in a dream God urges Solomon to emulate David’s obedience (“as your father David walked,” 3:14). In line with David’s sage advice to Solomon, in the book of Kings the Davidic kings will be measured against David as the standard of faithfulness, for the enjoyment of the benefits of the dynastic promise hinges on that.

The same positive evaluation cannot be made of the second part of David’s charge to Solomon (2:5: “Moreover [גַּם] . . .”), wherein David urges him to take vengeance on Joab and Shimei but to do so with ruthless cunning, finding a suitable occasion for that purpose (“according to your wisdom . . . for you are a wise man” [2:6, 9]).<sup>23</sup> Is this really how God intended that Solomon should establish his authority? Is this the way to ensure that the kingdom is established in the hands of Solomon? The theme of the remaining part of 2 Kgs 2 is the *establishment* of Solomon’s rule, as indicated by the strategic use of the verb “to establish” (כִּוֵּן) at the beginning, middle and end of the unit (2:12, 24, 45–46).<sup>24</sup> This vocabulary alludes to what God promised to do for David’s son in 2 Sam 7 (with the same Hebrew root found in vv. 12, 13, 16, and 26 of that chapter), as is explicitly stated in 2:24.<sup>25</sup> There is more than a touch of irony in its reuse in 1 Kgs 2, where David (and Solomon) seem to think he needs to take matters into his own hands. However, in accordance with the divine promise, before Solomon takes any action, the kingdom of Solomon is already “firmly established” (2:12 [with the root כִּוֵּן reinforced by the adverbial use of מְאֹד]), and after Solomon has

23. This negative appraisal fits with the presence of dubious wise figures in the Succession Narrative (e.g., Jonadab, the wise woman of Tekoa, and Ahithophel); see Iain W. Provan, “On ‘Seeing’ the Trees While Missing the Forest: The Wisdom of Characters and Readers in 2 Samuel and 1 Kings,” in *In Search of True Wisdom: Essays in Old Testament Interpretation in Honour of Ronald E. Clements* (ed. Edward Ball; JSOTSup 300; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 153–73. In the light of the “dissonant chord” sounded in vv. 5–9, Seibert seeks to relieve the tension in David’s portrait by arguing that these five verses are Solomonic propaganda placed on his lips (*Subversive Scribes*, 133–35). There is no need, however, to defend David’s character to make sense of the text.

24. For this paragraph I acknowledge my substantial dependence on Provan, *1 and 2 Kings*, 37.

25. Avioz, *Nathan’s Oracle*, 73.

disposed of Adonijah, Joab, and Shimei, the irony is that the kingdom is, if anything, a little *less* secure, for the narrator only states that “the kingdom was established (נִכְוְנָה) in the hand of Solomon” (2:46 [without an intensifier]). I argue that the difference in wording (though slight) between 2:12 and 2:46 is highly significant, indicating that, despite what Solomon may have thought, these acts of vengeance have *not* contributed in any way to the establishment of his kingdom; rather, the welfare and stability of the royal house is dependent on the godly obedience of its head (2:3–4). This close analysis of 1 Kgs 2 has been necessary to show the programmatic nature of the first piece of advice given by David to Solomon (2:3–4), for it provides the criterion of judgment that will be used by the author in evaluating the performance of subsequent kings.

#### THE MODEL PROVIDED BY DAVID

The thesis of Alison Joseph is that “[t]he Deuteronomistic Historian devises a prototype of a covenantally adherent king in the portrait of David, who provides the cultic model for subsequent kings to follow.”<sup>26</sup> She makes use of the historiographical methodology of Hayden White, especially what he calls “emplotment,” whereby a story is told and its key characters depicted according to a typical pattern (or typology),<sup>27</sup> in this case, the prototype of a good king provided by David with subsequent kings portrayed and evaluated (positively or negatively) “through the lens of the prototype.”<sup>28</sup> In his compositional strategy, the author of Kings “uses David as the royal comparative to construct the portrait of

26. Alison L. Joseph, *Portrait of the Kings: The Davidic Prototype in Deuteronomistic Poetics* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 5.

27. Hayden White, *The Content of Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 172–73; see also the discussion of the “grammar of literary archetypes” provided by Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 135. For an evaluation of Frye’s theory, including a comparison with the dream psychology of Jung, see Thomas Willard, “Archetypes of the Imagination,” in *The Legacy of Northrop Frye* (ed. Alvin A. Lee and Robert D. Denham; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 15–27.

28. Joseph, *Portrait of the Kings*, 55; cf. Gerhard von Rad, “The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings,” in *Studies in Deuteronomy*, tr. David Stalker, SBT 9 (London: SCM, 1953), 88: “[David] is the king after the heart of the Deuteronomist. He is the prototype of the perfectly obedient anointed, and therefore the model for all succeeding kings in Jerusalem.”

both good and bad kings. The good kings are those who are like David, while the bad kings are those who are not.”<sup>29</sup>

The first example is Solomon, whose foreign wives lead him astray, such that he goes after “other gods” (1 Kgs 11:1–8). He is condemned in these terms: “So Solomon did what was evil in the sight of the LORD, and did not wholly follow the LORD, as David his father had done” (11:6; cf. 11:33b: “[not] keeping my statutes and ordinances, as David his father did”). The crucial action for which he is condemned is his worship of other gods (11:33a), which is opposed to the true Yahwistic worship associated with the Jerusalem temple. The inverse of Davidic style obedience (9:4: “if you will walk before me, as David your father walked”) is specified to Solomon in these terms: “but if you . . . go and serve other gods and worship them” (9:6). On this basis it can be said that in Kings obedience to God is narrowly defined as the avoidance of the worship of “other gods” (cf. 11:4–6, 9–10, 33), and in these citations involvement in idolatrous worship is repeatedly contrasted with the obedience rendered by David.

The cultic focus of the evaluation of kings is not at all surprising given the importance of the temple in the book.<sup>30</sup> In attempting to determine the view of the status and role of kingship in Kings, it is assumed that its canonical shape is a unified literary and theological whole (whatever redactional layers may lie buried beneath). It is significant that the narrative moves from temple *erection* to temple *destruction*. The account of the reign of Solomon (1 Kgs 1–11) has at its heart the account of temple building (1 Kgs 6–7) and Solomon’s prayer at its dedication (1 Kgs 8). At the climax of the book is the account of temple destruction (2 Kgs 25:13–17), which takes up the details of 1 Kgs 7 (mentioning the pillars, the bronze sea, pots, and shovels) and binds Kings into a tight conceptual unity, for what is constructed at the start of the book is dismantled at the end. In this way the book of Kings is clearly separated off from the book of Samuel, and the cultic *inclusio* shows the special interest of the author of Kings in the temple.

#### THE REGNAL FORMULAE

In the regnal formulae, the good (only Southern) kings are those who do

29. Joseph, *Portrait of the Kings*, 58.

30. For the relation of the kings and the cultus in Kings, see e.g. R. H. Lowery, *The Reforming Kings: Cults and Society in First Temple Judah* (JSOTSup 120; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

what is “right in the eyes of YHWH,”<sup>31</sup> of whom there are only eight (Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, Amaziah, Azariah, Jotham, Hezekiah, Josiah) (1 Kgs 15:11; 22:34; 2 Kgs 12:3; 14:3; 15:3, 34; 18:3; 22:2), and they are also said to be like their own father if their father acted in the right way. However, only three kings reach such a level that they are likened to David the prototypical good king (Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah). One king, Amaziah, is said to do what was “right in the eyes of YHWH, yet not like David his father” (14:3), and two bad kings are said not to be like David (Abijam, Ahaz) (1 Kgs 15:3; 2 Kgs 16:2). Both Hezekiah and Josiah are praised by being said to be incomparable (2 Kgs 18:5; 23:25), and in line with this high commendation, Hezekiah is not merely said to be like David (as stated of Asa), but that he did “all that David did” (2 Kgs 18:3). The description of Josiah is even more impressive for “[he] walked in all the ways of David his father and he did not turn aside to the right hand or to the left” (2 Kgs 22:2).

Asa is something of an anomaly, for he is said to have acted “as David his father had done” (1 Kgs 15:11), but he is also a member of the group of basically good kings who allowed the people to continue the worship of YHWH at the provincial “high places” (במות) (1 Kgs 15:14; 22:43 [Heb. 44]; 2 Kgs 12:3 [Heb. 4]; 14:4; 15:4, 35),<sup>32</sup> though Asa himself only worshipped in the temple (1 Kgs 15:15: “and he brought . . . his own votive gifts into the house of YHWH” [following the *Ketiv*, which is supported by 1 Chr 15:18]).<sup>33</sup> Asa has the honour of being the first Judean cult-reformer,<sup>34</sup> and the three most lauded kings (Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah) each undertake some kind of cultic reform (1 Kgs 15:12–13; 2 Kgs 18:4; 23:4–20),<sup>35</sup> and concerning each there is also a positive

31. The evaluative phrase goes back to Deut 6:18. For this and what follows in the next two paragraphs, I acknowledge my dependence on Joseph, *Portrait of the Kings*, 77–93.

32. Iain W. Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 172; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988), 61–65; cf. W. Boyd Barrick, “On the Removal of the High-Places in 1–2 Kings,” *Bib* 55 (1974): 257–59.

33. Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 66–67.

34. Hans-Detlef Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen: Untersuchungen zu einem Grundthema der deuteronomistischen Geschichtsschreibung* (ATHANT 66; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980), 87–93.

35. Cf. Steven L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 119: “Asa,

statement about the state of his “heart” (1 Kgs 15:14; 2 Kgs 20:3; 23:25), which again links each of them to David, as is made plain by the negative comments about other kings whose hearts are said *not* to be like David’s (1 Kgs 14:8; 15:3; cf. 2 Kgs 10:31).

That the criterion of judgment for the kings is cultic in nature is confirmed by the basis on which Jeroboam and all subsequent northern kings are condemned by the Historian. In the regnal formulae, the northern kings are said to do what is “evil in the eyes of YHWH” and are compared to either Jeroboam or Ahab (e.g., 1 Kgs 22:52; 2 Kgs 8:18, 27; 10:31) (for the latter archvillain, see below).<sup>36</sup> The crucial event in the history of the northern kingdom is the action of Jeroboam in founding a counter-cultus in Bethel and Dan (1 Kgs 12:25–33; 2 Kgs 17:16). This is prophetically condemned and the cultic reform of Josiah is anticipated which will expunge this evil (1 Kgs 13:2–5; cf. 2 Kgs 23:15–18).<sup>37</sup> Each succeeding northern king (except for short-lived Elah and Shallum) is condemned in similar terms, namely that “he did what was evil in the sight of the LORD, and walked in the way Jeroboam, and in his sin which he made Israel to sin” (e.g., 1 Kgs 15:26, 34; 16:26), and the north perishes because of the sin of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 12:26–32; 14:10–11; 2 Kgs 10:28–31; 17:16, 20–22).<sup>38</sup> It is plain that the issue is the sin of idolatry (e.g., 1 Kgs 16:26: “provoking the LORD, the God of Israel, to anger by their idols”). The promises that God made to Jeroboam through Ahijah depended on him adhering to the Davidic standard (1 Kgs 11:38: “as David my servant did”), but Jeroboam, the potential second David,

---

Hezekiah, and Josiah are the only kings favourably compared to David because they are the only reforming kings”; likewise Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 40: “While it is true that only Asa, Hezekiah and Josiah are compared positively to David, it is equally true that only these three kings attempted reformation.” The action of Jehoshaphat recorded in the postscript (*Kultmotiz*) to his reign in 1 Kgs 22:46 (Heb. 47) (completing what his father Asa began to do, removing the remnant of the male cult prostitutes [שקדן]) in the eyes of the author may not have qualified as a reformation.

36. The condemnation of Ahab in superlative terms is probably due to his promotion of Baal worship (1 Kgs 16:30, 33). The LXX book division (e.g., in Codex Vaticanus and that of the Vulgate following it) is at 2 Kgs 1:1 (“After the death of Ahab”). Given how Ahab is described, after the death of the worst northern king there is possibly hope for the nation. On that basis, his death may be viewed as a favourable turning point. On this, see T. R. Hobbs, “2 Kings 1 and 2: Their Unity and Purpose,” *Sciences Religieuses/ Studies in Religion* 13 (1984): 334.

37. Robert L. Cohn, “Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative,” *ZAW* 97 (1985): 32, 35.

38. E. Theodore Mullen Jr., “The Sins of Jeroboam: A Redactional Assessment,” *CBQ* 49 (1987): 212–32.

failed to live up to this standard (14:8–9)<sup>39</sup> and instead became a kind of “anti-David,”<sup>40</sup> and so the negative benchmark for future northern kings. In this way the Davidic prototype is the key to the judgment of both kingdoms.

The corresponding culprit to Jeroboam in the South was Manasseh, who did as Ahab had done (2 Kgs 21:3, 13) and by so doing ensured the exile of the southern kingdom (2 Kgs 21:20; 23:26; 24:3).<sup>41</sup> Ahab was like Jeroboam, but worse (1 Kgs 16:31),<sup>42</sup> but he was mimicked by Manasseh, and by this means Jeroboam’s defection from the Jerusalem-centred cultus led to the destruction of both kingdoms.<sup>43</sup> In line with the compositional method in which each king is measured by some other king, toward the end of the book of Kings there is found an alternating pattern of the best and worst Judean kings, namely the contrasting pairs of kings Ahaz/Hezekiah and Manasseh/Josiah.<sup>44</sup> Just as the piety of Hezekiah and Josiah found cultic expression (2 Kgs 18:4; 23:4–20), the crimes of Ahaz and Manasseh were primarily cultic (2 Kgs 16:3–4, 10–18; 21:2–9). In summary, the individuality of the kings is

39. Paul S. Ash, “Jeroboam I and the Deuteronomistic Historian’s Ideology of the Founder,” *CBQ* 60 (1998): 18–19.

40. Ash, “Ideology of the Founder,” 19: “The Deuteronomist condemns Jeroboam for one primary reason: failure to be like David (1 Kgs 14:8).”

41. The disappearance of the cultic theme from the evaluative formulae concerning the last four (post-Josianic) kings (2 Kgs 23:32, 37; 24:9, 19) is used to support the theory of the double redaction of the Deuteronomistic History; cf. e.g., Gottfried Vanoni, “Beobachtungen zur deuteronomistischen Terminologie in 2 Kön 23,25–25,30,” in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. Norbert Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), 357–62.

42. Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen*, 78–82.

43. William M. Schniedewind, “History and Interpretation: The Religion of Ahab and Manasseh in the Book of Kings,” *CBQ* 55 (1993): 649–61.

44. Ehud Ben Zvi, “The Account of the Reign of Manasseh in II Reg 21,1–18 and the Redactional History of the Book of Kings,” *ZAW* 103 (1991): 359–60. He sees the intervening account of the reign of Amon, who did “as Manasseh his father had done . . . and walked in all the way in which his father walked, and served the idols that his father served” (2 Kgs 21:19–26) as an appendix to that of Manasseh and so it does not seriously disturb this pattern (361). Hoffmann designates Hezekiah, Manasseh and Josiah “die drei ‘großen’ Kultreformer” and sees them forming a triad (*Reform und Reformen*, 146).

largely suppressed,<sup>45</sup> and they are typed as being like, or unlike, another king. The writer condemns northern kings for mimicking Jeroboam and his crime of refusing the primacy of the Jerusalemite cult. Likewise, southern kings are the target of criticism when they do not follow the pious ways of David.

#### AN UNREALISTIC (INAUTHENTIC) PORTRAIT OF DAVID?

A markedly different (often said to be pre-Deuteronomistic) and richer portrait of David is provided by the book of Samuel.<sup>46</sup> However, despite what some scholars assert, the David of Kings is not without connection to what is found in Samuel,<sup>47</sup> for also in the preceding canonical book at significant junctures David's piety finds cultic expression.<sup>48</sup> The link between piety and devotion to the cult of YHWH is made in the book of Samuel in a number of ways. For instance, the book closes with the account of David's purchase of "the threshing floor of Araunah (אֲרוֹנָה) the Jebusite" and his offering of sacrifices (2 Sam 24), this being the site of the future temple (cf. 1 Chr 21:28–22:1; 2 Chr 3:1 ["the threshing

45. Cf. Robert L. Cohn, "Characterization in Kings," in *The Book of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (ed. André Lemaire and Baruch Halpern; VTSup 129; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 91: "the narrator's moral judgment of each king closes his file, flattening whatever individuality may have emerged from the account of the king's reign."

46. Cf. von Rad, "Deuteronomistic Theology of History," 86: "The actual history of David is noticeably free from Deuteronomistic additions." See also Jürg Hutzli, "The Distinctiveness of the Samuel Narrative Tradition," in *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Cynthia Edenburg and Juhu Pakkala; SBLAIL 16; Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 171–205. I do not as such subscribe to Noth's theory of a Deuteronomistic History (Dtr) (on this issue, see the references provided in note 49 below). When using the adjective "Deuteronomic," I am referring strictly to themes and motifs found in the canonical book of Deuteronomy.

47. E.g., the regnal formulae in the David narrative are not all that different to what is supplied for David in Kings (2 Sam 5:4–5; 8:15–18; cf. 1 Kgs 2:10–11).

48. Pace Alison L. Joseph, "Who Is like David? Was David like David? Good Kings in the Book of Kings," *CBQ* 77 (2015): 33–36, who explores "whether David [in Samuel] is like his literary alter ego [in Kings]" (21). She says: "David [in Samuel] is praised for his zeal for YHWH but not for his cultic activity . . . even though Samuel chronicles the reign of David, the portrait of the cultically adherent king is missing" (35, 39). Cf. idem, *Portrait of the Kings*, 226: "In all these depictions, it is clear that he is not a cultic hero . . . Dtr transforms the character of David, so well known from Samuel (or Samuel's sources), into a figure who is programmatically useful to him in his goal of writing a theologically based, cultically focused history."

floor of Ornan (אֲרִנָּן the Jebusite”). The climactic placement of this incident in the book of Samuel reinforces its role as a thematic connector to Kings that immediately follows in the ordering of the books in the Hebrew and Greek OT canons.

Despite the extremity of being driven to Philistia by the persecution of Saul (1 Sam 27:1), in that foreign land where other gods are worshiped, David does not succumb to the temptation to “serve [= worship] other gods” (26:19). True enough, in accordance with the different thematic emphases of the book of Samuel, David’s piety more often takes the form of his refusal to advance his career by harming Saul, the LORD’s anointed (1 Sam 24, 26; cf. 2 Sam 1:14), or by killing off his Saulide rivals (2 Sam 3:31–39; 4:9–12), but that only reflects the fact that Samuel and Kings are different books with their own thematic concerns and priorities,<sup>49</sup> but there is enough overlap to refute the suggestion that their nuanced portraits of David are incompatible or unconnected.

The highpoint of David’s piety in the book of Samuel is certain commendable actions in the cultic realm, namely his transfer of the ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam 6) and his desire to provide the ark with more adequate housing (2 Sam 7).<sup>50</sup> YHWH’s kingship over Israel was acknowledged by David in 2 Samuel 6 by bringing the ark (= YHWH’s throne or footstool [cf. 6:2]) to his newly conquered capital, with David’s motivation being that Jerusalem might become God’s capital and not just his capital—all with the aim of affirming God’s supreme rule over the sacred nation. Indeed, on that occasion David’s exuberant devotion to YHWH (6:14, 16, 21 [x2]: “[It was] before the LORD”) and lack of concern for his own royal dignity earned him the disapproval of “Michal the daughter of Saul” (6:16, 20–23), who is designated in this fashion to

49. For the view that the various historical books were individually edited and have a certain integrity of their own (*selbständig entstandene Bücher*), see Claus Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* (TBü 87; Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser, 1994), 78; with whom Erik Eynikel expresses agreement, see *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OTS 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 14, 363: “the unique character of each book prevents seeing the books of the dtr history as parts of one historical work . . . The individual books of the dtr history are clearly unified units that do not reflect a comprehensive ‘Geschichtswerk.’” Cf. J. G. McConville, “Faces of Exile in Old Testament Historiography,” in *After the Exile: Essays in Honour of Rex Mason* (ed. John Barton and David J. Reimer; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1996), 27–44.

50. As noted in passing by Ash, “Ideology of the Founder,” 19 n. 16: “David’s piety is closely associated with his treatment of the ark.”

suggest that how she reacted and what she said to her husband reflects her awareness of her high social status as a king's daughter. In turn, the naming used in 6:16 ("King David") reflects the viewpoint of his wife, implying that she viewed David as not maintaining proper kingly dignity, a point Michal made by way of her sarcastic comment: "How the king of Israel has honoured himself today . . . !" (6:20)

Likewise, David's reason for wanting to build a *temple* to house the ark is that there be a *palace* for the heavenly king (the word in Hebrew [הֵיכַל] having both senses), on analogy with David's own palace. Note the comment made in 7:1 ("the king dwelt in his house"), namely kings dwell in *palaces*, such that it was when Hiram built him a house that "David perceived that the LORD had established him king over Israel" (5:11–12). That an oblique argument is being mounted by David in 7:2 is indicated by use of an argumentative imperative ("look" [רֹאֵה]),<sup>51</sup> though any hint of impertinence before a prophet as God's representative is softened by the Particle of Entreaty (נָא) ("please") (though the particle is not always rendered in English translation). David only states the premise of what is an *a fortiori* argument ("Look, I dwell in a house of cedar . . ."). The unexpressed logic is that it is even more appropriate for YHWH to have a house for he is the supreme King.<sup>52</sup> The completed argument of David (supplying the elided conclusion) is that since David (the lesser king) has a house (= palace), then surely God should have a house (= temple). David is commended in 1 Kgs 8:18 for his desire to build a temple, and O'Brien views this as an expression of David's commitment to the policy of centralized worship in line with Deuteronomic orthodoxy.<sup>53</sup>

On the other hand, the writer of Kings in idealizing David does not fail to allude to the notable exception to David's godliness (1 Kgs 15:5: "except [רַק] in the matter of Uria the Hittite"), so that David is not whitewashed in the book of Kings. In both books David's most significant failing is the Bathsheba episode (2 Sam 11), and right near the end of the book of Samuel, in the verse that immediately precedes the account of a second major failing by David (the census), the reader is

51. Here רֹאֵה introduces a fact upon which a following statement is based ("Since . . .") (though in this case that statement is suppressed), and it has the same logical force as הִנֵּה in 1 Chr 17:1 (cf. Exod 33:12–13; 2 Sam 15:27–28); see *BHRG* §44.3; *IBHS* §40.2.1.

52. J. Schelhaas, "II Samuel 7:1–5," in *The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies Prepared in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis* (ed. John H. Skilton; Philadelphia: P & R, 1974), 289.

53. O'Brien, "A Story of Israel's Leaders," 28.

reminded of David's earlier misdemeanor, with the last of David's mighty men to be listed being "Uriah the Hittite" (2 Sam 23:39).

On the basis of what has been noted, the use of David as the prototype of the ideal king in Kings does not need to be viewed as tendentious or without foundation in the "life of David" as depicted in the book of Samuel, though of course Kings has its own concerns, and its nuanced portrait of David reflects this fact. There are enough links between the depiction of David in each book to render unnecessary the theory that the Historian's use of David as a prototype of the godly king cannot have its origins in the revered figure of David but must be a retrojection of the image of Josiah and an imposition of an alien image on David.<sup>54</sup> As well, though Josiah is likened to David (2 Kgs 22:2), it is not plain that David is all that similar to Josiah, for what is said of Josiah in 22:2 is not said of David ("and he did not turn aside to the right hand or to the left").<sup>55</sup> The similar phrasing found in Deut 17:20 would suggest that the Historian views Josiah as approximating the ideal king of Deut 17:14–20. The intertextual connection is supported by the multiple mentions of the "book of the law/covenant" in the Josiah narrative (2 Kgs 22:8, 11; 23:2, 21; cf. Deut 17:18).<sup>56</sup> The author of Kings has modeled Josiah on that Deuteronomistic royal portrait but then moves beyond its severely circumscribed role for the king, given the proactive reformist stance that Josiah adopts in an attempt to meet the challenge faced by the nation.<sup>57</sup>

54. E.g., Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 125–26, who views the Historian's portrait of David as "an image of Josiah projected back into history" (125). Alison Joseph concurs with Nelson ("Who Is like David?" 33–36; idem, *Portrait of the Kings*, 95, 103, 154, 185, 232). For an argument against the similar approach taken by Nelson with regard to the portrayal of the figure of Joshua in the book named after him, see Gregory Goswell, "Joshua and Kingship," *BBR* 23 (2013): 29–42.

55. It is found elsewhere only in Deut 2:27; 5:32; 17:11, 20; 28:14; Josh 1:7; 23:26; 1 Sam 6:12; 2 Chr 34:2 (references provided by Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 115 n. 61).

56. For this observation and what follows in the next paragraph I am dependent on Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 116–17.

57. Gary N. Knoppers, "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomistic Law of the King: A Re-examination of a Relationship," *ZAW* 108 (1996): 333–34; J. Gordon McConville, "Law and Monarchy in the Old Testament," in *A Royal Priesthood? The Use of the Bible Ethically and Politically: A Dialogue with Oliver O'Donovan* (ed. Craig Bartholomew et al.; Scripture and Hermeneutics Series 3; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002), 75–78.

In some ways Hezekiah is more like David than is Josiah, for only of David and Hezekiah among the Davidic kings is it said that “YHWH was with him” (1 Sam 16:18; 18:12, 14; 2 Sam 5:10; 1 Kgs 18:7) and that they “prospered” (root שָׁכַל) in military exploits (1 Sam 18:5, 14, 15, 30; 2 Kgs 18:7). As well, both David and Hezekiah enjoyed success against the Philistines (1 Sam 18:30; 2 Kgs 18:8). Furthermore, in contrast to only one mention of David in relation to Josiah (22:2), there are several explicit allusions to David in the account of Hezekiah’s reign (18:3; 19:34; 20:5, 6). The noted similarities between Hezekiah and David (as depicted in Samuel) confirm the argument made above that the author of Kings does not ignore how David is portrayed in the preceding book. I am not arguing for any particular theory of the compositional history of Kings but simply making the point that if the figure of David in Kings were modeled on Josiah it might have been expected that their portraits would be more closely aligned than they are. A better summation of the evidence would be that Josiah embodies the Davidic prototype of cultic orthodoxy but then goes beyond the model provided by David in various ways.<sup>58</sup>

#### THE FUTURE OF DAVIDIC KINGSHIP IN ISRAEL?

Due to Solomon’s sin, YHWH took the northern tribes out from under the rule of the Davidic kings, but “for the sake of David” he delayed the division of the kingdom until after the death of Solomon (1 Kgs 11:12–13, 32, 34). God left the Davidic house with Judah (and Benjamin) “that my servant David may always have a *lamp* (נֵר) before me in Jerusalem, the city where I have chosen to put my name” (11:36).<sup>59</sup> Behind such concessions by God lie his promises to David in 2 Sam 7.<sup>60</sup> Likewise, the

58. Cf. Joseph, *Portrait of the Kings*, 232: “The description of Josiah depicts him as exceeding the expectations of the good Davidic king.”

59. For the disputed meaning of this rare term, see Paul D. Hanson, “The Song of Heshbon and David’s *Nîr*,” *HTR* 61 (1968): 297–320 (who opts for “yoke” as a metaphor for “dominion”); Manfred Görg, “Ein ‘Machtzeichen’ Davids 1 Könige XI:36,” *VT* 35 (1985): 363–68; Ehud Ben Zvi, “Once the Lamp Has Been Kindled . . . : A Reconsideration of the MT *Nîr* in 1 Kgs 11:36; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19 and 2 Chr 21:7,” *ABR* 39 (1991): 19–30 (who favours “field” metaphorically understood as “territorial dominion”); David B. Schreiner, “Why נֵר in Kings?,” *JSOT* 39 (2014): 15–30 (who sees uses in Kings as wordplay on 2 Sam 21:17 [that has נֵר which does mean “lamp”]); and for a recent argument in favour of the meaning “lamp,” see Deuk-il Shin, “The Translation of the Hebrew term *nîr*: ‘David’s Yoke’?” *TynBul* 67 (2016): 7–21.

60. As indicated by the mode of reference used by God of David, which picks up 2 Sam 7:5 and 8 (“my servant David”).

deliverance of the city in Hezekiah's day is "for my sake and the sake of David my servant" (2 Kgs 19:34), and Isaiah tells Hezekiah that it is "the LORD, the God of David your father" who responds to his prayer for a lengthening of his days (2 Kgs 20:6). Even in the reigns of wicked kings, Jerusalem is spared for the same reason (1 Kgs 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19). In sum, God's promise to David of a sure house is the reason that Judah and Jerusalem lasted so long according to the writer of Kings.<sup>61</sup>

Divine statements of purpose like those in 1 Kgs 11:36 ("that David my servant may always [כל־הַיָּמִים] have a domain before me") and 11:39 ("I will for this afflict the descendants of David, but not for ever [כל־הַיָּמִים]") appear to be unconditional, and there is no explicit abrogation of the Davidic promise in Kings. This raises the possibility of the continued validity of the Davidic promise into the exilic period and beyond. There is an ongoing commitment to David's city as YHWH's chosen habitation, in some cases *forever* (1 Kgs 8:13; 9:3; 2 Kgs 21:7), but it was not without conditions (2 Kgs 21:8), and it is apparent that the kings failed to meet these requirements. No hope is expressed of a future for the dynasty.<sup>62</sup> For readers of the book of Kings, David becomes a pious model not for postexilic kings (of whom there proved to be none) but for the people of God generally who must avoid idolatry and, if there is opportunity, participate in the Jerusalemite cult.

In line with a democratizing interpretation of the royal expectations of the book of Kings, in Deut 17:14–20 the king sets an example for all Israelites in the habitual reading of the law, doing what all Israelites should be doing (cf. Deut 6:7–9; 11:18–21; 31:9–13).<sup>63</sup> He habitually studies the law "that he may learn to fear the LORD his God," which is a key Deuteronomistic ethic applicable to all God's people (4:10;

61. Steven L. McKenzie, *Covenant* (Understanding Biblical Themes; St Louis: Chalice, 2000), 67–68; Troy D. Cudworth, "Yahweh's Promise to David in the Books of Kings," *VT* 66 (2016): 194–216.

62. The summation of Kåre Berge, "Is There Hope in the Deuteronomistic History?" in *New Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy and History: Essays in Honour of Hans M. Barstad* (ed. Rannfrid I. Thelle et al.; VTSup 168; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 268, 272. For the provisional nature of the institution of kingship in Israel, see J. Gordon McConville, *God and Earthly Power: An Old Testament Political Theology, Genesis–Kings* (LHBOTS 454; London: T & T Clark, 2008), 155–56; cf. James Richard Linville, *Israel in the Book of Kings: The Past as a Project of Social Identity* (JSOTSup 272; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 162–63.

63. Dennis T. Olson, *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses: A Theological Reading* (OBT; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 82–83.

5:29 [Heb. 26]; 6:2; 14:23; 31:12). In this way the Deuteronomic ethic of obedience is to be modeled by the king. The king, as the first citizen, is the first among equals (*primus inter pares*), and he is to view his subjects as “his brothers” (17:20; cf. 17:15).<sup>64</sup> The egalitarian teaching of Deuteronomy, rather than being undermined by the appointment of a king (a distinct danger, as shown by later Israelite history), is in fact exhibited by this (optional) Israelite officer.<sup>65</sup> Moses in Deuteronomy repeatedly warns of the danger of idolatry (e.g. 12:2–3, 29–31; 17:2–5), and the limiting of worship to the place which God would choose was one way of reducing that danger (12:4–28; 16:16), and it is presumed in Deut 17 (given the context) that any future king who earned God’s approval would be exemplary in demonstrating these two key virtues: avoiding idolatry and only worshipping YHWH at the divinely chosen sanctuary. That, anyway, is how the author of Kings reads and applies this Deuteronomic passage.<sup>66</sup> In Kings, of course, that chosen place is Jerusalem, and David embodies this ethic of Yahwistic cultic orthodoxy.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of the kings according to a Davidic prototype in the book of Kings is closely linked to cultic orthodoxy and the kings primarily have a cultic vocation.<sup>67</sup> The role of the king is closely tied to the temple. Various features of the book of Kings (e.g., the opening portrayal of an infirm David, the physical and moral vulnerability of kings generally, and the explicitly conditional nature of the dynastic promise) would seem to call into question whether the institution of kingship has a future in the post-exilic period. If kings do come back after the exile—though Kings is silent on that point—kingship will need to take on a radically different

64. Knoppers, “Deuteronomic Law of the King,” 330.

65. The institution of kingship is a divinely permitted option rather than obligatory according to the polity of Deuteronomy (see 17:14–15).

66. In the prophecy of Jeremiah, on the other hand, the same Deuteronomic royal model is applied in a different way, namely the future king exemplifies the social justice ethic of Deuteronomy, which includes the care of vulnerable social groups (e.g. Jer 23:5; 33:15; cf. 21:12; 22:3, 13, 15–16). For this theme in Deuteronomy, see Moshe Weinfeld, “The Origin of the Humanism in Deuteronomy,” *JBL* 80 (1961): 241–47.

67. See e.g., William Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History* (JSOTSup 160; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

shape than was the experience in the monarchic period.<sup>68</sup> The implication of the compositional use in *Kings* of a Davidic prototype is that the role of any future king will be to act the part of a model Israelite in line with the programmatic passage in Deut 17.

68. See Nathan Lovell, "The Shape of Hope in the Book of Kings: The Resolution of Davidic Blessing and Mosaic Curse," *JESOT* 3.1 (2014): 18–21, for an attempt to map what future kingship might (should) look like.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*God, His Servant, and the Nations in Isaiah 42:1–9: Biblical Theological Reflections after Brevard S. Childs and Hans Hübner* by Frederik Poulsen. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2/73*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014. xiv + 269 pp., €79.00, hardcover.

This published version of the author's doctoral thesis is very good. It is a tightly focused study which offers an informed and challenging evaluation of the theories of Brevard S. Childs and Hans Hübner pertaining to the relationship between the OT and the NT, using the second Servant Song as a test case.

After a brief introduction which presents the reader to the various subfields of biblical theology, part 1 of the book surveys, summarizes, and evaluates the contributions of Childs and Hübner. Poulsen begins by presenting each of the two scholars and listing their key works. He then discusses their shared presuppositions: they are confessional theologians and ordained ministers, they both stress the role of faith in biblical interpretation, they both acknowledge the canon of the church, they both emphasize the theological aspects of biblical exegesis, and they both appreciate and practice the historical study of the biblical texts. In parallel, they differ in their views vis-à-vis the authority of the OT for the Christian church. Their opinions are influenced by their respective church tradition (Reformed, Lutheran) and also by their assessment of the formation of the canon. The key question concerns the shape of the OT at the time of the NT authors. While Hübner argues that the Hebrew canon was still open at the time of Jesus, Childs maintains that we can speak of a fairly stable canon already in the first century BCE. These two divergent views shape the two scholars' interpretations of the formation of the Christian OT. For Childs, the first Christians inherited the (already relatively stable) Jewish HB which later became the MT. Thus, the early synagogue and the early church shared the same Scripture. In contrast, Hübner maintains that the early Christians did not adopt an already existing canon because such a thing did not exist. Moreover, as most of them spoke Greek, the LXX became the dominant text which the early church used. Thus, Hübner argues, "the Old Testament was *theologically relevant* in its Greek translation" (p. 27), up and against the MT, which came to be the HB for the Jewish community. It follows, so Hübner, that the Christian church today should also use the LXX rather than the MT, which is completely Jewish in character. Childs disagrees on this point, instead arguing that the LXX has no separate integrity as it depends on

the (proto-)MT in terms of both textual form and authoritative status. Rather, it is the fusion of the HB and the NT which offers the best witness to God.

Turning to issues of authority, Poulsen demonstrates how the two scholars differ in fundamental aspects. For Hübner, the NT is authoritative because it preserves the original spoken gospel, i.e., *the kerygma of the risen Christ*; for Childs biblical literature is authoritative because it mediates *the reality of the gospel*. These two views have far-reaching consequences for their respective understanding of the authority of the OT texts. Childs stresses the importance of the whole Bible as the written word of God. The two testaments preserve the testimony of all its authors and should be read together, yet each part also conveys an independent witness to God. Speaking from a very different perspective, Hübner favours the spoken word of God, in the sense that what is canonical is the proclaimed divine word. According to this line of thinking, only the OT as received in the NT is authoritative for modern Christians (*Vetus Testamentum in Novo receptum*).

Their different views pertaining to the formation of the Christian canon influence, in turn, their respective approach to biblical theology. In short, what is the relation between the two testaments? Poulsen shows how Childs explores the inner unity of the Bible as a whole. Despite their disparities, Childs considers both parts to be equal and complementary witnesses to Jesus. In sharp contrast, Hübner argues that only a part of the OT is theologically relevant for the Christian church. He sees the link between the two testaments to be forged exclusively by the NT author's use of the OT. The OT is important because one cannot remove the quotations of the OT from the NT lest it fall apart both theologically and historically, yet those (substantial) parts that are neglected by the NT authors lack Christian significance. The HB in its totality remains, however, the Holy Scripture of the Jewish community.

Turning to their approaches to biblical theology, Childs advocates a dialectic approach which reads the OT in its own right yet also, in parallel, together with the NT. The resulting readings are by necessity multileveled and polyvalent: a biblical text can mean several things in tandem. In contrast, Hübner offers no strategic reading method, but his aforementioned approach remains true: a Christian should read the OT with the eyes of the NT authors. We should not, however, take the liberty of adopting their hermeneutics for ourselves.

In Part 2 Poulsen explores in great detail the text of Isa 42:1–9. He begins with a careful reading of the MT, followed by an equally careful reading of the LXX. He highlights how the two readings differ.

Who is the Servant? On what aspects of his ministry does the text focus? How does the text view the nations? Are there individual aspects that appear in one text and not in the other? How does the message of this passage align with that of its wider literary context? Poulsen further explores the use of Isa 42:1–9 in the NT and notices that its reception is ambiguous. First, the quote in Matt 12:18–21 fits neither the MT nor the LXX fully, and the changes that can be observed may be due to the endeavour of the gospel author to align the message of the OT text with the overall message of his gospel. Furthermore, the rest of the NT, when alluding to Isa 42:1–9, upholds the traditions of both textual traditions. The Servant is understood as an individual, i.e., representing the tasks of Jesus (cf. the MT), and also as a collective, i.e., representing the tasks of his disciples (cf. the LXX).

The final chapter defines the tasks of the Servant as seen in its different textual traditions (the MT and the LXX), as well as within its different textual contexts (Isaiah, Matthew, and Luke-Acts). Poulsen concludes that the relationship between the OT and the NT, insofar as this test case shows, is “dialectical, typological, and one of continuity” (p. 226). This, in turn, favours Childs’s approach to biblical theology in that it is easiest to adopt and apply *practically*. Poulsen ends as he began, namely to evaluate Childs’s and Hübner’s approaches and to highlight the pros and cons of their approaches vis-à-vis Isa 42:1–9. How do they help modern Christians to understand the relationship between the two testaments and what is the practical repercussions of this relationship in our understanding of the Bible as a whole?

LENA-SOFIA TIEMEYER  
University of Aberdeen

*Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* by Jeremy Schipper. Anchor Yale Bible 7D. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016. 221 pp., US \$75.00, hardcover.

Jeremy Schipper’s recent addition to the Anchor Bible series provides an update to Edward Campbell’s 1975 Anchor Bible Commentary on Ruth. The updated volume represents a thorough shift in methodology from Campbell’s classic commentary, which interpreted the book of Ruth through the lens of narrative criticism. Schipper’s commentary employs a social-scientific approach to interpretation, providing new insights into the book of Ruth. He is well practiced in using social-scientific methods to interpret the biblical text, having written multiple works focusing on

disability in the OT. Schipper is currently associate professor of Hebrew Bible at Temple University.

Consistent with the majority of Anchor Bible volumes, Schipper's Ruth commentary offers a thorough introduction to the biblical text. In his introduction he focuses on translation and textual issues in Ruth, questions of literary context and genre, the date and authorship of the book of Ruth, and specific types of relationships within the book of Ruth. A thorough bibliography and a translation of the book of Ruth follow Schipper's introduction.

Schipper's introduction is quite different from those in most commentaries. He spends little time discussing traditional issues of background in the book of Ruth such as canonical placement, the historicity of the narrative, and the date and purpose of Ruth's composition. Though Schipper does touch on these matters, his primary concern is to discuss the nature of the relationships in the book of Ruth, thus he dedicates twenty-three of the forty-eight pages of his introduction to identifying and defining relationships in the book of Ruth.

Schipper identifies four primary areas of relationship in the book of Ruth: God to humans and humans to God (specifically in regards to fertility), the role of sexual desire in relationships, exogamy and ethnicity, and the nature of household relationships (pp. 29–51). The core of Schipper's interpretation of the book of Ruth lies in his understanding of these areas of relationships. Schipper rejects Ronald Hals's assertion that YHWH's actions are hidden in the book of Ruth because in ancient Israel "the assumption was that all humans still depended on divine action to have children" (p. 33). Schipper's examination of exogamy and ethnicity leads him away from placing any emphasis on reading Ruth in light of the condemnations of marriage outside of covenant Israel elsewhere in the OT (p. 40).

Schipper divides the narrative of Ruth into twelve sections, each divided based upon the setting of the narrative. Schipper's comments on each section are divided into two parts. He first presents his notes on the section, offering readers a rich analysis of the Hebrew text. In his notes Schipper makes grammatical, syntactical, and textual observations on the text. The second part of Schipper's analysis contains his comments on the text. Here he offers his interpretation of the text, driven by his analysis of the relationships as they are presented in the passage.

Schipper's approach to interpreting Ruth is decidedly post-modern. Rather than proposing one interpretive method by which to lay bare the message and meaning of Ruth, Schipper presents his commentary as a volume that explores the book of Ruth in a particular way.

Whereas many commentators seek to extrapolate the meaning of a text using various interpretive methods, Schipper focuses on the nature of relationships in the book of Ruth and attempts to explain how those relationships relate to most of the content of the narrative (p. 29).

Schipper's methodology makes his commentary an original contribution to the study of the book of Ruth. His exegesis is unique in its focus upon relationships between characters in the book of Ruth rather than a focus on the relationship between events in the book of Ruth and other OT material. When examining the interaction between Boaz and Ruth in Ruth 2 for example, Schipper notes that the interaction between the characters is driven by favor of Boaz rather than legal obligation based on Pentateuchal legislation (p. 129). By highlighting the social roles of Boaz and Ruth in the narrative, Schipper challenges readers to approach this passage from a fresh perspective.

Though there are strengths to Schipper's social-scientific approach to the book of Ruth, certain limitations arise due to his methodology. First, despite his lack of focus on historical issues with the narrative and composition of Ruth, Schipper cannot avoid these issues playing a significant role in his interpretation. Though he does not linger on the discussion of the date of Ruth's composition, Schipper does posit that Ruth was written in the early Persian period, noting this date is "extremely tentative" (p. 22). Schipper's position on the date of composition raises two issues. First, he never discusses how the composition of the book of Ruth in the Persian period would affect the author's understanding of relationships. Second and more importantly, Schipper fails to provide a reason for the book of Ruth in the Persian period. His analysis of relationships in the book of Ruth leads him to understand the narrative of Ruth culminating in the reunification of Abraham and Haran's descendants through Ruth and Boaz's marriage (p. 188). Schipper provides no theory, however, about why a writer in the Persian period would have been concerned with the reunification of Moab and Israel.

Despite some limitations due to his methodology, Schipper's Ruth commentary is a valuable tool for students of the OT. His fresh approach to interpretation combined with consistent linguistic and textual analysis results in a volume that possesses a balance between practical tools and theoretical possibilities for future interpretation.

CORY BARNES

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary

*A Mouth Full of Fire: The Word of God in the Words of Jeremiah* by Andrew G. Shead. *New Studies in Biblical Theology* 29, Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 2012. pp. 321., US \$27.00, paperback.

In *A Mouth Full of Fire*, Shead presents a two-part argument—the first directly shaping the second. First, Shead discusses the clear distinction between the uses of “word” (singular) and “words” (plural) in Jeremiah. Shead references Jer 7:22–23 to illustrate the distinction: “I did not speak with them or command them . . . concerning words [pl.] of burnt offering and sacrifice. However, this word [sg.] I did command them: ‘Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you will be my people’” (p. 54). Fundamentally, from the Hebrew text Shead makes the distinction between the singular and plural uses of “word” based on its syntactic construction. He observes that the singular form references a general message from God, while the plural form is then an expansion upon the singular form by way of an extended speech. In Jeremiah, Jeremiah is typically the deliverer of the plural form, while the singular form is directly from YHWH. Shead argues on the basis of this distinction that a biblical theology of word and words can be formulated.

Shead divides his discussion of word theology into four categories: word and speaker, word and hearers, word and power, and word and permanence. Word and speaker “examine[s] Jeremiah’s role as the speaker of God’s words, and to ask whether the identity of the speaker should be a significant factor in a theology of the word of God” (p. 107). Word and hearer builds upon the argument, “The word of God . . . is a message spoken by God—spoken, not written” (p. 147). This section addresses the response of the hearers to the words of God. Word and power directly addresses the topic of whose authority is recognized when the words of God are heard. Is it the prophet of God? Shead argues, “When these words are received, what the listeners hear is the word of God” (p. 185). Word and permanence further explores the mode of revelation used in Jeremiah. In this section, Shead weighs the arguments between a written or oral tradition.

Second, the argument presented in Chapters 1 to 6 and Shead’s conclusion that Jeremiah presents a convincing word theology is brought into a discussion with the systematic theology of Karl Barth. Chapter 7 presents Shead’s argument that the word theology he discovers in Jeremiah disagrees with the conclusions of Karl Barth. In this section, Barth’s doctrine is placed in and against Shead’s categories of word theology discovered in Jeremiah.

While *A Mouth Full of Fire* is certainly considered a monograph, I would more specifically classify it as a specialized commentary on the subject of the word of God in the words of Jeremiah. Shead moves through Jeremiah highlighting a majority, if not all, of the instances that might support his position. As a hybrid between monograph and commentary, he presents his opinion in clear language as he refrains from the use of overwhelming scholarly terminology. As it is prefaced, *New Studies in Biblical Theology* is meant to bring scholarly discussions to lay persons. Shead certainly accomplished this task.

I must commend Shead. It is altogether too uncommon for one to bring together biblical and systematic theology. In observation of biblical scholarship's development over the last decade, the gap between biblical studies and systematics has widened. Shead's attempt to unite the two is well received and worthy of praise.

Concerning his overall approach to the first part of his argument, word theology in Jeremiah, I was concerned at the lack of emphasis given to the articulation of his analytical method. The closest definition of his methodology I could find is on page 51, where he states that literary and textual history of Jeremiah will be observed for exegesis. His observations are primarily limited to the Masoretic Text (MT), the proto-Masoretic Text (M), and the Septuagint *Vorlage* (LXXV). In contrast to the first section of Shead's argument, when he brings together biblical and systematic theology, it is clear that he engages Barth through the categories created in observation of Jeremiah. While this section is interesting and seemingly convincing, I find it unfair to bring one area of scholarship—in this case systematics—into another realm without allowing its original method to speak. Shead emphasizes sections of Barth's argument of word doctrine, but does so in a way that seems to take Barth's work out of context. While such an unfortunate result is possibly inevitable, more space should have been dedicated to the second section of Shead's argument instead of a single chapter of twenty-five pages. When I began the book, I thought his engagement with Barth would exhibit greater significance. If more space was given to this section of the argument, I believe that the unfairness could have dissipated.

As a word of final praise, Shead presents an effective and accurate definition of biblical theology—something that is seeming to be difficult for current scholars. Shead states, "Biblical theology . . . may be defined as *knowledge of God as the God of the Bible*. What it means for God to be the God of the Bible is something that develops progressively as we read Scripture with an ear to what it says about God and about itself" (pp. 27–28). This definition is brief, to the point, and seemingly

complete when contrasted against other explanations of biblical theology produced last decade.

I recommend *A Mouth Full of Fire* to any pastor, interested lay person, or scholar who desires to explore this new avenue of thought in prophetic research. Shead's addition to this series is exceptional and deserves recognition for his work in biblical studies and biblical theology.

ANDREW W. DYCK  
McMaster Divinity College

*The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant c. 8000–332 BCE*  
by Margreet L. Steiner and Ann E. Killebrew. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. 885 pp., US \$175.00, hardcover

The current state of archaeology in the news and the destruction of many precious sites and artifacts makes reviewing a work on the field a strange experience. While the Levant region has (to this point) been spared what has been seen elsewhere, current affairs demonstrate both the fragile nature of the field and the tensions between present political life and research of the past. That tension has long been in evidence in the area surrounding ancient Israel and has been taken into account in this excellent handbook. The choice of "Levant" for the region, while not without political implications itself, clearly demonstrates the editors' desire to offer as neutral as possible a term for the work. In fact, given the infighting common in archaeological literature, this whole work reads as a generally charitable and careful contribution to the field.

The handbook has fifty-five separate articles by scholars gathered from around the world and is divided into three uneven parts: four orientation essays, then four essays on the impact of the immediately surrounding regions on the Levant, and then the remainder on "the Archaeological Record." Of the latter, the essays are divided first into general chronology (Neolithic, Chalcolithic, Early and Intermediate Bronze, Middle Bronze, Late Bronze, then Iron Age I and II). And within these, the essays divide into (generally) the regions addressed from north to south, plus Cyprus. By Iron Age II the regional division gives way more to geo-political and, in line with the relative proliferation of material, more than a quarter of the essays are found here.

The editors gave themselves the following aim:

to provide a comprehensive overview of the state of the art of the region in these periods, to describe the most important debates and discussions within the discipline, and to present a more integrated treatment of the archaeology of the region within its larger cultural and social context. (p. 3)

And in each case the work can be called a success. The handbook is not an introduction in the most basic sense. The jargon, chronological headaches and inconsistencies, and (more importantly) the assumptions governing the field are all left intact. But introductions that explain the field exist in plenty; the contribution here is the amassing of so much information across such a large field into a single volume. The bibliographies are very generous, especially touching some of the more debated subjects. And while those who think the Bible faithful to the historical realities will be somewhat frustrated sometimes at the vague discussions, so will those who think little of the Bible's historical reliability. The work attempts to operate separate from these and, in this case, does so with great results. (And a further word of praise should be offered on the inclusion of so many maps, pictures, and illustrations.)

The essays themselves are a bit uneven, of course. The essay on "Egypt and the Levant" reads more like bullet points of things found in Egypt regarding the Levant, put into paragraphs almost arbitrarily. But by far the majority offer a helpful blend of archaeological, social and political history (with occasional political barbs, e.g. p. 539). And as noted above, the bibliographies in each case present more than enough material for the interested student to spend a lifetime following leads.

Some of the absences, however, were rather strange to me—admittedly reading from within the field of biblical studies—and that has to do with the rather limited interest in what we can broadly call overtly religious artifacts and material: little things like temples, figurines, "idols," amulets, and so on. Very brief mention is made of the temple in Jerusalem, but even there the silence of concern for sanctuary finds (with some impressive recent developments) seems deafening. We find the majority of the discussions of religious artifacts regarding Cyprus, oddly, where we have rather less material than elsewhere. We have some hints elsewhere, to be sure, such as the note on one page that "Canaanite cult and belief . . . became increasingly homogenized" in the Middle/Late Bronze eras (p. 460). But homogenized into what? From what? What are the artifacts that give that impression? Likewise, we have a note that the most common figurines in the Late Bronze age in the northern Levant feature "a woman holding her breasts" (p. 516). Is that a religious figurine? It seems unlikely to be a kind of pornography, but the author makes no attempt to express what the figurine might be despite the

assumption of most historians. For my own interests, and those of many others, these are rather important potential contributions for archaeology to provide larger discussions. And while one can find relevant discussion fully represented in other volumes, its near-complete silence here was unexpected.

In similar fashion the lack of critical engagement with the assumptions of the field was disappointing, though in keeping with the stated purpose (“debates and discussions within the discipline”). Assumptions made in the field, whether for dating materials or interpreting the significance of the material found, are second nature to those outside the field. Archaeology and philosophy have a rather distant relationship. But enough hesitations are expressed regarding the use of ceramics for absolute dating (e.g., p. 499) to have warranted an essay in the introduction defending the methods generally used in the field—what, for instance, counts as sufficient material for describing cultural influence or its lack. Given the note that archaeology can offer nothing to speak to the dominance of Assyria over the southern Levant in Iron Age II (p. 678), though all sides grant this as a matter of fact from the texts, one can easily find grounds for skepticism that throws the whole venture under a large set of question marks. To find them addressed in a sophisticated, if introductory way, would have lessened the impression that archaeology as a field has a lasting struggle with positivism, and a corresponding dubitability for philosophers and theologians. (Even something on the order of a “critical realism” to acknowledge the questions would have been useful here.)

Nonetheless, the handbook can only be viewed as a tremendous resource. It should reside in every library as the first point of entry to this enormous and important field, with essays that are interesting, well-organized, and filled with platforms for further in-depth work.

JOSHUA MOON  
University of Minnesota

*“YHWH Fights for Them!” The Divine Warrior in the Exodus Narrative* by Charlie Trimm. Gorgias Biblical Studies 58. Piscatawa, NJ: Gorgias, 2014. xviii + 310 pp., US \$95.00, hardcover.

*“YHWH Fights for Them!” The Divine Warrior in the Exodus Narrative* by Charlie Trimm, assistant professor of biblical and theological studies

at Biola University, is a slightly revised version of his dissertation written at Wheaton College. In this study Trimm looks at the use of the divine warrior motif in the exodus narrative and argues that the picture of YHWH that emerges from the prose narrative in Exod 1–14 matches YHWH’s image in the traditionally recognized divine warrior texts, which are more often than not poetic.

The book comprises eight chapters, including an introduction and conclusion. In the introduction Trimm argues that while the topic of the divine warrior in the OT has a significant history of scholarship, the question of the use of the motif in the prose narrative of Exod 1–14 has not been explored until now. Additionally, whereas much previous scholarship on the exodus narrative has had a diachronic interest, Trimm’s study looks at the divine warrior motif in the exodus narrative from a synchronic perspective—a final form perspective, in Trimm’s words (pp. 7–8).

In the next chapter, “The Divine Warrior in the Old Testament,” Trimm surveys the OT for the use of the divine warrior motif. Most of the passages that exhibit this motif are poetic, although Trimm notes that a few scholars have identified the motif in prose texts as well (e.g., Gen 32:2–3, Exod 19–20, Josh 5:13–15). While many scholars offer a broad definition of YHWH as a divine warrior or seek to situate the biblical divine warrior within the larger ancient Near Eastern context, Trimm deliberately defines the divine warrior solely from texts within the OT. To do so, he identifies a number of key elements of the motif found in biblical texts which clearly contain references to the divine warrior: e.g., the use of martial epithets (such as “man of war,” “hero”), the identification of YHWH coming from the south, the presence of a heavenly army or nature elements that play a role in battle, common military terminology, YHWH’s incomparability among the gods, and the depiction of YHWH rescuing his people from oppression. Based on the OT, it appears that the divine warrior persona was not a temporary persona that YHWH took up in times of crisis but was a consistent aspect of YHWH’s character. Furthermore, YHWH’s role as a divine warrior is distinct from, but often associated with, his role as king, judge, father, and redeemer.

In the chapter, “The Divine Warrior Motif in Exodus 1–14,” Trimm lays out the heart of his argument: The portrayal of YHWH in Exod 1–14 aligns with the depiction of YHWH as a divine warrior in Exod 15. Trimm bases this argument on a number of lexical and thematic points, e.g., YHWH uses a number of nature weapons against the Egyptians, YHWH employs psychological attacks, YHWH is associated with a supernatural envoy and employs disease as a weapon, and YHWH acts to deliver Israel from its enemy because of YHWH’s special re-

lationship with his people. Throughout the next several chapters, Trimm further explores these major motifs and addresses the differences found in Exod 1–14 and the traditional poetic portrayals of the divine warrior. He argues that these differences do not preclude identifying YHWH as a divine warrior in the exodus narrative but rather reflect the employment of these motifs adapted to the use of prose narrative rather than poetry.

“*YHWH fights for them!*” is a clearly written, well-researched, well-edited, and thorough study of the expansion of a specific motif within a defined, albeit substantial, narrative. Trimm also provides the most current summary of divine warrior research within OT studies. He convincingly shows that the divine warrior motif has been extended into the exodus narrative.

A few criticisms should be offered. First, the decision to define the divine warrior solely by the portrait painted by the OT appears arbitrarily constraining. The texts of the OT are ancient Near Eastern texts, and the Israelite conception of YHWH as a divine warrior can hardly be separated exclusively from its larger ancient Near Eastern context. Thus, the study could have benefited from incorporating aspects of the divine warrior motif found in other ancient Near Eastern literature above and beyond that only found in OT texts. This would have helped him provide a more robust definition of the divine warrior.

Second, Trimm bypasses the need to deal with traditional source-critical divisions by focusing on the final form of the book. However, Trimm does not demonstrate that the exodus narrative as a whole is univocal in the view of YHWH as a divine warrior. By taking a “final form” view of the narrative, and without dealing with the traditional sources, Trimm’s study risks projecting a coherence to the narrative that may not exist. Trimm is aware that the exodus narrative contains strands from various sources (p. 7 n. 24). Additionally, he is also familiar with Stephen Russell’s work, in which he argued that the various traditions within the HB remember Egypt differently and not all conceived of deliverance from Egypt in terms of YHWH the divine warrior or in terms of an “exodus” from Egypt (p. 125 n. 182, 183; Russell, *Images of Egypt in Early Biblical Literature* [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009], 194–95. I am grateful to Dr. Christopher B. Hays for pointing out this study.). There is nothing inherently wrong with taking a final form view of the narrative. However, if, as Trimm writes, “part of the purpose of this work is to determine the relevance of the divine warrior motif as a heuristic model for understanding the exodus narrative” (p. 7), then he could have strengthened his argument and fulfilled his stated purpose by attending to the various strands within Exod 1–14 and showing that they each do

depict YHWH as a divine warrior, thus showing that a final form study of the text does not arbitrarily force the narrative to be univocal in its depiction of YHWH.

Third, the divine warrior motif may not be as pervasive within Exod 1–14 as Trimm argues. Trimm spends several chapters arguing differences between the characterization of YHWH in Exod 1–14 and the divine warrior motif displayed in poetic texts do not disprove that the divine warrior motif is present, but that the motif has been expanded due to the nature of the genre. This is well and good, and perhaps correct; however, this raises a few questions: What could prove that the motif is not present, or that the exodus narrative does not depict YHWH as a divine warrior but rather as something else? Are the extensions of the divine warrior motif that Trimm identifies legitimate extensions of the motif, or does Trimm see the divine warrior motif where it is not? For example, Trimm argues that YHWH's affliction of the Nile in Exod 7:14–24 reflects the use of water as a nature weapon, a "martial expansion" of the divine warrior motif. He supports this by pointing to other passages in the HB in which YHWH punishes using water or famine, such as Lev 26:19–20, Amos 4:7–8, curses in Neo-Assyrian treaties, or Adad's use of rain to punish humans in the Atrahasis myth. However, Trimm notes that the use of water—or other environmental crises—as a weapon is not a common element associated with the divine warrior motif but that YHWH's use of water as a "weapon" against the Egyptians is evidence that YHWH is being depicted as a divine warrior. This appears to be a form of circular reasoning. Is it not more plausible that the use of nature as a means of punishment is more in line with YHWH acting as a nature god? It is worth asking what elements of YHWH's actions in the exodus narrative are *not* part of the divine warrior motif if, as Trimm argues, so much is?

There is no doubt that the divine warrior motif exists in the narrative material. Certainly, the concept that YHWH is a warrior god is an old—perhaps one of the oldest—understanding of YHWH, but perhaps the use of the motif is not as extensive as Trimm has attempted to demonstrate. As early as 1981 John Oswalt criticized Frank Moore Cross, Paul D. Hanson, and William R. Miller on their overuse of the divine warrior motif, and the criticism may apply here as well (Oswalt, "Recent Studies in Old Testament Eschatology and Apocalyptic," *JETS* 24 [1981]: 296–97. I am grateful to Christopher B. Hays for pointing me to this article as well.).

In spite of these objections, Trimm has written a fine book that positively contributes to the study of the divine warrior in the OT and a literary reading of the exodus narrative. Students and scholars interested

in studying the divine warrior and/or Exod 1–14 will benefit from referencing this study.

JASON RILEY  
Fuller Theological Seminary

*Exploring Our Hebraic Heritage: A Christian Theology of Roots and Revival* by Marvin R. Wilson. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2014, xxviii + 304 pp., US \$22.00, softcover.

The present volume functions as the sequel to Marvin Wilson’s widely read book, *Our Father Abraham: Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith* (Eerdmans, 1989). Wilson serves as the H. J. Ockenga Professor of Biblical and Theological Studies at Gordon College. He coauthored and coedited the *Dictionary of Daily Life in Biblical and Post-Biblical Antiquity*, a projected three-volume set (Hendrickson, 2014–).

In this offering Wilson compares Christian and Jewish thought and contends that “the areas we share in common are far greater than those teachings, beliefs, and practices that divide us” (p. xvi). Because “biblical Christianity is Hebraic to the core,” the contemporary church should seek to understand and cherish the HB (p. 64).

The book contains five parts: part 1 (“Theological Sources and Methods”), part 2 (“People of God: An Abrahamic Family”), part 3 (“God and His Ways”), part 4 (“On Approaching God”), and part 5 (“Moving into the Future”). The back matter includes an eight-page select bibliography and set of indexes. Throughout the treatise Wilson speaks fondly of his hero and dialogue partner, the late Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel (p. xxv).

The author advocates grammatical-historical hermeneutics (p. 30). Frequently he sets forth reliable guidance concerning biblical interpretation. For instance, one “must primarily establish the meaning of Scripture by Scripture” (p. xxi). Moreover, he states, “I often like to remind my students, ‘The Bible didn’t come out of heaven on a parachute.’ Rather, the theology of the Bible is inextricably interwoven into the chronology, places, and circumstances of Israel’s history” (p. 22). A warning comes across loud and clear: we ought to regard Scripture as our highest authority, rather than “a denominational creed, a Reformer, a church father, a theological system, or some other perspective” (p. 75).

In stride with many scholars, Wilson divides the Mosaic law into three parts—moral, civil, and ceremonial—and avows that Christians remain under the moral law, which primarily consists of the Ten Commandments (p. 54). This of course implies that believers today must keep the Sabbath, one of the purported moral laws (Exod 20:8–11). Other Bible interpreters, such as this reviewer, maintain that a threefold division of the law appears artificial and forced. The Mosaic law cannot be divided (Jas 2:10). Christians are not under the Mosaic law but the law of Christ, also known as the law of the Spirit, the law of liberty, the perfect law, and the royal law (Rom 7:3; 8:2; Gal 6:2; Jas 1:25; 2:8).

Additional matters emerge regarding the relationship between the Testaments. For one, Jesus endorsed multiple interpretations of the Mosaic law: “Jesus . . . was not prescriptively enslaved or chained to one interpretation of the law” (p. 52). Moreover, the author reads Gen 9:27 as follows: “May God enlarge Japheth and may he [Japheth] live in the tents of Shem.” Since Japheth never lived in the tents of Shem, the NT suggests a “deeper meaning,” namely, that the Jews will bless Gentile Christians (pp. 64–65).

Wilson opposes replacement theology (pp. 248, 254). He states, “If supersessionism is the will of God, then the logical conclusion of such teaching is to call for the removal of the Jewish people and their distinct religious identity from the face of the earth” (p. 246). On the other hand, the author offers little exegetical support for his claim that Jesus partially inaugurated the kingdom at the first coming (pp. 146, 148).

Three issues pertaining to the Godhead require attention. First, concerning Gen 1:26 (“Let Us make mankind in Our image”), Wilson states, “The first person plural, ‘Let us,’ may be a plural of majesty or an address to the heavenly court, but clearly the author intends no Old Testament ‘*vestigium Trinitatis*’” (p. 157). But could the plural allude to multiple members of the Godhead without specifying the number of members? Second, Wilson believes that Jacob wrestled with God but refers to him as an “angel” (pp. 228–29). This creates confusion because angels are created beings. For clarity it would be better to identify him as a “divine being” or “messenger.” And third, he translates Exod 3:14 as “I WILL BE WHAT I WILL BE” because imperfect verbs convey the future tense (p. 126). Hebraists such as the late Rabbi Umberto Cassuto maintain that the context and context alone determines the tense of a Hebrew verb (*Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, repr., Magnes, 1992, part II, p. 91).

The author embraces the new perspective on Paul. According to him, the reformed position reflects “a rather cursory reading of the Pauline corpus,” whereas proponents of the new perspective such as E. P.

Sanders offer “a more careful and thorough study of early Jewish texts” (p. 53). A robust discussion of the issue, he says, exceeds the scope of the book.

At times Wilson expresses his opinion concerning the finer points of eschatology. He regards the shepherd of Ezek 34:23 as someone other than King David himself (p. 145). And he seems to anticipate a heavenly (rather than earthly?) setting for the eschatological banquet of Isa 25:6 and Luke 13:29 (pp. 68, 89–90).

Two other tidbits merit mention. Wilson indicates that “Abraham is the first person in the Bible . . . to bear the title ‘prophet’” (p. 83). Readers may recall that prophets such as Abel preceded Abraham (Luke 11:50–51). On another note, the author sees the plagues of Exodus as an attack on the Egyptian gods (p. 135), whereas Duane Garrett argues that the plagues were not an attack (*A Commentary on Exodus*, Kregel, 2014, p. 301).

This reviewer recommends Wilson’s work as catalyst for motivating the Christian church to apprehend and appreciate the OT. One need not adopt every doctrinal nuance in order to profit from the book.

MARK A. HASSLER  
The Master’s Seminary

*Dictionary of Daily Life in Biblical & Post-Biblical Antiquity, vol. 1, A–Da* edited by Edwin M. Yamauchi and Marvin R. Wilson. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2014, xxxvi + 400 pp., US \$24.95, soft-cover.

Over thirty years in the making, the *Dictionary of Daily Life in Biblical & Post-Biblical Antiquity* (DDL), edited by Edwin Yamauchi and Marvin Wilson, is a much anticipated resource. Unlike other Bible dictionaries that limit entries to terms *explicitly* mentioned in the biblical text, DDL expands its scope based on the Human Relations Area Files database. This anthropological grid “systematically and comparatively [surveys] different aspects of culture, whether they were highlighted in the Bible or not” (p. 1). This convention is significant due to the assumed cultural knowledge underlying much of ancient literature. Admittedly, the topics selected do not play an equal role in the Bible. Nonetheless, they do serve to illuminate significant features of the ancient world.

The present volume is the first of three, ranging from articles on “abortion” (A) to “dance” (Da). The thirty-nine dictionary entries are the work of ten contributors: eight men and two women. While most authors contribute no more than three entries, Yamauchi is responsible for twenty-three of the total articles, twelve of which are co-authored with the late R. K. Harrison. Yamauchi’s vast knowledge of antiquity is evident in the wide range of subject matter covered, from “contraception & control of birth” to “art” and “athletics.”

Each article is divided into six identical sub-sections: 1) The Old Testament; 2) The New Testament; 3) The Ancient Near Eastern World; 4) The Greco-Roman World; 5) The Jewish World; and 6) The Christian World. The amount of space given to each area differs based on the author and subject. Depending on one’s particular interest, a reader may wish to see a more detailed treatment of a particular sub-section. For instance, Paul Maier’s contribution on “armies” contains less than a half-page on the Near Eastern data, while the Greco-Roman section is given more attention. For scholars of the ancient Near East, this disparity may leave something to be desired. Certainly there is more data on Mesopotamian warfare that could have been included. While this is inevitable due to the specialty of the author, some articles could perhaps receive a more extensive treatment.

Co-editor Marvin Wilson also contributes a number of articles to DDL (six total). The content of these entries further show the breadth of the work, from “alcoholic beverages” and “bribery” to “bellows & furnaces” and “bones & objects of bone.” Another notable article is by Rozenn Bailleul-Lesuer on “birds.” This well-written entry is as exhaustive as an eleven-page survey can be. Her expertise on the subject is apparent in the organization, detail, and bibliography of the section.

There are indeed many things to commend about this volume, but I must limit my comments to three areas. First, the book begins with a brief but helpful summary of dating and chronology. Readers unfamiliar with political and technological ages will find a brief discussion and simple outline. Included are the distinction between the early and late date of the exodus.

Second, the parallel format of each article in the six-fold structure affords an accessible and consistent presentation. A reader interested only in the Greco-Roman data, for example, need not wade through an entire entry to find relevant material. While the amount of attention for each sub-section will vary, as has been noted, the continuity of this outline will serve readers well.

Third, as with any good dictionary, DDL contains extensive bibliographic information. At the conclusion of every article readers will find up-to-date publications for further research. Moreover, a selective

bibliography is included at the back of the book that references the major dictionaries, encyclopedias, and monographs for each of the six subsections more generally.

And while there are many things to commend about this volume, there are several areas that could be improved upon. First, the title of the dictionary has the potential to mislead its readership. Someone interested in the *daily life* of a military unit or soldier, for instance, will not find much help in this volume. While some entries are more detailed than others, the combination of the broad scope and abbreviated article length make each entry cursory in nature. What the dictionary does is provide more of an overview summary of each topic in the light of the available evidence. Due to the amount of information included, there are instances where something is mentioned in an article without a reference. One example is the mention of the exile of Nero's wife for having an abortion. Though stated, the author does not cite the reference in Tacitus. Those interested in reading the original source must search elsewhere. While this is not the norm in every article, it is a noticeable omission.

Second, while there are several high-quality images at the back of the book, a reader could benefit from the inclusion of more graphics. Of course, the nature of the dictionary may limit the inclusion of such images. Nonetheless, many of the articles could benefit from more visual aids. For instance, the entry on "art" describes several fascinating discoveries that could be enriched with the inclusion of more pictures.

Third, the volume contains no ancient source index at the back of the book. This is most regrettable. A researcher looking for a specific reference in an ancient text must resort to exploring several potential topics that may or may not include the text. A detailed index of ancient sources would greatly increase the usefulness and accessibility of the dictionary.

Fourth, while the table of contents lists the article entries, it does not include individual authors in conjunction with their respective articles. This may be more of the reviewer's preference, but a reader may be interested to associate articles with authors at a glance. This would be all the more helpful since the contributors' page lists all the contributors for all three volumes. Thus, there is no way to know which articles a particular contributor authored without visiting the last page of each individual entry. Again, this may be more of a preference, but would be a helpful feature of the dictionary.

Finally, the layout of the bibliographic material at the conclusion of each chapter could be organized better. Like some other dictionaries, the secondary literature forms one long paragraph, with no special

markings separating sources. This can make it unnecessarily difficult to locate a particular reference. One simple solution would be to bold the names of the authors to provide some sort of conceptual break. This would help the reader more quickly navigate the bibliography.

Overall, DDL makes a unique contribution to the study of the ancient world. It will certainly be established as one of the standard reference works of biblical/post-biblical antiquity for future generations. Both students and scholars alike will reap the benefit of this work. The avoidance of excessive transliteration makes each article accessible to those with even the most basic knowledge of the languages of each academic field.

While one could quibble over details of particular articles, this work is incredibly valuable for its presentation. While it may not reflect *daily* life in biblical and post-biblical antiquity, it nonetheless paints a clear picture of cultural symbols and practices as they existed across the ancient world.

ANDREW M. KING

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Eating in Isaiah: Approaching the Role of Food and Drink in Isaiah's Structure and Message* by Andrew T. Abernethy. Biblical Interpretation Series 131. Leiden: Brill 2014, 234 pp., US \$128.00, hardcover.

*Eating in Isaiah* is a revision of Abernethy's 2012 Ph.D. dissertation written under the supervision of Willem VanGemeren. He begins by observing that the topic of eating appears in nearly 150 verses in Isaiah. Because food and drink are so common, they are often overlooked as important metaphors in biblical literature. Abernethy argues in this monograph that food and drink are used by Isaiah to support and reiterate major themes and contribute to the book's coherence. The primary theme of Isaiah is YHWH's status as the supreme king. In the first part of Isaiah YHWH is supreme, in contrast to the arrogant claims of the Assyrians. In the later chapters of Isaiah, YHWH is the supreme king because he is restoring Zion to glory and creating a community of obedient people. Provision of food and drink play a major part in demonstrating these themes and therefore unify the book of Isaiah.

After a short survey of previous scholarship of the importance of food and drink in the Old Testament, Abernethy describes his sequential-synchronic approach to the importance of eating in the book of Isaiah. The first and final chapters of Isaiah, along with chapters 36–37 and 55

function as “scaffolding chapters,” and each of these sections feature food and drink. The motif of eating is therefore integral to the structure and thematic coherence of Isaiah. Abernethy calls this a “sequential-synchronic approach” that attempts to take the literary seams of the book as editorial guides to the conceptual message of each section.

Abernethy applies this method to Isa 1 in order to argue that eating functions as both an introduction to the book of Isaiah and as a hermeneutical guide for reading the whole book of Isaiah (p. 51). He argues Isa 1:7 is a portrayal of the Assyrian battle tactic of confiscation and destruction of food supplies, but it is God who directs this punishment on his people (p. 33). Yet they can be forgiven and once again “eat from the good of the land” (Isa 1:19). If the people do not repent, they will be eaten by the sword. Their choice, according to Abernethy is to “eat, or be eaten” (p. 41). Food is therefore a “symbol of Israel’s spiritual status before God” (p. 47).

This theme is further developed in Isa 2–35, the unit bordered by the “scaffolding chapters.” Abernethy traces the lack of food in this section of Isaiah, concluding that the Lord used Assyrian imperial tactics to judge Israel’s sin (p. 68). All of the descriptions of lack of food are in the context of warfare and in nearly every instance the Lord has used warfare to judge Israel, Judah, or the nations. But Isa 2–35 also includes a number of promises of restoration of food and drink in the future. Perhaps the primary text for this restoration of food is feast prepared by the Lord on Zion for his people in Isa 25:6–8. Abernethy surveys several suggested ways to understand this feast (a covenant meal, mythological victory feast, or enthronement feast) and rejects labeling it as any one type of feast. Instead, he reads the feast within the context of Isa 24–25 as an example of imperial propaganda. Ancient Near Eastern kings often used feasts to demonstrate their power (p. 82). Similarly, abundant feasts are used frequently in the Old Testament to describe God’s power. Any ancient reader would see the feast in Isa 25:6–8 as a demonstration of power, whether the context was a covenant, victory, or enthronement feast. In fact, feasting is the “other side of the ‘imperial-retributive’ coin” (p. 90). Those who offend the Lord will lack food and drink, but those who return to covenant faithfulness will eat splendid food on Zion itself.

Abernethy develops this imperial-retributive schema in Isa 36–37, the Assyrian threat against Hezekiah (ch. 4). The central theme of these two chapters is “can YHWH be trusted to deliver his people from this blasphemous superpower?” (p. 98). Who is the real king, Sennacherib or YHWH? The Assyrians promise prosperity and good food if Hezekiah surrenders (Isa 36:16); if he does not, Jerusalem will eat their

own excrement (Isa 37:12). But the promised food and drink is described in terms evoking biblical traditions in which God leads his people into the new land (Deut 7:13, for example). For Abernethy, this use of food as a promise/threat recalls the imperial-retributive motif of Isa 1.

In Isa 40–55 eating and drinking is used to comfort God’s people (ch. 5). He examines two ways the invitation of 55:1–3a has been understood (an invitation to a feast and an invitation by Wisdom) and concludes the most promising suggestion is a merchant assuring his poverty-stricken customers they are able to purchase food and drink at no cost (p. 122). This food and drink may be spiritual nourishment, but Abernethy suggests there is “a promise of fullness of life at Zion” that includes both physical and spiritual needs (p. 123). There are frequent references to hunger and thirst in Isa 40–55 as well as eating food of the idols. The merchant of Isa 55:1–3a is calling people to turn back to God and eat the “real food” offered for free rather than the food provided by Babylon. It is possible Abernethy has overplayed the metaphor of a merchant in Isa 55:1–3a, since the evidence can be read plausibly as an invitation to participate in a banquet. Since he has already argued Isa 25:6–8 is like an imperial banquet demonstrating the power of a great king, perhaps this is a similar invitation to participate in a banquet. As such, it summarizes Isa 40–55 better than a merchant offering his goods for free. In fact, Isa 40 begins with the comforting invitation to return to the wilderness and participate in a new exodus where God will provide food and water evocative of not only the original exodus, but Eden itself (Isa 41:17–20).

Finally, in chapter 6 Abernethy argues Isa 65–66 uses eating as a conclusion to the book of Isaiah. Remarkably, food and drink appear in eleven verses of the final two chapters of Isaiah, a fact often overlooked in Isaianic studies. In these chapters eating determines who is “in” and who is “out.” For example, in 65:3–4 some people provoke the Lord by making unauthorized sacrifices and eating impure meats (including the flesh of pigs, cf. 66:17). They demonstrate their rebellion through improper eating and will therefore receive “the full measure for their deeds” (Isa 65:7). On the other hand, the servants of the Lord will never go hungry nor will they be thirsty (65:13–14) because the Lord himself will provide for them in Zion. The servants of the Lord will plant vineyards and eat their fruit (65:21) and return to Zion to celebrate festivals (66:23). Abernethy misses an opportunity to develop the theme of food and drink further by noticing allusions to creation and Eden in Isa 65–66. It was in Eden God provided food and drink to his people; in the final restoration God will once again provide for his people in a world which resonates with peace and prosperity.

In conclusion, Abernethy achieves what he has set out to accomplish, showing that the use of food and drink plays a supporting

role in Isaiah's goal of presenting God as the supreme king. Although it is possible a creation motif is more important in Isaiah than Abernethy can demonstrate in this focused monograph, he has made his case well that provision of food is one way a powerful king demonstrated his sovereignty over his people. It is therefore not surprising Isaiah would use this motif in his presentation of the ultimate sovereign Lord. Abernethy has provided a wealth of support for the importance of food and drink in the book of Isaiah.

PHILLIP J. LONG  
Grace Bible College

*Deuteronomy: One Nation Under God* by George Athas. Reading the Bible Today. Sydney: Aquila, 2016, 322 pp., AU \$24.99, softcover.

This is the latest in Aquila's Reading the Bible Today Series. George Athas, a lecturer in Hebrew and Old Testament at Moore College, brings his expertise in the language, literature, and theology of the Old Testament to bear on Deuteronomy and has produced a work that is ideal for lay people, preachers, and anyone else who wants to discover what this book of the Bible is saying, but without a lot of technical discussion. Three features of this work stand out as making it an ideal working tool for individual or group Bible study.

First, Athas provides enough of the general background and provenance of Deuteronomy to enable the reader to appreciate the culture and history out of which the book comes and which influences its narrative. The reader of Deuteronomy cannot ignore the progress of Israel towards the promised land, but may not want an extensive geography lesson. I believe a good balance is struck here, and a strategic map gives uncomplicated visual support to the descriptions. The author's introduction does indicate some of the areas that have exercised critical comment (date, authorship, structure, etc.) but has remained true to the aims of this series to provide guidance to the lay Christian Bible student.

Second, Athas brings his ability as an exegete to bear in carefully laying out the essential message of the text of Deuteronomy. In the writing of Old Testament commentaries, both these features (provenance and exegesis) are often so technical and detailed as to be daunting to the non-technically trained reader. This volume avoids this extreme while not sacrificing accuracy. There is an art in bringing the results of sound academic scholarship to the form that does not bewilder the theologically

untrained reader. Athas is able to refer unobtrusively to the Hebrew text when deemed necessary, but I doubt if this will deter even the most ardent pietist who just wants to “read the Word.” The positive effect is that skills in exegesis are taught without drawing attention to what is happening. I cannot think of a more important task for our pastors and Bible teachers to engage in than that of helping lay people ask the important questions about what the text is actually saying.

The third feature is one that is often lacking in Old Testament commentaries. The context of any text is crucial to our proper understanding of it. For a lot of people this is really an unexplored issue. It is the role of biblical theology to help us see how any text relates to any other text and, above all, how any part of the Bible testifies to Christ. There are two main parts to this process: an analytical one of exegesis and then the synthesis. Exegesis of a book or part of a book involves the analysis of the theology that is there. The often neglected process is the needed placing of the results of analytical exegesis within the context of the whole canon of Holy Scripture. Christians studying the Old Testament frequently need to be helped to see how the unity of the biblical message requires a legitimate Christian assessment of the ancient Hebrew text. In other words, we all want to be able to treat Old Testament texts as Christian Scriptures that tell us about our God and how he has come to us in Jesus. Often commentaries disappoint in this respect and disregard the unity of the Bible’s message. Not so this volume. Each chapter concludes with commentary on the text in its wider Old Testament context and then in its relationship to the message of the New Testament. By following this procedure, the author progressively shows how Deuteronomy testifies to the person and work of Christ. This is as it should be. This volume will edify and enrich all who read it.

There is one other useful feature to mention: the provision of questions for discussion at the end of each chapter. Individuals or groups may feel that these are just making hard work for them. But, if all you do is merely read them through, you will be challenged to think about the Christian applications of this important part of the Old Testament. The more I look at these appendages, the more I am impressed with the way the author is absolutely determined to see Deuteronomy through Jesus. And that, after all, is how Jesus, the apostles, and the first Christians looked at the only Bible they had: the Hebrew Scriptures. The questions echo the pronouncement of *Article VI* of the *XXXIX Articles*: “The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and the New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ.”

GRAEME GOLDSWORTHY  
Moore Theological College (retired)

*“Did I Not Bring Israel Out of Egypt?” Biblical, Archaeological, and Egyptological Perspectives on the Exodus Narratives* edited by James K. Hoffmeier, Alan R. Millard and Gary A. Rendsburg. BBRSup 13. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016, vii + 333 pp., US \$59.50, hardcover.

*“Did I Not Bring Israel Out of Egypt?”* is a part of the Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplements and is a collection of essays, most of which were presented at a symposium at Lanier Theological Library in Houston, Texas on January 17–18, 2014. The purpose of the book is to review the exodus narrative alongside literary and historical evidence to determine whether it is consistent with “the historical period implied in the Bible” (p. x). The book is organized by four parts, with multiple essays in each part (14 total).

The first part consists of four chapters with a focus on linguistic issues (especially loan words) in the exodus-wilderness narratives and Egyptology. James K. Hoffmeier (ch. 1) begins by exploring possible evidence of Egyptian influence in the exodus narratives. This includes the existence of Egyptian names, terms for priestly regalia, and archaeological evidence. Richard S. Hess (ch. 2) examines around forty personal names from the exodus-wilderness narratives and argues that if these are related to Egyptian names, then this provides credibility to the claims in the book of Exodus. A similar argument is made by Benjamin J. Noonan (ch. 3) regarding Egyptian loanwords. He begins from the viewpoint that if the Israelites were at one point historically living in Egypt, then we might expect this to impact the language in the book of Exodus. Noonan provides three helpful charts that outline the loanword in Hebrew, the Egyptian donor term, and the frequency of occurrences in the Hebrew Bible. David Falk (ch. 4) finds symbolic and practical significance of the horned altar described in Exod 27:2 in light of Egyptian altars (attested from Dynasty 2 through 18).

The second part (six chapters) of this book relates to Exodus in the Pentateuch/Torah. Richard C. Steiner (ch. 5) looks at Lev 18:3 (“You shall not copy the practices of the land of Egypt . . .”) in light of practices of incest. He speculates this might refer to Ramesses II and his children, given the increase in royal incest following the reign of this pharaoh (p. 84). Steiner arrives at the conclusion that the Israelites were living in Egypt during the reign of Ramesses II. In chapter 6 Joshua Berman examines the Exodus sea account (Exod 13:17–15:19) and the Kadesh inscriptions of Ramesses II with the hypothesis that the account has “strong affinities” with the Kadesh inscription (p. 94). He argues that it

has more similarities with the Kadesh Poem than the Baal Epic and thus strengthens the connection between ancient Egypt and the exodus narratives (p. 108).

Gary A. Rendsburg (ch. 7) challenges the source division maintained by the Documentary Hypothesis for Exod 1–14 and instead makes a bold proposal for the literary unity of this section. He explores several patterns within the plague cycle (pairs, triads, and number of verses for each plague) and contends that source division here is unconvincing and “strips the narrative of its literary structure, belletristic artistry, textual interconnections, and at times its theological messages” (p. 132).

Alan R. Millard (ch. 8) looks at the tension in the text between Moses’s claim that he cannot speak adequately and his ability to sing and (presumably) speak well after crossing the Sea of Reeds. Millard argues that Moses’s “heaviness of mouth” may refer to a type of speech impediment which affects speech but not singing (p. 142). Chapter 9 is an essay by Richard E. Averbeck concerning the deliverance of the Hebrew people from slavery and how this appears in shaping the Mosaic law. Attention is given to Exod 19–Deut 26 and Lev 25.

Jens Bruun Kofoed focuses on the exodus as cultural memory in chapter 10. He interacts significantly with the work of Egyptologist Jan Assmann on cultural-memory theory and proposes that this can be applied to a “different arrangement and dating of the biblical sources,” (pp. 177–78). He critiques aspects of the assumptions/positions of Assmann, such as reconstruction based on the classic source-critical dating of the biblical text (p. 190). Instead, Kofoed invites readers to consider the possibilities if cultural-memory theory is applied to the canonical chronology of events (p. 193).

Part 3 contains two essays on Exodus, the wilderness period, and archaeology. In chapter 11 K. Lawson Younger Jr. addresses recent developments in understanding the origin of the Arameans and challenges the “immobilist model” pertaining to migration and the early Israelites (p. 201). He calls scholars to begin examining the evidence differently, “developing explanations that incorporate more recent migration theory in their model” (p. 222). In chapter 12 Thomas W. Davis observes that the lack of archaeological evidence for the exodus has been used by scholars as a means of debunking the historical claims of the Hebrew Bible (p. 223). Davis argues this is a flawed approach to interpreting the data and encourages scholars to consider that the model is deficient, rather than the text.

The final part of this book contains two essays on Exodus in the Hebrew Prophets. Jerry Hwang (ch. 13) explores Hosea’s use of the exodus traditions and issues pertaining to the literary relationship between the Torah and the Prophets (p. 243). Hwang disputes the theory

that the book of Hosea predates the pentateuchal traditions. He argues that in Hosea the references to the exodus demonstrate how deeply imbedded it is with the covenant, exile, and return (p. 245). J. Andrew Dearman (ch. 14) reviews the exodus-wilderness traditions in Amos and Micah. He detects “formulaic language representing broader account of Israel’s origins” and explores the ways Amos and Micah drew upon this in order to address matters of religious identity (p. 255).

Anyone with an interest in the current research on the exodus-wilderness narratives, Egyptian loan words, and points of contact between the biblical world and Egypt will find this volume fascinating and worthwhile. The scope of these essays is impressive, ranging from archaeological evidence, linguistic studies, literary-critical issues, and cultural-memory theory. Critics might note that while diverse topics were presented here, the positions (and perhaps presuppositions) of the contributors appear to be rather similar. This is not altogether surprising given the purpose and aim of the book, but it should be acknowledged. The maximalist approach of the contributors will be criticized by some Hebrew Bible scholars but likely will be well received by an evangelical audience. It may have been beneficial to include a chapter devoted to addressing the main critiques of the positions presented here (which is hinted at in individual chapters), but this goes beyond the scope of this collection. Overall this book is recommended for students and scholars interested in the exodus narratives and discussion on the Egyptian evidence.

JULIANNE BURNETT  
University of Manchester

*Latino/a Biblical Hermeneutics: Problematics, Objectives, Strategies*  
edited by Francisco Lozada Jr. and Fernando F. Segovia. SemSt 68.  
Atlanta: SBL, 2014, xi + 372 pp., US \$46.95, softcover.

It is more crucial than ever for North American evangelicals to recognize the diverse world in which they live. One of the implications of this multicultural context is that the disciplines of biblical interpretation and theology must be re-assessed based on the needs and settings of diverse communities. SBL Press’s edited volume *Latino/a Biblical Hermeneutics* thus fills the double role of assisting Latino/a scholars in taking inventory of the major trends and schools of thought within this stream

of contextual interpretation and giving interested readers from other backgrounds a much-needed recalibration of the guiding concerns that they may all too easily view as self-evident.

Structurally, this volume begins with an introduction by Segovia. The main body of the text contains fifteen essays, all grouped under the heading of “Addressing the Problematic: What Does it Mean to Be a Latino/a Critic?” A concluding section contains separate chapters by Segovia and Lozada reflecting on the viewpoints presented and future possibilities. Due to the large number of essays in this work, the engagement in this review will necessarily be selective.

Segovia’s introduction helpfully situates the vision for the volume as a whole. He defines and describes the relationships between the fields of racial-ethnic studies, biblical studies, and minority biblical criticism. Specifically, he intends to, “analyze the vision of the critical task espoused by Latino/a critics,” and focus on the oft-neglected topic of, “the mission of the critic as critic” (p. 2). This is followed by a summary of recent work in Latino/a biblical studies, with particular attention to the nature of the critical task and the social/cultural location of the critic.

From an evangelical perspective, one of the most challenging yet revealing essays is the contribution by Hector Avalos, “Rethinking Latino Hermeneutics: An Atheist Perspective.” Avalos, who is also the author of a book entitled *The End of Biblical Studies* (Prometheus, 2007) bluntly opens with the assertion that his lack of religious belief has a far stronger bearing on his scholarship than his Mexican ethnicity and that he sees the majority of biblical scholarship—both in its confessional and non-confessional forms—as simply trying to make a case for the continued cultural relevance of the Bible in the current age when it is, in Avalos’s perspective, a morally regressive text. He chastises Latino critics who, in the name of “liberation,” have ironically failed to liberate themselves and their audiences from Christian scripture. Two hermeneutical strategies are isolated and condemned: “Representativism,” which arbitrarily picks one biblical viewpoint as praiseworthy while ignoring more difficult passages (his illustration here is the tendency to make the social justice of Deuteronomy normative while ignoring its genocide), and “Reinterpretation,” which freely ignores the historical meaning of the text. He then surveys the work of liberationist theologians and finds it guilty of relying heavily on these strategies. While many “minority” scholars appreciate the ethical perspective of the prophets, Avalos reads them as being hegemonic opponents of religious pluralism and unsuitable for today’s world; in fact, he sees this as being as equally incoherent as using Cortés as a “paradigm of liberation” (p. 69). He ends the essay by revealing that he is against all “religious empires” (p. 70). While

Avalos's blunt unbelief puts him in the minority in this volume, the reminder that Christians face a context in which they are seen not only as metaphysically incorrect but also totalitarian and bigoted is not out of place. Furthermore, it clearly shows the ineffectiveness of apologetic readings of Scripture that simply pass over its uncomfortable aspects.

A different kind of highlight is found in the more overtly exegetical essay of Aída Besançon Spencer, "Position Reversal and Hope for the Oppressed." Spencer reads Mary's Magnificat in Luke 1:46–55 as teaching "position reversal" and the "liberation of the oppressed" (pp. 95–96). She finds this emphasis on God's deliverance of the humble throughout the rest of the New Testament. Thus, Hispanic women can trust that God will elevate and recognize them. Similarly innovative in its engagement with the biblical text is Cristina García-Alfonso's "Latino/a Biblical Hermeneutics: Problematic, Objectives, Strategies," which begins with reality of *resolviendo*, which is the situation of economic desperation faced by many Cubans, in which various forms of theft and sometimes prostitution are necessary for survival. With this setting in mind, she reads the story of Rahab as portraying a woman who uses her unique outsider status to her advantage and finds crafty ways to survive. It thus functions as a paradigm for "women's power to be born from within the same oppressive system where they find themselves" (p. 163).

Elsewhere, other voices insightfully articulate the multifaceted nature of Latino/a identity. Lozada's "Toward Latino/a Biblical Studies: Foregrounding Identities and Transforming Communities" asserts that the overriding similarity of all those falling under the Latino/a label is the experience of being an "Other" in the United States (p. 189), a trait that still allows for some degree of uniqueness for both different groups of South American heritage and individuals. Perhaps most constructive of all is Rubén Muñoz-Larrondo, who in his "Toward a Latino/a Vision/Optic for Biblical Hermeneutics" provides a five-point framework for a Latino/a hermeneutic: "A Christian Identity beyond Nationalistic Overtones," "A Message of Hope and Liberation from Faith to Faith," "A Balance between Biblical Paradigms and Popular Beliefs," "Revising the Structures of Power in Our Traditions," and "From the Theoretical and Scholarly to the Practical and the Vernacular" (pp. 205–15). More autobiographical but no less powerful is the contribution of Timothy J. Sandoval. His essay, "How Did You Get to Be a Latino Biblical Scholar? Scholarly Identity and Biblical Scholarship" simply uses most of its space to unpack the various struggles he encountered relating to his ethnicity from primary school through doctoral studies.

In the concluding section, Segovia first gives a short evaluation of and response to each of the essays before synthesizing their major trends in the areas of theology, methodology, and social stance. Finally, Lozada asserts that “Latino/a biblical interpretation is a process of becoming” (p. 365) and commends the various contributors for being able to find commonality despite their diversity. He also notes that the nature of what Latino/a criticism *is* can be described as fluidly existing between being and practice. Lozada concludes by calling upon scholars to focus on their discipline constructs knowledge, and to explore the intersectionality of race, ethnicity, and sexuality.

In conclusion, *Latino/a Biblical Hermeneutics* is a cohesive assortment of essays that function well together. Despite some minor shortcomings, such as the lack of indices at the back and additional subgroupings for the chapters, the collection as a whole does an admirable job of making the reader aware of not only the currents trends in Latino/a biblical interpretation but also the variegated nature of what it means to identify as a Latino/a critic.

DAVID J. FULLER  
McMaster Divinity College

*Joel* by Christopher R. Seitz. International Theological Commentary. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016. 256 pp., US \$94.00, hardcover.

This theological commentary is the first OT volume (a two-volume commentary on Revelation already exists) in a new series published by Bloomsbury, aimed to serve as a companion series to the well-known ICC (International Critical Commentary) published by the same publishing house. It aims to “offers a verse by verse interpretation of the Bible that addresses its theological subject matter, gleaning the best from both the classical and modern commentary traditions and showing the doctrinal development of Scriptural truths” (<http://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/series/tt-clark-international-theological-commentary/>). The name of the series is, however, unfortunate as it is easy to mix it up with the commentary series with the same name published by Eerdmans. This aside, this is a very good volume which, standing squarely in the Christian tradition, highlights the theological value of the book of Joel.

Seitz’s commentary falls into two main parts. The first part, constituting nearly half the book, contains introductory matters. At times this part reads more like reflections on matters pertinent to the interpretation of prophetic books in general and Joel in particular, an

observation that is not meant as a critique. Seitz begins by discussing matters of diachrony and synchrony. His theological reading is based on the final form of the text yet takes into account the historical processes that caused this form to come into being. Seitz further makes clear that his present commentary, although it will draw inspiration from research on the Book of the Twelve, will nevertheless “guard the integrity” of Joel as a specific witness in being an individual book and aim to make its own unique message heard. How, for example, is the motif of the “Day of the Lord” used in Joel and how does this use differ from the way that the same motif is employed elsewhere in the Twelve?

In parallel, Seitz explores what it means to read Joel canonically, paying attention to how Joel’s message fits in with that of the surrounding books, read in their final form, but also resisting some of the tenets of pre-critical interpretations. Is it, for instance, possible to read Joel in its current position in the Twelve yet at the same time acknowledge its likely post-monarchic date of composition?

Continuing on this point, Seitz explores the verbal and thematic links between Joel and other prophetic books which, according to him, reveal a pattern of mutual influence in the Twelve. For Seitz, Joel’s dependence on earlier prophecy suggests a continuum where Joel is part of a long line of prophecies that seek to become fulfilled. Again, using the Day of the Lord as an example, Seitz highlights how Joel’s adaptation of earlier theological/literary motifs contributes to its overarching message.

Speaking about the inner coherence of the book, Seitz offers a brief history of research. His survey touches both on those scholars who uphold unity and those who see Joel as consisting of two or even three parts, as well as those who perceive this gradual growth as having taken place within the context of wider redactions which encompass the gradually expanding Book of the Twelve. Although Seitz neither denies nor confirms any of these theories, for him the canonical shape of Joel takes precedence, as he regards 2:17–20 as its intended centre piece.

Turning from book to prophet, Seitz notes the absence of a call narrative as well as the changing temporal landscape of the book. Seitz argues that it is his *book* that prophesies, a feature underlined by the author’s anonymity and by the absence of any kind of historical information about him. These aspects lend a sense of timelessness to the book which enables it to communicate to future generations.

Seitz also discusses the message and purpose of Joel. He argues that the book has been composed to respond to the scenario set out at the end of Hosea, namely the invitation to repent and to walk in God’s ways.

Seitz further analyses the structure of Joel and how the various parts of the book interact with and complement one another. There are, for instance, parallels between the structure and message of Joel and that of Malachi in its use of the motif of a messenger who precedes the future Day of the Lord. Seitz likewise explores the interaction between Joel and Zephaniah and between Joel and Jonah.

The substantial penultimate chapter in the introduction is devoted to the Day of the Lord. Seitz discusses the distinctive features of this motif as it appears in Joel, up and against its appearance in the surrounding texts (e.g., Amos, Isaiah). Seitz identifies five distinctive features that are unique to the portrayal of the Day of the Lord in Joel: its specific outcome, its links with the threat of locust, the possibility of survival of a whole generation, its present reality, and its connection to God's compassion.

The final chapter places the book of Joel in its Christian context and in dialogue with the message of Jesus's death and resurrection as celebrated at Easter. Seitz emphasizes the importance of Joel's message in the celebration of Ash Wednesday in many church traditions. Notably, Cranmer's Book of Common Prayer incorporates the text of Joel 2:1–2, 12–17 in its liturgy on that day. Seitz also touches upon Joel's liturgical position as the Haftarah reading on the Sabbath immediately preceding Yom Kippur. Each in its own way, both traditions serve, to cite Seitz, "to bring the sinful human soul straight into the vortex of judgment—the confrontation with God's righteousness through all time—and plot the course of forgiveness and new life" (p. 93). The introduction ends with a relatively short bibliography. Throughout the commentary Seitz is strongly indebted to the work of Jörg Jeremias.

Turning to the commentary proper, Seitz begins by citing the NRSV translation of Joel for easy reference. He then proceeds systematically through the text. There are few textual notes and any discussions of individual Hebrew words take place in the footnotes. There is also no recurring structure to the comments. Rather, as in the introduction, Seitz comments on the text with focus on its literary structure and its theology, as well as on its dialogue with other (prophetic) texts. His interpretations are centred on comparisons between Joel's message and that of these other texts, with the explicit aim of establishing the uniqueness of the former. Further, how does the theology of the book contribute to Christian theology?

In sum, Seitz's commentary offers a distinct theological perspective and it demands the reader's full attention. At times it reads more like a contemplation on the theological message of Joel than as a commentary, yet this style is surely intentional and contributes to its unique perspective. As a result, this commentary does not fill all the needs of an

exegete but it certainly carries out the aims of the commentary series, namely to serve as a companion to the ICC. Together, the two make a whole.

LENA-SOFIA TIEMEYER  
University of Aberdeen

*Was There a Wisdom Tradition? New Prospects in Israelite Wisdom Studies* edited by Mark R. Sneed. SBL Ancient Israel and Its Literature 23. Atlanta: SBL, 2015, xi + 325 pp., \$40.95, softcover.

*Was There a Wisdom Tradition?*, edited by Mark R. Sneed (Professor of Bible at Lubbock Christian University), sets out to explore the title question, which has sparked significant scholarly interaction since Sneed provocatively posed it in an eponymous 2011 article (Mark R. Sneed, “Was There a Wisdom Tradition?” *CBQ* 73 [2011]: 50–71). In the introduction Sneed sketches “the paradigm position in Hebrew Bible studies concerning the nature of the wisdom corpus” (p. 1). In short, wisdom literature was thought to represent the distinct tradition and worldview of the scribes as opposed to the covenantal traditions of the prophets and priests preserved in the Hebrew Bible more broadly. Though this position has been dominant for some decades in biblical studies, it was not always so and has recently come under harsh critique. The twelve essays in this volume represent “the most recent reassessment of the prevailing consensus” (p. 2). The discussion centers around questions of identity, genre, and setting for the so-called wisdom texts: Was there a wisdom tradition? What was distinctive about it? How does it relate to Israel’s scriptures more broadly?

The book is divided into three parts. Part 1, “Genre Theory and the Wisdom Tradition” contains seven essays; Part 2, “Case Studies,” contains 4; and the third part, “Ancient Near Eastern Comparison,” contains just one. In the introduction Sneed provides a valuable summary of each essay in the volume, so I will not reduplicate that work here—suffice to lay out the broad shape of the collection and make some comments on the conversation as a whole.

The contributors approach the discussion from all angles. Some, like Sneed, Kynes, and Weeks are keen to overthrow the “paradigm position,” going so far as to deny that wisdom literature is a genre (Sneed) or even that it is a useful or meaningful term at all (Kynes).

Weeks likewise believes the discussion of genre theory and wisdom to be methodologically narrow-minded and constrained by form criticism's sometimes procrustean bed. While not wanting to minimize their differences, these three essentially want a thorough reworking of the way biblical scholars think about so-called wisdom literature in light of a better engagement with genre theory and, dare we say, clearer thinking overall.

The majority of essays, however, call more for the remodeling of the paradigm position than for its demolition. Several of the essays represent fresh attempts to define or delimit the genre of wisdom literature. Schellenberg renovates the idea of worldview, Miller seeks to establish *gestalt* features for wisdom, and Dell frames a generic definition based on the concept of family resemblance. The problems with genre identification become more apparent as the approaches of the contributors diverge. Wisdom is clearly not a genre in the way that the lament psalm or the judgement oracle are genres; however, the very discussion itself suggests that there is something that holds Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes together as distinct from the rest of the Hebrew Bible. If not, then why are we talking about them?

Michael V. Fox's essay, "Three Theses on Wisdom," emerges as a helpful mediating position. His three theses are simply stated: "(1) there was no wisdom school; and (2) the authors of wisdom literature were not a distinct faction; but (3) there was a wisdom literature" (p. 69). Fox argues that the "ethical instruction" was indeed a real genre in the ancient world (p. 81). (Later in the collection he is supported by Shupak's formidable essay, "The Contribution of Egyptian Wisdom to the Study of Biblical Wisdom Literature," in which she establishes this point for Egyptian literature beyond any doubt). "Wisdom literature, in distinction," Fox continues, "is a heuristic genre, a construct of modern scholarship" (p. 82). Fox offers fuzzy set theory as a helpful framework and concludes that literary works can participate in multiple genres and to varying degrees (p. 78). If we ceased to talk about Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes together in one breath (הכל) then what *would* we do with them?

From the collection as a whole, intertextuality emerges as a promising path forward. Kynes closes his essay (the first in the book, and easily the most radical) with a call for "a more consciously intertextual approach" (p. 33). Several articles pick up this call in interesting ways. Heckl's main argument in his essay, "How Wisdom Texts Became Part of the Canon of the Hebrew Bible," is that intertextuality between the Job frame narrative, Proverbs 1–9, and Deuteronomistic texts is so pervasive that one cannot help but conclude that the redactors of Job and Proverbs were consciously using the authority of Deuteronomy to bring

older wisdom poetry into the canon. In so doing they brought wisdom literature into new literary and theological contexts. Hamilton's essay, "Riddles and Parables, Traditions and Texts: Ezekielian Perspectives on Israelite Wisdom Traditions," exemplifies this brilliantly. Through careful study of intertextuality in Ezekiel, Hamilton shows that scribes could rework multiple genres and forms toward complex purposes (pp. 256–58). He thinks wisdom texts do "reflect a tradition in a loose sense" (245), but reconsidering "how ideas moved about in ancient Israel" may help "to reframe our notions of wisdom traditions" (pp. 257–58). Even Teva Forti, whom Sneed says affirms "the paradigmatic position without modification" (p. 3), advocates for an intertextual approach to determining wisdom psalms (pp. 210, 215). Thus, from the most radical to the most conservative, these scholars agree that a more rigorous engagement with intertextuality is crucial to understanding Israel's wisdom tradition or lack thereof.

From an editing standpoint, the essays in the volume could have clustered around the question posed in the title more tightly. Some of the essays in parts 2 and 3 seem to address it as an afterthought. The most successful pieces framed their studies at the outset as genuine test cases of Sneed's thesis and actually moved the discussion forward by suggesting paths for future investigation (e.g., Hamilton). More such essays would have made the volume more constructive. Nevertheless, *Was There a Wisdom Tradition?* will be of interest to anyone working on genre studies in biblical texts and must be consulted by anyone whose work relates to the wisdom literature of ancient Israel. For students of biblical wisdom, this volume is an essential window on the current state of the scholarly debate.

ALEXANDER T. KIRK  
Training Leaders International and  
The University of Durham

*The Historical Writings: Introducing Israel's Historical Literature* by Mark A. Leuchter and David T. Lamb. Introducing Israel's Scriptures. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016. 606 pp., US \$49.00, ebook.

Works on the historical books are numerous. Contributors are, therefore, forced to enter a crowded room in the building of Old Testament studies. Whether because of archaeological, historical, or literary reasons, there is

a cacophony of voices, proving it difficult to stand out amidst the commotion. Nevertheless, Leuchter and Lamb may not struggle to find a place of prominence in that room. Their new publication represents an up-to-date and insightful introduction to the historical books that also transcends the expectations of the genre to offer a section of commentary for Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles (Ruth and Esther are omitted from the work because of a perceived difference in genre). The result is a resource that is not only current but also provides a catalyst for subsequent discussion.

Each chapter exhibits the same structure, resulting in a very predictable but accessible presentation. In each case a brief introduction gives way to sections devoted to literary issues, historical issues, theological themes, and bibliographic data. The penultimate section of each chapter is a brief commentary. It does not succumb to meticulous details, but rather it walks the reader through the content of each book in broad strokes while maintaining a concern for the whole. In my opinion, the commentary section constitutes the definitive characteristic and is arguably the work's most valuable asset.

There are also recurring side-bars devoted to a number of popular topics. For example, Leuchter and Lamb tackle the perpetual question, "Did David kill Goliath?" (Kindle ebook loc. 3390–3400). While the authors ultimately doubt it, instead yielding to a perceived monarchical convention of taking credit for the feats of others for the sake of their reputation among the populace, evangelicals should not allow individual disagreements to prevent their use of this resource. Leuchter and Lamb do many things well. For instance, their discussion of the diachronic issues associated with Samuel properly holds in balance synchronic concerns. Thus, they can state eruditely, "The shapers of the book of Samuel neither attempted to idealize the era that saw the rise of kingship nor did they attempt to vilify it—even if the sources they received were concerned for such purposes" (loc. 3328). These are good points, as Samuel's history of development is rich and complicated. That the development of Samuel was affected by the socio-historical developments of the community, theological discourse should be wedded with literary-critical and socio-historical discourse.

As for the ever-critical distinction between history and historiography, Leuchter and Lamb do well to discuss it. For the authors, history is the record, or memory, of the events of the past (loc. 259) whereas historiography is the genre that molds the memories into a narrative and projects a specific point or value (loc. 288). In particular, their tenets of historiography—being rooted in a literary endeavor and a desire to communicate a certain point or points—are laudable. Yet the lacuna about accuracy is significant. Yes, history writing is literature that

has an “agenda,” but the absence of an explicit concern for accuracy destroys the quintessential barrier between historiography and fiction. While the nuances of the term “accuracy” are a debate in itself, this issue for evangelicals cannot be overstated. Consequently, if there was a preliminary section that deserved a more robust discussion, it was this one. The debate over the dynamics of history writing is fierce, but if one’s exposure to the discussion was solely based on this resource, one may come away with a different, and inaccurate, impression of the debate.

Another thought provoking section discusses the interaction between author and audience (loc. 346–405). Leuchter and Lamb detail historical and socio-economic realities that affect the composition and development of ancient literature. In the end, Leuchter and Lamb paint a picture that reconstructs Israelite culture as moving from orally preserving their authoritative traditions to a written medium. As a result of this process, its literature manifests certain dynamics, and such dynamics are critical for forming a stance on Scripture’s authority and the essence of God’s revelation. In particular, one’s view and discussion of Scripture must accommodate the reality that God’s people periodically revisited their memories (oral and written) in light of new experiences, thereby establishing a mutual interaction between text, author, and audience. “This means that the authors of these later texts were very much a part of the audience for them, and wrote their works to highlight, promote, and sometimes argue against the ideas that these older texts contained” (loc. 384–94). Applied to the historical books, therefore, this shows that Israel’s national identity throughout the Iron Age and into the Persian Period was not rigid or static. Rather, it was malleable and responded to the revelations of God through the contours of history. Such awareness permits a deeper appreciation for the complexities of the canonization process, and it forms the foundation for constructing a theology of the human/divine interaction in the medium of history.

Other noteworthy features of this work include an ability to introduce complex debates without overwhelming the reader with cumbersome details. For example, Leuchter and Lamb do not try to solve the debate of the Deuteronomistic History, a literary-critical issue perpetually connected to the historical books. Without crippling the reader with Noth’s hypothesis, its subsequent variations, or conflicting schools of interpretation, they instead briefly introduce the topic in the opening chapter and discuss details as necessary in conjunction with each respective book. As another example, the frustrating historical questions of Israel’s emergence, the archaeology of the settlement period, and

Ezra's historical relationship with Nehemiah and the Persian Empire are discussed in a way that allows the reader to understand the complexities of the debates without being suffocated by them.

Leuchter and Lamb also make repeated references to Old Testament books outside of the historical books, and when this characteristic is considered along with the cross references between the books within the historical corpus, the reader cannot help but appreciate the literary, theological, and historical relationships that connect the Old Testament. The authors ponder the implications of the Chronicler's use of Jeremiah and Isaiah while ignoring Ezekiel. They also suggest the importance of being aware of Haggai and Zechariah for understanding the opening chapters of Ezra. These and other examples construct the impression that the historical books should be understood as an important thread within the biblical meta-narrative that traces ancient Israel through its Formative Age, Golden Age, Dark Age, and Restoration. These are not individual accounts read in isolation from each other and/or the Old Testament as a whole.

If one were offering a course on the historical books as a corpus, then I would certainly recommend this book as a chief text. At the very least it should find its place on any recommended reading list. For courses that focus upon only a particular book, this work will likely only function as a dialogue partner for certain issues and interpretive conclusions. Yet for those who specialize in the historical books, this resource deserves familiarization.

DAVID B. SCHREINER  
Wesley Biblical Seminary

*Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord? A Biblical Theology of the Book of Leviticus* by L. Michael Morales. New Studies in Biblical Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2015, 349 pp., \$27.00, softcover.

Framing the narrative of the book of Leviticus, the gate liturgy asks the question, "Who shall ascend the mountain of the Lord?" and it drives "*the drama and plot of the Bible*" (p. 304, emphasis original). This gate liturgy narrates not only who may enter God's presence but also how that entrance is made possible. So writes L. Michael Morales in his insightful book, *Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord? A Biblical Theology of the Book of Leviticus*, one of the latest additions to the New Studies in Biblical Theology series. Morales is Professor of Biblical Studies at

Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary. Morales carefully shows how the people of God come to dwell in the house of God not only in the covenantal context of Leviticus but also in light of the new covenant reality of Christ and the church. Through the dramatic unfolding of the book of Leviticus, he explains how the *mishkan* (house) of the Lord becomes the '*ohel mo'ed* (tent of meeting) with the people (p. 110). Or to put it another way, Morales seeks to describe how the revelation of who God is becomes experiential in the lives of his people, namely through the Levitical cult.

Morales spends about one third of the book laying the foundation for Leviticus by describing its connection to Genesis and Exodus. He claims that Leviticus contains the heart of the Pentateuch's theology, indicated by its central position in the Pentateuch. For Morales, the Pentateuchal heart is that the Lord intends to dwell among his sacred people in sacred space at sacred times (p. 53). As he introduces fundamental concepts related to ancient Near Eastern cosmology, he explains that Eden was understood to be the mountain of God, with all life and communion with God governed by one's proximity to the mountain summit. This communion was lost in the Fall, as Adam and Eve were cast down from and out of the mountain-garden (p. 240). Because exile is a major motif in Israel's history, the rest of Genesis and all of Exodus sets the stage for a God-ordained house (the tabernacle/temple) where he will once again dwell with his people (Israel).

When Morales turns to the New Testament, he navigates the complexities of fulfillment and covenant theology with remarkable skill. He shows that Jesus is the new, resurrected Israel and the fulfillment of the Levitical cultus. So with the gate liturgy in mind, Jesus Christ is uniquely qualified to ascend the mountain of the Lord. Further, the church—the house and household of God—is made holy by being united to Christ and is able to ascend as well (p. 232). Looking forward to the eschatological hope of the New Jerusalem, the church's final Sabbath rest is atop the heavenly Mount Zion enjoying perfect and eternal union with the Lord.

One of Morales's numerous insights pertains to the narrative climax of the creation account. Contrary to some, he asserts that the creation of mankind on the sixth day was *not* the climax of the creation narrative; rather, the consecration of the Sabbath day marks the dramatic height of God's creative activity (p. 46). This heightened emphasis on Sabbath communion with God shapes Morales's understanding of the goal of the Levitical cult.

Perhaps the greatest strength of Morales's work is his emphasis on the connection between the cultus and the community it creates—namely, the cultic liturgy shapes the covenantal community. Rooted in the creation account, mankind exists to enjoy Sabbath-day communion with the Lord, so all of the ceremonial instructions and cleanliness laws are intended to create the kind of community that is able to “[bask] in the renewing light of God's Sabbath-day presence” (p. 200). God's purpose in creation was again being realized among the Israelites through the cultus and is ultimately fulfilled in the new covenant as Jesus's incarnation establishes him as the *mishkan* of God and his resurrection transforms him into the ‘*ohel mo'ed* of God. In this way, Jesus fulfills the Levitical cult and ushers God's people into the eschatological Sabbath-day worship (p. 263).

One question that goes unaddressed is that of a center in biblical theology. Morales states that “the history of redemption, along with all of its narrative drama, is driven by one theological theme: *YHWH's opening a way for humanity to dwell in the divine presence*” (pp. 254–55, emphasis original). In another place he writes, “Entering the house of God to dwell with God, beholding, glorifying and enjoying him eternally . . . is *the* story of the Bible, the plot that makes sense of the various acts, persons and places of its pages, the deepest context for its doctrines” (p. 21, emphasis original). Considering the nature of the New Studies in Biblical Theology series, Morales's comments are striking. Though many works of biblical theology may claim that their theme is the central, fundamental, meta-theme that explains all others, the very reality of those perspectives testifies to a multifaceted nature of biblical theology. Morales does not seem to be deterred by contrasting perspectives, nor does he defend his approach. Regardless of whether or not the reader agrees with the author's method and conclusion, perhaps a methodological statement with reference to other works of biblical theology would help to place this book in its context among other biblical theologies.

Morales has done a great service for the church by providing an accessible theology of Leviticus that removes much of the intimidating mystique surrounding Israel's tabernacle and sacrificial administration. Not only that, Morales has also made a significant contribution to Pentateuchal studies as he readdresses the significance of the cosmological background to Israel's cultic system. The final result is a beautiful, literary-canonical reading of Leviticus that is sure to provide the church with a theological entry into the book of Leviticus. From his insightful review of Genesis and Exodus, which puts Leviticus in its canonical context, to his fresh and profound retelling of the drama of Leviticus, one inevitable effect of this book is that it will certainly make

the reader open a Bible to read and re-read the Old Testament with fresh perspective. For that reason, Morales is to be commended for his stimulating work.

GARRETT M. WALDEN  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology* by Eric D. Reymond. Society of Biblical Literature Resources For Biblical Study 76. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014, xvii + 309 pp., US \$37.95, softcover.

In this rewarding book, Eric Reymond has provided an excellent, must-read reference for both scholars and students working on Qumran Hebrew (QH), or those simply desiring to understand the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls better. The usefulness of the volume partly derives from its origin in an attempt to provide students at Yale Divinity School with an introduction to QH (p. 1). It is not intended to be a comprehensive grammar of QH, but aims in particular to fill in gaps in the standard works of Abegg and Qimron (p. 4).

After a brief “Introduction” (pp. 1–4), and short chapters outlining the “Corpus” (pp. 5–11) to be studied (more up-to-date than, e.g., Qimron’s much older work), and some “General Remarks” (pp. 13–21), in which Reymond sets out some of the assumptions he is making about QH, the book settles into its three major chapters. These are on “Orthography” (pp. 23–63), “Phonetics and Phonology” (pp. 65–150), and “Morphology” (pp. 151–224). Finally, there is a chapter of “Conclusions” (pp. 225–34). There are also indexes of sources, words, and authors. There is no subject index, but the table of contents gives a guide to the main areas.

It is not possible to give a sense of all the riches of Reymond’s analysis. Each chapter contains a wealth of observations and data that will reward close reading. It is not really a book best read from cover to cover. More helpful would be to use the book as a reference tool while working through specific texts. A reader could, for example, use the index of sources to follow through the comments on one particular text, with the option of reading further on any of the issues that come up in that context in the book. Nevertheless, I will note here two of the sections that I most appreciated. Something of a surprise (because it is

not done often enough) was the amount of attention given to scribal mistakes (pp. 23–35) which, of course, are an important phenomenon in ancient texts. This section is highly recommended not only for those interested in QH, but also for scholars working on the textual transmission of any ancient Hebrew texts, as it is full not only of data, but also peppered with useful methodological observations. I will also mention a magnificent section on the question of the “Weakening of Gutturals” (pp. 71–114!), which makes an important contribution to the study of QH, concluding that “the gutturals had ‘weakened,’ but they had not all become weak to the same degree” (pp. 111–12), having provided the details for this much more nuanced approach to the question than in previous presentations.

Among the other strengths of the approach in the book, in fact, are the various other areas where Reymond presents a more nuanced view on some issues than earlier introductions to QH. For example, Reymond is sensitive to the variety of types of Hebrew in the Scrolls (e.g., pp. 1, 35, 112). He knows that “a significant minority of the texts do not actually exhibit the most distinctive linguistic traits” (p. 6), and that mixtures of different forms occur in the same texts (p. 7). I have suggested (in Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 2008, 1:264) that we could speak of several “Qumran Hebrews.” Importantly, Reymond is aware that far from being the definition of QH, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is in many respects not typical (p. 11). Reymond is also aware of the complexity of the concept “biblical scrolls” when talking about Qumran (pp. 5–6). In general, Reymond demonstrates both the ability to make sensible judgements when presented with a range of interpretive options from older scholarship, and an incisive mind that often suggests a way forward in a number of areas of dispute.

As mentioned, Reymond makes it clear that this is not an attempt at a comprehensive work on QH. This is notable in regards not only to the subjects treated (e.g., unlike Qimron’s book, there is no section on syntax), but also in the references. It presents a useful summary of and interaction with major publications in the field by scholars such as Abegg, Kutscher, and Qimron. This is only right. Beyond the standard works, however, the coverage of scholarship is patchy. I, of course, did the common scholarly thing and checked where my own publications are referenced, and so I use my own work on the language of the Scrolls as an illustration of further scholarship that could have been referenced. Although three works of mine are referenced in the bibliography, only one of these actually features in the index of authors, a page where it is referenced as “see also.” Although cited in the bibliography, my article on the language of Peshar Habakkuk (“Late Biblical Hebrew and the Qumran Peshar Habakkuk,” 2008) is not actually referenced, even in

sections where issues dealt with in it are discussed, such as the issue of “imitation” of biblical language (p. 16). Other publications are not mentioned at all. For example, Reymond discusses the language of the Song of Songs scroll 4QCant<sup>b</sup> on a number of occasions (e.g., pp. 11, 66, 67), but does not seem to know my article on it (“Notes on the Language of 4QCant<sup>b</sup>,” 2001). So too, there is no reference to the chapter on QH in *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (2008), which leads me on to my last point.

This book, with all its strengths, led me to muse on how research on QH now finds itself in an interesting situation, since the main presuppositions of the dominant framework in which QH has heretofore been understood have been, to my mind, demonstrated to be false. The understanding of Hebrew, coming from the nineteenth century, was that it developed in a more or less linear fashion from its golden age in the pre-exilic period in books like Samuel, to the deteriorated Hebrew of the silver post-exilic age found in Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles (Late Biblical Hebrew: LBH), which in turn developed into post-biblical Mishnaic Hebrew (via the very late language of Song of Songs and Qoheleth). Because of its date, QH was simply assumed to be a later development along this path, and hence is regularly described as a development of LBH. In fact, if a scientific theory can be falsified by the utter failure of predictions based on it, the discovery of QH should have been the death of this chronological model. QH is much more “classical” than the five LBH books, and no QH text so far examined is in the LBH style (see, inter alia, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*). Scholars avoided this obvious conclusion by pointing to examples of LBH linguistic features in QH, but since every type of ancient Hebrew (including pre-exilic Hebrew inscriptions or “early” biblical texts) has a few of these features, the mere appearance of these features is beside the point, which is rather the concentration or “accumulation” of them in the five LBH books. The fact that Qumran is chronologically late, but not in the same type of Hebrew as the LBH books, allows us to realize that there is plenty of evidence of post-exilic Hebrew that is not LBH, whether in the Bible, like Joel, Haggai or Zechariah, or outside the Hebrew Bible, like the early second century BCE Ben Sira (see e.g., my “What Do We Actually Know about Ancient Hebrew,” 2013, 21–24). The five “LBH” books are the odd ones out, not the norm for post-exilic Hebrew.

In fact, we do not even have enough evidence to distinguish post-exilic Hebrew from pre-exilic Hebrew. Although this has been confidently done, it has been based on the presupposition that the language of the Masoretic Text (MT) of the Bible represents in detail the

language of the original authors of each of the books, a view in direct opposition to all mainstream scholarship on the history of the biblical text (Rezetko and Young, *Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, 2014). Evangelical authors have been prominent among those to acknowledge linguistic updating, for example Richard Hess's opinion that it "is both reasonable and likely" that "the Pentateuch, though written earlier, was edited or updated at a later period so that its language would conform to that of the remainder of the Bible" (Hess, "Language of the Pentateuch" in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, 494). Similarly, Alan Millard notes that "scribes could substitute current words for older ones, or replace one with another for now imperceptible reasons, practices attested in manuscripts from other Ancient Near Eastern societies" (in a review of my *Biblical Hebrew, Studies in Chronology and Typology*, 127). Even just a consideration of parallel texts in the MT shows that ancient authors and scribes did not consider that the distinctive details of the language of the biblical books (as opposed to basic, common grammatical forms) were important to reproduce exactly. We have, therefore, no reason to expect that any of the linguistic details in any of the late manuscripts of the Bible in our possession was written by original authors. The MT, like all our biblical texts, contains a mixture of older and later linguistic forms, but we do not have enough dated evidence for ancient Hebrew to tell which is which.

So where does Reymond's book fit in all this? On the one hand, it is clear that he is not out to dispute with the standard approach so far in this sub-field, and he makes the specific link with LBH (e.g., pp. 13, 18). Every so often he dutifully points to linguistic forms which he identifies as LBH (e.g., pp. 38, 68–69, 119). These seem to be occasional times when the evidence fits that presupposition, and no chronological comment is made when the data do not fit the theory (e.g., p. 123). Even then, many of the LBH links are not very convincing to someone who does not share those presuppositions, and in Reymond's work his references to LBH forms are usually peripheral to his main point, rather than forming the key to their interpretation. Furthermore, a major advance on some other work is that he refers to the language of the MT Bible as simply that "the MT" (e.g. p. 3) not, as was commonly done by scholars such as Kutscher, "the Bible," who thus betrayed his assumption that the MT was the original text of the Hebrew Bible (I did, however, notice a slip on p. 125). This means that Reymond generally frames his discussion as a comparison between the form of language in the MT and that in various scrolls, which is a more neutral approach which allows his work to be used in different frameworks (pp. 6–7).

In summary, Reymond's book is very helpful and an essential read for anyone interested in ancient Hebrew. Reymond's ability to think

and write clearly makes me hope that he will one day produce a second, more comprehensive edition of the book as an even better reference guide to QH as a whole. I also hope that QH scholarship can develop away from its now outdated chronological framework, although that is part of the long road ahead for all scholars of ancient Hebrew, as we take seriously the current state of scholarship on the nature of the manuscript evidence in our possession.

Ian Young  
University of Sydney

## BOOK REVIEW INDEX

- God, His Servant, and the Nations in Isaiah 42:1–9: Biblical Theological Reflections after Brevard S. Childs and Hans Hübner* by Frederik Poulsen  
(Reviewed by L.-S. Tiemeyer) ..... 187
- Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*  
by Jeremy Schipper (Reviewed by C. Barnes) ..... 189
- A Mouth Full of Fire: The Word of God in the Words of Jeremiah*  
by Andrew G. Shead (Reviewed by A. W. Dyck) ..... 192
- The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant c. 8000–332 BCE* by Margreet L. Steiner and Ann E. Killebrew  
(Reviewed by J. Moon) ..... 194
- “YHWH Fights for Them!” The Divine Warrior in the Exodus Narrative* by Charlie Trimm (Reviewed by J. Riley) ..... 196
- Exploring Our Hebraic Heritage: A Christian Theology of Roots and Revival* by Marvin R. Wilson  
(Reviewed by M. A. Hassler) ..... 200
- Dictionary of Daily Life in Biblical & Post-Biblical Antiquity, vol. 1, A–Da* edited by Edwin M. Yamauchi and Marvin R. Wilson (Reviewed by A. M. King) ..... 202
- Eating in Isaiah: Approaching the Role of Food and Drink in Isaiah’s Structure and Message* by Andrew T. Abernethy  
(Reviewed by P. J. Long) ..... 205
- Deuteronomy: One Nation Under God* by George Athas  
(Reviewed by G. Goldsworthy) ..... 208
- “Did I Not Bring Israel Out of Egypt?” Biblical, Archaeological, and Egyptological Perspectives on the Exodus Narratives* edited by James K. Hoffmeier, Alan R. Millard and Gary A. Rendsburg  
(Reviewed by J. Burnett) ..... 210

<i>Latino/a Biblical Hermeneutics: Problematics, Objectives, Strategies</i> edited by Francisco Lozada Jr. and Fernando F. Segovia (Reviewed by D. J. Fuller) .....	212
<i>Joel</i> by Christopher R. Seitz (Reviewed by L.-S. Tiemeyer) .....	215
<i>Was There a Wisdom Tradition? New Prospects in Israelite Wisdom Studies</i> edited by Mark R. Sneed (Reviewed by A. T. Kirk) .....	218
<i>The Historical Writings: Introducing Israel's Historical Literature</i> by Mark A. Leuchter and David T. Lamb (Reviewed by D. B. Schreiner) .....	221
<i>Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord? A Biblical Theology of the Book of Leviticus</i> by L. Michael Morales (Reviewed by G. M. Waldon) .....	223
<i>Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology</i> by Eric D. Reymond (Reviewed by I. Young) .....	226